

THE RIVERRUN OF REWRITING SCRIPTURE: FROM TEXTUAL CANNIBALISM TO SCRIPTURAL COMPLETION¹

ANDERS KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN

1. Embarking the Voyage

The aim of this essay is two-fold. First, I want to make a plea for retaining the concept of rewritten Bible in the slightly revised form of rewritten Scripture. This may occur as a presumptuous endeavour, since the term enjoys wide scholarly prevalence. Nevertheless, the notion has come under serious siege, verging on attack, in recent years and is, therefore, in need of defense if we want to retain it. Additionally, I think that more can be done in advancing the concept in terms of its theoretical scope. Second, I want to briefly touch upon the issue of authority existing in the relationship between scriptural predecessor and rewriting. Two seemingly contradictory views have loomed large in the previous debate, but they may not be as exclusive to each other as they at first sight appear. Apart from arguing for the recognition of both views, when seen from different theoretical perspectives, I shall contend that we are committing a serious fallacy if – on the basis of particular texts – we extrapolate from the part to the whole, thereby, either endorsing the ‘replacement thesis’ or advocating the ‘irenic interpretation’ of rewritten Scripture. On the contrary, it is crucial that we acknowledge that the phenomenon comprises a continuum of different possibilities. Finally, I shall make an over-all plea that if we want to continue using the category of rewritten Scripture, it is incumbent upon us that we advance it to the level of a cross-cultural analytical third-order concept which may be applied with respect to other texts originating in other times and at other spaces. Before embarking on this voyage, I shall underline the exploratory and provisional nature of the essay.

2. Theoretical Ruminations

In my view, analytical concepts can only be retained on the premise that they not only continue to have analytical value but also that they can be provided with a clear definitional frame underpinned by a lucid theoretical backing. Additionally, I think that third-order terms should only be upheld on the premise that they have comparative value. In fact, it would be contradictory to operate with a third-order concept void of comparative scope. Analytical concepts which are used only by a narrow scholarly guild with respect to a limited number of texts tend to have a parochial nature and are, therefore, of no significance outside the restricted circles of their users. In addition, the employment of such nomenclature which is used by a limited group of scholars only, risks having a self-confirmatory nature, that is to say that its usage sometimes is more a matter of protecting a particular field against the intrusion of outsiders with novel and different perspectives than it is a matter of advancing scholarship. It is, therefore, a token of scholarly soundness and vigour of a discipline to make room for the ongoing questioning of analytical terms and complementary theorising in order to avoid the perpetual dangers of habitual and prejudicial thinking.

¹ It is a pleasure and honour to dedicate this essay, first published in *JSJ* 43, (2012), 475-496, to Florentino Garzía Martínez who is not only by virtue of his works an admirable and prolific scholar but also a living token of the Schillerian dictum that: “Und es gibt keine höhere und keine ernsthaftere Aufgabe als die Menschen zu beglücken” from *Die Braut von Messina oder die feindlichen Brüder*. I am grateful to the influence which Professor Martínez for more than 14 years has exerted on my thinking. As a token of gratitude I focus on a subject that Martínez has worked copiously on, that is, the moot question of rewritten Bible. See Martínez, “Las Fronteras de «lo bíblico»,” *Scripta Theologica* 23 (1991), 759-784, and “Rethinking the Bible—Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. M. Popović; Leiden: Brill 2010), 19-36.

The impact of these considerations is one reason why a number of scholars during the last decade have found it necessary to slightly alter Geza Vermes' half a centennial old notion of rewritten Bible to the different term of rewritten Scripture.² With the final publication of the Qumran texts, especially those found in Cave Four, in the beginning of the nineties it became increasingly clear that the time-honoured clear-cut distinction between biblical and non-biblical texts had to be discarded in favour of other terms that were more susceptible to acknowledging the fluid borders between allegedly biblical and non-biblical terms.³

There were several reasons for this change. First, scholars like Florentino Garzía Martínez, the late Shemaryahu Talmon, Robert Kraft, James VanderKam, and Eugene Ulrich to name just a few prolific scholars in this debate have made it unambiguously clear that neither a closed nor even a fixed tripartite canon existed prior to the late first century and early second century CE at the very earliest.⁴ Second, it has become palpably clear that the scriptural texts were in a greater state of flux than it could be recognised by scholarship prior to the complete publication of the Qumran texts. Third, this trajectory of scholarship has made it evident that the continuum including texts which exhibit scriptural adjustments, amplifications, embellishments, harmonisations, omissions, rearrangements, over-writings, and supplementations with regard to scriptural antecedents was considerably more complex than previously could have been acknowledged. Fourth, it has also become increasingly apparent that the rewriting of Scripture was not only a phenomenon pertaining to differences between canonical and non-canonical texts. It was an intra-biblical matter as well as Deuteronomy and the Books of Chronicles, for instance, vividly demonstrate. It was for this reason that some scholars while wanting to retain the idea included in the original concept of rewritten Bible replaced it with Scripture and, therefore, began to speak of rewritten Scripture.⁵ If no Bible existed at the turn of the Common Era how could one possibly speak

² See, for instance, James C. VanderKam, "The Wording of Biblical Citations in some Rewritten Scriptural Works," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library 2002), 41-56, 43.52f.

³ See the fine article by Sidnie White Crawford, "The Fluid Bible: The Blurry Line Between Biblical and Non-biblical Texts," *Bible Review* XV (1999), 34-39, 50-51. For the history of scholarship on the term, see Daniel A. Machiela, "Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism—A Review of Recent Developments," *JJS* LXI/2 (2010): 308-320, which is organised according to the chronology of the majority of recent publications. See also my forthcoming essay "Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, term or technique? A Discussion with Geza Vermes* (ed. J. Zsengellér and G.G. Xeravits; Leiden/Boston: Brill 2013), in which I discuss the four stages in the history of scholarship on the term. With respect to the discussion of nomenclature, one may also benefit from Molly M. Zahn's article, "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology," in *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala and M. Marttila; Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 2011), 93-119.

⁴ Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the "Canon of Hebrew Scriptures" in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in idem *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible. Collected Studies* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2010), 419-442, 421f.439; James VanderKam, "The Wording of Biblical Citations," 2002, 52f; Robert A. Kraft, "Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies," *JBL* 126:1 (2007a), 5-27, and "Pursuing the Para-Scriptural by Means of the Pre-Scriptural," (Paper delivered at University of Toronto 11 April 2007; available at the internet on the following address: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak/temp/toronto1/jpgs/toronto-1-2007.html> – seen 19.07.2012); Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill 1999), 17.31.59f; F.G. Martínez, "Re-thinking the Bible," 2010, 20f.

⁵ Among the first to do this was J.C. VanderKam, "The Wording of Biblical Citations," 2002, 42f. Cf. Peter W. Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran," in *Emmanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emmanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul; R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman, and W.W. Fields; Leiden: Brill 2003), 269-304, 272; Jonathan G. Campbell, "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts: A Terminological and Ideological Critique,'" in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (ed. idem, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen; London: T&T Clark 2005), 43-68, 49; Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Scripture as

about rewriting it? Replacing Bible with Scripture was a way of providing remedy for this problem.

In recent years, however, a number of scholars have begun to question even the continuous use of the terminology ‘rewritten’ and ‘Scripture’ on the basis that both of these terms are flawed as well.⁶ Armin Lange, for instance, argues that there is a too close relationship between the category and Jewish literature, and that the religious connotations pertaining to Scripture are too great in order to retain the concept as a viable term.⁷ Apart from the fact that Lange’s contentions are questionable, his own proposal – in the wake of Gérard Genette – to replace ‘rewritten Scripture’ with the terms ‘paratext’ and ‘paratextual’ in my view falters on the ground that Genette in his later work took these concepts to refer to textual elements such as titles, subtitles, prefaces, postfaces, etc., whereas he began to use ‘hypertext’ to designate what he originally had termed ‘paratext’. The use of this terminology may, therefore, cause more confusion than contribute to create conceptual clarity.⁸ Other scholars have favoured the use of terms characterised by para-something without the ending ‘biblical’ or ‘scriptural’ in order to avoid canonical biases in the nomenclature.⁹ Others again have opposed the continuous use of ‘rewritten’ in the coinage, since they claim that there is hardly any text which is not in one way or the other of a rewritten nature. If that is the case, the use of ‘rewritten’ in the expression obviously runs the risk of becoming tautological, verging on the meaningless.

3. A Plea for Retaining the Concept

Despite the objections presented above, I continue to think that rewritten Scripture has a heuristically advantageous nature over against alternative terminology. To make my case clear, I shall underline that there is no language fetishism inherent in the argument. As far as I am concerned, we could operate with terms ‘x’ and ‘y’ on the premise that we would know what we were talking about. Contrary to Bible, however, Scripture has the great advantage that it can designate any piece of text being accorded a particularly authoritative value by its users. The use of the capital ‘S’ in Scripture underscores the culturally, authoritative nature of the piece of writing in question.¹⁰ Additionally, Scripture has the advantage that it is a common-sense term available to the

a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism,” in *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garzía Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill 2007), 285-306, 286-288; Sidney White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Period*, Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans 2008, 6.

⁶ Some of the following considerations are also found in A.K. Petersen, “Textual Fidelity,” 2013.

⁷ Armin Lange, ““In the Second Degree”: Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature,” in *In the Second Degree. Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature* (ed. P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger; Leiden: Brill 2010), 3-42, 17.

⁸ See G. Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (transl. C. Newman and C. Doubinsky; Lincoln, Nebr: University of Nebraska Press 1997 (French 1982)), 3, in contrast to his previous work *The Architext: An Introduction* (transl. J.W. Lewin; Berkeley: University of California Press 1992 (French 1979)), 82. In his recent work, George J. Brooke favours the use of the terminology of the late Genette with respect to rewritten Scripture. See G.J. Brooke, “Hyperetextuality and and the “Parabiblical” Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *In the Second Degree. Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature* (ed. P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger; Leiden: Brill 2010), 43-64.

⁹ For arguments in favour of designating the texts para-something without the ending ‘biblical’ or ‘scriptural’, see Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts,” 103-105; cf. J.G. Campbell, ““Rewritten Bible,”” 2005, 66.

¹⁰ In a forthcoming collection of essays, I have made the argument that rewritten Scripture may advantageously be taken to include any authoritative text in the wider semiotic sense of the concept, that is, any cultural product available in the form of a coherent set of signs (be it indexes, icons or symbols) transmitting a mes-

majority of people and not part of a particular scholarly lingo incomprehensible to people outside the scholarly guild in question. Complementarily, the use of Scripture builds on an existing tradition and is not something without linguistic precedence. Contrary to the alternative terminology which in recent years has been put forward whether we are talking about paratextual literature, hypotexts or hypertexts, the coinage ‘rewritten Scripture’ brings the essential question to the fore of the mind, that is, that we are dealing with intertextuality of a particular kind. First, the alternative nomenclature does not make it clear that not only are we dealing with a form of intertextuality connecting different texts with each other but also that the texts that are being rewritten are accorded an authoritative nature. Second and closely connected to the first point, the alternative vocabulary does not highlight that the rewritten texts are borrowing authority and in some cases usurping it from the texts which they are rewriting.¹¹ To be very bold on this issue, I argue that if we are leaving out the aspect of authority indicated by the term, I cannot see the point of retaining rewritten Scripture as a category, since it may just as well be replaced by the more common notion of intertextuality.

Before I return to my present understanding of rewritten Scripture, I want to pay attention to a slightly different view on the concept put forward by two distinguished colleagues. About the same time as some scholars began to question the appropriateness of retaining ‘Bible’ in the phrasing of rewritten Bible, Moshe Bernstein and Michael Segal endorsed the view that it would be beneficial to adhere to a more rigid understanding of the concept in line with Geza Vermes’ original notion (although excluding the Palestinian Targumic literature and the *Sefer ha-Yashar*).¹² Bernstein rightfully opposed a development by which the concept was in danger of becoming a *signifiant flottant* being attributed such a wide scope of meaning that almost any Jewish text of the era could be encapsulated in the category. By making a sound distinction between rewriting the Bible and rewritten Bible, Bernstein acknowledged the fact that in the words of Carol Newsom “echoes of the biblical text haunt virtually all of the new literary compositions of this period.”¹³ Yet, one is not left in doubt about the reformist nature of Bernstein’s contribution. Only at one point, he diverged from Vermes’ original understanding,¹⁴ namely with regard to the inclusion of legal texts into the category – a point on which numerous other scholars have chosen the same path.

Although differences exist between the view-points of Moshe Bernstein and Michael Segal, they advocate an understanding that is remarkably similar. Parallel to Bernstein, Segal emphasises the similarities between earlier examples of rewriting in Biblical texts and subsequent texts of the later Second Temple period. At the same time, he acknowledges the element of authority as important to the category. Segal contends that: “Rewriting, as opposed to creative

sage open for decoding. Hence, the aim of the collection of essays is to broaden the category of rewritten Scripture by locating it in the wider context of rewriting authoritative texts, which is a far more prevalent phenomenon found not only in literature but in arts in general. See my introduction to the volume, “The Prevalence of Rewritten Scripture in Cultural Production,” in *Contextualising Rewritten Scripture – Different Approaches to the Rewriting of Scripture and the Attribution of Authority to Rewritings in Art, Literature, and Music* (ed. A.K. Petersen; Leiden: Brill 2013).

¹¹ See my essays, “The Gospel of Judas: A Scriptural Amplification or a Canonical Encroachment?,” in *Judasevangelium und Codex Tchacos* (ed. G. Wurst and E.E. Popkes; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck 2012), and “Textual Fidelity,” 2013, 253-290.

¹² Moshe J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?,” *Textus* 22 (2005), 169-196; Michael Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans 2005), 10-29.

¹³ Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill 2004), 6.

¹⁴ As I have argued in “Textual Fidelity,” 2013, over the years Vermes, in fact, vacillates between different understandings of the concept.

composition, is characteristic of this corpus of religious literature in which later writers always look to the past to suggest new ideas in the present and for the future. Rewriting was thus the rule rather than the exception.”¹⁵ From Segal’s perspective, what separates earlier examples of rewriting from subsequent ones of the late Second Temple period is the extent which the rewriting takes. Whereas in the earlier period one may find rewritings of individual laws, prophecies, or narrative passages, the further one moves forward in time the more extensive becomes the scale of rewriting, since entire works such as, for instance, *Chronicles*, *Book of Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *1 Esdras* rewrote complete literary works.¹⁶

4. Some Additional Reflections Increasing the Burden of Problems Pertaining to the Concept

Contrary to my own previous understanding which I first put forward in a Festschrift article to Florentino Garzía Martínez in 2007, I have relinquished the view that we may benefit from conceptualising rewritten Scripture as a genre from an etic perspective of analysis. Although there is nothing to prevent such an interpretation, I am now uncertain about how much it contributes to bringing the current debate forward. However, there are also a number of points on which I adhere to my previous understanding. First, I continue to think that Bible should be replaced with Scripture in the nomenclature, since the arguments against using Bible have neither been reduced nor weakened over the past half a decade. On the contrary, the increased acknowledgement of the lateness of the final formation of the Jewish Bible as well as the enhanced appreciation of the fluidity of the scriptural writings as late as the first century BCE and, perhaps, for some texts even later should make us reluctant to apply Bible to this period. Second, as I have already noted it is also problematical with the term Bible, since it can be used with respect to a particular group of writings only (in that respect I fully concur with Armin Lange’s corresponding effort to detach the concept from a too close relationship with Jewish writings, which bans us from acknowledging the considerably greater prevalence of the phenomenon under scrutiny, see note 7). If the concept is without comparative value, we may end up in a very parochial form of scholarship reproducing what we already know and not contributing at all to the further development of research. Far from explaining anything at all, we are left with a pleonastic notion reduplicating that which it was meant to explain. The term is also misleading on the account that it drives a wedge between biblical and non-biblical, thereby, suggesting a difference which has no support in the material under examination. If rewritten Scripture is also found in biblical texts proper, then surely, it is misleading by the use of nomenclature to indicate a difference between biblical and non-biblical. Third, I have also become increasingly reluctant with respect to using the term ‘rewritten’ as the other element of the composite in the expression. Sidnie White Crawford among others has forcefully argued that if the texts of the books traditionally categorised biblical were not fixed in the epoch under discussion, but rather were of a pluriform nature the term rewritten may also be called into question.¹⁷ If a fixed text did not exist, so the argument, how does it make sense to speak of it as being of a rewritten nature? Fourth and perhaps even more challenging to the element ‘rewritten’, is the fact to which I have already hinted that hardly any text is not in one way or the other of a rewritten nature. Like other clusters of signs, texts do not evolve *ex nihilo*. They are always presupposing an existing tradition to which they may relate in a number of different manners comprising a continuum that consists of an utterly polemical stance at the one end of the axis and an irenic and embracing one at the other end. In this sense, every text – despite the stress it may lay on its own novelty and originality – is engaged in a perpetual river-run of tradition, since texts by virtue of the act of rewriting respond to existing textual and, hence, cultural tradition. This observation, of course, may be a semiotic truism, but as most trivi-

¹⁵ M. Segal, “Between Bible,” 2005, 28.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ S.W. Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 2008, 5.

alities nevertheless a fact.¹⁸ In light of such an understanding, it becomes redundant to claim for a text that it is of a rewritten character. Additionally, there may also be another element of superfluousness adhering to the notion. If all texts, whether deliberately or not, are rewriting antecedent tradition, it is obviously misleading to single out a special category as being of a rewritten nature.

5. *Reclaiming Rewritten Scripture as an Appropriate Scholarly Category*

With these objections in mind, can there, one may justifiably ask, be any sustainability in adhering to the concept of rewritten Scripture if we have dismissed both elements of the composite? Certainly, I shall argue, but to retain the notion it is incumbent upon us that we not only specify its meaning but also the level of analysis to which it may be applied. As long as we have a fair sense of what we are doing analytically and can reap theoretical and empirical gains from the endeavour, I do not see problems in adhering to the terminology. The more so, since the potential objection that we have created an artificial category with no 1:1-relationship with the textual territory under consideration, is of no bearing. Analytical constructs by virtue of being constructs never provide any unmediated access to empirical reality. They are representative of an active modeling on blurred reality that enables us to make differentiations and, hence, to advance our understanding. If the concept ‘rewritten Scripture’, underpinned by a lucid theoretical perspective, enables us to conceive of a particular segment of reality, that is, the spectrum encapsulated by our theoretical outlook, then we are definitely in a better situation than proceeding without the concept and its corresponding theoretical perspective.

Unlike my previous understanding, I am more inclined to think of rewritten Scripture as a ‘textual strategy’ rather than a genre, even if it is acknowledged that such a notion of genre would have to be located at the etic level of analysis. Certainly, the six examples of literature (including the *Targums* and the *Sefer ha-Yashar*) to which Vermes originally assigned the classification are already too diverse in terms of genre to be attributed the same generic rubric at the emic level of analysis, if we understand genres to constitute particular semiotic habits crystallised in terms of a particular number of shared properties with respect to content, form, and function. Needless to say, already the inclusion of Josephus’ *Antiquities* under the generic rubric should have warned us against thinking of the notion in terms of a genre placed at the emic level of analysis, since it would be odd to operate with a piece of writing, where only part of the work could be accorded the assigned genre designation (*Ant.* 1.1-11.296; it would also run against Josephus’ own understanding of his work which he – in accordance with a Graeco-Roman historiographical tradition – claims should be conceived as an attempt “to embrace our entire ancient history and political constitution, translated from the Hebrew records” to the Greek-speaking world as a whole, *Ant.* 1.5).¹⁹ Be that as it may, I think it is more promising that we give up the whole discussion of genre or textual strategy once and for all and acknowledge that when using the term rewritten Scripture we are focusing on the far more prevalent phenomenon of intertextuality. But if that is the case, one may reasonably object, what is the point of operating with a distinct category and not solely adhere to the more common concept?

I believe that, in fact, there is good reason to retain the concept as a scholarly term, since it may analytically, advantageously be taken to designate one particular and excessive type of intertextuality. In this regard, I consider rewritten Scripture to constitute a sub-category of the wid-

¹⁸ For an extensive discussion of this argument of sign production as a perpetual riverrun, see Anders Klostergaard Petersen, ““Invention” and “Maintenance” of Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Historical Perspectives,” in *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation. Discursive Fights over Religious Traditions in Antiquity* (ed. J. Ulrich, A.-C. Jacobsen and D. Brakke; Frankfurt: Peter Lang 2011), 129-160. For a similar argument made with respect to the process of canonisation, see my essay “Constraining Semiotic Riverrun – Different Gradations and Understandings of Canonicity and Authoritative Writings,” in *Religion and Normativity. The Discursive Fight over Religious Texts in Antiquity* (ed. A.-C. Jacobsen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press 2009), 22-52, 28-30.

¹⁹ Translation from H.St.J. Thackeray in the LCL-edition.

er class of intertextuality. It designates that particular type of intertextuality which exists between an authoritative scriptural antecedent and its subsequent reuse in a type of rewriting, in which there is a close textual relationship between the scriptural predecessor and the rewritten work. This move allows us to elevate the concept to a category of comparative and, hence, of cross-cultural value, thus avoiding the somewhat constrained perspective of previous discussions of the notion. In the forthcoming volume (referred to in note 10), I asked colleagues from art history, classics, history, literature, and the study of music to use the concept in order to explore the theoretical and empirical gains they would achieve by the application of it to their particular field of study. At the same time, the idea was to examine how their work could, potentially, facilitate progress in the field in which the concept originally had been developed. Thus, in the forthcoming volume the reader will find essays on, for instance, Vergil's *Aeneid* as a piece of rewritten Scripture of the Homeric Songs, on medieval church music as rewritten pieces of scriptural antecedents, on Shakespeare's rewriting of his scriptural predecessors, etc. Does such a sweeping use of the notion render the category excessively vague and, therefore, superfluous? I do not think so, since the underlying theoretical perspective informing the use of the category should make it clear that we are engaged with the more comprehensive phenomenon of intertextuality, but with a special focus on the aspect of authority.

Needless to say, there is an element of uncertainty involved in the designation, since the extent to which any work is of a 'close rewritten nature' is open to debate. As indicated by the previous discussion, the element of authority will not suffice as sole criterion for defining rewritten Scripture. We have already observed how every text is in a sense a piece of rewritten Scripture in so far as it is engaged in the rewriting of antecedent texts. To the extent that it rewrites particular traditions over against others, one could, in fact, argue that every piece of writing in this broad sense exhibits the category of rewritten Scripture, since only traditions accorded cultural significance by the writer, whether they are of negative or positive nature, would qualify as suitable candidates for being rewritten. However, on the basis of such a comprehensive understanding we run the risk of once more making the category superfluous. Therefore, we need to spend time on looking at the other element which has been a constituent feature in the previous discussion, namely that texts belonging to this sub-category are characterised by rewriting their scriptural predecessors in a manner that exhibits a continuum of embellishments, harmonisations, insertions, omissions, and variations with respect to their scriptural antecedents, but without any explicit commenting on the intertextual relationship between base text and the rewriting such as is found in, for instance, the commentary literature.²⁰

As to the discussion of whether one should include legal texts in the category or not as a number of colleagues in recent years have advocated,²¹ I tend to think that it would be wise to install a further sub-category making a differentiation between rewritten texts of a legal nature and those of a narrative character. The aim is not, I want to underline, to set up an artificial, scholastic scaffold, but to attain as much analytical clarity as possible in order to advance our discussions, so that we know exactly what we are talking up when using third order concepts.

²⁰ For this reason, I am sceptical about Peter Borgen's attempt to include the works of Philo in the category of rewritten Scripture. I acknowledge the proximate nature of the Philonic works as any other piece belonging to commentary literature proper, but I think there is an analytical gain in keeping them distinct, while, simultaneously, acknowledging their closeness in terms of resemblance of familiarity. See P. Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M.E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum 1984), 233-282, 234; and *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (Leiden: Brill 1997), 63-79, in which Borgen proposes to include the *Life of Moses* and the *Exposition of the Laws* in the category of rewritten Bible.

²¹ See, for instance, Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (Leiden: Brill 1995), 227; Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 1995, 193-195; Segal, "Between Bible," 2005, 11.21f; Devorah Dimant, "The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1999), 43-59, 50; George J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000), vol. 2 777-781, 779.

With these clarifications in mind, time has come to take a fresh look at rewritten Scripture in light of the previous considerations.

6. *The Prevalence of the Phenomenon: From Donald Duck to Book of Jubilees*

It may appear preposterous in this context to initiate our discussion by examining Donald Duck. Yet, I shall argue that it may, in fact, be beneficial to embark on our voyage by examining a text which to my knowledge has not been included in the previous scholarly debate. The more so, since Donald Duck is interesting not only with respect to the element of rewriting *per se* but also with regard to that other aspect which I have laid stress on as intrinsic to the category, that is, the facet of authority. At the same time, the inclusion of Donald Duck will allow us to place emphasis on the pervasiveness of the phenomenon of rewritten Bible across genres, time, space and, thereby, cultures.

As I have learned from my colleague, Professor Hans Jørgen Lundager of Hebrew Bible at Aarhus University,²² Donald Duck underwent a ‘serious’ crisis subsequent to the death of main cartoonist Carl Barks: Who could preserve the authoritative tradition of Barks? Although one should not press the point too hard, the crisis may be compared to the transition from the stage of charismatic authority within the Weberian typology of authority to that of a stage of traditionalisation characterised by the challenge how to maintain tradition in a situation, when the charismatic carrier of tradition had disappeared. It is at this point that Keno Don Rosa comes into the picture. Whereas family relations in the classical Donald Duck stories are conceived of in asymmetrical relationships between uncles and nephews, nieces and aunts, cousin and cousin, and, eventually, grandmothers, one cannot help being baffled by the absence of the missing parents who, potentially, could fill out the narrative lacunae. Rosa’s ingenious contribution consists among other things in narratively filling out the gaps left by the charismatic precursor.

In the trilogy, *The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck*,²³ Rosa narrates the father, the mother, the two sisters, their children, and the one husband of the one sister of Scrooge McDuck. We are *eo ipso* also informed about the parents of Donald Duck and Gladstone Gander. By the inclusion of previously unnarrated characters, Rosa is simultaneously contributing to a partial *Entzauberung* of the cartoon universe, since he has to introduce death (for instance, the departure of the father of Scrooge McDuck) into a world which previously has been left to a stage of incessant lack of anxiety. In addition to narratively filling out the gaps of ‘uninvented’ persons left by the authoritative predecessor, Don Rosa creates his stories by searching for details in the authoritative antecedents that can be narratively completed. How, for instance, did Scrooge McDuck attain his # 1 Dime?,²⁴ how did Scrooge McDuck fare during his days on the Mississippi River (thrice referred to in the authoritative antecedent of Carl Barks)?,²⁵ etc.

The Scrooge McDuck example is one of a great variety of texts of all kinds that point to the pervasiveness of the phenomenon of rewritten Scripture.²⁶ It is conspicuous if one spends some time on the internet site <http://www.fanfiction.net/book/> (seen 20.07.2012) to see how vir-

²² Hans Jørgen Lundager Jensen, “En anden mester,” *Kritik* 109 (1994), 13-17.

²³ Don Rosa, *The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck. Volume One* (Los Angeles: Boom Kids 2009); idem *The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck. Volume Two* (Los Angeles: Boom Kids 2010); idem *The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck. Companion* (Los Angeles: Boom Kids 2010).

²⁴ Don Rosa, “The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck. Part One. “The Last of the Clan McDuck”,” in *The Life and Times of Scrooge McDuck. Volume One* (idem; Los Angeles: Boom Kids 2009), 10-23, 20. An additional dime story recounting the struggles pertaining to Scrooge McDuck’s acquisition of his favourite dime is found in the Companion volume. See Don Rosa, “Of Ducks and Dimes and Destinies,” in idem *Companion* 2010, 5-19.

²⁵ Don Rosa, “The Master of the Mississippi,” in *The Life. Volume One* 2009, 26-54.

²⁶ See my forthcoming essay, “From Morse to Matthew: Rewritten Scripture as Epitome of Semiotic Riverrun,” in *Contextualising Rewritten Scripture* (ed. idem; Leiden: Brill 2013).

tually all kinds of literature have been rewritten by the fans, so-called fan-fiction. As one of my PhD students, Markus Davidsen of Leiden University and Aarhus University, is currently exploring in his PhD project, this rewriting of texts which the fans consider to be of authoritative nature, sometime takes on a rather excessive character. This may be seen from, for instance, Tolkien's narrative universe and the world of Star Wars, which are not only turned into objects of religious devotion but are also made the basis for new religious world-views. We do not need to dwell on this. In this context, the point should be remarkably clear: The rewriting of Scripture is a far more prevalent phenomenon which calls for cross-cultural studies that may benefit and advance the studies of particular cultures or groups of texts. By this observation we are brought back to the discussion of Scrooge McDuck and its relationship to its authoritative predecessor. In the previously mentioned essay by Lundager, he contends that:

Rosa's work is first and foremost reuse, a reinvention in terms of a consciousness of tradition and style of a prolific legacy that may be used as the raw material for what can and shall be done now and here within a genre. It is not a self-promoting betrayal against an invincible prototype, but a consequent radicalisation of the existing, virtual possibilities within a universe. The son creates by taking over some of the father's heritage, but certainly not the whole, and by incorporating it in a combination with expressions and also societal realities that were not previously found and not formerly possible within the genre.²⁷

If there is one thing that has loomed large in the previous discussion of rewritten Bible or Scripture it is exactly the point highlighted in the final remarks by Lundager, that is, the relationship in terms of authority between the Scripture rewritten and the subsequent piece of literature. In scholarship of recent years, it has become an almost truism that rewritten texts do neither aim to supersede nor to replace the authoritative antecedent which they are rewriting. Hindy Najman is one of the most prolific and elegant advocates of this more irenic view. She contends that:

It is important to consider the implications of the fact that, although some sacred written traditions were recognized as authoritative Torah from the very beginning of the Second Temple period, canonization did not occur until later. In such a climate, it was entirely possible to aspire, not to replace, but rather to *accompany* traditions already regarded as authoritative, and thus to provide those traditions with their proper interpretive context.²⁸

Similarly, Philip Alexander has endorsed the view that: "Despite the superficial independence of form, these texts (sc. those assigned the category rewritten Bible – AKP) are not intended to replace, or to supersede the Bible."²⁹

²⁷ Lundager, "En anden mester," 17 (my translation of the Danish text).

²⁸ Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill 2003), 44. For Najman's whole discussion of this issue, see particularly pp. 43-50. In her recent collection of essays, *Past Renewals. Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill 2010), 54, however, Najman comes close to acknowledging at least *Jubilees* as a text that strives to acclaim for itself a higher authority than that attributed to the Torah (the essay referred to was originally published by Najman in 1999).

²⁹ Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (ed. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1988), 99-121, 116. See also George J. Brooke, who has done much perceptive work on this issue. See, for instance, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library 2002), 31-40, 33; "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for the Advanced Studies Research Group on*

The most outspoken voice in defying this view is that of Ben Zion Wachholder, who has argued that rewritten Scripture is, in fact, engaged in the attempt to replace its scriptural predecessor.³⁰ In recent time, I have become increasingly sceptical about both of these views as exclusive to each other, since they may cast light on particular texts and/or particular facets of the discussion, but on their own neither of the two view-points is satisfactory, since they rest on an extrapolation from a part to the whole. As I have also argued in another recent essay, I think that the two view-points may both be right. I acknowledge that *ab initio* this sounds like a self-contradiction in terms, but I shall contend that both interpretations may be plausible when it is recognised that they originate in different perspectives and as such shed light on different issues.³¹ Metaphorically speaking, the argument is parallel to Wittgenstein's celebrated duck-rabbit illustration of his *Philosophische Untersuchungen*, which dependent upon the perspective of the observer may be viewed as either duck or rabbit.³²

It may well be that rewritten Scripture does not strive to replace its scriptural predecessor in a straightforward manner (although some texts belonging to the category clearly do) as Najman, Alexander and Brooke have forcefully emphasised; but I do not see how at the outset it can be excluded that some rewritten scriptural texts at the cost of their authoritative predecessors, in fact, do aim to appropriate for themselves the authority of the antecedents. If by replacement one can also understand the act of surpassing or exceeding one's scriptural predecessor with respect to claims to authority, it cannot be excluded that some rewritten texts attempted to supersede their authoritative base texts. Such appropriation does not necessarily imply the cannibalisation of the base text in a direct manner, but it does move the understanding in the direction of acknowledging that some rewritten texts could render their scriptural antecedents superfluous and of less value in terms of authority. If one takes a look at the Christian New Testament canon and the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Matthew over against Mark, I believe that we have a suitable candidate exemplifying how a base text through the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of early Christianity became engulfed by its scriptural successor.

When it comes to my initial example from Donald Duck, I think that we have a perfect example of something similar to those parts of Josephus' *Antiquities* which do qualify as rewritten Scripture and the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, which both do not strive to replace their scriptural antecedents but simply to fill out the narrative lacunae of the predecessors. These texts do only have a life on their own by subsidising and complementing their scriptural predecessors. Things become more complicated, when we move to the *Book of Jubilees*. I concur with Hindy Najman that a too bombastic emphasis on *Jubilees* as a replacement faces some serious problems in terms of interpretation. Yet, I think the book also demonstrates how a too strong negation of the aspect of replacement is confronted with serious interpretational problems not only at the level of content but also with respect to the possible function of the book. I think the text bears witness to how some species belonging to the category of rewritten Scripture with respect to the question of authoritative relationship existing between textual predecessor and rewriting both want to have their cake and eat it.

Qumran 15-17 January 2002 (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant and R.A. Clemens; Leiden: Brill 2005), 85-104, 96; and the aforementioned essay "Hypertextuality and "Parabiblical"," 2010, 51f.

³⁰ Ben Zion Wachholder, "The Relationship between 11QTorah (The Temple Scroll) and the Book of Jubilees: One Single or Two Compositions," *SBL Seminar Papers. 1985* (SBLSP 24; Chico, Calif: Scholars Press 1985), 205-216, and "Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1985* (ed. M. Bernstein, F.G. Martínez and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill 1997), 195-211.

³¹ A similar view is now argued by Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press 2010), 323-336, 331.

³² Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations. The German Text, with a Revised English Translation* (transl. G.E.M. Anscombe; Oxford: Blackwell 2001), Part II, §11.

When, for instance, it is stated in *Jubilees* that: “This is because I (the angel of presence) have written it (the celebration of the feast of Shebuot), in the book of the first Law which I wrote for you, so that you might observe it in each of its appointed times, one day per year” (6:22; cf. 2:24; 30:12.21), the text does affirm the status of the laws of the Genesis-Exodus account which it narrates (Gen 1-Ex 19).³³ The relationship between the two, however, is not as straightforward as it may look at first sight. Simultaneous with the affirmation of the first Law, *Jubilees* also makes it clear that the first Law did not suffice, since not only revelations provided by God but also dictated from heavenly tablets by the angel of presence were needed. The work does not consider the first Law deficient in the sense that it was erroneous and, therefore, in need of replacement. Since it has given rise to false calendrical practices, however, it is in need of correction. These corrections are provided by *Jubilees* and discursively authorised from the highest thinkable instance. From the perspective of *Jubilees*, however, the corrections provided are not of novel nature. The book orchestrates its calendrical adjustments – exclusively recognising a 364 days’ solar calendar – as revelatory discourse, since it purports to reveal what has been written on the heavenly tablets from primordial time. Thereby, it does assign its own interpretation a superior status over the laws found in its scriptural antecedents. By its affirmation of the first Law, *Jubilees* excludes the possibility that a discrepancy exists between the first Law and the revelations provided by God and the angel of presence and conveyed by the work itself. At the same time, the book virtually replaces the first Law by adding a new interpretative lens through which it claims the first Law should be grasped. It is true that in this regard *Jubilees* does not replace the Genesis-Exodus account in a straightforward fashion, but it does insist on the fact that unless the calendrical laws are understood by the interpretative lens provided by *Jubilees* they cannot be properly perceived. In this manner, the book is representative of the broader phenomenon of scriptural *deuterōsis*, whereby secondary texts claim to constitute the right interpretation of the authoritative, primary texts.

The primordial nature attributed to the laws of *Jubilees* over against those revealed in the first Law highlights the text’s superior status over the scriptural predecessor which it rewrites. Pentateuchal laws are often said to derive from the heavenly tablets transmitted by *Jubilees* (see, for instance, 16:28-30; 28:6; 30:8-10; 32:10-15). This is no replacement in the sense of an abrogation of the claims of the base text, but certainly it is a way by which *Jubilees* appropriates for itself a higher degree of authority over against that of the scriptural predecessors. This changes the order of the authoritative relationship between base text and subsequent rewriting. By virtue of reproducing from heavenly tablets and transmitting to Moses “both what (was) in the beginning and what will occur (in the future), the account of the division of all of the days of the Law and testimony” (1:4, cf. 1:26-29; 2:1), *Jubilees* becomes primary Scripture, whereas the authoritative antecedent is accorded the role of interpretative supplement. The same applies by virtue of the same discursive logic to those instances in which *Jubilees* narratively rewrites its *Vorlage*. By its asserted temporal precedence over against the scriptural predecessor, *Jubilees* becomes an improved version of the Genesis-Exodus account. Given its self-acclaimed divine priority over the *Vorlage*, it is difficult to see how the intended audience should only conceive of it in terms of an interpretative supplement. The scholars who argue against the idea of replacement are right to emphasise the continued authority ascribed by the *Book of Jubilees* to its scriptural predecessors. Yet, they underestimate the superior nature which *Jubilees* claims over against its base text. The book epitomises a text which by virtue of rewriting an authoritative predecessor strives to supersede it in terms of authority both with regard to content and to pragmatic function.

³³ Translations from *Jubilees* are taken from Wintermute’s translation in the Charlesworth edition of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.

7. *Rewritten Scripture as a Continuum of Possibilities in Terms of the Question of Authority: A Conclusion*

The options in terms of authoritative relationship between authoritative predecessor and rewriting provided by our two examples from *Donald Duck* and the *Book of Jubilees* points to the existence of a continuum of possibilities. As I have already argued, I think it would be wrong on the basis of a few texts to elevate a particular interpretation and make it typify the whole category of rewritten Scripture. On the contrary, I believe it would be wise to acknowledge the existence of a continuum of different possibilities and not only begin examining this variety of options but also provide some typological distinctions that would enable us to install several caesuras on the gamut and, thereby, to segment it into pieces. However, we may be facing different axes dependent upon whether we are studying the texts in terms of content, form or function.

If at the one end of the spectrum we find texts epitomising the harmonious embellishment of authoritative Scripture such as, for instance, Josephus' *Antiquities* Books 1-11, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and the Gospel of Matthew, we find at the opposite end works like, for instance, the *Gospel of Judas* and, dare I say, the Gospel of John, which I consider to constitute a virtual deconstruction of the previous Synoptic tradition. At the one end of the axis, we find a form of textual completion, in which the secondary texts do neither aim to challenge nor to rival against their scriptural predecessors. At the other end, we see sons rivaling against their fathers by attempting to take up their position by replacing the fathers. This description, however, applies to the level of content.

If we proceed to the level of function, things may look different, as I have already indicated by my brief reference to the Gospel of Matthew.³⁴ Whereas Matthew at the level of content may appear as an irenic completion of the Gospel of Mark, at the level of function the relationship is not as reconcilable. In fact, Matthew comes out as a form of textual cannibalism by which a rewritten piece of Scripture literally devours its authoritative *Vorlage* as may be seen from the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the two texts in the history of Christianity. At the level of function, the same could, I argue, potentially have happened with respect to the relationship between the *Book of Jubilees* and the Genesis-Exodus narrative. To understand why it did not happen in this particular instance may obviously elude our possibilities for conducting historical research. Yet, I think it would be worthwhile to pursue such questions in terms of social-historical considerations, where, of course, it becomes crucial to examine the dissemination of particular texts and the prevalence of such texts in multi-layered cultural and social milieus. With respect to previous scholarship on rewritten Scripture, we have not yet come very far at such types of supplementary investigations, although recent scholarship on the Qumran texts has provided a fair beginning for pursuing such wider examinations.

Having briefly looked at the elements of content and function, I will finish these reflections by a few words on the aspect of form, which is the third essential part constitutive for any definition of genre. Although I am not yet in a position to draw the finer contours of such a typological axis, I can easily image that we may also benefit from including the element of form in our typological considerations. Similar to what we have seen at the level of content, the Gospel of Matthew embraces Mark's Gospel at the level of form, while, I emphasise, engulfing it at the level of function. Rewritten Scripture from the Nag Hammadi library, for instance, and perhaps especially those texts of Valentinian origin, is likely to be an illustrative case of the category which at the level of form defies its scriptural predecessor. The *Evangelium veritatis* may be such a case, but the assessment depends on how much we shall insist on the direct relationship between rewritten text and authoritative antecedent in terms of textual correspondence. Additionally, one should also acknowledge that any genre-bending or modulation is likely to give rise to new cultural conventions.

Be that as it may, I think I have documented how we may benefit from operating with continua on three different levels, that is, content, form, and function. We have also seen how texts

³⁴ A fuller argument is found in my forthcoming essay "The Gospel of Judas," 2012.

that diverge at the one level resemble each other at the two other taxonomic levels and vice-versa. What does this in the end amount to? First and foremost, I find it crucial that if we are to advance the discussion of rewritten Scripture it is important to provide the concept with the nature of a truly cross-cultural category that may be used in other contexts outside the more specific one of Second Temple Jewish literature. In that regard, I find the increasing tendency to analyse rewritten Scripture – although understandable as it is – in light of Qumran texts detrimental to the progress of the discussion. Judged on the basis of the discussion of the recent decade, the concept is predominantly being used by Qumran scholars to interpret Hebrew or Aramaic texts. That is, of course, fine; but this development does not contribute to detach the concept from its rather parochial context of origin and turn it into a general third-order concept.

To the extent that we are to retain the notion and we want to advance the scholarly discussion on the subject, which I think there is every good reason to do, I have in this essay aimed to provide not only examples of how we may do it but also to delineate the contours of such advancement in terms of theory. Ultimately, I have by raising the question of authoritative relationship existing between scriptural predecessor and rewritten work underlined what I think is the essential reason for adhering to the concept, that is, that we are designating and, thereby, operationalising for analysis a particularly excessive form of intertextuality, which may be found not only in the context of Second Temple Jewish literature but in a variety of other contexts as well. The rewriting of Scripture is an incessant riverrun flowing through all kinds of texts which rewrite authoritative prototypes.

Rewritten Scripture highlights the phenomenon of texts that borrow authority from scriptural predecessors by rewriting them, but this rewriting may take a variety of forms, which makes it crucial for us to study the phenomenon both at the level of content, form, and function. By drawing attention to a few internally, conspicuously different examples, I have warned against the recent tendency to interpret rewritten Scripture as an irenic embellishment of antecedent scriptural texts. The same *eo ipso* holds true for the replacement thesis. While both theses may hold true for a number of works belonging to the category, their respective arguments cannot reasonably be extended to characterise the category as a whole. Not only should we make crucial taxonomic differentiations in terms of whether we are looking at the levels of content, form and/or function but we should also acknowledge the reasonableness of aspectualism (cf. Wittgenstein's duck-rabbit example). What from one perspective may be seen to constitute a form of textual poaching or even cannibalism may from another perspective just as justifiably be conceived to embody a loyal appropriation or endorsement.

Abstract

To retain the concept of rewritten Bible as a scholarly category it is not only crucial to slightly change the name of the notion by re-designating it 'rewritten Scripture' but also to accord the term the status of a cross-cultural third-order concept. This will allow research to detach the notion from its somewhat current 'parochial' nature intrinsically linked as it is to the study of Second Temple Jewish literature. Rewritten Scripture should be conceived of as an excessive form of intertextuality that signifies the relationship existing between scriptural predecessor and rewritten piece with respect to the question of authority. Apart from advancing the theoretical discussion of the nomenclature, the essay takes a fresh look at a moot point that has loomed large in previous debates, whether rewritten Scripture strives to replace its scriptural predecessor or aims to complement it in an irenic fashion. The acknowledgement of some aspectualism grants legitimacy to both viewpoints, when they are rightfully understood within their proper perspectives. Finally, the article engages in typological considerations that will allow us to distinguish between three continua defined by respectively content, form, and function. Each constitutes a continuum on its own that advantageously may be segmented by several caesuras, which will allow us to differentiate between irenic scriptural completion at the one end of the spectrum and scriptural cannibalism at the other end of the spectrum. The fact that two works belonging to the category diverge on one continuum does not imply a corresponding divergence at other continua.