**Material Reconstruction of 4Q11 and Its Contribution to the Textual Classification of the Scroll**

Good afternoon. Thank you, Professor Tov, and thank you all for attending today. I see some familiar faces, and it’s a real delight to see you, even virtually.

I would like to thank the Orion Center for supporting my research and for hosting this workshop. I also want to thank to IAA for permission to use photos of 4Q11 for today’s presentation.

I want to acknowledge Drew Longacre for his helpful advice in proceeding with this project, and to Professor Jonathan Ben-Dov and Dr. Ruth Clements for their comments on this paper.

I am also grateful to Einat Tamir, who designed with me the font of the scroll.

I would stress that what I am presenting today is still work in progress, which means that I would be especially delighted to hear your comments and suggestions.

The discovery of the Qumran scrolls in the mid-twentieth century constitutes a turning point in the study of the biblical text. One of the fundamental issues in biblical scrolls scholarship is the textual classification of the scrolls and the manner in which it advantages our understanding of the textual history of the HB.

A manuscript’s classification is made, first and foremost, by its agreement with distinctive features and indicative readings that characterize a specific textual tradition. However, often the key passages that would allow for a distinction between the textual traditions were not preserved. In such cases, we use the influential model for textual analysis of Pentateuchal scrolls developed by Emanuel Tov. According to this model, manuscripts are classified by means of statistical analysis of the number of agreements between each manuscript and each of the known textual traditions. Thus, Pentateuchal scrolls are generally classified as semi and proto-Masoretic, pre-Samaritan, manuscripts that are close to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX and non-aligned texts.

Textual criticism of the HB has been enormously enriched by Tov’s classification model of manuscripts. Nevertheless, this methodology does have limitations. It works well for manuscripts in which it is possible to observe a clear tendency toward agreements between the manuscript and one of the known textual traditions. However, in the many instances in which there is no such tendency, it is impossible to classify a manuscript textually. Moreover, there are some manuscripts defined as semi-Masoretic. These manuscripts show some degree of affinity with the Masoretic tradition, but at the same time also contain significant differences with it. In these cases, it may be that the statistical data are merely the coincidental result of those fragments that were preserved and that the classification of a manuscript would change if additional parts had also been preserved.

For today’s workshop, I am presenting some of my preliminary work to fill this gap, by offering an additional tool for textual classification of biblical manuscripts: material reconstruction. The material reconstruction offers fruitful source of additional information, which is not depend on the preserved text.

In certain instances, when there are differences between the textual versions whose scope is one or more verses – such as editorial additions, large harmonizations, differences in the order of verses, or omitted text – material reconstruction may be able to shed light on the textual tradition to which a manuscript belongs. This is despite the fact that the manuscript was only partially preserved. In these cases, after placing the fragments in their approximated locations prior to the scroll’s disintegration, one can estimate the quantity of text missing between them and even to reconstruct it. The material reconstruction, therefore, is instructive in determining the textual tradition to which the manuscript belongs. I will demonstrate the potential inherent in the material reconstruction of a manuscript for its textual classification by the reconstruction of 4Q11.

(slide-workshop outline) I will begin with a survey of the material evidence of 4Q11. I will then discuss the distinctive differences between the short and long edition of Exodus and the accepted textual affiliation of 4Q11. I will propose a new material reconstruction of three sheets of the scroll and thus provide a material data that will establish the textual classification of the scroll.

4Q11, also named 4QpaleoGenExl, is a fragmentary manuscript that was paleographically dated by McLean (1982, 66) to 100-30 BCE. It was written in paleo-Hebrew script and preserves letters that are probably from the last verse of Genesis and portions of the text of Exodus 1:1 to 36:36. (slide) Fragment 1 preserves right margin and remnants of a seam, the letters במ that are probably remnants of במצרים, the last word of Genesis, followed by three blank lines and the beginning of the book of Exodus. The fragment, as all fragments of this scroll, does not preserve top margin. We should conclude, therefore, that the text of Genesis 50 probably appeared at the beginning of this column. Moreover, the seam indicates that this sheet was not the first sheet of the scroll. Therefore, most scholars believe that this scroll originally consisted of the books of Genesis and Exodus.

Moreover, the scroll possibly contained the entire Pentateuch. Patrick Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith Sanderson consider this possibility (DJD 9, 17) in the introduction to the critical edition of the scroll, published in 1992. Armin Lange (2009, 15) even considers it probable. This suggestion is based on the estimated large amount of text included in each column. The amount of text was calculated based on the small script and the tall columns. No column of 4Q11 has been entirely preserved. The largest fragment of the scroll, fragment 7 (slide), preserves two adjacent columns, one with thirty lines. However, the editors, followed by most of the scholars, suggested that 4Q11 originally contained 55–60 lines per column. This suggestion will be reexamined in the material reconstruction presented today.

(slide- physical description)

4Q11 comprises sixty-four fragments, which preserves 804 partial or complete words. It was characterized by Tov as a de-luxe edition, due to the large writing block, the large bottom margins, the skilled script, and the limited amount of scribal interventions.

The recto surface of the fragments is extremely damaged. The upper leather layer was peeled away in many places, leaving the inner leather layer exposed. Another material feature of this scroll is the deterioration of the ink, probably due to its chemical compound. However, in some places, the letters are legible, even though the ink was not preserved. In these cases, the letters were engraved and recognized by their skeleton. It should be noted that in the critical edition of the scroll, the outlined letters have been transcribed in the same way as those identified by ink.

The critical edition of the scroll includes many unidentified fragments. Only 38 of the 64 fragments are identified. Fragments 39–50 were edited but not identified. Fragments 51–64 were not included in the edition at all, as “they have no decipherable letters or were identified only after the edition was completed” (DJD 9, 50). The advanced images currently available to us allow us to achieve new readings and new fragments identifications and to approve some readings. Drew Longacre successfully identified four of the previously unidentified fragments. On the basis of my research, I propose the identification of three previously unidentified fragments, but there is more work to be done in this area.

Fragment 46, for instance, is a small fragment that includes remnants of two lines of text (slide). The reading of the editors is presented in the slide in front of us. Yet, in the IR image, one can also identify that the last legible letter at the second line as *aleph*. The only possible identification for this combination is Ex 17:4. The identification of fragment 46 is apparently reinforced by near preserved fragments. The last line of the fragments 17+18 preserves Ex 17:3, and the first line of fragment 19 preserves the text of Ex 17:5. Fragment 46 is therefore distantly joined with fragments 17+18 and 19.

Let us look now at fragment 52, which was not edited by the editors (slide). This fragment preserves two lines of text and probably also a bottom margin. The first line is really too poorly preserved to be read. Similarly, the beginning of the second line is too poorly visible in the image to identify confidently. The first legible letter in this line is *mem*, followed by the word לא. The next letter can be read in different ways. In addition, tiny traces of a head of *lamed* are certainly seen at the edge of the line. The only possible readings of these remnants in MT-Ex and SP-Ex are in 22:7 or 22:10, both include the words אם לא שלח ידו.

Reading as many fragments as possible and their identifications contribute to the reconstruction of the scroll's text and a better understanding of its textual state. In addition, it may also contribute to the material reconstruction of the scroll. As we observed in the case of fragment 46, new identifications occasionally point to new joins and thus improve the likelihood of identifying recurring damage patterns.

SP-Ex, when compared to MT, includes seventeen major expansions and a different order of the text in two places (*DJD* 9, 67). (slide) In the main, there are four sets of major expansions and transpositions in SP-Ex: in the plague narrative, in the Sinai theophany, in the tabernacle construction, and in a narrative context, where counterparts are found with Deuteronomy 1 (Kartveit, THB). The pre-Samaritan version of SP-Ex is also known from the DSS: 4Q22, named also 4QplaeoExm, is textually characterized as a pre-Samaritan. 4Q22 preserves most of the major expansions documents on SP-Ex. According to Sanderson’s analysis, 4Q22 shared all the major expansions with SP-Ex, except for the tenth commandment to build an altar on Mount Gerizim in Ex 20:17b. Sanderson’s analysis became the current consensus opinion.

My discussion of 4Q11 will focus on the plague narrative. Ten of the seventeen pluses in the pre-Samaritan tradition appear in the plague narrative:

(1) In instances of a divine command to Moses, such as לך אל פרעה or בוא אל פרעה, MT-Ex does not report of Moses addressing Pharaoh. The pre-Samaritan tradition remedied it by a text copied from the divine command in the preceding verses. It occurs in the first, second, fourth, fifth, and seventh plagues in SP, while in 4Q22 the text of the second plague did not preserve.

(2) In a reverse situation, when Moses speaks to Pharaoh without a divine command to do so, the pre-Samaritan tradition remedied it by copying the message to Pharaoh into the preceding verses as a divine command. This is the case in the eight and tenth plagues in SP, while the tenth plague did not preserve in 4Q22.

There is no sufficient evidence attested on 4Q11 to confidently determine whether this manuscript originally contained the major expansions found in the pre-Samaritan tradition. Only two fragments of the scroll may attest to a major expansion: fragments 6 and 7. However, the question whether the text of these fragments represents the pre-Samaritan expansion or not is not decisive, as the expansions are basically the same text as the successive or preceding verses.

(slide) Fragment 6 is a relatively small fragment that preserves five lines. Most of the ink has been lost from the surface of this fragment. The poor preservation allows reading only some of the traces. In the third line, we can certainly identify the word ערב and the letters *kaf* and *bet*, probably attesting to the word כבד, as well as the word מפני in the fourth line. At a lower level of certainty, we can identify the letters *vav* and *bet* in the second line. According to this, the editors correctly state that fragment 6 preserves the text of Ex 8:19-21. However, the tentative reading of line 2 could represent either Ex 8:19 as in MT or Ex 8:19b as in 4Q22 and SP.

(slide) Fragment 7 preserves two columns with an intercolumnar margins. Column i comprises the text of Ex 9:33-10:5. Lines 10-12 could represent either Ex 10:3-4 as in MT, or alternatively Ex 10:2a-2b as in 4Q22 and SP. 4Q11 agrees with MT reading אליו in line 10, as opposed to אל פרעה in 4Q22 and SP. However, as the editors denote, this agreement does not necessarily indicate that the scroll does not include the large expansion here. 4Q11 could have agree with the pre-Samaritan tradition in including it, while exhibiting a minor variant of אל פרעה.

In one instance of a major feature of the pre-Samaritan tradition, 4Q11 is unambiguous: the incense altar instruction. MT-Ex, as well as LXX, place the altar instruction at the beginning of chapter 30. In contrast, 4Q22 and SP place it after Ex 26:35. 4Q11 agrees with MT and LXX in lacking the passage containing the incense altar instruction after Ex 26:35, as documented in fragment 30ii. Nevertheless, Ex 30 was not preserved at 4Q11. One cannot ascertain whether the scroll originally had the altar instruction at that point, therefore. Moreover, although the placement of altar instruction characterizes the pre-Samaritan tradition, it is one of the two variants of transposition rather than large expansion. The possible agreement of 4Q11 with the pre-Samaritan tradition at this point does not necessarily indicate an agreement on the large pluses as well.

The incidences of agreement between the scroll and each of the known textual traditions of the Pentateuch also do not allow a decisive conclusion regarding its textual classification: (slide) According to Lange (2016a, 24), the scroll reads 25 times with and 25 times against the Masoretic text; 12 times with and 38 times against the Samaritan Pentateuch; 15 times with and 24 against the *Vorlage* of LXX; 12 times its readings are non-aligned. The relatively large number of agreements with MT is overshadowed by a similar number of disagreements with this tradition. We cannot, therefore, point to a textual tendency of 4Q11 agreements with MT, SP, or LXX. On the other hand, the portion of the non-aligned readings is not large enough to classify 4Q11 as a non-aligned manuscript. The statistical tools, therefore, do not contribute to the textual classification of the scroll.

Since the extant remains do not allow a conclusive textual classification of the scroll, its material aspects may provide additional information about the manuscript and its textual context. Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson hypothetically calculated the amount of missing text between fragments. They cautiously concluded that 4Q11 reflects a text of a length similar to that found in MT and does not include typological features of the pre-Samaritan tradition (*DJD* 9, 24). The editors were followed by scholars such as Tov, Lange, Handel, and Longacre. However, Tov (2002, 154) placed 4Q11 in the outer circle of proto-Masoretic texts, due to the textual diversity of 4Q11 from MT revealed at the statistical analysis. Lange considers it a semi- Masoretic manuscript (Lange 2009, 52).

Although the textual classification of 4Q11 is based on probable reconstruction, the editors do not present it in detail. Moreover, they do not proceed with the material reconstruction to the fullest extent warranted by the evidence. Furthermore, to the best of my knowledge, no comprehensive reconstruction of the scroll has been published so far. My research aims to fill this lacuna and offer as comprehensive as possible a new material reconstruction of 4Q11, using innovative digital tools. Thus, one could reevaluate the scroll’s classification, based on the material reconstruction.

Bible scholars have previously used the material features of biblical scrolls to seek clues about the manuscript. Sanderson (1992, *DJD* 9), in her critical edition of 4Q22, used the reconstruction of some columns of the scroll to determine if they contained the SP major expansions. Edward Herbert (1997), in a monograph revisiting his PhD dissertation, offers a detailed reconstruction of 4QSama in order to analyze the textual relationship between 4QSama and Chronicles. Andrew Fincke (2001) also dealt with the reconstruction of 4QSama, comparing it to 4QSamc and the LXX translation of the book. Eva Jain (2014) proposes material reconstructions of three Psalms manuscripts, 11Q5, 4Q83 and 4Q88. She discusses the conclusions stemming from them regarding the textual history of Psalms. An article recently published by Torleif Elgvin (2020) deals with the material reconstruction of Samuel scroll from Cave 1 and the recension of 2Sam that it represents. My research attempts to follow this path, utilizing the added information obtained from material reconstruction of 4Q11 as a means of its textual classification.

At today’s presentation, I will propose a new material reconstruction of three sheets of the scroll. The reconstruction comprises twenty-three fragments, which are approximately one third of the preserved fragments of the scroll. It contains fragments from Gen 50:26 to Ex 17:11. The reconstruction is based on the method developed by Stegemann and further elaborated in later studies. According to Stegemann, repeating patterns of damage, which formed prior to the fragmentation of the scroll, are used to locate fragments within the scroll: the distance between corresponding points of damage is treated as the circumference of the scroll at that particular point.

The reconstruction uses a digital canvas to stimulate the original scroll before its decay. It involves placing scattered fragments in their original position according to preserved material evidence, such as margins, ruling and repeated damage patterns. Once the fragments have been placed on a digital canvas, it will be possible to reconstruct the missing text between them and place accordingly additional fragments. In the following, I will describe the principles underlying the reconstruction.

The first step for the reconstruction begins with a well-established fact – location of the fragments that preserves bottom margins. There are three such large fragments – fragments 10, 19 and 35 (slide). These fragments contain ten to fourteen lines of text. (slide) Fragments 10, 19, and 35 show recurrent pattern damage in the common oblique shape on the right edge of each fragment. The pattern is well recognized when using a digital representation of the borderlines of the fragments. The sequence of the fragments on the original scroll is determined by their preserved text. Fragment 35 is not included on the three sheets presented today, as its preserves text of the second half of Exodus (27:6–14).

Fragment 7 (slide), in which we discussed earlier, is an additional large fragment. Based on textual considerations, the editors joined fragment 7i with fragment 8, both preserve Ex 9:33-10:5. In addition, Longacre identified fragment 44 as Ex 12:5-8, and consequently joined it to fragment 7ii, both preserve Ex 11:4-12:12. Fragment 7 does not preserve bottom margin, but it shares the oblique shape on its right edge (slide). I therefore suggest that fragment 7 belongs to the wad of fragments 10,19 and 35, and accordingly located it in the canvas. According to this, the last preserved line in fragment 7ii precedes the last line of the column.

(slide) The size of the bottom margins point to a progression at the deterioration of the scroll: fragment 35 shows the largest bottom margin, fragment 19 shows a large bottom margin, but smaller than fragment 35, fragment 10 shows a smaller part of a bottom margin, and fragment 7 does not show bottom margin at all.

A key data for the scroll’s reconstruction is the number of lines in a column. As stated, no complete column was preserved, and therefore the number of lines is unknown. Essentially, the number of lines per column could be drawn from fragments that preserve two consecutive columns, as completion of the missing text between the fragments may indicate the size of the writing block.

Five fragments of 4Q11 preserves parts of two consecutive columns: (slide)

1. Fragment 2: 2i attests to Ex 2:10; 2ii attests to Ex 3:17-21.
2. Fragments 5: 5i attests to Ex 8:13-15; 5ii attests to Ex 9:25-29.
3. Fragment 7: 7i+8 attests to Ex 9:33-10:5; 7ii+44 attests to Ex 11:4-12:12.
4. Fragment 30: 30i attests to Ex 25:18-20; 30ii attests to Ex 26:33-27:1.

Fragment 10 also preserves portions of two consecutive columns, but the text of the first column is extremely damage and no legible traces were survived on it. Therefore, fragment 10 is not valuable for determining the number of lines in a column.

The hypothetical missing text between the first and the second columns of fragments 5 and 7 differs between MT and 4Q22 SP. Major expansions appear at the pre-Samaritan tradition at this hypothetical text, and therefore the fragments cannot helpfully determine the number of lines in a column. In contrast, the hypothetical missing text between the two columns of fragment 2, as well as fragment 30, is stable at both textual traditions. No major expansions, omissions or transpositions are documented at these texts.

To complete the text of the scroll and to obtain a good estimate of the distance between fragments, Einat Tamir and me created a font of the scroll’s script. The creation of the font involved collecting the shapes of all letters from the preserved text and defining the exact distance between pairs of consecutive letters. We then examined the font using fragments that display consecutive fragmentary lines. After repeated corrections and re-examinations, we achieved good results, in which the reconstruction of the missing text between the fragmentary lines was in accordance with the layout of the preserved text on the fragments. In other words, the distance between fragmentary lines was similar to the distance required to complete the missing text between them, using the new font.

Three considerations have to be taken into account when completing missing text between fragments: orthography, paragraphs division and distances between lines.

According to Ulrich (1995, 127) 4Q11 “strikes a moderate balance between conservative and full orthography, whereas MT-Ex tends to be somewhat more conservative”. The editors (*DJD* 9, 21–22) list words that are consistently missing spelled, such as כל, אהרן, אלהים, as well as orthographic variants, whenever 4Q11 differs from 4Q22, MT and SP. In the course of reconstruction of recurrent words, I followed the forms attested in the scroll. In the rest of cases, I tentatively followed a balanced orthographic tendency, meaning I used the missing spelling of MT while occasionally inserted plene forms.

4Q11 shows no complete suitability between its paragraphs division and the פרשה פתוחה and פרשה סתומה handed down in MT manuscripts. Nor it fully corresponds with קצה used in the Samaritan manuscripts. As Ulrich (1995, 107) argue, the scribe appears to have made a logical division between sections to help the reader. Based on the material evidence, Tov (2004, 273) observes that 4Q11 uses expanded system of paragraphs division. It subdivides extending from the last word in the line to the end of line, and in addition a completely empty line (frg. 7i 5–6; 16 3–4; 19 5–6). However, occasionally the new section is begun at the right margin of the next line, without a blank line (see frg. 2i). In the reconstruction of the text, I followed the spaced paragraph division system of the scroll, when mostly, but not consistently, I left blank line between two paragraphs.

The horizontal ruler lines whose traces can be seen in many fragments of the scroll indicate that 4Q11 was ruled, like almost all Qumran and Masada texts written on leather (Tov 2004, 53–54). The horizontal ruling runs across all the columns on the sheet. The distance between the horizontal ruling in 4Q11 is fairly regular, and is estimated to 0.5 cm. (slide) I digitally ruled each sheet on the canvas according to preserved lines on fragments belonging to this sheet. Where the text has not been preserved, I ruled the lines with an average space of 0.5 cm between them.

Completion of the missing text between the two columns of fragment 2, according to the detailed considerations, indicated that the scroll originally consisted of 60 lines per column (slide). The same result was concluded from the completion of the missing text between 30i and 30ii. I therefore suggest that 4Q11 is a 60-lines scroll. My suggestion will be verified by means of “trial and error”, as it provides a comprehensive suitability of the location of fragments, measurements of columns width and estimation of the missing text between the fragments (in places where the text is stable).

The next step is to determine the number of sheets. (slide) Fragment 1 preserves right margin with seam remnants, indicating that it belongs to the first column of the first sheet containing Exodus in 4Q11. Fragment 44, which is distantly join with fragment 7ii, preserves left margin with seam remnants, indicating that these fragments belong to the last column of the sheet. It is unlikely that one sheet comprises all the text running from Gen 50:26 (the beginning of frg. 1) to Ex 12:12 (the end of frg. 7ii). Two sheets are therefore required to include the text. Furthermore, fragment 19 also preserves left margin with seam remnants, indicating that it belongs to the last column of the next sheet. Consequently, the scroll containing Gen 50:26 to Ex 17:11 (the end of frg. 19) is assigned to three distinct sheets. The text restoration below will approve that each sheet comprises four columns.

The position of fragments 7, 10 and 19, the determination of numbers of lines in a column and the number of sheets represents valuable data for the reconstruction. Now we can completely reconstruct the missing text of the third sheet, between fragment 7ii and fragment 19. This text is stable, as it does not include major expansions or transpositions in the pre-Samaritan tradition. By doing so, one can locate additional fragments and present new joins between fragments (slide). Note that the join of fragment 9 with fragment 10 reinforces the recurrent damage pattern (slide). The borders of the joined fragments reveal even better correspondence between the protrusion of fragments 7 and 9+10.

The columns width in the third sheet ranges between 10.5 cm and 11.8 cm, obtaining a format of relatively narrow and tall columns.

Reconstructing the text of the third sheet and defining the columns width enables to measure the distances between corresponding points of damage in fragments 7, 10 and 19. I represented these points with the letters A–C (slide).

The distances between points A to C indicate that it is possible to display a series of four circumferences of the scroll, ranges between 13.1 cm to 14 cm, with an incremental growth of 0.3 cm. In other words, the corresponding points of damage reflect four consecutive layers in the rolled scroll. Moreover, the incremental growth between layers indicates that the scroll was rolled with the end of the scroll inside and the beginning of the text outside.

Two acid tests for examining whether the scroll originally contained the large pluses in the plagues narrative are fragments 5 and 7. As stated, the missing text between the two columns preserved on these fragments differs from MT and pre-Samaritan tradition. At fragments 5, the gap between the text of both columns may include three major expansions: Ex 8:19b; 9:5b; 9:19b. At fragment 7, the gap between the text of both columns may also include three major expansions: Ex 10:2b; 11:3bi; 11:3bii. According to the proposed reconstruction, there is no room for the major expansions between the columns in both fragments. In contrast, the text of MT-Ex fits well in the space between the columns in both cases. (slide) The fact that there are three expansions in any case, and the amount of their text is large, allow a high level of certainty at this point.

The large pluses in plague narrative has a consistent and systematic construct. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that a scroll which lacked expansions in two plagues will have the others. Since the space between the two columns of fragments 5 and 7 is too short for the major expansions, we may conclude that the scroll did not contained all the large expansions on the plague narrative. According to this conclusion, I reconstructed the missing text between fragments 2ii and 5i, and located fragments 1,2,3 and 4 in a good level of certainty (slide). The text reconstruction indicates that the two sheets containing fragments 1–7 consist of four columns each, similarly to the third sheet.

Although the reconstruction shows correspondence with all relevant material data, there is a margin of error as in every reconstruction. However, the fact that independent material signs fits together in the reconstruction proposal narrows down the margin of error. The columns widths have been determined by reconstruction of the missing text between fragmentary lines. They are in accordance with the distances between corresponding points of damage that show incremental growth between the rolls of the scroll. It can be seen, therefore, that the material reconstruction successfully combines independent data.

To conclude, I have proposed a material reconstruction of three sheets of 4Q11, comprising twelve consecutive columns. These columns consist of passages from Gen 50:26 to Ex 17:11, almost a half of the text of Exodus. The reconstruction locates fragments within the columns, using material evidence. In addition, it reconstructs the missing text between the fragments using a font of the scroll’s script and applies Stegemann method by identifying corresponding points of damage. The material reconstruction provided crucial data for the analysis of the textual relationships between 4Q11 and the MT and pre-Samaritan traditions of the book of Exodus. It assesses the accepted textual classification of the scroll as a semi-Masoretic manuscript and firstly offers an evidence for the assumption that the scroll did not originally contained the major expansions that characterize the pre-Samaritan tradition.

In my future research, I intend to elaborate the material reconstruction of the scroll and to include in it as fragments as possible. I hopefully be able to identify additional groups of wadded fragments, such as fragments 16 and 23 which are materially similar (slide), and to elaborate the application of Stegemann method. By doing so, I aim to examine if the major expansions on SP-Ex at the Sinai theophany, the tabernacle construction and the narratives that contradicts Deuteronomy 1 were originally included in the scroll.