In 1994 Emanuel Tov and I published the group of four manuscripts known as *4Q Reworked Pentateuch*, 4Q364–367.¹ These manuscripts had originally belonged to the lot assigned to John Strugnell, who subsequently requested that we undertake the publication, and turned over to us his extensive notes on the manuscripts. The identification of a group of six fragments assigned by Strugnell to 4Q365 seemed troublesome to us.² Strugnell had placed these fragments in 4Q365 primarily because they were copied by the same scribe as 4Q365. His paleographical assessment was correct; those six fragments were written in the same hand, using the same orthography, as the rest of 4Q365.³ However, prior to the publication of 4Q365, three of the fragments had already been published by Yigael Yadin, who suggested that they were part of the *Temple Scroll* (in a recension different from 11QTemple⁴). Michael Wise subsequently made a careful study of those three fragments, and concluded that they constituted a source for the Temple Scroll.⁵ Strugnell, however, continued to insist that the
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* It gives me great pleasure to dedicate this article to Eileen Schuller, my companion in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship for many years. When I was in Jerusalem in the early 1990s working on these fragments, Eileen was often there as well, and we spent many pleasant hours discussing our mutual work.


² These fragments were subsequently numbered 4Q365 23, and 4Q365a 1–5.


⁴ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (rev. and eng. ed.; 3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983). The fragments are found in the Supplementary Plates. 4Q365 23 = Plate 40*, 1; 4Q365a 3 = Plate 40*, 2; and 4Q365a 2 = Plate 38*, 5.

fragments belonged to 4Q365; other scholars have since weighed in on either side of the argument.7

Tov and I, upon examining the entire group of six fragments, decided that fragment 23 did indeed belong to 4Q365. This decision was based on both physical and content considerations. As stated above, frg. 23 is copied by the same scribe as the rest of 4Q365. Further, frg. 23 contains a diagonal crease which has the same slant as the crease in 4Q365 12b iii, indicating that they came from the same scroll.8 In terms of the content, frg. 23 opens with Lev 23:42–24:2, followed directly, without a break or other scribal indication, by the addition of at least eight and one half lines of new material. This layout follows the pattern of the rest of 4Q365, that is, Pentateuchal text harmonized, expanded or rearranged for exegetical purposes,9 strengthening the argument that frg. 23 indeed belongs to 4Q365.

The location of the other five fragments was more uncertain. One of the remaining fragments (frg. 2; Yadin, pl. 38*, 5) contains extensive
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6 See Strugnell’s quotation in B.-Z. Wacholder, The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983), 206: “the work to which these fragments belong is not a copy of the ‘Temple Scroll,’ but a Pentateuch with frequent non-biblical additions; whether they are quotations from the Temple Scroll incorporated by that Pentateuch, or vice versa (i.e. bits of an earlier ‘wild’ Pentateuch text used as a source by 11QT) remains to be seen.” Strugnell is also quoted on this topic by F. García Martínez: “My ms. of which only a bit was published by Yadin in his supplementary Volume, is a Middle Hasmonean copy of a wildly aberrant text of the whole Pentateuch containing several non-Biblical additions, some identical with Samaritan Pentateuchal pluses, others unattested elsewhere….It is more likely that these additions were copied by 11QTemple from an expansionist text of the Pentateuch rather than that my biblical scroll incorporated excerpts from the Temple Scroll.” (in “Sources et redaction du Rouleau du Temple,” Henoch 13 [1991]: 219–232, 224).


9 See, e.g., frg. 6a col. ii and 6c. Ibid., 269–272.