

4QMMT

*Reevaluating the Text,
the Function,
and the Meaning
of the Epilogue*

HANNE VON WEISSENBERG

BRILL

4QMMT

Reevaluating the Text, the Function,
and the Meaning of the Epilogue

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate Editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 82

4QMMT

Reevaluating the Text, the Function,
and the Meaning of the Epilogue

By

Hanne von Weissenberg



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

ISSN: 0169-9962

ISBN: 978 90 04 17379 8

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints BRILL, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	viii
Abbreviations and Sigla.....	x
Chapter One INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Research and Publication History of 4QMMT.....	2
1.2 The State of the Question	7
1.2.1 The Genre of 4QMMT	9
1.2.2 The Date of the Document	15
1.2.3 The Dramatis Personae ‘We’-‘You’-‘They’	17
1.2.3.1 We = The Authors	17
1.2.3.2 You (sg. and pl.) = The Addressee(s).....	20
1.2.3.3 They = The Opponents	21
1.3 The Historical Setting.....	22
1.4 Reconstructing the Text of 4QMMT.....	25
1.5 The Goal of the Present Study.....	27
Chapter Two THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE COMPOSITE TEXT OF 4QMMT	31
2.1 The Calendar Fragments: 4Q394 1-2 Calendrical Document D.....	33
2.2 Material Evidence for the Halakhic Section and the Epilogue.....	38
2.2.1 Manuscripts Preserving Fragments from both the Halakhic Section and the Epilogue.....	40
2.2.2 The Transition from the Halakhic Section to the Epilogue.....	43
2.2.3 The Overlapping Sections of the Manuscripts of 4QMMT.....	44
2.3 Transcription of the Fragments of the Epilogue.....	48
2.3.1 Manuscript 4Q397.....	48
2.3.2 Manuscript 4Q398.....	53
2.3.3 Manuscript 4Q399.....	62
2.4 The Synopsis of the Manuscripts of the Epilogue.....	65
2.5 The Composite Text of DJD X Reconsidered.....	66
2.5.1 Comments Based on Manuscript 4Q397.....	66
2.5.2 Comments Based on Manuscript 4Q398.....	70

2.5.3 Variant Readings of the Manuscripts	71
2.5.3.1 Variant Readings in the Halakhic Section	72
2.5.3.2 Variant Readings in the Epilogue	80
2.6 The Placement of Fragments 4Q398 11-13 Within the Epilogue.....	85
2.7 Conclusions	90
2.8 The Composite Text of the Epilogue: An Alternative Arrangement With a Translation	95
2.8.1 The Composite Text	96
2.8.2 Notes on the Reconstructions of the Lacunae	99
2.8.3 Translation of the Composite Text	102
 Chapter Three THE STRUCTURE OF 4QMMT	 105
3.1 The Contents of the Halakhic Section and the Epilogue	106
3.2 Diversity between the Halakhic Section and the Epilogue: Syntax, Vocabulary, and Subject Matter	110
3.2.1 Syntax and Vocabulary	110
3.2.2 References to the Priests.....	114
3.2.3 Subject Matter	115
3.2.4 Earlier Halakhic Sources or/and Redactional Activity?	117
3.3 Biblical Laws and Deuteronomy as a Model.....	120
3.3.1 Deuteronomy in the Halakhic Section.....	121
3.3.2 Deuteronomy in the Epilogue.....	126
3.3.3 The Problem of the Calendar.....	129
3.3.4 The Dramatis Personae.....	134
3.4 Conclusions	141
 Chapter Four THE GENRE OF 4QMMT.....	 144
4.1 Defining the Epistolary Genre: Letters and Literary Epistles.....	146
4.2 Defining the Genre: A Treatise	159
4.3 4QMMT and the Formal Markers of the Epistolary Genre	161
4.4 Conclusions	167
 Chapter Five THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE EPILOGUE	 169
5.1 Methodological Considerations.....	169
5.2 Analysis of the Passages.....	180
5.2.1 A History-Based Exhortation with a Reference to the Bless- ings and Curses.....	182
5.2.2 An Admonition to Maintain the Purity of the Cult.....	191
5.2.3 A Statement about the Separation	201

5.2.4 The Alleged Reference to a Tripartite Canon.....	204
5.2.5 An Exhortation to Repentance and Return with a Reference to the Blessings and Curses	206
5.2.6 A Paraenetic Conclusion with a Reference to the Halakhic Interpretation	213
5.3 Conclusions	218
5.3.1 Qumranic – non-Qumranic?.....	219
5.3.2. Setting	221
5.3.3. The Addressee – The Genre.....	224
 Chapter Six SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	 226
6.1 The Textual Basis of the Epilogue	226
6.2 The Calendar	230
6.3 The Structure of 4QMMT and the Content of the Epilogue: Cove- nantal Motives in 4QMMT.....	230
6.4 The Author, the Addressee, and the Genre.....	232
6.5 The Use of Scripture.....	233
6.6 Provenance: Is 4QMMT a Sectarian Text?	234
 Bibliography	 237
Indices.....	253
Appendix: Synopsis	

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, supervised by Professor Raija Sollamo at the Department of Biblical Studies in the University of Helsinki. Professor Sollamo's motherly care and wise encouragement have been the supporting pillars of my academic path. Among the many colleagues at the University of Helsinki, I am particularly indebted to the late Professor Timo Veijola for guiding me in the world of biblical law and Deuteronomy. His expertise was an enormous source of inspiration. I am furthermore grateful to my colleagues Dr. Jutta Jokiranta, and Dr. Juhana Saukkonen. We have now worked side by side for many years and it has been incredibly gratifying. It is not often that one gets to work with a team of such talented and cooperative persons. Thank you for sharing your knowledge with me and also for your tireless efforts in reading my papers and commenting upon them.

For several years, I had the privilege of working as a research fellow in the *Research Unit on the Formation of Early Jewish and Christian Ideology*, nominated a Centre of Excellence and funded by the Academy of Finland and the Finnish Centre of Excellence Programme (2000-2006). I would like to thank the Finnish Cultural Foundation for awarding me a doctoral studies scholarship. I wish to thank the *Nordic Network in Qumran Studies*, funded by NordForsk, for providing me with travel grants that have made it possible to study the original fragments in Jerusalem and to maintain international contacts. The network has enabled the young Qumran generation of the North to meet and discuss our work with both Nordic and non-Nordic colleagues.

I am in great debt to my external examiners, Professors Eugene Ulrich, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Florentino García Martínez for their detailed comments and critical remarks that helped me to improve the manuscript considerably. I want to thank Professor García

Martínez for accepting my manuscript for publication in the STDJ-series. Professor Ian Werrett, a true friend and a colleague, helped me to create a proper book from the dissertation manuscript with his editorial skills and love for the English language. The book would not be the same without his patient help. All remaining mistakes are due to my own negligence.

I have received invaluable advice and support from a number of colleagues in the field of Qumran Studies. Many have read the manuscript during various stages of its development and by being such great people they have made Qumran studies a truly enjoyable enterprise. I want to mention especially Prof. George Brooke, Prof. Sarianna Metso, Dr. Annette Steudel, Dr. Charlotte Hempel, Dr. Jonathan Ben-Dov, Dr. Mladen Popović, and Dr. Torleif Elgvin.

Finally, I wish to thank those people outside the academic world who have been part of my life during these years. There are many people, both in Finland and elsewhere, whose names are not mentioned here, but who all are irreplaceable. I cannot even begin to say how much it means to have parents and a sister like mine, Esko, Maisa, and Katja Pihlainen, who have always been so proud of me, and stood by me, no matter what absurd turns life and work take at times.

My husband Jens von Weissenberg has been a moral and technical support, and has bravely endured my total reluctance to learn anything new about computers. He has also proved that it is possible to fulfil the dreams of two people in one marriage by living and embracing the concept of shared parenthood. Thank you for standing by me and making me so happy. Jag älskar dig.

Finally my thoughts, thanks and apologies go to my two daughters: Vilja and Venni. These two adorably intelligent and hard-headed persons have taught me valuable lessons, and helped me to see this project in perspective. There are other, more precious things in life than work. It is to my girls I dedicate this book.

Tampere, September 2008
Hanne von Weissenberg

ABBREVIATIONS AND SIGLA

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
ANE	Ancient Near East
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DJDJ	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies
LXX	The Septuagint
MT	The Masoretic Text
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NEB	Die Neue Echter Bibel
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature

SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBL SBS	Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study
SBLStBl	Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature
SBLSym	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
<i>SBT</i>	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i>
SDSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>ThWAT</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAH</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebraistik</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Biblekommentare

QUMRAN TEXTS

CD	Damascus Document
D	CD and 4QD manuscripts
1QS	Community Rule
1QSa	Rule of the Congregation
4QDibHam ^a	Words of the Luminaries ^a (4Q504)
4QMMT	Miqsat ma'aseh ha-Torah
11QT	Temple Scroll

OTHER TEXTS

2 Bar	The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch
Dan	The Book of Daniel
Deut	Deuteronomy
Ex	Exodus

Gen	Genesis
1 Macc	The First Book of Maccabees
2 Macc	The Second Book of Maccabees

SYMBOLS IN THE TRANSCRIPTIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

[]	Lacuna caused by physical damage to the leather
[SSSS]	Text restoration
[[]]	Double brackets; used in the <i>DJD X</i> edition to denote a lacuna the length of which cannot be determined with certainty
[...]	Lacuna of unspecified length in the manuscript
]...[One or more undecipherable traces or untranslatable readings in the manuscript
◦	Undecipherable letter
⚡	Letter seriously damaged; reading uncertain
⚡	Letter damaged; reading substantially certain
<i>vacat</i>	Uninscribed leather

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

From the earliest descriptions of its contents to its official publication by Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell in the Discoveries of the Judean Desert series (*DJD X*),¹ the document known as 4QMMT has both intrigued and puzzled its readers, and continues to do so. When first announced, this text was understood to be a letter written by the founder of the Qumran community, the so-called Teacher of Righteousness, to his opponent the Wicked Priest, in order to explain the reasons for the Qumran community's existence. Given that this text would appear to provide us with valuable information regarding the formation of the Qumran community, it should come as no surprise that many scholars consider it to be one of the most important documents in the Qumran corpus. However, the initial interpretation of this text has been somewhat modified in recent years, and both its genre as a letter and its Qumranic origin have been questioned by some scholars. In spite of these ongoing debates, the contents of this document, when combined with the unfortunate delay in its publication and the subsequent court cases over intellectual property and the copyrighting of ancient manuscripts, have made 4QMMT one of the best known and most interesting texts from Qumran.²

¹ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell et al., *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah* (*DJD X*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

² See for example Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 55 (1990): 64-73; Kapera, "How not to Publish 4QMMT in 1955-1991," in *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report* (ed. Z. Kapera; Krakow: Enigma, 1991) 55-67; *idem*, "How not to Publish 4QMMT. Part II: Spring 1991-Spring 1994," *The Qumran Chronicle* 4. No. 1/2 (1994): 41-52; García Martínez, "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert: Textes Legaux," *JSJ* 32/1 (2001): 71-89; T. H. Lim, H. L. MacQueen and C. M. Carmichael (eds.), *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

1.1. RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION HISTORY OF 4QMMT

Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell published the *editio princeps* of 4QMMT (*DJD X*) in 1994. The title of the document, 4QMMT, was proposed by the editors in 1981. The designation derives from the words “Some of the Works of the Torah” מִקְצַת מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה, which were found in line C26 of the composite text in *DJD X*.³

The manuscripts of this document, numbered 4Q394-399, were found in cave 4 at Qumran and they were delivered to the Palestine Archaeological Museum, now known as the Rockefeller Museum, in Jerusalem during the years 1953-1959. In the *DJD* edition, photographs of all the fragments were published for the first time with transcriptions of the manuscripts and a composite text based on all of the available manuscripts.

The palaeographic analysis of 4QMMT was performed by the editors and Ada Yardeni, who analyzed manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398.⁴ They dated all of the manuscripts palaeographically to the early or mid-Herodian period.⁵ Earlier, however, Frank Moore Cross had given one of the 4QMMT manuscripts a late Hasmonean date. In his seminal article “The Development of the Jewish Scripts” Cross listed “a late Hasmonean semi-cursive script from an unknown work in Hebrew to be edited by J. Strugnell” and he dated the script to the years 50-20 BCE. In another article Cross referred to 4Q398, and dated it either to the late Hasmonean or the early Herodian period.⁶

The oldest preserved manuscript is not likely to be the original composition, and the editors dated the document to around 150 BCE. It is generally considered either one of the earliest writings of the Qumran community or, alternatively, pre-Qumranic in its origin.⁷

³ The Hebrew word מַעֲשֵׂי of the title has been translated either ‘precepts’ or ‘works’.

⁴ Yardeni, “4Q397. 4Q398. Script,” in Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’aseh ha-Torah*, 21-25, 29-34.

⁵ *DJD X*, 3-6; 14; 16-18; 21-25; 29-34; 38-39.

⁶ Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. E. Wright; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961) 149; *idem*, “Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment. Vol I* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 396-401.

⁷ Qimron and Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology. Jerusalem, April 1984* (Jerusalem: IES, 1985) 401; *DJD X*, 121. Schiffman views 4QMMT as “a foundation document” of the Qumran sect, “The

This early dating was partly based on the assumption that the moderateness of the polemical tone in this document must reflect the early history or prehistory of the Qumran community.⁸

Strugnell was assigned as the editor of this text from the beginning, and he mentioned 4QMMT for the first time in a collective report by the editorial team in 1956. The report was published both in French in *Revue Biblique* and in English in *The Biblical Archaeologist*. In this report, Strugnell gave a description of four manuscripts containing purity regulations. As a characteristic of this work he noted its peculiar language as containing elements of Mishnaic Hebrew, for instance, the use of the participle and the relative pronoun װ.⁹

In 1957 Josef Milik published an article on the editing of the Qumran manuscripts. In this article he mentioned two papyrus fragments, written in semi-cursive script, the language containing ‘promisnique’ traits. Although difficult to tell, Milik may have been referring to manuscript 4Q398 of 4QMMT.¹⁰ 4QMMT is mentioned again in Milik’s edition of the Copper Scroll, published in 1962.¹¹ In this work, Milik referred to a text represented by six groups of fragments, apparently originating from six different manuscripts. He labelled these manuscripts as 4QMishn(ique)^{a-f}. According to Milik, Daniel and the pseudepigrapha identified at Qumran influenced the literary genre of the text. The authors of the text, referred to in the

Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBLSym 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 84-85. For a pre-Qumranic origin see García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 15-27.

⁸ This view is repeated in the introduction of Qimron’s new edition of 4QMMT; E. Qimron with J. H. Charlesworth et al., “Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts with English Translations. Vol 3. Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen / Louisville: Mohr Siebeck / Westminster John Knox, 2006) 187-251.

⁹ Baillet et al., “Travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *RB* 73 (1956): 49-67; Benoit et al. “Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran,” *BA* 19 (1956): 75-96.

¹⁰ Milik, “Le travail d’édition des manuscrits du Désert de Juda,” *VTSup* 4 (1957): 24.

¹¹ It is also possible, that Milik is referring to 4QMMT in his book *Ten Years after the Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (transl. by J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 1959) 130, when describing two documents the language of which have mishnaic traits.

first person plural, are ‘angels’ revealing to the anonymous addressee the purity regulations concerning Jerusalem and the Temple and informing him/them of the things that will happen at the end of time.¹² After this, virtually nothing concerning 4QMMT was published for several years.

In order to get the text ready for print Strugnell invited Elisha Qimron to join the editorial work in the early 1980’s. In 1984, at the *International Congress on Biblical Archaeology* in Jerusalem, the text was officially introduced to the scholarly audience. During the congress, Qimron presented preliminary remarks and disclosed some details about 4QMMT. The presentation was published in *Biblical Archaeology Today* in 1985. The same year, Qimron and Strugnell published another article on 4QMMT (with the same title) in *The Israel Museum Journal*. With this article, a photograph of one of the fragments of 4QMMT (MS 4Q398) was printed.¹³

The expected publication of the official edition aroused anticipation in the scholarly community, and the delay generated both disappointment and speculation about 4QMMT. In the mid 1980’s unofficial copies of the composite text of 4QMMT were circulated. The existence of these pirate copies resulted in some unauthorized publications of the composite text. One of the pirate copies was sent to Zdislaw J. Kapera, the editor of the *Qumran Chronicle*, and was published in the *Qumran Chronicle* in 1990, yet, this bootleg version was later withdrawn from the public.¹⁴ In 1991, a composite text of

¹² Milik, “Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15),” in *Les ‘petites grottes’ de Qumran* (ed. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux O.P; DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962) 222. See Strugnell’s comment: “I was misled by a false hypothesis that the laws in the work were angelic laws (as in the Book of Jubilees) rather than legal pronouncements of a human group” in his article, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 58.

J. M. Baumgarten, in discussing the purity issues of poured liquids refers to Milik’s edition of the Copper Scroll and to one of the MSS of 4QMMT with the designation given by Milik, namely 4QMishn^a. See Baumgarten, “The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 164.

¹³ Qimron and Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” *Biblical Archaeology Today* (1985): 400-407; “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985): 9-12.

¹⁴ Anonymous, “An Anonymously Received Pre-Publication of 4QMMT,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 2. Appendix A. No.2 (1990-91): 2-9. Kapera organized a Mogilany Qumran Colloquium on 4QMMT in 1991 – according to Otto Betz he provided

4QMMT was printed in the publisher's *Foreword* in a facsimile edition of the Qumran manuscripts edited by Robert H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson.¹⁵ The Israeli court demanded that the sale of the book be halted, and in the subsequent edition the text of 4QMMT was removed from the *Foreword*.¹⁶

In their book *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, Robert H. Eisenman and Michael O. Wise published a composite text of 4QMMT in 1992. According to Eisenman and Wise, 4QMMT was originally two separate documents: The First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness (4Q394-398), and The Second Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness (4Q397-399). In addition to publishing some of the PAM plates with photographs of the fragments of 4QMMT, the authors presented a Hebrew transcription, English translation, and commentary of the manuscripts of 4QMMT.¹⁷

Apparently, the confusion with the copyright matters related to 4QMMT and its publication delayed the work of Martin G. Abegg and Ben Zion Wacholder, who reconstructed many of the cave four

the congress participants with a 4QMMT text, with the permission of Emanuel Tov and Eugene Ulrich. Betz, "The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context* (ed. D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: SAP, 1994) 177, note 7.

¹⁵ R. H. Eisenman and J. M. Robinson (eds.), *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Prepared with an Introduction and Index. With a Publisher's Foreword by Hershel Shanks* (2 vols; Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991). The publisher Hershel Shanks had obtained a draft of a paper by Qimron circulating among scholars for comment, and decided to print it in his *Foreword*. Qimron sued Shanks, Eisenman, and Robinson after they had published the Hebrew composite text of 4QMMT without his consent and without crediting him for the reconstruction. Qimron won the case and was entitled to the copyright of the reconstructed text of 4QMMT by the Jerusalem District Court and the Israeli Supreme Court; Shanks, Eisenman and Wise were fined. For the discussion on legal issues, see, for instance, the articles in Lim, MacQueen and Carmichael (eds.), *On Scrolls, Artefacts and Intellectual Property*.

¹⁶ The verdict was first given in 1993 and upheld by Israeli Supreme Court in 2000.

¹⁷ R. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992). Even though the authors state that "our reconstruction, transliteration and translation here are completely new", it remained unclear how much of the Hebrew text was based on the authors' independent work and how much on Qimron's composite text. The book is commented on by F. García Martínez in "Notas al margen de 'Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered,'" *RevQ* 16/61 (1993): 123-150, see esp. pages 146-7. See also Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer, und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994) 49.

texts by means of a computer program that utilized the card-index concordance created by the members of the original publication team.¹⁸ The unclear copyright issues and the hope that the official edition would soon be published made scholars reluctant to write and publish anything concerning 4QMMT for several years.

Regardless, the first translations of the (composite) text were published before the official edition was ready for print. Based on the pirate version of the composite text, Bruno Dombrowski authored an English translation, first published privately in 1992 and in 1993 as an appendix to the subscribers of *The Qumran Chronicle*.¹⁹ A Spanish translation by Florentino García Martínez was published in 1992.²⁰

In 1991, three years before the publication of *DJD X*, Kapera published an article entitled *Qumran Cave Four. Special Report*. This article included several essays on 4QMMT, a history of the publication, and a preliminary bibliography.²¹

Lawrence Schiffman was one of the few scholars to be given permission to work with the composite text and comment upon it in public. As a specialist of Jewish halakhah, Schiffman studied the laws of 4QMMT and compared them with the Temple Scroll and its regulations. Schiffman further investigated the similarities of some of

¹⁸ M. G. Abegg and B. Z. Wacholder, *The Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (4 vols; Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991-1995).

¹⁹ See Dombrowski, *An Annotated Translation of Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Tora (4QMMT)* (Weenzen: Privately printed, 1992); *idem*, "An Annotated Translation of Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Tora (4QMMT)," *The Qumran Chronicle* 2. Suppl. vol. Appendix B (1993): 1-44. Dombrowski has stressed that he has left out all the reconstructions that he believes are made by Qimron. Instead he has suggested many independent reconstructions and corrections; *idem*, "Miqsat Ma'aseh Hattora (4QMMT) in English," *The Qumran Chronicle* 4 (1994): 28-40.

²⁰ García Martínez, *Textos de Qumran* (Madrid: Trotta, 1992). W. G. E. Watson translated the Spanish text into English for the English edition. The first edition of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* was published in 1994 (Leiden: Brill), the second in 1996. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, there is both a translation of the composite text, and the individual manuscripts. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, García Martínez and Tigchelaar have included transcriptions and translations of the individual manuscripts, but not of the composite text of the *DJD X* edition. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1997/1998) 791-805.

²¹ Z. J. Kapera (ed.), *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report* (Krakow: Enigma, 1991).

the halakhic rulings in 4QMMT with the Sadducean views.²² Qimron and Strugnell also cooperated with Yaakov Sussmann on the halakhic matters, and, as a result, Sussmann wrote an article concerning the history of halakhah that was published as an appendix to the *DJD X* edition.²³

The official edition was finally published in 1994. The particular interest of the academic audience towards this text is expressed by the fact that, in the same year, two special sessions concerning 4QMMT were organized: the first in the Annual Meeting of Society of Biblical Literature (SBL), and the second in the meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies (AJS). The papers presented at these two congresses were published in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*.²⁴ Somewhat surprisingly, this volume is still the only publication, besides the official edition, to be completely devoted to 4QMMT.

1.2. THE STATE OF THE QUESTION

Since the publication of the *DJD X* edition, the essays on 4QMMT have mainly dealt with the legal material of the halakhic section. The halakhic section is of major importance for understanding the development of Jewish halakhah. Furthermore, 4QMMT has had a profound impact on the study of late Second Temple Judaism, the com-

²² See, for instance, Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 239-255; "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 55 (1990): 64-73; "Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 435-457; "The Prohibition of the Skins of Animals in the Temple Scroll and Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah," in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Jerusalem, August 16-24 1989. Division A: The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990) 191-198.

²³ Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT)," Appendix 1 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*, 179-200. The article was first published in Hebrew in *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990): 11-76. Sussman's article was summarized in English by Piotr Muchowski and published in *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report*, 69-73.

²⁴ M. J. Bernstein and J. Kampen (eds.), *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law* (SBLSym 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

munity behind the Qumran texts, and the development of the Hebrew language.²⁵

Of particular significance for New Testament scholars is the appearance of the term *מִקְצַת מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה* in the epilogue. Apparently this is the only occurrence in early Jewish literature of a Hebrew term comparable with Paul's *ἔργα νόμου* (Rom 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16; 3:2, 5, 10).²⁶

Several questions and assumptions are intertwined in the understanding and interpretation of 4QMMT: the definition of the genre of 4QMMT, the date of the document, the identification of the personal pronouns 'we' – 'you' – 'they', together with the historical setting of this text. Furthermore, since 4QMMT has generally been defined as a text emanating from the Qumran community or its predecessors, the answers to these questions inevitably reflect each individual scholar's understanding concerning the history of the Qumran community.

According to the consensus opinion, the Qumran community, and the broader Qumran movement, is related to but not necessarily identical with the Essenes, who are known from such classical sources as Josephus, Philo of Alexandria, and Pliny the Elder.²⁷ This group was in disagreement with the Temple establishment over certain religious matters, such as the high priesthood, the festival calendar, and halakhic issues. This disagreement created an increasing tension with the Temple establishment, ultimately leading to the separation and

²⁵ See, for instance, Qimron and Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," 404-406; Smith, "The Waw-Consecutive at Qumran," *ZAH* 4/2 (1991): 161-164; Qimron, "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden/Jerusalem: Brill/The Magnes Press/Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992) 349-361.

²⁶ Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997): 147-53; Abegg, "4QMMT C27, 31 and 'Works Righteousness'," *DSD* 6/2 (1999): 139-147; Kampen, "4QMMT and New Testament Studies," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 129-144. See also P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2002) 351-352.

²⁷ See, for instance, the helpful edition *The Essenes According to Classical Sources* (ed. G. Vermez and M. D. Goodman; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989); for a summary of the main interpretations, with an emphasis on the Essene identification, see VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 239-254. The theories challenging the consensus are described, for instance, by Davies in his article "Was There Really a Qumran Community?" *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 3 (1995): 9-35.

isolation of the Qumran group.²⁸ Against this background, 4QMMT has been interpreted in a variety of ways, and the interpretations vary in their details; however, in most cases this text has been defined as the very document explicating the main disputes of the Qumranites or Qumran-Essenes with the Jewish establishment of Jerusalem. Whether 4QMMT is understood as an early document or as a later text stating the main views of the group behind it, its purpose is viewed as a document created “to justify the sectarian schism.”²⁹

The publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls is finally drawing to a close and, accordingly, the diverse contents of this collection are making the interpretation of these texts a much more complex issue. In this situation, the history of the Qumran movement may have to be rewritten. Therefore, during this particular phase of Qumran scholarship, caution is needed when the texts and their meaning are interpreted in order to avoid an artificial forcing of the literary documents into historical models that are under reconsideration and which might have to be revised.³⁰

1.2.1. *The Genre of 4QMMT*

It is a well-known fact that even the editors of 4QMMT were not able to agree on the definition of the genre of this text. Despite the difficulties in defining the genre of 4QMMT, in Qumran scholarship the document is often referred to as the ‘halakhic letter’ in accordance with the first descriptions of Qimron and Strugnell. When first

²⁸ For instance, VanderKam and Flint (*The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263) use the term “self-imposed exile.” More recently the historical development of the Qumran community has been described as an “increasing separation from the outside world” by Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Religion and Society 45; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007) 95.

²⁹ As stated, for instance, by Schiffman in his article “Miqsat Ma’asei ha-Torah,” in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000) 558.

³⁰ For instance, the archeological interpretation of the Qumran site and its artifacts is currently a debated issue. The outcome of this discussion could indeed change our understanding of the history of the community and, owing to that, the interpretation of the texts. See, for instance, Juhana Markus Saukkonen, “A Few Inkwells, Many Hands: Were There Scribes at Qumran?” in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen; Helsinki/Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2008) 538-553.

publicly announced, the editors described the text as a letter by the leader of the Qumran community, possibly even by the Teacher of Righteousness, to the leader of its opponents, a high priest in Jerusalem.³¹

The difficulties in defining the genre of 4QMMT are reflected by several, partly conflicting opinions attested in the *DJD* edition. In the *Introduction*, Qimron and Strugnell state that 4QMMT “appears to be in the form of a letter.”³² However, the definition of the genre as a *personal* letter, originally advocated by the editors, has been rejected by both of them. Instead, in a sub-chapter of *DJD X* (4.2.1. *Literary Genre and Function of MMT: Epistle or Treatise?*), the editors suggest that 4QMMT represents a corporate letter, a public letter, or a treatise.

Clearly, the definition of the genre of 4QMMT is complicated by the lack of appropriate formal features and parallel texts. The editors have pointed out that the document has few of the formal features of a personal letter and that the form-critical parallels could rather be found in the genres of the (public) epistle or of the treatise, even though “formal descriptions of these genres are hard to make.”³³ Despite these difficulties, the editors have noted possible parallels for a public letter in post-mishnaic literature: t. Sanh. 2:6 and par.; in what they call ‘intertestamental’ literature: 2 Macc 1:1-2:18; and in the Pauline epistles. The letter to the Hebrews, and possibly even Luke-Acts, are mentioned as representatives of the genre of treatises by Qimron and Strugnell.³⁴

In their attempt to define the genre of 4QMMT, Qimron and Strugnell have argued that the existence of *an explicit author and the addressee(s)* indicates that the literary genre of the text is either a letter or an epistle. The *content* of 4QMMT, on the other hand, suggests that the text “should be classed with corporate or public letters sent from one group to another, or even with treatises, rather than with the private letter.” Finally, the editors have noted that 4QMMT, rather than being a personal letter, “is probably a treatise on certain points of traditional Zadokite legal praxis”, an appeal sent by a group (of Zadokites) to an individual leader and his people Israel. The pur-

31 Qimron and Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 400.

32 *DJD X*, 1.

33 *DJD X*, 114.

34 *DJD X*, 114.

pose of this treatise was to list the reasons why this group had separated from another Jewish group, which according to the editors was probably Zadokite in origin.³⁵

Strugnell himself abandoned the classification of 4QMMT both as a letter and as a treatise. In his presentation at the Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, held before the publication of the edition,³⁶ and in the Appendix 3 of *DJD X*, Strugnell repeated that the document contains few traits of a personal letter. He found it an inappropriate classification for both the halakhic section and the epilogue on form-critical grounds. Strugnell pointed out that, form-critically, the beginning of the halakhic section does not resemble the opening of a letter – though he admitted it could constitute the beginning of a section inside a letter. Instead, he suggested that the first words look rather like an incipit “to introduce a collection of laws, pronouncements or the like”. Apparently his final position on the matter was that the opening lines (*DJD X* B1-3) form a freestanding introduction to a collection of laws, and the document ends with a hortatory conclusion, an exhortation on the observance of the previously described halakhot. Nevertheless, he assumed that 4QMMT was a document *sent* to someone, and he concludes: “the minimalist will call MMT not a letter but a legal proclamation sent to an accepted ruler.”³⁷ In the end, the editors of 4QMMT found it impossible to agree upon the genre of the document.

Some scholars still support the ‘letter-theory,’ while others have distanced themselves from this generic definition. It has become increasingly clear that 4QMMT eludes any clear definition of genre, as stated by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein in their *Introduction* to the volume *Reading 4QMMT*:

One of the difficulties faced by the interpreter of MMT is the identification of its genre. Accordingly, although termed a “halakhic letter” in Qimron and Strugnell’s first publications, this characterization may legitimately be questioned.

³⁵ *DJD X*, 113; 114; 121.

³⁶ Published as “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 57-73.

³⁷ Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 72.

Kampen and Bernstein have commented on Strugnell's classification of 4QMMT as a collection of laws, and criticized this because it does not take into consideration the argumentative tone of the document. According to them, the legal section alone could be defined as a text "which describes legal disputes." However, the existence of the final section, the epilogue, makes the case more complicated, and, in the end, Kampen and Bernstein have refrained from proposing an alternative classification for 4QMMT.³⁸

There are a few scholars according to whom 4QMMT is a personal letter, written by a leader of the Qumran movement.³⁹ Sussman has stated that "the work is written as a *personal epistle* – apparently from one of the leaders of the sect to a leader of the opposing group."⁴⁰ Hartmut Stegemann gave the document the title "*Die Weisung des Lehrers an Jonatan*", clearly implying both the genre and the historical setting of 4QMMT. Stegemann further referred several times to the document as a letter (*Brief*).⁴¹ Also Otto Betz has defended the hypothesis that the Teacher of Righteousness was responsible for the authorship of 4QMMT, and, according to Betz, that the document's addressee was a Hasmonean priest king, most likely Jonathan.⁴² Miguel Pérez Fernández, although admitting that the document has significance beyond what it originally was, has argued that the document was written as "*an epistle* from one representative of the community to another leader of Israel about ritualistic halakhot."⁴³

It seems, however, that most scholars, while maintaining that the formal features of the epistolary genre dominate 4QMMT, have abandoned the generic classification of 4QMMT as a *personal* letter.

³⁸ Kampen and Bernstein, "Introduction," 5.

³⁹ Eisenman and Wise have, in fact, divided the document into *two* letters: the First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness (4Q394-398), and the Second Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness (4Q397-399). Eisenman – Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 182-200.

⁴⁰ Sussman, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT)," 179-200, esp. p. 185.

⁴¹ Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 148-151.

⁴² Betz states that "4QMMT has so many similarities with the special theology and ethics of the Qumran community and the Essenes of Flavius Josephus, that I am strongly inclined to attribute this document to the Teacher of Righteousness." Betz, "The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition," 193-194; 197.

⁴³ Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 193.

For instance, Jesper Høgenhaven, while recognizing the complexity of the genre of 4QMMT, has stated that the epistolary form governs the overall structure of 4QMMT, and that the rhetorical features used by the author(s)'s should be associated with the letter genre. Furthermore he has referred to the epilogue as "the explicitly epistolary C section." Høgenhaven has followed the classification of the editors, and concluded that 4QMMT "exhibits the form of a public letter."⁴⁴ Recently, Annette Steudel has repeated the definition of the 4QMMT as a literary epistle, maintaining that the text contains literary features of a letter. Furthermore, she has tentatively suggested that 4Q448 might constitute the lost beginning of the document.⁴⁵

Although several scholars have become cautiously critical of the definition of 4QMMT as a letter, most remain ambivalent and consider 4QMMT either as a real letter or a document perceived of as such by the Qumran community. Schiffman has maintained that 4QMMT "purports to be a letter," even though accepting the possibility that the text might in fact not be a real letter from the early period of the community, as suggested in *DJD* X, but could also be a later, apocryphal text, created to "express the break, or schism, with the Jerusalem establishment."⁴⁶ H. Eshel, on the other hand, does not consider 4QMMT to be a real letter written by the Teacher of Righteousness, but has suggested that it was perceived as such by the author and the readers of another text found in the Qumran caves, namely 4QpPs^a, which, according to Eshel, refers to 4QMMT by the "Law and Torah" mentioned in the text.⁴⁷ The letter-theory has also been criticized by Lester Grabbe, who has queried the general identification of the sender as (a member of) the Qumran community and the assertion of the addressee of the 'letter' as a leader in Israel – as Grabbe has reminded us: "We do not know who wrote MMT or to

⁴⁴ Høgenhaven, "Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT," *DSD* 10/2 (2003): 187-204; esp. pages 198-199.

⁴⁵ Steudel, "4Q448 – The Lost Beginning of MMT?" in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; *STDJ* 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 247-263. Steudel's suggestion concerning the relationship of 4Q448 and 4QMMT will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 of this book.

⁴⁶ Schiffman refers to the document as the "so-called 'halakhic letter'"; see, for instance, Schiffman "The New Halakhic Letter 4QMMT and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," 65.

⁴⁷ Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law*, 55, 64.

whom it was addressed"; he even wondered whether 4QMMT was sent *from* Qumran or *to* Qumran. In the end, however, like most scholars, he has remained hesitant in deciding whether 4QMMT is a real letter or a pseudo-epistle.⁴⁸

It has become increasingly clear that one of the problems for modern readers and interpreters of 4QMMT is the elusive genre of this document. Possibly the first scholar to call into question the title of 4QMMT as the 'halakhic letter' was Philip Callaway. Callaway questioned the identification of the author(s) and the addressee(s) suggested by the editors, the early dating of 4QMMT, and even the connectedness of the composite text of the editors.⁴⁹ In his article on the letter texts found in the Judean Desert, James M. Lindenberger has noted that 4QMMT is "generically mixed", and has pointed out that the number of preserved copies suggests that it was *treated* rather as a literary text than as "an occasional communication" – but in the end he has left the question of the historical origins of the text open.⁵⁰ The letter genre has been most clearly rejected by George Brooke, who has suggested that 4QMMT should be classified not as a letter, but as a "treatise with a didactic element."⁵¹

Because of the lack of suitable or satisfactory parallel texts the generic classification of 4QMMT has not been resolved definitively. Even though different genre assumptions might lead to differing historical reconstructions, as has been shown by Maxine Grossman,⁵² 4QMMT is often used to explain the history and origins of the Qumran movement, most recently by Eyal Regev and Stephen Hultgren.⁵³

⁴⁸ Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 89-108, esp. p. 90, see also n. 5.

⁴⁹ Callaway tentatively suggests that the fragments of 4QMMT might actually belong to more than one composition; Callaway, "4QMMT and Recent Hypothesis on the Origin of the Qumran Community," in *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Krakow: Enigma, 1996) 15-29.

⁵⁰ Lindenberger, "Letters," in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 481-482.

⁵¹ Brooke, "Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT," 80-82.

⁵² Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 3-22; See also Fraade, "To Whom it May Concern: 4QMMT and its addressees," *RevQ* 19/76 (2000): 507-526.

⁵³ Both use 4QMMT for historical reconstructions of the Qumran movement with hardly any mention of the debate around the document. Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 5, 97; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant Commu-*

The problem with assigning a genre to 4QMMT is amply demonstrated by the Index Volume of the DJD series (*DJD XXXIX*), in the chapter entitled *Annotated List of the Texts from the Judean Desert*. Here, all the findings are classified according to their genre, and 4QMMT is defined as an “Epistolary Treatise Concerned with Religious Law” – the only representative of this category.⁵⁴

1.2.2. *The Date of the Document*

As mentioned above, 4QMMT is conventionally dated to c. 150 BCE. This early dating is justified by the moderate tone of the polemic of 4QMMT, and the respectful and friendly manner in which the 2nd person sg. reader of the epilogue is addressed. This has led some scholars to assume that 4QMMT must date from the early period of the Qumran movement, possibly even constituting a foundation document of the Qumran group. Accordingly, the text was authored before the situation with their opponents, presumably the Temple establishment, had come to an intolerable tension that led to a permanent and irreconcilable separation.

According to Qimron and Strugnell, polemical discussions with outsiders were allowed only in the time of the Teacher of Righteousness, before the community was withdrawn and completely separated, since 1QS 9:16-17 prohibits disputes with the opponents. Because of the moderateness of 4QMMT and the fact that the document does not discuss the genealogy of the high priest, which the editors name as the cause of the schism between the groups, 4QMMT is dated to an early phase of the Qumran movement, or to a pre-Qumranic stage.⁵⁵ While they admit that one need not assume that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of 4QMMT,

it fits most of our evidence if we conclude that MMT was written in the Teacher’s community and reflects the earlier phases of its devel-

nity: *Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 250-264.

⁵⁴ Lange – Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judean Desert Classified by Content and Genre,” in E. Tov, *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002) 285-321.

⁵⁵ DJD X, 117.

opment before it adopted its later and more developed forms shown in the writing composed at Qumran.

4QMMT is defined as a group composition, originating in the Qumran group, or in one of its antecedents, probably between 159-152 BCE, possibly “a systematic exposition of the reasons why a group of Zadokites separated from another group.”⁵⁶

Most scholars follow the editors and date 4QMMT to the early Hasmonean period, to roughly 150 BCE. For instance, Schiffman dates 4QMMT around 152 BCE when the Hasmoneans took over the high priesthood and began to follow temple practices identified as pharisaic by later Tannaitic sources.⁵⁷ According to H. Eshel the composition of 4QMMT should be dated to c.152 BCE, the beginning of Jonathan’s rise to power,⁵⁸ Hultgren has followed this dating.⁵⁹ Schwartz refers more vaguely to the early Hasmonean period.⁶⁰ Schiffman even considers 4QMMT to be a possible foundation document for what became the Qumran sect.⁶¹

Hans Burgmann, A. S. van der Woude and Israel Knohl have suggested a later date for 4QMMT. Burgmann’s dating between 134-104 BCE is based on his assumption that 4QMMT was a letter sent to a high priest, most likely to Hyrcanos I; this identification is shared by van der Woude.⁶² Knohl’s candidate for the addressee is Simon (son of Boethus, c. 23-5 BCE) and he dates the composition of the document in the last three decades of the first century.⁶³ The problem with all these suggestions is the uncertainty of the assumption they are based on, namely, an understanding of 4QMMT as a letter sent to

⁵⁶ DJD X, 120-121.

⁵⁷ Schiffman, “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 287.

⁵⁸ Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” 64.

⁵⁹ Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant Community*, 514.

⁶⁰ Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 67-80.

⁶¹ Schiffman, “Miqsat Ma’aseh ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll,” 435; *idem*, “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Case of Tevul Yom,” *DSD* 1/3 (1994): 287; *idem*, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Mss,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 84-85.

⁶² Burgmann, “A Historically Justifiable Dating of 4QMMT,” in *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report*, 114. This identification is shared by A. S. van der Woude, “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988),” *Theologische Rundschau* 54 (1989): 245-247.

⁶³ Knohl, “Re-Considering the Dating and Recipient of Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” *Hebrew Studies* 37 (1996): 119-125.

a high priest in Jerusalem, as well as of the development of the Qumran movement and its relation to other Jewish groups. If these assumptions are abandoned or revised, the arguments for the dating of the document need to be reconsidered. Unfortunately 4QMMT lacks any specific historical allusions or references that would give a fixed point for the dating.⁶⁴

1.2.3. *The Dramatis Personae* “We” – “You” – “They”

The frequent use of personal pronouns in 4QMMT has led scholars to make efforts to identify these epithets with some known historical person(s) and/or groups known from other sources, such as Josephus, Philo, Pliny, the New Testament, and the Rabbinic literature. Various solutions have been proposed, and even the opinions of the editors seem to differ slightly. The main assumption, however, is that 4QMMT “is to be explained as reflecting the history (or prehistory) of the Qumran community.” In accordance with this assumption, the starting point for the identification of the *dramatis personae* is that 4QMMT needs to be placed in a historical phase so that an eirenic discussion between the author(s) of 4QMMT and the outsiders would have been possible.⁶⁵

1.2.3.1. *We = The Authors*

Initially, Qimron and Strugnell identified the author of the ‘letter’ as the Teacher of Righteousness.⁶⁶ It seems that at least Strugnell has rejected this identification; however, the editors apparently disagree over this matter as well. For instance, in *DJD X* it is stated that “we have real evidence that connects MMT to the Teacher of Righteousness.” The editors of *DJD X* further state:

Though MMT is formally, and on internal grounds, a communal document ... there is a later inner-Qumranian tradition in 4QpPs^a referring to a document or ‘precepts and laws’ which the Teacher of Righteousness had sent to the Wicked Priest.

⁶⁴ Also pointed out by Regev (*Sectarianism in Qumran*, 107): “MMT simply contains no historical data.”

⁶⁵ *DJD X*, 114.

⁶⁶ Qimron and Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 400.

According to the editors, if 4QpPs^a is referring to MMT, then the author of MMT must be the Teacher of Righteousness and the addressee the Wicked Priest.⁶⁷

In his article “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” however, Strugnell states that he can find no evidence in 4QMMT itself suggesting “the presence of the specific *dramatis personae* (e.g. Wicked Priest, Teacher of Righteousness) known from the other Qumran texts.”⁶⁸ Even though most scholars have abandoned the original identification of the author of 4QMMT as the Teacher of Righteousness, there are still some scholars who have maintained it, for instance Hartmut Stegemann, who named the document *Die Weisung des Lehrers an Jonatan*.⁶⁹

In *DJD X*, the halakhic opinions of the ‘we’-group are identified as those attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and furthermore as those represented in Tannaitic Literature by the Sadducees. Supported by the similarities in the halakhah, the editors draw the conclusion that 4QMMT is “a document emanating from a priestly group related to the early Sadducees, and either identical with, or an ancestor of, the Qumran group.”⁷⁰ The other editor, Qimron, states unambiguously in *DJD X* that the ‘we’-group is “clearly the Dead Sea Sect.”⁷¹

In a later article, entitled “Second Thoughts”, Strugnell sketches the minimalist view, according to which 4QMMT was a legal proclamation sent by a priestly group that only later developed into what became the Qumran sect. He further proposes that the theological discrepancies between 4QMMT and the Qumran sect result from a different phase in the development of the Qumran group, rather than a completely dissimilar setting.⁷²

Schiffman also identifies 4QMMT as a document written by the Qumran community and more specifically by its leaders. Based on the similarities in the halakhah of 4QMMT with some of the practices associated with the Sadducees of the rabbinic sources, Schiff-

⁶⁷ *DJD X*, 114; 119-120.

⁶⁸ Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 70-71.

⁶⁹ Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 148.

⁷⁰ *DJD X*, 116-117.

⁷¹ Qimron, “The Halakha,” *DJD X*, 175.

⁷² Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 72. According to Strugnell, “it was only later, in the Psalms Commentary that MMT was given the historical setting it lacked, by anachronistic projection into the later conflict over the authority of the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness.”

man developed a theory according to which the first members of the Qumran sect, and the authors of 4QMMT, must have been Sadducees.⁷³ It appears that he later modified his approach: In an article published ten years later he speaks of “the confluence of Qumran texts and Sadducean evidence” resulting from the common antecedents of the two groups.⁷⁴ Schiffman’s theory of the Sadducean origins of the Qumran group was strongly opposed, and the Essene origin of the Qumranites defended, for instance, by James VanderKam, and more moderately by Joseph Baumgarten.⁷⁵

It is generally concluded that 4QMMT was authored by the members of the Qumran group or its predecessors.⁷⁶ It has, however, also been pointed out that at least the halakhic section of 4QMMT has nothing specifically Qumranic or sectarian in it. Sussmann and Charlotte Hempel have pointed out the general, non-sectarian scope of the halakhic section.⁷⁷ The focus is not necessarily sectarian, governing

⁷³ Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” 69; *idem*, “4QMMT – Basic Sectarian Text,” in *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report*, 82.

⁷⁴ Schiffman, “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 285-299.

⁷⁵ VanderKam, “Qumran Residents: Essenes Not Sadducees!” in *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report*, 105-108; J.M. Baumgarten, “Some Remarks on the Qumran Law and the Identification of the Community,” in *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report*, 115-117; *idem*, “Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 27-36. See also Grabbe, “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society,” 89-108; Davies, “Sadducees in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report*, 85-94.

⁷⁶ For instance, according to H. Eshel, the text “reflects the sect’s notion that it shared with Jonathan and the Pharisees some fundamental assumptions about the biblical laws and their interpretation.” Apparently, for Eshel, the ‘sect’ responsible for authoring 4QMMT is the Qumran group or movement; Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” 53-65. For Schwartz, the author(s) of 4QMMT are member(s) of the Qumran movement originating from a “priestly camp”, but one that has separated itself from the “corrupted priests”. The author(s) wishes to “revise the laws of the Temple and priesthood in line with the positions of the Qumran community and convince the addressee of his/their sincerity”; Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 79-80. According to Medala, the authors of 4QMMT must have been members of a pre-Pharisaic Hasidean group; Medala, “The Character and Historical Setting of 4QMMT,” *The Qumran Chronicle* Vol. 4 No. 1/2 (1994): 7, 11, 12, 14-15, 27.

⁷⁷ Sussmann, Appendix 1, DJD X, 186; Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of the Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 70-71.

the life of a particular group, but rather it is addressed to Israel as a whole. Furthermore, the document lacks the technical terminology and expressions that are found in the sectarian documents from Qumran, a feature that has been noted by Strugnell and García Martínez. Accordingly, they consider the text to be a pre-Qumranic document.⁷⁸ It is pointed out by Brooke in a book review of *DJD X* that the early dating combined with the archaeological evidence in fact makes 4QMMT pre-Qumranic.⁷⁹

1.2.3.2. *You (sg. and pl.) = The Addressee(s)*

It has often been proposed that the 2nd person singular of the epilogue refers to a priestly or a royal leader of Israel. In *DJD X* the editors state:

Nowhere else in the Qumran literature is there any mention of such an effort to convince the leader of Israel of the validity of the sect's halakhic views and the invalidity of its opponents.⁸⁰

The editors were the first to suggest that the 2nd person singular addressee refers to one of the Hasmonean / Maccabean rulers; possibly a High Priest. In *DJD X*, the 'you' in the singular, the addressee and the receiver of the letter, is identified as a political leader of Israel, probably a Maccabean ruler; one that would later become the

⁷⁸ Strugnell was the first to suggest a pre-Qumranic origin for 4QMMT; Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 68, 71, 73; García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," 27. Admittedly, "standard Qumran texts" or "sectarian texts" are slightly problematic categories. The question is further complicated by the increased amount and diversity of published data after the opening of the archives in the 1990's. There have been several attempts to develop criteria for defining the sectarian or specifically Qumranic texts. See Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 167-187; Chazon, "Is Divrei Ha-Me'orot a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research*. (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden / Jerusalem: Brill / The Magnes Press / Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992) 3-17; Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem 1989-1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 26-30; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden Brill, 1998) 9-16.

⁷⁹ See Brooke's review of *DJD X* in *JTS* 46/2 (1995): 597-601, esp. p. 600.

⁸⁰ *DJD X*, 115.

Wicked Priest (cf. 1QpHab).⁸¹ Qimron (in the chapter on halakhah in *DJD X*) concludes that the addressee was one of the Hasmonean kings.⁸² Strugnell has maintained this theory in his later article, where he states that 4QMMT was sent to a ruler, who was one of the High Priests of Israel “and possibly even the one who was to turn to proto-Pharisaic positions and to become the Wicked Priest of the Commentaries”.⁸³ The ‘you’ in plural, on the other hand, is a group related to the leader, “the people of Israel,” a priestly group or the priestly establishment of Jerusalem.⁸⁴

Alternatively, it has been suggested by H. Eshel and Schwartz that *the addressee* of the document was in fact *a Pharisee*. According to Schwartz the halakhic section is addressed to a group, and the epilogue is addressed to an individual, apparently a ruler, in some way closely connected with the previously mentioned group. Both the individual addressee of the epilogue, and the group referred to in the halakhic section are Pharisees.⁸⁵

1.2.3.3. *They = The Opponents*

In *DJD X*, the ‘opponents’ of the ‘we’-group, the so-called ‘they’-group are identified as the Pharisees.⁸⁶ The ‘they’ of the halakhic section do not appear at all in the epilogue, but the editors identify the ‘they’-group of the halakhic section with the רוב העם of the epilogue, the “multitude of the people” from which the authors have separated themselves.⁸⁷ However, since even in the halakhic section, the existence of a clearly definable ‘they’-group is not certain, the identification is somewhat problematic.

⁸¹ *DJD X*, 117-118, 121.

⁸² *DJD X*, 175.

⁸³ Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 72.

⁸⁴ *DJD X*, 121; Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” 65; “Miqsat Ma’aseh ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll,” 435.

⁸⁵ Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 77; Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” 61.

⁸⁶ *DJD X*, 115; Qimron, “The Halakha,” *DJD X*, 175; Sussmann, Appendix 1, *DJD X*, 187. The same identification is made by Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 98.

⁸⁷ *DJD X*, 115. According to Schwartz, since the addressees are Pharisees, the רוב העם refers to the Sadducees, the Temple priesthood; Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 79-80.

1.3. THE HISTORICAL SETTING

In all of the various interpretations of 4QMMT it is generally assumed that the document was addressed to a group of ‘outsiders’,⁸⁸ probably the Temple establishment. After the break with this group, the relationship with the opponents remained hostile and defensive, and no more efforts were made toward reconciliation or reformation of the situation in the Jerusalem Temple.⁸⁹ However, this assumption does not completely explain the rather large number of the late copies of the text. Obviously, the number of manuscripts bears witness to the importance and possible authority of a text for the Qumran community. According to the editors,

the large number [of copies] does not necessarily imply that MMT originated within the Qumran community. It could be a work of pre-Qumranic origin, but the large number of manuscripts present would imply that there was at Qumran a great and lasting interest in both the controversial and the legal positions of the document.⁹⁰

Kampen has questioned the identification of the addressee as one of the Hasmonean rulers, and he believes it is more likely that “the addressee is part of the same movement as the writer, but geographically and/or theologically somewhat removed from the author’s group.”⁹¹ Brooke, who has compared Luke-Acts with 4QMMT, has proposed a similar setting. The purpose of the author of 4QMMT, who writes “on behalf of a group to an audience with whom he shares much in common”, is to “confirm that the two groups are much in agreement”.⁹² Adele Reinhartz has pointed out that the af-

⁸⁸ For example, VanderKam and Flint propose that 4QMMT indicates how “the community living at Qumran and the wider movement of which they were a part tried at least once to convince others of the rightness of their way”; VanderKam – Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 275.

⁸⁹ See, for instance, Fraade, “To Whom it May Concern: 4QMMT and its addressees,” 518.

⁹⁰ DJD X, 112. The editors comment: “If MMT was composed – or believed to have been composed – by the Teacher of Righteousness, this would explain the great authority assigned to it among the Qumran sectarians.”

⁹¹ Kampen, “4QMMT and the New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 131.

⁹² Brooke, “Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” 81-82. According to Brooke, both Luke-Acts and 4QMMT “appear to have been written to confirm, strengthen and assure the reader that the position they have been taught or

finites in the mode and expression of 4QMMT and certain New Testament epistles, and in particular those that discuss boundary-marking issues (e.g. Galatians, 2 Peter, 1 John), imply an “instability in the relationship between the author and the addressee”. In all these texts, the 1st person author, and the 2nd person addressee are closely connected, and the addressee may be either an individual or a group, nevertheless not far removed from the author(s), except perhaps geographically. Reinhartz has argued for a generally identical function and setting for 4QMMT, regardless whether or not it is a real letter.⁹³

Maxine Grossman and Steven Fraade have further questioned the polemical character of 4QMMT, and have experimented with several different ways of reading 4QMMT. Fraade has proposed for 4QMMT an ‘intramural’, exhortative or pedagogical use inside the community. While Fraade considers a pre-Qumranic dating and extramural addressee for 4QMMT or its antecedents possible, he has pointed out the fact that the existence of the copies found at Qumran indicates the use of the text “for intramural sectarian instruction in the first century BCE/CE,” and finds it more likely that the document was composed for intracommunal, pedagogical use to train and educate the candidates and new members of the community for the purpose of “reinforcing the process of social separation.”⁹⁴

Grossman has made a very important point in demonstrating how the genre assumptions made by modern readers result in differing interpretations of the historical significance of the document. According to Grossman, 4QMMT can be read and understood both as an extracommunal epistle, as an intracommunal treatise, and as a document-after-the-fact. Grossman has shown how one can postulate one single author, possibly even the Teacher of Righteousness, an individual addressee, and a specific conflict as the historical background of 4QMMT if it is defined as an extracommunal epistle. In this case, the late copies signify the importance of this letter as a foundational document of the group. In the second reading 4QMMT in seen as an intracommunal treatise, only purporting to be a docu-

now hold is indeed the correct or appropriate one. Both MMT and Luke-Acts are confirmatory instruction.”

⁹³ Reinhartz, “We, You, They; Boundary Language in 4QMMT and the New Testament Epistles,” *The Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature* (ed. D. R. Schwartz and R. A. Clements, *forthcoming*).

⁹⁴ Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 507-526.

ment directed to an outside authority. According to this reading, even though 4QMMT was authored in the early period of the community, it was preserved and studied by the later members as an “account of the community’s foundation and a record of their most central concerns.” In the third reading, 4QMMT is given a later date and is defined as a “historicizing document” recording “the statutes and concerns they considered most central.”⁹⁵

In presenting the various possible settings and interpretations, Grossman and Fraade have listed several reasons for writing, preserving, and studying 4QMMT in the first century BCE/CE⁹⁶ but have not mentioned the most obvious one: a continuous, real and acute concern for the purity of the Temple cult. Apparently even these scholars conform to the general assumption that once the break with the Jerusalem Temple was reality, the group remained isolated and discussions with outsiders were ended.⁹⁷ It seems possible, however, that the “lasting interest,” proved by the number of late copies, actually imply, as suggested by Brooke, that

the issues discussed at the time of the break with the Jerusalem Temple were revisited from time to time by members of the community, perhaps at times when there seemed to be the possibility of genuine reform and reconstruction, such as with Herod.⁹⁸

The discussion summarized above reveals how easily the interdependence of the historical setting and the interpretation of the document can easily descend into the realm of circular reasoning. The presumptions of both the genre and the historical setting of the document have an impact on our reading and interpretation of this text. Similarly, our reading and interpretation of the text influence our decision about its genre and historical setting. When none of these are known with certainty, the project devolves into an exercise in Diophantine analysis. The fact is that our reconstructions of the history of the Qumran community together with the assumptions we make concerning their theological and ideological development,

⁹⁵ Grossman, “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” 5; 8-16; 19-22.

⁹⁶ See also Brin, in a Review of DJD X, *JSS* 40/2 (1995): 335.

⁹⁷ See, for instance, Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 525-526, and n. 63.

⁹⁸ Brooke, “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel* (ed. J. Day; LHBOTS 422; London: T&T Clark, 2005) 424.

affect the way we date, and how we understand the setting and function of the documents we read.⁹⁹

1.4. RECONSTRUCTING THE TEXT OF 4QMMT

In *DJD X*, the editors created a composite text from the six existing manuscripts of 4QMMT (numbered 4Q394-399). Clearly, the editors have made a substantial contribution in their identification of the fragments, and in piecing together this document. The composite text at each point follows the most complete manuscript, complemented, where possible, with parallel material from other manuscripts or other texts. It is not intended to be a critical text representing the most original text form. The editors divided the composite text into three literary divisions: Section A) the calendar section representing a 364-day solar calendar, Section B) the halakhot,¹⁰⁰ and Section C) an epilogue.¹⁰¹ According to the editors it is even possible that the document originally consisted of four sections, the fourth being an opening formula or a poem that, although unattested in the finds from Cave 4, may have appeared before the calendar.¹⁰²

Qimron has advised that the composite text should not be used independently, but ought to be consulted together with the individual

⁹⁹ Recently, Charlotte Hempel has demonstrated the effect of the scholarly preconceptions on the interpretation of 4QMMT. She has suggested that often these preconceptions have influenced the interpretation more than the evidence provided by the text itself; see Hempel, "The Context of 4QMMT: Unassuming Assumptions," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ; Leiden, Brill, forthcoming).

¹⁰⁰ Strugnell has questioned the appropriateness of the rabbinic term halakhah in the context of the Qumran texts; Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 65-66. I have decided to use the standard terminology, in the meaning introduced by Hempel in her study of the legal material of the Damascus Document. She refers with the term halakhah to those Laws of D that "contain legislation that is general in its formulation and which does not refer to a particular organized community;" Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 25. In this meaning the term is entirely appropriate to describe the legal section of 4QMMT. However, even though issues that correspond to what in rabbinic texts are described as halakhah are discussed extensively in texts found at Qumran, the term itself, halakhah as a noun, was apparently not used in the Qumran corpus, see Meier, "Is There Halaka (the Noun) at Qumran?" *JBL* 122/1 (2003): 150-155.

¹⁰¹ *DJD X*, 109-111.

¹⁰² *DJD X*, 1-2; Qimron and Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," 9.

manuscripts.¹⁰³ In spite of this caveat, the composite text of *DJD X* has been regarded almost as the *textus receptus* of 4QMMT, and has remained virtually unchallenged in subsequent Qumran scholarship.¹⁰⁴ It must be acknowledged, however, that the composite text created by the editors is not entirely unproblematic.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, a critical assessment of the text of 4QMMT is required.

Attempts to determine the function and meaning of the epilogue of 4QMMT are hindered by the considerable text critical problems and the level of uncertainty of the epilogue's composite text. One of the problems that need to be addressed concerns the arrangement of the fragments of the epilogue. Qimron and Strugnell disagree over the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 in the composite text of section C, and Strugnell legitimately points out the fact that

when we are unable to establish where a complete paragraph belongs, then we may not have reached too precise an understanding of the document.¹⁰⁶

In *DJD X*, the composite text is arranged according to Qimron.¹⁰⁷ There, fragments 4Q398 11-13 are placed in the lower part of column 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, resulting in *penultima* column of MS 4Q398 of approximately 16 lines.

In the arrangement chosen for the composite text of *DJD X*, MS 4Q397 frgs. 14-21 constitute the first part of section C: the epilogue. With regard to the division of 4QMMT into different literary sections, some scholars have suggested that the first fragmentary lines of this column actually belong to the previous section of the docu-

¹⁰³ Qimron, "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text", 9-10.

¹⁰⁴ The composite text of the *DJD X* edition is referred to as the *textus receptus* of 4QMMT by Talshir in his book review of the *DJD X* edition in *DSD* 2/3 (1995): 365-377, esp. p. 366. Importantly, J. M. Baumgarten has pointed out that "scholarly convention requires the use of sigla to distinguish restorations from readings, and marking the latter according to degree of reliability. But proposed readings have an insidious way of infiltrating the literature as if they were assured readings." Baumgarten, "The 'Halakha' in Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (MMT)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116/3 (1996): 512-516, n.1.

¹⁰⁵ Regardless of the apparent problems, the composite text is printed in a virtually identical form in Qimron's new edition; Qimron with J. H. Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 187-251.

¹⁰⁶ For a more detailed discussion, see, for example, Appendices 2 and 3 in *DJD X*, 201-206; Qimron, "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text," 12-13 or Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 69.

¹⁰⁷ Also in Qimron with J. H. Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 187-251.

ment, namely to the halakhic section: *DJD X C1-7* = 4Q397 frgs. 14-21 lines 1-7 according to Bernstein;¹⁰⁸ *DJD X C1-9* = 4Q397 frgs. 14-21 lines 1-9 according to Pérez Fernández.¹⁰⁹

Strugnell and Stegemann have proposed an alternative placement for fragments 4Q398 11-13. According to these scholars, fragments 4Q398 11-13 are to be located *before* 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i. In their reconstruction of this manuscript, each column contains approximately eight lines. Unfortunately, they have not published an alternative arrangement of the fragments of the epilogue. A material reconstruction of manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 would possibly give a more definite answer to this unsettled question, but it is impeded by the material deterioration of MS 4Q398. Stegemann has made a preliminary material reconstruction of MS 4Q397, but he did not publish his results before his untimely death in 2006. Currently, his notes are being prepared for publication by Reinhard Kratz.¹¹⁰

1.5. THE GOAL OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Scholarly essays written on 4QMMT have dealt mainly with the legal material of the halakhic section. Less attention has been paid to the third section, the so-called epilogue. The aim of the present study is to understand the function and meaning of the epilogue, and to read and evaluate the entire document in light of the results of this analysis.

In order to establish a reliable textual basis for our subsequent analysis, Chapter 2 of this study necessarily begins with an investigation of the textual evidence of the manuscripts. This part of the work is based on the contribution of the initial editors in identifying, piecing together, and locating the fragments; however, the final form of the text is based on my own readings.

¹⁰⁸ Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 46-47.

¹⁰⁹ Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," 196-197.

¹¹⁰ The notes were written during Stegemann's several stays in Jerusalem, mainly in 1983, 1985, and 1990. For some preliminary considerations, especially with regard to the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 see Kratz, "Moses und die Propheten: zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, 151-176.

In addition to the palaeography and transcription of the fragments, the text critical work will help to establish how, and to what extent, the material evidence of the manuscripts indicates the connectedness or disconnectedness of the different sections. The whole document is not preserved in any of the extant manuscripts, and not all of the manuscripts preserve fragments from both the halakhic section and the epilogue.

The variant readings of the manuscripts both in the halakhic section and in the epilogue will be analyzed in order to establish and compare the level of certainty of the composite text in each section. Moreover, an investigation of the redactional activity, or the lack thereof, detectable when manuscripts are compared, will provide information on the nature of each section. Accordingly, in order to allow a comparison between the halakhic section and the epilogue, the detailed treatment of the variant readings also includes the halakhic section. The arrangement of the fragments of the epilogue is discussed, and the different solutions that have been proposed are evaluated in an attempt to establish the text form of the epilogue.

Qimron and Strugnell already noted the disparate character of 4QMMT,¹¹¹ and some scholars have attempted to separate the epilogue and the halakhic section.¹¹² Others have criticized the editors' division of 4QMMT into different sections, and have suggested that the two main sections, the halakhot and the epilogue, may belong more closely together than is apparent to the modern readers.¹¹³ Therefore, apart from investigating the purpose and content of the epilogue, the present study is concerned with the literary integrity and coherence of 4QMMT, and in establishing the relationship of the literary divisions of 4QMMT, the calendar, the halakhic section and the epilogue. We have no material manuscript evidence for the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue, and neither the ending of the halakhic section nor the opening of the epilogue is pre-

¹¹¹ DJD X, 111; 113; Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 67.

¹¹² Cf. Eisenman and Wise, according to whom the calendar and the halakhic section make up "The First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness", and the epilogue "The Second Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness"; R. Eisenman and M. O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 182-200; Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," 191-205.

¹¹³ Bernstein, "Review: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah from Qumran Cave 4.V." *Jewish Studies* 36 (1996): 67-74.

served in any of the manuscripts. Furthermore, since several scholars have questioned the relationship of the calendar to 4QMMT, the problem of the calendar and the calendrical fragments will also be discussed.

In Chapter 3, the form and structure of 4QMMT will be analyzed with the goal of clarifying the place and function of the epilogue as a part of the whole document, and to understand the composition and structure of 4QMMT. The halakhic section and the epilogue are compared both on the level of the language (e.g. syntax, vocabulary) and the content; furthermore, the structure of the document is analyzed in order to clarify whether the literary units of the document form an integrated whole and create a purposeful entity. A better understanding of the structure of the document and the purpose of each section as a part of a larger literary context may provide a key for understanding the meaning and significance of the document as a whole, and even the theological intention or hermeneutical agenda of the author/redactor. The question of the genre of 4QMMT will be investigated in Chapter 4.

A more profound analysis of the epilogue has so far remained a *desideratum*.¹¹⁴ Initially, Strugnell was planning to write a chapter on the theology of the epilogue for the edition, but had to abandon his plan in order to get the volume published.¹¹⁵ In Chapter 5, the explicit citations and the implicit allusions, alongside the scriptural language and terminology of this section, will be analyzed in detail. The main object of comparison is the assumed source text of the author(s) of the epilogue: Scripture. A close reading of the epilogue will show how the source text is used to create the meaning of the epilogue, and this in turn will help to distinguish the theological intention or message of the author/redactor.

The results of the analysis of the epilogue will contribute to our understanding of 4QMMT as a whole. The complexity of the genre of 4QMMT has already been indicated; however, the question will necessarily receive some attention also in the present study. The question of form, function and genre of any document is connected with questions of its historical setting. The underlying assumption of the present study is that 4QMMT is a document preserved and cop-

¹¹⁴ The first significant attempt was made by Kratz, "Moses und die Propheten: zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," 151-176.

¹¹⁵ Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 67-68.

ied, and possibly – but not necessarily – composed by the community living at Qumran, as witnessed by the number of copies found in cave 4. Whether 4QMMT is a specifically sectarian document will be discussed in light of all the evidence this study provides.

The analysis of the literary divisions and the structure of 4QMMT alongside the more detailed analysis of the epilogue will help to trace the ideological or theological origins of 4QMMT with more clarity. The contents of the document reflect a grave concern for the purity of the cult in Jerusalem, and in the epilogue Deuteronomic language and expressions are used to convince the readers of the agenda of the author/redactor. The main results of the work will be summarized in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE COMPOSITE TEXT OF 4QMMT

For those wishing to write about and comment on 4QMMT, the starting point is usually the composite text that appears in *DJD X*. The document is conventionally divided into three sections: Section A) a 364-day solar calendar; Section B) the halakhot; and Section C) an epilogue.¹ The calendar is preserved in only one of the manuscripts, namely 4Q394, and the entire document is not preserved in the extant material. Furthermore, in light of palaeographical analysis it seems likely that only one manuscript (4Q397) contains fragments both from the halakhic section and the epilogue.

Although the main emphasis of the present study is on the epilogue (section C), the structure of 4QMMT, and the relationship of the epilogue to the other sections will be discussed. Therefore the problem of the calendar and the calendrical fragments (4Q394 1-2 and 4Q394 3-7 i, lines 1-3) will also be treated in light of the text critical and palaeographical evidence.

The goal of this chapter is to establish the textual basis of 4QMMT and the epilogue in particular. It is necessary, therefore, to begin with a text critical reading of the manuscripts in order to determine how much of the halakhic material and the epilogue are extant. The overlapping sections of the manuscripts will be examined in order to determine how much evidence the manuscripts provide for the composite text, and what material evidence we have for the unity of the three different sections of 4QMMT. Additionally, the material indications for a possible solution of the unsettled arrangement of the fragments of the epilogue will be investigated.

The work continues with an examination of the problems of the composite text of the epilogue by going through the manuscript evidence. This part of the work begins with a transcription of the fragments of the epilogue and with some comments on the individual readings. In addition to the examination of the actual fragments in

¹ *DJD X*, 109-111.

Jerusalem,² both the photographs of the *DJD* edition, Emanuel Tov's first CD-rom edition,³ and the microfiche edition⁴ have been used for textual criticism. After the publication of *DJD X*, Qimron published a new edition of the manuscripts and the composite text of 4QMMT with English translations.⁵ In this edition, according to the guidelines of the series, Qimron transcribed the individual manuscripts without major reconstructions, a solution different in comparison with the *DJD* edition.⁶

Recently, Eibert Tigchelaar has prepared a transcription of the manuscripts for the revised edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library (*DSSEL*), published in 2006. He has not, however, created a composite text.⁷

After the transcription of the individual manuscripts, a synopsis of the three manuscripts of the epilogue in three parallel columns will be presented. The synopsis enables the reader to compare the parallel, overlapping sections in each manuscript, assess possible variant readings and evaluate the reliability of the composite text. The synopsis is followed by comments on the overlapping sections of the manuscripts of the epilogue, together with a survey of the variant readings in each manuscript, and their relevance to the composite text of the epilogue in *DJD X*.

² I am indebted to Professors Eugene Ulrich and Sarianna Metso and the staff of the Rockefeller Museum, and to Dr. Torleif Elgvin, the Nordic Network in Qumran Studies, and the staff of the Israel Antiquities Authority for making it possible to examine the original manuscripts of 4QMMT in Jerusalem in July 1999 and September 2005.

³ E. Tov et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library 2. Including the Dead Sea Scrolls Database (Non-Biblical Texts) Prepared by the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies and Its Center for the Preservation of Ancient Religious Texts at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

⁴ E. Tov and S. J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

⁵ Qimron with J. H. Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 187-251.

⁶ These guidelines are explained in the introduction to the text, Qimron with J. H. Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 194.

⁷ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library Revised Edition* (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006). This transcription was prepared by Tigchelaar in 2005 and it is a revised reading of the manuscripts of 4QMMT first published by García Martínez and Tigchelaar in the DSS Study Edition (ed. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Vol II*; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

In order to establish the level of certainty for the *DJD X* composite text and to enable a comparison of the text form of the halakhic section with that of the epilogue, the variant readings of the halakhic section will also be examined. However, since *DJD X* is relatively reliable with regard to the manuscripts of the halakhic section, and, furthermore, since the epilogue is the main focus of the present work, no transcriptions of the fragments of the halakhic section are provided. The study of the variant readings and the traces of redactional activity that are present in the document will shed some light on the subject matter and the issues that are treated in each of the two main literary divisions. Finally, in order to make the results of this chapter more accessible, an alternative arrangement of the composite text is presented with an English translation. It needs to be stressed that I am indebted to the editors of 4QMMT, and the fundamental work done by them in *DJD X*. In many ways it will remain the starting point of this work, in spite of some critical remarks and a revised version of the composite text of the epilogue.

2.1. THE CALENDAR FRAGMENTS: 4Q394 1-2 CALENDRIAL DOCUMENT D

The calendar fragments 4Q394 1-2 were originally numbered 4Q327, and listed as a separate document.⁸ The fragments have been re-edited in *DJD XXI* by Shemaryahu Talmon and Jonathan Ben-Dov. They use the signum 4Q394 1-2 or *4QCalendrical Document D*.⁹

In *DJD X*, Qimron and Strugnell presented the calendrical fragments 4Q394 1-2 as a part of the manuscript 4Q394, presuming that they form a part of the calendar, the ending of which is preserved in

⁸ The fragments were first registered as 4Q327 possibly by Milik. The signum is used, for instance, by Tov in *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: Companion Volume* (Leiden: Brill, 1993) 40; García Martínez in his article “Dos Notas Sobre,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 293-298; by García Martínez and Tigchelaar in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Vol. II*, 701; and by VanderKam in “The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organisation for Qumran Studies* (ed. M. J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 179-194; *idem*, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London/New York: Routledge; 1998) 75.

⁹ See S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov and U. Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD XXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) 2, Table 1. The re-edition of the calendar fragments is found on pages 157-166 of this volume.

the beginning of 4Q394 frgs. 3a-4 col i, 1-3. Subsequently, however, the relationship of fragments 4Q394 1-2 to manuscript 4Q394, and even the relationship of the whole calendar section to the rest of 4QMMT has been questioned by several scholars. James VanderKam has presented a retrospective on the discussion about these fragments:

Scholars have, then, sketched out different positions regarding the question whether the calendrical fragments (4Q327) belong to MMT or even to the manuscript 4Q394. The official edition puts them at the beginning of 4Q394 and of the composite text; Eisenman and Wise think they belong to 4Q394 and thus to the First Letter on Works Reckoned as Righteousness; Strugnell now doubts they belong to MMT but thinks they are part of 4Q394; Qimron raises questions about whether they are a part of 4Q394; and García Martínez denies they belong to 4Q394 or to MMT.¹⁰

Strugnell was the first scholar to raise concerns about the calendar and its relationship with 4QMMT. In 1993, during a Qumran meeting at the University of Notre Dame, Strugnell questioned whether or not the calendar actually belonged to 4QMMT:

This calendar, then, is hard to relate to the rest of the work, whether form-critically or even in terms of subject matter. ... It is far from certain that the calendar, as found here, belonged to any letter at all or that it formed any part of the document MMT^{B+C}.¹¹

To support his view, Strugnell used the material evidence provided by the right margin of manuscript 4Q395, preserved in one fragment with the right margin of 17.5 mm. Strugnell suggested, that this margin is broad enough to constitute the handle sheet at the beginning of this scroll, instead of being an unscribed margin between two columns. Accordingly, the preserved column, containing text from the beginning of the halakhic section, would have been the first column of this scroll. From this would follow that this manuscript could not have contained the calendar section, but would have begun with the words **אלה מקצת דברינו**.¹²

¹⁰ VanderKam, "The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 183.

¹¹ Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 61-61; Appendix 3 in DJD X, 203.

¹² DJD X, 14.

However, the evidence Strugnell discusses is not conclusive, since it is not impossible to have a margin as broad as 17.5 mm *between* two written columns. The width of the margin does not alone suffice to prove that the calendar did not belong to MS 4Q395. Nevertheless, Strugnell was of the opinion that the calendar was not a part of MS 4Q395, and hence, Strugnell doubted the calendar was an original component of the document 4QMMT. Instead, it was added to manuscript 4Q394 for an unknown reason.¹³ Strugnell did not, however, question that the fragments 4Q394 1-2 belonged with the rest of the manuscript 4Q394.

Qimron has pointed out that the calendrical fragments probably have fewer lines of writing than the other fragments of 4Q394. He also notes that the letters in the calendar differ from their counterparts in the next section. Despite the differences in the size and form of the letters he states that

the ascription of the calendar written in narrow columns to MMT is based on palaeographical considerations, and on its typological resemblance with the end of the calendar, which appears on 4Q394 3-7 i.¹⁴

In actual fact, fragments 4Q394 1-2 differ notably from the rest of manuscript 4Q394. In fragments 4Q394 1-2 the size of the letters is smaller than in the rest of manuscript 4Q394. In addition, the distance between the lines is smaller on these fragments when compared with the others.¹⁵ Because of the repetitive nature of the calendar, a rather reliable reconstruction can be made. After reconstruction, the number of lines on fragments 4Q394 1-2 is 18 at the most.¹⁶ Fragments 4Q394 3-7 preserve in the first column 19 extant lines, but the upper margin is missing, so there could originally have been more lines in this column. Fragment 8 contains 20 lines. Provided that the height of the sheet was the same on fragments 4Q394 1-2 as in the rest of the manuscript and fewer lines were written in a smaller hand, this would result in a broad uninscribed margin either at the top or bottom of the

¹³ Strugnell, Appendix 3 in DJD X, 204.

¹⁴ Qimron, Appendix 2 in DJD X, 201-202.

¹⁵ This has also been pointed out by VanderKam, "The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 185.

¹⁶ Both García Martínez ("Dos Notas Sobre," 294-295) and VanderKam ("The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 184) have noted the difference in the height of the columns.

sheet or both. Another possibility, although far less likely, would be that the sheets were of a different height. Furthermore, the presentation of the text differs markedly. On fragments 1-2 the text is written in very narrow columns of only a few words. On fragments 3a-4, which preserve the ending of a calendar, the width of the column is 11.2 cm between the dry lines, approximately 40-49 corrected letter spaces.¹⁷ Some variance in the penmanship can also be discerned.¹⁸

Talmon and Ben-Dov give a full description of the fragments in their re-edition of 4Q394 1-2. Importantly, they prove that these fragments do not belong with the rest of 4Q394 or with 4QMMT but originate from an independent calendrical document.¹⁹

The main arguments have been stated by Talmon and Ben-Dov and before their re-edition in *DJD XXI* by VanderKam, García Martínez, and Callaway. Apart from *DJD XXI*, most convincing and thorough is the argumentation and analysis of James VanderKam. VanderKam's arguments are divided into three main groups. He points out clear differences in three aspects between the two groups of fragments: 1) presentation of the text, 2) paleography and 3) spelling practices.²⁰ Whereas Strugnell sees the fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 as a part of 4Q394, VanderKam has proved that fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 and the rest of MS 4Q394 actually originate from two different manuscripts. And while Strugnell questions the place of a calendar in 4QMMT, VanderKam seems to think a calendar section or statement is an essential part of the document. Thus, the two scholars, starting with the same evidence, seem to have reached opposite conclusions.

García Martínez points out three major difficulties: 1) the columns in 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 are much narrower than those in 4Q394, 2) the reconstructed height of the column in 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 is approximately 7-9

¹⁷ Again, García Martínez ("Dos Notas Sobre," 294) and VanderKam ("The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 185) have noted this phenomenon. VanderKam also discusses the possible reasons for the difference in the length of lines. He admits that "the differing lengths of lines are not decisive in answering our question, but they seem to be a problem for those who posit unity here."

¹⁸ VanderKam has pointed out major and consistent differences in several letters. A detailed discussion on the paleography and spelling practices can be found in VanderKam's article "The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 186. See also *DJD XXI*, 159-161. Callaway has noted the different usage of final *mem*; Callaway, "4QMMT and Recent Hypothesis on the Origin of the Qumran Community," 20.

¹⁹ *DJD XXI*, 156-161.

²⁰ VanderKam, "The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 184-187.

cm at the most, whereas in 4Q394 it is 16-18 cm, and 3) the difference in content: 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 is a festival calendar listing the Sabbaths and feasts of the year without any intercalation. 4Q394 on the other hand deals simply with a calendar of 364 days and the times when the days were intercalated.²¹ The first two of García Martínez's arguments are convincing, but the two texts are in fact not that different, and more likely do not represent two different types of calendars.²² Rather, the phrase in 4Q394 "1 [...The twenty-eighth of it (i.e. the twelfth month)] is a Sabbath. Unto it (i.e. the twelfth month), after [the] Sab[bath, Sunday and Monday, a day] 2 [is to be ad]ded" is rather similar to what 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 reads in its second column: "The twenty eighth of it is a Sabbath. After it (i. e. the Sabbath), Sunday, Monday, [Tuesday is to be added (to this month)]."²³ Moreover, the text of fragments 4Q394 3a-4 is too short to allow major comparisons with other calendrical texts.²⁴

Callaway points out the palaeographic and orthographic differences and the different format. He proposes that since 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 and 4Q394 3a-4 did not originally belong together, it "would preclude all claims about the second section of the document being a calendar."²⁵ Callaway apparently ignores the fact that there is a calendaric phrase at the beginning of the first column in fragments 4Q394 3a-4.

Accordingly, all of these scholars have concluded that fragments 4Q394 1-2 do not belong together with the rest of the manuscript numbered 4Q394. After the examination of the original fragments it can be stated that the material and palaeographical evidence, already indicated by other scholars, is conclusive: fragments 4Q394 1-2 do not constitute a part of manuscript 4Q394.

While it is clear that 4Q394 1-2 is not a part of 4Q394 proper, it is important to remember that a "tail end of an ephemeris,"²⁶ or calendaric statement, is preserved at the beginning of MS 4Q394 frgs. 3a-4. Although the text breaks just before stating the exact number of the

²¹ García Martínez, "Dos Notas Sobre 4QMMT," 294-295.

²² Similarly in DJD XXI, 158, note 5.

²³ The translations are from DJD X, page 45.

²⁴ Similarly VanderKam, "The Calendar, 4Q327 and 4Q394," 183, note 18.

²⁵ Callaway, "4QMMT and Recent Hypothesis on the Origin of the Qumran Community," in *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Krakow: Enigma, 1996) 20.

²⁶ The term is used in DJD XXI, 1.

days of the year, it is likely that the fragmentary passage represents the 364-day solar calendar:²⁷

1 [ושמונה בו]שבת ע[ל]י אחר [ה]ש[בת] ויום השני השל ישי
 2 [נו]סף ושלמה השנה שלוש מאות ושלשים וארבעה
 3 יום

1 [...The twenty-eighth of it (i.e. the twelfth month)] is a Sabbath. Unto it (i.e. the twelfth month), after [the] Sab[bath, Sunday and Monday, a day] 2 [is to be ad]ded. And the year is complete, three hundred and si[xty-four] 3 days.

Based on the reading of the first lines of 4Q394 frgs. 3a-4, it is clear that at least one of the copies of 4QMMT contained a calendrical section. However, whether or not a calendar was an original component of 4QMMT will have to be re-addressed when the structure of 4QMMT is analyzed.

2.2. MATERIAL EVIDENCE FOR THE HALAKHIC SECTION AND THE EPILOGUE

The text of 4QMMT is, according to the editors, preserved in six manuscripts numbered 4Q394-4Q399. Manuscripts 4Q394-4Q396 contain text only from the halakhic part, and do not preserve text from the epilogue. Manuscript 4Q399, preserved as one fragment, contains text only from the end of the epilogue.

Additionally, Stephen Pfann has tentatively identified another manuscript of 4QMMT in cryptic script. This manuscript is labeled as 4QcryptA *Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*²⁸ – justifiably with a question mark, since there is very little text preserved on the two small fragments of this manuscript, only a few letters on each.²⁸

²⁷ Text and translation follows DJD X, 44-45.

²⁸ First published in Pfann et al; *Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1: Qumran Cave 4.XXVI* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000) 697-699. The fragment is transcribed by Pfann and published together with the other manuscripts of 4QMMT in the edition by Qimron and Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 232-233.

Annette Steudel has made a cautious suggestion that 4Q448 might be another copy of 4QMMT, providing us with the lost beginning of the document.²⁹ Steudel refers to the calculations by Stegemann, according to which approximately one third of the text of 4QMMT is missing from the beginning. She discusses several possible parallels between 4QMMT and 4Q448 and evaluates their significance in order to propose a link between these two texts, while reminding the reader that because of the fragmentary state of both documents and lack of material overlap a definitive answer cannot be given.

Steudel admits that the similarities found between the two texts are of different value. More problematic, however, is the fact that she compares 4Q448 with the composite text of 4QMMT and not with the individual manuscripts. Steudel's main arguments are philological, and she begins with an orthographical phenomenon, the interchange of ש and ס as a shared feature of 4Q448 and 4QMMT. However, this interchange is a phenomenon attested in only two of the manuscripts of MMT, namely 4Q394 and 4Q396, and does not occur in all of them.³⁰ She further mentions the parallel usage of both the longer and shorter form of the relative pronoun שֶׁנֶשׂ/שׁ . In 4QMMT, the longer form is used only once, and this occurs when the formulaic command of cultic centralization from Deuteronomy 12 is cited in the halakhic section. Otherwise, the shorter form is always used, and this usage is one of the several exceptional linguistic features of 4QMMT.³¹ These features are, according to Steudel, the strong arguments for a connection between 4Q448 and 4QMMT, however, they are not convincing. Additional arguments proposed by Steudel are based on the traditional assumptions of the setting and genre of 4QMMT, and it has already been indicated that these might have to

²⁹ Steudel, "4Q448 – The Lost Beginning of MMT?" 247-263.

³⁰ The orthographical inconsistency is probably due to a phonological change, namely the gradual assimilation of the sounds represented by *sin* and *samek*, and is attested already in Biblical Hebrew and common in Mishnaic Hebrew; see Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQIsa^a)* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 185; Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 24. The change of the sounds is possibly due to Aramaic influence; Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991) 32. *Samek* instead of *sin* occurs only three times in 4QMMT, in words שֶׁנֶשׂ (4Q394, DJD X B12), שֶׁנֶשׂ (4Q394, DJD X B14), and שֶׁנֶשׂ (4Q396, DJD X B75).

³¹ The short form -שׁ is rather unusual in texts found at Qumran, but in addition to the manuscripts of 4QMMT and 4Q448 it is attested for instance in 4QJub^b, 4Q385, 4QD^c and the Copper Scroll. Qimron and Strugnell suggest that the frequency of the form -שׁ reflects the spoken language of the authors of 4QMMT; DJD X, 75.

be revised. Finally, Steudel suggests that the shared vocabulary between 4Q448 and 4QMMT is a common denominator of these documents. However, the vocabulary is far too common to create a credible link between the two texts. Therefore, even though her suggestion is intriguing, it must be rejected: 4Q448 is not the lost beginning of 4QMMT.

2.2.1. *Manuscript Preserving Fragments from both the Halakhic Section and the Epilogue*

Manuscript 4Q397 includes fragments from both of the two main sections: text belonging to the halakhic part in fragments 1-13 and to the epilogue in fragments 14-23. The halakhic section is preserved fragmentarily in this manuscript and in the *DJD X* edition it is mostly reconstructed with the help of the better preserved MSS 4Q394 and 396 or other texts. The editors have used, for example, scriptural material and the Temple Scroll.³²

At first, it appears that manuscript 4Q398 also contains fragments that preserve text from both sections: fragments 4Q398 1-3 are placed in the halakhic section by the editors, and fragments 4Q398 11-17 contain text of the epilogue.³³

³² For an example see Qimron, "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text," 11-12.

³³ Fragments 4Q398 11-13, and fragments 4Q398 14-17 cols i-ii have three columns, not fully preserved, that contain text from the epilogue. The problem of the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13, and the different solutions proposed, will be discussed below.

Table 1. The 4QMMT Manuscripts According to DJD X

Calendar	4Q394 fragments 1-2, 3a-4					
Halakhot	4Q394	4Q395	4Q396	4Q397	4Q398 fragments 1-3 ³⁴	
Epilogue				4Q397	4Q398 fragments 11-17	4Q399

For their composite text, Qimron and Strugnell combine the text of fragments 4Q397 1-2 with 4Q398 1-3. Qimron describes the combination and the placement of these fragments and the reconstruction of the halakhic statement on lines B 21-23 in his article “The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text.” Here he points out that no direct physical joins between any of these fragments are possible, and to indicate the uncertainty of the reconstruction Qimron used double brackets in *DJD X*. The placement of the fragments and their reconstruction is based on the Temple Scroll.³⁵

The extant texts of MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398 contain only one overlapping word: על. The combination of the readings of these two manuscripts into a composite text is supported by common vocabulary (עור), yet it remains uncertain. Qimron and Strugnell place the combined passage in the composite text on lines B21-24, after line ii,4 of MS 4Q394.³⁶

Fragments 4Q398 1-3 clearly do not overlap with MSS 4Q394-396, which preserve most of the halakhic section. Fragments 4Q398 4-10 have not been located by the editors, but at least two of them contain a word otherwise known from the halakhic fragments of other manuscripts, namely, fragment 5 contains the word תערובת ‘mixture’

³⁴ In *DJD X* Qimron and Strugnell have joined fragments 4Q398 1-3. In line 1, fragment 1 contains or preserves in its present state only one of the words that Qimron and Strugnell read (הטורה [ה]נישה). In their notes (*DJD X*, 34) they actually say that “the word [ה]נישה cannot be seen on any photograph, but Strugnell said that it did exist.” I was not able to find the word on any fragment; fragment 1 is broken right after the letters הטורה. For some reason the editors do not read the second line of fragment 1 that preserves the letter ה.

³⁵ Qimron, “The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text,” 11-12.

³⁶ *DJD X*, 46.

(*DJD X B48*, 50, 50) and fragment 7 exhibits the word לטהרת הקן, which can be compared with the similar expressions לטהרת הןקודש (4Q398 fragments 2-3) and לטהרת המקדש *DJD X B54* (4Q396, partly preserved in 4Q394).

However, there is so little material left that one could even question whether fragments 4Q398 1-10 represent a manuscript of 4QMMT or another text altogether. Moreover, in manuscript 4Q398, the papyrus of fragments 1-9 seems to be different from that of 11-17 (N. B. Fragment 10 is presently missing from the plate!). In 1-9 the papyrus is ‘tidier,’ smoother on the surface, and lighter in color than that in 11-17. The edgings of fragments 1-9 are even, while fragments 11-17 are uneven in form and are fringed by loose fiber-ends. The letters are smaller and equal in size in fragments 1-9, the average height being 3 mm. In the other fragments the average height is about 4 mm, varying between 3 and 5 mm. Callaway has pointed out the difference in the size of the letters, and he considers it possible that the fragments could belong to two separate manuscripts.³⁷

Some letters are also drawn differently, for instance, in fragments 1-9, *lamed* is always written on the line, in fragments 11-17 on the imaginary top line; also, the hook of the *lamed* is ‘tighter’ in frgs. 1-9; in frgs. 1-9 the strokes of *alef* are straight, whereas in frgs. 11-17 the left leg of the *alef* is curving.

Thus – in spite of the small size of fragments 4Q398 1-9 and the amount of extant writing on them leaving us with very little material for comparison – there are several indications, both material and in the penmanship, suggesting that fragments 4Q398 1-9 originate from a manuscript other than 4Q398 11-17. Accordingly, for the sake of clarity, I use in the table below the siglum 4Q398^a for fragments 4Q398 1-9 (not including the missing fragment 10) and 4Q398^b for fragments 11-17.

³⁷ Callaway, “4QMMT and Recent Hypothesis on the Origin of the Qumran Community,” 22.

Table 2. The 4QMMT Manuscripts after the Palaeographical Analysis of Ms 4Q394 and Ms 4Q398

Calendar	4Q394 fragments 3a-4					
Halakhot	4Q394	4Q395	4Q396	4Q397	4Q398 ^a fragments 1-3, 5, 7	
Epilogue				4Q397	4Q398 ^b fragments 11-17	4Q399

Rather than there being six manuscripts of 4QMMT, it would appear that there are at least seven or eight manuscripts, depending on if 4QcryptA *Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*³⁷ is included in this count. More importantly, however, it leaves us with manuscript 4Q397 as the only one comprising – in its present state of preservation – *both* the halakhic section (section B) *and* the epilogue (section C).³⁸

2.2.2. The Transition from the Halakhic Section to the Epilogue

One of the other major problems of the composite text is the fact that we have no material evidence of the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue, because neither the ending of the halakhic section nor the opening of the epilogue is preserved in any of the manuscripts. Since manuscript 4Q397 is the only manuscript that includes fragments from both of the two main sections, text belonging to the halakhic part in fragments 1-13 and to the epilogue in fragments 14-23, the evidence of it provides is decisive. In the composite text of *DJD X*, fragments 14-21 of MS 4Q397 make up the first section of the epilogue.³⁹

³⁸ Obviously, the other manuscripts could originally have contained both sections, but this could be determined only with the help of material reconstruction.

³⁹ Bernstein and Pérez Fernández have, however, suggested that the first lines of 4Q397 14-17 belong to the halakhic section; Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 47; Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 196-197.

We do not even know with certainty how much text is missing between the extant lines of the halakhic section and the epilogue. A material reconstruction of 4Q397 would be instructive for establishing with greater certainty the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue. With the aid of this method, the order of the fragments and the distance between them in the original scroll can be determined by comparing recurring shapes and damage patterns in the scroll.⁴⁰ Strugnell has proposed that “some twenty lines” are missing between the halakhic section and the epilogue, but he does not explain how he reached this conclusion.⁴¹ Apparently, however, it is based on Hartmut Stegemann’s reconstruction of MS 4Q397.⁴² If this estimate were correct, there would be one whole column between the last preserved lines of the halakhic section in MS 4Q397 (4Q397 frgs. 6-13, line 15) and the first fragments of this MS containing text from the epilogue (4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 1).

2.2.3. *The Overlapping Sections of the Manuscripts of 4QMMT (4Q394-399)*

In the table below are listed all the overlapping sections of the parallel manuscripts in comparison with the composite text of the *DJD X*

⁴⁰ The methodology of material reconstruction is described by Stegemann in his article from 1990, and has been successfully applied by Carol Newsom in her study of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4QShirShabb), Annette Steudel on Midrash on Eschatology (4QMdrEschat) and Sarianna Metso on the manuscripts of the Community Rule. Stegemann, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 189-220. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMdrEschat^{a,b})*. *Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (Catena^a) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994); Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁴¹ *DJD X*, 111. Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 67.

⁴² Stegemann made a material reconstruction of MS 4Q397, but never published his results. In May 2005, before his death, Prof. Stegemann was preparing his material reconstruction of MS 4Q397 for publication. The reconstruction will be published by Reinhardt Kratz.

edition.⁴³ For the sake of clarity, overlapping means that there is extant text – words or letters – in both or all of the manuscripts mentioned. Due to the fragmentary state of the manuscripts, however, the overlapping is only partial in most cases. Sometimes the *lacunae* of one manuscript can be reconstructed from the text of a parallel manuscript regardless of whether or not they overlap in their extant parts, however, these instances are not referred to in this table.

Table 3. The Overlapping Sections of the Manuscripts of 4QMMT (4Q394-399)

The Halakhic Section

		Overlapping sections	DJD X
4Q394 frgs. 3-7	col i, 1-3		A19-20
	col i, 4-12		B1-9
	col i, 13- col ii,2	4Q395	B10-18
	col ii, lines 3-4		B19-20
	col ii, lines 5-12	<i>lacuna</i>	
4Q394 frg. 8	col ii, lines 13-18	4Q397 frg. 3	B26-33
	col iii, lines 1-5	<i>lacuna</i>	
	col iii, lines 6-8	4Q396 frgs. 1-2 i, 1-4	B36-38
	col iii, lines 9-11		B39-40
	col iii, lines 12-16	4Q397 frg. 5	B42-46
	col iii, lines 17-20		B47-50
	col iv, lines 1-5	4Q396 frgs. 1-2 ii, 2-7	B51-55
	col iv, lines 5-16	4Q396 frgs. 1-2 ii, 8-iii,6 4Q397 frgs. 6-13, 1-7	B56-66 B56-66
4Q395 frg. 1	lines 1-4		B5-8

⁴³ In the composite text of the DJD X, there are slightly more overlapping letters resulting from the different location of fragments 4Q398 11-13, see also Tables 4 and 5 in this chapter. One should also consult the table of overlaps by E. J. C. Tigchelaar in DJD XXXIX, Table 23 on p. 305.

	lines 5-12	4Q394 frgs. 3-7 i, 13-ii, 2	B9-18
4Q396 frgs. 1-2	col i, line 1		B35
	col i, lines 2-4	4Q394 frg. 8 iii, 6-8	B36-38
	col i, line 5		B39
	col i, line 6	4Q397 frg. 5	B40
	col i, lines 7-11	<i>lacuna</i>	
	col ii, line 1		B49-50
	col ii, 2- col iii, 6	4Q394 frg. 8 iv, 1-16	B50-66
	col ii, 8- col iv, 9	4Q397 frgs. 6-13	B56-80
	col iv, lines 10-11	<i>no overlapping</i>	B81-82
4Q397 frgs. 1-2	lines 1-3	<i>no overlapping</i>	B21-23
	line 4	4Q398 frgs. 1-3? ⁴⁴	B24
4Q397 frg. 3		4Q394 frgs. 3-7 ii, 13-18	B26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34
4Q397 frg. 4		<i>no overlapping</i>	B36-37
4Q397 frg. 5	line 1	<i>no overlapping</i>	B39
	line 2	4Q396 frgs.1-2 i, 6	B40-41
	lines 3-5	4Q394 frg. 8 iii, 12-16	B42,44,46
	line 6	<i>no overlapping</i>	B48
4Q397 frgs. 6-13	lines 1-7	4Q394 8 iv, 6-16	B56-66
	lines 1-14	4Q396 frgs.1-2 ii, 8-iv, 9	B56-80
	line 15	<i>no overlapping</i>	B81
4Q398 ^a frgs. 1-3	lines 1-2	<i>no overlapping</i>	B22-23
	line 3	4Q397 1-2?	B24

⁴⁴ The fragments 'overlap' with merely one word, על.

The Epilogue

		Overlapping sections	DJD X
4Q397 frgs. 14-21	lines 1-8		C1-8
	lines 9-14	4Q398 ^b frgs. 14-17 i,1-8	C9-12, 14-16
	lines 15-16		C17-18 ⁴⁵
4Q397 frg. 23		4Q398 ^b 14-17 ii,5-8	C29-30
	line 3	4Q399 ii, 2-5	C30
4Q398 ^b frgs. 11-13			C18-24 ⁴⁶
4Q398 ^b frgs. 14-17	col i, lines 1-4	4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 9-12? ⁴⁷	C9-12
	col i, lines 5-8	4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 12-16	C13-16
	col ii, line 1		C25
	col ii, lines 2-8	4Q399 frg. 1 i, 9- ii,5	C26-32
	col ii, lines 5-6	4Q397 23	C29-30
4Q399 frg. 1	col i,1-8	<i>lacuna</i>	
	col i, 9-col ii,5	4Q398 ^b frgs. 14-17 ii, 2-8	C26-32
	col ii, 4	4Q397 23	C30

⁴⁵ In the DJD X composite text the underlines show some overlapping on lines *DJD X* C17-18. This will be discussed in Chapter 2.5.

⁴⁶ See also Tables 4 and 5.

⁴⁷ According to the DJD X edition MS 4Q398 overlaps here with MS 4Q397. However, this is difficult to determine, since these two manuscripts seem to contain some major variant readings. The problems will be discussed in Chapter 2.5.

2.3. TRANSCRIPTION OF THE FRAGMENTS OF THE EPILOGUE (4Q397-399)

In the following, I will present a simple transcription of all the relevant fragments containing text from the epilogue, and offer some comments on the readings. The underlines show the overlapping passages or letters in parallel manuscripts. The starting point is the identification and piecing together of the fragments by Qimron and Strugnell in the *DJD X* edition. The description of manuscripts is provided by the editors, and a paleographic analysis of MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398 by Ada Yardeni⁴⁸; therefore, a few comments will suffice here.

2.3.1. *Manuscript 4Q397*

Manuscript 4Q397 contains 23 fragments, but only those containing text from the epilogue are transcribed below. The manuscript is written on leather and the script is dated by Ada Yardeni to the first half of the Herodian period. The height of the columns is at least 15-16 lines but cannot be determined with certainty; the width of the column is approximately 60-75 corrected letter-spaces. The last column, represented by fragment 23, is an exception and the reconstructed width in this column is less than 35 corrected letter-spaces.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Yardeni, "4Q397. 4Q398. Script," 21-25, 29-34.

⁴⁹ *DJD X*, 21.

4Q397 fragments 14-21

- 1 [] שם[] ש []
- 2 עותון[] °יבוי[]
- 3 ומי ישנ[] [] היה מה[]
- 4 ועל הנשי[] ° והמעל[]
- 5 כי באלה[] [] החמס והזנות אבד[]
- 6 מקומות [ואף] כתונב ולו[] א תבוא תועבה א[]
- 7 התועבה שנואה היא[] [] פרשנו מרוב הע[]
- 8 [] מהתערב בדברים האלה ומלכוא ע[] מהם [] לזב אלה ואתם י []
- 9 [] מצא בידנו מעל ושקר ורעה כי על [] אנחנו נותנים א[]
- 10 [] [] או אליכה שתבין בספר מוש[] ה [] בספר [] ביאים ובדוי[] ד []
- 11 [] [] דור ודור ובספר כתוב [] ° [] ים ל° לו[]
- 12 [] [] כה ואפ כתוב [] [] מהד[] ר[] וקרת[] כה [] הועה זכת[] וב []
- 13 [] [] ל הדברי[] [] באח[] רית הי[] מי[] ה[] כה [] ו[] קלל[]
- 14 [] [] [] ושבת[] ה [] אלו בכ[] ל לבכה [] ו[] בכ[] ל [] נ[] פ[] שכה [] באחרית[] []
- 15 [] [] מושה ובט[] פר [] ש[] יבוא[] ו [] ° של [] []
- 16 [] [] ות[] ש [] [] מי[] []

Notes on the readings (4Q397 14-21)

Line 1: ש[]שם °[There are traces of ink both before and after the first *sin*. The editors have not transcribed the first trace; the letter could be a *lamed*. The second one they have identified as a medial *mem*, but the right bottom angle seems too sharp for a medial *mem*. *Pe*, *bet* or a final *mem* are more likely readings. The second *sin* after a small gap was legible when a microscope was used. Tigchelaar reads]°[]שׁמ[].⁵⁰

Line 2: Tigchelaar reads: []שׁיבוא[נערה] and translates “perversion (?) []”.⁵¹

Line 5: Before the word כ״ there are traces ן״[that must have belonged to the preceding column.⁵²

Line 7:] ה״א״ה After the word ה״א״ה there is a hole and an un-inscribed space on the leather. According to Qimron and Strugnell it is uncertain whether there is an intentional *vacat* or it was created when the top-most layer of the leather flaked off.⁵³

ה]ע״ The trace after *he* identified as an *ayin* by the editors is uncertain but a possible reading.

Line 10: מושׁ]ה The *šin* is uncertain, only upper parts of a letter can be discerned before a gap.

ד]וּב After *dalet*, there are two strokes visible, the one probably being a *waw*; the other is only partially preserved.

Eisenman-Wise do not place the small fragment 4Q397 17 containing the word]בספר[on this line, instead they read and reconstruct the passage as follows: מושה]ובדברי הנביאים.⁵⁴ The placement of frg. 4Q397 17 has been strongly questioned by Ulrich. No material reasons force its

⁵⁰ Tigchelaar, “4Q397,” *DSSEL*.

⁵¹ Tigchelaar, “4Q397,” *DSSEL*.

⁵² See also the editors’ comment in DJD X, 28.

⁵³ DJD X, 28.

⁵⁴ Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 198.

placement here; rather the location and reconstruction are based on an interpretation of the contents of this passage.⁵⁵

Lines 11, 13 and 14: In some places, the editors have been able to read more letters, probably due to the better condition of the fragments. For instance, on line 11, the first unidentified trace, (]°[preserved on frg. 17) is possibly a *lamed* the editors suggest, but it is difficult to be certain, since the trace is so small. Also, on line 13, in the word הַיָּמַיִם there is a material gap between two fragments, and therefore I have not been able to read the letters [מַיִ].

Line 11: Tigchelaar reads the end of this line slightly differently:

לְוֵ []° [לְּ. ⁵⁶

Line 12: Tigchelaar reads the beginning of this line slightly differently: יָהּ וַאֲ []. The *yod* instead of a *kaf* is possible, but the *pe* is certainly not in its final form.

Line 13: הַדְּבָרִים The stroke identified as a *yod* is visible in the photograph of the *DJD X* edition, but it is not transcribed by the editors.

Lines 12 and 14: The reconstructions וַקְּרַתְךָ and אֵלֶי בְּכָל follow the orthography of the parallel manuscript 4Q398. In accordance with the orthography of MS 4Q397 the text should actually be reconstructed וַקְּרַתְכֶּה and אֵלַי בְּכוֹל. I have here maintained the orthography of MS 4Q398, so that the reconstruction would correspond to the composite text, see lines 20 and 22 of the alternative composite text in 2.8.

Line 15:] שְׁלִ° [Qimron and Strugnell have not marked in their reconstruction a trace of a letter before the word שְׁלִ even though a stroke is visible in the photograph of the *DJD X* edition.⁵⁷ Unfortunately the letter is no longer legible.

Line 16: Tigchelaar reads] שְׁ° [instead of] מַיִ [.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ For a more detailed discussion, see the article by Eugene Ulrich, “The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65/2 (2003): 202-214.

⁵⁶ Tigchelaar, “4Q397,” *DSSEL*.

⁵⁷ *DJD X*, 28.

⁵⁸ Tigchelaar, “4Q397,” *DSSEL*.

4Q397 fragment 22

] 1
 [מיומ]] 1
] 2
 [שיובא]] 2
] 3
 [הוז]] 3

The editors place this fragment in the epilogue, and they assert that it overlaps with MS 4Q398 frgs. 11-13 lines 1-3. This placement of this fragment by the editors results to two variant readings and is therefore relatively uncertain, which is why I do not follow their location. Eibert Tigchelaar locates this fragment in the halakhic section in column III of MS 4Q397 together with fragments 1-2 of MS 4Q397.⁵⁹

4Q397 fragment 23

] 1
 [עצת]כָּהּ וְהַרְחִיק] 1
] 2
 [בְּשֵׁל שְׁתָּ]שִׁמְחָה] 2
] 3
 [מִקְצָת]] 3
] 4
 [] ° [] 4

Line 4: An unidentifiable trace of a letter, not transcribed by the editors, can be discerned.

This small fragment can be compared with and placed with the help of MSS 4Q398 14-17 ii, 5-8 and 4Q399 ii,2-5. The location of the fragment is uncertain because of the small amount of preserved text; nevertheless the location is possible. If the text around this fragment

⁵⁹ Tigchelaar, "4Q397," *DSSSEL*.

is reconstructed with the help of the well preserved parallel MS 4Q398 it results in a width of the column of only 26-32 reconstructed letter-spaces. It could be that this fragment originates from a narrow end sheet of this scroll.

4Q397 fragment 24

] בגלל [

Eibert Tigchelaar has identified on PAM 43.398 a fragment containing the word בגלל, belonging to this manuscript. Initially he placed this fragment in line 5 on the column created by fragments 14-21. In his earlier transcription the line read as follows:

.60 כי באלה] [בגלל] [אֲחַמַּס וְהַזְנוֹת אֲבִיךָ וְהַרְבֵּה]

Later he abandoned this location of the בגלל-fragment because of material reasons, and has not proposed a new placement for it. However, palaeographical and material factors indicate this fragment clearly belongs to MS 4Q397.⁶¹

2.3.2. Manuscript 4Q398

This manuscript was written on papyrus. The height of the column cannot be determined with certainty. The fragments contain eight preserved lines each; the width of the column is, according to the editors, approximately 11 cm.⁶² However, the reconstructed width of the column of fragments 11-13 is approximately 50-60 corrected letter spaces, whereas the width of the first column of frgs. 14-17 is only 40-48 corrected letter spaces. Ada Yardeni has analyzed the script; she describes it as semi-cursive, and dates it in the early Herodian period.⁶³

⁶⁰ Tigchelaar, "4Q397," *DSSEL*.

⁶¹ Tigchelaar, "Publication of PAM 43.398 (IAA #202) Including New Fragments of 4Q269," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, 269.

⁶² DJD X, 28.

⁶³ Yardeni, "4Q398. Script," 29-34.

Unfortunately the manuscript has deteriorated considerably since the publication of the *DJD X* edition and the last photographs. Some of the fragments are missing; most of them have suffered to some extent. Plate 157c should include, according to the photograph in the *DJD X* edition, fragments 4Q398 14-17. In the photograph, fragment 14 seems to be rather large and well preserved, containing two columns (the first one only partially preserved) with eight lines of writing. My examination of the original manuscript in July 1999 and September 2005 revealed a rather different situation. There were twenty-seven pieces of papyrus (or papyrus fibers) of different sizes and shapes on the plate, some of them upside down, some displaying the reverse side. Some pieces had been rubbed into an unrecognizable form. Some accident must have occurred with the plate, probably after the publication of the official edition since Qimron and Strugnell do not mention the current state of the manuscript.

Fragment 14 was scattered in several pieces; the first column has suffered badly. From the upper part of the right edge of column ii a piece about 2 cm wide has broken off. Some of the small pieces on the plate can be identified with the help of the photographs, but I was not able to find or identify every missing part. Fragment 16, which in the photographs seems to be one piece, was broken into two. Fragment 17 was placed upside down. In their current state, some of the pieces are either so small, or have no traces of writing on them, that their identification and reconstruction has become impossible. Fragment 15, located in the first column of fragments 14-17, is missing or has become unrecognizable.

4Q398 fragments 11-13

° [] 01

1] [םׁ] [םׁ] [םׁ] [בְּיָמֵי שְׁלוֹמוֹה בֶּן דְּוִיד וְאֵף הַקָּלְלוֹת

2 [שׁ] בְּאֵז בְּיָמֵי יְרוּשָׁה בֶּן נְבֻט וְעַד גַּלְוִת יְרוּשָׁה וְצִדְקָה מַלְךְ יְהוּדָה׃

3 [] [יָבַר] [אָם בָּ] וְאֵנְחָנוּ מְכִירֵם שְׁבָאוֹ מְקַצְתָּ הַבְּרִכוֹת וְהַקָּלְלוֹת

4 [שׁ] כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר מוֹשֶׁה וְזֶה הוּא אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים שִׁשּׁוּבוּ בִּישְׂרָאֵל

5] [ןׁ] וְלֹא יִשׁוּבוּ [אׁ] הוֹרֵר וְהַרְשָׁעִים יִדְשָׁן] יֵזְבֵּחוּ וְאַמִּי םׁׁ לַת

6] [ןׁ] [וּזְבָחֶךָ אֵת מַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] וְהִתְבַּנֵּן בְּמַעֲשֵׂי הַמֶּה שְׁמִי מִהֵם

7] שֶׁאֵין יִרְאֶה הַתּוֹרָה הִיא מְצוּלָה] [מְצַרְרָה] וְהֵם מְבַרְקֵי תוֹרָה

Notes on the readings (4Q398 11-13)

The best photographs available of MS 4Q398 are PAM 42.368 and 42.838.

Line 01: Above the first line of Qimron and Strugnell's reconstruction, above the first *lamed* of the word *הַקָּלְלוֹת* a trace of ink, not mentioned by the editors, can be discerned. It is difficult to recognize the letter, but it is quite probable that at least one line existed above the first readable line.

Line 1:] ° [םׁ] [םׁ] [םׁ] The first traces, where I read םׁ Qimron and Strugnell read בָּ.⁶⁴ The vertical stroke they identify as a *waw* seems too long for a *waw*. *Waw* in this hand is often very short and almost never reaches the imaginary bottom line. The sharp left bottom angle could belong to a final *mem*. Also Tigchelaar reads a final *mem* (ם) here.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ DJD X, 36. In his new edition Qimron has the same reading; see Qimron and Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 226.

⁶⁵ Tigchelaar, "4Q398," *DSSEL*.

After the *mem* the papyrus breaks off, and on the next fragment there are traces of three letters, the first two of which are unrecognizable. The third trace could be a straight baseline belonging to a *bet*. After *bet* again an unrecognizable trace of ink can be discerned.

Qimron and Strugnell read the beginning of this line:⁶⁶

4Q398 (DJD X) [הבר] כו[ת] ש[ב]א[ו] ו[]° []° [בימי

In their composite text they have a slightly different reading:⁶⁷

DJD X C18 [הבר] כו[ת] ש[ב]א[ו] ו[]° []° [בימי

I think their reconstruction [הבר] כו[ת] is paleographically problematic, even though it would nicely suit the context. Also Tigchelaar reads a final *mem* here. He reads the first line as follows:⁶⁸

1 [] [ם] []°°°° []° [בימי שלומה בן דויד ואף הקללוה

Line 2: [ש]בא[ו] The editors read בא[ו].⁶⁹ The photograph hardly allows two *waws* after the *alef*. Eisenman – Wise read בא[ו].⁷⁰

Line 3: [] [יב] The trace after the first letter *yod* is very difficult to identify, but a *bet* is possible. Qimron and Strugnell read the first word אש[] [ש]יב[]י.⁷¹

הברכות והק[ל]לוה In PAM 42.838 and 42.368 the letter *waw* of the plural ending of the word הברכות looks like a circle.

Line 5: ° [] ולוא Qimron and Strugnell have also been able to discern a trace of ink before the word ולוא, but do not transcribe it; instead they discuss it in their notes.⁷² It is difficult to say which letter the very small trace could have been, Qimron and Strugnell think that *waw*, *yod* and *he* are possible. *Nun* could be another possibility.

⁶⁶ DJD X, 36.

⁶⁷ DJD X, 60.

⁶⁸ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSSEL*.

⁶⁹ DJD X, 36.

⁷⁰ Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 199.

⁷¹ DJD X, 36.

⁷² DJD X, 36.

י[יִרְשֵׁ] The fragment is broken and has a hole here, and the letters are only partly preserved, but *sin* and *res* can be recognized with reasonable reliability. Of the descender of the *waw* after the gap, a small trace of ink is visible on PAM 42.368. The editors and Tigchelaar reconstruct the word as follows: ירש[יע]ו.⁷³

◦ ◦ וְאִמְּ: After וְאִמְּ some traces, probably of ink, can be seen, but it is impossible to recognize any of the letters with certainty. The last letter could be a final *mem* (PAM 42.838). The editors read: []וְאִמְּ.⁷⁴ Tigchelaar reads ◦ ◦ ◦ וְאִמְּ.⁷⁵

Line 6:]וְהִ The first letter *waw* could also be a *yod* or a *zayin*.⁷⁶

וְזָוֶרְ: This word is preserved only on a small piece of papyrus, which is connected to the main fragment by a few fibres. Qimron and Strugnell have identified the first three letters “with a fair degree of certainty”.⁷⁷ I follow Qimron and Strugnell’s reading though it should be noted that it is extremely uncertain.

Line 7:]רִאֵ: Above the *alef* a vertical stroke can be discerned. It probably is a descender of a *qof* (final *nun* or *kaf* are also possible). The *alef* in]רִאֵ is rather uncertain.

מַצַּרְ[ו]תִּיהֶם [Tigchelaar reads מַצַּרְ[ו]תִּיהֶם and translates “from their afflictions.”⁷⁸

⁷³ DJD X, 36, Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

⁷⁴ DJD X, 36.

⁷⁵ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

⁷⁶ Qimron and Strugnell mention the possibilities, and state that *yod* is less likely. They further note that the third letter had a descender with no base. DJD X, 36.

⁷⁷ DJD X, 36.

⁷⁸ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

4Q398 fragments 14-17 column i

- 1] [גות]נים את]°°
- 2] [נים] ° [ז' לז']°
- 3] [] ° [ודור] ° [ז' כתוב
- 4] [ך וק[ד]מני[ו]ת °° א
- 5] [בתו]ב ש'] [ך [הרע]ה וכתוב [ו]היא כי
- 6] [א עליך] [בא]חרית[ת] ה'מים ה'ככה
- 7] [וה]קלא] [אל ל[בב]ך ו[ש]בת[ה] אלו בכל לבבך
- 8] [ובכ]ל נ'שך [באחר]י'] [ז'] [פ' מ']

4Q398 fragments 14-17 column ii

- 1] [י עולות זכור [את] ד[ו]י שהיא איש חסדים א'
- 2 2 ה'א]נצל מצרות רבות ונסלוח לו ואף אנחנו כתבנו[א]לך
- 3 3 מקצת מעשי התורה שחשבנו לטוב לך ולעמך[ך] שראינו
- 4 4 עמך ערמה ומדע תורה הבן בכל אלה ובקש מלפנו ש'נתקן]
- 5 5 את עצתך והרחיק ממך מחשבת רעה ועצת בל'ל
- 6 6 בשל שתשמח באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו[ו] כן
- 7 7 ונחשבה לך לצדקה בעשותך הישר והטוב לפנו לטוב לך
- 8 8 ול ישראל vacat

Notes on the readings (4Q398 14-17 col i)

The first column of fragments 4Q398 14-17 has suffered severely and photographs need to be consulted.

Line 1:]^{oo}[Traces of ink are visible, lower parts of letters no longer legible. The editors do not mark these traces in their transcription of MS 4Q398.

Line 2:]^{נום}[The editors do not read the first trace, but it has been transcribed by Ulrich.⁷⁹ The parallel passage in MS 4Q397 reads as follows:]^{ו אל יכה}].

°[^{מי}] In *DJD X* the editors read]^{בס}פֿוֹר מִוִּשֶׁה,⁸⁰ in his new edition Qimron reads more cautiously:]^{בס}פֿוֹר מִוִּשֶׁה.⁸¹ Ulrich's transcription is °[^{מי}.⁸² Tigchelaar reads]^{בס}פֿוֹר מִוִּשֶׁה.⁸³ The first recognizable letter, the *waw*, is slightly blurred, and Ulrich has rightly pointed out that the horizontal stroke of this letter seems to be too short for a *res*, but it is another possible reading. In this hand the upper stroke of the *res* has a tendency to be rather short; see for instance the last word of the MS: וְלִישְׂרָאֵל. As pointed out by Ulrich, the first trace, the one before the *waw/res*, could be a *bet* rather than a *pe*; indeed, the *pe* suggested by the editors is an unlikely reading – the head should be sharp if the letter is a *pe*.⁸⁴ Another possible reading is a *kaf*.

The trace identified as *mem* in the word °[^{מי}] looks more like a *pe* on PAM 42.838, however, *mem* is not an impossible reading. There are traces of three or four letters after the *pe/mem*, the first legible letter is possibly a *qof*, and after it, there is the upper curve of a *res*. The last trace is a thick base line of a letter, and apparently belongs to a *bet*. Also here the papyrus

⁷⁹ Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of the Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," 202-214.

⁸⁰ *DJD X*, 37.

⁸¹ Qimron and Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 226.

⁸² Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of the Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," 210.

⁸³ Tigchelaar, "4Q398," *DSSEL*.

⁸⁴ Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of the Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," 210, n. 28. Ulrich: "Pe should have a pointed head and a baseline that descends below the following letter."

of the original fragment has been destroyed and only the photographs can be used for textual criticism. Nevertheless, the reading of the *DJD X* edition appears to be in error.

In a consultation with Dr. Torleif Elgvin, he proposed the reading $\text{ב}[\text{י}] \text{מקרב}$ (a *hif* ptc. from קרב “to approach, to sacrifice”). On PAM 42.838, the first letter looks more like a *pe*, but that would require another letter between the *pe* and the following *qof*. Accordingly, $\text{ב}[\text{י}] \text{מקרב}$ is a tempting reading, with no need to reconstruct one more letter between מ and ק . However, this would be the only participle in singular in the whole document; otherwise the participle is always used in plural in 4QMMT.

Line 3: $\text{ז}[\text{ו}]$ The editors read in *DJD X* $\text{ז}[\text{ו}] \text{טפ}[\text{ב}]$,⁸⁵ and Qimron follows this reading in the new edition.⁸⁶ Ulrich reads $\text{ר}[\text{ו}]$ ⁸⁷ and Tigchelaar $\text{ז}[\text{ו}] \text{טפ}[\text{ב}]$.⁸⁸ Again, it is difficult to determine whether the third letter is a *res* or a *waw*. The second letter is only partly preserved, and the ‘hook’ could belong to *mem*, *ayin*, *sade* or *sin* – the curve next to the leg of *waw/res* could belong to *sade*, but the letter is definitely not a *pe* as suggested by the editors and Tigchelaar. The first letter could be either a *mem* or a *samek*. One reading suggested by Dr. Elgvin, could be $\text{ז}[\text{ו}] \text{טפ}[\text{ב}]$ ‘his strength’.⁸⁹

Line 4: מ Qimron and Strugnell interpret the traces at the end of the line as מ .⁹⁰ From the photograph, however, it is impossible to recognize a *mem*. Tigchelaar transcribes only $\text{ך}[\text{ד}] \text{מניח}$ and nothing in the end of this line, though clear traces of ink are visible.⁹¹

The first stroke identified either as a *zayin* or a *het* was identified as the left leg of the *taw* by the editors, however, the *lacuna* in the papyrus is so long that it cannot possibly be a part of the previous stroke, the last letter of the word $\text{ך}[\text{ד}] \text{מניח}$. Besides, the stroke lacks the circle typical of the left leg of a *taw* in this hand. Accordingly, there are traces of at least

⁸⁵ *DJD X*, 37.

⁸⁶ Qimron and Charlesworth et al., “Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313,” 226.

⁸⁷ According to Ulrich the first letter could be a *pe*, and the second an *ayin*; Ulrich, “The Non-attestation of the Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT,” 210, see also n. 28.

⁸⁸ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSSEL*.

⁸⁹ I am indebted to Dr. Torleif Elgvin for consultation regarding these readings.

⁹⁰ *DJD X*, 37.

⁹¹ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSSEL*.

four letters after the word וְקָדְמָנִיּוֹת. After the ו/ח, there is a *waw/yod*, then a *bet* or a *kaf*, possibly a very uncertain *lamed* after that – a spot of ink above the imaginary top line is barely visible – and finally an *alef* or a final *pe*.⁹² The papyrus of the original fragment has been destroyed, and even in the earlier photographs the manuscript has a hole at this spot. The editors reconstruct a prepositional phrase in the *lacuna*: וְקָדְמָנִיּוֹת לְ, apparently with the support of MS 4Q397. In any case, the reading in MS 4Q398 is different from that of MS 4Q397. Even if MS 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 12 is reconstructed with the help of this passage of MS 4Q398, it should be acknowledged that MS 4Q397 contains a different word order here:

]12 וְקָדְמָנִיּוֹת לְ[כֹה וְאִפְּ כְתוּב שׁ]

After ^{ooo}א a cursive *alef* or, according to Tov, a palaeo-Hebrew *alef* can be seen in the photograph. This is the only occurrence of this form of *alef* in this manuscript and could be a scribal mark instead of being part of the text.⁹³

Line 6: Here both the editors and Tigchelaar can read more. In *DJD X* and in Tigchelaar's reconstruction the entire line reads as follows:

]יב[ו אַ עֲלֵיךְ [כּוֹל הַדְּבָרִים] הָאֵלֶּה בְּאַחֲרֵי[ת] הַיָּמִים הַבְּרֹכָה

Line 8:]וּחִי[[] בְּאַחֲרֵי[ת] After בְּאַחֲרֵי[ת] Qimron and Strugnell reconstruct the word [הַעֲתָ] in the gap.⁹⁵ Tigchelaar follows this reconstruction.⁹⁶

]וּחִי[The first letter could be either *waw* or *yod*. Qimron and Strugnell read °[]וּחִי.⁹⁷ However, immediately after *het* an illegible trace of a letter is discernable; after that stroke the fragment breaks off.

]מָ[Qimron and Strugnell, as well as Tigchelaar, read only]°[at the end of the line where traces of three letters, possibly מָּ, can be seen.

⁹² I am indebted to Dr. Torleif Elgvin for consultation regarding these readings.

⁹³ See Tov, "Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judean Desert," *DJD XXXIX*, 339.

⁹⁴ *DJD X*, 37; Tigchelaar, "4Q398," *DSSEL*.

⁹⁵ *DJD X*, 37.

⁹⁶ Tigchelaar, "4Q398," *DSSEL*.

⁹⁷ *DJD X*, 37.

Of these three letters *res* is the most certain one, but a *qof* is also possible.⁹⁸

Notes on the readings (4Q398 14-17 col ii)

Line 1: In the beginning of the line, instead of "[]" Tigchelaar reads יִּי[].⁹⁹

Line 3: In the end of this line, both the editors and Tigchelaar can read more, instead of [וּלְעַמְּךָ] שְׁרָאִינִי the editors in *DJD X* and Tigchelaar read יִּי[א] שְׁרָאִינִי.¹⁰⁰ In his new edition, Qimron is slightly more cautious: יִּי[א] שְׁרָאִינִי.¹⁰¹

Line 4: Also at the end of this line the editors and Tigchelaar can read more, instead of [וּלְעַמְּךָ] שְׁרָאִינִי both *DJD X* and Tigchelaar read שְׁרָאִינִי.¹⁰² Again, in his new edition, Qimron is slightly more cautious שְׁרָאִינִי.¹⁰³

Line 5: *Qimron* and *Strugnell* read מַחְשָׁב(וֹ)ת, and say that the *waw* is “certainly blurred” and probably intentionally deleted.¹⁰⁴ There is a spot visible that can possibly be identified as a *waw*.

Line 7: בַּעֲשׂוֹתֶךָ According to *Qimron* and *Strugnell* it is hard to decide between בַּעֲשׂוֹתֶךָ and כַּעֲשׂוֹתֶךָ.¹⁰⁵ I think that the sharp right bottom angle makes *bet* more probable.

⁹⁸ *DJD X*, 37; Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

⁹⁹ Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

¹⁰⁰ *DJD X*, 37; Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

¹⁰¹ *Qimron* and *Charlesworth et al.*, “Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313,” 228.

¹⁰² *DJD X*, 37; Tigchelaar, “4Q398,” *DSSEL*.

¹⁰³ *Qimron* and *Charlesworth et al.*, “Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313,” 228.

¹⁰⁴ *DJD X*, 37-38.

¹⁰⁵ *DJD X*, 38.

2.3.3. *Manuscript 4Q399*

This manuscript is preserved in one fragment only, and it contains text from the end of the document. Qimron and Strugnell have identified the script as a regular Herodian formal hand. According to the editors, the height of the columns is 7,2 cm; the width of column i is 35 corrected letter-spaces and col ii 32 corrected letter-spaces. The manuscript contains several shorter readings in comparison to the parallel MS 4Q398, and in addition, the editors have reconstructed the *lacunae* of column ii, lines 1 and 3 with shorter readings.¹⁰⁶ These reconstructions lack words that are extant in the text of the parallel MS 4Q398 and could therefore in theory be reconstructed in MS 4Q399. However, if the *lacunae* of column ii were fully reconstructed with the help of MS 4Q398, the width of the column would vary between 33-44 corrected letter-spaces. This seems unlikely, since the preserved text from the ends of these lines show that they end virtually at the same spot on column ii. Additionally, the scribe has drawn a vertical dry line to mark the beginning of the lines, as is visible in the beginning of the unscribed third column. Accordingly, the lines would have to contain approximately the same amount of corrected letter-spaces each. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume, that the *lacunae* in MS 4Q399 contained variant or shorter readings.

¹⁰⁶ DJD X, 38-41.

4Q399 column i

1-8

מִצֹּל]

9

וְאִףּ בְּתַבְנִי אֲנַחֲנוּ אֵלֶיךָ]

10

לְטוֹבֵךְ לְךָ שְׂרַאֲיִנוּ]

11

4Q399 column ii

מִלְפָּנֶיךָ]

1

מִחֻשְׁבַּת רַע]

2

בְּמִצְאֵךְ מִדְּבַרֵינוּ]

3

בְּעַשׂוֹתְךָ הַיָּשָׁר לְפָנֶיךָ]

4

vacat וְלִישְׂרָאֵל]

5

vacat 6-11

4Q399 column iii

vacat 1-4

Notes on the readings (4Q399 col ii)

Line 4: There is a small, unscribed space, perhaps too short for an intentional *vacat*, between the words הַיָּשָׁר and לְפָנֶיךָ. This unscribed space was possibly a scribal means to create regular margins.

2.4. A SYNOPSIS OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE EPILOGUE (4Q397-399)

The synopsis (see APPENDIX I) presents the Hebrew transcriptions of the three manuscripts of the epilogue in parallel columns in order to facilitate comparison of the extant text, the variant readings, and the examination of the level of certainty of the official edition's composite text. The purpose of the underlines is to show parallel sections, words, or letters between the manuscripts. In the comments, the variant readings of the manuscripts are discussed. Also, as a result of the synoptic comparison some critical comments on the *DJD X* composite text are offered.

The editors of the *DJD X* edition did not intend the composite text to be a critical text representing the most original text form of the document 4QMMT. The editors state that the composite text is at each point following the most complete manuscript, complemented with other parallel manuscripts. They claim that: "Each line of the composite text contains exactly the same words as the corresponding line of whatever is the basic manuscript for the section in question."¹⁰⁷ However, this is clearly not always the case; see, for instance, below the comments on line *DJD X C* 12. In the foreword of his new edition, Qimron is more cautious, and he, along with the other editors emphasize that the composite text is a hypothetical reconstruction, not a transcription of any actual manuscript.¹⁰⁸

Obviously, the compilation of a composite reading is a complicated task, since the manuscripts are not always identical. Most of the variants are provided in the apparatus of the *DJD X* composite text, yet their significance for the reliability of the composite text is not always discussed. Moreover, there seem to be passages in the manuscripts that contain so much variance that one could legitimately question whether the composite text actually corresponds to the evidence provided by the individual manuscripts. The difficulty with the composite text of the *DJD X* edition is that it does not always correspond to the manuscripts. Moreover, the reception and use of the composite text by scholars who have not heeded Qimron's advice to

¹⁰⁷ *DJD X*, 2.

¹⁰⁸ Qimron and Charlesworth et al., "Some Works of the Torah: 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313," 194.

use the composite text together with the individual manuscripts raises some serious methodological problems.

2.5. THE COMPOSITE TEXT OF *DJD X* RECONSIDERED

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the composite text of the *DJD X* edition in light of the results provided by the synoptic comparison of the manuscripts of the epilogue (4Q397-399). The goal is to evaluate the correspondence between the *DJD X* composite text and the manuscript evidence, and to discuss the significance of the variant readings for the composite text.

2.5.1. *Comments Based on Manuscript 4Q397*

4Q397 frgs. 14-21

Lines 1-8: No overlapping with other manuscripts

Line 10: נָרְ[In MS 4Q398 the corresponding passage reads נָרְ[. The editors have not transcribed the unidentified letter. Since there is a variant reading here and further variance and text critical problems in the surrounding passages, it is difficult to speak of overlapping of the manuscripts. If a text form is chosen for the composite text, it can only correspond to one of the manuscripts in this passage. The editors reconstruct the parallel manuscripts in the *DJD X* edition as follows:¹⁰⁹

4Q397 כתב[נָרְ אֵלֵיכָה שְׁתַּבִּין בַּסֵּפֶר מִשְׁחָה

4Q398 כתב[נָרְ נָרְ[שְׁתַּבִּין בַּסֵּפֶר מִשְׁחָה

Their reading in the composite text of *DJD X* in section C, lines 10-11:110

¹⁰⁹ *DJD X*, 27; 37.

¹¹⁰ *DJD X*, 58.

C10 [כתב]נו אל יכה שתבין בספר מושׁה
 [[ו]]בספר[[י הנ]]ביאים וברוי'ד]

C11 [[במעשי] דור ודור וספר כתוב] [[ל]] [[י]]ם ל' לו

In fact, the *DJD X* composite text on these lines originates mainly from MS 4Q397.¹¹¹ According to the editors, the underlined text should correspond to 4Q398, but it is difficult to be certain, since they overlap by only a few letters, and contain at least one variant reading. In addition, the word בספר [ו] is found on the very small fragment 17, and its placement here is rather uncertain. No material reasons necessitate its placement here.¹¹² With respect to line *DJD X* C11, there appear to be variant readings or at least text critical problems in the parallel manuscripts.

Line 12: כה [] It is possible that these letters correspond with the final *kaf* (possibly a suffix) on line 4 in MS 4Q398 14-17 col i:

ל [ל]ך וק'ד[ד]מניו[ו]ת'ז'ס This seems to be the assumption of the editors, since they reconstruct MS 4Q397 with the help of 4Q398.¹¹³ Here, the two manuscripts seem to contain a textual variant, at least a variant in the word order, possibly a different text form. In spite of that the editors reconstruct use them here for a reconstruction, and read as follows:¹¹⁴

4Q397 [וק'דמניו'ת ל]כה ואפ כתוב

4Q398 ל [ל]ך וק'דמניו'ת מ' [בתו]ב

¹¹¹ The editors mention in their apparatus (*DJD X*, 59, n. 3) that MS 4Q398 contains a variant here: כהב[נו] instead of כהב[נו]. They do not mention however, that the manuscripts apparently also contain a different word order here. Also, in 4Q398 there is a trace of a letter visible before the nun: ׀ו' .

¹¹² See also Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," 202-214.

¹¹³ Manuscript 4Q397 is consistent in using the longer QH forms for the 2nd person sg. suffix, therefore I have reconstructed them also in the lacunae on lines 12-14, unless there is a parallel reading that is only preserved in MS 4Q398. In those cases I have decided to follow the orthography of MS 4Q398, so that the text of the reconstructions would correspond to the composite text. In 4Q398 the 2nd person suffix is in the BH form ׀-.

¹¹⁴ *DJD X*, 27; 37.

In manuscript 4Q398 Qimron and Strugnell read וְנִי° whereas I read וְנִי° .¹¹⁵ Both alternatives would also result in a variant reading (וְנִי° versus וְנִי° / וְנִי°). In their *DJD X* composite text they have a reading that differs from both of their transcriptions of the manuscripts:¹¹⁶

C12 לך וקדמניות [ה° ואף כהוב

The editors comment on the reading ה° : “There were traces of letters here in both d and e, but we could not propose any suggested text which would account for all the readings.”¹¹⁷ The traces before the word וְנִי° in manuscript d = 4Q397 are transcribed on p. 27 in *DJD X* by the editors as כה , yet in manuscript e = 4Q398 the editors transcribe it as וְנִי° .

It is unclear to me from where the transcription of ה° originates. It is true that the variants here create a problem for the composite text, and the individual manuscripts are not easily integrated into a combined reading. Nevertheless, the reading of the composite text on line C12 of *DJD X* seems odd and is somewhat misleading. Furthermore, it is far from certain that this passage, and in particular the beginning of line C12 in *DJD X*, can or should be combined into a composite text.

Line 16: Qimron and Strugnell reconstruct some text in the *lacunae* of this line from MS 4Q398 in accordance with the location of 4Q398 11-13 chosen for the composite text of *DJD X*.¹¹⁸ Also, in the composite text of the *DJD X* edition the placements chosen for fragments 4Q398 11-13 seems to result in some overlapping, demonstrated by the underlines in the edition (*DJD X* C 18):¹¹⁹

C18 [הבר] כו[ו] [תש] [בא] [ו] [ב] [] [כימי שלומה בן דוד]
ואף הקלות

Apparently, the underlined text should correspond to 4Q397 14-21, line 16. Otherwise this line of the composite text is arranged according to 4Q398 11-13. It is unclear to me where the editors find the

¹¹⁵ *DJD X*, 37.

¹¹⁶ *DJD X*, 58.

¹¹⁷ *DJD X*, 59, n. 4.

¹¹⁸ *DJD X*, 28.

¹¹⁹ *DJD X*, 60.

parallel of the underlined *alef*. The different placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 I have chosen results in no overlapping of 4Q397 14-21, lines 15-16 with other MSS.

Comments on 4Q397 fragment 22

According to Qimron and Strugnell this tiny fragment overlaps with 4Q398 11-13.

מִיּוֹמְ]] 1
שְׂיֹבֵא]ו] 2
הַ וְזָה]] 3

Therefore the *DJD X* composite text has the underlined letters on lines C19-21, in order to show correspondence between the two manuscripts of 4QMMT.¹²⁰

C19 [ש]בֹּאֲזוֹ בִּיּוֹמֵי יר[[וּבְעַם בֶּן נִבְט וְעַד גִּלְיָהוּת יְרוּשָׁלַם וְצַדִּיקָה
מֶלֶךְ יְהוֹדִיָה]

C20 [ש]יְבִיאֵם בְּ[[וְאִנְחֵנוּ מִכִּיָּיִם שְׂבֵאוֹו מִקְצַת
הַבְּרִכּוֹת וְהַקְּלָלוֹת]

C21 שְׂכִתּוֹב בְּסִי[[פֶּר מוּ]שֶׁה וְזֶה הוּא אַחֲרֵיתָ הַיָּמִים
שִׁישׁוּבוּ בִישֶׁר]אַל]

Their location is supported by the words **וּם** and **בֹּא**. I think that the fragment is too small and contains too little text, and the location and reconstruction chosen by Qimron and Strugnell results in two variant readings ([ש]יְבִיאֵם - שְׂיֹבֵא]ו and [ש]יְבִיאֵם - מִיּוֹמֵי]). Therefore I do not follow the editors' suggestion. Tigchelaar has proposed another location for this fragment in the halakhic section.¹²¹

¹²⁰ DJD X, 28; 60. On page 61, notes 4 and 5 the editors refer to the variant readings of MS d (4Q397), and say that they are found "on a small fragment". They must be referring to 4Q397 22.

¹²¹ Tigchelaar, "4Q397," *DSSSEL*.

2.5.2. Comments Based on Manuscript 4Q398

4Q398 11-13

If the placement suggested by Strugnell and Stegemann is accepted, these fragments do not overlap with any other manuscript.¹²² Also, in his article, “The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text”, Qimron states that “this section is preserved in only one of the larger fragments of the papyrus, 4QMMT^e [= 4Q398]. There is no parallel text extant in any of the other manuscripts and its placement is therefore physically unknown.” In the *DJD X* composite text, however, there are underlined passages that apparently suggest correspondence with manuscript 4Q397, see the comment above on *DJD X* C18 (and Table 5).

We do not know with certainty how much text is missing after these fragments before the next preserved section.

4Q398 14-17 col i

Lines 1-4: When these lines are compared with MS 4Q397 there seem to be variant readings.

Line 5: **וְהָיָא כִּי** [ו] In their composite text of *DJD X*, Qimron and Strugnell place the words **וְהָיָא כִּי** on their own separate line and leave an empty space at the beginning of that line.¹²³ The reason for this odd placement is that in line *DJD X* C12 they arrange the text according to MS 4Q397, and in line *DJD X* C13 according to 4Q398. Therefore their composite text includes almost a whole extra line between the words **וּבְרֹחַ** on line *DJD X* C12 and **וְהָיָא** on line *DJD X* C13:

וְהָיָא כִּי

C13

This space at the beginning of the line is not possible based on the material witness of the individual manuscripts: 4Q397 or 4Q398.

¹²² Qimron, “The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text,” 12.

¹²³ *DJD X*, 58-59.

Line 8: In the composite text of the *DJD X* edition the editors combine MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398 in the following way (the underlines should correspond to 4Q397):¹²⁴

[וּבְכוּלְנִפְשְׁךָ] C16
 [בְּאַחֲרֵיָתָן] וְחַן]°
 [וּכְתוּב בְּסֵפֶר מוֹשֶׁה וּבְסֵפֶרֵי הַנְּבִיאִים שִׁבְעָאֵלֶּיךָ] C17
 [שֶׁל]

For some reason, Qimron and Strugnell have in their composite text on line *DJD X* C16 a longish *lacuna* between the words נִפְשְׁךָ and בְּאַחֲרֵיָתָן.¹²⁵ This is materially impossible both in 4Q397 and in 4Q398. Also, the two long *lacunae* at the end of the same line in *DJD X* are not possible either in 4Q397 or 4Q398. The reconstructed word וּכְתוּב in line *DJD X* C17 cannot be combined with the preserved traces of writing of MS 4Q398. It is possible that the manuscripts contained a textual variant in this passage as well.

Without a material reconstruction it is impossible to know how many lines are missing above line 1 or after line 8.

4Q398 14-17 col ii

Lines 2-8 overlap with 4Q399, yet in each overlapping passage a variant reading is attested, except for the final word וְלִישְׂרָאֵל. The variant readings are discussed below.

2.5.3. Variant Readings of the Manuscripts

In the overlapping sections of the manuscripts of 4QMMT, there are some variant readings. In order to establish the level of certainty for the composite text and to address the question of possible redaction within 4QMMT the variant readings in the manuscripts will be analyzed. Most of the variant readings are listed in a table in *DJD X*, and in the apparatus of the *DJD X* composite text.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ *DJD X*, 60.

¹²⁵ *DJD X*, 60.

¹²⁶ *DJD X*, 41.

Orthographic, morphological and phonological variants are usually of minor importance, since they do not affect the meaning of the passage. Mostly, these variants are routine and merely reflect scribal practices or a stage of development in the Hebrew language. Some scribes can also be inconsistent with regard to, for instance, orthographic variants. There are also attested in 4QMMT manuscripts individual variant readings, which in some cases constitute a difference in the meaning of the passage. If the variant readings form large-scale patterns of variants, witnessing intentional creative work of a scribe or redactor, it can result to a variant literary edition of a text, either restricted to a certain passage or reflected by the whole composition.¹²⁷ Obviously, some variants can also result simply from scribal mistakes.

2.5.3.1. Variant Readings in the Halakhic Section

In this chapter, the variant readings of the halakhic section will be analyzed. Comparing the results of the analysis of the epilogue and the halakhic section will aid in establishing the level of certainty of the composite text in each section. Furthermore, the existence or non-existence of redactional traces will be instructive concerning the nature of the legal material treated in the halakhic section and the formation of the whole document.

Orthographic, Morphological and Phonological Variants

4Q394	4Q395	4Q396	4Q397
רָאוּ	רָאוֹי		
רָאוּאִי	רָאוֹי		
לְהוֹדִיר	לְהוֹדִיר		
הַקֹּדֶשׁ			הַקֹּדֶשׁ
		הַזֹּנוֹת	הַזֹּנוֹת
		[לְהוֹדִיר] תָּם	[לְהוֹדִיר] תָּמָה

¹²⁷ See also Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSRL. Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans. 1999) 86-94.

לה[תיכם]			להתיכמה
		וא[תם]	ואת[מה]

Comments

רִאֲוֹ / רִאֲוִי / רִאֲוִי In 4QMMT רִאֲוִי (pass. ptc. form of the verb רִאָה) is used in a formula concerning the priests' duties (based on Lev 22:16).¹²⁸ According to Qimron, the different forms suggest that the diphthong *uy* represented by ׀- in final position was not sustained in Qumran Hebrew (QH).¹²⁹ Instead, it was either contracted or sometimes broken into two vowels. In manuscript 4Q394 there are examples of both phenomena. For the first, 4Q394 has the contracted form רִאֲוֹ (4Q394 3-7 i,15). Formally this occurrence could also be understood as a *qal* perf. 3rd person pl. but then it would not fit the formula. Secondly, 4Q394 has רִאֲוִי representing the resolution (4Q394 3-7 ii,1), the second *alef* constituting a *Vokalträger*.¹³⁰ 4Q395 has the form רִאֲוִי and רִאֲוִי (4Q395 1, 7; 11), which would correspond to the practice of Biblical Hebrew (BH). Ms 4Q394 has also a second occurrence of the longer form רִאֲוִי (4Q394 8 ii,13 / *DJD* X B26), but the parallel section in 4Q395 is no longer preserved.

The variant readings in 4Q394 likely reflect the phonology of QH. The forms of 4Q394 represent QH whereas those in 4Q395 represent BH. It is probable that all three forms of the word רִאֲוִי were used side by side dur-

¹²⁸ The word is more often used in Mishnaic Hebrew (MH) and Jastrow gives it several meanings: "chosen, selected; designated, predestined; fit, worthy, adapted"; Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature. Vol I-II* (New York, 1950) 1435.

¹²⁹ With Qumran Hebrew (QH) I am referring to those linguistic features common in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls and deviant from the typical traits of Biblical Hebrew (BH). One should, of course, avoid too broad generalizations with regard to the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls, since the documents are dated between approximately 200 BCE and 70 CE and are not necessarily homogenous from a linguistic standpoint. The language apparently also shows traces of development when the earlier and the later documents are compared. It seems to be generally accepted, however, that the language of the Dead Sea Scrolls represent a later stage of development of the Hebrew language in comparison to BH. See, for instance, Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (trans. J. Elwolde; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 130-146, esp. p. 133.

¹³⁰ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 34; *DJD* X, 71.

ing the time 4QMMT was composed and none of them were considered superior to another. It is interesting that two variants are attested in the same manuscript, namely, in 4Q394.

לה[נ]הר / להזהר (DJD X B12)

The supralinear *yod* in MS 4Q394 3-7 i,15 is an interesting case. *Hif'il* (instead of *nif'al*) does not fit in the context. A plene reading is possible, but would be surprising.¹³¹ It is possible that the supralinear *yod* is merely a scribal error. The *nif'al* form is certainly to be preferred. At another place (DJD X B50) MS 4Q396 reads להזהר.

הזונות / הזונות (DJD X B75)

According to Qimron, possibly the form הזונות in 4Q396 1-2 iv, 4 may indicate “an original short *u* in the initial vowel”, whereas the form הזונות in 4Q397 6-13, 12 reflects biblical pronunciation with a *sch^ewa*.¹³²

In general, 4Q397 seems to prefer the longer morphological forms of pl 3. suffix and pl 2. pronoun, often used in QH: לההי[ו]תמה, לההתיכמה, לההתיכמה, [וואת]מה versus לההי[ו]תם in 4Q396, [לה]תיכם in 4Q394 and [ווא]תם in 4Q396.

If the reconstruction of 4Q398 1-3 by Qimron and Strugnell is correct, there is one more possible orthographic variant attested:¹³³

4Q397	4Q398
[הנוש]א	[ה]נושה

The problem here is that the word [ה]נושה of MS 4Q398 Qimron and Strugnell are referring to cannot be seen on any photograph or fragment.

Other Variant Readings

4Q394	4Q395	4Q396	4Q397
	פרת		
פרת החטאת	החט[את]		
		אנחנו אומרים	שאנחנו [אומ]רים

¹³¹ See DJD X, 47; 90.

¹³² DJD X, 66; 71.

¹³³ DJD X, 34; 41.

		משכתוב	כשכתוב
		לרבעה	להרביע[ה]
[וי]רושלי[ם] מחנה היא			[וי]רושלים היא מחנה
ירושלימ היא ראש [מ]חנות ישראל]		[יר]ושלים היא ראש [מ]חנות ישראל	י[רושלים] ראש מחנות ישראל [היא]

Comments

פרת החטאת] / פרת החטאת (DJD X B13)

4Q394 3-7 i, 16 reads פרת החטאת. The term פרת החטאת is found in MH, but not in BH or QH.¹³⁴ In the parallel passage in 4Q395 frg. 1, line 8 החטאת] is written on the line, but the word פרת supralinearly. It is possible that the text of 4Q395 before the correction reflected the biblical usage of החטאת / חטאת. According to the editors, the interlinear פרת was added by the original scribe.¹³⁵ It could either have been a scribal error, or, in 4Q395 the earlier terminology was corrected to correspond the usage already seen in 4Q394 and later familiar from MH. Possibly the *Vorlage* of 4Q395 contained the biblical reading (החטאת), which was changed by the scribe.

אנחנו אומרים “we say/state” / אנחנו [אומ]רים “of which we say/state” (DJD X B73)

The reading of 4Q396 1-2 iv,2 features the formulaic nature of the halakhic section. The longer formula in 4Q397 6-13,11 is the only occurrence, and it is somewhat puzzling, since otherwise the formulae אנחנו אומרים / אנחנו חושבים are always used in an identical manner. Possibly the longer form of 4Q397 is a later development.

משכתוב / כשכתוב (DJD X B76)

Kimron and Strugnell mention that the term כשכתוב (4Q397 6-13,12) was current in post-exilic Hebrew in its biblicalizing form כאשר כתוב.

¹³⁴ DJD X, 98. פרת החטאת is attested in *m. Para* 2:1 and 4:1. Elsewhere in the tractate the word פרה is used alone. In BH the term חטאת / החטאת is used for the purification offering and פרה אדמה for “red heifer” (Num 19). In Leviticus the masculine פרת החטאת is used.

¹³⁵ DJD X, 15.

According to them, the form *משכתוב* in 4Q396 1-2 iv,5; not known from any other Hebrew source, is a loan translation of the Aramaic *מדכתיב*.¹³⁶ This may reflect the bilingualism of the scribe.

לרבעה / להרביע[ה] (DJD X B77)

The Context:

ועל בה[מתו הטהורה] כתוב שלוא
לרבעה כלאים

ל[הרביע]ה כלאים [ועל בהמתו הטהו]רה כתוב של[וא]

Qimron and Strugnell interpret the form in 4Q396 as a *pi'el* and the *he* at the end as a suffix sg. 3: “One must not let *it* mate.” Still, they admit, “the *pi'el* of רבע in this meaning is peculiar.”¹³⁷ I think it would be easier to understand the form in 4Q396 as a *qal*, either *infinitivus constructus* with a *he*-ending or *infinitivus constructus* with a suffix 3rd person sg. Both forms are grammatically possible. In this passage we have a citation or a paraphrase of Lev 19:19 לא־תִרְבִּיעַ כֹּל־אִים where the *hif'il*-form of this verb is used. The *qal*-form of the verb רבע is used in Lev 18:23 לרבעה (*qal infinitivus constructus* + suff.) and in Lev 20:16 לרבעה (*qal infinitivus constructus*). Apparently, the scribe of 4Q396 mixed up the verb forms of three close passages of Leviticus, presuming the form of 4Q396 is to be interpreted as a *qal*, instead of a *pi'el* suggested by Qimron and Strugnell.¹³⁸ It is also possible, that the use of this rather rare verb was not consistent. Anyhow, the *hif'il* form used in 4Q397 and Lev 19:19 is the most intelligible reading for this context.

The variants in word order: All readings are syntactically possible. Although fragmentary, the readings of the MSS 4Q394 and 4Q396 seem to be identical. Note that 4Q397 also has a QH form of הִיאֵה.

¹³⁶ DJD X, 55; 92; 100.

¹³⁷ DJD X, 56.

¹³⁸ It is, I think, unnecessary to postulate a *pi'el* form here, since, as Qimron and Strugnell admit, that form is nowhere attested. DJD X, 100: “In the BH the *qal* and *hif'il* of רבע are used in this sense; here we have the (non-biblical) *pi'el*, with a causal meaning (as is further shown by the use on 4Q397 of the *hif'il* as a variant of the *pi'el*). As far as we know, the *pi'el* is not attested in any other Hebrew source.”

One possibly significant variant

In lines B39-42 of the *DJD X* composite text Qimron and Strugnell have reconstructed a halakhic statement concerning the persons forbidden to enter the congregation (4Q394 frg. 8 iii, 9-19; 4Q396 frgs. 1-2 i, 5-6; 4Q397 frg. 5).

[ועל העמוני והמואבי והממזר וְפָצוּע הַדְּכָה וְכָרוּ] ת *DJD X* B39

השפכת שהם באים

DJD X B40 [בקהל] ונשים [לְוָיָהּ] קָהָנִים

להיו] תָּם עֲצָם

[*DJD X* B41 [אחת ומבאים למקדש

טמאות ואף חוש] בים אנהנו] *DJD X* B42

In MS 4Q397 there must have been either a *vacat* or a textual variant, namely a longer text form in comparison with MS 4Q394. The three manuscripts are all fragmentary, and overlap only marginally, and the sources the editors have used for the conjecture are Deut 23:2-4, Lam 1:10, Tg. Ruth 2:10-13 and 4Q174 1-2 i,3-4.¹³⁹ The problem is the amount of text at the end of line 2 and the beginning of line 3 of 4Q397 frg. 5 when compared with 4Q394. The overlapping sections with MS 4Q394 are demonstrated by underlines, and the overlapping with MS 4Q396 with bolded letters.

4Q397 frg. 5

1 [ועל העמוני והמואבי והממזר] השפכת שהם באים בקהל]

2 [ונשים לוקחים להיו] תָּמָה עֲצָם אחת []

3 [טמאות ואף חושבים] אנהנו [° עליהם]

4 [וא] ^י להתיכמה ולעשותמה [אם

5 [שמק] צת העם] בימ

6 [להזהר] מְכֹלֵל ת] ערובת הגבר ול היות יראים]

¹³⁹ *DJD X*, 158-159.

A comparison between 4Q397 frg. 5, lines 2-3 and the corresponding passage of MS 4Q394 shows that there is, in MS 4Q394, room only for approximately 8 corrected letter-spaces, whereas, in MS 4Q397 there could be many more corrected letter-spaces (admittedly, the width of the column can not be determined with certainty). MS 4Q397 could either have had a *vacat* or a longer reading. The contents of that longer reading cannot, however, be determined with any certainty.

A Summary of the Variant Readings In the Halakhic Section

Manuscript 4Q395 overlaps only with MS 4Q394. These manuscripts have four minor variant readings. The little evidence that can be adduced from these examples points vaguely in the direction that 4Q395 shows more traits of Biblical Hebrew than 4Q394, which features Qumran Hebrew in the parallel sections. These variants do not necessarily suggest redactional activity but may merely reflect scribal practices. The phonological variants possibly result from the fluctuation in the developing language between BH and QH. The forms in MS 4Q394 represent QH and the ones in 4Q395 BH. In the case of *הַחֲטָאֵת* (*פִּרְתָהּ*) the scribe of 4Q395 apparently corrected the text himself in order to achieve a reading similar to that represented by MS 4Q394. The reading on the line in MS 4Q395, the more original one, possibly reflects the text form of the *Vorlage* of 4Q395 that could have followed BH in its terminology and in phonology (cf. the other variants reflecting BH). Before the interlinear addition by the scribe, MS 4Q395 represents a BH formulation. The scribe possibly made a correction in order to follow the more current use of halakhic terminology.

Manuscripts 4Q394 and 4Q396 are virtually identical where they overlap. No major variant readings are attested. Only some variance in orthography is recorded, mostly in the use of medial and final letters. MS 4Q394 uses medial and final forms inconsistently; for instance, in some cases the final *mem* at the beginning or in the middle of the word, or a medial *mem* in final position; MS 4Q396 follows the standard orthography.

4Q397 has two occurrences of a different word order compared with 4Q394 and 4Q396, but all readings are syntactically possible. Also, 4Q397 offers the only example of a variant in the halakhic

formula, namely a longer form of $\text{שִׁאֲנַחֲנוּ} [\text{אֲוִמַּרִים}]$. Otherwise, in the 4QMMT manuscripts, the formulae are always used identically in the form $\text{אֲנַחֲנוּ אֲוִמַּרִים} / \text{אֲנַחֲנוּ חֹשְׁבִים}$. The longer form of 4Q397 is probably later. In the cases of orthographic and morphological variants, 4Q397 prefers the forms typical of Qumran Hebrew. The text form of 4Q397 is likely to be later than that of MSS 4Q394 and 4Q396; however, it must be admitted that it shows only minor evidence of redactional activity.

Manuscript 4Q397 prefers the longer forms of the 3rd person plural suffix and the 2nd person plural pronoun typical of QH. The longer QH forms are fairly consistent throughout MS 4Q397, except in 4Q397 6-13, 8 $\text{ע}[\text{מַהֲרֵם}]$. The 2nd person sg suffix in the epilogue of this manuscript is always in the longer QH form.

The composite text of the halakhic section is not entirely unproblematic, and in some cases the parallel manuscripts overlap only in the *reconstructed* passages, rather than in the extant text. However, the analysis of the variant readings demonstrates that the attested morphological, phonological or orthographical variants and the textual variants of the halakhic section are of minor importance. There is hardly any evidence for rescensional or redactional activity discernable, all readings may also reflect scribal habits of individual copyists. This result can be compared with the analysis of the legal material of the Damascus Document by Charlotte Hempel:

In contrast to the communal legislation the halakhah material [of the Laws of D] shows no evidence to speak of redactional activity and updating. It appears that this material was transmitted much more faithfully without the need being felt for updating it and adjusting it to present-day community realities.¹⁴⁰

In a like manner, the lack of virtually all traces of redactional activity could reflect the nature of the halakhic section as non-communal Jewish legislation which is directed for all Israel in contrast to laws pertaining to community organization needing regular updating.

¹⁴⁰ Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 71.

2.5.3.2. Variant Readings in the Epilogue

The text of the epilogue is preserved in manuscripts 4Q397-399. Despite the general coinciding of manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398, variant readings are recorded, some of them orthographic variants and some differences in wording or word order. Even though only one fragment of 4Q399 is preserved, quite a few variants are recorded.

Orthographic, Morphological and Phonological Variants

4Q397	4Q398	4Q399
והקלה	והקלה	
לבבכה and לבבכה	לבבך and לבבך	
	נצל	מצול
	לפנו and מלפנו	לפניו and מלפניו
	רעה	רע

Comments

והקלה / והקלה

In Qumran Hebrew a non-radical *alef* could be used as a vowel marker for *a* in the final position, cf. 4Q398 14-17 i, 7. In MS 4Q398 there are other occurrences of this phenomenon as well, for example והי instead of היה (e.g. 4Q398 14-17 i, 5; ii, 1).¹⁴¹

לבבך and לבבך / לבבכה and לבבכה

In morphology, 4Q397 prefers the longer Qumran Hebrew form for the 2nd person singular masc. suffix, while 4Q398 uses forms of BH. MS 4Q397 is almost entirely consistent in its use of the longer forms.

¹⁴¹ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 23; DJD X, 68. According to Qimron, this spelling is used, for instance, in the Copper Scroll, and more rarely in 1QIsa^a

מ[נ]צול / [נ]צל

This variant מ[נ]צול is uncertain: a stroke, that could be a *waw* (or a *yod*), can be discerned above the line over the word in 4Q398 14-17, ii, 2. According to the editors, the word was possibly corrected to [נ]צול or מ[נ]צול.¹⁴²

מלפניו and לפניו / מלפנו and לפנו

The forms in 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 ii, 4; 7 reflect the contraction of a diphthong, typical of QH. The contraction of the diphthong is possibly a dialectical feature.¹⁴³ 4Q399 ii, 1; 4 reflect the BH forms. The change in the orthography most likely reflects a monophthongisation of the diphthong, which in essence is a phonological phenomenon.¹⁴⁴

רע / רעה

According to Qimron and Strugnell an adjective is used as a noun in 4Q398 14-17 ii, 5; cf. 4Q399 ii, 2.¹⁴⁵

Qimron and Strugnell also propose the following variant readings:¹⁴⁶

4Q397	4Q398
מיומ[י]	בימי
שיובא[ו]	[ש]יוב[י]אם

Qimron and Strugnell say that the variant readings of 4Q397 are found “on a small fragment.” By this they must mean 4Q397 22.

Other Variant Readings

There are textual variants between 4Q397 and 4Q398, although the exact amount or significance of the variance is difficult to determine because the fragments and the writing on them are so poorly preserved.

¹⁴² See DJD X, 77.

¹⁴³ Morag, “Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations,” *VT* 38 (1988) 152; Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 33-34; Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 140.

¹⁴⁴ Joüon – Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Volume I. Part One: Orthography and Phonetics. Part Two: Morphology* (Subsidia Biblica 14/I; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991) xxi, 93.

¹⁴⁵ DJD X, 87.

¹⁴⁶ DJD X, 28; 41; 61; 91. Here they acknowledge that the reading and context of 4Q397 are doubtful. See also García Martínez 1996, 18.

4Q397 frgs 14-21, line 10

4Q398 frgs 14-17 col i, 2

כתב]זו אליכה שתבין בספר מוש[ה]] °נום [°זי מ[] °
-----------------------------------	---------------------

Even if the reconstruction of the editors were accepted, the manuscripts must have contained a textual variant at this point:¹⁴⁷

] °נום [כתב] 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 2 (*DJD X*)

4Q397 frgs 14-21, line 12

4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 4

] ל[כה ואפ כתוב ש]	ל[ך זק[ד]מני[ו]ת זי א
--------------------	-----------------------

The editors reconstruct MS 4Q397 with the help of 4Q398:¹⁴⁸

] ל[כה ואפ כתוב ש]תור 4Q397 (*DJD X*)

It is questionable whether the first *lacuna* of manuscript 4Q397 can be reconstructed with the help of 4Q398, since the two manuscripts obviously contain differing word orders, and apparently other variant readings as well. In MS 4Q398 Qimron and Strugnell read זי° instead of זי°.¹⁴⁹

Manuscripts 4Q398 and 4Q399 also contain several textual variants. The number of variants is surprisingly large in comparison with the amount of material preserved from these manuscripts.

¹⁴⁷ See *DJD X*, 37. If the reconstruction of the phrase is accepted, the final *mem* is probably a suffix, possibly referring to בדרברים האלה; see *DJD X*, note 10 on p. 59; and the comment on p. 72.

¹⁴⁸ *DJD X*, 27

¹⁴⁹ *DJD X*, 37.

4Q397	4Q398	4Q399
	ואף אנחנו כתבנו א[ל]יך	ואף כתבנו אנחנו אליך
	לטוב לך ולעמ[ך] ש[ראינו]	לטוב לך שראינו
[במצאך] ¹⁵⁰ מקצת דברינו	במצאך מקצת דברינו	במצאך מדברינו
	בעשותך הישר והטוב לפנו	בעש[ו]תך הישר לפניו

The first variant is a difference in the word order, but both readings are syntactically possible.¹⁵¹ The second variant could be of major importance: לך לטוב / לטוב לך ולעמ[ך]. The shorter readings are likely to be earlier. The significance of this variant will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The third variant does not constitute a difference in the meaning of the sentence; however, it should be noted that the term *מקצת* is rare in BH. It is used only in some of the later texts such as Daniel and Nehemiah, and becomes more common in MH. The fourth case *הישר והטוב* / *הישר* is probably of minor importance; since both the longer and shorter forms of this expression of Deuteronomic origin could be used interchangeably. However, it is possible that all of these variants are intentional and probably the shorter form of 4Q399 is more original. Text form has a tendency to be expanded during the history of its transmission rather than to be abbreviated. In addition, the orthographic and phonological variants, and

¹⁵⁰ Although fragmentary, 4Q397 seems to present a longer reading in accordance with 4Q398 and against 4Q399. The longer reading of 4Q397 is preserved on a very small fragment (frg. 23) and is therefore uncertain.

¹⁵¹ See DJD X, 82.

in the case of [ו]במציאך מקצת דבריני / במציאך מדבריני the variant readings suggest that the text form of 4Q399 is closer to BH. Admittedly, the evidence is meager, and one should perhaps refrain from deciding between an earlier text form and a later one. Nevertheless, when the small amount of evidence from all the variants between MSS 4Q398 and 4Q399 is read cumulatively, the linguistic variants and the shorter readings imply that the text form of 4Q399 is earlier than that of 4Q398. This decision requires an explanation for the longer reading in the case of the variants: לטוב לך ולעמך / לטוב לך. How was the longer reading of MS 4Q398 created if the shorter one is the more original one? It seems credible that the copyist of 4Q398 was influenced by the concluding phrase of the epilogue: לטוב לך ולישראל and decided to harmonize the phrase with the one concluding the whole document.

A Summary of the Variant Readings in the Epilogue

Compared with the entire number of fragments originating from the epilogue, manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 overlap surprisingly little. In morphology, 4Q397 prefers the longer Qumran Hebrew form for the 2nd person singular masc. suffix while 4Q398 uses forms of BH. In the epilogue, as well as in the halakhic section, 4Q397 is almost completely consistent in using the longer forms of personal pronouns and pronominal suffixes typical of QH orthography and morphology, and reflects a pattern of differing, more contemporary, orthography.¹⁵² Despite the general coinciding of the overlapping lines, variant readings are recorded, some of them orthographic variants and some significant differences in wording or word order, and in some cases the manuscripts appear to contain a different text form. It could be, however, that major literary variants are restricted to a few particular passages of the epilogue.

4Q399 preserves text from the end of the epilogue and overlaps partially with 4Q398 14-17 ii,1-8 and 4Q397 frg. 23. Even though only one fragment of 4Q399 is preserved, quite a few variants are

¹⁵² The term 'contemporary orthography' is introduced by Ulrich to describe the plene orthography typical of many texts found at Qumran. Even though he admits that the term is not completely satisfactory, it is more adequate than the generally applied classification 'non-Qumranic' or 'Qumranic' orthography indicating an existence of a distinct Qumran scribal school. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," 86-88, see also n. 22.

recorded, though most of them are of minor importance. The phonological variants in 4Q399 represent BH, while the parallels in 4Q398 feature QH; for instance, the forms מלפנו and לפנו in 4Q398 reflect the contraction of a diphthong, typical of QH.¹⁵³ The orthography of MS 4Q398 also presents QH features. In the case of a variant word order the reading of manuscript 4Q398 וַאֲרָא אֲנַחְנוּ כְּתַבְנָנוּ is stressing the subject of the clause in comparison to the normal word order of MS 4Q399. Both readings are syntactically possible. Most important are the shorter readings in 4Q399 compared to 4Q398. These differences could be intentional and the shorter readings are likely to be earlier. It is possible that manuscript 4Q399 contained other shorter readings as well, implied by the length of the *lacunae*. In their reconstructions of the *lacunae* of MS 4Q399 the editors have several shorter readings in comparison to MS 4Q398; however, they do not discuss these shorter reconstructions explicitly.¹⁵⁴ In manuscript 4Q399, the phonological forms presenting BH together with the shorter readings point vaguely in the direction that the text form of 4Q399 is earlier than that of 4Q398. Even though MSS 4Q398 and 4Q399 are clearly manuscripts of the same document, the amount of difference suggests that some passages of the manuscripts contain important textual variants.

2.6. THE PLACEMENT OF FRAGMENTS 4Q398 11-13 WITHIN THE EPILOGUE

In order to establish the text form of the epilogue it is necessary to solve the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 and their relation to the text of manuscript 4Q397. In the *DJD X* composite text, the translation of the text of the disputed fragments 4Q398 11-13 runs as follows:¹⁵⁵

18 [the blessings have (already) befallen in ...] in the days of Solomon, the son of David. And the curses 19 [that] have (already) befallen from the days of Jeroboam the son of Nebat and up to when Jerusalem and Zedekiah king of [Judah] went into captivity 29 that He

¹⁵³ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 33-34; Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," 152.

¹⁵⁴ *DJD X*, 39-40.

¹⁵⁵ Translation by the editors; *DJD X*, 61.

will bring them [...]. And we know that some of the blessings and the curses have (already) been fulfilled 21 as it is written in the bo[ok of Mo]ses. And this is at the end of days when they will return to Isra[el] 22 [forever...] and not be cancelled, but the wicked will act wickedly and [...] 23 and [...] Think of the kings of Israel and contemplate their deeds: whoever among them 24 feared [the To]rah was delivered from troubles; and these were the see[ke]rs of the Torah...

In the *DJD X* composite text, the first preserved passage of the epilogue is made up of manuscript 4Q397 frgs. 14-21. The epilogue in *DJD X*, lines C 1-4 (=4Q397 frgs 14-21, lines 1-4) begins:¹⁵⁶

1[...] 2[...] that they will come [] 3 And who will [...] he will[...] 4
And concerning the women [... the malice] and the treachery [...]

In the *DJD X* composite text, fragments 4Q398 11-13 are placed below fragments 4Q398 14-17, continuing column i of these fragments. If located here, fragments 4Q398 11-13 would physically make up the lower part of column i of 4Q398 14-17.

The reconstruction of the *lacuna* of MS 4Q397 in *DJD X* also reflects this placement; the underlines suggest the correspondence with MS 4Q398 frs 11-13, line 1.

4Q397 14-21, line 16 in *DJD X*:¹⁵⁷

[[הברכ]]ות ש[[באון]]
[[ב]]י מ'י שלומה בן דוד
ואף ה'קלות

In *DJD X* the composite text is arranged according to Qimron; there the fragments 4Q398 11-13 follow line *DJD X* C17, and make up lines *DJD X* C18-24.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, in lines C18-24 of the composite text, fragments 4Q398 11-13 partially overlap with 4Q397 frgs 14-21, line 16 and 4Q397 frg. 22.

¹⁵⁶ Translation by the editors; *DJD X*, 59.

¹⁵⁷ *DJD X*, 28.

¹⁵⁸ *DJD X*, 28, 60.

Table 4. The Arrangement of the Fragments of the Epilogue in DJD X

C1-8	4Q397 14-21, lines 1-8		
C9-12	4Q397 14-21, lines 9-12	4Q398 14-17 i, lines 1-5	
C13		4Q398 14-17 i, line 5	
C14-17	4Q397 14-21, lines 13-15	4Q398 14-17 i, lines 6-7	
C18	4Q397 14-21, line 16	4Q398 11-13, line 1	
C19-21	4Q397 22	4Q398 11-13, lines 2-4	
C22-24		4Q398 11-13, lines 5-7	
C25		4Q398 14-17 ii, line 1	
C26-32	4Q397 23	4Q398 14-17 ii, lines 2-7	4Q399 1 i-ii

The readers of *DJD X* are informed that it was Menahem Kister who first proposed the location chosen for frgs. 4Q398 11-13 in the *DJD X* composite text. According to Qimron, his arguments are based on the contents of 4QMMT. The editors further consulted Hartmut Stegemann and Bezalel Porten. As reported by Qimron, according to Stegemann the location chosen for fragments 4Q398 11-13 in the *DJD X* composite text is materially impossible. Porten is of the opposite opinion. Qimron summarizes the discussion over the location of these fragments in Appendix 2 in *DJD X*.¹⁵⁹ Strugnell thinks that the arrangement of the *DJD X* composite text is thematically possible, but materially improbable.¹⁶⁰ Strugnell and Stegemann have proposed an alternative arrangement, but have not published an alternative composite text.

¹⁵⁹ Qimron, Appendix 2 in *DJD X*, 201. See also Qimron, "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text," 12-13; Strugnell, Appendix 3 in *DJD X*, 203-206; *idem*, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 69.

¹⁶⁰ Strugnell, Appendix 3 in *DJD X*, 206.

The major problem with Qimron's solution is that the *reconstructed* column of fragments 11-13 in the *DJD X* edition is much broader (50-60 corrected letter spaces) than column i on fragments 14-17 (40-48 corrected letter spaces). Accordingly, if the reconstructions of the *lacunae* are accepted, it is improbable that fragments 11-13 would constitute the lower part of column i of fragments 14-17, since this would result to a column of approximately 16 lines, with a *narrower upper part* and a *broader lower part*. This is materially unlikely and therefore not a satisfactory solution for the arrangement of the fragments. Furthermore, as the examination of the original fragments revealed, there has most likely been at least one written line above the first legible line of fragments 4Q398 11-13 (cf. 2.3.2).

The material reconstruction of MS 4Q397 by Stegemann would possibly settle the matter with more certainty. In May 2005 Stegemann began to prepare his material for publication, and he was planning to make some revisions and modifications in his earlier reconstructions. However, this was not accomplished before his death in the summer of 2005. His notes are currently being prepared for publication by Reinhard Kratz, who refers to Stegemann's material in a recently published article. Kratz discusses the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 and the different solutions proposed. He points out some material indications and damage patterns in the papyrus of MS 4Q398 suggesting that the location of these fragments before 4Q398 14-17, already proposed by Strugnell and Stegemann, is more likely. It is difficult to comment on these proposals, however, prior to the publication of these material reconstructions.¹⁶¹

Even without Stegemann's reconstruction, however, there are enough indications to infer that the arrangement of fragments chosen by Qimron for the *DJD X* edition is problematic and needs to be reconsidered. The difference in the width of the reconstructed columns of 4Q398 frgs. 11-13 and 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i respectively suffices to question the location chosen for the *DJD X* composite text.

Another indication suggesting a new location for fragments 4Q398 11-13 is the fact that the last written column of 4Q397, represented by fragment 23, was apparently much narrower than the other col-

¹⁶¹ Kratz, "Moses und die Propheten: zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," 151-176, esp. p. 162-166. Additionally, Kratz presents a preliminary analysis of the epilogue of 4QMMT. In his analysis of the epilogue, the starting point is a text form that follows Strugnell and Stegemann's arrangement of the fragments.

umns, and was possibly the handle sheet of this scroll. The scribe of MS 4Q397 had to finish the text of the epilogue on this narrow column, and when the text of MSS 4Q397 and 398 are compared, it can be concluded that there would have been no room for the text of fragments 4Q398 11-13 between the column of 4Q397 14-21, and the final column represented by fragment 23. Accordingly, the scribe of 4Q397 either had a *Vorlage* that did not contain the text of 4Q398 11-13, or this section was placed elsewhere in the scroll. The gap of “some twenty lines” between the halakhic section and the epilogue referred to by Strugnell would be the most likely place to locate these fragments. Therefore, I prefer the arrangement suggested by Strugnell and supported by Stegemann. In accordance with this, fragments 4Q398 11-13 are located in the beginning of section C, before line C1 of the composite text in the *DJD X* edition.

Some scholars have suggested that lines *DJD X* C1-7 or C1-9 (=4Q397 frgs. 14-21, lines 1-7 or 1-9) of the composite text of the edition should actually represent the end of the halakhic section; for instance, Bernstein states that the scriptural citation on lines C5-7 “would be a fitting conclusion to the halakhic section”;¹⁶² Pérez Fernández uses mainly linguistic arguments to place the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue on line C9 of the *DJD X* composite text.¹⁶³ If the fragments 4Q398 11-13 are placed in the beginning of section C, the text of 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, lines 1-7 or 1-9 is moved to the middle of the epilogue (see Table 4 below), and accordingly the material arguments speak against the possibility that these lines were a part of or the ending of the halakhic section.

¹⁶² Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 46-47. The citation is analyzed in Chapter 5 and it will be demonstrated that it fits well in the theological milieu of the epilogue.

¹⁶³ Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 196-197. His suggestion is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3. See also Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Mss,” 95. Both Bernstein and Pérez Fernández follow Qimron’s composite text, where the first fragment of the epilogue, section C is MS 4Q397 14-21. In other words, in Qimron’s composite text, line *DJD X* C1 = 4Q397 14-21, line 1, and so on.

Table 5. The Arrangement of the Fragments in the Alternative Composite Text

01-7		4Q398 frgs. 11-13	
8-15	4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 1-8		
16	4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 9	4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 1 (?)	
17-19 no composite text	4Q397 frgs. 14-21,10- 12a	4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 2-4	
20-24	4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 12b- 16	4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 5-8	
25-32	4Q397 frg. 23	4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col ii,1-8	4Q399 1, col i-ii

The alternative arrangement of the fragments of the epilogue is based on material evidence; however, one can also argue for the alternative location of fragments 4Q398 11-13 on contextual grounds as will be demonstrated in the analysis of the content of the epilogue that will be carried out in Chapter 5. These fragments contain an admonition with historical-theological references creating the appropriate theological framework for an understanding of the epilogue. In light of this opening section, made up by fragments 4Q398 11-13, the message of the following scriptural citations and their interpretation unfolds clearly.

2.7. CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the manuscript evidence of 4QMMT in order to determine how much of the document is physically extant. The study began with an examination of the calendrical fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327. The investigation proved, as had already been suggested by other scholars, that the calendrical

fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 do not belong to the same manuscript as the rest of the 4Q394. However, on the first extant lines of MS 4Q394, 3-7 col i there is a calendrical phrase preserved, probably the ending of a calendar. Therefore, at least one of the manuscripts of 4QMMT contained some calendrical material before the halakhic section.

There are several text critical problems contributing to the level of uncertainty of the epilogue's composite text. Difficulties for the analysis of the epilogue and its relationship to the other sections are caused by those text critical problems created by the fragmentary state of the manuscripts. For instance, the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue is not preserved in any of the extant manuscripts. In addition, the examination of MS 4Q398 showed that there are several indications, both material and in the penmanship, suggesting that fragments 4Q398 1-9 originate from a manuscript other than 11-17. Given the small size of the fragments 4Q398 1-9 and the amount of extant writing on them, this suggestion remains somewhat tentative. Nevertheless, only one manuscript, namely 4Q397, preserves with certainty fragments from both of the main sections of the composite document. Since only one manuscript preserves a material link between the halakhic section and the epilogue, the reliability of the composite text of 4QMMT would appear to be decreased.

The main witnesses of the text of the epilogue, namely manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 overlap surprisingly little. Even in the overlapping sections variant readings are recorded. Some of them are of minor importance, but the comparison between 4Q397 and 4Q398 shows that these manuscripts contain textual variants, different wordings and word order; readings that cannot easily be combined into a single reliable composite text.

The synopsis of the manuscripts of the epilogue was presented to demonstrate the difficulties of the composite text of the epilogue in *DJD X*. The extant manuscripts show almost no overlapping for extensive parts. Where they do overlap, variant readings are always attested. The variant readings of both the halakhic section and the epilogue were briefly analyzed. Some of the variants are of minor importance – orthographic, phonological, and morphological – and bear no significance for the meaning of the text. Some passages contain variance in syntax and/or in word order. It is possible that in *some passages* the manuscripts of the epilogue represent variant liter-

ary editions of the text, even though the exact amount of variance is difficult to determine because of the fragmentary state of the manuscripts. The careful reading of the manuscripts also showed that the composite text of the epilogue created by the editors in *DJD X* contains several readings that are not possible in the individual manuscripts.

The main results of the synoptic comparison were:

1) Fragments 4Q398 11-13 do not overlap with any other manuscript.

2) 4Q397 fragments 14-21, lines 1-8 and lines 15-16 do not overlap with any other manuscript.

3) 4Q397 fragments 14-21, lines 9-14 contain some overlapping with 4Q398 14-17, col i, 1-8 but variant readings are also attested. Some of these variant readings make the combination of the manuscripts into an intelligible composite text impossible.

The synoptic comparison has also shown that there are some serious difficulties in the composite text of the epilogue in *DJD X*. Especially problematic are lines *DJD X* C10-12a, and the combination of the readings of manuscripts 4Q397 14-21, lines 10-11 *versus* 4Q398 14-17 col i, lines 2-4 into a composite text. These two manuscripts evidently contained a different text form on lines 4Q397 frgs 14-21, 10-12a when compared with the parallel manuscript 4Q398 frgs 14-17, lines 2-4. It seems that one should refrain from creating a composite text from the two manuscripts on these lines. Instead, one should present both manuscripts in parallel columns as is done in the following alternative arrangement of the composite text of the epilogue (see 2.8, lines 17-19). For lines 20-24 of the alternative composite text, manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 are combined into one composite text.

Another problematic passage is *DJD X* C16-17, where the edition's composite text is materially impossible in both individual manuscripts (4Q397 and 4Q398). Even though the editors have stated that the composite text in *DJD X* should always follow the main manuscript chosen for the basis of the composite text, this is not always the case; see for example *DJD X* C12, C13. Sometimes the composite text does not correspond exactly to any of the manuscripts.

Nevertheless, despite the problems and variants described above, it can be concluded that MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398 represent manuscripts of the same text, as suggested in the *DJD X* edition. Yet, in

some passages, they may contain major textual variants, such as lines 17-19 of the alternative composite text.

4) 4Q398 fragments 14-17 col ii, lines 2-8 overlap with 4Q399 i, 9-ii, 5, but in each overlapping passage variant readings are attested, though mostly of minor importance. Manuscript 4Q399 contains several shorter readings in comparison to 4Q398. The length of the *lacunae* of MS 4Q399, and the reconstructions of the editors suggest that there could have been other shorter readings as well in MS 4Q399. When the evidence of the linguistic variants is included, indicating that MS 4Q399 contains forms closer to BH whereas 4Q398 those of QH, there is some evidence suggesting that the shorter form of MS 4Q399 could be the more original one. One might tentatively suggest that manuscripts 4Q398 and 4Q399 represent slightly differing editions of 4QMMT. In spite of the variance between these manuscripts, it is possible to create a composite text; however, it should be used with caution and evaluated with the individual manuscripts. In the alternative composite text the variant readings of these MSS are indicated by using cursive script and by mentioning them in the footnotes.

The analysis of the variant readings in the halakhic section and in the epilogue shows that the reconstructed composite text of the epilogue is relatively uncertain because of the variant readings and the rather small amount of common material. On the other hand, in the halakhic section much less variance of real importance is discernable in the text form. The main witnesses of the halakhic section, manuscripts 4Q394 and 4Q396, are virtually identical where they overlap. The absence of redactional traces may reflect the nature of the halakhot of 4QMMT as non-communal legislation in contrast to community laws (i.e. as seen the Community Rule), and was compared with Charlotte Hempel's analysis of the legal material of the Damascus Document. According to Hempel, the halakhah stratum of the Laws of D showed virtually no evidence of redactional activity or updating; this seems to be the case with the halakhic material of 4QMMT as well.

The placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 is difficult to settle with certainty due to the poor condition of manuscript 4Q398 and the lack of a material reconstruction of MS 4Q397. Manuscript 4Q398 has undergone major material changes since the publication of *DJD X*. Some of the fragments are missing; most of them have suffered to

some extent. In Qimron's composite text of *DJD X*, fragments 4Q398 11-13 would make up the lower part of column i of fragments 14-17. The problem with Qimron's solution is that the *reconstructed* column of fragments 11-13 is much broader (50-60 corrected letter spaces) than column i on fragments 14-17 (40-48 corrected letter spaces). Accordingly, this would mean that the upper part of this reconstructed column is much broader than its lower part. Consequently, this reconstruction needs to be reconsidered. A further indicator is the width of the last (reconstructed) column of MS 4Q397, represented by fragment 4Q397 23. The width of this column is only half of the width of the other columns in scroll 4Q397. It could be either a very narrow final column, or possibly represents the handle sheet of this scroll. When manuscripts 4Q397 and 398 are compared, it is clear that the text of fragments 4Q398 11-13 could not be placed between the column of 4Q397 14-21, and fragment 23 because of the width of this last narrow column. Accordingly, the scribe of 4Q397 either had a *Vorlage* that did not contain the text of 4Q398 11-13, or this section was placed elsewhere in the scroll. The placement suggested by Strugnell and Stegemann seems to be more probable. Therefore, in the synopsis of the manuscripts of the epilogue, fragments 4Q398 11-13 make up the first section of MS 4Q398 and, in my alternative arrangement of the composite text, the first extant section of the epilogue.

After a careful examination of the manuscripts of 4QMMT, it can be deduced that this document existed, and was copied, in slightly differing forms. In at least one manuscript, there was a calendrical section of some kind before the halakhot, but this calendar was not necessarily incorporated into all manuscripts of 4QMMT. It seems that the halakhic section was transmitted rather faithfully, since the manuscripts contain hardly any indications or traces of rescensional activity. By contrast, all manuscripts attesting the final section, the epilogue, contain variant readings witnessing scribal license and redactional activity. Apparently, the text form of the epilogue was not fixed and varied from scribe to scribe. The exact text form of the epilogue was not identical in the different manuscripts of 4QMMT – increasing the uncertainty of a composite text of this section. While

working with 4QMMT, one should always consult the individual manuscripts and not rely on the composite text alone.¹⁶⁴

2.8. THE COMPOSITE TEXT OF THE EPILOGUE: AN ALTERNATIVE ARRANGEMENT WITH A TRANSLATION

In the composite text, some reconstructions of the *lacunae* have been added that are not found in the transcriptions of the individual manuscripts and the synopsis. The reconstructions are discussed below.

The composite text serves as a helpful tool, even though it may not accurately correspond to the original text form of the epilogue. There is an apparent problem concerning the numbering of the lines created by the uncertainty of the amount of text missing in the beginning of this section, between lines 7 – 8, and 24 – 25 of the composite text. Obviously, there could be several lines missing in between these lines. Therefore, it is important to remember that the running numbering of the lines in the composite text of the epilogue could give a false impression of a solid and connected text with no breaks, which is not necessarily the case. Again, the existence of variant readings and textual variants in the manuscripts of the epilogue need to be acknowledged when the composite text is used. Nonetheless, the composite text serves the purpose of placing the preserved fragments of the epilogue in a larger context.

Whenever several MSS are used to create a composite text, the diacritical marks above the Hebrew letters are not used. This is to emphasize the hypothetical nature of such a text. In lines 25-32 I have decided mainly to follow the more fully preserved manuscript 4Q398 instead of the shorter variant reading of 4Q399. The longer variant readings of 4Q398 are printed in italics both in the Hebrew text and in the translation.

¹⁶⁴ As, in fact, already suggested by Qimron, “The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text,” 9-10.

14 התועבה שנואה ה'א'ה [] [פרשנו מרוב הע'ם]

15 [1]מהתערב בדברים האלה ומלבוא ע'מהם [לגב אלה

ואתם י'ודעים שלוא]

16 [1]מצא בידנו מעל ושקר ורעה' כי על [] [אנחנו נותנים א]ת

Lines 17-19:

No composite text (4Q397 frags. 14-21, 10-12a; 4Q398 frags. 14-17 col i, 2-4)

4Q397 frags. 14-21, lines 10-12a	4Q398 frags. 14-17, col i, lines 2-4
10 [] כתב]ו אליכה שתבין בספר	2] 2 [ניום [] [] מ'מ' []
מוש[ה ו]בספר[י הנ]ביאים ובדו[ר]	3] 3 [] [] ודנר [] [] כ'תוב
11 [] דור ודנר ובספר כתוב	4] 4 [] [] מ'ני[ו]ת [] א
[] [] ים ל' לוא	
12 [] כה	

Lines 20- 24: (4Q397 frags. 14-21, 12b-16 and 4Q398 frags. 14-17 col i, 5-8)

20 ואפ כתוב שת[סור] מהד[ר]ך וקרתיך הרעה וכתוב [ו]היא

21 כי [יבו]א עלי[כה כו]ל הדבר[ים] האלה בא[חרית הימים

הברכה [ו]הקלה

22 [והשיבותה] אל ל[בכ]כה ושבתה אלו בכל לבבכה

ו[בכו]ל נפשכה באחרית[]

23 וחי[] בס[פר מושה ובס[פרי הנביאי]ם שיבואו] [של]

24] ות ש[] מי []

The amount of text missing between lines 24-25 is uncertain.

Lines 25-32: (4Q397 frg. 23, 4Q398 frags. 14-17 ii, 1-8 and 4Q399 frg. 1)

25] י עונות זכור [את] ד[ו]יד שהיא איש חסדים אף

26 היא [נ]צל מ[צרו]ת רבות ונסלוח לו ואף אנחנו כתבנו אליך

27 מקצת מעשי התורה שחשבנו לטוב לך ולעמך[] שראינו

28 עמך ערמה ומדע תורה הבן בכל אלה ובקש מלפנו שי[תקן]

29 את עצתך והרחיק ממך מחשבת רעה ועצת בליעל

30 בשל שתשמח באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו כן

31 ונחשבה לך לצדקה בעשותך הישר והטוב לפנו לטוב לך

32 ול ישראל vacat

2.8.2. *Notes on the Reconstructions of the Lacunae*

Line 5: לת[ורה] “to the T[orah...]” instead of לת[מיד] (*DJD X C22*).¹⁶⁵ A similar reconstruction was first proposed by Eisenmann and Wise: לת[ורת אל בכול לבם], translated as “When (those) in Israel are to return to the *La[w of God with all their heart]*”, and לת[ורה] instead of לת[מיד] is suggested by García Martínez and Bernstein.¹⁶⁶

ו[ה]רשעים ירש[יע]ו The text is reconstructed following the edition in *DJD X*. In note 22 on page 61 the editors refer to Dan 11:10, however an identical formulation is found in Dan 12:10. The editors admit that the restoration of the phrase is uncertain.¹⁶⁷

Line 7: התו[רה] יראו “feared[... the To]rah”. The editors reconstruct in line *DJD X C24* התו[רה] את יראו.¹⁶⁸ Their reconstruction is too short for the *lacuna*, yet this is obscured by their running translation, with no indication of the gap: “whoever among them feared [the To]rah...”.¹⁶⁹ García Martínez has proposed an alternative reconstruction in English (but not given the corresponding Hebrew for it): “feared [God and observed the l]aw”.¹⁷⁰ However, the epithets אל or אלהים are never used in 4QMMT. Furthermore, the author(s) avoid the *tetragrammaton* by reducing it to a pronominal suffix when citing a scriptural source text.

At the end of line 7, the placement of frgs 4Q398 11-13 in the composite text of the *DJD X* edition results in a translation: “... these were the seekers of the Torah whose transgressions were [for]given.” (lines C24b-25a in the *DJD X* composite text).¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁵ *DJD X*, 60.

¹⁶⁶ Eisenmann and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 199-200; García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 19; Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 49.

¹⁶⁷ *DJD X*, 60.

¹⁶⁸ *DJD X*, 36.

¹⁶⁹ *DJD X*, 61.

¹⁷⁰ García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” 19.

¹⁷¹ *DJD X*, 60-63.

Line 10 of MS 4Q397: The reconstruction follows the edition. The problems of this reconstruction were discussed above in 2.3.1, and will be revisited in 5.2.4.

Line 12: I mainly follow Qimron and Strugnell's reconstruction of this manuscript (4Q397). Bernstein suggests a reconstruction הַרְבֵּה מְקוֹמוֹת "many places" instead of Qimron's "some places" מְקַצֵּת מְקוֹמוֹת. Bernstein reconstructs הַרְבֵּה saying that it "corresponds to the biblical כֹּל better than מְקַצֵּת does"; however, Qimron's reconstruction is equally possible.¹⁷²

Line 13: The reconstruction of the words בַּסֵּפֶר מוֹשֶׁה is uncertain, but possible, the following citation is from Deuteronomy. The reconstruction וְלֹא תִבְיֵא תוֹעֵבָה follows Bernstein's suggestion, who sees the phrase as a quotation of Deut 7:26.¹⁷³ Qimron's reconstruction makes the passage more paraphrase-like:

[שְׁלוֹ] אֵל תִּבְיֵא תוֹעֵבָה אֵל בֵּיתְכֶם כִּי

For בֵּיתְכֶם, see Deut 7:26: וְלֹא תִבְיֵא תוֹעֵבָה אֶל־בֵּיתְךָ. The כִּי originates from the alluded source text that follows, namely Deut 12:31: כִּי כָל־תוֹעֵבַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר שָׂנֵא עָשׂוּ, see 5.2.2.

Line 14: cf. *DJD X C7*: [הַעֲמֵם וּמְכוּל טַמְאָתָם].¹⁷⁴ The editors' reconstruction is possible; apparently it reflects the content of the halakhic section.

Line 15: [וְאַתֶּם יֹדְעִים שְׁלוֹא] : The reconstruction follows the editors' suggestion, cf. *DJD X C8*.¹⁷⁵ In 4QMMT the 2nd person plural pronoun is used only in this phrase "and you know", therefore this reconstruction seems credible.

¹⁷² *DJD X*, 58; Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 47, see especially note 41.

¹⁷³ Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 47. Brooke defines the passage as a quotation even with the 2nd-relative pronoun. Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 76.

¹⁷⁴ *DJD X*, 58.

¹⁷⁵ *DJD X*, 58.

Lines 17-19: For these lines there is no composite text because of the variant readings in the manuscripts.

For MS 4Q397, lines 9-11, Puech gives a following reconstruction:¹⁷⁶

ואף 9
 10 כתבנו אליכה שתבין בספר מושה [ו]בספרי [הנ]ביאים ובדוי[ד]
 ושהשמ(ו)ר
 11 כול אלה [דור ודור ובספר כתוב]

Lines 20-24: There seems to be enough overlapping material in the parallel manuscripts at this point to establish an integrated composite text, as proposed by the editors. For the reconstruction, both the *DJD X* edition and parallel material from Deuteronomy have been used; see also Chapter 5. The orthography varies, since the composite text follows the orthography of the individual manuscripts where only one manuscript is extant.

From line 20 onwards no diacritical signs to indicate the certainty of individual letters have been used because of the composite character of the text.

Line 26: MS 4Q399 has a different word order: ואף כתבנו¹
 אנהנו אלך.

¹⁷⁶ Puech, "Quelques observations sur le 'canon' des 'Écrits,'" paper delivered at the Groningen Qumran Institute Symposium 2008, April 28-29, revised version to be published in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism: Proceedings of the Groningen Qumran Institute Symposium, 28-29 April 2008* (ed. M. Popović; JSJSup; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

2.8.3. *Translation of the Composite Text*

01 [...]... 1-2 [...]...[...][...][...][...] in the days of Solomon, the son of David, and also the curses [which] came/have befallen in the days of [Jero]boam the son of Nebat and until the ex[i]le of Jerusalem and of Zedekiah, king of [Judah]... 3¹⁷⁷ [...]...[...][...][...] And we are aware that some of the blessings and the cur[se]s have occurred / been fulfilled 4 [which] are written¹⁷⁸ in the bo[ok of Mo]ses. And this is the end of days: that they will return in Israel 5 to the T[orah ...] ... and not turn bac[k¹⁷⁹ and] the wicked will con[tinue to act wic]kedly and ...[...][...] 6 and ...[...][...][...] remember the kings of Israe[l] and contemplate their deeds, since whoever [of them] 7 feared[... the To]rah was delivered from troubles. And they were the see[ke]rs of the Torah.

The amount of text missing between lines 7 and 8 is uncertain.

8 [...]...[...][...][...] 9...[...][...][...] 10 And who ...[...][...] he is ...[...][...] 11 And concerning wome[n ...][...] and disloyalty[...][...] 12 Because in these [...]...[...because of] violence and fornication [many¹⁸⁰] 13 places have been destroyed. [And also] it is writ[ten in the book of Moses: do] not bring an abhorrent thing in[to your house¹⁸¹ for] 14 an abomination is a hateful thing. [...we ha]ve separated ourselves from the multitude of the pe[ople...][...] 15 [and] from mingling in these matters and from participating wi[th them] in these affairs.¹⁸² And you k[now that one cannot] 16 [f]ind in us any disloyalty, deceit or evil, because concerning [...] we give ...[...]

¹⁷⁷ The editors (DJD X, page 60, composite text line C20) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*Study Edition*, 803) read the beginning of line 3 as follows: [...] כּוּבְרֵי יְהוָה וְשִׁבְרֵי יְהוָה. The editors translate “that he will bring them [...]”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate: “[that] he should bring them in [...]”

¹⁷⁸ DJD X, 61 “some of the blessings and the curses have (already) been fulfilled as it is written...”

¹⁷⁹ DJD X, 61 “and not be cancelled.”

¹⁸⁰ In *DJD X*, 58-59 the editors reconstruct מְקַצֵּת “some”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 801 הַרְבֵּה “many”.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Deut 7:26.

¹⁸² The meaning of the phrase לֹגֵב לְגַב (or לְגַב לְגַב) is unclear, see DJD X, 58 n. 8; 59; 98. The editors translate: “from being involved with these matters and from participating with [them] in these things.” García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 801 “from mingling in these affairs, and from associating wi[th them] in these things.”

<p>4Q397 14-21, lines 10-12a</p> <p>10 [...we have wri]tten to you so that you would understand the book of Mos[es and] the book[s of the Pro]phets and Dav[id...] 11 [...] many generations. And in the book it is written [...]...[...]. not 12a [...]...</p>	<p>4Q398 14-17, col i, lines 2-4</p> <p>2 [...]...[...]. 3 [...]and] generation[...]...it is written 4 [...]to] you and anci[en]t (things)...</p>
---	---

20 And also it is written that you shall [stray] from the pa[t]h and evil will encounter you. And it is written: [and] it shall happen 21 when al[l these] thing[s shall befall]l [you¹⁸³ at the e]nd of days¹⁸⁴, the blessing [and] the curse, 22 [then you will take it] to your he[art]¹⁸⁵ and you will return to him with all your heart and a[ll your] soul in the end[...] 23 ...[...in the bo]ok of Moses and in the bo[oks of the Prophet]s that they/there will come [...]... 24 [...]...[...].

The amount of text missing between lines 24 and 25 is uncertain.

25 [...]... (their) sins. Remember Da[v]id, because he was a pious man¹⁸⁶ [and] also 26 he [was r]escued from many troubles and he was forgiven. Also, we have written¹⁸⁷ to you 27 some of the works of the Torah of which we have formed an opinion, for your *and*

¹⁸³ DJD X, 59: “when all these things [be]fall you”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 803 “all these things shall befall you.”

¹⁸⁴ The passage contains citations from Deuteronomy, see 5.2.5. NRSV translates: “in time to come.”

¹⁸⁵ NRSV: “if you call them to mind;” DJD X, 59 “[then you will take]it to hea[rt];” García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 801, 803 “then you shall take it to your heart.”

¹⁸⁶ DJD X, 63 “a man of righteous deeds”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 803 “a man of the pious ones.”

¹⁸⁷ The editors translate “sent you”; DJD X, 63.

[*your*] *people's*¹⁸⁸ benefit. For we have seen 28 that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law. Study all these (matters) and seek from him that he would [straighten] 29 your plans¹⁸⁹ and remove from you evil thought and the counsel of Belial, 30 so that at the end of time, you may rejoice in finding that *some of*¹⁹⁰ our words are true. 31 And it shall be reckoned to you as righteousness when you do what is right and *good*¹⁹¹ before him, for your good 32 and that of Israel.

¹⁸⁸ Ms 4Q399 contains a shorter reading “for your benefit.”

¹⁸⁹ DJD X, 63 “ask Him that He strengthen your will”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 803 “seek from him that he may support your counsel.”

¹⁹⁰ Ms 4Q399 contains a shorter reading מִדְּבַר יְיָ whereas MS 4Q398 reads מִקְצַת דְּבַר יְיָ.

¹⁹¹ Ms 4Q399 contains a shorter reading “...do what is right before him.”

CHAPTER THREE

THE STRUCTURE OF 4QMMT

In *DJD X*, Qimron and Strugnell acknowledged the disparate character of 4QMMT:

We have separated section B and section C according to content and to the absence of the characteristic formal markers of the legal pronouncements, but the two sections may fit more closely together, each being referred to as *מקצת דברינו*.¹

The opening phrase of the halakhic section *מקצת דברינו* “some of our words” (*DJD X B1*; MS 4Q394) appears again at the end of the epilogue (*DJD X C 29*). The expression in this form can be found in manuscript 4Q398, while in manuscript 4Q399 a shorter form *מדברינו* is used. This term connects the halakhic section and the epilogue, and, whereas the expression *אנחנו כתבנו אל יך מקצת מעשי התורה* (*DJD X C25-26*) possibly refers only to the halakhot, the broader term *דברינו* could actually signify the document as a whole. In the following chapter, the diversity of the halakhic section and the epilogue will be discussed. It will be demonstrated that a parallel for the structure of 4QMMT can be found in Deuteronomy, and in the covenantal pattern of the biblical laws.

¹ *DJD X*, 111. And further, on p. 113; “What literary purpose and historical background can be postulated to explain such a composite or disparate work?” In his article “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition”, on p. 67, Strugnell also states: “Clearly the subject matter of the final section is very different from that of the collection of the laws.”

3.1. THE CONTENTS OF THE HALAKHIC SECTION AND THE EPILOGUE

Scholars far more familiar with Jewish law have tried to identify a unity in the structure and organization of the halakhic section without much success. It is possible that the diversity in the presentation of the halakhic issues indicates the use of earlier halakhic sources by the author/redactor of 4QMMT. Furthermore, many of the laws are fragmentarily preserved, and it is often impossible to tell with certainty what the topic of each individual ruling was, or how many halakhot a certain passage originally contained. The following outline contains the references to the possible scriptural source texts of the halakhot and draws attention to the connecting themes of the laws: virtually all regulations fall in the domain of the priests, and the priests' responsibility is emphasized several times. The rulings are concerned with sacrifice, (profane) slaughter, ritual purity, priestly marriages, and other boundary marking issues based on ethnicity or an ability to observe ritual purity, holiness and the purity of Jerusalem, the city of sanctuary.²

B The Halakhic section

B 1. An Incipit: MS 4Q394 frgs. 3-7 col i, 4-6 (*DJD X B1-3a*)

4 אלה סקצת דברינו] [ל שהם מ]קצת דברי
5 [ה]מעשים שא[נ]ח[נו] חושבים וכו]לם על]
6 וטהרת]

4 These are some of our regulations [...] ... which are s[ome of the regulations of] 5 [the] works of which we [have formed an opinion and] they [a]ll concern [...] 6 and purity of [...] ...³

² The (im)purity of the temple is seen as a common denominator of the halakhot in 4QMMT by Regev, "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran," *DSD* 10/2 (2003) 243-278, esp. p. 245-249.

³ Schiffman has proposed that the first lacuna could be reconstructed either with a term like *matanot* (gifts to the Temple and priests) or *qorbanot* (sacrifices). See Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea

B 2. The Legal Statements (*DJD X B3b-82*)

a) Sacrifice

Gentile Grain *DJD X B3-5* (or The Grain Tithe of the Levites⁴)

Sin Offering *DJD X B5-8* (Lev 6:19-21)

Gentile Sacrifice *DJD X B8-95*

Cereal Offering *DJD X B9-12* (Lev 7:15), concluding with the phrase: “And the sons of] the priest[s] should take into consideration this regulation...”

b) Sacrifice / Ritual Purity / *Tevul Yom*

Red Heifer *DJD X B13-17* (Num 19:1-10), concluding with the phrase: “And the sons of Aaron should...”⁶

c) Slaughtering

Sect,” 66; *idem, Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994) 83.

⁴The topic of this halakha is difficult to determine because of the fragmentary state of the text. However, the editors state that “it is obvious that the purity of the grain of the gentiles was a controversial subject in the Second Temple period.” See *DJD X*, 148. Elman has proposed another interpretation, he suggests that the halakha is about the Grain tithe of the Levites; Elman, “MMT B 3-5 and its ritual context,” *DSD* 6/2 (1999): 148-156.

⁵ See Josephus, *War*, 2:17:2; *DJD X*, 150. According to Sanders, the gentiles were allowed to bring sacrifices to the Jerusalem Temple, just as the Jews, but approximately from the 2nd century BCE onwards, they were no longer allowed to enter the Temple enclosure, cf. *Ez* 44:6-9. E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief. 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1994) 72; 75.

⁶ The ritual of the Red Heifer is discussed also in the Tohorot-fragments 4Q276 and 4Q277. See J. M. Baumgarten, “The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 46 (1995): 112-119. See also m. Para 3:7. The ashes of the Red Heifer were needed for the purification from corpse contamination, which was the most severe of the ritual impurities. The ruling in the halakhic section of 4QMMT is concerned about the purity of the priests participating in the preparation of the ashes. The burning of the Red Heifer made the priests impure and they had to go through a purification ritual and wait a certain period of time – apparently until sunset according to 4QMMT – to become pure. The author/redactor of 4QMMT rejected the concept of *tevul yom*, see Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law,” 247.

(The purity of) animal hides and carcasses (is dependant of the place of their slaughtering) *DJD X B18-27* (Lev 11:24-25, 27-28, 31-32; 11QT 47:7-18).⁷ The ruling concludes with the phrase: “And the sons of] the prie[st]s should take [into con]sid[eration] all [these] regulations[...”

The correct place of slaughtering *DJD X B27b-35* (Lev 17:3-9, Deut 12:5; 11QT 52:13-21)

Slaughtering of pregnant animals *DJD X B35b-39* (Lev 22:28)

d) Those Forbidden to Enter the Temple or the Congregation

Ammonites, Moabites, etc. *DJD X B39b-49a* (Deut 23:2-4; Gen 2:24; Ezra 9:1-2; Neh 13:1, 23)

The blind and the deaf *DJD X B39a-54*

e) Purity Regulations

The liquid streams *DJD X B55-58a*⁸

Dogs / Purity of the Temple City *DJD X B58b-62a* (Deut 12:5)

f) The Priestly Gifts

DJD X B62b-64a (Lev 19:23-25, 27:30-32; Deut 26)⁹

⁷ The passage is extremely fragmentary, and may contain several regulations. On lines *DJD X B21-24* the editors' reconstruction is based on MSS 4Q397 frgs. 1-2 and 4Q398 frgs. 1-3. The reconstruction is tentative, and the combination of the MSS rather problematic, since they 'overlap' only by one single word, namely עָל. It is possible that 4QMMT prohibits the hides of animals slaughtered outside the Temple in the Temple, see Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law," 248; *idem*, "The Prohibition of the Skins of Animals in the Temple Scroll and Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah," 191-198; *DJD X*, 154-156. If this interpretation is correct, the passage would actually be thematically connected with the following one that possibly attempts to forbid slaughtering outside the Jerusalem Temple. However, both passages are too fragmentary for us to know with certainty.

⁸ The liquid streams were understood as connectors between pure and impure vessels. *DJD X*, 161-162. See also m. Yadayim 4:7; m. Teharot 8:9.

⁹ The passage is referring either to the fruit of the fourth year (Lev 19:24) or the tithe from the fruit crop (Lev 27:30, Deut 26), which according to 4QMMT is to be given to the priests. Harrington, "Biblical Law at Qumran," 160-185, esp. page 168. The fruit of the fourth year is designated holy in Lev 19:24, but the recipient is not stated. See also 4Q251.

g) Purity Regulations

The lepers, *Tevul Yom DJD X B64b-72* (Lev 4:13-14, 27-28; 13:46; 14)¹⁰

Corpse Impurity / Human Bones *DJD X B73-74* (Num 19:16-18)

h) Illegal Marriages

DJD X B75-82 (Lev 19:19; Deut 22:9,11; Lev 21:13-15)¹¹

*C The Epilogue*¹²

The line numbers of the composite text refer to the alternative arrangement by the author, see Chapter 2.

a) A History-Based Exhortation with a Reference to the Blessings and Curses

Composite text lines 01-7; 4Q398 frgs. 11-13

¹⁰ The reference is to priestly duties even though the priests are not explicitly mentioned in this passage. In Leviticus the priests were to supervise that the leper, having gone through the purification process, waited until the sunset of the eighth day before he entered the sanctuary and came into contact with the holy gifts (holy food), cf. Lev 13-14. In the 4QD fragments dealing with skin disease, the priests and their responsibility are explicitly mentioned. Hempel infers that the text of 4QD fragments “seems to be addressed to a priestly readership.” See Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 43-50.

¹¹ The ruling is not explicit, and its contents have been interpreted in different ways. Qimron is of the opinion that it intends to prohibit the intermarriage of priests and lay Israelite women, J. M. Baumgarten suggests it refers to the marriages of the Israelites with the gentiles, and Kugler sees it as a reference to all improper marital relationships that were taking place “among the people.” See DJD X, 171; J. M. Baumgarten, “The Halakha in Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah,” 515; Kugler, “Halakhic Interpretative strategies at Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 109; 128-129; *eadem*, “Biblical Law at Qumran,” 136. Harrington is of the opinion that the regulation prohibits marriage with gentiles; Harrington, *The Purity Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; London: T&T Clark, 2004) 66, 115, 121.

¹² The outline of the epilogue is based on the analysis that follows in Chapter 5 where the content of these passages will be discussed in more detail.

b) An Admonition to Maintain the Purity of the Cult with a Statement about the Separation

Composite text lines 8-16; 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 1-8 (Deut 7:26; 12:2; 12:31)

c) Lines 17-19: MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398, no composite text

d) An Exhortation to Repentance and Return with a Reference to the Blessings and Curses

Composite text lines 20-22[24]; 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 12b-16 and 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 col i, 5-8 (Deut 4: 29-30; 30:1-2; 31:29)

e) A Paraenetic Conclusion with a Reference to the Halakhic Interpretation

Composite text lines 25-32; 4Q397 frg. 23, 4Q398 frgs. 14-17 ii, 1-8 and 4Q399 (Gen 15:6; Ps 106:31; Deut 6:18; 6:24-25; 12:28)

3.2. DIVERSITY BETWEEN THE HALAKHIC SECTION AND THE EPILOGUE: SYNTAX, VOCABULARY, AND SUBJECT MATTER

When the vocabulary and the syntax of the halakhic section and the epilogue are compared, a clear literary diversity between the two is discernable. The two main sections of 4QMMT are of different styles and each has a distinct character.

3.2.1. *Syntax and Vocabulary*

The syntax of the halakhic section exhibits some distinctive and unique characteristics that are directly related to the formulaic nature of its legal statements. Certain formulas are used repeatedly: **אנחנו חושבים / אנחנו אומרים** when stating the author/redactor's opinion, and **ואף על / ועל / ואף** as a heading of a new halakhic statement. A similar introductory heading with an expression **על** is used in the halakha stratum of the laws of the Damascus Document (CD and 4QD fragments), in 4Q159 (Ordinances), and 4QHalakhah

A.¹³ According to Hempel, during late Second Temple Judaism the use of the preposition **על** was a standard phenomenon when creating halakhic statements.¹⁴ Baumgarten has suggested that the use of **על**, introducing a heading under which a set of rules was collected, shows how the Qumran halakhah had begun to develop in the direction of Tannaitic methodology.¹⁵ Therefore, rather than being an epistolary feature, as suggested by the editors,¹⁶ this is a typical feature of a halakhic text. Hempel further points out that these headings are used specifically in the halakha stratum of the Laws of D whereas in the stratum containing communal legislation another type of heading is used, namely **וזה סדרך** (CD 10,4; 12,22-23; 13,7; 14,12). The latter heading is also used in 1QS (1QS 5,1 and 6,8).¹⁷ The use of the preposition **על** can be identified as another shared phenomenon in the halakhic stratum of the Laws of D and in the legal section of 4QMMT. This is in accordance with my analysis of the variant readings of the halakhic section of 4QMMT carried out in the previous chapter (Chapter 2), which demonstrated that the manuscripts of the halakhic section of 4QMMT show virtually no evidence of rescensional or redactional activity. In the same way, Hempel noticed a lack of updating and redactional activity in the halakha stratum of the Laws of D, in contrast to the communal legislation.¹⁸

The participle is clearly the dominant verbal form in the halakhic section, not only used in a nominal sentence with the 1st person plural pronoun, but in general and especially used in the halakhic statements. The participle is also used with the 2nd person plural pronoun (**ואתם יודעים** *DJD X B65, 80, and C15*), and 3rd person plural

¹³ The legal material of the Damascus Document has been analysed by Charlotte Hempel. Regarding the Laws of the Damascus Document, Hempel makes a distinction between two literary strata: a halakha stratum and a stratum of communal legislation pertaining to the organization of a particular community; Hempel, "The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 73; *eadem*, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 26.

¹⁴ Hempel, "The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT," 73.

¹⁵ J. M. Baumgarten, "The Laws of the Damascus Document – Between Bible and Mishnah," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, 17-26, esp. p. 26.

¹⁶ *DJD X*, 113-114.

¹⁷ Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 26.

¹⁸ Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 71.

(שאינם רואים) *DJD X B50, B51*).¹⁹ While in the halakhic section the verb form used with the 1st person plural is always a participle, in the epilogue, to express 1st person plural, alongside the participle the *qal* perfect (*qatal*) is used (cf. Table 1): for example, פּרְשָׁנוּ, כְּתַבְנוּ, שְׂרַאֲנוּ and, interestingly, שְׁחַשְׁבְנוּ instead of the phrase אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים used in the halakhic section. In the halakhic section the formula אֲנַחְנוּ אוֹמְרִים / אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים is used to express the author/redactor's opinion concerning a certain halakhic problem.²⁰ In the epilogue, such formularized statements are no longer used because of the shift in the topic. The *qal* perfect is required when the text or the author is referring to a historic, completed action, whereas the participle is used for describing a state of affairs. In the halakhic section the 1st person plural is only used to state legal opinions, and the *qatal* form is not needed. Therefore, the usage of the verb forms depends on the different context, rather than reflecting redactional activity.

*Table 1. The 1st person plural in the halakhic section and the epilogue*²¹

<i>The Halakhic Section</i>	
	וְאֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים (4Q394) <i>DJD X B 29</i>
	[אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים] (4Q397) <i>DJD X B 36</i>
	וְאֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים שְׁ- (4Q396) <i>DJD X B 37</i>
	וְאֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים אֲנַחְנוּ (4Q394 and 4Q397) <i>DJD X B 42</i>
	אֲנַחְנוּ אוֹמְרִים (4Q394 and 4Q396) <i>DJD X B 55</i>
	אֲנַחְנוּ אוֹמְרִים (4Q396) <i>DJD X B 64/65</i>
	אֲנַחְנוּ אוֹמְרִים (4Q396 and partly in 4Q397) <i>DJD X B 73</i>

¹⁹ *DJD X*, 80.

²⁰ In the halakhic section, with the 1st person pl. the verb is a participle. In the epilogue, the participle is used four times with the 1st person pl., but otherwise the *qal* perfect is used. In rabbinic halakhic literature, the participle is used in normative statements; Samely, *Forms of Rabbinic Literature and Thought: An Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

²¹ With regard to the halakhic section, I refer to the composite text of the *DJD X* edition; the line numbers of the epilogue follow the alternative arrangement as presented in Chapter 2.

The Epilogue

In the epilogue, with 1st person plural, both the participle and *qal* perfect are used.

וְאִנְחָנוּ מְכִירִים שְׁבָאוּ מִקְצָ[ת] הַבְּרֻכּוֹת וְהַקְּלָלוֹת (4Q398) C 3

And we are aware that some of the blessings and curses have occurred...

[פָּרַשְׁנוּ מְרֹב הָעָם] (4Q397) C14

[we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the pe]ople

[אִנְחָנוּ נוֹתְנִים אֹתָּהּ] כִּי עַל (4Q397) C 16

because concerning [...] we give...[...]

[כתב]נו אֵלֶיךָ 4Q397 14-21, line 10

[... we have wri]tten to you

וְאִנְחָנוּ כְּתַבְנוּ אֵלֶיךָ (4Q398, partly in 4Q399) C 26-27

מִקְצַת מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה שֶׁחֲשַׁבְנוּ

Also, we have written to you some of the works of the Torah of which we have formed an opinion

שֶׁרֵאִינוּ (partly in 4Q398 and in 4Q399) C27

For we have seen

For the negative of the imperative the construction $\text{ל} + \text{אין} + \text{infinitive}$ (*DJD X B44*, 58) or $\text{ל} + \text{לוֹא} + \text{infinitive}$ (*DJD X B77*, 78) is used. This construction “it is forbidden to...” is typical for the halakhic section and its usage would appear to be restricted to the legal statements in 4QMMT. Therefore this construction with the negation אין does not occur in the epilogue.²² Consequently, the different usage of the negation structure in these sections cannot necessarily be used as an indication of redactional layers.²³ For the negative of the indicative the word לוֹא is used in both sections.

The terminology used for laws and rulings (מִשְׁפָּט, חֹק, מִתְּוֹרָה) differs from the terms of the epilogue, where the expressions תּוֹרָה and סֵפֶר מִשְׁהָ / סֵפֶר are used. The word תּוֹרָה, referred to several times in the epilogue, does not appear in the halakhic section.²⁴ On the other hand, the epilogue refers to the Torah as a whole, whereas in the halakhic section individual rulings and their interpretation are discussed, which could explain the different usage of the terms.

²² See *DJD X*, 80.

²³ Contrary to the suggestion of Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 196.

²⁴ Cf. Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 197.

3.2.2. *References to the Priests*

The responsibility of the priesthood is emphasized with an expression peculiar to the halakhic section: “For the priests must be worthy to take this ruling into consideration so that they will not let the people bear the guilt...” (*DJD X* B11-13, partly preserved on lines B16-17, and B25-27). Although this phrase is probably based on Num 18:1,²⁵ it varies slightly in every one of its occurrence in 4QMMT:

לְהִזְהִיר בְּדַבָּר הַזֶּה בְּשֵׁל שְׁלוֹא יִ[היו] מְסִיאָ[ים] אֶת הָעַם עִוּוֹן
(4Q394, partly in 4Q395) *DJD X* B11-13

כִּי לְבַנֵּי אֶהְרֵן רְאוּאֵי לַהִיּוֹת[ת] מִן
(4Q394, 4Q395) *DJD X* B16-17

רְאוּאֵי לַהֶשֶׁם[ם] רַב־כּוֹל הַדְּבָרִים [הָאֵלֶּה בְּשֵׁל שְׁלוֹא יֶהְיוּ
מְשִׂאִים אֶת הָעַם עִוּוֹן
(4Q394, possibly partly in 4Q397) *DJD X* B25-27

In addition to the emphasis on priestly responsibilities, terms belonging to the realm of the priesthood – references to the priests (כֹּהֲנִים), purity and impurity, sacrifice, sanctuary, and holiness – are found in the halakhic section, but do not appear in the epilogue. It is clear from the terminology that the issues of priestly concern, the Jerusalem Temple, cult, and ritual purity, are at the heart of the halakhic section. It is possible that 4QMMT – or at least some parts of the halakhic section – reflects inner-priestly disputes.²⁶

²⁵ *DJD X*, 47, n. 11. The readings above are based on the *DJD* edition, with some minor adjustments resulting from my own reading of the fragments.

²⁶ As suggested by Charlotte Hempel and Lawrence Schiffman. Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” 63-74; Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 74-75. Hempel further suggests that 4QD material on the Disqualification of the Priests also reflects inner-priestly disputes. The focus on priestly matters in the legal section of 4QMMT has been pointed out also by Harrington, “Biblical Law at Qumran,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 160-185, esp. p. 173. See also Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 80.

3.2.3. *Subject Matter*

There is a distinct difference in the subject matter of the halakhic section and the epilogue. In the halakhic section, the author/redactor is concerned with questions of ritual purity, the cult, and the Temple. By contrast, the epilogue admonishes the reader to take heed and follow the correct legal interpretations that are offered in the halakhic section. The practical differences in purity matters are no longer discussed; instead, the reader is warned and exhorted to repent. The epilogue refers to the sins of the people. Violence and fornication – even idolatry – seem to be the concerns of the author/redactor of the epilogue.²⁷ These are the grave sins that in the biblical sources are considered to be severe transgressions causing moral impurity and must be punished; otherwise it will lead to the pollution of the land and the expulsion of the people.²⁸ Failure to follow the author/redactor's views will lead to serious consequences, and the reader is urged to repentance, and return (*Umkehr*).

It has been pointed out by Hempel and Sussmann that the halakhic section has nothing specifically Qumranic in it.²⁹ The focus is not necessarily sectarian, in the sense that it would be meant for governing the life of a particular group, but rather it is addressed to Israel as

²⁷ Recently, Eyal Regev has pointed out the shift from ritual impurity in the halakhic section to moral impurity in the epilogue; Regev, "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community," 250-251; *idem*, *Sectarianism in Qumran*, 103, 131.

²⁸ Moral impurity and ritual impurity are the two basic categories of impurity derivable from Scriptural sources. The clearest expression of the distinction of these two categories comes from Jonathan Klawans, who bases these two categories on two separate purity systems. Klawans makes a distinction between ritual impurity, described in Lev 11-15 and Num 19 and moral impurity, the defiling force of sin. See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 21-31. Similar categories are also used by Harrington in *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (SBLDS 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 26; 31. She refers to two classes of (im)purity, ethical and ritual, though she concentrates her study on ritual impurity: "I am not concerned with impurity of moral trespasses but with ritual impurity ... To blur the distinction between violations of the law and ritual impurity is to make a gross error." In the Qumran scholarship, the terms ritual and moral impurity are used for example by García Martínez, "The Problem of Purity: The Qumran Solution," *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* (ed. F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 154, and Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS and 4Q512," *DSD* 8/1 (2001): 9-37.

²⁹ For example Hempel, "The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT," 70-71; Sussmann, "The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (4QMMT)," Appendix I in *DJD* X, 179-200.

a whole. Perhaps the only so-called ‘sectarian’ feature of the halakhic section is the strictness of legal interpretation represented by the author/redactor of the laws of 4QMMT.³⁰ Yet, even the systematic stringency of the purity regulations could be questioned – many of the laws are so fragmentarily preserved that it is difficult to tell what the position of the author/redactor of 4QMMT might have been.³¹ In addition, the generally assumed Qumranic equation of ritual impurity and sin³² cannot be detected in the legal section of 4QMMT.³³ Thus, even though the legal section of 4QMMT expresses a difference of opinion with another other Jewish group over some central legal matters, there is nothing in the text itself that points to a specifically sectarian community.

Legal matters were discussed in late Second Temple Judaism and different opinions did not necessarily lead to separation or isolation. A certain amount of disagreement was tolerable inside a single religious community; such as the Pharisean – Sadducean disputes referred to in the New Testament, similar discussion continues in the later rabbinic halakhic literature. On the other hand, it has been indicated that the schism between the Qumranites and the Temple establishment was basically of a halakhic nature.³⁴

³⁰ According to Harrington, the system of holiness reflected by the laws of 4QMMT suggests a sectarian position. She is also of the opinion that 4QMMT adopts a “sectarian cultic system” as does the Temple Scroll; Harrington, “Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 109; 128-129; *eadem*, “Biblical Law at Qumran,” 162.

³¹ The consistent stringency of the laws of 4QMMT is assumed by the editors, and the fragmentary laws are reconstructed in accordance with this assumption. Their preconceptions about the nature of 4QMMT’s halakhah are criticized by Ian Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 203-209.

³² J. M. Baumgarten, “Zab Impurity in Qumran and Rabbinic Law,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 275; García Martínez, “The Problem of Purity: The Qumran Solution,” 154; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 90-91; Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (Brown Judaic Studies 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) 173. Schiffman summarizes (with regard to the Penal Code in 1QS): “... to the sect, ritual impurity goes hand in hand with moral impurity. A transgressor, by his very existence, brings ritual impurity.” Himmelfarb has questioned the generally assumed complete identification of moral and ritual impurity in the Qumran texts; Himmelfarb, “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS and 4Q512,” 9-37.

³³ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 72-75.

³⁴ The significance of the legal matters for the separation of the Qumran movement has been emphasized, for instance, by Sussmann, “The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 184; 191 and Kister, “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International*

In sum, while certainly valued by the Qumran community, as demonstrated by several copies of the document found in cave four, the regulations of the halakhic section of 4QMMT do not contain any sectarian terminology or references to a specific communal organization. The laws are directed at all Israel, instead of a limited group. The priests' responsibility in the application of correct legal interpretation is also emphasized.³⁵ There is no trace of any conflation of ritual impurity and sin discernible in the halakhic section.

The legal statements in the halakhic section, which are primarily focussed on ritual purity and priestly matters, are heavily dependent upon Leviticus and Numbers. By contrast, the epilogue employs language and terminology that is rich with allusions to Deuteronomy, a scriptural text which is significantly less interested in priestly matters and purity.³⁶ Accordingly, there appears to be a shift between the two sections, both in the vocabulary and syntax. This shift is due to the biblical background, the difference in the subject matter, and the different genre of these sections.

3.2.4. *Earlier Halakhic Sources and/or Redactional Activity?*

Some scholars have explained the diversity in the vocabulary and syntax between the halakhic section and the epilogue of 4QMMT as a result of a compositional history of this document, resulting from the use of earlier sources or/and from redactional activity.

Hempel has proposed the possibility of the use of earlier sources in the composition of 4QMMT. In her source critical analysis of the legal material of the Damascus Document (D = CD and 4QD manuscripts) she has found correspondence in the contents and relevant topics discussed in the halakhic section of 4QMMT and the *halakha*

Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March 1991 (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11/2; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 571-573.

³⁵ Strugnell points out the absence of Qumranic sectarian language in the whole document 4QMMT; Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 68.

³⁶ The affinities of the epilogue with Deuteronomy have been pointed out at least by Strugnell, Brooke and Fraade. See Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 62-63, 67; Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 83-84; *idem*, "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT," 80; Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," 513; 515; *idem*, "Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (4QMMT): the Case of Blessings and Curses," *DSD* 10/1 (2003): 150-161.

stratum of the Laws of D. These correspondences include a shared concern for priestly matters and certain purity regulations. Also, Schiffman has pointed out the similarities of the rulings of the halakhic section of 4QMMT with some of those in D, the Temple Scroll, and a ruling preserved in the Florilegium as examples of “a common halakhic trend.”³⁷

According to Hempel, the affinities between 4QMMT and the halakha *stratum* of the Laws of D are best explained as a result of a similar literary and compositional history of both of these texts, that is, the author(s) of these texts probably used similar types of sources, possibly earlier collections of halakhot or the like.³⁸ Apparently, however, Hempel refers to a possibility of earlier sources only with regard to the halakhic section – which I believe is possible. It is unlikely that the halakhic compositions found at Qumran would contain merely new and innovative legal interpretations. Rather they must have been a continuation to older traditions.³⁹ Nevertheless, the correspondence with the halakha *stratum* of Laws of D is on the level of the content – the two texts share common interests in priestly and cultic matters. The thematic affinities could also be explained as expressions of a general interest in certain legal issues during the Second Temple period. In the Laws of D, there are different strata of rules with divergent foci, and, accordingly, traces of different sources and redactional activity. It is possible that in 4QMMT a similar divergence of focus and ensuing tension *within* the halakhic section is detectable, yet this is beyond the scope of the present study, and a matter different from the tension *between* sections B and C of 4QMMT. The differences between the halakhic section and the epilogue, however, can be explained as a result of a shift or change in subject matter and genre.

³⁷ Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” 86-94. Florilegium differs from the other texts in that it is not in essence focused on legal interpretation.

³⁸ Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 69-84. See also note 21.

³⁹ See also Dimant, “The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discover: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: IES/The Shrine of the Book, 2000) 173-174.

Miguel Pérez Fernández has conducted a Redactional and linguistic analysis of 4QMMT.⁴⁰ He has concluded: “Given the differences in style, lexicon and content, it does not seem likely that the halakhic and exhortative parts are the work of the same person.” According to Pérez Fernández, the final redactor of the document redrafted an already existing written source for the halakhic section.⁴¹

Pérez Fernández draws attention, for instance, to the use of the participle with the 1st person plural, and the differences in the negation structure. Owing to these differences, he separates the halakhic section and the epilogue (which he calls the exhortative part) as follows: B-C9 and C9-32. Pérez Fernández places lines *DJD X* C1-9 of the composite text (in the edition placed in the epilogue) in the halakhic section.⁴² One of the reasons for this division is that according to Pérez Fernández, from *DJD X* C9 onwards, the verb with the 1st person plural should always be in *qatal*-form.⁴³ Yet, in *DJD X* C20 the verb is a participle.⁴⁴ Apparently, the use of the verb forms is not quite as clearly divided between the halakhic section and the epilogue as Pérez Fernández seeks to demonstrate. In addition, as discussed above, the specific usage of the verb forms in each section can be explained by the difference in the function and content of these sections.

A further problem with Pérez Fernández’s study is that his starting point is the composite text of the *DJD X* edition; however, as was pointed out earlier, the editors disagree over the arrangement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 in the epilogue. In the alternative arrangement of the text, lines C1-9 of the composite text in *DJD X* become lines C8-16 in the middle of the epilogue. If the alternative arrangement is accepted, it becomes materially

⁴⁰ Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 191-206.

⁴¹ Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 199; 202-203. Pérez Fernández sees, for example, the references to you pl. (“and you know...”) as later additions to the halakhic section.

⁴² Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 191-205. Pérez Fernández points out that between sections B and C there are “notable differences in syntax, lexicon and content. This reveals not only a division in the document but perhaps rewriting of a previous text.” Furthermore Pérez Fernández finds in the epilogue two redactional stages: α (C9-26) and β (C26-32). According to him, in α the whole lexicon is completely new with respect to the halakhic section. In β some fundamental terms from B1-2 are repeated with the intention to refer to the halakhic section; Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 199.

⁴³ Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 196-197.

⁴⁴ Pérez Fernández, “4QMMT: Redactional Study,” 200.

impossible that these lines could still be a part of the halakhic section. Accordingly, it is difficult to separate the halakhic section and the epilogue the way Pérez Fernández has done; his division of the epilogue (section C) into two redactional stages also becomes incomprehensible.

Even though the manuscripts of the halakhic section show virtually no evidence of redactional activity, it may well be that the author/redactor of the halakhic section of 4QMMT had earlier halakhic sources at their disposal. The absence of traces of redactional activity on the manuscript level does not, of course, completely rule out the possibility of redaction that was conducted before the earliest preserved copy resulting in redactional additions no longer detectable from the manuscript evidence. The use of earlier halakhic sources could explain some of the diversity *within* the halakhic section; however, if the diversity of the literary elements between the halakhic section and the epilogue can be explained structurally or as resulting from a change in content and genre, it does not necessarily require multiple redactions.⁴⁵

3.3. BIBLICAL LAWS AND DEUTERONOMY AS A MODEL

Whereas the halakhic section could stand independently without the epilogue; the epilogue, on the other hand, does indeed refer to the halakhic section:

אנחנו כתבנו אל יך מקצת מעשי התורה

A term common to both sections is *מקצת דברינו* in *DJD X B1* (4Q394) in the halakhic section and in C29 in the epilogue (4Q398; however, the shorter form *מדברינו* is found in manuscript 4Q399 ii 3).

A comparison with the biblical legal material, and Deuteronomy in particular, could clarify the unity of these sections of seemingly

⁴⁵ See Tigay, "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern and Postbiblical Literature," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) 149-173, esp. pp. 152; 172. Obviously, a structural parallel does not alone suffice to prove literary integrity, since the structure may also have been introduced by a later author having earlier sources at his disposal.

different genre and explain the structure of 4QMMT as intelligible and purposeful.

3.3.1. *Deuteronomy in the Halakhic Section*

Strugnell has pointed out that the first words of the halakhic section of 4QMMT, rather than being an opening of a letter, look like the incipit of a collection of laws. This incipit could have been consciously modeled after the first words of Deuteronomy; cf. 4Q394 frgs. 3-7 col i, line 4 (in *DJD X* line B1)⁴⁶ אלה מקצת דברינו – Deut 1:1 אלה הדברים.⁴⁷

Due to the strong focus on cultic and purity regulations the rulings in the legal section are largely based on Leviticus and Numbers.⁴⁸ However, it is certainly not without significance that two rather important occurrences of a citation from Deuteronomy can be found in the halakhic material: the core of Deuteronomy, the basic commandment of cultic centralization (cf. Deut 12:5), is used twice in the halakhic section to argue the authors' opinion in a legal case; first, when the correct procedure of slaughtering is described in B27-33; and, second, when the dogs are banned from the city of the sanctuary in order to maintain the purity of Jerusalem in B58-62. This reference is important, since it reflects the attitude of the author/redactor of the halakhic section toward the Jerusalem Temple. Furthermore, in the halakhic section there are several regulations dealing with the

⁴⁶ In MS 4Q394 the medial and final forms of letters are use inconsistently, and I have decided to follow the original orthography of the scribe.

⁴⁷ Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition", 62-63, 67. Strugnell has also proposed that the ending of section C "would well fit at the end of a legal code as it does in the covenant formulae. Deuteronomy would thus provide a parallel for the ending of this work just as it did for the beginning." See also Appendix 3 in *DJD X*, 205.

⁴⁸ One of the cases is *DJD X* B39-49, which is a regulation concerning forbidden unions. In fact, this is the only halakha that is based solely on Deut: "[And concerning the Ammonite] and the Moabite and the bastard [and the one with crushed testicles and the one whose] penis [has been cut] off, those who enter the congregation ...". This section is extremely fragmentary, preserved partly in 4Q394, 4Q396 and 4Q397, and the reconstruction is tentative, based on Deut 23:2-4; see *DJD X*, 158-160. Similar topics are discussed, for instance, in 4Q174, 1QM, 1QSa, Ezra, Nehemiah. In two other cases, Deut is *one* of the texts behind a halakhic rule: the priests' gifts in B62-64 (Deut 26; Lev 19:23-25; 27:30,32; 2 Chron 31:6) and the forbidden marriages between the priests and the Israelites in B75-82 (Deut 22:9,11; Lev 19:19; 21:13-15).

purity of the Temple city and the correctness of cultic procedures. Apparently, the group responsible for authoring 4QMMT, even though criticizing the current practices at the Jerusalem Temple, still considered it to be the only legitimate cultic place. The centrality of Jerusalem is most clearly reflected by the use of the basic commandment of Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomic centralization formula in the legal section.

In the composite text of *DJD X*, lines B27b-33 apparently the correct place for slaughtering is discussed (Lev 17:3-5; Deut 12:5):⁴⁹

[ועל שא כתוב] 27
 [מחוצ לםחנה שרר וכשב ועז כי ° [בצ פון המחנה] 28
 29 ואנחנו הושבים שהמקדש [משכן אוהל מועד הוא וירושל ים]
 30 מחנה היא וחוצה למחנה [הוא חוצה לירושלים] הוא מחנה
 31 ער [י] הם חוצ מם [חנה] ° [החט] את [ו] מוציאים את דשא
 32 [ה] מוצב ושרר [פים שם את החטאת כי ירושלים] היא המקום אשר
 33 [בחר בו] מכול שב [מי ישראל]

27 [And concer]ning what is written [...] 28 outside the camp a bull, or a sheep or a goat, for ...[... in the n]orthern part of the camp. 29 And we think that the Temple [is the tent of meeting, and Je]rusale[m] 30 is the camp; and outside the camp [is outside of Jerusalem;] it is the camp of 31 their cities. Outside the ca[mp...]...[...the sin-offe]ring [and] removing the ashes 32 of [the] altar and bur[ning there the sin-offering, for Jerusalem] is the place which 33 [he has chosen] among all the trib[es of Israel...]

The text is fragmentary at this point and the editors have used a similar passage in B58-62 for the reconstruction. The occurrence in line B32 is the only occasion in 4QMMT where the relative pronoun

⁴⁹ Lines B27-33 are (partly) preserved in MSS 4Q394 and 4Q397. The transcription of the Hebrew text is based on the *DJD* edition, with some minor adjustments resulting from my own reading of the manuscripts. In *DJD X*, Qimron and Strugnell have also made extensive reconstructions of this passage. I do not follow their reconstructions with the purpose to show more clearly the uncertainty and the fragmentary state of the text. In the transcriptions, I follow the orthography of the manuscript, which displays an inconsistent use of medial and final letters.

אשר is used in the longer form, while otherwise the short form -ש is always used. The use of the longer form was probably caused by the formulaic nature of the cited centralization law.

The ruling referring to the correct place of slaughtering is poorly preserved and therefore difficult to interpret. It is, however, possible that the writers of 4QMMT wanted to concentrate all slaughter, both profane and sacral, in the Temple (B27-35).⁵⁰ This idea has its origin in the passage of the Holiness Code (H), Lev 17:3-7, which further develops the commandments concerning the cultic centralization in Deuteronomy 12 and wants to concentrate all slaughtering in the Temple. The passage of 4QMMT can be compared with 11QT 52:13-53:8. The Temple Scroll rules that in Jerusalem, one is allowed to eat only the meat of animals that have been sacrificed in the Temple. But if an Israelite lives farther away than three-days walk from Jerusalem, he is allowed profane slaughter in those cities. It seems that the discussion concerning the restrictions on ritual and profane slaughter still continued after the Deuteronom(ist)ic reform, and from time to time a more stringent approach to profane slaughter was revived. Apparently the author/redactor of 4QMMT, combining the passage of Leviticus 17 and the centralization formula from Deuteronomy 12, wanted to forbid any kind of slaughtering outside the Jerusalem Temple.⁵¹

When the author/redactor wants to protect the sanctity of the Temple City by prohibiting dogs from entering Jerusalem in *DJD X* B58b-62,⁵² the *maqom*-formula of Deuteronomy 12 is used to justify the ruling:

ואין להבי למחני הק[ו]דש כלבים שהם 58

⁵⁰ According to Qimron, all that one can state is that the passage refers to secular slaughter, but apart from that, the fragmentary state of the text makes further interpretation impossible. Qimron's cautious approach is followed by Werrett. See, *DJD X*, 156-157; Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 191-192.

⁵¹ See also A. Yadin, "4QMMT, Rabbi Ishmael, and the Origins of Legal Midrash," *DSD* 10/1 (2003): 143; Kratz, "The place which He has chosen': The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI. A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and E. Tov; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute/Haifa University Press, 2007) 61-62, 79-80; Kugler, "Relexicalizing Leviticus in 4QMMT: The Beginnings of Qumran Anti-Language?" *forthcoming*.

⁵² Lines B58-62 are partly preserved in MSS 4Q394, 4Q396 and 4Q397. The transcription of the Hebrew text is based on the *DJD X* edition, with some minor adjustments.

- 59 אוכל ימ מקצת [ע]צמות המן[דש ו]הבשר עליהם כי
 60 ירושלם היאה מחנה הקדש והיא המקום[ם]
 61 שבחר בו מכל שבטי ישראל כי ירושלם היא ראש
 62 ה[ח]נות ישראל

58 And one should not let dogs enter the h[o]ly camp, because they 59 might eat some of the bones from the temp[le with] the flesh on them. For 60 Jerusalem is the holy camp and it is *the place he has chosen among all the tribes of Israel*. For Jerusalem is the head of 62 the camps of Israel.

These references to Deuteronomy in 4QMMT are not verbatim quotations in the strictest sense,⁵³ but they clearly allude to the language and most of all to the theological idea of one, central cultic site as presented in Deuteronomy, for example, Deut 12:5:

המקום אשר- יבחר יהוה אלהיכם מכל שבטיכם

The identification of the central cultic place with Jerusalem, only implied in Deuteronomy, is explicit in 4QMMT. Jerusalem is also identified with the camp, מחנה. While adjusting the Deuteronomic passage to his text, the author/redactor of 4QMMT omits the divine name. This can also be seen in the Deuteronomy citations on lines *DJD X C13-14, C19-21 and C30*. The avoidance of the *tetragrammaton* is probably intentional, and theologically motivated.⁵⁴

⁵³ The question of whether there are quotations of Scripture or merely allusions or paraphrase in 4QMMT will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter. The first attempts to analyze the use of Scripture in 4QMMT are by Moshe Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of the Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations", 29-51 and George Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 67-88.

⁵⁴ See also Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 77. In the Hebrew Bible similar theologically motivated corrections and revisions can be found as a result of scribal redactions, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985) 66-77. The avoidance of the *tetragrammaton* is generally considered a special feature of the particularly Qumranic texts. This does not, however, have to be a specifically sectarian feature of the text; it could also reflect in general the growing awareness of the holiness of the divine name during the late Second Temple period. For that or some other reason the use of *tetragrammaton* was gradually disappearing in the 2nd century BCE. See Rösel, "Names of God," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 600-602; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 11.

The particular concern for the purity of the Temple and the Holy City in the halakhic section reflect the holiness and importance of Jerusalem and the Temple for the author/redactor of 4QMMT. This idea is further strengthened by the use of the centralization formula and the explicit identification of Jerusalem as “the place He has chosen.”⁵⁵ Therefore, it seems improbable that the author/redactor of this text would have seen the Temple as an illegitimate sanctuary. Apparently, during some other time or period at Qumran, the community (or some part of it) distanced themselves from the Temple, rejected it as polluted and saw itself as the “real Temple,” as is stated for example 1QS VIII, 4b-6 or in 1QSa.⁵⁶ Reformation of the Temple and purification of the cult was expected to happen in the (eschatological?) future.⁵⁷ The late copies of 4QMMT found at Qumran suggest that at least for some part of the Qumran movement, the Jerusalem Temple was the only legitimate sanctuary until the very end of their existence. The cultic regulations needed continuous attention and study in order to maintain the knowledge of the correct procedures while the community was waiting for the reformation of the cult. In

⁵⁵ According to Harrington, 4QMMT expresses a desire to extend the area of holiness to the whole city of Jerusalem; a similar wish to extend the area of holiness can be detected in the Temple Scroll (11QT) as well. The whole city is equated with the holy camp, requiring a high standard of purity. For Harrington, the system of holiness behind the laws of 4QMMT is an indicator of a sectarian position. Harrington, “Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT,” 109; 113-117; 128-129.

⁵⁶ Schiffman analyzes 1QSa and concludes that “the sect saw itself as constituting a sanctuary through its dedication to a life of holiness and purity”; Schiffman, “Purity and Perfection: Exclusion from the Council of the Community in the Serekh Ha-’Edah,” *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: IES, 1985) 385.

⁵⁷ In the Qumran texts, there are various descriptions of the Temple of various degrees of significance, see Brooke, “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, 417-434. How the ideology or theology of the group responsible for the preservation of these texts and its self-understanding and understanding of the Temple developed over the time of its existence is a complex issue, and beyond the scope of this study. García Martínez (“The Problem of Purity: The Qumran Solution,” 157) suggests, that during the formative period the purity requirements are applied to the Temple, cult, and priests. After the break with the Temple, the community takes its place. Harrington (*The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 57) believes that “the Qumran sectarians were committed to the Jerusalem Temple, albeit not in its present condition. ...It could not be supplanted, however, by a non-biblical replacement.” See also J. M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law*, 64. The common meals of the community were seen as a temporary and imperfect substitute for the cult, but were not, according to Schiffman, considered as cultic or sacral meals replacing the Temple cult; Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scroll*, 191-197.

the final chapter, where the scriptural quotations and allusions of the epilogue are analyzed, it will be investigated whether the use of the scripture further reflects the importance of the Temple and the cult.

3.3.2. *Deuteronomy in the Epilogue*

Blessings and curses are mentioned several times in the epilogue, and Brooke has pointed out how these references “recall the covenantal framework of Deuteronomy.”⁵⁸

C1-2⁵⁹ אף הִקְלַל וְתָ [ש] בְּאֵזְרֵי יְרֵמְיָהוּ [וְ] בְּעַם בֶּן נְבֻטָה
וְעַד גִּלְיָהוּ [וְ] יְרוּשָׁלַם וְצַדִּיקִיהָ מֶלֶךְ יְהוּדָה

...and also the curses [which] came/have befallen in the days of [Jero]boam the son of Nebat and until the ex[i]le of Jerusalem and of Zedekiah, king of [Judah]

C3-4⁶⁰ וְאִנְחָנוּ מִכִּירִים שְׁבָאוּ מִקְצָתָ [ת] הַבְּרִכוֹת וְהַקְלָלִים
[ש] כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר מֹשֶׁה

And we are aware that so[me] of the blessings and the curses have occurred / been fulfilled [which] are written in the bo[ok of Mos]es.

C20-22⁶¹ וְאִם כְּתוּב שֵׁת [סוּר] מִהַדְרָךְ וְקִרְתָּךְ הִרְעָה וְכָתוּב [וְ] הִיא
כִּי [יְבוּ] אֵלֶיךָ [כֹּה] לְהַדְבִּירֶיךָ הָאֵלֶּה בְּאִחְרֵי הַיָּמִים הַבְּרִכָּה
[וְ] הַקְלָלָה [וְ] הַשִּׁבוּתָהּ אֵל לְבָבְךָ וְשָׁבְתָה אֵלֶיךָ לְבָבְךָ
וּבְכוֹל נַפְשְׁךָ בְּאַחְרֵי []

And also it is written that you shall [stray] from the pa[t]h and evil will encounter you. And it is written: [and] it shall happen 21 when

⁵⁸ Brooke, “Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” 80. See also Strugnell, “4QMMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 67.

⁵⁹ 4Q398 frgs. 11-13, line 1.

⁶⁰ 4Q398 frgs. 11-13, lines 3-4.

⁶¹ 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 13; 4Q398 frgs. 14-17, col i, lines 6-7.

al[l these] thing[s shall befall]l [you⁶² at the e]nd of days,⁶³ the blessing [and] the curse, 22 [then you will take it] to your hea[rt]⁶⁴ and you will return to him with all your heart and a[l]l your] soul in the end[...]

It seems that the epilogue, with its many allusions to Deuteronomy, was in all probability modeled after the biblical legal material. In Deuteronomy, the laws are closely connected with the concept of covenant. The understanding of the law presupposes the obligation of the people to obey. Reward and punishment are the consequences of obedience or disobedience. In Deuteronomy, the legal corpus (Deut 12-26) is followed by sections of blessings and curses (Deut 27; 28). Blessings and curses are commonly used as a legal formula of covenantal obligation and loyalty, both in ancient Near Eastern and in biblical laws.⁶⁵

The composition of 4QMMT implicates and adjusts a covenantal pattern (*Bundesformular*) of biblical laws: 1) An incipit, 2) legal statements, 3) a paraenetic conclusion with references to blessings and curses. In an attempt to imitate the covenant form of the biblical laws, the author/redactor of 4QMMT edited the legal material – some of which may have originated from earlier sources – and closed the legal corpus with a paraenetic conclusion that includes a reference to the blessings and curses.⁶⁶

Even though 4QMMT does not contain an explicit list of blessings and curses (cf. Lev 26; Deut 27; 28), the text implies that the correct interpretation of the halakhot described in the previous sec-

⁶² DJD X, 59: “when all these things [be]fall you”; García Martínez – Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, 803 “all these things shall befall you.”

⁶³ The passage contains citations from Deuteronomy, see 5.2.5. NRSV translates: “in time to come.”

⁶⁴ NRSV: “if you call them to mind”; DJD X, 59 “[then you will take]it to hea[rt]”; García Martínez – Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, 801, 803 “then you shall take it to your heart”.

⁶⁵ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Oxford University Press/Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1972/1992) 61-62. “The curses and blessings constitute the sanctioning paragraph of all ancient Near Eastern treaties. ... Sanctions of this kind were included not only in treaty texts but in all types of official legal settlements.” See also the ANE law collections in the excellent edition by Martha T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* (SBLWAW 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular* (WMANT 4; Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1964).

⁶⁶ If the paraenetic section with its reference to the blessings and curses is seen as an integral part of legal collections, it is perhaps slightly misleading to refer to the epilogue as a “non-legal segment,” as Kampen and Bernstein do in their “Introduction,” 5.

tion is “protected” in a manner similar to the biblical laws. In the epilogue, the paraenesis is interwoven with references to the blessings and curses.⁶⁷ The consequences of obedience or failure to fulfill the halakhah of 4QMMT are equated with the biblical blessings and curses, life and death.

The incipit in B1-3 and the epilogue, section C, apparently make up a framework for the legal statements consciously modeled after biblical legal material, especially Deuteronomy. Just as the authors/redactors of Deuteronomy and of other Biblical texts used the covenantal treaty patterns known in their time, adopting and developing the traditional structure in a style free from strict formality,⁶⁸ the author/redactor of 4QMMT adopted a structure used in legal texts and adjusted it freely. Whereas the biblical law collections developed over a long period of time, 4QMMT’s compositional history is probably much shorter. It is clear that the author/redactor of 4QMMT did not live in a vacuum. Instead, they most likely were learned men, familiar with the structures and formalities of biblical laws and dependant on them. Deuteronomy was the most important normative collection of laws of the time and would therefore have been in a position to set an example for later authors. The number of Deuteronomy manuscripts found in the Qumran caves as well as the frequency of Deuteronomy citations in the New Testament bears witness to the significance of Deuteronomy in the late Second Temple period.⁶⁹ Moreover, Martin Hengel has referred to deuteronomic

⁶⁷ This phenomenon of working the hortatory material together with the blessings and curses appears also in some biblical passages representing covenantal theology, as was pointed out in a personal communication by Professor Timo Veijola. According to Veijola, this intermingling occurs especially in the later texts. See Veijola, “Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium,” *Moses Erben. Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000) 153-175.

⁶⁸ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 157. “Unlike the treaty, Deuteronomy is not a legal document but an oration. The structure of the speech follows a legal pattern, but its style is that of a sermon.” The structure was developed in other biblical texts as well; see also Klaus Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 96; 181.

⁶⁹ See, for instance, Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 19; *idem*, “The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: An Overview and a Progress Report on their Publication,” *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 207-228; and Hengel, “‘Schriftauslegung’ und ‘Schriftwerdung’ in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels,” *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana. Kleine Schriften II* (WUNT 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) 1-71, esp. p.11; see also the articles by Sidnie White Crawford, “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period,” in *Reading the Present in*

theology as the ‘underlying theology’ (*Basistheologie*) of the Second Temple period.⁷⁰ In 4QMMT, the adopted structure emphasizes the author/redactor’s focus on covenantal theology and a concern for covenantal faithfulness. These themes are elaborated on in the epilogue by citing relevant passages of the scriptural text.⁷¹

3.3.3. *The Problem of the Calendar*

It was already demonstrated in Chapter 2 that the calendar fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 do not belong to manuscript 4Q394. However, in this one manuscript of 4QMMT, a short calendrical reference is preserved and precedes the halakhic section. A structure with a calendar preceding the legal part has no parallel with the biblical laws. In Deuteronomy, an elaborated version of the short festival calendar of the Book of the Covenant (Exod 23:14-17) is incorporated *into* the legal section (Deut 16:1-17). The main point of the festival calendar in Deuteronomy was to reform the festivals in accordance with the program of cultic centralization. Reformation and centralization of the cult had an impact on the festivals, and therefore required a reformation of the festival calendar.⁷² Accordingly, even though the festival calendar of Deuteronomy 16 does not offer a parallel for the

the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; SBLSym 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005) 127-140 and Timothy H. Lim, “Deuteronomy in the Judaism of the Second Temple Period,” in *Deuteronomy in the New Testament* (ed. S. Moyise and M. Menken; London: T&T Clark, *forthcoming*).

⁷⁰ Hengel, “‘Schriftauslegung’ und ‘Schriftwerdung’ in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels,” 46.

⁷¹ It is well known that the Qumran community adopted and developed the idea of a covenant between the people and Yahweh – the community itself became the counterpart of the $\text{קְהִלַּת הַבְּרִית}$, the Community of Renewed Covenant instead of the whole people of Israel. See, for instance, Talmon, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 3-24. It is also worth noting that the covenantal terminology deriving from Deuteronomy is used also elsewhere in the literature found from Qumran. For instance, the ceremony of entry into the covenant IQS I, 16-II, 18 or the admission into the covenant by swearing an oath IQS 5:7c-20a / 4QS^b IX:6b-13 / 4QS^d I:5b-13 // CD 15,5b-16,6a / 4QD^a 8 i / 4QD^e 6 i-ii / 4QD^f 4 ii contain echoes of Deuteronomic language.

⁷² Festivals celebrated locally were transformed as they were moved to Jerusalem as a result of the cultic centralization; see Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997) 53-97.

annexing of the calendar into 4QMMT on the *structural* level, it does indeed provide a parallel on a *conceptual* level. The festival calendar is essentially a cultic issue and therefore closely connected with the regulations of the halakhic section; also, according to the editors of *DJD X*, the subject matter of the calendar belongs to the domain of halakhah, “although the literary genre ‘calendar’ is not itself halakhic.”⁷³

The significance of the calendar to the covenantal theology in the Book of Jubilees, in CD and in 1QS could explain the addition of the calendar reference before the halakhic section. In the Book of Jubilees, the calendar is a fundamental part of the covenantal relationship.⁷⁴ This idea also occurs in CD and 1QS (CD III, 12b-15a; VI, 17b-21; 1QS I, 13b-15a).

In CD, the calendar is a significant component of the covenantal relationship (CD III, 12b-15a; VI, 17b-21):⁷⁵

But with those who remained steadfast in God’s precepts, with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray: his holy sabbaths and his glorious feasts...

...to keep the sabbath day according to its exact interpretation, and the festivals, and the day of fasting, according to what was discovered by those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus...

The significance of the calendar is also emphasized in the Community Rule (1QS I, 13b-15a):⁷⁶

They shall not stray from any one of God’s orders concerning their appointed times; they shall not advance their appointed times nor shall they retard any one of their feasts.

In Jubilees the correct performance of law includes the correct observance of the calendar, for instance, in Jub 1:10; 14:⁷⁷

⁷³ *DJD X*, 123.

⁷⁴ VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, 28.

⁷⁵ Translations by García Martínez – Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, 555.

⁷⁶ Translation by García Martínez – Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, 71.

⁷⁷ Translation by VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium Vol 511; Scriptorum Aethiopicum; Tomus 88; Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1989).

They will be captured and will fall into the enemy's control because they abandoned my statutes, my commandments, my covenantal festivals, my sabbaths, my holy things which I have hallowed for myself among them, my tabernacle, and my temple which I sanctified for myself in the middle of the land so that I could set my name on it and that it could live (there). (1:10)

They will forget all my law, all my commandments, and all my verdicts. They will err regarding the beginning of the month, the Sabbath, the festival, the jubilee, and the decree. (1:14)

The covenant is nowhere explicitly mentioned in 4QMMT, yet the structure of the text, the scriptural source texts chosen for the epilogue, the references to the blessings and curses reflect covenantal theology. The significance of the calendar to the covenantal relationship in 1QS, and more clearly in CD and in the Book of Jubilees,⁷⁸ could explain the attachment of the calendar section (a festival calendar?) to the beginning of MS 4Q394.

In 4QMMT, however, the calendar section was not integrated into the legal material. It could be argued, that since the calendar is a foreign element in the covenantal structure, it is unlikely that it was an original component of the document.⁷⁹ This is, however, not conclusive, since the author/redactor of 4QMMT has modified the covenant pattern in other ways as well; for instance, the use of the 1st person plural throughout the legal section and in the epilogue is one of the features of 4QMMT alien to the structure of the biblical laws. Despite the covenantal structure of the law collections adopted and adjusted by the author/redactor, 4QMMT, is not, generically speaking, a 'pure' collection of laws. Especially in the intertestamental literature, the '*Bundesformular*' could be varied, and used in several different genres, as stated by Baltzer:

Gegenüber dem Alten Testament ist eine weitere Differenzierung der Gattung des Bundesformulars zu beobachten. Die Untersuchung hat

⁷⁸ VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, 28.

⁷⁹ According to the editors, one or more sections could have stood before the first extant part of the document, preceding the calendaric part; see DJD X, 109. One can only guess what the content of this section would have been. Admittedly, no (historical) prologue that often makes up the first part of a law collection is preserved in 4QMMT. There are also some cuneiform law collections that lack a prologue, at least in the form they are preserved today. One could, of course, speculate that such a section existed and is missing from the extant 4QMMT manuscripts.

vier verschiedene Möglichkeiten der Verwendung des Formulars ergeben: 1. in der Liturgie, 2. in der Predigt, 3. als Gemeindeordnung, 4. als rein literarische Form.⁸⁰

Nevertheless, the idiosyncratic expressions used in the presentation of the calendar differ markedly from the formulaic composition of the halakhic section and the paraenetic style of the epilogue. Importantly, the calendar or issues related to it are never mentioned in the halakhic section or the epilogue.

There is one further indicator suggesting that the calendar originated from a separate source. Namely, another kind of calendrical text was annexed to one of the manuscripts of the Community Rule, namely 4QS^e, suggesting that calendrical documents existed separately, but could also be attached to other documents, and/or be replaced by other textual components.⁸¹

According to Metso's analysis of the textual development of the Community Rule, the final psalm of manuscript 1QS (1QS IX, 26b-XI, 22), also containing calendrical references, did not belong to the earliest stages of the redaction of the Community Rule, and existed independently prior to its annexing to MS 1QS. In MS 4QS^e (4Q259), which, according to Metso's analysis, represents an earlier version of the Community Rule, the manuscript concludes with the calendrical text 4QOtot (4Q319). Also according to the editor of the Otot-text, Jonathan Ben-Dov, the difference in the subject matter in comparison with the rest of the Community Rule strongly suggests that the Otot-text is a separate document, even though it is copied by the same scribe on the same scroll with 4QS^e.⁸² The Otot text contains data concerning the weekly services of certain priestly families in the Temple. MS 4QS^e contains three relatively well-preserved columns

⁸⁰ The *Bundesformular* could be freely adapted also in the Biblical texts. Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 96; 180-181. See also Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 157.

⁸¹ Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 119, 126; 128-129; 142.

⁸² See the edition by Ben-Dov in DJD XXI, 195-244. Because the Otot-text is understood as a separate document, the text is published in the calendar volume of the DJD series rather than together with the 4Q manuscripts of the Community Rule, edited by P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

from the beginning of 4QOtot. This text, related to the Temple, was replaced by a psalm in later copies of the Community Rule.⁸³

A special kind of calendrical text, a catalogue of “David’s compositions” is also attached to the end of 11QPs^a XXVII.⁸⁴ This text lists all the songs and other compositions of David that are to be sung together with the 364 daily sacrifices, every Sabbath, at the beginning of each month, and in the religious festivals during the year.

The calendar texts also existed separately, and apparently they were circulated independently. Possibly these texts could also be attached to other compositions – and sometimes be replaced by other texts, as happened in the development of the Community Rule. I would suggest that the calendar section, which differs noticeably from the presentation and subject matter of 4QMMT, was originally a separate document, and not a part of the earliest form of 4QMMT.⁸⁵ The scribe of 4Q394 attached a calendrical section to the beginning of 4QMMT because of the importance of the calendar reckonings to the community, and to the covenantal theology as reflected by the Book of Jubilees.

⁸³ According to Metso, 4QOtot was no longer relevant in a community which had rejected the temple as defiled; Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 183.

⁸⁴ J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 91-93.

⁸⁵ According to Schiffman, the calendar preserved in the beginning of MS 4Q394 lies behind the text he names 4QCalendar A-B that also existed separately. Schiffman suggests that this, and the fact that another calendar was attached to 4QS^c proves that the calendar of 4QMMT “was not composed by the author of the MMT text” and cannot be understood as an integral part of the composition of 4QMMT as a whole. The scribe of 4Q394 would have added the calendar to 4QMMT, which Schiffman sees as a foundation document of the sect, because of the importance of the calendar issues for the schism leading to the foundation of the Qumran community. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” 84-85. It is not clear to me, which texts exactly Schiffman is referring to with signums 4QCalendar A-B; cf. Table 1 in DJD XXI, page 2. Schiffman himself refers in his article to the preliminary edition and the readings of Milik as attested in Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991) 1.60-76. Nevertheless, it is a correct observation that all calendrical texts found in cave 4 use similar paradigms.

3.3.4. *The Dramatis Personae*

We

The 1st person plural is used in both the halakhic section and the epilogue, thus being a unifying feature between them, despite some differences in the applied verb forms resulting from the shift in the topic and genre of these two sections (see Table 1 in the beginning of this chapter). As mentioned above, in comparison with the structure of the biblical laws, one of the puzzling features of 4QMMT is the use of the 1st person plural both in the legal section and in the epilogue. There is no parallel in the ANE or biblical law texts for the formula *אנחנו אומרים / אנחנו חושבים* used in the halakhic section. It seems to be an innovation without a predecessor, probably a modification resulting from the genre or function of 4QMMT. The 1st person plural refers to the author/redactor of 4QMMT and/or the larger movement behind him/them. Although the halakhah is not focused on governing the life of a particular group, and is seemingly addressed to Israel as a whole,⁸⁶ it appears that the use of the 1st person plural alludes to an awareness of a defined group identity or a set of opinions, and implies the existence of an alternative view.⁸⁷ Still we need to ask whether, or to what extent, the awareness of a defined or developing group identity requires as a matter of course a polemical, extracommunal setting for 4QMMT.⁸⁸

In the *historical prologue* of Deuteronomy in chapters 1-3, the 1st person plural (alongside the singular) is used where Moses addresses the people. Interestingly enough, in Deuteronomy, the 1st person plural includes the addressees of Moses's speech, who are also addressed in the 2nd person plural and singular – meaning that in Deuteronomy 1-3 'we' refers both to Moses and to the people referred to as 'you' in the plural, as well as 'you' in the singular, the people of Israel listening to the speech of Moses. In other words, the 'we'-

⁸⁶ Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," 186; Hempel, "The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT," 70-71.

⁸⁷ As stated by Kampen and Bernstein: "Section B is not merely a collection of laws but part of an argument." in "Introduction," 6.

⁸⁸ A group can have a distinct social identity, marked by boundaries, "the understanding of what makes 'us' versus 'them'", without it having to be a specifically sectarian group identity, see Jokiranta, *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim* (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2005).

group referred to by the 1st person plural includes the ‘you’-group, the people addressed in the 2nd person plural and singular.

Another scriptural passage offering a model of comparison on a more general level for the use of the 1st person plural is in Nehemiah 9-10 where the reassessment of the covenant of the people is described. According to Baltzer, in this passage the covenantal pattern is applied in the description of the renewing of the covenant (*Bundeserneuerung*), demonstrating the close connection between covenant and law.⁸⁹ Here the 1st person plural is used several times. Another point of similarity is the content, since both 4QMMT and Neh 10:33-40 contain regulations concerning the Temple and the cult and they share an interest in matters of the priesthood and the Temple.

Moshe Weinfeld and Steven Fraade have pointed out other parallels for the 1st person. Weinfeld refers to the Sermon on the Mount, where the 1st person singular is used “you have heard...but I say.”⁹⁰ Fraade discusses the Mishna and its use of the 1st person plural in the phrase “we cry out against you, Pharisees...” and points out that this clearly polemical verse is not “rhetorically analogous” to the more neutral phrase used in 4QMMT. Fraade further wishes to point out that in 4QMMT there is nothing “to preclude an intramural, dialogical rhetoric” whereby ‘we’, representing the community, wishes to include ‘you’, the addressees, instead of polemicizing against them.⁹¹

They

The regularly assumed ‘they’ of the halakhic section does not appear at all in the epilogue. Strugnell identifies the ‘they’ group of the halakhic section with the *רוב העם* of the epilogue.⁹² But since it seems that even in the halakhic section, the existence of a clearly definable ‘they’ group is not certain, the identification is somewhat problematic. In more than half of the halakhot of the halakhic section, there is no reference to the 3rd person plural.⁹³ Actually, the

⁸⁹ Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 51-55. Cf. also Esra 9-10; 2 Chron 29:5-11.

⁹⁰ Moshe Weinfeld is referred to in John Kampen’s article, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, 130.

⁹¹ Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 511.

⁹² *DJD X*, 111.

⁹³ According to Fraade, “of the approximately twenty extant rules contained in section B of the composite text, not one identifies an opposing practice of the addressees”; Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 510.

editors, who specify the ‘they’-group as the opponents of the ‘we’-group, mention explicitly only three passages that according to them refer to the practice of the opponents: *DJD X* B6, B10 and B35.⁹⁴ In *DJD X* B5b-6 the halakhah apparently discusses the cooking of the purification offering, and in *DJD X* B9b-12 the eating of the cereal offering of the שלמים-sacrifice, but both passages are too fragmentary to establish the exact topic and the contents of the halakhot with certainty. In *DJD X* B35 the 3rd person plural refers to those who do not slaughter their animals in the Jerusalem Temple: “they do n[ot] slaughter in the sanctuary,” [אִי]נָם שׁוֹחֲטִים בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ.

According to the editors, this passage refers to the practice of the opponents. The passage is fragmentary, but as was pointed out above, it is possible that the halakha wants to forbid profane slaughter of pure animals outside the Temple, a practice allowed in Deuteronomy (Deut 12:15), and most likely a general custom; therefore the accusation in the 3rd person plural could refer to anybody, any Jew who would slaughter his animals outside the Jerusalem Temple.

In many passages the identification of the 3rd person plural is difficult because of the fragmentary state of the text; nevertheless, it seems that it does not necessarily refer to one single group.⁹⁵ However, all the references to the 3rd person plural are in the rulings that deal with sacrifice or slaughter – matters clearly related to the priests and their duties. In some cases, the 3rd person plural refers to something or someone discussed in the text, for instance, to the lepers, the blind; sometimes the reference is unclear.

You in the Plural

The 1st person plural ‘we’ as well as the 2nd person plural ‘you’ are common ‘actors’ in both sections. The phrase אַתֶּם יַדְעִים, using ‘you’ the 2nd person plural, appears twice in the halakhic section, *DJD X* B68-70, 75-80, and is twice reconstructed by the editors, and once in the epilogue, and is once reconstructed by the editors. References to ‘you’ in the plural are found in 4QMMT only in this particular phrase.

⁹⁴ *DJD X*, 46; 47; 50; 149; 150-152.

⁹⁵ See, however, Regev (*Sectarianism in Qumran*, 98), who identifies the ‘they’-group with the Pharisees and states that “three of the opponent’s lenient legal views are explicitly attributed to the Pharisees in the Mishnah.”

The first passage is concerned with regulations concerning the lepers and their purification process *DJD X B 68-70*:⁹⁶

And you know [that if someone violates a prohibitive commandment unintentionally], and the fact escapes him, he should bring a purification offering...

(4Q396) ואתם יודעים [שעל השוגג שלא יעשה את המצוה]
ונעלה ממנו להביא הַטְּאת

The second passage of the halakhic section containing a reference to the 2nd person plural discusses forbidden unions in *DJD X B80*:

But you know that some of the priests and [the laity mingle with each other]

(4Q396/4Q397) [וא]תֵּם יודעים שמקצת הַכֹּהֲנִים וְ[העם מתערבים]

The third attestation can be found in the epilogue (cf. the alternative arrangement lines C 15-16):

And you k[now that one cannot f]ind in us (= in our hands) any disloyalty, deceit or evil...

(4Q397) וְאַתֶּם יודעים שלא יִ[מצא בידנו מעל ושקר ורעה]

You in the Singular

In the epilogue, however, there is a new ‘person’ not mentioned in the halakhic section: ‘you’ in the singular. The references to ‘you’ in the sg. have contributed to the identification of the addressee of 4QMMT as an individual, possibly even a leader of Israel. The definition of 4QMMT as a personal letter, originally advocated by the editors of 4QMMT, has been rejected by both of them, and 4QMMT has been identified as a corporate or public letter. Nevertheless, they assume that 4QMMT was ‘an appeal’ sent “to an individual leader and his people Israel.”⁹⁷

⁹⁶ The text and translation of the halakhic section follows the edition; *DJD X*, 54-57.

⁹⁷ *DJD X*, 113-114; 121. See, however, Strugnell’s other articles, Appendix 3 in *DJD X*, 204; *idem*, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 63.

Composite text line 6: “...remember the kings of Israe[l] and *contem-plate* their deeds...”

Manuscript 4Q397: “[...we have wri]tten to *you* so that *you would understand*...”

Composite text line 25: “...remember Da[v]id...”

Composite text line 26/27: “We have written to *you* some of the works of the Torah...”

Manuscript 4Q398: “... for your and [your] people’s benefit.” Manuscript 4Q399 contains a shorter reading “for your benefit”.

Composite text lines 27/8: “For we have seen that *you* have intel-lect...”

Composite text lines 28/9: “*Study* all these (matters) and *seek* from him that he would str[aighten] *your* plans and remove from *you* evil thought”

Composite text line 29: “...so that ... *you* may rejoice...”

Manuscript 4Q398: And it shall be reckoned to *you* as righteousness when *you* do what is right and good⁹⁸ before him, for *your* good 32 and that of Israel.

A passage in lines C20-22 is a citation of Deuteronomy. All refer-ences to the 2nd person in this passage of the epilogue are in the sin-gular, even though in the source text also the 2nd person plural is used (see further Chapter 5.2.5):

20 And also it is written that you shall [stray] from the path and evil will encounter you. And it is written: and it shall happen 21 when all these things have happened to you at the end of the days, the blessing and the curse, 22 [then you will take it] to your he[art] and you will return to him with all your heart and a[ll your] soul in the end[...]

⁹⁸ Ms 4Q399 contains a shorter reading lacking the word *good*.

In the epilogue, when the 2nd person singular is referred to, there are two cases where the parallel manuscripts display variant readings:

<p>4Q397 14-21, lines 10-12</p> <p>10 [...we have wri]tten to you (sg) so that you would understand the book of Mos[es <i>and</i>] <i>the book[s of the Pro]phets and Dav[id...]</i></p> <p>11 [...] many generations. And in the book it is written [...][...][...]</p>	<p>4Q398 14-17, col i, lines 2-4</p> <p>2 [...][...][...] ...</p> <p>3 [...and] generation[...][...]it is written</p>
--	---

In the parallel passage in manuscript 4Q398 the reference to the 2nd person addressee or reader is lacking. There is another variant reading in the manuscripts of the epilogue, also in an important passage C27, in this case between manuscripts 4Q398 and 4Q399:

<p>4Q398</p> <p>לְטוֹב לְךָ וּלְעַמְּךָ</p> <p>for your (sg.) <i>and</i> [your (sg.)] <i>people's</i> benefit</p>	<p>4Q399</p> <p>לְטוֹב לְךָ</p> <p>for your (sg.) benefit</p>
---	---

The longer phrase is used to bolster the theory that the first addressee of 4QMMT must have been an individual, a ruler and a leader of the Israelite people; possibly even a royal figure. This theory is often supported by the references to the kings in the epilogue, which will be discussed in Chapter 5. Based on the analysis of all the variant readings between manuscripts 4Q398 and 4Q399, it was suggested in Chapter 2 that the shorter variant in MS 4Q399 is the more original reading. If this is accepted, the theory of an original individual addressee, identified as a leading figure of the Israelite nation, is weakened.

The longer reading of MS 4Q398 is possibly influenced by the final phrase of the epilogue: לַטוֹב לְךָ וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל. This reading is preserved in its entirety only in MS 4Q398. In MS 4Q399 the passage is only partially preserved: לְיִשְׂרָאֵל and the length of the *lacuna* cannot be determined with certainty. MS 4Q399 contains several shorter readings in comparison to 4Q398, however it is possible that it had a reading identical with that of MS 4Q398 on the last line of 4Q399 col ii: לַטוֹב לְךָ וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל. Rather than being another piece of evidence for a postulated royal addressee, the phrase possibly recalls the priestly responsibility referred to in the halakhic section. Priests were responsible for the people: “For the priests must be worthy to take this ruling into consideration *so that they will not let the people bear the guilt...*” (*DJD X B11-13*, partly preserved on lines B16-17, and B25-27). Accordingly, the correct behavior of the priests would benefit the entire nation as well (for the opposite, see, for instance, Hos 4:4-7, 9, 14). This could possibly explain the longer variant of 4Q398 “for your (sg.) and [your (sg.)] people’s benefit” discussed above.

Furthermore, the priests were responsible for the Temple and the cult (Hag 2:11-13),⁹⁹ and the Temple stood at the center of religious life. The priesthood was the authority of the late Second Temple Jewish society, both in the religious and in the civil sphere.¹⁰⁰ Accordingly, the 2nd person singular could also refer to a group, for instance, a priestly group – cf. the suggestion by Hempel and Schiffman that the halakhic section reflects inner-priestly disputes.¹⁰¹

The biblical sections of blessing and curses, Deuteronomy 27 and 28, offer a possible parallel for the use of both the 2nd person singular and plural in the epilogue. In Deuteronomy 27 both the 2nd person singular and plural are used. In Deuteronomy 28 mostly the 2nd person singular is used, and only on a few occasions the 2nd person plural, namely in verses 28:62-63. Nevertheless, the addressee of Moses’ didactic speech (in both chapters) is the people of Israel (cf.

⁹⁹ Grabbe, *Leviticus* (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 65.

¹⁰⁰ Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (2 vols; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992) 538-545.

¹⁰¹ Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” 63-74; Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 74-75. See also Betz, “The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition,” 181; 197.

Deut 27:9). Fraade refers to Deuteronomy chapters 30-31, cited in the epilogue, as another possible parallel to the rhetorical use of the 2nd person plural and singular in the epilogue.¹⁰² Importantly, in Deut 31, the public reading of the law is named as the task and responsibility of the priests (Deut 31:9-13).

The use of the 2nd person singular in the epilogue can be understood as a rhetorical device, and it functions to stress the seriousness of the issues discussed in 4QMMT and the responsibility of each individual in the audience(s) addressed. The possibility of an individual addressee, possibly of royal status, cannot entirely be ruled out. However, one should perhaps – rather than trying to identify one specific historical figure as the addressee – accept the fact that the internal evidence provided by the manuscripts of 4QMMT itself remains ambiguous. The fragmentary state of the manuscripts, together with the variant readings, has deprived us of conclusive evidence. Most importantly, the opening of the document is not preserved in any of the manuscripts. The question of the genre of 4QMMT will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

Even though it does not solve the question of the historical identification of the *dramatis personae* in 4QMMT, it appears that one model for the variation on the literary level can be found in Deuteronomy. The differences in their use, as well as the general divergence between the halakhic section and the epilogue can partly be explained by the different genre and function of these sections.

3.4. CONCLUSIONS

Attempts to try to determine the function and meaning of the epilogue of 4QMMT are considerably hindered by the text critical problems and the level of uncertainty of the epilogue's composite text. Moreover, the comparison between the halakhic section and the epilogue demonstrates clear differences between the two sections. These sections discuss different matters and differ in content and genre. Although the diversity in the presentation of the halakhic issues could be an indication of the use of earlier halakhic sources by the

¹⁰² Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," 512-513.

author/redactor of 4QMMT, the divergences between the halakhic section and the epilogue can be explained by the dissimilarity in the content and genre of the two sections.

The parallels for the structure of 4QMMT from the biblical legal texts help us to understand the composition of the document, to explain the unity of these sections of different genre, and to shed some light on the function and meaning of the epilogue. Furthermore, the structure is one indicator suggesting that the calendaric section did not constitute an original component of 4QMMT, but was instead annexed to the document in a similar manner as the 4QOtot-calendar was attached to 4QS^c.

It seems that the author/redactor of 4QMMT had a model in the covenantal pattern of biblical laws (*Bundesformular*), and Deuteronomy in particular. The author/redactor adopted this pattern and modified it freely in order to adjust it to his own literary creation. Deuteronomy further offers one possible parallel for the use of the personal pronouns in 4QMMT; however, it does not explain the usage of the different *dramatis personae* satisfactorily.

The genre of 4QMMT, which has presented many problems for the modern readers of this puzzling document, cannot be explained merely with the structural parallels.¹⁰³ The structure of 4QMMT is borrowed from the legal texts of Scripture, but 4QMMT is not a pure representative of the genre of legal documents. Structural analysis is only one of the methodological steps in the process of determining the genre of a given document, and the covenantal pattern can be used in a variety of genres.¹⁰⁴ Genre can never exist without parallel texts: one text alone cannot comprise a genre. Different genres have been suggested for 4QMMT, and in the following chapter, the formal elements of these genres will be investigated. As a result of this analysis the question of the genre of 4QMMT can be addressed.

Since the use of Deuteronomic structures, language and expressions seems intentional, the author/redactor's use of scriptural citations and allusions in the epilogue demands a more extensive analysis, which will be carried out in Chapter 5. This will result in a

¹⁰³ See, for instance, Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," 5; 8-16; 19-22; and Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," 507-526; esp. pp. 524-526.

¹⁰⁴ Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 96; 181.

deeper understanding of the theology of the epilogue and of 4QMMT as a whole.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE GENRE OF 4QMMT

Since the publication of *DJD X* the genre of 4QMMT has become a debated issue. In the first descriptions of Qimron and Strugnell, 4QMMT was defined as a letter, written by the leader of the Qumran community – possibly even by the Teacher of Righteousness himself – to the leader of the community’s opponents, a high priest in Jerusalem, possibly Jonathan or Simon.¹

This identification of 4QMMT has been supported by some and questioned by others. Different genres have been proposed: a personal or private letter, a literary epistle which is a literary text making use of the formal features of the epistolary genre, or a treatise. The main scholarly positions are outlined in Chapter 1. A description and evaluation of the scholarly opinions about the genre of 4QMMT is unfortunately hindered by the fact that the scholars proposing different genres for 4QMMT are rarely explicit in their argumentation. They do not discuss the formal criteria of the genres, and some leave unanswered, for instance, the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of the text, crucial for traditional form criticism.²

It may indeed have to be accepted that in the case of 4QMMT, some of the questions, which require an answer in order to positively define the genre of this document may remain unsettled because of the fragmentary state of both the textual and the historical evidence. The deterioration of the manuscripts of 4QMMT has deprived us from important material evidence. The historical reconstructions of the development and formation of the Qumran community are in the process of being refined and rewritten, and thus, the originally proposed purpose and setting of 4QMMT must be questioned. Both the literary epistle and the treatise are difficult genres to define and dis-

¹ Qimron and Strugnell, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 400.

² According to classical form criticism, when the genre of a given text is defined, there are three main (categories of) criteria that need to be examined: 1) form and structure; 2) intention; 3) setting (“*Sitz im Leben*”). See, for instance, Lohfink, *Jetzt verstehe ich die Bibel: Ein Sachbuch zur Formkritik* (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974) 38.

tinguish with proper formal criteria; sometimes these genres even overlap, as will be shown in this chapter. Furthermore, it is possible that 4QMMT, or any ancient text for that matter, had several different settings, audiences, and legitimate readings during the history of its transmission.³

In general, scholars have accepted the originally proposed setting for 4QMMT, according to which the text is a polemical document stating the main reasons of dispute that have led the community of the author/redactor of 4QMMT to separate from the majority of Judaism. However, Grossman and Fraade have come to conclusions very different from the original identification of 4QMMT as a letter of dispute between two separated communities after they questioned the initial setting of the text. Grossman's main contribution is to demonstrate that our assumptions about the genre of 4QMMT are largely dependent upon our historical reconstructions.⁴ Since 4QMMT is a document often used for the historical reconstructions of Qumran movement, the problem of the genre needs to be properly addressed. The question requires a formal critical investigation, and in this chapter the formal criteria of the suggested genres – letter, literary epistle, and treatise – will be investigated, and compared with 4QMMT. Furthermore, examples of representative texts from these genres will be introduced in order to gain a clearer picture of the variety of texts classified in these generic categories.

Apart from formal and structural elements, the setting and the purpose of the document are further determining factors when defining its genre. In the present study, it is suggested that a close reading of the epilogue will shed new light on the purpose and setting of 4QMMT as a whole. The question of function and genre will there-

³ As proposed by Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," 3-22.

⁴ Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," 3-22; Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees," 507-526; esp. pages 509, 51, 525-526. Grossman's thesis suffers perhaps slightly from the lack of clear formal critical analysis, but the main point she makes is indeed a valuable one. Grossman does not argue on a traditional formal critical level, and does not analyze 4QMMT with formal and structural tools. Instead, she accepts the ambiguity of the formal and generic identification of 4QMMT in the scholarship, according to which 4QMMT can be either an epistle or a treatise, and sketches different historical interpretations resulting from these various genre suppositions. Interestingly, she even discusses the initial theory of 4QMMT as a letter by the Teacher of Righteousness himself, even though this historical setting has largely been abandoned. In addition to the genres proposed in earlier scholarship, Grossman postulates the genre and setting of a 'document-after-the fact' for 4QMMT.

fore be revisited after the investigation of the use of Scripture in the epilogue in Chapter 5.

4.1. DEFINING THE EPISTOLARY GENRE: LETTERS AND LITERARY EPISTLES

In general, a letter in antiquity was a written communication between persons or groups who were separated by such (geographical) distance as to make oral communication impossible.⁵ It is helpful to make a distinction between the subgenre of letters, and the subgenre of literary and public epistles, documents that apply the formal features of the private letter but were created for a variety of purposes and meant for a wider audience. The distinction between letters and literary epistles is made on the basis of the content, intent, and setting. Letters deal with concrete issues and problems, and they were hardly intended for a wider consumption, even though the addressee could have been a group or a specific community as well, not just another individual.⁶ By contrast, a literary epistle used the form of a letter, but the document was meant for publication and could have a more general didactic or paraenetic purpose.⁷ Since these subgenres contain overlapping features, it is often difficult to tell whether a text that demonstrates the formal characteristics of the epistolary genre, was an actual, historical letter, meant to communicate matters of daily life, or a literary epistle that mimicked the characteristics of a personal letter but was meant for a more general purpose. Although the letter and the literary epistle share many features, which makes it difficult to create a firm distinction between the two, in the following analysis I will try to maintain these as separate subgenres within the broader category of the epistolary genre.

The distinction between the letter (*Brief*) and the literary epistle (*Epistel*, *Kunstbrief*) was first introduced by Adolf Deissmann in New Testament studies. According to Deissmann, letters, such as

⁵ See Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition* (SBL SBS 15; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982) 2; Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (SBL WAW 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 3.

⁶ See, for instance, Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epistolography" in *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing: Semeia* 22 (1991): 27.

⁷ White, "The Ancient Epistolography Group in Retrospect," in *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing*, 6.

those that were written by Paul, were not meant for the public or to be handed down to posterity, but only for the addressees.⁸ The literary epistle, on the other hand, is an artistic literary form, which only exhibits the formal features of a letter. The contents of an epistle are intended for a larger audience, and the purpose of the document is to interest ‘the public’.⁹ The definition of the letter proposed by Deissmann is not entirely unproblematic, especially for the students of the Pauline letters, and has been criticized by some scholars.¹⁰ Nevertheless the description of the epistle is helpful in demonstrating the intention and purpose of this particular literary genre.

While not completely satisfied with Deissmann’s description of these two genres, Fitzmyer uses it to highlight the fact that the whole corpus of Aramaic letters consists of private or official letters.

Aside from these instances [= Dan 3:31-4:34 and 6:25-27] there are in the limited Aramaic corpus no examples of epistles or literary letters (either of the philosophical, hortatory, or imaginative types); nor do we know of any spurious or pseudepigraphal letters. Those that have survived are all either private letters or official letters, treating matters either of concerns, news, or business.¹¹

According to Pardee, this also holds true for the corpus of the Hebrew letters.

[T]here are no literary productions in epistolary form in Hebrew during the periods covered [= the 7th-6th century BCE and the 2nd century CE].¹²

In other words, there are no examples from the genre of a literary epistle preserved either in Hebrew or in Aramaic from these periods.

⁸ Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1909) 168.

⁹ Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 165. “Ist der Brief ein Geheimnis, so ist die Epistel Marktware; jeder soll und darf sie lesen: je mehr Leser sie findet, um so besser erfüllt sie ihren Zweck.”

¹⁰ See, for instance, the criticism by William Doty, *Letters in Primitive Christianity* (Good News Studies 41; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973) 24-27; and Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995) 42-45.

¹¹ Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 27.

¹² Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*, 1.

The only exceptions might be Daniel 3:31-4:34 and Daniel 6:25-27 in Aramaic and Jeremiah 29 in Hebrew.¹³

Furthermore, when the case of 4QMMT is discussed, it is important to note that there are virtually no extant manuscript letters written in Hebrew or Aramaic from the late Second Temple period. There are neither private letters nor apocryphal or public epistles preserved. This might, however, be due to mere coincidence, or to the dominance of Greek as the *lingua franca* of the period.¹⁴

The extant corpus of ancient Hebrew manuscript letters is divided chronologically into two groups: the letters preserved from the 7th-6th century BCE, mainly originating from Lachish and Arad and those preserved from the 2nd century CE (the time of Bar Kochba).¹⁵ The collection of Aramaic letters lacks this kind of geographical unity. The Aramaic letters also appear to form two main chronological groups, but geographically they display more variety than the Hebrew letters. The Aramaic letters are dated from the mid 7th to the 5th century BCE (e.g. the Elephantine papyri belong to this group) and the 2nd century CE (the Bar Kochba period).¹⁶

At Masada two letters dated before the year 73 CE were found: papMas Ep gr 1039-307/1 in Greek and MasOstr 16-89/1 in Aramaic.¹⁷ The Greek text, entitled "Letter of Abaskantos to Judah," deals with the supply of liquids and vegetables. The Aramaic ostrakon letter is concerned with the payment of money. To my knowledge, this is the *only* preserved manuscript letter in either Hebrew or Aramaic from the period between the early letter finds and the time of Bar Kochba.

¹³ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*, 1; Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epigraphy," 27.

¹⁴ Cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (Transl. by J. Bowden; London: XPress Reprints, 1996) 38-39.

¹⁵ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*, 11-13, 160-162.

¹⁶ Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epigraphy," 40-46; Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 1, 15, 23, 37, 71-72.

¹⁷ The texts are first briefly mentioned in a preliminary report, Yadin, "The Excavation of Masada – 1963/64. Preliminary report," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 110-111. The Aramaic ostrakon is published by Y. Yadin and J. Naveh in *Masada I: The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports* (Jerusalem: IES, 1989) 49-50. The Greek papyrus text is published by H. Cotton and J. Geiger in *Masada II: The Latin and Greek Documents. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports* (Jerusalem: IES, 1989) 85-88.

In addition to the manuscript letters in Hebrew and Aramaic, one could mention the (fragments of) letters preserved in the Hebrew Bible: 2 Sam 11:15; 1 Kgs 21:9-10; 2 Kgs 5:6; 2 Kgs 10:2-3; 2 Kgs 10:6; 2 Kgs 19:10-13 (= Isa 37:10-13); Jer 29:4-23; Neh 6:6-7; 2 Chr 2:10-15; 2 Chr 21:12-15 in Hebrew;¹⁸ Ezra 4:11-16; Ezra 4:17-22; Ezra 5:7b-17; Ezra 6:2-12; Ezra 7:12-26; Dan 3:31-4:34; and Dan 6:26-28 in Aramaic.¹⁹ The technical terms in the Hebrew Bible denoting a letter are **אָגֵרָה** (Ar. **אָגֵרָא**), **מִכְתָּב**, **נְשִׁתוֹן** (=Ar.), **סִפְר**; in Ar. **פִּתְגָּם**. Since these are incorporated into a narrative framework, it is impossible to tell whether they were actual letters that were written and sent or just imaginary compositions created by the author or redactor of the larger work they are a part of.

Despite the relative paucity of letters written in Hebrew and Aramaic, the *literary* epistle, as a specific genre, began to emerge in Jewish literature during the late Second Temple period. This development can perhaps be traced to the influence of Hellenism.²⁰ According to Martin Hengel, the epistle was one of the (new) forms of Jewish literature that were typical of the early Hellenistic period.²¹ The literary epistle made use of the letter form, but the purpose and contents could be more general than in a letter, e.g. didactic or paraenetic and accordingly differed from those of the private or official letter. As stated by Philip Alexander:

In literary letters epistolary form is used as a means of communicating moral, philosophical or religious ideas. No matter who are the named addressees, such letters are aimed at a wider readership.²²

A problem with the study and the genre of the literary epistle in general is the ambiguity of the category itself. In addition, some of the

¹⁸ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*, 169-182.

¹⁹ Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epistolography," 43. For a complete list of Aramaic letters see pages 40-46.

²⁰ As suggested by Philip Alexander, "Epistolary Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984) 584. As Alexander points out, the literary letter was an established genre in Greek already in antiquity.

²¹ Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 110.

²² Alexander, "Epistolary Literature," 583.

documents belonging to this group can demonstrate generic ambiguity or mixture of generic features.²³

There are further difficulties in trying to define and analyze the specifically Jewish corpus of literary epistles from this period. For instance, examples of Jewish literary epistles are not preserved as manuscripts, instead, they are all attached or incorporated into other compositions; for instance, Josephus cites some 37 letters.²⁴ The first two books of Maccabees contain both reports on or short references to written communication, and longer epistolary texts.²⁵ It is not always easy to tell whether these ‘letters’ are authentic or freely invented; merely created for some stylistic or other purpose of the author of the larger composition.²⁶ Many scholars do not make a distinction between letters and artificial epistles. In some cases it is virtually impossible to make such a distinction, and for certain purposes (e.g. for the study of epistolary phraseology) it can also be argued that this distinction is unnecessary.²⁷ It has also been suggested that for ancient epistolary theorists such a clear distinction was virtually unknown. In antiquity, both the private letters and the literary epistles were included in the theoretical treatments of the epistolary genre. Even the artificial, literary epistle is based on the formal principles of the private letter, and is to a certain extent evaluated according to the same standards.²⁸

Some of the epistolary texts have only been preserved as translations (e.g. the Second Festival Letter in 2 Maccabees). The difficulty of dating some of these texts leads to further problems; especially

²³ White, “The Ancient Epistolography Group in Retrospect,” 6. “The treatise type letters which were, apparently, intended for publication frequently exhibit hybrid characteristics, mixing genres and employing variety of stylistic/rhetorical devices.”

²⁴ Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 580, and note 5.

²⁵ See, for instance, Nisula, “Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees,” *JSP* 14/3 (2005): 204-206.

²⁶ The methodological problems and problems of definition in relation to the corpus of Jewish letters and epistles are discussed by Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 579-583. See also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 110.

²⁷ Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 582; Nisula, “Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees,” 207.

²⁸ Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* (Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1956) 50-51. See also the edition by Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (SBL SBS 19; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988) with an excellent introduction and texts with translations of the central epistolary theorists of antiquity.

when we try to find the most appropriate parallel texts for a comparison with 4QMMT.

In sum, virtually all of the Hebrew or Aramaic letters written in antiquity and known to us are either from an earlier time than 4QMMT, or later, from the Bar Kochba period. No literary epistles in a Semitic language are preserved from the (late) Second Temple period, unless Jeremiah 29 and the epistolary passages in the Book of Daniel are counted as such. It is hardly without significance that the sole possible exceptions are embedded in biblical books, and not found as manuscripts.²⁹ Additional parallel texts must be found in Greek or other sources.³⁰ In the following, I will introduce and describe some examples of Jewish epistolary texts in order to show the variety of texts classified as literary epistles and to provide a rough sketch of the contours of this elusive subgenre.

Jeremiah 29

In Jeremiah 29, the prophet Jeremiah writes to the exiled Jews in Babylonia. Verses 1-23³¹ begin with an introduction comparable to both Deuteronomy 1:1 and 4QMMT: וְאֵלֶּה דְּבַרֵי הַסֵּפֶר: “*These are the words of the letter* that the prophet Jeremiah sent from Jerusalem to the remaining elders among the exiles, and to the priests, the prophets, and all the people, whom Nebuchadnezzar had taken into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon.”³² In spite of the technical term הַסֵּפֶר, the text has neither a proper epistolary opening nor a conclusion,³³ possibly due to the present location in a larger literary context

²⁹ See also Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 27.

³⁰ For an extensive listing see the article by Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 580-596, esp. pages 579-582. Hengel mentions as examples of the epistle from this period the following texts: the edict of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 3:31-4:34), the *Epistula Jeremiae*, the second Festival Letter in 2 Macc 1:10-2:18, the letters of Mordecai and Esther (Esther 9:20-32), and the two letters of Artaxerxes in the Greek Esther. He further mentions a later text, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, which ends with Baruch’s letter (2 Bar 78-86); Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 110.

³¹ The final verses of chapter 29 report the consequences of the ‘letter’ and She-maiah’s reply in verses 24-29 and finally Jeremiah’s reply in the closing verses 30-32, see, for instance, McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah. Vol II. Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996) 741-742; however, Lundbom considers verses 24-28 as another letter by Jeremiah; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 21B; New York: Doubleday, 2004) 344.

³² The translation follows the NRSV.

³³ See, however, Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 26-52* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 138.

or the manifold reworking of the original source material.³⁴ The chapter is a text critical puzzle. It is noteworthy that the parallel passage in the LXX (Jer 36) differs markedly from the MT, for instance, it does not contain verses 16-20.³⁵ Jeremiah's message to the exiles in Babylon is clearly not preserved in its original form;³⁶ the text lacks proper epistolary formulae and is difficult to define.

In its present form, though purporting to be an authentic communiqué sent by the prophet to the exiles, Jeremiah 29 is more properly defined as prophetic promulgation, cast in the form of a literary epistle. The contents are religious rather than practical, conveying Yahweh's message to the exiles.³⁷ Furthermore, it has a hortatory function and it is meant to be read and studied by other audiences as well, not merely the 'original' one.

Daniel 3:31-4:34 and Daniel 6:26-28

The beginning of the story of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity is cast in the form of a letter, beginning with an epistolary introduction,³⁸ a *praescriptio* identifying the author and the addressees, a greeting, and a concluding doxology:³⁹

King Nebuchadnezzar to all peoples, nations, and languages that live throughout the earth: May you have abundant prosperity! The signs and wonders that the Most High God has worked for me I am pleased to recount. How great are his signs, how mighty his wonders! His

³⁴ Taatz, *Frühjüdische Briefe. Die paulinischen Briefe im Rahmen der offiziellen religiösen Briefe des Frühjudentums* (NTOA 16; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1991) 47-48.

³⁵ For textual criticism see McKane, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, 727-735; 736; Holladay, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 26-52*, 134-137.

³⁶ Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36*, 346; Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*, 1.

³⁷ Holladay (*Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 26-52*, 139-140) considers the nucleus of Jeremiah 29 an authentic letter from the prophet Jeremiah to the exiles.

³⁸ According to Fitzmyer, with a 'quasi-epistolary' introduction; Fitzmyer, "Aramaic Epistolography," 27.

³⁹ Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 216.

kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his sovereignty is from generation to generation.⁴⁰

There is no epistolary conclusion, however, in the story. As was the case with Jeremiah 29, also Daniel 3:31-4:34 has a complex redactional history.⁴¹ Though mostly written in the 1st person singular, which is appropriate to the epistolary style, one section (4:25-30) is in the 3rd person. In spite of the epistolary form used in the opening, the story is in essence a folk tale,⁴² the relationship of the epistolary opening to the rest of the story being the issue here.

In chapter 6 of the book of Daniel there is a short decree by King Darius. This text does not begin with a *praescriptio*; instead the author and addressee are mentioned in the narrative framework of the 'proclamation', which begins with a greeting similar to the one in 3:31: "Then King Darius wrote to all peoples and nations of every language throughout the whole world: 'May you have abundant prosperity!'"⁴³ The ending is "a typical hymn in praise of the God of Israel".⁴⁴ In the edict, King Darius orders all the people of his kingdom to serve the God of Daniel. The proclamation "summarizes the theological message" of the tales of the book of Daniel.⁴⁵

In both of these cases, it is clear that one cannot consider these texts as genuine letters; in the case of Dan 3:31-4:34 one might even question the definition of the story as a literary epistle, apart from the opening. Instead, the formal features of the epistolary genre were used for literary and artistic purposes.

Epistula Jeremiae

The letter in Jeremiah 29 seems to have inspired the composition of the *Epistula Jeremiae*.⁴⁶ In spite of its title, the *Epistula Jeremiae* is rather a sermon or a didactic text than a letter or a literary epistle.⁴⁷

⁴⁰ The translation follows the NRSV.

⁴¹ Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 216-220.

⁴² See Hartman – Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; New York: Doubleday, 1978) 174-175; Collins, *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 232-233.

⁴³ The translation follows the NRSV.

⁴⁴ Hartman – Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 200.

⁴⁵ Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 262.

⁴⁶ See, for instance, Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21-36*, 348.

⁴⁷ According to Harrington, the Letter of Jeremiah is in fact a sermon; Harrington, *Invitation to Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 104; Brooke has suggested that the text is rather a didactic wisdom text; Brooke, "The Structure of

The text is tentatively dated around 300-200 BCE. All surviving manuscripts of the *Epistula Jeremiae* are in Greek, including one fragment from Cave 7 at Qumran (7Q2 = EpistJer 43-44)⁴⁸; however, it is possible that the text was originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic.⁴⁹ The text, which is a polemic against idolatry, is addressed to the Babylonian exiles and is identified as a letter in the introduction of the document. Here then, is a cogent example of an ancient text that was classified as a letter in spite of it lacking typically epistolary features.⁵⁰ In this respect, the *Epistula Jeremiae* is not unlike the so-called Epistle of Enoch in 1 Enoch, or the Letter of Aristeas.⁵¹

Epistolary Texts in 1 Maccabees

1 Maccabees, preserved in Greek but originally written either in Hebrew or Aramaic, contains both shorter notes reporting of correspondence between various parties, and longer texts that have preserved certain epistolary features, such as a proper *praescriptio*.⁵² It is virtually impossible to determine whether the documents are historical letters used as source material by the author of 1 Maccabees, or invented literary epistles to create a flavor of historicity for the entire document.⁵³ In any case, the epistolary texts of 1 Maccabees are all

the Poem Against Idolatry in the Epistle of Jeremiah (1 Baruch 6),” in *Poussières de christianisme et de judaïsme antiques: Études réunies en l'honneur de Jean-Daniel Kaestli et Éric Junod* (ed. A. Frey and R. Gounelle; PIRSB 5; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007) 107-128. Doering treats the entire corpus of Jeremianic epistolary texts under the sub-genre of fictive “Diaspora Letters;” see Doering, “Jeremiah and the “Diaspora Letters” in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary communication with the Golah as Medium for Dealing with the Present,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*, 43-72.

⁴⁸ M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux (eds.), *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran*, 142-146.

⁴⁹ Taatz, *Frühjüdische Briefe*, 57.

⁵⁰ Taatz, *Frühjüdische Briefe*, 58: “Die Tatsache, dass der Verfasser der EpJer sein Werk, dessen Anliegen in keiner Weise eine Briefform verlangte, als Abschrift des Jeremia-Briefes gestaltete, unterstreicht das Ansehen, das ein derart autorisierter Brief im babylonischen Frühjudentum gehabt haben muss.”

⁵¹ Alexander, “Epistolary Literature”, 580-581.

⁵² See the helpful distinction by Nisula, “Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees”, 204-207. As “actual letter texts” he lists 10:17-20; 10:25b-45; 11:29-37; 12:5-23; 13:36-40; 14:20-23; 15:2-9; 15:15-21. All of these texts open with a *praescriptio*. Alexander mentions 11 letters quoted in 1 Macc, see Alexander, “Epistolary Literature”, 579-580, and esp. note 2.

⁵³ See, however, Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41A; New York: Doubleday, 1984) 28-30.

concerned with practical and administrative matters, such as taxes, the Temple, and military co-operation. The obvious epistolary form of the letter texts of 1 Maccabees differs from that of 4QMMT, which does not exhibit the formal features of the epistolary genre. The texts also differ in their content: whereas the epistolary texts in 1 Maccabees are concerned with practical matters, 4QMMT deals with halakhic and paraenetic issues.

Epistolary Texts in 2 Maccabees – The Public Festival Letters in 2 Maccabees

The second Book of Maccabees also contains several epistolary texts, both the appended Festival Letters at the beginning of the actual document, (1:1-10 and 1:10-2:18),⁵⁴ and other epistolary texts (9:19-27; 11:16-21; 11:22-26; 11:27-33; 11:34-38).⁵⁵ Based on internal data, 2 Maccabees is dated before the destruction of the Second Temple.⁵⁶ I will here concentrate only on the two Festival Letters, which, even though preserved in Greek, were originally written in a Semitic language, either Hebrew or Aramaic.⁵⁷

The first Festival Letter in 2 Maccabees (2 Macc 1:1-9), dated c. 124 BCE, was apparently an authentic letter addressed to the Egyptian Jews.⁵⁸ However, the second Festival Letter at the beginning of 2 Maccabees is one of the best examples of an artificial, literary epistle dated to the Second Temple period.

The purpose of the first Festival Letter is to convince the Egyptian Jews of the legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple, and to convince the Egyptian Jews of the necessity to observe the celebration honoring

⁵⁴ Goldstein gives one explanation on how and why the letters were appended at the beginning of 2 Macc; Goldstein, *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41; New York: Doubleday, 1976) 551-557.

⁵⁵ See Alexander, "Epistolary Literature," 580; Nisula, "Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees," 206.

⁵⁶ Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ I/3; Historische und legendarische Erzählungen; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976) 169-170.

⁵⁷ See, for instance, Bickerman, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc 1,1-9)" *ZNW* 32 (1933) 245-246; Fischer, "The Second Book of Maccabees," in *ABD* 4: 1992) 442; Goldstein, *II Maccabees. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 139, 164, 172; Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, 170. The rest of the 2 Macc was composed in Greek.

⁵⁸ Bickermann, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc 1,1-9)," 243; Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 138; Taatz, *Frühjüdische Briefe*, 27.

the rededication of the temple cult, since Jerusalem is the only proper cultic place. The letter, apparently written by an anonymous group (instead of an individual or Jewish officials), calls for repentance and combines this call with an exhortation to observe the coming festival. This implies the superiority, even the sole legitimacy, of the Jerusalem temple over that of Leontopolis.⁵⁹ Accordingly, there are interesting thematic affinities with 4QMMT, a document possibly contemporary with the first Festival Letter.

The second Public Festival Letter (2 Macc 1:10-2:18) is also referred to as the Letter to Aristobulos. The Festival Letter gives detailed instructions on how the festival should be celebrated. The centrality of the cult and legitimacy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem are the main issues even in the second Festival Letter.⁶⁰ In this Festival Letter, the addressee is identified as an individual named Aristobulos, and is addressed in the 2nd person singular. For the most part, however, the readers are referred to with the 2nd person plural, signifying the broader intention of the document. The vacillation between the 2nd person singular and plural is reminiscent of the same phenomenon in 4QMMT. The genre of this document is debated; however, it was most likely not a letter that was ever sent and it can be classified as a literary, artificial epistle.⁶¹

Later Non-Jewish Parallel Texts

The New Testament provides a large corpus of parallel texts. It contains a complex corpus of epistolary literature, both letters and literary epistles. The technical term used for a letter is ἐπιστολή (e.g. Acts 9:2; Rom 16:22). Apart from the genuine Pauline letters,⁶² there are texts in the NT that have adopted – at least some features of – the

⁵⁹ Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 138-139; 144-145. In fact, the first Festival Letter is apparently made up of two epistolary texts, since verses 7-8 contain a reference to an earlier letter.

⁶⁰ Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 159, 160, 171, 173, 188.

⁶¹ See, for instance, Alexander, "Epistolary Literature," 586; Bickerman, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief," 233; Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 157-159. Some scholars do classify the second Festival letter as a real letter; see, Taatz, *Frühjüdische Briefe*, 42.

⁶² For Pauline epistolography, see, for instance Stirewalt, *Paul, the Letter Writer* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995).

letter form, such as the Epistle of James, which is a paraenetical text;⁶³ 1 John, a polemical treatise;⁶⁴ the Epistle of Jude, a polemical tractate lacking a specific addressee;⁶⁵ and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, rather than being a letter, is a didactic or homiletic text. The text lacks an epistolary prescript; however, the ending resembles the conclusion of a letter.⁶⁶

Considerably later parallels are provided by the Gnostic Christian texts. The Gnostic corpus contains two documents, both of debated genres, which make use of the letter form and other formal characteristics of the letter genre. Nevertheless in both cases scholars disagree with regard to their genre. It appears to be almost impossible to determine whether the texts were authentic letters or literary epistles, partly because both texts lack a proper *praescriptio*. These texts are the Treatise on the Resurrection⁶⁷ and Ptolemy's Letter to Flora.⁶⁸

Ptolemy's Letter to Flora is a carefully outlined essay or treatise on Biblical law cast in the form of a letter.⁶⁹ The contents are similar to our text but because of its composite nature one can hardly describe 4QMMT as a carefully outlined and thoroughly planned essay. The document named the Treatise on the Resurrection is addressed to an individual named Rheginos. The manuscript preserves the title given to the document: "the treatise on the resurrection", "ΠΛΟΓΟΣ

⁶³ Rather than being a private letter, the Epistle of James is a general circular in the form of paraenesis. Ruckstuhl, *Jakobusbrief. 1.-3. Johannesbrief* (NEB 17/19; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985) 1; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament. Vol 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982/2000) 162.

⁶⁴ Ruckstuhl, *Jakobusbrief. 1.-3. Johannesbrief*, 35; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 200.

⁶⁵ Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 252.

⁶⁶ März, *Hebräerbrief* (NEB 16; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1989) 1; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 276-277.

⁶⁷ Peel, "The Treatise on the Resurrection," in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex) Introductions, Texts, Translations, Indices* (ed. H. W. Attridge; NHS XXII; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 123-157.

⁶⁸ Ptolemy's Letter to Flora is preserved in Epiphanius' *Panarion*; the text is edited and published by Quispel, *Protoméé: Lettre a Flora. Texte, traduction et introduction* (Sources Chrétiennes 23b; Paris: Cerf, 1949).

⁶⁹ Dunderberg, "Ptolemaioksen kirje Floralle," in *Nag Hammadin kätetty viisauus: Gnostilaisia ja muita varhaiskristillisiä tekstejä* (ed. I. Dunderberg and A. Marjanen; Helsinki: WSOY, 2001) 145; *idem*, "Valentinian Teachers in Rome," in *Christians as a Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome* (ed. J. Zangenberg and M. Labahn; JSNTSup 243; London: T&T Clark, 2004) 163-164; *idem*, "The School of Valentinus," in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian "Heretics"* (ed. A. Marjanen and P. Luomanen; Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 76; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 77-79.

ΕΤΒΕ ΤΑΝΔΑΚΤΑΚΙΟ΄”; possibly, however, the title is a later addition.⁷⁰ Several genres have been suggested, and the text has been classified variously as a letter written for a didactic purpose, a doctrinal letter, or a treatise.⁷¹ The text is an especially interesting parallel for our purpose, since in its epilogue it mixes the forms of the 2nd person singular and plural. E.g.:

[I have] taught you and your [brethren], my sons, considering them, while I have not omitted any of the things suitable for strengthening you. But if there is one thing written which is obscure in my exposition of the Word, I shall interpret it for you (pl.) when you (pl.) ask. But now, do not be jealous of anyone who is in your number when he is able to help. Many are looking into this which I have written to you. To these I say: Peace (be) among them and grace. I greet you and those who love you (pl.) in brotherly love.⁷²

This brief and by no means complete introduction to a collection of Jewish and non-Jewish letters and literary epistles shows that the literary epistle could have been created and used for several purposes. In historical narratives, the literary epistle could be used to give an impression of authenticity, or to add stylistic variation.⁷³ Furthermore, it seems that the formulae used in letters and literary epistles can cross genre boundaries and can be used in a variety of genres and for differing purposes, such as a folk tale, a homily, or paraenesis. The literary epistles in Greek Esther and 1-2 Maccabees could even deal with very concrete issues. In some cases, documents defined by some as literary epistles are of debated genre, and no scholarly consensus has been reached. It is clear, as already stated at the beginning of this chapter, that the genre of a literary epistle is difficult to define due to the complexity of the corpus. The situation is further complicated by the fact that in some cases texts have been titled or identified as letters or epistles despite a complete lack of any proper formal

⁷⁰ Peel, “The Treatise on the Resurrection,” 128. As usual, the title is given at the end of the document. It is noteworthy that the Coptic translator has preserved the original Greek technical term.

⁷¹ The problem of the genre is discussed by Peel, “The Treatise on the Resurrection,” 128-130.

⁷² The translation is by Peel, “The Treatise on the Resurrection,” 157.

⁷³ For the problem of authenticity, see Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 28-30; Alexander, “Epistolary Texts,” 585-588. In some cases, the author of the narrative could, of course, have used source material for his composition

features of the letter genre, and sometimes even when they represent some other identifiable genre, as in the case of *Epistula Jeremiae*.

4.2. DEFINING THE GENRE: A TREATISE

The genre of treatise was suggested in the *DJD* edition as an alternative classification of 4QMMT. This generic definition is advocated by Brooke, and Gershon Brin. Brooke proposes that 4QMMT could be classified as a “treatise with a didactic element”.⁷⁴ Brin suggests that even if 4QMMT could originally have been a letter sent outside the community, it would later have become a “basic treatise aimed at teaching its members the fundamental principles which distinguish the sect from other groups in Judaism”.⁷⁵ However, it should be noted that in his article “Second Thoughts”, Strugnell has abandoned the categorization of 4QMMT as a treatise, since “...the treatise is, at least in Hellenistic literature, a very ill-defined genre.”⁷⁶

The treatise is an ancient genre, and one that is difficult to define with specific formal criteria, but, in general, it has not been identified as one of the genres used in the Hebrew Bible.⁷⁷ It can be defined as a systematic analysis, usually an extensive written discourse of a certain subject. The purpose of a treatise is didactic or hortatory; a treatise is an elaborate and systematic exposition of important or central ideas, theories, or doctrines. Furthermore, a treatise is generally intended for a wider audience.⁷⁸

Possible examples of the treatise genre are difficult to identify. Perhaps the ‘purest’ representatives of this genre, in the Jewish context, were composed by Philo. Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE – 50 CE), who wrote in Greek and was influenced by Hellenistic culture, com-

⁷⁴ Brooke, “Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” 80-82.

⁷⁵ Brin, Review on *DJD* X, 335.

⁷⁶ Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 63. This correction can also be found in the appendix Strugnell wrote for the edition; *DJD* X, Appendix 3, 204.

⁷⁷ See also Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 63.

⁷⁸ See, for instance, Grossman, “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” 7. See also *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Gramercy Books, 1989) 1509: Treatise: “1. a book or writing that treats of some particular subject. 2. a formal and systematic exposition in writing of the principles of a subject, generally longer and more detailed than an essay.”

posed several treatises on a variety of topics.⁷⁹ Most importantly, Philo himself refers to some of his writings as treatises (e.g. λόγος in *Every Man is Free* I,1; συνταξις in *On Rewards and Punishments* I,3; *On Abraham* I,2).

Among the pseudepigrapha of the Hebrew Bible there is a document, known as “The Treatise of Shem”, which is an astrological almanac (*calendologion*).⁸⁰ Regardless of the title, which might be a later addition, the text belongs to the genre of calendar texts. The title treatise could apparently be given to a variety of texts. The editors of 4QMMT cite as an example of the genre of the treatise the Epistle to the Hebrews. However, treatise is only one of the genres scholars have proposed for the Epistle to the Hebrews, and it is hardly undisputed. Rather, the Epistle to Hebrews has been called a literary riddle (“das literarische Rätsel”).⁸¹ The Epistle to the Hebrews lacks a *praescriptio*, but the closing resembles that of the Pauline letters. Other generic classifications proposed are a homiletic tractate,⁸² and a sermon or homily.⁸³ It has been suggested that the first Epistle of John could be classified as a polemical treatise;⁸⁴ however, other descriptions have also been proposed, such as “a written communication.”⁸⁵ These texts are ample parallels for 4QMMT mostly because they display generic ambiguity, which is clearly one of the issues in

⁷⁹ Philo’s works can be divided and classified in many ways, one possible two-fold classification being the following: (1) exposition and interpretation of the Pentateuch; (2) other works, containing, among others, apologetic works and philosophical treatises. In both categories one can find documents that can, and have been, classified as treatises. See, for instance, Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, 233-282; VanderKam, *Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 138-142.

⁸⁰ The document is preserved in a single medieval manuscript in Syriac, but it is probable that it was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic. The dating of this text is debated; Mingana dates it after the Jewish War of 130-135, Charlesworth to the 1st century BCE; see Charlesworth, “Shem, Treatise of,” *ABD* 5: 1196-1197. For the text and translation see Mingana in *Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands Library: Syriac Texts* (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1917) 24-29; 52-59.

⁸¹ Schunack, *Der Hebräerbrief* (ZBK 14; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2002) 12; Attridge, “Hebrews, Epistle to the,” *ABD* 3: 98.

⁸² Schunack, (*Der Hebräerbrief*, 13) refers to the epistle to the Hebrews as a “homiletische Traktat.”

⁸³ Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989) 14.

⁸⁴ Ruckstuhl, *Jakobusbrief. 1.-3. Johannesbrief*, 35; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 200.

⁸⁵ Grayston, *The Johannine Epistles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) 1.

the case of 4QMMT. Nevertheless, in some cases the treatise was indeed given the guise of a literary epistle, such as in the case of the aforementioned Treatise on the Resurrection and possibly the first Epistle of John. Accordingly, a distinction between these two genres is sometimes difficult to make.⁸⁶

This brief listing of examples of texts classified as treatises show the wide range of texts belonging to this ambiguous genre. Furthermore, in some cases the genres of treatise and literary epistle overlap. Similarly, as in the case of the genre of literary epistle, the genre of treatise includes a variety of different texts. It appears that the genre displays no exclusive formal criteria; even the content of these texts seem to vary considerably.

With regard to 4QMMT, it is, however, far from certain that the collection of laws in the halakhic section is meant to give a “systematic exposition” of the whole halakhic system or the distinguishing “fundamental principles” of the author/redactor of 4QMMT. Instead, the purpose of the halakhic section is to list those legal topics where the author/redactor and the group behind him disagreed with the religious ideas and practices of another Jewish group. Even the opening phrase of the halakhic section *מִקְצַת דְּבַרֵּינוּ* “some of our words” seems to be designed as an introduction to a list of the most important topics of disagreement, not to a systematic treatment of the halakhic system that was embraced by the author/redactor or his group.⁸⁷ The only explicit justification given for the author(s)’s halakhic interpretation is a brief phrase, repeated three times: “For the priests must be worthy to take this ruling into consideration so that they will not let the people bear the guilt...” (*DJD X B11-13*; partly preserved on lines B16-17, and B25-27).

4.3. 4QMMT AND THE FORMAL MARKERS OF THE EPISTOLARY GENRE

When discussing the manuscript letters that are written in Hebrew, Pardee uses two main criteria to separate letters from other literary

⁸⁶ See also Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar” (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 68 (1998-1999): 319, n. 6; Grossman, “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” 6.

⁸⁷ Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 63.

genres, namely form and function.⁸⁸ In general, the structure of the letter – both the Semitic and the Hellenistic letter – has three main parts:⁸⁹ (1) *praescriptio*, an opening, which may include an address and a greeting;⁹⁰ (2) a body; and (3) a closing, with certain concluding formulae.

In the case of the Hebrew and Aramaic letters, however, one or all these elements may be omitted.⁹¹ For instance, it should be noted that in the earlier Hebrew letters (from the 7th-6th century BCE) there are no concluding formulae attested whatsoever. The letter texts in Hebrew and Aramaic display certain typical formulae, such as the openings marking the transition from the *praescriptio* to the body of the letter. There are two types of formulaic openings that are attested in the corpus of the Hebrew letters: ׀ׁׂ in the early letters and ׀ in the Bar Kochba letters. The cognate formula in Aramaic, found in the Aramaic Bar Kochba letters, is ׀ׁ / ׀,⁹² however; these formulaic elements are not always present.

Another primary characteristic of the letter genre is direct speech (I – you discourse). Direct speech can be used as one criterion to define a fragmentary document as belonging to the letter genre even if other formal features typical of the letter genre are lacking. This is due, either to the fragmentary state of the texts, or, as in the case of the letters preserved in the Hebrew Bible, to the new context.⁹³ However, direct speech is used and attested in other genres as well, such as wisdom literature, homilies, and testamentary texts, and thus cannot be seen exclusively as a feature of epistolary texts.

Returning to 4QMMT, it is clear that no opening typical of a letter is preserved in any of the manuscripts of this text. One can, of course, because of the fragmentary state of the manuscripts, speculate that

⁸⁸ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition*, 1.

⁸⁹ Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters* (SBLWAW 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 6; Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 589; Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 39; Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.*, 155.

⁹⁰ There appears to be two ways to define the *praescriptio*: according to Pardee, the *praescriptio* includes both the initial address and the greeting; according to Fitzmyer and Lindenberger only the initial address (the names of the sender and the addressee); Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Epistolography,” 31; Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 6-8.

⁹¹ Lindenberger, *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*, 6.

⁹² Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition*, 149, 155-159; Alexander, “Epistolary Literature,” 590-591.

⁹³ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letter: A Study Edition*, 2, 23, 108, 169.

such an opening once existed, but in its present form the document lacks a proper *praescriptio*, and neither the author nor the addressee is explicitly identified.⁹⁴ Equally, the ending of 4QMMT does not correspond to the closing formulae known from the Semitic letter corpus; however, even the lack of a proper epistolary conclusion is not unusual in Semitic epistolography.

Despite the observations of some scholars,⁹⁵ the ending of 4QMMT **לְטוֹב לְךָ וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל** does not resemble the closing formulae attested in the Bar Kochba letters. The preserved closing formulae of these letters are regular, differing only slightly from one another.⁹⁶ The most distinctive common feature of the final greetings attested both in Hebrew and Aramaic Bar Kochba letters is the use of the greeting **שְׁלוֹם**, which is clearly *not* found in the ending of 4QMMT.⁹⁷

One of the “epistolary features” of 4QMMT listed by the editors is the introductory formulae used in the halakhic section, which resembles the use of the structure $\text{περὶ } \delta\epsilon + \text{gen.}$ (e.g. 1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1) in the Pauline corpus.⁹⁸ However, the introductory heading **וְאֵף / וְעַל** / **עַל וְאֵף** used in the halakhic section to introduce new halakhic statements is not specifically a formal feature of letters; even the editors admit that it is not necessarily a unique characteristic of letters. Indeed, a comparison with the legal texts in the Qumran corpus has shown that a similar introductory heading with the expression **עַל** is used in the *halakha stratum* of the laws of the Damascus Document (CD and 4QD fragments), in 4Q159 (Ordinances), and 4QHalakhah A. According to Hempel, during late Second Temple Judaism the use of the preposition **עַל** was a standard phenomenon when creating halakhic statements.⁹⁹ Consequently, rather than being

⁹⁴ In accordance with the letter structure, if there once was a *praescriptio* in 4QMMT it would, of course, have preceded the halakhic section, and in the (those) manuscript(s) where a calendar was attached, even the calendaric section.

⁹⁵ Brooke, “Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” 81.

⁹⁶ Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition*, 155-156.

⁹⁷ As a matter of fact, Strugnell himself has pointed out in his “Second Thoughts” that the conclusion does *not* resemble the conclusion of a letter; rather, the final passage could be defined as an “exhortation on the observance of the previously mentioned laws.” Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 67.

⁹⁸ See DJD X, 113-114.

⁹⁹ Hempel, “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT,” 73. In the same volume (STDJ 34) see also J. M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the Damascus Document – Between Bible and Mishnah,” 17-26, esp. p. 26.

an epistolary feature, as suggested by the editors, this is a typical feature of legal or halakhic texts.

It is possible that the Jewish epistolary texts from the Hellenistic period may contain some formulae and phraseology derived also from Greek epistolographic conventions.¹⁰⁰ For instance, a phrase comparable to the *formula valetudinis* is used twice in the Maccabean epistolary texts. The epistolary texts of 1-2 Maccabees also reveal other features resembling – either consciously or inadvertently – the Greek rhetorical devices of the epistolary genre, such as the *phraseology of friendship*.¹⁰¹ It could be argued, that the polite phraseology of the epilogue of 4QMMT resembles, at least on a conceptual level, the phraseology of friendship of Hellenistic epistolography, used in our document as a deliberate rhetorical device; cf. C27-28: “For we have seen that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law”.

The friendly and respectful tone in addressing the reader, typical of Hellenistic epistolary rhetoric, explains, according to Høgenhaven, the irenic tone of the epilogue of 4QMMT.¹⁰² However, the suggestion by Høgenhaven that the epistolary form “must be described as governing the overall structure” of 4QMMT is misleading. While some of the polite phrases of the epilogue of 4QMMT might echo the Hellenistic epistolary conventions, other structural and formal elements of the letter genre are lacking.

Another way of explaining the conciliatory and moderately polemical tone of 4QMMT is to create a historical setting where a style such as this would be suitable and appropriate for the authors. The editors of *DJD X* see it as a characteristic of the early phase of the Qumran movement, when the hope of restitution was still cherished. This, together with the lack of specifically sectarian terminology and theology has contributed to the early, possibly even pre-Qumranic dating of 4QMMT.¹⁰³ Fraade, on the other hand, questions this assumption, and shows how an inner-Qumranic setting and pedagogical purpose of 4QMMT can also adequately explain the lack of polemics and dualistic language in 4QMMT.¹⁰⁴ Both the editors and Fraade, however, apparently accept the fact that the relationship of the (pre-

¹⁰⁰ See Koskenniemi, *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.*

¹⁰¹ Nisula, “Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees,” 208-219.

¹⁰² Høgenhaven, “Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT,” 201-202.

¹⁰³ *DJD X*, 116, 121.

¹⁰⁴ Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 514.

Qumranic or Qumranic) authors of 4QMMT to outsiders would develop towards a complete separation, which would make any discussion impossible.

In sum, the use of direct discourse is the only clear stylistic criterion that links 4QMMT to the letter genre. However, it was already pointed out that even though direct speech is one of the primary characteristics of the letter genre, it is used in several other genres as well, and cannot therefore be seen as an exclusive feature of the epistolary texts, nor fully justify the classification of 4QMMT as either a letter or a literary epistle.

Because of the fragmentary state of the document as a whole, the few similarities with epistolographic conventions do not allow a positive identification of the genre of 4QMMT as either a letter or a literary epistle. Of these two options, the generic identification of 4QMMT as a personal letter can rather safely be rejected. The subgenre of literary epistle, however, contains so much variation that one should perhaps remain more cautious in rejecting it completely, although it is clearly not a satisfactory solution since so many appropriate epistolary features are lacking both from the beginning and the conclusion of the extant document. The difficulty with this subgenre, however, is that texts classified as literary epistles do not always exhibit the formal features of the epistolary genre.

It is perhaps more interesting and fruitful to consider the (possible) reasons for why the text has been defined as a letter or a literary epistle. In the case of 4QMMT, it is necessary to remember that the title and classification of the text as a 'Halakhic Letter' cannot be proven to be an ancient one, having been given to the document by its modern editors.

It is rarely explicit in the Qumran scholarship, but it seems that the phrase אָנַחְנוּ כְּתַבְנוּ אֵלֶיךָ "we have written to you" (*DJD X* line C26) is one of the arguments for those supporting the hypothesis according to which 4QMMT was a letter. It is entirely possible that the translation proposed by Qimron and Strugnell has contributed to this, as they translate the phrase: "we have (indeed) *sent* to you some of the precepts of the Torah."¹⁰⁵

The same phrase is used in MS 4Q397 14-21, line 10: "[...we have wri]tten to you so that you would understand...". In both cases, the

¹⁰⁵ *DJD X*, 63.

phrase does not necessarily have to refer to a letter, rather it seems that it would point towards the halakhic section and the correct legal interpretation; in 4Q397 14-21, line 10, is a possible reference to the theological arguments of the epilogue, depending on how the passage should be reconstructed. Furthermore, in the case of the other occurrence of the phrase, there is a variant reading in the parallel MS 4Q398:

<p>4Q397 frags. 14-21, 10-11</p> <p>10 [כתב] נו אליכה שתבין בספר מוש[ה] ו[ב]ספר[י] הנ[ב]יאים ובדו[ו]ד 11 [דור ודור] ובספר כתוב [] ים ל[] לוא</p>	<p>4Q398 frags. 14-17, col i, 2-3</p> <p>2 [] נום [] זים[] 3 [] ודר [] צו כתוב</p>
--	---

<p>4Q397 frags. 14-21, 10-11</p> <p>10 [...we have writ]tten to you (sg.) so that you (sg.) would understand the book of Mos[es and] the book[s of the Pro]phets and Dav[id...]</p> <p>11 [...] many generations. And in the book it is written [...][...][...] not</p>	<p>4Q398 frags. 14-17, col i, 2-3</p> <p>2 [...][...][...] ...</p> <p>3 [...and] generation[...][...]it is written</p>
---	--

The passage in MS 4Q398, parallel to the important phrase “[...we have writ]tten to you (sg.)” lacks both a reference to the act of writing and to the (individual) 2nd person addressee or reader. Besides, references to the act of writing are not a sufficient indicator of the epistolary genre; compare the beginning of the Gospel of Luke (1:3) or the ending of the Gospel of John (21:24), where the authors of these

documents refer to the writing of a text in a clearly non-epistolary context.

4.4. CONCLUSIONS

It was demonstrated above (in Chapter 3.3.) that the structure of 4QMMT is an adjusted form of the *covenantal pattern* known from biblical legal texts; however, 4QMMT is not a ‘pure’ legal collection. The text contains features and elements that are strange in comparison to the biblical legal texts, most importantly, the use of the 1st person plural formulae **אֲנַחְנוּ אֹמְרִים / אֲנַחְבוּ חוֹשְׁבִים** in the legal section (see Table 1. and the discussion on the *dramatis personae* in Chapter 3).

Both in the Hebrew Bible and in the intertestamental literature, the covenantal pattern (*‘Bundesformular’*) can be used in several different genres, such as in liturgical texts, sermons, community rules and even as a purely literal form.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, it needs to be repeated that the parallels to the covenantal structure do not alone suffice to explain the genre of 4QMMT, since defining the structure and form of a document is only one of the methodological steps in determining the genre. Purpose and setting must also be taken into consideration.

The author/redactor of 4QMMT adopted the covenantal pattern for the whole document. Additionally, the function and purpose of the new literary creation demanded the creative use of appropriate formulae that are unknown in the parallel legal and epistolary texts. The use of direct speech is typical of the genre of letters and epistles, even though not exclusively a formal feature of the epistolary literature. The polite phraseology of the epilogue could have been influenced by Greek epistolary conventions, but the friendly and respectful style can also depend upon the setting and purpose of 4QMMT. It should be stressed, however, that apart from the document’s conciliatory tone, no epistolary formulae known from Jewish sources could be found either in the halakhic section or in the epilogue. Therefore, the document can only with great difficulty be defined as a personal letter. It would be preferable, in order to prevent too far-reaching historical reconstructions, if the title ‘Halakhic Letter’ was abandoned.

¹⁰⁶ See, for instance, Baltzer, *Das Bundesformular*, 180-181.

The text is rather of a literary character. The large number of preserved copies, as suggested by Brooke, implies that 4QMMT

was always intended as an open circular, designed to be heard by a wide audience who might identify themselves with the 'you' of the addressee.¹⁰⁷

It is easier to reject the genre of personal letter for 4QMMT than to make a positive proposal for an alternative generic identification. The most appropriate parallel texts were either written in or translated into a language other than Hebrew or they are of a considerably later date. Most importantly, they are of a debated genre, as is the case with 4QMMT. When the genre of 4QMMT is analyzed and discussed, it is necessary to remember that the fragmentary state of the manuscripts, especially the loss of the opening section of the document, which is not preserved in any of the manuscripts, may have deprived us of conclusive evidence. However, the document is not a pure representation of any previously known form or genre; rather it appears to be a mixture of some previously known elements of various genres combined with innovative elements suitable for the purposes of its author/redactor.

¹⁰⁷ See Brooke, "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT," 81.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE EPILOGUE

In this chapter, the focus of investigation is the use of Scripture in the epilogue, both the explicit citations and the more subtle allusions to the scriptural source texts. The epilogue of 4QMMT is rich with references to scriptural language and the analysis of these passages will help to trace the theology of the epilogue, which has so far remained largely unstudied in Qumran scholarship. To date, the study of the halakhic section has defined the focus and purpose of 4QMMT. However, since the epilogue is a significant part of the whole document, a better understanding of it will provide a more balanced reading of 4QMMT in its entirety.

5.1. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The composite nature of the epilogue requires a cautious approach when the passages are analyzed. Text from the epilogue is preserved in MSS 4Q397, 4Q398, and 4Q399, and some or the passages of the epilogue are preserved in only one manuscript. Furthermore, where the manuscripts overlap, there are several difficulties in trying to establish a composite text.

Scriptural texts are often used in order to reconstruct a fragmentary passage of the manuscript. Therefore, a danger of circular reasoning arises when, after such a reconstruction, an analysis is made of how the author/redactor of the text has used and modified the scriptural source. Both because of the problems of the composite text, and the fragmentary state of the manuscript material, one must first inspect the individual manuscripts before trying to analyze the use and function of the scriptural citations or allusions in the epilogue. Having discussed the text-critical problems and the reconstructions of the lacunae in Chapter 2, I will now analyze the context

and content of the passages, which will further increase the reliability of the reconstructions.

Another question demanding clarification before an analysis of the use of Scripture is possible is the distinction between a citation, a paraphrase, and an allusion. In many of the texts found at Qumran, specific formulae are used to set apart explicit scriptural citations (for instance **אמר**, **כתוב**) or their interpretation (for example **פִּשְׁר**) from the rest of the text. In other cases, scriptural citations are introduced without a quotation formula.¹ Sometimes the cited text varies from the scriptural text form known from the MT (or the assumed proto-MT), which is the text form most often used for comparison between the scriptural passages and their possible source in non-biblical compositions. There could be two main reasons for these deviations: either the author/redactor is using another form of the scriptural text, or he is intentionally modifying the source text. Of course, inadvertent modifications also occur, slips of memory, scribal mistakes etc.

It is acknowledged that it is not entirely unproblematic to use the MT as the main source of comparison for the scriptural citations found in the Qumran texts, or in any late Second Temple period compositions. In light of the new evidence from Qumran, it has become increasingly clear that the text form of the Hebrew Bible was not fixed when the texts found at Qumran were authored. Instead, the text form of the Scriptures was in flux. It is well known that, in the Qumran library, different text forms of the scriptural manuscripts coexisted.² Furthermore, the MT (or proto-MT) did not necessarily have a privileged position or an authoritative status for the authors/redactors of the non-scriptural texts found at Qumran. Accordingly, all known text forms need to be examined prior to analyzing the use of the Scriptures in a composition originating from the late Second Temple period. When a passage is at variance with the MT it does not have to be a paraphrase or non-scriptural. Rather, it could

¹ For instance, in 1QpHab and 4Q161 the primary *lemmata* are not introduced by a quotation formula; in 1Q16, 4Q171, 4Q173, 4Q166, and 4Q167 introductory formulae are never used. For a helpful overview, see C. D. Elledge's article "Exegetical Styles at Qumran: A Cumulative Index and Commentary," *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 165-208.

² See, for instance Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (SDSRL; Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans, 1999) 17-33.

represent another text form of the scriptural text, a different edition or a textual variant.³

The fragmentary state of the texts obviously creates additional difficulties. When a passage is only partly preserved it is sometimes impossible to assess with certainty how the source text has been used and which textual tradition the author/redactor has followed. This needs to be remembered also when a scriptural text is used for the reconstruction of the lacunae.⁴ Sometimes, the author/redactor could have been intentionally selective in his use of a source text. In some cases, the variants can be exegetically influenced – exegetical variants instead of textual variants – meaning that the author/redactor of a later composition deliberately modified the source text to make it suit his interpretative aim.⁵

In the epilogue, the introductory formula, כְּתוּב, occurs five times: once to refer to the blessings and curses that have occurred “as has been written in the Book of Moses;” once in a broken context (וּבְסֵפֶר כְּתוּב) of MS 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 11, where the function of the formula cannot be defined; and three times when quoting Deuteronomy. Even though these quotations are abbreviated, modified, and not identical with any known text form, they cannot exactly be defined as paraphrases either, not in the sense of rewording: the scriptural idioms are maintained and not replaced by other expressions.⁶

³ Cf. Bernstein’s problematic statement: “it is immediately clear that כְּתוּב in MMT need not precede a quotation, but a paraphrase is to be considered כְּתוּב as well. This fact may be very important when we come across passages throughout Qumran literature which purport by their introductory formulas to be biblical citations, but which are at variance with MT. The introduction of non-citation by כְּתוּב might at times explain such ‘variant’ quotes.” Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 39-40.

⁴ See Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 34.

⁵ The importance and difficulty of making a distinction between exegetical and textual variants, and the methodological issues, are illustrated by a case-study by Lim in his article “Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible – Methodological Considerations,” in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London/New Castle: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002) 71-78.

⁶ Brooke (“The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 72) calls for terminological precision: “a *paraphrase* is the use of alternative words to express the same or similar ideas”. According to Brooke, a quoted passage does not need to be *completely* identical with the source text, provided that no new, major expressions lacking from the source text are introduced or added to the quotation. See also the definition of the noun *paraphrase* by *Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Diction-*

ת] הברכות והקללות [4Q398 (3-47) 1] אנחנו מכירים שבאוו מקצ[ת] הברכות והקללות
[ש] כתוב בספר מו[שה]

9 4Q397 (13) [ואף] כתוב בספר מושה ולו[א] תביא
תועבה א[ל] ביתכה

4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 11 (cf. 4Q398) ובספר כתוב]

20 4Q397; 4Q398 ואפ כתוב שת[סור] מהד[ר]ך וקרתך הרעה

20 4Q397; 4Q398 וכתוב [ו]היא כי [יבו]א
על י[כ]ה כו[ל] הדברי[ם] האלה

The function of the כתוב-formula in 4QMMT has been discussed by several scholars. In *DJD X*, Qimron has stated that in 4QMMT the word כתוב

never introduces biblical verses. It sometimes precedes a description or a paraphrase of a biblical verse... It would seem that כתוב is not intended to introduce a verbatim quotation from Scripture, but rather to introduce the statement which was derived from such a verse.¹⁰

The use of Scripture in 4QMMT, and the relevant methodological issues, has been treated in the preliminary studies by Bernstein and Brooke. Regarding the כתוב-formula Bernstein seems to be of the opinion that it does not necessarily introduce a scriptural quotation. This is not to say that it could not have been used in this way, how-

ary of the English Language, page 1047: "a restatement of a text or passage giving the meaning in another form, as for clearness; rewording".

⁷ The line numbers inside the brackets refer to the alternative composite text, cf. Chapter 2.

⁸ In 4Q398 frgs. 11-13, line 4 (line 4 in the alternative composite text; *DJD X* C21) the term is not used as an introductory formula; instead, the phrase summarizes the history of Israel as the blessings and curses that have occurred "as has been written in the Book of Moses." See also Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 78.

⁹ Elledge's claim that the phrase ואף כתוב does not introduce direct citations but scriptural paraphrase in *DJD X* C6 (4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 6) and C12 (4Q397 frgs. 14-21, line 12) is not convincing. In both cases, the citations are slightly abbreviated and modified, but not paraphrased; Elledge, "Exegetical Styles at Qumran: A Cumulative Index and Commentary," 181

¹⁰ *DJD X*, 140-141.

ever.¹¹ Brooke has legitimately challenged Qimron's initial understanding of the use of the כְּתוּב formula. His survey of the various instances where the quotation formula כְּתוּב is used in 4QMMT shows that "כְּתוּב is nearly always associated with scripture explicitly, or in summary form," whereas different terminology is used for expressing the opinions of the group behind 4QMMT.¹²

The understanding of the function of the כְּתוּב formula, and the definition of what follows כְּתוּב, be it a quotation or a paraphrase, is partly a matter of correct terminology. Furthermore, the use of terminology reflects the attitudes of modern scholars towards the scriptural text and its varying forms.¹³ Thirdly, one has to relate the question to the broader issue of what was the appropriate way of quoting Scripture during the Second Temple period.¹⁴ In inner-biblical exegesis the כְּתוּב formula functions in a variety of ways. In the (later) narrative historical sources such as the Books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, כְּתוּב is used both with literal and with abbreviated citations.¹⁵ It appears that the כְּתוּב formula indicates or signifies the use and/or dependence on an earlier source, rather than denoting an exact reproduction of the earlier text.¹⁶ Additionally, it can also function as a reference to something written in a "Sefer Moshe", as in the expression:

¹¹ In a footnote Bernstein comments upon Qimron, stating: "That כְּתוּב need not introduce a quotation in 4QMMT is clear; whether it can is another issue." Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 36, note 23. He also says: "there is no reason to claim that כְּתוּב cannot introduce verbatim citation in MMT, even though that is not its primary function."

¹² Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 71.

¹³ Brooke ("The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 88) rightly points out that "...MMT helps us to see that we should not look for nor expect to find scripture quoted exactly in the form it is known to us in the MT."

¹⁴ Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 71; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*.

¹⁵ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 106.

¹⁶ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 9. Authorial intention and possible literary dependence of the source text is made clear by the quotation formulae. Citing and usage of an earlier text furthermore reflects a certain level of authoritativeness of the source text – but the 'exact' level of authority of the cited text is a more complicated issue, and the level of authoritativeness of a certain composition should rather be seen as a development on a continuum than as a dichotomy of two extreme positions. Nevertheless, as is pointed out by Hengel, texts and authors apparently needed to have some kind of extraordinary position in order to invite interpretation; see Hengel, "'Schriftauslegung' und 'Schriftwerdung'," 2

4Q398 [אנחנו מכירים שבאוו מקצ]ת] הברכות והקללות

[ש] כתוב בס[פר מו]שה

In order to distinguish between a paraphrase and a quotation, it is more important to look for what is added or replaced than what is lacking in comparison to the supposed source text. Still, even what is lacking could be important for the interpretation, since abbreviation can function as an interpretative, exegetical method. The deliberately selective way of citing the source text is a purposeful means of forming an interpretation in the new context. It will be demonstrated that even though the author/redactor of 4QMMT sets off these passages from the composition by using quotation formulae, he could be selective in his use of the scriptural source passage. The reformulation of the cited text functions to elucidate the author/redactor's hermeneutical message. This is not in itself a sectarian feature – rather it is a clarifying hermeneutical action.¹⁷ Sometimes the changes and omissions reflect theological ideas,¹⁸ for instance, the reluctance to use the *tetragrammaton*, which is always avoided in 4QMMT.

The use of an introductory formula reveals a certain level of authorial intention in the use of a source text; therefore, in an explicit quotation the changes made by the later author/redactor to the source text are most likely purpose-oriented and reflect the author/redactor's hermeneutical agenda. In sum, even citations introduced by the *כתוב*-formula may contain exegetical modifications,¹⁹ and one could define them as explicit, intentional, and interpretative quotations, where citation of the source text and its interpretation are intertwined. 4QMMT is not an exegetical text in the narrow sense of the word; especially if the pesharim are understood to be the model of

¹⁷ This could be compared with the use of Scripture in the inner-biblical exegesis, where scriptural passages are combined in order to achieve the desired interpretation; see for instance Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 116-117; 188-197; 216-220; 228-230; 247-252.

¹⁸ There are also non-sectarian, "theologically motivated intentional variants" in the scriptural texts, as is pointed out by Eugene Ulrich in his article "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as a Book*, 179-195, esp. pages 182-183.

¹⁹ Some of the quotations of Scripture in 4QMMT have undergone what Brooke calls "exegetical changes", such as "abbreviation, reordering, idiomatic adjustment, harmonistic juxtaposition, and avoidance of the divine name." Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 79.

the exegetical genre. Instead of separating scriptural quotations and their interpretation (cf. the pesharim), it is suggested that in 4QMMT the specific and selective way of citing – introduced by using the כְּתוּב-formula – is an exegetical measure. Furthermore, the combination, juxtaposition, and conflation of quotations with other quotations, scriptural allusions, and paraphrases seem to function interpretatively. Through a conjunction of scriptural citations, passages, names, historical references and specific scriptural vocabulary the author/redactor creates a new meaning and interpretation that is building on the original, yet becomes something more in its new context. Moreover, the structure of the composition can be used to serve the author/redactor's interpretative purpose.²⁰

Devorah Dimant has attempted to distinguish between the different ways Scripture is used in the Qumran texts. She lays out three basic categories of the way Scripture has influenced Qumran compositions: the literary, the ideological, and the exegetical. She has pointed out that

biblical expressions, phraseology, style, literary forms and genres can also be used without a conscious exegetical purpose. ... The influence in the exegetical field differs from the previous ones in that it implies a conscious exegetical attitude and activity, and is crystallized in hermeneutic rules, exegetical devices and corresponding literary forms and genres.²¹

It is a worthwhile effort to try to determine the authorial intention and to define a set of exegetical methods and the existence of clear exegetical genres, but the enterprise of scriptural interpretation in the Qumran corpus is not restricted to the genre of pesharim. This is implied by Dimant, who only focuses on the pesharim in her chapter on the exegetical literature of Qumran. However, the Qumran corpus contains other, more subtle ways of interpretation than those of the pesharim, comparable with inner-biblical exegesis. Brooke has presented a fivefold classification of scriptural interpretation found in

²⁰ Fishbane, "Use, Authority, and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. Mulder; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988) 357-359.

²¹ Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Ed. M. Stone; Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984) 503-514.

the texts found at Qumran: 1) prophetic interpretation, with pesharim as the clearest example; 2) legal interpretation; 3) narrative interpretation; 4) exhortatory or homiletic (paraenetic) interpretation; and 5) poetic or hymnic interpretation, the characteristic of which is the anthological style.²² Whereas the halakhic section of 4QMMT fits nicely into the category of legal interpretation, the epilogue, on the other hand, seems to represent exhortatory (or paraenetic) interpretation.

In addition to the observations made above, it is important to recognize that the use of previous or pre-existent literature by a subsequent author/redactor always involves an interpretive act. Interpretation, therefore, is a broad category with several aspects:

Der Begriff Auslegung kann dabei nicht eng begrenzt werden. Er umfasst sowohl die Überlieferung dieser Texte wie die Berufung auf sie in der Form der Zitierung, Deutung, Übersetzung, Ergänzung oder auch Fortschreibung.²³

It could be, and has been, argued that virtually all of the texts from Qumran are exegetical in the sense that they all are in some way based on Scripture. In the Qumran corpus virtually every text cites, reuses and alludes to Scripture through its phrasing, style, forms, and characters. The language of 4QMMT is saturated with scriptural phrases and expressions as a result of the author/redactor's thorough familiarity with the Scripture. It is not always easy to distinguish between a citation, a pseudo-citation, or a paraphrase, even when an introductory formula is used, since the scriptural phrase can be modified or abbreviated. The relation with the source text becomes even more complicated when there are no quotation formulae in the text, as in the case of allusions.

It is possible, and even likely, that the ancient author/redactor did not always use scriptural language consciously. It is difficult from a modern perspective to determine the level of intentionality of ancient author/redactor in his use of the source texts.²⁴ Their familiarity with

²² Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: IES/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000) 60-73.

²³ Hengel, "'Schriftauslegung' und 'Schriftwerdung'," 2.

²⁴ In his article, Bernstein points out several times how the language, vocabulary, and theological frame of reference of 4QMMT are dependent on the scriptural source. Bernstein points out how the language of 4QMMT owes a good deal to

scriptural texts would make it only natural for them to use scriptural terminology and expressions as the “building blocks” for their later compositions.²⁵

Although it is helpful, for the sake of methodological and terminological clarity, to make a distinction between allusions and explicit citations, it is nevertheless clear that the use of Scripture either as a verbatim quotation or merely an echo reveals a strong orientation towards intertextuality. The basic idea of intertextuality is that of dialogue: all texts are in dialogue both on a horizontal level between the author or the writing subject and the addressee or an ideal reader. On the other hand, on a vertical level they relate to other, exterior texts and with the surrounding culture and context.²⁶ According to Sanders, “all Early Jewish literature was largely written scripturally, that is, intertextually.”²⁷ It grows from earlier, authoritative literature and is dependent on it in a variety of ways. Furthermore, later compositions are in a sense always interpretations and reflections of the

biblical Hebrew, but whether the employment of scriptural language in the *legal section* of 4QMMT is “to be understood as biblical exegesis in those passages where the law seems to be related to a biblical passage, or whether it is merely the stylistic employment or imitation of convenient terminology, without regard to the derivation of the law”, is still an open question for him. Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 33.

²⁵ In the Community Rule, for instance, according to Metso, the isolated explicit quotations are introduced by specific formulae, in contrast to the scripturally saturated text used more or less inadvertently. Metso, “Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule,” in *The Bible as a Book*, 81-92.

²⁶ The term intertextuality was first introduced by Julia Kristeva in an essay on Mihail Bakhtin: “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” in *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (“Le mot, le dialogue et le roman” 1969; Transl. by T. Gora, A. Jardine and L. S. Roudiez; New York: Columbia University Press, 1980) 64-91. In current literary critical theory the term as a theoretical concept and a methodological tool is used in several ways, therefore some scholars have suggested that one should actually speak of ‘intertextualities’, cf. Owen Miller, “Intertextual Identities,” in *Identity of the Literary Text* (ed. M. J. Valdés and O. Miller; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985) 19.

²⁷ Intertextuality is used here in the sense that “all literature is made up of previous literature and reflects the earlier through citation, allusion, use of phrases and paraphrases of older literature to create newer literature, reference to earlier literary episodes, even echoes of earlier familiar literature in construction of the later”. Sanders further lists seven modes of this type of intertextuality: 1) citation with formula; 2) citation without formula; 3) weaving of scriptural passages into a newer composition; 4) paraphrasing Scripture passages; 5) reflection of the structure of a Scripture passage; 6) allusions to Scriptural persons, episodes, or events; and 7) echoes of Scripture passages in the later composition. J. Sanders, “Canon as Dialogue,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P. W. Flint; SDSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 17-19.

earlier material. By using a quotation formula, the author/redactor is explicitly indicating his dependence on an earlier, possibly authoritative text.²⁸ When no introductory formulae are used, and scriptural passages are merely alluded to, it is more difficult to determine the level of intention, since intertextuality can also occur independently of the author/redactor's intentions.

The significance of the intentional allusions lies in the fact that the author/redactor assumes that the readers will recognize the original sources and relate their meaning to the new context. By using allusions, the author/redactor assumes a certain level of awareness or knowledge of a common heritage in the readers. Without this awareness the allusions lose their significance. From the author/redactor's point of view it is, strictly speaking, only the intentional allusions that bear significance for the meaning of the text. Obviously, in most cases the modern readers of an ancient text have no possibility to distinguish the intentionality of allusions, and so their interpretation always partly belongs to the realm of subjectivity.

There are – at least – two problems in the decision to take the allusions into consideration for the analysis of the contents and significance of the text. Firstly, there is a danger in identifying the allusions, since it is difficult to know with certainty whether a particular scriptural passage underlies the text under examination. Secondly, there is the difficulty of defining whether the author/redactor is using the allusions deliberately or whether their appearance or occurrence in the text is accidental or inadvertent, resulting from a subconscious familiarity with a certain set of texts or expressions.

For those interested in intertextuality, the main question is not necessarily the authorial intention, or whether a subtext is used inadvertently. Rather, the starting point is the observation made by the reader of the coexistence a subtext(s)²⁹ in the text under considera-

²⁸ Interpretation and rewriting both indicate the (growing) authoritative status of the source text, but furthermore, these processes also contribute to the increasing authoritativeness of the source used. See Brooke, "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 Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Dimant and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 85-104.

²⁹ Sometimes also called the intertext(s).

tion.³⁰ The concept of intertextuality includes the reader as a participant within the hermeneutical process. For a ‘legitimate’ reading of a text it is not just the hermeneutical agenda of the ancient author that is relevant. Other aspects brought in by the reader to the interpretative process are equally important. The object of the investigation is how other ‘texts’, such as literary subtexts, the cultural context, and the reader come together to create new meanings.

In the definition by Gerard Genette, intertextuality functions as a subcategory of a broader term *transtextuality* corresponding to Julia Kristeva’s intertextuality. He listed five subtypes of transtextuality: *intertextuality*: quotation, plagiarism, allusion; *paratextuality*: the relation between a text and its ‘paratext’ such as titles, headings, prefaces, epigraphs, etc.; *architextuality*: designation of a text as part of a genre or genres; *metatextuality*: explicit or implicit critical commentary of one text on another text; *hypertextuality*: the relation between a text and a preceding ‘hypotext’ – a text or genre on which it is based but which it transforms, modifies, elaborates or extends.³¹ In Genette’s definition, intertextuality refers to “the effective co-presence” of two or several texts in a later text that is demonstrated by quotation, plagiarism, and allusion. With plagiarism Genette refers to word-for-word quotations that are not formally identified with quotation marks or other appropriate formulae. Allusions are fragmentary reflections that the reader only recognizes and understands if he/she is familiar with the subtext(s).

One can rather safely assume that the author(s)/redactor(s) of the texts preserved in the Qumran library were very familiar with the Scriptures. When it comes to the supposed addressee or audience, it needs to be acknowledged that the text might have had different audiences, both literate and illiterate, during the history of its transmission, transcription, and preservation. Other learned individuals could have studied these texts, or they could have been read and taught to

³⁰ For a very helpful overview of the questions and methods of intertextuality (in Finnish), see Makkonen, “Onko intertekstuaalisuudella mitään rajaa?” in *Intertekstuaalisuus: Suuntia ja sovelluksia* (ed. A. Viikari; Tietolipas 121; Helsinki: SKS, 1991) 9-30.

³¹ See Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in Second Degree* (transl. by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997). The creative use of structure in 4QMMT, and the way how the author/redactor of 4QMMT adjusted and modified the scriptural models, could be defined as hypertextuality in Genette’s definition.

people who did not have any scholarly training. Therefore one can only offer hypotheses of this individual/group and his/their knowledge of the Scripture.³² One possible clue for the present case could be the phrase of the epilogue "... for we have seen that you have intellect and knowledge of the Torah" (4Q398 14-17 ii,3-4), which is possibly a reference to the initial addressee of 4QMMT.

While acknowledging the pitfalls of subjectivity, it is presumed that in addition to the explicit quotations, allusions to Scripture, scriptural characters, and vocabulary that are identifiable in the following *close reading* were recognizable by the postulated ancient audience(s). Therefore all these references provide further keys for unraveling the message of the text and understanding the theology of the epilogue. Obviously, no ancient *or* modern reader ever meets the standard of the *ideal reader*, the imaginary audience that would completely understand every phrase, reference, and allusion in a text as intended by the author, and respond according to the author/redactor's wishes.

The use of Scriptural vocabulary, characters, quotations etc. reflects the process in which "Early Judaism was in constant dialogue with its past and for the most part re-signified or re-conceptualized its past in doing so."³³ This is especially true within a group responsible for the authoring of 4QMMT, which was not only re-signifying the past but also trying to define its own identity within Judaism and the traditions of its time. This was accomplished through a creative hermeneutical process, interpreting those texts the author/redactor of 4QMMT considered holy or authoritative.

5.2. ANALYSIS OF THE PASSAGES

One of the problems in trying to understand the function and meaning of the epilogue is that we have no material evidence for the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue. Without a material reconstruction it is impossible to tell how much text is missing be-

³² Cf. J. Sanders, "Canon as Dialogue," 19. "The most obvious constraint on a speaker or writer who echoes Scripture in these matters is the factor of recognizability; the community addressed would have to be able to recognize that the paraphrase or echo was indeed from Scripture for the reference to have authority."

³³ J. Sanders, "Canon as Dialogue," 18.

tween the halakhic section and the epilogue. The disagreement over the placement of fragments 4Q398 11-13 has further contributed to this confusion. I prefer and follow the placement proposed by Strugnell and Stegemann, and, accordingly, fragments 4Q398 11-13 make up the first extant section of the epilogue.³⁴

In my analysis of the use of Scripture in the epilogue, I will use the MT as the main source of comparison. It is necessary to stress, however, that this is merely a practical approach, and it does not assume any priority of the MT (or proto-MT) as a source text of the author/redactor of the epilogue. Other known text forms of the Scripture will be discussed when they provide additional information.³⁵

As was demonstrated in Chapter 3, the structure of 4QMMT is an adjustment of the covenantal pattern (*Bundesformular*) known from the legal and treaty texts of the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East. In the epilogue, the blessings and the curses, the guarantee for the covenantal obligation, are woven together with paraenetic material in a manner similar to some later scriptural passages representing covenantal theology and adapting the covenant form.³⁶ Although the term covenant is nowhere explicitly mentioned, it seems that covenantal faithfulness becomes one of the main themes of the epilogue as the author/redactor further develops the covenantal theology derivable from the quoted scriptural passages.

³⁴ For a more detailed discussion see Chapter 2.

³⁵ The following editions have been used: A. von Gall, *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Biblia Hebraica; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1918); P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4: IV. Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts. With a contribution by P. J. Parsons* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992); E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4: IX. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); J. W. Wevers, *Deuteronomium. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum; Vol. III,2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1977).

³⁶ Veijola, "Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium," in *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000) 153-175.

was delivered from troubles. And they were the see[ke]rs of the Torah.

Analysis of the passage

This passage does not contain any explicit scriptural quotations. Nevertheless, the vocabulary echoes scriptural phrases, and the passage contains several references to biblical characters, and historical events.

The reference to history and to the kings is no doubt a deliberate attempt to recall certain historical events and persons in order to create the right state of mind and spiritual awareness for the paranaesis and the exhortation to follow the correct interpretation of the law. The passage reflects a self-critical understanding of history that was born out of disappointment and frustration at the expiration of the Davidic monarchy, the destruction of the first Temple, and the exile. This understanding of history proved to be adaptable in successive times of crisis.³⁷ Furthermore, an acute historical crisis creates a need for education, and instruction. It seems that the author/redactor of 4QMMT experienced the time he was living in as a period of crisis or as a turning point of history. By using the historical allusions he wants to arouse in the addressee an awareness of the seriousness of the situation through an exhortation to “remember the kings of Israel and contemplate their deeds.”

Even though the beginning of this passage is fragmentary, it is possible that the author/redactor is referring to the righteous king Solomon as a source of divine blessings,³⁸ and the (end of the) golden era of Israelite history. The following pair of names, “Jero-boam son of Nebat” יְרוּבְעָם בֶּן נְבַט (1K 11:26; 2Chron 9:29; 13:6) and “Zedekiah, king of Judah” וְצִדְקִיָּה מֶלֶךְ [הַיְהוּדָה] (2K 24:17-20; 2Chron 36:11; Jer 27:12; 52:1-11) on the other hand, describes another, negative period of the history. This period is seen as the decline beginning with the end of the united monarchy, and the

³⁷ Hengel, “‘Schriftauslegung’ und ‘Scriptwerdung,’” 46.

³⁸ The reconstruction of the first line by the editors would support this interpretation; see line *DJD X C18* in their composite text, *DJD X*, 60. However, in the Deuteronomistic history (DtrG) – and similarly in Ben Sira, in the Praise of the Fathers (44-50) – Solomon does not receive a solely positive evaluation. It is only in the Chronicles that he is revered as the perfect and blameless king, since he was the one who established the cult by building the Temple.

“sin of Jeroboam”, the king of the northern kingdom,³⁹ and ending in the disaster of the southern kingdom and exile during Zedekiah’s reign. Therefore, the kings mentioned do not serve solely as a positive role model, but as examples of two alternative ways of responding to God’s will and the requirements of the Torah. For the addressee or the reader there are two alternatives: obedience that brings scriptural blessings, or disobedience that has, from a historical standpoint, resulted in national catastrophe.⁴⁰

It has often been proposed that the kings mentioned in the epilogue suggest that the addressee of this document was a political and religious leader, possibly even one of the Hasmonean kings or high priests.⁴¹ Nevertheless, it has also been pointed out that the document lacks the formal features typical of a personal letter.⁴² It does not seem necessary to postulate a royal addressee merely because the kings are mentioned as prototypical examples of both rewarded and sanctioned behavior in a hortatory context.⁴³ One of the main themes or subjects of the epilogue is repentance and covenantal faithfulness. The historical persons and events are used to highlight this particular theological emphasis of the author/redactor. The kings and the consequences of their actions reflected by historical events are used to

³⁹ The kingship of Jeroboam as a period of curses in the epilogue reflects the interpretation of history by the Deuteronomistic history (DtrG), where the “sin of Jeroboam” was to build local sanctuaries in Bethel and Dan, an act of apostasy against the program of cultic centralization. Furthermore, the period of the divided monarchy in its entirety was seen as a period of apostasy. See, for instance Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (SBLStBI; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003) 295-296. The interpretation of the authors of 4QMMT can be compared with Ben Sira’s teaching. In the Praise of the Fathers, Jeroboam, the son of Nebat is described as the sinner who made the people fall, resulting to expulsion, Sir 47:23b-25.

⁴⁰ Brooke, “The kings seem to be used in two complementary ways in the closing section of 4QMMT: they provide examples of how behaviour leads to real blessings and curses, and as such they may form the basis of an exhortation for repentance which leads to divine forgiveness.” Brooke, “The Significance of the Kings in 4QMMT,” in *Qumran Cave Four: Special Report*, 109-113.

⁴¹ See, for instance, Schiffman, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 48.

⁴² DJD X, 113; Strugnell, Appendix 3 in *DJD X*, 204. See also Chapter 4.

⁴³ Brooke, “The Significance of the Kings in 4QMMT,” 110. In his article Brooke shows several examples of texts where royal figures are used as role models or means of justification for certain ideas. See also Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” 130-131. The references to the kings in the epilogue of 4QMMT are reminiscent of the inner-biblical typological exegesis described by Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 350-379.

convince the reader of the importance of covenantal obedience. In another passage, David is referred to as a role model and as a righteous and pious man who is faithful to the Law and covenant (4Q398 14-17 ii,1):⁴⁴

זכור [את] ד[ו]ן שְׁהִיָּא אִישׁ חֲסִדִים

The priests and Aaron referred to in the halakhic section are not mentioned in the epilogue. In the halakhic section, with its emphasis on the Temple and ritual purity, the focus on the priests was predictable and self-evident, since it was the priests' responsibility to maintain ritual purity and the purity of the Temple. In the epilogue, the kings offer a model for (individual) responsibility and right observance of the Law, and the focus is no longer limited to the correct behavior of the inner circle of cultic personnel. Whatever the original *Sitz im Leben* of the document, the hortatory material was adaptable to a wide variety of settings. The entirety of Israel is addressed; the need for repentance and contemplation of the Law is not bound to a specific time and place.

On line 4 of the epilogue the כְּתוּב formula does not introduce a quotation; instead, it precedes a "summary statement."⁴⁵ Not only the foundations of the Law, but also the consequences of obedience or disobedience, the blessings and the curses, are written and predicted in "Sefer Moshe". The blessings and curses, וְהַקְלִלוֹת הַבְּרִכוֹת, are referred to several times in the epilogue. In biblical legal collections, the blessings and curses function as an affirmation of covenantal obligations. The blessings and in particular the curses serve in covenantal formulae as sanctions assuring loyalty to the covenant. Keeping the covenantal stipulations will provide life and divine protection whereas violation of the law results in death (Deut 30:19). The read-

⁴⁴ The use of חֲסִדִים in the plural is slightly peculiar. García Martínez – Tigchelaar translate the passage: "Remember David, who was a man of the pious ones..." (García Martínez – Tigchelaar, *The DSS Study Edition*, 803). The editors translate their *DJD X* composite text: "Think of David who was a man of righteous deeds..." (*DJD X*, 63). In 1 Macc 2:42 the "synagogue of hasidim" are those who had remained faithful to the Law. In 1 Macc the law and the covenant are virtually identical, cf. 1 Macc 2:27. See also Hengel, "'Schriftauslegung' und 'Schriftwerdung'," 45. Bernstein refers further to 2 Sam 7:15; Isa 55:3; Ps 89:50; 2 Chron 6:42 as the source texts for the theological frame of reference of this allusion. Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 35.

⁴⁵ Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 78

ers of the epilogue are encouraged to recall and reflect upon familiar historical events and to accept the reality of the blessings and the curses. The addressees are exhorted to return to the Torah and to the covenant thereby indicating that repentance is still possible.⁴⁶

When compared with other Qumran texts, the phrase “to return to the Torah” echoes passages describing the entrance into or admission to the covenant community in CD and in 1QS.⁴⁷ Entering the covenant community is described as a return to the Torah of Moses, and as an act of repentance, which echoes Deuteronomic language. In CD, the community refers to itself as those who enter or have entered the covenant, for instance in CD XV, 8b-10⁴⁸ (see also XV,12; XVI,1-2; 4-5):⁴⁹

XV:8 יפקדוהו בשבועת הברית אשר כרת
 XV:9 משה עם ישראל את הברית לש[וב] אל תורת משה
 בבכל לב ו[ב]כ[ל]
 XV:10a נפש

...they shall muster him with the oath of the covenant which Moses made with Israel, the covenant to *re[turn] to the Torah of Moses* with all one's heart and [with] al[*I*] one's soul...

In the Liturgical Section of 1QS (I,16-III,12), there are three covenantal rituals described: in 1QS I, 16-II, 18 *The Ceremony of Entry into the Covenant*, in 1QS II, 19-25a *A Rite for the Annual Renewal of the Covenant*,⁵⁰ and in 1QS II, 25b-III, 12 we find a passage con-

⁴⁶ The possibility of repentance and return appears to be in contrast with the generally assumed deterministic theology of the specifically Qumranic or sectarian texts; a trait assigned to the Essenes by Josephus; see, for instance, VanderKam – Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 242-244.

⁴⁷ For the centrality of the concept of covenant in the Qumran literature, see, for instance, Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarrians,” in *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. S. E. Porter and J. C. R. de Roo; JSJSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 81-97; Talmon, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant,” 3-24; VanderKam, “Covenant,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 151-155; VanderKam – Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 262-263.

⁴⁸ This passage belongs to the stratum of the laws containing community organization; Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 73-90.

⁴⁹ Text and translation by Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 74.

⁵⁰ The annual renewal of the covenant ceremony of the *Yahad* essentially follows the biblical covenantal formula of renewing the covenant with God, see 1QS II, 19-25 (4Q256, 1-4; 4Q257 1.I, 5Q11 1.I-II), Curse text 4Q280, Berakhot^{a-c} (4Q286-290).

demning those who refuse to enter the covenant. The process of entering the community is described in 1QS V, 7b-20a as admission into the covenant by swearing an oath.⁵¹ This passage has lexical similarities with the epilogue of 4QMMT, Deuteronomy, and CD:

וִיקָם עַל נַפְשׁוֹ בַּשְּׁבוּעָה אֲסָר לָשׁוּב אֶל תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה
 כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה בְּכֹל
 לֵב וּבְכֹל נַפְשׁוֹ v:8b

He shall take upon himself a binding oath *to return to the Torah of Moses* [according to all that he has commanded]⁵² with all his heart and all (his) soul...(1QS V:8-9)

Repentance was understood as an entrance requirement for the Qumran community in 1QS II, 25-III,4; V, 1, 14. However, initiation into the community involves not only moral repentance, but ritual purification as well, since in 1QS sin and impurity are combined into a single conception of defilement.⁵³

In both CD and 1QS, the community refers to itself as those who enter or have entered the covenant. In CD it is emphasized that the covenant is the same as the one made with the ancestors and that this covenant will last forever. Whereas CD stresses the continuity with the covenant of the ancestors, and the one made at Sinai, this feature

⁵¹ This passage of 1QS has parallels in the MSS 4QS^b IX, 6b-13 / 4QS^d I, 5b-13. In these parallel passages, however, the references to the covenant are missing. Palaeographically, 4QS^b and 4QS^d are younger MSS than 1QS, written in the last third of 1st century BCE; see Alexander – Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad*, 45, 89. However, according to Metso, MSS 4QS^{b,d} preserve a more original form of the text, and in these manuscripts the additions strengthening the self-understanding of the community are absent – the terms בְּרִית and יְהוָה, for example, occur in the later text form preserved in 1QS more often than in 4QS^{b,d}. According to Metso, a comparison between the versions of 4QS^b, 4QS^d and 1QS reveals a process of redaction, the purpose of which was to strengthen the self-understanding of the community and to emphasize its role as the true keeper of the covenant. Several of the editorial changes involve terms related to community organization, and the words absent from 4QS^{b,d} but added in 1QS demonstrate the theological significance attached to the terms. Metso, “Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement,” *RevQ* 20/79 (2002): 435-436; 441.

⁵² The passage inside the brackets is missing from MSS 4QS^{b,d}.

⁵³ Cf. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*, 216; García Martínez, “The Problem of Purity: The Qumran Solution,” 153.

is lacking in 1QS.⁵⁴ The term “Renewed Covenant,” or the “New Covenant in the land of Damascus” **הברית החדשה בארץ דמשק** (CD VI, 19; VIII, 21) is unique to CD and is the a technical term derived from Jer 31:31 (a *hapax legomenon* in BH).

The covenant is nowhere explicitly mentioned in 4QMMT, but the covenantal structure of the text and the references to blessings and curses do reflect *covenantal theology*. As already discussed in Chapter 3, the calendar in CD, 1QS and in Jubilees⁵⁵ is a significant component of the covenantal relationship; the correct observance of law also includes the calendrical issues. The significance of the calendar to the covenantal relationship could explain the attachment of the calendar section to the beginning of MS 4Q394. However, there is nothing in the epilogue of 4QMMT comparable with the particularistic understanding of the covenant as presented in 1QS or CD.

The term **אחרית הימים** appears several times in the Qumran texts,⁵⁶ and almost always in connection with scriptural interpretation.⁵⁷ In the epilogue the phrase is fully preserved twice, and both of these occurrences appear together with a reference to the blessings and curses. The first reference is found in the beginning of the composite text, in lines C3-5 (4Q398 11-13, 3-5):

3 ו[אנחנו מכירים שבאוו מקצ]ת[ה] הברכות והקללות

4 [ש]כתוב בס[פר מו]שה וזה הוא אחרית הימים שישובו בישראל

5 לת[ורה]

⁵⁴ According to Christiansen, this indicates that “a change from ethnic to a particularistic identity has been made, that self-understanding in the community behind 1QS is more exclusive than in CD.” Christiansen, “The Consciousness of Belonging to God’s Covenant and What it Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: SAP, 1998) 86.

Another point of difference between CD and 1QS, according to Metso, is that in CD one does not find the kind of attributes attached to the term **ברית** which would directly identify the *Yahad* community with the covenant, Metso, “Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement,” 435.

⁵⁵ VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, 28.

⁵⁶ All occurrences of the term in the Qumran writings are analysed by Annette Steudel, “**אחרית הימים** in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225-231. According to Steudel all occurrences of **אחרית הימים** in the Qumran corpus are found in texts she defines as “original Qumran texts,” the only possible exception being 4QDibHam^a (4Q504).

The second fully preserved reference is found in the composite text lines C20-21 (4Q397 / 4Q398)

20 [ו]היא 21 כי [יבו]א עלי[כה כו]ל הדבר[ים] האלה
בא[חרית] הימים הברכה [ו]הקלה

Only the first part of the expression is preserved in a broken context in the composite text line C22 (4Q397 / 4Q398):

22 ושבתה אלו בכל לבבכה ו[בכו]ל נפשכה באחרית []

A similar expression באחרית העת is used once in the epilogue: 4Q398 14-17, ii, line 6 (in the composite text line C30)

בשל שתשמח באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו כן

It has been suggested that the expression אחרית הימים is infused with eschatological meaning in the Qumranic writings.⁵⁸ However, eschatological references are completely lacking from the halakhic section of 4QMMT. Rather, the legal portion of 4QMMT is practically oriented, dealing with problems of present interest. Therefore, an appearance of terminology with eschatological connotations in the epilogue would create some tension between the halakhic section and the epilogue. It is necessary, therefore, to take a closer look at the term אחרית הימים.

Both occurrences apparently recall three passages of Deuteronomy that are connected by their vocabulary and theological content, namely Deut 30:1-2, 31:29, and 4:29-30.⁵⁹ The first occurrence in the epilogue (composite text lines C3-5) is detached from the scriptural source text, only alluding to it; the second passage of the epilogue (composite text lines C20-21), as will be shown in more detail be-

⁵⁷ García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," 20. The only exception mentioned by García Martínez is 1QSa 1:1.

⁵⁸ Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," 231; 241-242. However, García Martínez is of the opinion that the term lacks eschatological meaning in the epilogue of 4QMMT. According to him, the presence or absence of the eschatological connotation can help us determine whether the text in which the term appears is Qumranic or pre-Qumranic. Accordingly, García Martínez considers 4QMMT as a pre-Qumranic composition; García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," 20-23.

⁵⁹ See also, Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations," 48-49.

low, cites the source text explicitly. In the second passage a quotation of Deut 31:29 is followed by a citation of Deut 30:1-2.

In lines C20-21, which includes a quotation of Deut 30:1-2, the Deuteronomic reference to the exile is replaced with a reference to **אחרית הימים**. This phrase originates either from the previously cited Deut 31:29, or, more likely, the passage is a conflation of two Deuteronomic verses, namely Deut 30:1-2 and Deut 4:30. These two passages of Deuteronomy share the terminology and the theological idea of repentance and return, the “*Umkehr*”.

The conflated quotation of Deut 30:1-2 and Deut 4:30 is linked to the preceding citation of Deut 31:29 by the use of the phrase **וּקְרָאָה** **אתכם הרעה באחרית הימים** “In time to come trouble will befall you...” shared by Deut 4:30 and 31:29. The connection between Deut 4:30 and 31:29 is further strengthened by the unique appearance of the term **אחרית הימים** which is used in Deuteronomy only in these two verses. In the Deuteronomic source text of 4QMMT the term **אחרית הימים** describes a relatively near future and lacks all eschatological connotations.⁶⁰

In lines C3-5 4QMMT, the phrase **ונהוה הוה** functions interpretatively, in a manner comparable to inner-biblical exegesis:⁶¹ “This is the significance of **אחרית הימים** that they will return in Israel to the T[orah].” Here we have the definition of the period that is in 4QMMT referred to as **אחרית הימים**: it is a time of repentance and return. The theological idea of repentance and return in the time of **אחרית הימים** in the epilogue of 4QMMT is in close proximity with the source texts of Deuteronomy where return is not just a possibility reserved for eschatological times.

In sum, the term is not used in an eschatological sense in the epilogue. The **אחרית הימים** is the time of trouble and distress, the ultimate point of historical, spiritual, or theological crisis where there is no other choice but to repent. It seems that the author/redactor of the epilogue considered his own time, the present, to be the period of

⁶⁰ Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (ATD 8,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004) 108-109.

⁶¹ For **הוה** as an interpretative term see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 44-48.

אחרית הימים.⁶² The time of *Umkehr*, repentance and return, is either now or in the very near future.

5.2.2. An Admonition to Maintain the Purity of the Cult

*Lines 12-14a in the Alternative Composite text;
4Q397 frgs. 14-21, lines 5-7 (DJD X C5-7)*

12 כי באלה [החמס והזנות אבדו] []
13 מקומות [ואף] כתו[ב בספר מושה ולו] א תביא תועבה
א[ל ביתכה כי]
14a התועבה שנואה היא []

Translation

12 for in these (matters)[...] violence and fornication [...] 13 places have been destroyed. [And also] it is writ[ten in the book of Moses: and] you shall not bring an abomination in[to your house for] 14a abomination is a hateful thing.⁶³

Analysis of the passage

The words אבדו and מקומות in the epilogue allude to Deut 12:2: אבד תאבדון את כל המקומות “You must demolish completely all the places...”⁶⁴ The passage in 4QMMT is not an explicit citation in that it lacks the כתוב formula and contains only a few words

⁶² Steudel has suggested that the term אחרית הימים is referring to the author’s time, but through an eschatological interpretation: “The present situation is described by the aid of an eschatological interpretation of different passages from Dt ... illustrating that the present time is the time of אחרית הימים to which the Scriptures refer, the time to turn back.” Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran”, 228. I agree with Steudel that the אחרית הימים most likely refers to the present, but this does not require an eschatological interpretation of the Deuteronomic passages. See also Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 50.

⁶³ See also 11QT 2:9-10.

⁶⁴ The passage is identified as an allusion to Deut 12:2 at least by Qimron (“The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text,” 58); and Bernstein (“The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 47).

of the scriptural text (depending on the reconstruction). Nor do the words *החמס והזנות*, which appear before the allusion and offer a reason for the destruction, have an explicit parallel in the scriptural source text. However, Deut 12:2 is the only passage in the Hebrew Bible where the verb *אָבַד* is used together with the word *מִקּוֹם*. In any case, the whole passage is highly intertextual, and when it is read in light of the following citations and allusions, the identification of the source text as Deut 12:2 becomes more probable.

The *כתוב*-formula “it is writ[ten in the book of Moses]” in line 13 introduces the citation of the Deuteronomic source text. The cited passage combines two sections from the source text: an explicit citation followed by an explanatory or justificatory *כִּי*-phrase, which is probably an allusion.⁶⁵ The first citation follows Deut 7:26 almost literally: *וְלֹא-תָבִיא תועֵבָה אֶל-בֵּיתְךָ* “Do not bring an abhorrent thing into your house.”⁶⁶ The explanatory *כִּי*-clause is a modification of or an allusion to Deut 12:31:

כִּי כָל-תועֵבַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר שָׂא עָשׂוּ

“because every abhorrent thing that the Lord hates they have done.”⁶⁷ The replacement of the divine name with a pronoun or a suffix is typical of the author/redactor of 4QMMT. Therefore, when Deut 12:31 is alluded to in 4QMMT, the divine name is omitted: *תועֵבַת יְהוָה* instead of *הַתועֵבָה שְׂנוֹאָה הַיְהוָה* of Deuteronomy 12.⁶⁸ In the context of the Hebrew Bible, the expression of the source text *תועֵבַת יְהוָה* occurs for the first time in Deuteronomy and it is an idiom typical of Deuteronomic language, mostly used as a polemic against idolatrous practices.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Cf. Brooke, according to whom the reconstructed *כִּי* “belongs to the scriptural passage and so should perhaps not be considered as introducing a scriptural text to justify an opinion.” Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 82.

⁶⁶ The phrase in 4QMMT is defined as a quotation of Deut 7:26 both by Brooke and Bernstein.

⁶⁷ Brooke (“The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 76; 82) sees this as a separate explanatory phrase, whereas Bernstein (“The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 47) as a continuation of the citation, “a harmonistic reading of two scriptural texts.”

⁶⁸ See also Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 82.

⁶⁹ The phrase appears in Deut 7:25; 12:31; 17:1; 18:12; 22:5; 23:19; 25:16; 27:15. See, Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 323. It is also used in Proverbs (3:22; 11:1, 20; 12:22; 15:8-9, 26; 16:5; 17:15; 20:10-23).

It is certainly not insignificant that the author/redactor of 4QMMT refers twice to Deuteronomy 12, the scriptural chapter that introduces the major cultic innovation of Deuteronomy: the centralization of the cult. In the halakhic section the formulaic command for the centralization, derived from Deuteronomy 12, was cited to justify the author/redactor's opinion concerning certain purity regulations (B27-33; 58-62).

Deuteronomy 12 is conventionally divided into four passages (verses 2-7; 8-12; 13-19; 20-28) and a concluding paragraph (verses 29-31).⁷⁰ The allusions of the epilogue derived from Deuteronomy 12 originate from passages that make up the late frame of the chapter, namely Deut 12:2-7 and Deut 12:29-31.⁷¹ These passages clearly share a common interest. Whereas the main concern in the older redactional layers of Deuteronomy 12 is cultic centralization and cultic unity, in these sections the focus is shifted from cultic unity (*Kultuseinheit*) to cultic purity (*Kultusreinheit*).⁷²

The Deuteronomistic redactors address Canaanite cultic practices, and aggressively command the total destruction of their cultic places. This hostile attitude becomes understandable, once it is realized that these foreign practices were a part of the worship of Yahweh⁷³ and the real concern of the authors of Deuteronomy is the purity of the Israelite cult. Laws presented in 12:2-7 and 12:29-31, respectively,

⁷⁰ See, for instance, von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium* (ATD 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1983) 63; Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (NCBC; Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan&Scott, 1987) 220-222; Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*, 23; Rose, *5. Mose. Mose 12-25. Einführung und Gesetze* (ZBK AT, 5.1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1992) 11.

⁷¹ According at least to Rose, Levinson, and Veijola Deut 12:2-7 and 12:29-31 originate from the same redactor, and make up the latest redactional layer of Deuteronomy 12. According to Braulik, (*Deuteronomium 1-16,17*. [NEB 15; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986] 93) the latest frame includes only verses 12:2-3; 29-31. Veijola labels the redactor of this late layer DtrB, whose characteristics are the inconsistent use of the numerus (*Numeruswechsel*) and the application of the covenantal formula (*Bundesformular*); Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 153-175, esp. pages 164-166.

⁷² See also Aspinen, "Getting Sharper and Sharper: Comparing Deuteronomy 12-13 and 16:18-17:13," in *Houses Full of All Good Things*, 42-61, esp. pages 57, 61.

⁷³ von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium*, 66; Braulik, *Deuteronomium II* (NEB 29; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992) 94; 101, esp. page 94: "Für [Dtn] 12 gilt jetzt jede Kultstätte ausserhalb Jerusalems, auch wenn in ihr Jahwe verehrt werden sollte, als kanaänäisches Heiligtum. Deshalb bedeutet auch jeder Jahwekult ausserhalb des zentralen Kultortes Abfall zum Götzerdienst der übrigen Völker."

address issues of cultic purification and polemicize against syncretism with Canaanite practices. Yet, what is forbidden as ‘foreign’ is in fact Yahwistic, resembling “former Israelite orthodoxy.”⁷⁴

What are the ‘places,’ מְקוֹמוֹת, referred to in 4QMMT? In Deut 12:2, the word מְקוֹם is not a neutral term, but instead, refers to a cult site or altar.⁷⁵ It is possible to read this allusion as a thematic continuation of the historical references to the kings in 4Q398 frgs. 11-13 and as a historical reference to the local sanctuaries that were demolished during the Deuteronomi(sti)c reform. Also, if the reconstruction is accepted, the verb-form is changed from imperfect (in *pi.*) into perfect (in *qal*), making it a reference to a completed action in the past.⁷⁶

The original sin of the northern kingdom, namely, the setting up of local sanctuaries during the reign of Jeroboam, was characterized as a period of curses by the author/redactor of 4QMMT (MS 4Q398 frgs. 11-13), and it reflects the judgement of the rivals of Jerusalem sanctuaries. The allusion to Deut 12:2, read together with the references to cultic centralization in the halakhic section, signifies the author/redactor’s interest in both issues reflected in the source text, the purity and the unity of the cult. The purity of the cult, ‘*Kultusreinheit*’, which requires the correct praxis of the Temple, purified of all improper elements, is achieved and maintained by creating unity of the cult through extermination of all rival religious institutions. Using the German terminology referring to king Josiah’s reform: “*Kultusreinheit durch Kultuseinheit.*”

What could these rival institutions have been in the time of the author/redactor of 4QMMT? In accordance with the deuteronomi(sti)c theological idea of cultic centralization, it is tempting to suggest that the passage refers to the siege of Gerizim and the demolition of the Samaritan Temple by John Hyrcanus around or after 128 BCE (cf. Josephus, Ant. XIII, 9-10). It has also been suggested that Jubilees

⁷⁴ Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*, 148: “If these Canaanites did not exist, the authors of Deuteronomy would have found it necessary to invent them: for the prohibited practices involved ... suspiciously resemble former Israelite orthodoxy.”

⁷⁵ Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*, 31; Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 94; Tigay, *Deuteronomy* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996) 119.

⁷⁶ In addition, the *paronomasia* of the Deuteronomic source text is not used in 4QMMT.

30:2-4 reflects this event.⁷⁷ If the passage of the epilogue actually reflects John Hyrcanus's activities, the date of 4QMMT would obviously have to be reconsidered. The substantiation of this claim would, however, require further investigation which is beyond the scope of this study. It is more likely that the allusion to Deut 12:2 should be interpreted rather as a warning: if the purity of the cult is not maintained, it could lead to the destruction of the Temple, as had already happened once during the history of the nation.

In line 13, Deuteronomy 7:26 is cited. The topic in Deut 7:26 is idolatry, and *herem*, forbidden pagan objects dedicated to complete destruction. In Deut 7:26, it is prohibited to bring תועבה, foreign (Canaanite) idols, as booty to one's home after the annihilation of pagan nations; instead, everything has to be destroyed. The reason for the commandment is the danger of apostasy.

In the cited source text Deut 7:26 and in the following allusion Deut 12:31 the expression תועבה has specific references, in 7:26 to the gold and silver of the idols, objects of *herem*, and in 12:31 to sacrifice of children. The combination of these two passages extends the sense of the word: תועבה refers to everything immoral or causing moral impurity.⁷⁸

There are two basic categories of impurity derivable from the scriptural sources: ritual and moral impurity.⁷⁹ The second category, moral impurity, is described, for instance, in Leviticus 18 and 20. Moral impurity is caused by sinful actions referred to as תועבות: fornication, murder, and idolatry. These grave sins have the capacity to pollute the land and the sanctuary, ultimately leading to the expulsion of the people. Such sins require severe punishment, even the

⁷⁷ According to Josephus, in addition to the destruction of the Temple at Gerizim, John Hyrcanus conquered Idumea introducing circumcision to the people and destroyed the city of Samaria. Even though the original reasons for this appear to have been political – as was most likely the case with the centralization of the cult a few centuries earlier – a religiously unified country was achieved. See VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 27-28; Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen 1-2* (GAT 4 / 1-2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2001) 486-487; Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament Vol I: History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age* (Philadelphia/Berlin: Fortress/Walter de Gruyter, 1995) 218-219.

⁷⁸ Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1-16,17*, 67. "Ein 'Greuel' ist alles, was mit dem Wesen Jahwes oder Israels unvereinbar ist, deshalb als gefährlich erscheint und ausgestossen werden muss. Das Dtn ächtet entscheidende religiöse und soziale Verbrechen durch 'Greuel-Sprüche' (z.B. 13:15; 14:3; 18:12; 25:16)."

⁷⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 27.

death penalty.⁸⁰ The term תועבות, however, does not serve as a reference to the sources of ritual impurity.⁸¹

In the epilogue of 4QMMT the תועבה is not only referring to those individual or isolated transgressions meant by the Deuteronomic source texts. Rather, it is used an expression to cover everything morally unacceptable, abhorrent and defiling, such as the crimes that are meant by the terms החמס והזנות in the preceding line.

The term חמס, ‘violence’ or ‘injustice’, has a negative connotation in the biblical texts and refers to something that is clearly against God’s will.⁸² The terms ‘fornicate’ and ‘fornication’ are used in a figurative sense in many scriptural books to describe idolatry.⁸³ Most likely, in the epilogue ‘violence’ and ‘fornication’ are used as generalized terms referring to the impurities and wrong practices that once lead to the destruction of ‘places’, מקומות. The word pair “violence and fornication”, החמס והזנות is used in a broader, figurative sense, describing actions against God’s will. Together with the term תועבה these three expressions cover a wide range of transgressions; actions that are against God’s will and endanger the purity of the cult and the correct praxis in the Temple.

The wrong practices and the current standards of ritual purity in the Jerusalem Temple are an ‘abomination’ תועבה for the author/redactor of 4QMMT. The purity of the Temple cult and correct praxis, matters that are discussed in the legal section of 4QMMT, were of utmost importance to the author/redactor of this document, and this is reflected and stressed by the Deuteronomic verses cited in the epilogue. The wrong practices are equaled with idolatry and other grave sins.

In its original setting, Deut 7:26, ‘house’ refers to one’s home. However, in the epilogue of 4QMMT, when the quotation is read in

⁸⁰ On the other hand, a morally impure person, a sinner, was not ritually defiling; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 29.

⁸¹ See also Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 172, n. 26 and 31. “Some other sins and well as sinfulness in general are also referred to as תועבות ... Still [it is] not used with regard to the sources of ritual defilement.”

⁸² Cf., for instance, Gen 6:11; 13; Ez 7:23; 8:17; Am 3:10; Mich 6:12; Ps 11:5.

⁸³ See for example the prophetic books of Ezekiel, especially chapters 16 and 23), Hosea, and Jer 3:2,9; 13:27. In Deuteronomy the term is used three times: once in a figurative sense to describe idolatry in Deut 31:16, in Deut 22:21 the word refers to adultery, and in Deut 23:19 זונה (the fee of a prostitute) is defined as תועבה.

light of the halakhic section discussing the purity of the Temple cult, it could be understood as referring to the Temple. The identification of the 'house' with the Temple becomes even more credible when the quotation of Deut 7:26 is read as a continuation to the preceding allusion to Deut 12:2, where the word 'place' clearly denotes a cultic site. This identification is further strengthened by the following prohibition. The justification for the ruling is created with an allusion to Deut 12:31, a passage advocating the purity of the cult. Cultic purity (*Kultusreinheit*) is both the concern of our source text, Deuteronomy, and of the epilogue of 4QMMT.⁸⁴

Cultic purity is not restricted to the correct observation of ritual purity. Instead, cultic purity is about the correct implementation of the Israelite religion and the purification of the cult from all foreign and idolatrous elements. The author/redactor of 4QMMT opposes idolatry in its extended meaning, which covers all cultic misconduct and malpractice. The proper observance of cultic matters, therefore, seems to be a matter of moral impurity in 4QMMT.

The themes of the source text

Deut 12:2 – cultic purity (*Kultusreinheit*)

Deut 7:26 – idolatry, *herem*

Deut 12:31 – cultic purity (*Kultusreinheit*)

The author/redactor of the epilogue combines in a creative manner three passages of Deuteronomy that share a common idea: while seemingly opposing pagan rites, cult objects, and practices, the real concern is with the purity of the Israelite cult. The focus of the au-

⁸⁴ Interestingly, also in 11QT^a col II there are references to the demolition of the Canaanites and an allusion to Deut 7:26 in the beginning of the preserved scroll, before the legal section, which begins with the Temple Law. The first extant column of 11QT^a is the conclusion of an introduction based on Exodus 34 and Deuteronomy 7; see Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 3.

thor/redactor was correct praxis: the purity of the cult and the right interpretation and implementation of the religious law, the halakhah.

The hermeneutical goal of this passage of the epilogue is to stress the importance of the halakhah, as interpreted in the previous section. By combining the Deuteronomic phrases mentioned above the author/redactor wants to make his case clear. The cult in the Jerusalem Temple had been reformed in an earlier setting and now it needs to be reformed in the time of the author/redactor of 4QMMT. When this passage is read together with the historical references in the beginning of the epilogue, it becomes a warning to the addressee not to repeat the mistakes of the former generations.

In the scriptural source text, Deuteronomy, the verses Deut 12:2-7 and 12:29-31 are further connected with Deuteronomy 13.⁸⁵ These verses are concerned with the religious temptation of foreign gods. Cultic purity means “don’t do like the others!” The danger of imitating pagan (= wrong) worship is clearly expressed in Deut 12:30-31 and is followed by the command not to add anything to the law and not to subtract from it (13:1). In Deuteronomy 13 the author is concerned for the faithfulness to the covenant and its regulations: the Israelites are warned not to enter into an alliance with anyone who is rebelling against the sovereign, that is, against Yahweh. Importantly, the real threat is not caused by the outsiders, but the treacherous members of one’s own group or society, the traitors, especially if they are in a dominating or authoritative position.⁸⁶ It is easy to imagine a similar situation in the community where 4QMMT was authored and studied.

In 4Q397 14-21,4 we find the term **המעל**. Unfortunately the context of this word is no longer extant,⁸⁷ but its meaning is nevertheless illuminating when the expression is read together with the epilogue

⁸⁵ Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 126.

⁸⁶ Veijola summarizes the significance of the warnings in Deut 13: “Die Gefahr kommt nicht von aussen, sondern von innen, von eigenen Mitgliedern der Gemeinschaft, die in ihrer Mitte Leben, aber in Wirklichkeit geistige Outsider sind und die Integrität der Gruppenidentität durch ihre Propaganda in Frage stellen. Ihre Gefährlichkeit besteht darin, dass sie Autorität in der Gemeinschaft besitzen...” “Gleich wie die altorientalischen Staatsverträge als eine der wichtigsten Vertragsbestimmungen am Anfang der Stipulationen Bündnisse mit den Rebellen gegen den Suzerän verbieten, so warnt der Bundestheologische Verfasser in Dtn 13 nachdrücklich vor religiösen Verführern, die zum Aufstand gegen eigenen Gott aufwiegen.” Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 126; 128.

⁸⁷ Qimron and Strugnell reconstruct in DJD X, 58, on line C4, **החמ[ם] המעל**.

and the passage of 4Q397 14-21, lines 5-7 in particular. In 4QMMT, the term is used also in 4Q397 frgs. 14-21, lines 8-9.⁸⁸

וְאַתֶּם יְיָ וְדַעִים שְׁלוֹא] 8b
[י] מִצָּא בִידְנוּ מַעַל וְשִׁקֵּר וְרַעָה 9a

And you (pl.) [know that one cannot f]ind in us (= in our hands) disloyalty (= sacrilege), betrayal or evil...

It has been suggested that in the Qumran texts, the word **מעל** is a generic expression for ‘sin’.⁸⁹ In the Hebrew Bible, however, the term is most often used in connection with disloyalty towards God, and is in some cases connected with impiety and idolatry (e.g. 2 Ch 33:19, 36:14). In the biblical texts it is made clear that the sacrilege, **מעל**, requires a reparation offering (**אָשָׁם**), and in the worst case, **מעל** could result in exile (1 Ch 9:1, Dan 9:7).⁹⁰

According to Milgrom, the common denominator of all the occurrences of the term **מעל**, is that it denotes “sin against God.” “Sin against God” has two aspects: first, it can denote trespassing on the Temple sancta, which should be understood as interfering with the purity of the Sanctuary by unauthorized persons (mainly in Chronicles). And second, it can be representative of an oath violation, such as in Lev 26:39-42, where the misuse of the name of God, is seen as a violation of the covenant and a deliberate **מעל** committed against God. Both aspects have in common the offence against the Deity, and trespass against covenant, “since reverence for sancta is presumed in the covenant relationship,” offences which result in exile and national catastrophe (Lev 26:14ff.; Neh 1:5).⁹¹

In Ezra-Nehemiah (Ezra 9:2,4; 10:2,6,10; Neh 13:27) the word **מעל** refers to mixed, forbidden marriages between common Israelites and foreigners, which in itself is considered as unfaithfulness to

⁸⁸ The readings and the reconstructions of the lacunae are discussed in Chapter 2.

⁸⁹ For instance, Ringgren, **מעל**, *ThWAT* 4: 1041-1042.

⁹⁰ E.g. Lev 5:21; Num 5:6; 31:16; Ez 14:13; 15:8; 20:27; 2 Ch 28:19; 28:22; 36:16; Jos 22:16. In Jos 7:1; 22:20 it refers to a theft of objects dedicated as *herem*, and therefore belonging to Yahweh, in Lev 5:15 to a tampering with gifts consecrated to Yahweh. Exceptions are Num 5: 12, 5: 27, where it is referring to marital infidelity, and Job 21:34.

⁹¹ Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience: The ASHAM and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance* (Leiden: Brill, 1976).

God, and treated as an “illegitimate profanation of holiness”.⁹² One reason for the strict marital regulations advocated by the authors of Ezra-Nehemiah was the need to strengthen the community. Furthermore, intermarriage was a dangerous practice leading to apostasy, and therefore needed to be put to an end. The connection between intermarriage and apostasy is made in, for instance, Ex 34:16 and Deut 7:4. The halakhic section of 4QMMT also includes regulations on marriages.⁹³ In the epilogue, however, the term *מעל* is more likely used in a general sense, as a term comparable with *שקר ורעה* “betrayal or evil”; all three terms denoting a failure to correctly follow the law, reverence for purity regulations and holiness, and covenantal faithfulness. This term with all its connotations would therefore suit the general covenantal language of the epilogue of 4QMMT.

The generalized references in the epilogue to moral impurity remind one of the three nets of Belial mentioned in CD IV,12-V,11. Interestingly, in CD, as well as in 1QS, the section of admonitions, with the more general references to the sins of the people, is placed before the laws, whereas in 4QMMT the order is the opposite, following the structure of biblical legal texts.⁹⁴ In the epilogue of 4QMMT the author/redactor uses references to history, scriptural language and terminology to convince the reader of the importance of their opinions and halakhic interpretations. The cult of the Jerusalem Temple has to be ‘reformed’ in order to maintain the purity of the Temple. The purpose of this ‘reformation’ is to protect the covenantal relationship with Yahweh. The allusions and citations point to a similar cultic reformation that, according to the writers of Deuter-

⁹² Olyan, “Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a tool to Reconstitute the Community,” *JSJ* 35/1 (2004): 3; 7. According to Olyan the illegitimate profanation of sancta resulting from intermarriages between common Israelites and foreigners is even more serious than the moral impurity caused by priestly intermarriages.

⁹³ For the different interpretations of the marital laws see Chapter 3. It has been suggested by Sharp that the main focus of the *whole* 4QMMT is the concern for wrong marital practices, more specifically the intermarriages with gentiles. This seems rather unlikely to me. The halakhic section contains several laws that are not related to marital issues, and in the epilogue these are not referred to at all. See Sharp, “Phinehan Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT,” *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 207-222.

⁹⁴ According to Fraade, in the Temple Scroll, in the “law of the king” (11QT 56:12-59:21) the legal section is concluded with blessings and curses in a manner comparable to 4QMMT. Cf. Fraade, “Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat ma ‘ase ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses,” 154-155.

onomistic history, was realized once before in the history of the nation. This time, however, the regulations described in the halakhic section are to be followed.

5.2.3. A Statement about the Separation

*Lines 14b-16 in the Alternative Composite text;
4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 7-11 (DJD X C7-9)*

[14b] פִּרְשָׁנוּ מֵרֹב הָעָם
 15 [ו]מֵהִתְעַרֵּב בְּדַבְרֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וּמִלְבוֹא עֵ[מָה]ם [לְגַב אֱלֹהִים
 וְאֵתֶם י[וֹדְעִים שֶׁלֹּא]
 16 [י]מִצָּא בִידְנוּ מֵעַל וּשְׁקֵר וְרַעָה כִּי עַל [אֲנַחְנוּ
 [נֹתְנִים אֵת

Translation

14b ...]we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the pe[ople...95] 15 [and] from mingling in these matters and from participating wi[th them] in these affairs. And you k[now that one cannot] 16 [f]ind in us any disloyalty, deceit or evil, because concerning [...] we give ...[...]

Analysis of the Passage

There are no scriptural references in this passage. However, we have the well known statement often referred to in Qumran research: פִּרְשָׁנוּ מֵרֹב הָעָם [“we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people”. It is implied by the editors of *DJD X* that this phrase describes the decision by the ‘we’-group to form a separatist group, a sect.⁹⁶ In general, it is interpreted as a reference to a complete separation from the Temple worship. This separation allegedly resulted from a schism with the Temple establishment due to the

⁹⁵ The editors’ reconstruction “and from all their impurities” (וּמִכּוֹל טִמְאוֹתָם) is possible, linking the epilogue with the issues of the legal section; *DJD X*, 58.

⁹⁶ *DJD X*, 111.

differences in cultic calendar, cultic practices, standards of ritual purity, and the main differences and reasons for the separation would be the halakhic disagreements listed in the halakhic section.⁹⁷

Charlotte Hempel, who gives this passage an alternative reading: ׀ר׀ב ה׀ע׀, ⁹⁸ interprets the separation passage as a “fitting summary” of the halakhic disagreements and criticisms. I agree with Hempel, when she suggests that instead of denoting a full scale schism and creation of a sect, the phrase rather refers to a disagreement over halakhic matters.⁹⁹

It is possible to interpret this phrase as an expression of tension with another group or with Jewish society at large.¹⁰⁰ In 4QMMT there is a certain effort to make a distinction between ‘us’ versus ‘them’ detectable, but the document does not reflect an introversionist attitude. According to the author/redactor of the epilogue, someone referred to as ‘you’ can find out the will of God through intense study of the Torah. The addressee is described as someone prudent and wise: in lines C 27-28 “For we have seen that you have intellect and knowledge of the Torah”. However, he apparently has erred in some way according to the opinion of the author/redactor of 4QMMT, but it is not too late for the addressee to ask God to correct his thoughts and remove wickedness from him/them (C28-30): “Reflect on all these matters and seek from him that he would straighten your plans and remove from you evil thoughts and the counsel of

⁹⁷ The phrase ׀ר׀ב ה׀ע׀ has been translated either as the ‘multitude’ or the ‘majority’ of the people; however, most translators prefer the rendering ‘multitude’ see, for instance DJD X, 58, see also note 7; Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” 74-75. See also A. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of the Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era*, 75-76; Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 121; Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressees,” 525-526.

⁹⁸ The phrase is preserved in MS 4Q397, where the letters *waw* and *yod* can sometimes look very similar; DJD X, 21; 23.

⁹⁹ Hempel, “The Context of 4QMMT: Unassuming Assumptions,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ; Leiden, Brill, forthcoming).

¹⁰⁰ The concept of *tension* is discussed by Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta in their article “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. D. J. Chalhcraft; London: Equinox, 2008) 205-245. According to Wassen and Jokiranta, tension “does not necessarily mean an open conflict with society, or open hostility to outsiders in *all* everyday matters. Rather than attempting to reform the society using power, the Qumran movement seems to have formed an inward society where these ideals could be fulfilled. Tension is manifested in the distinctiveness of these groups in comparison to other groups.” See also Jokiranta *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim* (PhD diss., University of Helsinki, 2005).

Belial, so that at the end of time, you may rejoice in finding that *some of*¹⁰¹our words are true.”

On the other hand, it was pointed out earlier that the ‘you’ (both in singular and plural) might refer to someone belonging to the ‘we’-group. In this case it is understandable that the reader(s) and receiver(s) is (are) expected to have the capacity to make the right decisions concerning the legal interpretation and its implications. The group behind 4QMMT does, however, appear to have partly different norms and practices from some other Jewish groups, as stated in the halakhic section, and this created a need to take some distance to the wrong practices.

In the text of the epilogue, the phrase is stated after the admonition to maintain the purity of the cult. In this context, the phrase does not necessarily signify an irrevocable and irreconcilable separation from all Jews or a complete abandonment of the Temple – rather it reflects a need to take and maintain some distance from impure practices. Yet the desire to see the ‘reformation’ of the cult still remained.

In order to maintain the covenantal loyalty to Yahweh, the author/redactor of 4QMMT could not possibly support the Temple cult while it was carried out against his/their understanding of the ritual purity. The wrong ritual practices were a continuous violation of covenantal faithfulness, and the author/redactor states in the epilogue: “one cannot find in us any (covenantal) disloyalty (מעל), deceit or evil...”. Nevertheless, the emphasis of the epilogue is on the reformation of the cult rather than in a physical separation from other Jews or the Temple and a total rejection of the participation in the Temple worship. Instead, 4QMMT witnesses of an attitude where the Temple is still the centre of the religion and religious practice for the author/redactor of this document.

¹⁰¹ Ms 4Q399 has a variant, shorter reading: מדברינו.

5.2.4. *The Alleged Reference to a Tripartite Canon*

The following passage contains variant readings in the parallel manuscripts, and it is impossible to establish a composite text.

No composite text:

(4Q397 frgs. 14-21, 10-12a; 4Q398 14-17 col i, 2-4)

<p>4Q397 frgs. 14-21, lines 10-12a</p> <p>10 [כתב]וּ אֵל יִכָּה שְׁתִּבִּין בְּסֵפֶר מוֹשֶׁה וְ[ב]סֵפֶר יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּיָמֵינוּ וּבְדוֹרֵינוּ 11 [דוֹר וְדוֹר וּבְסֵפֶר בְּתוֹב] יָמֵינוּ לֹא 12 [כֹּה]</p>	<p>4Q398 frgs. 14-17, col i, 2-4</p> <p>2] נִגְמָה [] 3] וְדוֹר [] וְדוֹר [] 4] וְקִדְמוֹתֵינוּ []</p>
---	---

<p>4Q397 14-21, lines 10-12a</p> <p>10 [...we have wri]tten to you (sg) so that you would understand the Book of Mos[es and] the Book[s] of the Pro]phets and Dav[id...]</p> <p>11 [...] many generations. And in the Book it is written [...][...][...] not</p> <p>12a [...].</p>	<p>4Q398 14-17, col i, 2-4</p> <p>2 [...][...][...] ...</p> <p>3 [...and] generation[...].it is written</p> <p>4 [...to] you and anci[en]t (things)...</p>
--	--

Regarding the alleged reference to a tripartite canon¹⁰² on line 10 in MS 4Q397 I agree with Ulrich that the placement of fragment 4Q397 17, which does not contain much more than the fragmentary word]בספר[. is relatively uncertain, and therefore the reconstruction is printed in the translation with cursive (*and*) *the Book(s)*.¹⁰³ Given that the location of this fragment is possible, one should keep in mind that its location is based on an assumption of a tripartite canon, but this does not prove the existence of such a concept at the time 4QMMT was authored. In addition, both Ulrich and Kratz agree about the uncertainty of the reading of וברוי[ך].¹⁰⁴ In other words, the reading of this passage in the better preserved MS 4Q397 can be questioned.¹⁰⁵

Also the meaning and content of the references has been debated. Timothy Lim does not question the editors' reconstruction of MS 4Q397, but finds other reasons for questioning the meaning of the phrase preserved in 4QMMT as a reference to a tripartite canon. For example, with regard to the term ספר מושה Lim has approached this question by examining the use of scripture in 4QMMT, and he points out that while allusions to Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy can be found in 4QMMT, there are none to Exodus. He further investigates the use of the term ספר מושה in some other Qumran writings. It seems, that only CD is giving any proof (and only indirect) for assuming that the Qumran community used the term ספר מושה for the whole Pentateuch. He concludes by stating, that no hard evidence can be found to demonstrate that ספר מושה is referring to the whole Pentateuch, though this is a possible definition.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, Emile Puech and Kathell Berthelot have suggested that the three references could refer to three different corpora – but not necessarily to the entire Hebrew Bible and its three parts as they

¹⁰² *DJD X*, 112.

¹⁰³ Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," 209-210.

¹⁰⁴ Kratz, "Moses und die Propheten: zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C," 159.

¹⁰⁵ Puech has criticized the editors' reconstruction of these lines of MS 4Q397 and considers them too short. He reconstructs the word ושרתשמו(ו)ר in the end of line 10 and the word כול in the beginning of line 11. Puech translates: "...Et aussi] nous t' [avons écrit] que tu dois étudier (avec soin) le Livre de Moïse et les livres des [p]rophètes at (le livre) de Davi[d, et que tu dois les garder tous,] de génération en génération. Et dans le Livre, il est écrit[. Puech, "Quelques observations sur le 'canon' des 'Écrits,'" *forthcoming*.

¹⁰⁶ Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 23-37.

stand in the final form of the Jewish canon;¹⁰⁷ in the pre-canonical period this would seem to be an appropriate way to interpret these references.

Importantly, as the synoptic comparison of the manuscripts demonstrates, the parallel manuscript 4Q398 does not contain such a reference (cf. also Chapter 2). Therefore, I must disagree with the reconstruction of a composite text here, contrary to the suggestion by the editors in *DJD X*. The fragmentary reading of MS 4Q398 contains no reference to a tripartite canon.

5.2.5. *An Exhortation to Repentance and Return With a Reference to the Blessings and Curses*

The next reference to Scripture is partly preserved in MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398. The text critical difficulties of the composite text of *DJD X* have been discussed in Chapter 2.

*Lines 20-22 in the Alternative Composite text;
4Q397 frags. 14-21, lines 12-14 – 4Q398 frags. 14-17, lines 4-8
(DJD X C12-16)*

20 ואפ כתוב שת[סור] מהד[ר]ך וקרתך הרעה וכתוב [ו]היא
21 כי [יבו]א עלי[נ]כה כו[ל] הדברי[ם] האלה בא[ח]רית הימים
הברכה [ו]הקלה
22 [והשיבותה] אל ל[בב]כה ושבתה אלו בכל לבבכה
[ו]בכו[ל] נפשכה באחרית []

¹⁰⁷ Berthelot understands these as references to Deuteronomy, the books of Samuel and Kings, and the Psalms; for Puech the exact shape of the third division in particular is undefined. Berthelot, “4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, 1-14; Puech, “Quelques observations sur le ‘canon’ des ‘Écrits,’” forthcoming.

Translation

20 And also it is written that you shall [stray] from the pa[t]h and evil will encounter you. And it is written: [and] it shall happen 21 when al[l these] thing[s shall befa]ll [you at the e]nd of days, the blessing [and] the curse, 22 [then you will take it] to your he[art]¹⁰⁸ and you will return to him with all your heart and a[ll your] soul in the end[...]

Analysis of the passage

If the reconstruction and combination of the two manuscripts (4Q397 and 4Q398) is accepted, it seems that the author/redactor of the epilogue is combining two or possibly three passages from Deuteronomy and adjusting them slightly, namely Deut 31:29, and a conflation of Deut 30:1-2 and Deut 4:29-30. The citations are introduced by a quotation formula, כְּתוּב. These citations clearly belong together, and form an integrated whole, even though the empty line, *DJD X C13*, in the composite text of the editors easily obscures this connection for modern readers.

When this passage is analyzed, a danger of circular reasoning needs to be acknowledged, since the reconstruction is already based on the scriptural source text. Both citations are more or less abbreviated and modified in comparison to the MT. It is shown below by the square brackets how the author/redactor of the epilogue abbreviated the citations:

Deut 31:29:

וּסְרַתֶּם מִן־הַדֶּרֶךְ
 [אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי אֶתְכֶם]
 וּקְרָאתֶם אֶתְכֶם הַרְעָה
 [בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים]

... turning aside from the way [that I have commanded you.] [In time to come] trouble will befall you...

¹⁰⁸ NRSV: “if you call them to mind”; *DJD X*, 59 “[then you will take] it to hea[rt]”; García Martínez – Tigchelaar, 801, 803 “then you shall take it to your heart”.

Deut 30:1-2:

והיה כִּי־יִבְאוּ עֲלֶיךָ כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה הַבְּרָכָה וְהַקְּלָלָה
 [אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לִפְנֶיךָ]
 וְהִשְׁבַּת אֶל־לְבָבְךָ
 [בְּכָל־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר הִדְיָחְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׁמָּה]
 וּשְׁבַת עַד־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 [וּשְׁמַעַת בְּקִלּוֹ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי מְצַוְךָ הַיּוֹם אֶתָּה וּבְנֶיךָ]
 בְּכָל־לְבָבְךָ וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁךָ

When all these things have happened to you, the blessings and the curses [that I have set before you,] if you call them to mind [among all the nations where the LORD your God has driven you,] and return to the LORD your God, [and you and your children obey him] with all your heart and with all your soul, [just as I am commanding you today...]

Deut 30:1-2 is closely connected with Deut 4:29-30 both theologically and due to shared vocabulary, and the second quotation seems to be a conflation of these two scriptural verses.

Deut 4:29-30:

[וּבִקְשַׁתֶּם מִשָּׁם אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ וּמְצֹאתָ כִּי תִדְרָשׁוּן]
 בְּכָל־לְבָבְךָ וּבְכָל־נַפְשְׁךָ
 [בְּצַר לְךָ וּמְצָאוֹךָ]
 כָּל הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים וּשְׁבַת עַל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 [וּשְׁמַעַת בְּקִלוֹ]

[From there you will seek the LORD your God, and you will find him if you search after him] with all your heart and soul. [In your distress,]

when all these things [have happened to you] in time to come, you will return to the LORD your God [and hear his voice.]¹⁰⁹

The *Vorlage* of the LXX in Deut 30:1-2 must have had a shorter reading since the Greek text does not contain the equivalents of the expressions אלהיך and אלהיך ובניך. It is possible that the source text of the author/redactor of the epilogue represented a text form similar to the LXX *Vorlage*.

The reference בכל־הגוים אשר הדיחך יהוה אלהיך שמה to the exile in Deut 30:1-2 is omitted when the text is cited in the epilogue. Instead the epilogue refers to the אחרית הימים.¹¹⁰ This phrase was omitted from the previously cited Deut 31:29, where the scriptural phrase refers to the trouble that will befall during the אחרית הימים as a result of the sins of the people.¹¹¹ However, the following quotation is a conflation of Deut 30:1-2 and 4:29-30, and the term אחרית הימים is introduced into the quotation from Deut 4:30, a passage in which the אחרית הימים is connected with the idea of repentance and return. This is also the interpretation chosen by the author/redactor of the epilogue. For this reason the expression אחרית הימים was omitted from Deut 31:29 and, instead, the quotation was continued with a conflation of verses 4:29-30 and 30:1-2, resulting in the desired interpretation of the term (see above 5.2.1).¹¹²

The promise of return is construed in 4:30 and 30:2 in a specific way: ושבת עד־יהוה אלהיך ושמעת בקלו “and you (sg.) will return to *Yahweh, your God* and hear his voice” The construction verb שוב + preposition עד is unique and typical of only these two

¹⁰⁹ The translation follows NRSV with some modifications.

¹¹⁰ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 5; New York: Doubleday, 1991) 209. The passages Deut 4:29-30 and 30:1-2 contain a promise for the return of the people in the exile (see also 1 Kgs 8:4ff; Jer 29:12ff). “It is commonly believed that all of these passages were written under the impact of the exile of Judah which seems plausible.” Obviously, the author(s) of the epilogue of 4QMMT omitted the references to the exile, since it was not their historical context.

¹¹¹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 197-198.

¹¹² Therefore, the expression אחרית הימים in this context does indeed originate from the scriptural source text. Cf. the suggestion by Brooke that this expression seems to be one that is sometimes added to scriptural citations even when it is not in the cited source text, for instance 4Q252 4:2 (citing Deut 25:19), and Acts 2:17-21 (citing Joel 2:28-32). Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 77.

passages. Its meaning is connected with the phrase “hearing Yahweh’s voice.”¹¹³ In the epilogue of 4QMMT, in order to avoid the divine name, the author/redactor reduced the whole expression to a pronominal suffix: וּשְׁבַתָּהּ אֵלָיו “and you (sg.) will return to him...”¹¹⁴

The sentences in the 1st person singular both in Deut 31:29 and Deut 30:1-2 are omitted for the obvious reason that in the source text they are referring to Moses. In the source text of Deuteronomy the speaker in the 1st person singular is Moses. The author/redactor of 4QMMT uses the 1st person plural when they are expressing their own opinions both in the legal section and in the epilogue.

It is noteworthy that the author/redactor of 4QMMT apparently does *not* wish to make the impression that the person responsible for authoring this document is a Moses-like figure. It is not a single person, one leading figure who is responsible for the admonitions of the epilogue, rather a community, ‘we’, making correct interpretation through exegesis and meditating on the authoritative texts. The use of the first person plural in 4QMMT is yet another piece of evidence that argues against the early letter-theory and the hypothesis that this document was originally composed by the Teacher of Righteousness.¹¹⁵

In addition to the abbreviations of the source text described above there are some other alterations in comparison with the source text of Deut 31:29. Some of these are of minor importance. For instance, the scriptural form מִן-הַדְּרֹךְ is changed into a shorter form מִהַדְּרֹךְ. The variant in 4QMMT is of little significance, since it does not constitute a difference in the meaning of the sentence. In addition, if the reconstruction שֶׁהַסּוּר [סור] in the epilogue is accepted, the scriptural verb form in the 2nd person plural *qal* perf. וּסְרַתֶּם is changed into the 2nd person sg. *qal* impf. in 4QMMT. Furthermore, the scriptural 2nd person plural אִתְּכֶם is changed to a 2nd person singular suffix in

¹¹³ Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17*, 108-109.

¹¹⁴ Brooke (“The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 77) points out that “the divine name is avoided as the author reduces it to a pronominal suffix”. Apparently, the author felt that the expression וּשְׁבַתָּהּ בְּכָל־וְשֵׁם belonging together the previous sentence could be deleted as well.

¹¹⁵ Brooke suggests that 4QMMT could perhaps be understood as “the reporting of decisions perhaps taken in a council session, not unlike that in Acts 15.” This would explain the references to the 1st person plural. See Brooke, “Luke – Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT,” 82-83.

4QMMT: the reading וּקְרָאתָ אֶתְכֶם הַרְעָה of Deut 31:29 is changed into וּקְרָתְכָה הַרְעָה in 4QMMT. Notably, even the LXX has the 2nd person plural here. Therefore, it seems that the plural forms of this citation were intentionally harmonized and changed into singular forms. This was done either to create agreement with the following citation, where the 2nd person singular is used, or, as suggested by Brooke, to make it conform to the usage of the 2nd person sg. elsewhere in the epilogue.¹¹⁶

In the source text, Deut 31:29, Moses predicts how, after his death, the people will turn to wrong ways and abandon Yahweh. The verse contains a warning, anticipating the disobedience of the people. In the epilogue, and in the context of 4QMMT “turning aside from the way” can be understood as a reference to wrong halakhic practices (compare also Deut 11:26-28). The reader should take heed and follow the legal interpretation proposed by the author of 4QMMT.

The following citation is a combination of Deut 30:1-2 and 4:29-30. The blessing and curse, הַבְּרָכָה וְלִקְלָלָהּ, refers to the curses of Deuteronomy 28 and 29. The citation recalls the fact that obedience results in blessings and life, whereas disobedience brings curses. The reminder prepares the reader for the exhortation to repentance. Both scriptural passages (Deut 30:1-2 and 4:29-30) are unique to Deuteronomy in that they share both the language and the theological idea of repentance and return (‘*Umkehr*’)¹¹⁷ reflected, for instance, by the use of the verb שׁוּב.¹¹⁸ Both passages represent the Deuteronomi(sti)c theology of repentance.¹¹⁹ On the scriptural level, all three passages of the source text¹²⁰ are terminologically and ideo-

¹¹⁶ Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 77.

¹¹⁷ Braulik, *Deuteronomium II. 16,18-34,12* (NEB 16; Würzburg: Neuer Echter Verlag, 1992) 217. “Die in 4:30 und 30:1-10 hervorgehobene ‘Umkehr’ Israels, ein Zentralmotiv spät-dtr Theologie, das sich im Dtn nur an diesen beiden Stellen findet und gewissermassen das Kernstück des Buches rahmt, hat ihre Basis in Jer 31:16-21. Damit ist der Grundtext schon in der Nähe von Jer 31:31-34, dem Text vom ‘neuen Bund’, dessen Kerngedanken Dtn 30:6 aufgreift.” These are the only passages of Deuteronomy that speak of “*Umkehr*”, see Braulik, *Deuteronomium I-16,17, 45*.

¹¹⁸ Braulik, *Deuteronomium II. 16,18-34,12*, 218-219. “Dtn 30:1-10 wird, insofern es zugleich eine eigene Grösse darstellt, vor allem vom Leitwort ‘Umkehr’ (als Verb sub 1, 2, 3, 3, 8, 9, 10) geprägt.” For שׁוּב as the key term of this passage, see also Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 283.

¹¹⁹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy I-11*, 217

¹²⁰ All cited verses originate from larger textual units: Deut 30:1-2 from 30:1-10, Deut 31:29 from 31:16-29, and Deut 4:29-30 from 4:1-40.

logically connected. The verses are saturated with scriptural expressions used to render the idea of distress that will motivate repentance.¹²¹

The scriptural sequence idolatry – exile – repentance – return is modified in the epilogue of 4QMMT. The exile is replaced with a reference to אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, shifting the emphasis from distress to repentance. This shift was already indicated by the analysis of the expression אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים in 5.2.1.¹²² In 4QMMT, the scriptural source texts are modified, and the changes made by the author/redactor of the epilogue seem to be deliberate and purposeful. The source text is abbreviated and modified but more importantly, not a single major expression foreign to the source text is introduced into the citation used in 4QMMT.¹²³

The quotations are modified deliberately in order to make them serve the author/redactor's hermeneutical purpose and suit his historical situation. In this passage, it is clear how the citations of the source text and their interpretation are intertwined. The author/redactor of the epilogue combines with profound understanding theologically related passages of Deuteronomy. With hermeneutical and exegetical insight, he weaves together texts that share theological themes, ideas, and terminology. The passage is concerned with covenantal faithfulness, a source of divine blessings, even though a direct reference to the covenant both in the source texts and in the epilogue of 4QMMT is avoided— perhaps intentionally.¹²⁴ In order to avoid the dire consequences of the curses the addressee is exhorted to repent, to return, and to follow the legal interpretation presented in the halakhic section.

¹²¹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 216; 219. According to Weinfeld: "Chapters 4 and 30 as well as 31:16-29 may be seen as a kind of envelope for Deuteronomy."

¹²² According to Tigay, in Deuteronomy the repentance and return happen only after the punishment resulting from disobedience. Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 54.

¹²³ See also Brooke, "The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 77-78.

¹²⁴ For the avoidance of the explicit use of the term covenant in the cited passages of Deuteronomy, see Braulik, *Deuteronomium II*, 218-219.

5.2.6. *A Paraenetic Conclusion*
With a Reference to the Halakhic Interpretation

In the final section of the epilogue, the reader of 4QMMT is further advised to follow the halakhic interpretations of the author/redactor.

Lines 25b-32 in the Alternative Composite text;
 4Q398 14-17 ii, 1b-8 – 4Q399 (DJD X C25b-32)

25b זכור [את] ד[ו]יד שהיא איש חסדים אף
 26 היא [נצל מ]צרות רבות ונסלוח לו ואף אנחנו כתבנו אליך
 27 מקצת מעשי התורה שחשבנו לטוב לך ולעמך [ך] שראינו
 28 עמך ערמה ומדע תורה הבן בכל אלה ובקש מלפנו שי[תקן]
 29 את עצתך והרחיק ממך מחשבת רעה ועצת בליעל
 30 בשל שתשמח באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו כן
 31 ונחשבה לך לצדקה בעשותך הישר והטוב לפנינו לטוב לך
 32 vacat ולישראל

Translation

25 Remember Da[v]id, because he was a pious man [and] also 26 he [was r]escued from many troubles and he was forgiven. Also, we have written to you 27 some of the works of the Torah of which we have formed an opinion, for your (sg.) and [your (sg.)] people's¹²⁵ benefit. For we have seen 28 that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law. Study all these (matters) and seek from him that he would [straighten] 29 your plans and remove from you evil thoughts and the counsel of Belial, 30 so that at the end of time, you may rejoice in finding that *some of*¹²⁶ our words are true. 31 And it shall be reckoned to you as righteousness when you do what is right and *good*¹²⁷ before him, for your good 32 and that of Israel.

¹²⁵ לטוב לך The parallel MS 4Q399 has a shorter reading: לטוב לך ולעמך [ך].

¹²⁶ מדברינו The parallel MS 4Q399 has a shorter reading: מקצת דברינו.

¹²⁷ הישר לפנינו The parallel MS 4Q399 reads: הישר והטוב לפנינו.

Analysis of the Passage

This final passage of the epilogue has no explicit scriptural citations, but the themes and the vocabulary echo scriptural language.

In lines 27-28, the phrase “For we have seen that you have intellect and knowledge of the Law” echoes the emerging of the synthesis of wisdom and law in Deuteronomi(sti)c tradition,¹²⁸ as described in Deut 4:5-8, where the *statutes and ordinances* will make Israel known as a wise and discerning people among the nations:

See, just as the LORD my God has charged me, I now teach you (pl.) statutes and ordinances for you to observe in the land that you are about to enter and occupy. You must observe them diligently, for this will show your wisdom and discernment to the peoples, who, when they hear all these statutes, will say, “Surely this great nation is a wise and discerning people!” (For what other great nation has a god so near to it as the LORD our God is whenever we call to him?)¹²⁹ And what other great nation has statutes and ordinances as just (צַדִּיקִים) as this entire law (בְּכֹל הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת) that I am setting before you (pl.) today?

According to Veijola, the Deuteronomic passage does not signify a complete identification of law and wisdom, but it declares that the knowledge and observance of the law is a proof of Israel’s wisdom among other nations. In Deut 4:6 the references to wisdom and discernment are collective epithets, defining the whole people of Is-

Both the shorter and the longer form of the phrase הַיֵּשֶׁר וְהַטּוֹב are used interchangeably in Deuteronomy; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic School*, 335.

¹²⁸ In Deuteronomy, “the legal and sapiential traditions flow together” see Blenkinsopp, *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism* (The Oxford Bible Series; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983) 100-101. According to Veijola, the late Deuteronomistic circles were familiar with the wisdom tradition; Veijola, “Law and Wisdom: The Deuteronomistic heritage in Ben Sira’s Teaching of the Law,” in *Ancient Israel, Judaism, and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Karl-Johan Illman* (Ed. J. Neusner, A. Laato, R. Nurmela, K. G. Sandelin and A. J. Avery-Peck; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 429-448; *idem*, “Thora als Inhalt der Lehre in der deuteronomistischen Literatur,” in *Religionsunterricht und Dialog zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. R. E. Heinonen et al. Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag, 1988) 98-106.

¹²⁹ According to Veijola, verse 7 is likely a later enlargement; Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17*, 111-112; see also Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium* (HKAT I/3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923) 65.

rael.¹³⁰ It is obvious that the passage of Deuteronomy is referring to the Deuteronomic law.¹³¹ In 4QMMT, however, it is implied that the wisdom and knowledge of the Torah will lead the reader (you in sg.) to accept the author/redactor's *interpretation* of the cultic and purity laws.

The closing formula of the epilogue has several significant allusions to scriptural language (4Q398 frgs. 14-17, ii, 7-8; 4Q399):

וְנִחְשְׁבָה לְךָ לְצַדִּיקָה בַעֲשׂוֹתֶיךָ הַיָּשָׁר וְהַטּוֹב לִפְנֵי לַטּוֹב לְךָ
31
32 וְלִישְׂרָאֵל vacat

The phrase “And it shall be reckoned to you as righteousness ...” alludes to both Gen 15:6 (Abraham) and Ps 106:31 (Phinehas).¹³² The scriptural source texts used in this passage are again in accordance with the theological emphasis of the author. Gen 15:6 and Ps 106:31 are the only biblical verses that contain both the verb *חָשַׁב* and the noun *צִדִּיקָה*.¹³³ Abraham was the first patriarch to enter into a covenantal relationship with God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness. Phinehas had protected the covenantal relationship from foreign influence – illegal marital relations – leading to apostasy, and was therefore rewarded with a covenant of eternal priesthood (Num 25:7-8, 11-13). In Ps 106:31, where an expression similar to the one used in Gen 15:6 is used, through inner-biblical intertextuality or exegesis, it is implied that Phinehas' action was interpreted, like that of Abraham, as an expression of his covenant faithfulness.¹³⁴ Both Abraham and Phinehas serve as models demonstrating faithfulness to covenant obligations.¹³⁵ The allusion to Phinehas,

¹³⁰ Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17*, 111-112. According to Veijola the collective emphasis on the people of Israel is typical for the Deuteronomistic scribes; Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilzeit anhand des 89. Psalmes* (AASF B 220; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982) 133-175.

¹³¹ Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17*, 111.

¹³² The allusion has been identified at least by Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” 35.

¹³³ The close thematic and terminological affinity of these two verses has been pointed out at least by Westermann, *Genesis. 2. Teilband. Genesis 12-36* (BKAT I/2; Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1981) 26; and Jacob, *Das erste Buch der Tora: Genesis* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 2000) 394.

¹³⁴ Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” 151, n. 23; Abegg, “4QMMT C27, 31 and ‘Works Righteousness’,” 139-140; *idem*, “4QMMT, Paul, and ‘Works of the Law’” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*, 208-209. See also 1 Macc 2:52.

¹³⁵ Dunn, “4QMMT and Galatians,” 151-152

a member of the Aaronide family, connects the epilogue to the halakhic section and its references to the **בני אהרן**. More importantly, both Abraham and Phinehas are mentioned in Ben Sira's Praise of the Fathers (Sir 44:19-21; 45:23-24). Whereas in Numbers Phinehas is rewarded with the covenant of eternal priesthood, in Ben Sira he receives the promise of eternal high priesthood. In a manner similar to the epilogue of 4QMMT, covenant is one of the structuring elements of the Praise of the Fathers.¹³⁶

The correct performance of the law, the faithful following of Yahweh and his commandments, and loyalty to the covenant is expressed in the Hebrew Bible with the Deuteronomic phrase used in a formula: **עשה (הטוב) הישר בעיני יהוה** "to do that (which is good and) which is right in the eyes of Yahweh."¹³⁷ The phrase on line C31 **הישר (והטוב) לפניו** clearly recalls the Deuteronomic phrase. Note again the avoidance of the divine name typical of the author of 4QMMT. In the Hebrew Bible, the longer form of the phrase almost always occurs in the word order **הטוב והישר**.¹³⁸ The word order used in 4Q398 is in MT found only in Deut 6:18 (in SP also in Deut 12:28 and 13:39):

Do what is right and good in the sight of the LORD, so that it may go well with you...

ועשית הישר והטוב בעיני יהוה למען ייטב לך

Qimron has also suggested that this passage of 4QMMT could be influenced by Deut 6:24-25. In verse 6:25 the term **צדקה** is used, an expression otherwise rare in Deuteronomy.¹³⁹ Deut 12:28 is another possible source of influence:

Be careful to obey all these words that I command you so that it may go well with you and with your children after you for ever, because

¹³⁶ Marböck, "Die 'Geschichte Israels' als 'Bundesgeschichte' nach dem Sirachbuch," in *Der neue Bund im Alten. Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente* (ed. E. Zenger; Quaestiones Disputatae 146; Freiburg: Herder, 1993) 177-197.

¹³⁷ Deut 6:18, 12:25, 28; 13:19; 21:9; 1K 11:33, 38.; 14:8; 15:5, 11; 22:43; 2 K 10:30; 12:3; 14:3; 15:3, 34; 16:2, 18:3; 22:2; Jer 34:5. See Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, 335.

¹³⁸ The short form **עשה הישר בעיני יהוה** is also frequently used and it lacks the word **הטוב** entirely.

¹³⁹ According to Qimron the last lines "are perhaps influenced by Deut 6:24-25," DJD X, 63.

you will be doing what is good and right in the sight of the Lord your God.

שמר ושמעת את כל־הדברים האלה
 אשר אנכי מצוך למען ייטב לך
 ולבניך אחר־יך עד־עולם כי תעשה
 הטוב והישר בעיני יהוה אלהיך

Intriguingly, Deuteronomic phraseology is also used in the introduction of 1QS (1QS I, 1b-2; 4Q255 frg 1):¹⁴⁰

1 לדרוש

2 אל ב[כול לב ו]בכ[ול נפש] לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו

...in order to seek God with [all (one's) heart and] with a[ll (one's) soul;] in order to do what is good and just in his presence...

In addition to 1QS, the Deuteronomic phrase **הישר והטוב** combined with **לפני** occurs four times in the Temple Scroll: 11QT LIII, 7; LV, 14; LIX, 17; LXIII, 8. The phrases are found in the final section of the Temple Scroll (L,11-LXVI), in the Deuteronomic Paraphrase, which includes the Law of the King (cols. LVII-LIX).¹⁴¹ In this passage the author/redactor of the Temple Scroll rewrites or paraphrases several central passages from Deuteronomy: 11QT LIII,7 rewrites Deut 12:25, 11QT LV, 14 uses Deut 13:19, and finally 11QT LXIII rephrases Deut 21:9. In all three instances the author/redactor of the Temple Scroll adds **והטוב** to the scriptural source text. 11QT LIX, 17 originates from the section describing the statutes of the king, and here the faithful king is described as one who does what is **הישר והטוב** in the eyes of Yahweh. This particular section lacks a Deuteronomic source text, but is indebted to Deuteronomic phraseology. In all four cases of 11QT, as well as in 1QS, the phrase is used to describe and emphasize the correct procedure

¹⁴⁰ Apart from 4QMMT, the phrase **הישר והטוב** occurs in the opening lines of 1QS and the parallel manuscript 4Q255, and in the Temple Scroll.

¹⁴¹ For the source texts of these final sections of the Temple Scroll, see Sidnie White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls; Sheffield: SAP, 2000) 57-62.

and the desirable behavior of the faithful followers of Yahweh and his law.

Covenantal faithfulness is demonstrated by protecting the covenantal relationship from apostasy, idolatry, and wrong practices. It will be regarded as righteousness also for the reader or addressee of 4QMMT during the time of return and repentance, provided that the correct halakhic interpretation is accepted: "Study all these (matters) ... so that at the end of time, you may rejoice in finding that *some of* our words are true. And it shall be reckoned to you as righteousness when you do what is right and *good* before him, for your good and that of Israel."

5.3. CONCLUSIONS

In the epilogue of 4QMMT, Scripture is used in a variety of ways. The text contains both allusions and intentionally modified, explicit quotations, in which the citation of the scriptural source text and its interpretation are intertwined. When the text of the epilogue is analyzed in more detail, it can be seen that the main scriptural source text of the epilogue is Deuteronomy. The results of the analysis of the epilogue contribute further to a better understanding of the literary purpose and historical setting of 4QMMT as a whole.

As was demonstrated in Chapter 3, the structure of 4QMMT is an adjustment of the covenantal pattern (*Bundesformular*) known from the legal and treaty texts of the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East. Covenantal faithfulness becomes one of the main themes of the epilogue as the author/redactor further develops the covenantal theology derivable from the quoted scriptural passages, even though the term covenant is nowhere explicitly mentioned. In the epilogue, the blessings and the curses, the guarantee for the covenantal obligation, are woven together with paraenetic material. The reader of the epilogue is reminded of the consequences of covenantal obedience and disobedience by historical references and models of right and wrong behavior, and he (they) is exhorted to repent and to return to the covenant. In biblical law collections, and more specifically in Deuteronomy, the laws are closely connected with the concept of covenant. For the author/redactor of 4QMMT the return to Yahweh and

to the covenant means accepting and following the correct interpretation of the Torah, as described in the halakhic section.

4QMMT must have been written by someone who felt the utmost concern for the Temple and the purity of the cult. The cult in Jerusalem did not meet the standards of the author/redactor and needed to be 'reformed'. To emphasize the importance of the matter, the epilogue uses the Deuteronomic language and theology, and appeals to the ideology of cultic centralization and the consequences of it. Cultic purity, which is the concern of Deuteronomy, is also the theme of the author/redactor of the epilogue of 4QMMT, and it is not restricted to ritual purity. Rather, the concern for the correct implementation of the Israelite cult is a question of *moral* (im)purity. There is still, however, a possibility for repentance and "*Umkehr*" for those who take seriously the exhortations and legal interpretations of the author/redactor of 4QMMT. Repentance and return signify a new beginning, a renewed covenant for the faithful followers of Yahweh.

5.3.1. *Qumranic – non-Qumranic?*

The halakhic section is concerned with ritual purity, the sanctity of the cult and with the proper maintenance of the Temple. As was already pointed out in Chapter 3, the regulations of the halakhic community and cannot be defined as sectarian legislation. The laws are directed at all Israel and the priests' responsibilities are particularly emphasized; this, however, could be due to the focus of the document, which seems to be the Jerusalem Temple and the cult, rather than the practical matters of a (smaller) community. Furthermore, there is no trace of the generally assumed conflation of ritual impurity and sin detectable in the halakhic section. On the other hand, the rigidity of the interpretation of the cultic laws as presented in the halakhic section of 4QMMT has been seen as a typically Qumranic feature.¹⁴² Furthermore, it has been indicated that the schism between

¹⁴² Harrington in particular has suggested that the legal system of 4QMMT reflects a sectarian position; Harrington, "Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 109; 128-129; *eadem*, "Biblical Law at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 162.

the Qumranites and the Temple establishment was basically of a halakhic nature.¹⁴³

Even the epilogue seems to lack sectarian features. The understanding of the covenant in 4QMMT has no traits of the exclusiveness comparable with the covenantal theology in 1QS or CD. The possibility of repentance and return is maintained, which appears to be in contrast with the determinism that is sometimes seen as a typical feature of Qumranic theology.¹⁴⁴

Nevertheless, the combination of the ritual purity issues of the halakhic section and the emphasis on repentance in the epilogue approaches in one sense the Qumranic equation of ritual impurity and sin, and the need of both ritual purification and repentance.¹⁴⁵ Furthermore, the use of Deuteronomic theology and expressions in the epilogue to justify the legal interpretation of the halakhic section could help to trace the ideological origins of 4QMMT and to identify the group responsible for authoring it. Importantly, however, the interpretation of Deuteronomic passages in the epilogue and the theology of repentance and return are not far removed from the theology of the source text, but rather along the lines of general *Deuteronomismus*. The main differences of the epilogue in comparison with its source text are the avoidance of the *tetragrammaton*, and the avoidance of 1st person singular references. The references of Deuteronomy to the exile are obviously omitted, and the scriptural sequence idolatry – exile – repentance – return has been transformed so that the emphasis lies not on the exile but rather on repentance and return during the period of אַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים. The combination of rather stringent halakhot, with a focus on ritual purity issues and cult in the legal section, and the more ‘general’ *Deuteronomismus* of the epilogue could be of some significance and aid in placing the thought and theology of 4QMMT on the ideological map of late Second Temple Judaism.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ Sussmann, “The History of the Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on 4QMMT,” 184; 191; Kister, “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah,” 571-573.

¹⁴⁴ VanderKam – Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 242-244.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*, 216; García Martínez, “The Problem of Purity: The Qumran Solution,” 153.

¹⁴⁶ It seems at least to differ from the development of the *Schriftgelehrtentum* that according to Veijola has its roots in *Deuteronomismus*. See Veijola, “Die Deuteronomisten als Vorgänger der Schriftgelehrten,” in *Moses Erben*, 192-240.

The fragmentary calendrical statement attached to one of the manuscripts (MS 4Q394) apparently represents the 364-day solar calendar known from several other texts found at Qumran. Since the solar calendar is known from non-sectarian compositions, and in the case of 4QMMT most likely was an independent entity later annexed to one of the copies of the document, it cannot be used as a criterion for defining 4QMMT as a specifically sectarian or Qumranic text. It does reveal, however, the importance of the calendrical issues to the author/redactor of 4QMMT or those responsible for copying and preserving MS 4Q394: the correct observance of the religious festivals is connected with the law. The significance of the calendrical matters for the covenantal relationship in 1QS, in CD and in the Book of Jubilees could explain the attachment of the calendar section to the beginning of one of the copies of 4QMMT.

Several late copies of 4QMMT found in cave 4 witness the importance of this document for those who compiled the Qumran library, presumably the community living at Qumran. Therefore, even though 4QMMT does not show many particularly Qumranic features and might originally have been composed either at Qumran or elsewhere, it definitely had significance for the community. The number of copies found at Qumran could have several, not necessarily mutually exclusive, explanations.

5.3.2. *Setting*

The paraenetic mode of the epilogue could be adaptable and relevant even outside the inner circle of cultic personnel. Nevertheless, since the halakhic section and the epilogue clearly belong together, forming a unity (cf. Chapter 3), the focus of the document as a whole has to be kept in mind. In a search for a *Sitz im Leben* for 4QMMT as a whole one has to take into consideration both the content of the halakhic section and that of the epilogue. The author/redactor is not concerned with social justice, the success of the wicked or the distress of the righteous etc. Furthermore, he is not writing regulations

4QMMT could be compared with a similar phenomenon in the Temple Scroll, where the priestly and Deuteronomic influences flow together. According to Swanson (*The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 5) “[t]his gives the impression that the Scroll’s structure recasts Deuteronomy from a priestly perspective.”

for the organization of a particular community, and the legal section does not provide its readers with advice or definitions of how to organize and manage the practical life of a certain group. The inescapable focus of the halakhic section is the Temple, its cult, and the ritual and purity issues related to it, whatever the real and concrete historical relationship to the Temple was of the group behind the text.

The original setting of 4QMMT and the purpose of its composition reflect the issues where the halakhic interpretation of the author/redactor of 4QMMT differed from those of the Temple establishment, or (other) priests in general. The author/redactor must have been seriously concerned for the Temple and the purity of the cult. The differences in the halakhic interpretation and requirements of the level of ritual purity could have led the group or community behind 4QMMT to distance themselves from the practices that, according to their understanding, were polluting the Temple and violating its sanctity. There is, however, no need to assume a complete separation from the Temple and Jerusalem.

The existence of several late copies also imply that this group continued to revere the Jerusalem Temple as the only legitimate sanctuary, despite its current condition and the unacceptable laxity in the standards of sacrificial procedures, ritual purity, and the purity of the city of the sanctuary. In spite of all this, Jerusalem was considered as the only proper cultic place, in accordance with the centralization of the cult.¹⁴⁷

Could 4QMMT be understood as a reformatory declaration? The contents of 4QMMT do seem to reflect an interest for the reformation of the cult, and the halakhic section gives the guidelines for the contents of the reformation, whereas the epilogue has the theological and historical justification for it.

During its history of transmission, the document could have had different functions. The document could, for instance, have served the purpose of an intracommunal, pedagogical text, as suggested by Fraade. According to him, this could have been either 4QMMT's original function, or one adopted in a later historical situation.¹⁴⁸ In this case, the study of this document could have functioned as an

¹⁴⁷ Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law*, 61, 74.

¹⁴⁸ Fraade, "To Whom it May Concern: 4QMMT and its addressees," 524. Similarly Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," 19-20.

instrument for strengthening the identity and ideology of the Qumran community.

The late copies also imply that the halakhot were studied in the hope of the ‘reformation’ of the Temple cult; on the other hand, it is equally possible that during some period of the history of the community the study of the halakhot could even have served as some kind of substitute for the sacrificial cult.¹⁴⁹ An interesting parallel is provided by rabbinic literature, where the regulations concerning the Temple and sacrifice continued to be one of the topics under discussion, years after the destruction of the Temple. It is of course possible that even after the destruction of the Temple the sacrificial halakhah was studied in the hope that the Temple soon would be rebuilt, but also, the study of the sacrificial and purity regulations were understood as a (perhaps temporary) replacement for the Temple cult.¹⁵⁰

R. Isaac said, what is the significance of the verses, this is the law of the sin-offering and this is the law of the guilt-offering? They teach that whosoever occupies himself with the study of the laws of the sin-offering is as though he were offering a sin-offering, and whosoever occupies himself with the study of the laws of the guilt-offering is as though he were offering a guilt-offering. – Talmud, Menahot 110a

However, the seriousness of the exhortatory expressions and the language of repentance together with the subtle (historical) warnings of the epilogue suggest that the purity of the Temple cult was too grave an issue for the author/redactor of 4QMMT to be ignored – after all, the Temple was still standing. Instead, it is possible that even the readers of the late copies of 4QMMT felt the urgency of the matter, which might have resulted in concrete efforts to reform the actual situation in Jerusalem at appropriate times.

In sum, 4QMMT could have been composed as a document listing the main opinions of the community that made it differ from the halakhic interpretation of other groups; or, alternatively, understood as such by its readers. In this case it would have served the pedagogical

¹⁴⁹ As suggested by Kugler, “Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler; SDSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 90-112.

¹⁵⁰ Stemberger, *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur: Eine Einführung* (München: Beck, 1977) 72.

purpose suggested by Fraade and Grossman, to educate new members of the community and to reinforce the community identity. The continuous interest for cultic matters could also have functioned as a substitute for the actual participation in the Temple cult. On the other hand, it could reflect the hope that the Temple cult would one day be purified, and a return to Jerusalem would be possible. In order to maintain knowledge of the central cultic and purity matters, they were studied by the community members. Furthermore, it is also possible, that the community made renewed efforts to actually reform the cult in Jerusalem, in accordance with the regulations described in the halakhic section. When the epilogue is read carefully, it seems that the separation from the rest of the people is not the main emphasis of the epilogue, rather the repentance and reformation of the Jerusalem cult, which could not be achieved by separation only. The tone of the epilogue, calling for repentance and return, is serious and reminds the readers of the consequences of covenantal disobedience, the curses, the exile, and death. It is possible, and likely, that even the late readers of 4QMMT, felt the urgency of the matter, and being persuaded by the exhortative tone and language of the epilogue, felt the necessity of making a concrete effort for the reformation of the Jerusalem cult.¹⁵¹

5.3.3. *The Addressee – The Genre*

The references to the 2nd person singular in the epilogue, giving it a certain amount of “epistolary colour” were already discussed in the previous chapter (Chapter 3). Most references to the 2nd person singular are attested in the concluding lines of the epilogue, 25-32. The problem of the addressee seems to be connected with the definition of the genre of the document, also a complex issue (see Chapter 4). Clearly, 4QMMT is not a *personal* letter, rather a generically mixed legal text, which contains some elements known from the genre a *literary* epistle, e.g. the direct discourse. It should be noted, however, that the direct discourse can be used in other genres as well.

If the categorization of 4QMMT as a personal letter is abandoned, one could also question the assumption according to which the 2nd person singular addressee refers to a single, historically identifiable

¹⁵¹ Similarly Brooke, “The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 424.

individual. The references to the 2nd person singular should rather be interpreted as a rhetorical device. Additionally, the references to the kings in the epilogue have a purpose as models of either covenantal obedience or disobedience and the consequences related to covenantal faithfulness, and cannot therefore justify a postulated royal addressee for 4QMMT.

When the scriptural source text is cited in the epilogue, it is striking that all references to the 1st person singular are omitted. Instead, the author/redactor of 4QMMT uses the 1st person plural when expressing opinion both in the legal section and in the epilogue. Evidently, the author/redactor of the document is not a single person, rather a community, ‘we’ – contrary to the initial identification of the author as the Teacher of Righteousness.

It was already pointed out that in Deuteronomy the 1st person plural includes the addressees of Moses’s speech, who are also addressed both in the 2nd person plural and singular.¹⁵² In that case, ‘we’ and ‘you’ are not separate entities, but members of the same, larger movement, group, or people. Furthermore, as in Deuteronomy, the 2nd person singular of the epilogue could refer to a group, for instance, a priestly group; also, the late copies found at Qumran suggest that the community experienced themselves as being addressed by 4QMMT. Thus, in their reading the 2nd person singular could without difficulty have been understood as a reference to the community itself, as well as to its individual members. Additionally, each reader or student of this text could have interpreted the 2nd person singular phrases as personal exhortations to repentance and return, the right observation of the law resulting in righteousness that will benefit the larger community as well.

¹⁵² See also Fraade, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” 513. “It is commonplace in hortatory speech to switch between plural and singular forms of second person address.”

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The goal of the present study was to explore the purpose and function of the epilogue of 4QMMT. The aim was to investigate how the epilogue functions as a part of 4QMMT on the one hand, and how the results of the analysis of the epilogue advance our understanding of the whole document on the other. This study began with an inspection and synopsis of the manuscripts containing text from the epilogue, 4Q397, 4Q398, and 4Q399, which resulted in an alternative composite text of the epilogue. The calendar and the halakhic section have also received some attention, albeit more limited and purpose oriented. After the relationship of the epilogue to the other sections of 4QMMT was investigated it became clear how the document has a purposeful structure that reflects the theological intentions of its author/redactor. Even though the structure of 4QMMT had clear scriptural predecessors, it was demonstrated that the genre of this text is an innovative combination of elements from several previously known genres. In 4QMMT, the author/redactor skillfully created a text in which both the structure and the scriptural subtext(s) are used to argue in favour of the legal interpretations of the author/redactor. The purity of the Temple cult and covenantal faithfulness are linked for the author/redactor of 4QMMT. For him, the Jerusalem Temple is the only legitimate sanctuary, which needs to be purified in order to avoid the curses resulting from covenantal disloyalty.

6.1. THE TEXTUAL BASIS OF THE EPILOGUE

The text critical part of the work began with a simple transcription of the manuscripts of the epilogue and some brief comments on the individual readings. In order to facilitate a comparison of the manuscripts of the epilogue, 4Q397, 4Q398, and 4Q399, and to demon-

strate the difficulties of the composite text in *DJD X*, a synopsis of these three manuscripts, was created. Finally, to make the results of the textual work of Chapter 2 more accessible, an alternative arrangement of the composite text of the epilogue with an English translation was presented.

A brief analysis of the variant readings both in the halakhic section and in the epilogue was carried out. It indicated that in the halakhic section hardly any variance of real importance is discernable in the text form. This could reflect the nature of the halakhic section as general halakhic legislation with a focus on all Israel in contrast to laws pertaining to community organization needing regular updating. According to Hempel, in the Laws of D the halakhic material shows virtually no evidence of recensional activity; whereas the sectarian communal legislation contains traces of redactional activity and updating. If Hempel's division of the legal material of D in these two groups is accepted, the lack of redactional activity in the halakhic section of 4QMMT can be compared with the result of her analysis of the two strata of legal material of the Damascus Document. Both corpora contain no specifically communal laws governing the life of a particular group, and neither shows signs of redaction.

In the manuscripts of the epilogue, however, the relatively small amount of common material contains some significant variant readings. For instance, the main witnesses of the text of the epilogue, namely manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 overlap surprisingly little. Even in the overlapping sections variant readings are recorded. Some of them are of minor importance, but the comparison between 4Q397 and 4Q398 shows that these manuscripts contain textual variants and different readings that cannot at each point be combined into a single reliable composite text. Apparently, the text form of the epilogue was not fixed and varied from scribe to scribe, and it is possible that some of the manuscripts of the epilogue, or at least some *passages* of the manuscripts of the epilogue, represent variant literary editions of the text. Yet, the level of variance is difficult to determine with certainty because of the fragmentary state of the manuscripts.

Based upon the synoptic comparison it can be demonstrated that manuscripts 4Q397 and 4Q398 contained a different text form in the following lines: 4Q397 frgs 14-12, lines 10-12a *versus* 4Q398 frgs 14-17, lines 2-4. These variant readings make it impossible to combine these two manuscripts into an intelligible composite text in this

particular section. This can be seen in the proposed alternative arrangement of the composite text of the epilogue, where the text is presented in two parallel columns (see Chapter 2.8.). As for the rest of this material, it was concluded that MSS 4Q397 and 4Q398 represent manuscripts of the same text, and accordingly, for lines 20-24 in the alternative arrangement of the composite text, the two manuscripts are combined into one composite text, as in the *DJD X* edition,

Although manuscripts 4Q398 and 4Q399 overlap (4Q398 col ii, lines 2-8 – 4Q399 i, 9-ii, 5) variant readings, though mostly of minor importance, are attested. MS 4Q399 contains several shorter formulations and linguistic features of Biblical Hebrew (BH) in comparison to the longer readings and Qumran Hebrew (QH) of MS 4Q398, and the shorter form of MS 4Q399 is possibly the more original one. Despite the variants there is enough overlapping in MSS 4Q398 and 4Q399 to conclude that they represent manuscripts of the same text, but MS 4Q399 has a shorter text form in some passages.

The results of my text critical reading of the manuscripts and synopsis demonstrate that the composite text of the epilogue created by the editors in *DJD X* contains several readings that are not possible in the individual manuscripts. Therefore, the suggestion by Qimron not to use the composite text independently without consulting the individual manuscripts is warranted.¹ When the composite text of 4QMMT is used, it should also be noted that the transition from the halakhic section to the epilogue is not materially extant in any of the preserved manuscripts. Since it was demonstrated that fragments 4Q398 1-9,² containing text from the halakhic section, originate from a manuscript different from 4Q398 11-17, we have only one manuscript that contains text from both the halakhic section and the epilogue: MS 4Q397.

The placement of the fragments 4Q398 11-13 within the epilogue is difficult to determine with certainty due to the poor condition of the manuscript.³ In Qimron's reconstruction fragments 4Q398 11-13 would make up the lower part of column i of fragments 14-17. The problem with Qimron's solution, however, is that the *reconstructed*

¹ Qimron, "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text", 9-10.

² Fragment 10 is presently missing.

³ This manuscript has undergone major material changes since the publication of the *DJD X*, and some of the fragments are missing.

column of fragments 11-13 is much broader than column i on fragments 14-17. This would mean that the upper part of this (reconstructed) column is much broader than the lower part, which seems rather unlikely.

An alternative placement for fragments 4Q398 11-13 has been suggested by Strugnell and Stegemann. One of the main arguments supporting the alternative arrangement is the *reconstructed* width of the last column of MS 4Q397, represented by fragment 23. This *reconstructed* column is considerably narrower than the other columns of MS 4Q397. Since fragment 23 contains text from the end of the scroll, the reconstructed width suggests that there is no space for the text preserved on 4Q398 11-13 between columns 4Q397 14-21 and the final column of MS 4Q397. Therefore, the text of 4Q398 11-13 must have either been eliminated by the scribe of 4Q397; or he had a *Vorlage* containing a text form of the epilogue completely lacking the text of 4Q398 11-13; or the text of 4Q398 11-13 was placed in the scroll before the fragments 4Q397 14-21, which seems to be the most probable solution. Therefore, in the synopsis of the manuscripts of the epilogue, fragments 4Q398 11-13 make up the first section of MS 4Q398, and in the alternative arrangement of the composite text of the epilogue they make up the first extant section of the composite text.

It should be acknowledged that the text form of the epilogue differs somewhat in each of the preserved manuscripts. When a composite text of the epilogue is created and used it is important to remember that the exact wording of the epilogue was fluctuating and developing; however, a considerable amount of variance is of minor importance and results merely from the diversity in scribal habits, or expresses the developing language. Nevertheless it should be stressed that the composite text should never be used alone, but always together with the individual manuscripts, as already suggested by Qimron.

6.2. THE CALENDAR

Both the inclusion of the calendrical fragments 4Q394 1-2 (or 4Q327) to MS 4Q394, and the whole relationship of the calendrical section to the rest of 4QMMT has been questioned by several scholars prior to this study. As a result of the examination of the original fragments it was inferred that – as had already been suggested by other scholars – the calendar fragments 4Q394 1-2 = 4Q327 do not belong to the same manuscript as the rest of the 4Q394. Nevertheless, the first extant passage of MS 4Q394 (frgs. 3a-4, lines 1-3) is a calendrical phrase, probably a concluding section of a longer calendrical section. Therefore, at least one of the manuscripts of 4QMMT contained a calendar of some kind before the halakhic section.

The structural parallel for 4QMMT in the biblical *Bundesformular*, the covenantal pattern of legal texts, provides an indicator suggesting that the calendrical section did not constitute an original component of 4QMMT, and rather was annexed to the document in a similar manner as another kind of calendar was attached to 4QS^e.⁴ The centrality of the covenantal motives in 4QMMT and the significance of the calendar to the covenantal relationship in 1QS, and more clearly in CD and in the Book of Jubilees⁵ could perhaps explain the attachment of the calendar section (a festival calendar?) to the beginning of MS 4Q394.

6.3. THE STRUCTURE OF 4QMMT AND THE CONTENT OF THE EPILOGUE: COVENANTAL MOTIVES IN 4QMMT

When the halakhic section and the epilogue are compared, a clear divergence between the two sections can be discerned. These sections discuss different matters and differ in vocabulary and syntax. Although the diversity in the presentation of the halakhic issues, and the existence of documents dealing with similar halakhic issues (CD/D, 11QT, etc.), could indicate the use of earlier halakhic sources by the author/redactor of 4QMMT, the disparity between the ha-

⁴ Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 183.

⁵ VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, 28.

lakhic section and the epilogue can best be explained by the dissimilarity in the content and genre of the two sections.

A structural parallel to the biblical legal texts shows the composition of 4QMMT as purposeful and explains the unity of these sections of seemingly different genre. Apparently, the author/redactor of 4QMMT had a model in the covenantal pattern of biblical laws (*Bundesformular*), and Deuteronomy in particular. The author/redactor adopted this pattern and modified it freely in order to adjust it to his own literary creation. The structural parallel in the covenantal pattern does not, however, alone suffice to solve the problem of the genre of 4QMMT that has puzzled the modern readers and interpreters of this document.

In a *close reading* of the epilogue, an analysis of the author/redactor's use of scriptural citations and allusions was carried out in order to achieve a better understanding of the theology of the epilogue. In the epilogue, the blessings and the curses, the guarantee for the covenantal obligation, are woven together with paraenetic material in a manner similar to some later scriptural passages representing covenantal theology and adapting the covenant form. Furthermore, covenantal faithfulness becomes one of the main themes of the epilogue as the author/redactor developed the covenantal theology derivable from the quoted and alluded scriptural passages. The selection and interpretation of the scriptural passages in the epilogue emphasize the covenantal theology, repentance, covenantal obedience and the results of disobedience, even though the term covenant is nowhere explicitly mentioned.

In the first extant section of the epilogue, there are references to kings known from Israelite history. The historical persons and events referred to in the epilogue are used to highlight the particular theological emphasis of the author/redactor. The context is hortatory, and the description of Israelite history recalling Deuteronomi(sti)c theology with the evaluation of kings as prototypical examples of both rewarded and sanctioned behavior is used to create a hermeneutical framework in which the following scriptural citations and allusions can be correctly interpreted. The kings and the consequences of their actions reflected by historical events are used to convince the reader of the importance of covenantal obedience and the implications of covenantal obedience in relation to the Israelite religion and cult.

In this context, the significance of the several references to Deuteronomy becomes all the more clear. In Deuteronomy 12 the major cultic innovation, the centralization of the cult, is introduced. Deuteronomy 12 is cited and alluded to both in the halakhic section, to justify the author/redactor's opinion concerning certain purity regulations (B27-33; 58-62), and in the epilogue. Cultic purity (*Kultusreinheit*) is also central to of the author/redactor of the epilogue of 4QMMT, and it is not restricted to ritual purity. Rather, the concern for the correct implementation of the Israelite cult is a question of *moral* impurity. The interpretation of Scripture in the epilogue aims at stressing the necessity of covenantal faithfulness. The reader of the epilogue is reminded of the consequences of covenantal obedience and disobedience, and historical events and persons are used as models of right and wrong behaviour in order to emphasize the hermeneutical and theological agenda of the author/redactor. The adopted covenantal structure of the document as a whole serves the same purpose. The cult in the Jerusalem Temple needs to be reformed in the author/redactor's time, following the regulations described in the halakhic section, in order to protect the covenantal relationship to Yahweh. The readers of the epilogue are discreetly exhorted not to repeat the mistakes of the former generations. Scriptural passages expressing the Deuteronomi(sti)c theology of repentance are cited, and, for the readers of the epilogue, repentance and return are offered as a chance to enter into the renewed covenant. To return to the covenant means accepting and following the correct interpretation of the Torah, as described in the halakhic section.

6.4. THE AUTHOR, THE ADDRESSEE, AND THE GENRE

In the epilogue, the reader is addressed in the 2nd person singular and plural. It has been proposed that the 2nd person singular references and the kings mentioned in the epilogue suggest that the text was a letter and the addressee was a political and religious leader, possibly even one of the Hasmonean kings or high priests. However, the comparison with Semitic epistolary texts showed that 4QMMT lacks the formal features typical of a personal letter, such as a *praescriptio* and an epistolary conclusion. The text itself gives no explicit identification of either the author or the addressee, and it is important to

remember that the title ‘Halakhic Letter’ was given to 4QMMT by its modern readers.

The 2nd person singular and plural references are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.3.4. Even though the use of direct speech discourse is suggestive of the epistolary genre, it is not exclusive to this genre and cannot therefore be used as a sole criterion for genre identification. Rather than being a private letter, 4QMMT was a text that was meant to be circulated and studied by a wider, more general audience. Both the members of the community responsible for the copying of 4QMMT, and persons outside this community, for instance the priests of Jerusalem, could have been addressed by this text.

4QMMT remains difficult to define in terms of literary genre. It is rather a mixture of genres, and the author/redactor has made use of the formal and structural features of several genres, such as legal texts and literary epistles. The combination of the literary features serves the purpose of 4QMMT, which is both reformatory and hortatory. The document presents the correct interpretation of some disputed cultic and purity laws. In the epilogue, the author/redactor of 4QMMT gives the justification for the legal interpretations presented in the halakhic section, and it contains an admonition to each one who feels responsible – either now or in the future – for the implementation of them.

6.5. THE USE OF SCRIPTURE

When the scriptural source text is cited or alluded to in the epilogue, the source texts are abbreviated and modified; however it is important to note that nothing new is added to the citations of the source text. The quotations are modified deliberately in order to make them serve the author/redactor’s hermeneutical purpose and suit his/their historical situation. In the epilogue, the citation of the source text and its interpretation are intertwined, and the citations could be defined as explicit, intentional, and interpretative quotations. Furthermore, the author/redactor of the epilogue combines both citations of and allusions to Deuteronomy. These selected passages share theological themes, ideas, and terminology, and by using them together the author/redactor creates his own theological justification for the refor-

matory cultic program presented in the halakhic section. The correct observance of the law, the faithful following of Yahweh's commandments, and loyalty to the covenant are the concerns of the author/redactor of the epilogue. In order to avoid the curses the addressee is exhorted to repent and return to the law, which means to follow the legal interpretation presented in the halakhic section.

6.6. PROVENANCE: IS 4QMMT A SECTARIAN TEXT?

The epilogue of 4QMMT has nothing particularly Qumranic or sectarian in it. Furthermore, neither is the halakhic section specifically Qumranic, or sectarian, apart perhaps from the stringency of the legal interpretation. No trace of a Qumranic conflation of ritual purity and sin can be detected in the halakhic section. The calendar attached to one of the manuscripts apparently represents the 364-day solar calendar known from other Qumran texts and the pseudepigrapha; however, more than one calendar is attested at Qumran. In addition, the calendrical section, of which only the conclusion is preserved in MS 4Q394 was most likely an independent entity later annexed to one of the copies of 4QMMT. Therefore, it cannot be used as a criterion for defining 4QMMT as a sectarian or Qumranic text, but it is an indication of the importance of the calendrical issues to those who preserved and copied 4QMMT. Importantly, there is nothing in the epilogue of 4QMMT comparable to the particularistic understanding of the covenant of the specifically Qumranic texts such as 1QS or CD.

Notwithstanding all the non-sectarian features of 4QMMT, the strictness of the interpretation of the cultic laws as presented in the halakhic section of 4QMMT has generally been considered to be a typically Essene or Qumranic feature. The combination of the ritual purity issues of the halakhic section and the emphasis on repentance in the epilogue approaches, in one sense, the Qumranic equation of ritual impurity and sin without making a complete identification between these two concepts. The use of generally Deuteronomi(sti)c theology and expressions to justify the exclusive and rigid legal interpretation of cultic and purity laws in the halakhic section could help to trace the ideological origins of 4QMMT and to identify the group responsible for authoring it. On the other hand the popularity

of the book of Deuteronomy and its theology made it applicable in a variety of settings and circles.

Several copies of 4QMMT found in Cave 4 at Qumran witness the importance of this document to those who compiled the Qumran library: the community living at Qumran. Therefore, even though 4QMMT could originally have been composed either at Qumran or elsewhere, it certainly was of considerable significance for the community. The relatively large number of copies could have several explanations that are not necessarily mutually exclusive. 4QMMT could have been composed as a document listing the main opinions of the author/redactor or community, where the halakhic interpretation of him/them differed from those of other groups. Alternatively, it could have been understood as such by its readers. In both cases, the document could have served a pedagogical function, used for instruction and strengthening of the (sectarian) identity of new members, as proposed by Fraade and Grossman. The continuing interest in cultic matters could also have functioned as a substitute for the actual participation in the Temple cult. On the other hand, the copies could reflect the hope that the Temple cult would one day be purified. Therefore, the cultic and purity matters that, according to the author(s)/redactor(s) of 4QMMT, were central for the reformation of the cult, were continuously studied by the community members. This would make it possible to properly carry out the cult when a historical situation arose in which the interpretation of the halakhic section could be realized. Furthermore, when the epilogue is read carefully, the separation from the rest of the people is not the main emphasis of the epilogue; rather the author/redactor's main focus is on the repentance and reformation of the Jerusalem cult, which could not be achieved by separation only.

The tone of the epilogue, calling for repentance and return, is serious and reminds the readers of the consequences of covenantal disobedience: the curses, exile, and death. The exhortative and persuasive language of the epilogue may well have convinced even the late readers of 4QMMT, which could have caused for them a need resulting even in concrete efforts to reform the Jerusalem cult.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Editions and Reference Works

- Abegg, Martin G. and Ben Zion Wacholder. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four. Fascicle Three. Based on a Reconstruction of the Original Transcriptions of Józef T. Milik and John Strugnell*. Washington D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995.
- Alexander, Philip S. and Geza Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha Ya-had and Two Related Texts*. DJD XXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-4Q273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Baillet, Maurice, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux. *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran*. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Cotton, Hannah M. and Joseph Geiger, eds. *Masada II: The Greek and Latin Documents. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports*. Jerusalem.: IES, 1989.
- von Gall, August, ed. *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*. Biblia Hebraica. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1918.
- Ellinger, Karl and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Vierte, verbesserte Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- Jastrow, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature*. Vol I-II. New York, 1950.
- Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Volume I. Part One: Orthography and Phonetics. Part Two: Morphology*. Subsidia Biblica 14/I. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *Die syrische Baruch Apocalypse*. JSRZ V/2. Apokalypsen. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1976.
- Leemhuis, F., A. F. J. Klijn and G. J. H. Van Gelder. *Arabic Text of the Apocalypse of Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- Lindenberger, James M. *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*. SBLWAW 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. SBL SBS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

- Mayer, G., ed. "Para (Die rote Kuh)." In: *Die Mischna. VI Seder: Tohorot 4. Traktat: Para. Text, Übersetzung und ausführliche Erklärung*. Hrsg. K. H. Rengstorf – L. Rost. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- Milik, Józef T. *Textes non bibliques. Qumran Cave 1*. Eds. D. Barthélemy O.P. – J. T. Milik. DJDJ I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- . "Le Rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15)." Pages 201-317 in *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumran*. Edited by Maurice Baillet et al. DJDJ III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Pardee, Dennis et al., eds. *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: A Study Edition*. SBL SBS 15. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Pfann, Stephen J. and Philip S. Alexander. *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Cryptic texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. In Consultation with J. Vanderkam and M. Brady. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Peel, M. L. "The Treatise on the Resurrection." Pages 123 -157 in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Translations, Indices*. Ed. H. W. Attridge. NHS XXII. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Qimron, E. "The Text of CDC." Pages 20-21 in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by Magen Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Qimron, Elisha and James H. Charlesworth, J. H. et al. "Rule of the Community (1QS)." *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al. Tübingen: Mohr, 1994.
- . "Some Works of the Torah. 4Q394-4Q399 (4QMMT a-f) and 4Q313." Pages 187-251 in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts with English Translations. Vol 3. Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*. Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. Tübingen / Louisville: Mohr Siebeck / Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Qimron, Elisha and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah. In Consultation with Y. Sussmann and with contributions by Y. Sussmann and A. Yardeni*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Quispel, G. *Ptolémée: Lettre a Flora. Texte, traduction et introduction*. Sources Chrétiennes 23b. Paris: Editions du Cerf, s.a.
- Roth, Martha T. *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor*. SBL WAW 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Segal, M. H. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.
- Skehan, Patrick. W., Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson. *Qumran Cave 4: IV. Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts. With a Contribution by P. J. Parsons*. DJD IX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Talmon, Shemaryahy, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer. *Qumran Cave 4. XVI: Calendrical Texts*. DJD XXI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- Tov, Emanuel et al. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library 2. Including the Dead Sea Scrolls Database (Non-Biblical Texts). Prepared by the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies and Its Center for the Preserva-*

- tion of Ancient Religious Texts at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.* Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel et al. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert. Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in Judaean Desert Series.* DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Tov, Emanuel and Stephen J. Pfann. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judaean Desert.* Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Companion Volume.* Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Ulrich, Eugene et al. *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings.* DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- VanderKam, James C., *The Book of Jubilees.* Corpus Scriptorum Orientalium Vol 511. Scriptorum Aethiopicum. Tomus 88. Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1989.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin D. Goodman, eds. *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Washburn, David L. *A Catalogue of Biblical Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* SBL Text-Critical Studies. Vol. 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Wevers, John W. *Deuteronomium. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum.* Vol. III, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht, 1977.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll.* Volume Three: Plates and Text. Jerusalem: IES, 1977.
- . *The Temple Scroll.* Volume One: Introduction. Jerusalem: IES, 1983.
- . *The Temple Scroll.* Volume Two: Text and Commentary. Jerusalem: IES, 1983.
- Yadin, Yigael and J. Naveh. *Masada I: The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports.* Jerusalem. IES, 1989.

Literature

- Abegg, Martin G. "4QMMT C27, 31 and 'Works Righteousness'," *DSD* 6/2 (1999): 139-147.
- . "4QMMT, Paul, and 'Works of the Law'." Pages 203-216 in *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape and Interpretation.* Ed. P. W. Flint. SDSRL. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarrians." Pages 81-97 in *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. JSJSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* SBLStBl. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Epistolary Literature." Pages 579-596 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period.* Edited by M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984.

- Anonymous, "An Anonymously Received Pre-Publication of 4QMMT," *The Qumran Chronicle* 2. Appendix A. No. 2 (1990): 2-9.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- . "Hebrews, Epistle to the." *ABD* 3:97-105.
- Baillet, Maurice et al. "Travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumran," *RB* 73 (1956): 49-67.
- Baltzer, Klaus. *Das Bundesformular*. WMANT 4. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1964.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. JSJSup 55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *JJS* 31. (1980): 157-170.
- . "Some Remarks on the Qumran Law and the Identification of the Community." Pages 115-117 in *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report*. Edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . "The Purification Rituals in DJD 7." Pages 199-209 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts," *JJS* 46. (1995): 112-119.
- . "Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law." Pages 27-36 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- . "The 'Halakha' in Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (MMT)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 116/3 (1996): 512-516.
- . "The Laws of the Damascus Document – Between Bible and Mishnah." Pages 17-25 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of the Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Ester G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000. 17-26.
- Benoit, Pierre et al., "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran," *BA* 19 (1956) 75-96.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Review: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah from Qumran Cave 4.V." *Jewish Studies* 36 (1996): 67-74.
- . "The Employment of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations." Pages 29-52 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. SBLSym 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1996.
- Berthelot, Katell. "4QMMT et la question du canon de la ébraïque Bible." Pages 1-14 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Betz, Otto. "The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition." Pages 176-202 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. Edited by Derek R. G. Beattie and Martin J. McNamara. JSOTSup 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1994.

- Bickermann, Ernst. "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc 1,1-9)," *ZNW* 32 (1933): 233-254.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: The Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism*. The Oxford Bible Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 233-282 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1984.
- Braulik, Georg. *Deuteronomium 1-16,17*. NEB 15. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986.
- . *Deuteronomium II*. NEB 29. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992.
- Brin, Gershon. "Review on DJD X. Qumran Cave 4/V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell," *JSS* 40/2 (1995): 334-342.
- Brooke, George J. "The Significance of the Kings in 4QMMT." Pages 109-113 in *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report*. Edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . "Review on DJD X. Qumran Cave 4/V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell," *JTS* 46/2 (1995): 597-601.
- . "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of 4QMMT." Pages 72-90 in *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. JSNTSup 116. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1995.
- . "Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT." Pages 67-88 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 61-73 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: IES/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- . "The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 417-434 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. LHBOTS 422. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Burgmann, Hans. "A Historically Justifiable Dating of 4QMMT." Page 114 in *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report*. Edited by Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- Callaway, Philip R. "4QMMT and Recent Hypotheses on the Origin of the Qumran Community." Pages 15-29 in *Mogilany 1993: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls offered in Memory of Hans Burgmann*. Edited by Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1996.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Shem, Treatise of," *ABD* 5: 1196-1197.
- Chazon, Esther G. "Is Divrei Ha-Me'orot a Sectarian Prayer?" In: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Eds. D. Dimant – U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992. 3-17.
- Christiansen, Ellen Juhl. "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What It Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule." Pages 69-97 in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas H. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Development of Jewish Scripts." Pages 133-202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. E. Wright. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
- . "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 379-402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Vol I. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Davies, Philip R. "Sadducees in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 85-94 in *Qumran Cave Four: Special Report*. Edited by Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . "Was There Really a Qumran Community?" *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 3 (1995) 9-35.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Licht vom Osten: Das neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1909.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984.
- . "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance." Pages 26-30 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University. Jerusalem 1989-1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character." Pages 170-176 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, 2000.
- Dombrowski, Bruno, *An Annotated Translation of Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Tora (4QMMT)*. Weenzen: Privately Published, 1992.
- . "An Annotated Translation of Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Tora (4QMMT)," *The Qumran Chronicle* 2. Suppl. Vol. Appendix B. (1993): 1-44.
- . "Miqsat Ma'aseh Hattora (4QMMT) in English," *The Qumran Chronicle* 4. (1994): 28-40.
- Doering, Lutz. "Jeremiah and the "Diaspora Letters" in Ancient Judaism: Epistolary communication with the Golah as Medium for Dealing with the Present." Pages 43-72 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. SBLSym 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Donner, Herbert. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen 1-2*. Grundrisse zum Alten Testament 4/1-2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2001.
- Doty, William. *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. "Ptolemaioksen kirje Floralle. Käännös ja johdanto." Pages 145-159 in *Nag Hammadin kätkeyty viisaus: Gnostilaisia ja muita varhaiskristillisiä tekstejä*. Edited by Ismo Dunderberg and Antti Marjanen. Helsinki: WSOY, 2001.
- . "Valentinian Teachers in Rome." Pages 157-174 in *Christians as a Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome. Studies on the Basis of a Seminar at the Second Conference of the European Association for Biblical Studies (EABS) from July 8-12, 2001*, in

- Rome. Edited by Jürgen Zangenberg and Michael Labahn. JSNTSup 243. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . “The School of Valentinus.” Pages 64-99 in *A Companion to Second-Century Christian “Heretics”*. Edited by Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 76. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Dunn, James D. G. “4QMMT and Galatians,” *NTS* 43 (1997) 147-53.
- Eisenman, Robert and James M. Robinson, eds. *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Prepared with an Introduction and Index. With a Publisher’s Forword by Hershel Shanks*. 2 vols. Washington D. C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991.
- Eisenman, Robert and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years*. Shaftesbury: Element, 1992.
- Elledge, Casey D. “Exegetical Styles at Qumran: A Cumulative Index and Commentary,” *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 165-208.
- Elman, Yaakov. “MMT B 3-5 and Its Ritual Context,” *DSD* 6/2 (1999): 148-156.
- Eshel, Hanan. “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period.” Pages 53-65 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Falk, Daniel. K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- . “Use, Authority, and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran.” Pages 339-377 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin J. Mulder. Assen-Maastricht/ Philadelphia – Van Gorcum/ Fortress, 1988.
- Fischer, Thomas. “Maccabees, Books of: First and Second Maccabees,” *ABD* 4: 439-450
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Aramaic Epistolography,” *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing. Semeia* 22 (1981): 25-57.
- Fraade, Steven D. “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” *RevQ* 19/76 (2000): 507-526.
- . “Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses,” *DSD* 10/1 (2003): 150-161.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *Textos de Qumrán*. Madrid: Trotta, 1992.
- . “Notas al margen de ‘Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered’,” *RevQ* 16/61 (1993): 123-150.
- . “Dos notas sobre 4QMMT,” *RevQ* 16/61 (1993): 293-297.
- . “4QMMT in a Qumran Context.” Pages 15-28 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. SBLSym 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran texts in English*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “Discoveries in the Judean Desert: Textes Legaux,” *JSJ* 32/1 (2001): 71-89.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in Second Degree*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- . *II Maccabees. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41A. New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . *Leviticus*. Old Testament Guides. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- . “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society.” Pages 89-108 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Grayston, Kenneth. *The Johannine Epistles*. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Grossman, Maxine L. “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 3-22.
- . *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. STDJ 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Habicht, Christian. 2. *Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ I/3: Historische und legendarische Erzählungen. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976.
- Harrington, Daniel J., *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Harrington, Hannah K., *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations*. SBLDS 143. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- . “Holiness in the Laws of 4QMMT.” Pages 109-130 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Biblical Law at Qumran.” Pages 160-185 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. Vol I. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Halakhah and Religion of Qumran.” Pages 74-89 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. SDSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Purity Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5. London-New York: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. New York: Doubleday, 1978.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Laws of the Damascus Document and 4QMMT.” Pages 69-84 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February 1998*. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Ester G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

- . “The Context of 4QMMT. Unassuming Assumptions.” Forthcoming in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ. Leiden: Brill.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. London: Xpress Reprints, 1996.
- . “‘Schriftauslegung’ und ‘Schriftwerdung’ in der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels.” Pages 1-71 in Martin Hengel, *Judaica, Hellenistica et Christiana*. Kleine Schriften II. WUNT 109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. “Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS and 4Q512,” *DSD* 8/1 (2001): 9-37.
- Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 26-52*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. “Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT,” *DSD* 10/2 (2003): 187-204.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jacob, Benno. *Das erste Buch Torā: Genesis*. (Nachdruck der Originalausgabe von 1934) Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 2000.
- Jokiranta, Jutta M. “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’,” *RevQ* 20/78 (2001): 223-239.
- . *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim*. PhD diss. University of Helsinki, 2005.
- Kampen, John and Moshe J. Bernstein, eds. *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. SBLSym 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kapera, Zdislaw J., ed. *Qumran Cave Four and MMT: Special Report*. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- Kapera, Zdislaw J. “How not to Publish 4QMMT in 1955-1991.” Pages 55-67 in *Qumran Cave Four: Special Report*. Edited by Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . “How not to Publish 4QMMT. Part II: Spring 1991-Spring 1994,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 4. No. 1/2 (1994): 41-52.
- Kampen, John. “4QMMT and New Testament Studies.” Pages 129-144 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. SBLSym 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kister, Menahem. “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah.” Pages 571-588 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Madrid 18-21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11/2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma‘ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar (Hebrew),” *Tarbiz* 68 (1998-1999) 317-371.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Knohl, Israel. “Re-Considering the Dating and Recipient of Miqsat Ma‘aseh Ha”-Torah,” *Hebrew Studies* 37 (1996): 119-125.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament. Vol 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982/2000.
- Koskenniemi, Heikki. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1956.

- Kratz, Reinhard G. "Moses und die Propheten: zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C." Pages 151-176 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "'The place which He has chosen': The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT." Pages 57-80 in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls V-VI. A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant*. Edited by Moshe Bar-Asher and Emanuel Tov. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute/Haifa University Press, 2007.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." Pages 64-91 in Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Edited by Leon S. Roudiez. Trans. Thomas Gorz, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kugler, Robert A. "Halakic Interpretative Strategies at Qumran: A Case Study." Pages 131-140 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Rewriting the Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 90-112 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. SDSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "Relexicalizing Leviticus in 4QMMT: The Beginnings of Qumran Anti-Language?" forthcoming in *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*. Edited by Dietmar Neufeld. SBLSym. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- . *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Edited by Raphael Kutscher. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Lange, Armin and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, "Annotated List of the Texts from Judaeen Desert Classified by Content and Genre." Pages 115-164 in *The Texts from The Judaeen Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- Levinson, Bernhard. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lim, Timothy H., Hector L. MacQueen, and Calum M. Carmichael, eds. *On Scrolls, Artefacts, and Intellectual Property*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Lim, Timothy H. "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 23-37.
- . "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible – Methodological Considerations." Pages 71-78 in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaeen Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London/New Castle: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
- Lindenberger, James M. "Letters." Pages 480-485 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Lohfink, Gerhard. *Jetzt verstehe ich die Bibel: Ein Sachbuch zur Formkritik*. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1974.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 21-36: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 21 B. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Makkonen, Anna. "Onko intertekstuaalisuudella mitään rajaa?" Pages 9-30 in *Intertekstuaalisuus: Suuntia ja sovelluksia*. Edited by Auli Viikari. Tietolipas 121. Helsinki: SKS, 1991.
- Marböck, Johannes. "Die 'Geschichte Israels' als 'Bundesgeschichte' nach dem Sirachbuch." Pages 177-197 in *Der neue Bund im Alten: Studien zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Quaestiones Disputatae 146. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- Mayes, Andrew D. H. *Deuteronomy*. NCB. Grand Rapids/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan&Scott, 1987.
- McKane, William. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah. Vol II. Commentary on Jeremiah XXVI-LII*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Medala, Stanislaw. "The Character and Historical Setting of 4QMMT," *The Qumran Chronicle* Vol. 4 No.1/2. (1994): 1-27.
- Meier, J. P. "Is There Halaka (the Noun) at Qumran?" *JBL* 122/1 (2003): 150-155.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement," *RevQ* 20/79 (2002): 429-444.
- . "Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule." Pages 81-92 in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London/New Castle: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Cult and Conscience: The ASHAM and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Milik, Józef T. "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du Désert de Juda," *VTSuppl* 4 (1957): 17-26.
- . *Ten Years After the Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Trans. John Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Miller, Owen. "Intertextual Identities." Pages 19-40 in *Identity of the Literary Text*. Edited by Mario J. Valdés and Owen Miller. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.
- Morag, Shelomo. "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," *VT* 38 (1988): 148-164.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Paul the Letter-Writer: His World, His Options, His Skills*. Good News Studies 41. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- März, Claus-Peter. *Hebräerbrief*. NEB 16. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1989.
- Newsom, Carol A. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- . "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167-187 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Nisula, Timo. "'Time has passed since you sent your letter': Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees," *JSP* 14/3 (2005): 201-222.
- Nitzan, Bilha. "4QBerakhot (4Q286-290). A Covenantal Ceremony," *RevQ* 16/64 (1995): 487-506.

- Olyan, Saul M. "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community," *JSJ* XXXV/1 (2004): 1-16.
- Pérez Fernández, Miguel. "4QMMT: Redactional Study," *RevQ* 70/18 (1997): 191-205.
- Puech, Émile. "Quelques observations sur le 'canon' des 'Écrits,'" paper delivered at the Groningen Qumran Institute Symposium 2008, April 28-29, revised version to be published in M. Popović (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism: Proceedings of the Groningen Qumran Institute Symposium, 28-29 April 2008*. JSJSup. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents." Pages 349-361 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden/Jerusalem: Brill/The Magnes Press/Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- . "The Halakhah." Pages 123-177 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*. DJD X. 1994.
- . "Additional Textual Observations on 4QMMT. Appendix 2." Pages 201-202 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*. DJD X. 1994.
- . "The Nature of the Reconstructed Composite Text of 4QMMT." Pages 9-14 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. SBLSym 2. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Qimron, Elisha and John Strugnell. "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran." Pages 400-407 in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*. Jerusalem: IES, 1985.
- . "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," *The Israel Museum Journal*. Vol. IV (1985): 9-12.
- von Rad, Gerhard. *Weisheit in Israel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1970.
- . *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium*. ATD 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Regev, Eyal. "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran," *DSD* 10/2 (2003): 243-278.
- . *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Religion and Society 45. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "We, You, They; Boundary Language in 4QMMT and New Testament Epistles." Forthcoming in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*. Edited by Daniel R. Schwartz and Ruth A. Clements. Leiden: Brill.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "לְעַל" *ThWAT* 4: 1038-1042.
- Rose, Miriam. *5. Mose: 5. Mose 12-25. Einführung und Gesetze*. ZBK AT, 5.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1975.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugen. *Jakobusbrief. 1.-3. Johannesbrief*. NEB 17/19. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985.

- Rösel, Martin. "Names of God." Pages 600-602 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Trans. John Elwode. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Sanders, James A. "Canon as Dialogue." Pages 7-26 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. SDSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Sanders, Ed P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Saukkonen, Juhana Markus. "A Few Inkwells, Many Hands: Were There Scribes at Qumran?" Pages 538-553 in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*. Edited by Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen. Helsinki/Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2008.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. Brown Judaic Studies 33. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . "Purity and Perfection: Exclusion from the Council of the Community in the Serekh Ha-'Edah." Pages 373-389 in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*. Edited by Janet Amitai. Jerusalem: IES, 1985.
- . "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law on the Second Temple Period." Pages 239-255 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by George J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 55 (1990): 64-73.
- . "Miqsat ma'aseh ha-torah and the Temple Scroll," *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community: Proceedings of the Groningen Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls (20-23 August 1989)*. Vol II. Ed. F. García Martínez. *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 435-457.
- . "The Prohibition of the Skins of Animals in the Temple Scroll and Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah." Pages 191-198 in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and its World*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990.
- . "4QMMT – Basic Sectarian Text." Pages 81-83 in *Qumran Cave Four: Special Report*. Edited by Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Case of Tevul Yom," *DSD* 1/3 (1994): 285-299.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.
- . "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 81-98 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. SBLSym 2. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "Miqsat Ma'asei ha-Torah." Pages 558-560 in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Schunack, Gerd. *Der Hebräerbrief*. ZBK 14. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2002.

- Schwartz, Daniel. "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees." Pages 67-80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. SBLSym 2. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Segal, M. H. A *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Sharp, Carolyn J. "Phinehan Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT," *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 207-222.
- Smith, Mark S. "The Waw-Consecutive at Qumran," *ZAH* 4/2 (1991): 161-164.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments." Pages 189-220 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. JSPSup 8. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur: Eine Einführung*. München: Beck, 1977.
- Studel, Annette. "מִשַׁט מַא'אֶשֶׁה הַתּוֹרָה in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225-231.
- . *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 (Catena^a) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "4Q448: The Lost Beginning of MMT?" Pages 247-263 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Studel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Steuernagel, Carl. *Das Deuteronomium*. HKAT I/3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923.
- Stirewalt, M. Luther, Jr. *Paul, the Letter Writer*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Stone, Michael E. "Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 383-441 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984.
- Strugnell, John. "MMT: Second thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition." Pages 57-73 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- . "Additional Observations on 4QMMT. Appendix 3." Pages 203-206 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Sussmann, Yaakov. "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Observations on Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah (4QMMT) (Hebrew)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-90): 11-76.
- . "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Preliminary Talmudic Observations on 4QMMT. Appendix 1." Pages 179-200 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Taatz, Irene. *Frühjüdische Briefe: Die Paulinischen Briefe im Rahmen der offiziellen religiösen Briefe des Frühjudentums*. NTOA 16. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1991.

- Talmon, Semaryahu. "The Community of the Renewed Covenant." Pages 3-24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Talshir, David. "Review of DJD X. Qumran Cave 4.V. Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell," *DSD* 2/3 (1995): 365-377.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern and Postbiblical Literature." In *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.
- . *Deuteronomy*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. J. C. "Annotated Lists of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada." Pages 285-322 in *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in Judaean Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- . "Publication of PAM 43.398 (IAA #202) Including New Fragments of 4Q269." Pages 265-280 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "4Q394-399." In: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library (Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library CD-ROM)*. Revised ed. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Brigham Young University. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judean Desert." Pages 323-349 in *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in Judaean Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: An Overview and a Progress Report on their Publication," *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 207-228.
- . "The Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon." Pages 79-98 in Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SDSRL. Leiden/Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans, 1999.
- . "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran." Pages 179-195 in *The Bible as a Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London/New Castle: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
- . "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65/2 (2003): 202-214.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Qumran Residents: Essenes not Sadduceans!" Pages 85-94 in *Qumran Cave Four. Special Report*. Ed. Zdislaw J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
- . "The Calendar, 4Q327, and 4Q394." Pages 179-194 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Cambridge 1995*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . “Covenant.” Pages 151-155 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *Introduction to Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- VanderKam, James and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity. With a Foreword by Emanuel Tov*. San Francisco: HarperCollins Publishers, 2002.
- Wassen, Cecilia and Jutta Jokiranta. “Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.” Pages 205-45 in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. Edited by David J. Chalcrafft. London: Equinox, 2007.
- Veijola, Timo. *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum*. BWANT 149. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2000.
- . Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium. Kapitel 1,1-16,17. ATD 8,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2004.
- . “Law and Wisdom: The Deuteronomistic Heritage in Ben Sira’s Teaching of the Law.” Pages 429-448 in *Ancient Israel, Judaism, and Christianity in Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of Karl-Johan Illman*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, Antti Laato, Risto Nurmela, Karl Gustav Sandelin and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: /Winona Lake: Oxford University Press/Eisenbrauns, 1972/1992.
- . *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- von Weissenberg, Hanne. “4QMMT – Towards an Understanding of the Epilogue,” *RevQ* 21/81 (2003) 29-45.
- Werrett, Ian C. *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 72. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis: 2. Teilband. Genesis 12-36*. BKAT I/2. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1981.
- White, J. L. “Ancient Epistolography Group in Retrospective,” *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing. Semeia* 22 (1981): 1-14.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . “Reading Deuteronomy in the Second Temple Period.” Pages 127-140 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange. SBLSym 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- van der Woude, Adam. S. “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988),” *Theologische Rundschau* 54 (1989): 245-247.
- Yadin, Azzan. “4QMMT, Rabbi Ishmael, and the Origins of Legal Midrash,” *DSD* 10/1 (2003): 130-149.
- Yadin, Yigael. “The Excavation of Masada – 1964/64. Preliminary Report,” *IEJ* 15 (1965): 1-120.
- Yardeni, Ada. “4Q397. 4Q398. Script.” Pages 21-25, 29-34 in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’aseh Ha-Torah*. DJD X. 1994.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Hebrew Bible

<p>Genesis</p> <p>2:24 108</p> <p>6:11 196</p> <p>6:13 196</p> <p>15:6 110, 215</p> <p>Exodus</p> <p>23:14-17 129</p> <p>34 197</p> <p>34:16 200</p> <p>Leviticus</p> <p>4:13-14 109</p> <p>4:27-28 109</p> <p>5:15 199</p> <p>5:21 199</p> <p>6:19-21 107</p> <p>7:15 107</p> <p>11-15 115</p> <p>11:24-25 108</p> <p>11:27-28 108</p> <p>11:31-32 108</p> <p>13-14 109</p> <p>13:46 109</p> <p>14 109</p> <p>17 123</p> <p>17:3-5 122</p> <p>17:3-7 122</p> <p>17:3-9 108</p> <p>18 195</p> <p>18:23 76</p> <p>19:19 76, 109, 121</p> <p>19:23-25 108, 121</p> <p>19:24 108</p> <p>20 195</p> <p>20:16 76</p> <p>21:13-15 109, 121</p> <p>22:16 73</p> <p>22:28 108</p>	<p>26 127</p> <p>26:14 199</p> <p>26:39-42 199</p> <p>27:30 108, 121</p> <p>27:30-32 108, 121</p> <p>Numbers</p> <p>5:6 199</p> <p>5:12 199</p> <p>5:27 199</p> <p>18:1 114</p> <p>19 75, 115</p> <p>19:1-10 107</p> <p>19:16-18 109</p> <p>25:7-8 215</p> <p>25:11-13 215</p> <p>31:16 199</p> <p>Deuteronomy</p> <p>1-3 134</p> <p>1:1 121, 151</p> <p>4:1-40 211</p> <p>4:5-8 214</p> <p>4:6 214</p> <p>4:29-30 110, 189, 207, 208, 209, 211</p> <p>4:30 190, 209</p> <p>6:18 110, 216</p> <p>6:24-25 110, 216</p> <p>6:25 216</p> <p>7 197</p> <p>7:4 200</p> <p>7:25 192</p> <p>7:26 100, 102, 110, 192, 195, 196, 197</p> <p>11:26-28 211</p> <p>12 123, 192, 193, 232</p>
--	---

254 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

12-13	193	30:19	185
12-26	127	31:9-13	141
12:2	110, 191, 192,	31:16	196
	194, 195, 197	31:16-29	211
12:2-3	193	31:29	110, 189, 190,
12:2-7	193, 198		207, 209, 210,
12:5	108, 122, 124		211
12:8-12	193		
12:13-19	193	Joshua	
12:15	121, 136	7:1	199
12:20-28	193	22:16	199
12:25	216	22:20	199
12:28	110, 216		
12:29-31	193, 198	2 Samuel	
12:30-31	198	7:15	185
12:31	100, 110, 192,	11:15	149
	195, 197		
13	197, 198	1 Kings	
13:1	198	8:4	209
13:19	216	11:26	183
13:39	216	11:33	216
16	129	11:38	216
16:1-17	129	14:8	216
16:18-17:13	193	15:5	216
17:1	192	15:11	216
18:12	192	21:9-10	149
21:9	216	22:43	216
22:5	192		
22:9	109, 121	2 Kings	
22:11	109, 121	5:6	149
22:21	196	10:2-3	149
23:2-4	77, 108, 121	10:6	149
23:19	192, 196	10:30	216
25:16	192	12:3	216
25:19	209	14:3	216
26	108, 121	15:3	216
27	127, 140	15:34	216
27:9	141	16:2	216
27:15	192	18:3	216
28	127, 140, 211	19:10-13	149
28:62-63	140	22:2	216
29	211	24:17-20	183
30-31	141		
30:1-2	110, 189, 190,	Isaiah	
	207, 208, 209,	37:10-13	149
	211	55:3	185
30:1-10	211		
30:2	209, 210	Jeremiah	
30:6	211	3:2	196

3:9	196	12:22	192
13:27	196	15:8-9	192
27:12	183	15:26	192
29	148, 151, 152,	16:5	192
	153	17:15	192
29:1-23	151	20:10-23	192
29:4-23	149		
29:12	209	Job	
29:24-28	151	21:34	199
29:24-29	151		
29:30-32	151	Lamentations	
31:16-21	211	1:10	77
31:31	188		
31:31-44	211	Esther	
34:5	216	9:20-32	151
36	152		
36:16-20	152	Daniel	
52:1-11	183	3:31	153
		3:31-4:34	147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153
Ezekiel		4:25-30	153
16	196	6:25-27	147, 148
23	196	6:26-28	149, 152
		9:7	199
Hosea		11:10	99
	196	12:10	99
4:4-7	140		
4:9	140	Ezra	
4:14	140	4:11-16	149
		4:17-20	149
Joel		5:7b-17	149
2:28-32	209	6:2-12	149
		7:12-26	149
Amos		7:23	196
3:10	196	8:17	196
		9:1-2	108
Micah		9:2	199
6:12	196	9:4	199
		9-10	135
Haggai		10:2	199
2:11-13	140	10:6	199
		10:10	199
Psalms		14:13	199
11:15	196	15:8	199
89:50	185	20:27	199
106:31	110, 215	44:6-9	107
Proverbs		Nehemiah	
3:22	192	1:5	199
11:1-20	192		

256 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

6:6-7	149	6:42	185
9-10	135	9:29	183
10:33-40	135	13:6	183
13:1	108	21:12-15	149
13:23	108	28:19	199
13:27	199	28:22	199
		29:5-11	135
1 Chronicles		31:6	121
9:1	199	33:19	199
		36:11	183
2 Chronicles		36:13	199
2:10-15	149	36:14	199

New Testament

Luke		Galatians	
1:3	166		23
		2:16	8
John		3:2	8
21:24	166	3:5	8
		3:10	8
Acts		Hebrews	
2:17-21	209		157, 160
9:2	156		
Romans		James	
3:20	8		157
3:28	8		
16:22	156	2 Peter	
			23
1 Corinthians		1 John	
7:1	163		23, 160, 161
7:25	163		
8:1	163		

Dead Sea Scrolls

1Q16 (1QPesher to Psalms)		1QS (1QRule of the Community)	
	170		111, 130, 131, 132, 133, 186, 187, 188, 200, 217, 221, 230, 234
1QIsa ^a (1QIsaiah ^a)			
	80		
1QpHab (1QPesher to Habakkuk)		1.1b-2	217
	21, 170	1.13b-15a	130
		1.16-2:18	129, 186
		1.16-3:12	186

2.19-25	186	4Q174 (4QFlorilegium)	
2.19-25a	186		44, 121
2.25-3:4	187	1-2 i 3-4	77
2.25b-3.12	186		
5.1	111, 187	4Q217 (4QpapJubilees ^b)	
5.14	187		39
5.7b-20a	187		
5.7c-20a	129	4Q251 (4QHalakha A)	
5.8-9	187		108, 110, 163
6.8	111		
8.4b-6	125	4Q252 (4QcommGen B)	
9.16-17	15	4.2	209
9.26b-11.22	132		
		4Q255 (4QRule of the Community ^a)	
1QSa (1QRule of the Congregation)			217
	121, 125	1	217
1.1	189		
		4Q256 (4QRule of the Community ^b)	
1Q33 (1QWar Scroll)			187
	121	1-4	186
		9.6b-13	129, 187
3Q15 (3QCopper Scroll)			
	4	4Q257 (4QRule of the Community ^c)	
		1 I	186
4Q159 (4QOrdinances ^a)			
	110, 163	4Q258 (4QRule of the Community ^d)	
			187
4Q161 (4QIsaiah Peshet ^a)		1.5b-13	129, 187
	170		
		4Q259 (4QRule of the Community ^e)	
4Q166 (4QHosea Peshet ^a)			132, 133, 142,
	170		230
		4Q260 (4QRule of the Community ^f)	
4Q167 (4QHosea Peshet ^b)			132
	170	4 ii	129
4Q171 (4QPsalms Peshet ^a)			
	13, 17, 18, 170	CD (Cairo Damascus Document)	
			110, 117, 130,
4Q173 (4QPsalms Peshet ^b)			131, 163, 186,
	170		187, 188, 200,

258	4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE	
	205, 221, 230,	4Q313 (4QCryptic A)
	234	3, 26, 32, 38, 43,
3.12b-15a	130	55, 59, 60, 62, 65
4.12-5:11	200	
6.17b-21	130	4Q319 (4QOtot)
6.19	188	132, 133, 142
8.21	188	
10.4	111	4Q327 (4QCalendrical Doc E ^b)
12.22-23	111	33, 34, 35, 36,
13.7	111	37, 90, 91, 129,
14.12	111	230
15.5b-16.6a	129	
15.8b-10	186	4Q385 (4QPseudo-Ezekiel ^a)
15.12	186	39
16.1-2	186	
16.4-5	186	4QMMT (<i>DJD X</i> Composite Text)
		Section A
4QD (4QDamascus Document)		25, 31
	110, 117, 163	A 19-20 45
		Section B
4Q266 (4QDamascus Document ^a)		
8 i	129	25, 31, 34, 105, 118, 119, 134, 135
4Q269 (4QDamascus Document ^d)		
	53	B-C9 119
		B 1 105, 120, 121
4Q270 (4QDamascus Document ^e)		
	39	B 1-2 119
		B 1-3a 106
6 i-ii	129	B 1-3 11, 128
		B 1-9 45
4Q276 (4QTohorot B ^a)		
	107	B 3-5 107
		B 3b-82 107
		B 5-8 45, 107
4Q277 (4QTohorot B ^b)		
	107	B 5b-6 136
		B 6 136
		B 8-9 107
4Q280 (4QCurses)		
	186	B 9-12 107
		B 9b-12 136
		B 9-18 46
4Q286-290 (4QBerakhot ^{a-e})		
	186	B 10 136
		B 10-18 45
		B 11-13 114, 140, 161

B 12	39, 74	B 44	46, 113
B 13	75	B 46	46
B 13-17	107	B 47-50	45
B 14	39	B 48	42, 46
B 16-17	114, 140, 161	B 49-50	46
B 18-27	108	B 50	42, 74, 112
B 19-20	45	B 50-66	46
B 21-23	41, 46	B 51	112
B 21-24	108	B 51-55	45
B 22-23	46	B 54	42
B 24	46	B 55	112
B 25-27	114, 140, 161	B 55-58a	108
B 26	46, 73	B 56-66	45, 46
B 26-33	45	B 56-80	46
B 27-33	121, 193, 232	B 58	113
B 27-35	123	B 58-62	121, 122, 123, 193, 232
B 27b-33	122	B 58b-62a	108
B 27b-35	108	B 58b-62	123
B 28	46	B 62-64	121
B 29	112	B 62b-64a	108
B 30	46	B 64/65	112
B 31	46	B 64b-72	109
B 32	122	B 65	111
B 33	46	B 68-70	136, 137
B 34	46	B 73	75, 112
B 35	46, 136	B 73-74	109
B 35b-39	108	B 75	39, 74
B 36	112	B 75-80	136
B 36-37	46	B 75-82	109, 121
B 36-38	45, 46	B 76	75
B 37	112	B 77	76, 113
B 39	46, 77	B 78	113
B 39-40	45	B 80	111, 137
B 39-42	77	B 81	46
B 39-49	121	B 81-82	46
B 39a-54	108		
B 39b-49a	108		
B 40	46, 77	Section C	
B 40-41	46		25, 26, 31, 34, 89, 105, 118, 119, 120, 128
B 41	77		
B 42	46, 77, 112		
B 42-46	45	C 1	89

260 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

C 1-2	126	C 20-22	126, 138
C 1-4	86	C 21	69, 172
C 1-7	27, 89	C 22	99, 189
C 1-8	47, 87	C 22-24	87
C 1-9	27, 89, 119	C 24	99
C 3	113	C 24b-25a	99
C 3-4	126	C 25	47, 87
C 3-5	188, 189, 190	C 25-26	105
C 5-7	89, 191	C 25b-32	213
C 6	172	C 26	2, 165
C 7	100	C 26-27	113
C 7-9	201	C 26-32	47, 87, 119
C 8	100	C 27	113, 139
C 8-16	119	C 27-28	164, 202
C 9	89, 119	C 28-30	202
C 9-12	47, 87	C 29	105, 120
C 9-26	119	C 29-30	47
C 9-32	119	C 30	47, 124, 189
C 10	67	C 31	216
C 10-12a	92		
C 11	67	4Q394 (4QMMT ^a)	
C 12	65, 68, 70, 92, 172		31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 91, 93, 105, 112, 114, 120, 121, 122, 123, 129, 131, 133, 188, 221, 230, 234
C 12-16	206		
C 13	70, 87, 92, 207		
C 13-14	124		
C 13-16	47		
C 14	113		
C 14-16	47		
C 14-17	87		
C 15	111		
C 15-16	137	1-2	31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 90, 91, 129, 230
C 16	71, 113		
C 16-17	92		
C 17	71, 86	1-2 3a-4	41
C 17-18	47	3a-4	36, 37, 38, 43
C 18	56, 68, 87, 183	3a-4 i 1-3	34, 230
C 18-24	47, 86	3-7	35
C 19	69	3-7 i	35, 91
C 19-21	69, 87, 124	3-7 i 1-3	31, 45
C 20	69, 119	3-7 i 4	121
C 20-21	189, 190	3-7 i 4-6	106

3-7 i 4-12	45	4Q396 (4QMMT ^c)	
3-7 i 13-ii 2	45, 46		39, 40, 41, 42,
3-7 i 15	73, 74		43, 72, 74, 76,
3-7 i 16	75		77, 78, 79, 93,
3-7 ii 1	73		112, 121, 123,
3-7 ii 3-4	45		137
3-7 ii 5-12	45	1-2 i 1	46
3-7 ii 13-18	46	1-2 i 1-4	45
8 ii 13	73	1-2 i 2-4	46
8 ii 13-18	45	1-2 i 5	46
8 iii 1-5	45	1-2 i 5-6	77
8 iii 6-8	45, 46	1-2 i 6	46
8 iii 9-11	45	1-2 i 7-11	46
8 iii 9-19	77	1-2 ii 1	46
8 iii 12-16	45, 46	1-2 ii 2-7	45
8 iii 17-20	45	1-2 ii 2-iii 6	46
8 iv 1-5	45	1-2 ii 8-iii 6	45
8 iv 1-16	46	1-2 ii 8-iv 9	46
8 iv 5-16	45	1-2 iv 2	75
8 iv 6-16	46	1-2 iv 4	74
		1-2 iv 5	76
4Q394-396 (4QMMT ^{a-c})		1-2 iv 6	76
38, 41		1-2 iv 10-11	46
4Q394-398 (4QMMT ^{a-e})		4Q397 (4QMMT ^d)	
5, 12			2, 27, 31, 40, 41,
			43, 44, 47, 48,
4Q394-399 (4QMMT ^{a-f})			51, 52, 53, 59,
2, 3, 25, 26, 32,			61, 66, 67, 68,
38, 44, 55, 59,			69, 70, 71, 72,
60, 62, 65			74, 75, 76, 77,
			78, 79, 80, 81,
4Q395 (4QMMT ^b)			82, 83, 84, 85,
34, 35, 41, 43,			86, 88, 89, 91,
45, 72, 73, 74,			92, 93, 94, 100,
75, 78, 114			101, 110, 112,
1	75		113, 114, 121,
1 1-4	45		122, 123, 137,
1 5-12	46		138, 169, 172,
1 7	73		189, 205, 207,
1 11	73		226, 227, 228,
			229

262 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

1-2	41, 52, 108	14-21 10-11	92, 166
1-2 1-3	46	14-21 10-12a	90, 92, 97, 103, 204, 227
1-2 4	46	14-21 10-12	139
1-13	40, 43	14-21 11	51, 171, 172
3	45, 46	14-21 12	51, 61, 67, 82, 172
4	46	14-21 12-14	206
5	45, 46, 77	14-21 12-16	47
5 1	46	14-21 12b-16	90, 97, 110
5 2-3	77, 78	14-21 13	51, 126, 172
5 2	46	14-21 13-15	87
5 3-5	46	14-21 14	51
5 6	46	14-21 15	51
6-13	46	14-21 15-16	47, 69, 92
6-13 1-7	45, 46	14-21 16	51, 68, 86, 87
6-13 1-14	46	14-23	40, 43
6-13 8	79	17	50, 51
6-13 11	75	22	52, 69, 81, 86, 87
6-13 12	74, 75	23	47, 48, 52, 83, 84, 87, 88, 89, 90, 94, 98, 110, 229
6-13 13	76	23 3	47
6-13 15	44, 46	24	53
14-21	26, 43, 49, 50, 66, 86, 89, 94, 229	4Q397-399 (4QMMT ^{d-f})	5, 12, 48, 65, 66, 80
14-21 1	44, 50	4Q398 (4QMMT ^e)	2, 3, 4, 26, 27, 40, 41, 43, 47, 48, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 74, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 104, 105, 110, 113, 120,
14-21 1-4	86		
14-21 1-7	27, 89		
14-21 1-8	47, 66, 87, 90, 92, 110		
14-21 1-9	27, 89, 96		
14-21 2	50		
14-21 4	198		
14-21 5	50		
14-21 5-7	191, 199		
14-21 6	172		
14-21 7	50		
14-21 7-11	201		
14-21 8-9	199		
14-21 9	90		
14-21 9-12	47, 87		
14-21 9-14	47, 92		
14-21 10	50, 66, 82, 113, 165, 166		

	138, 139, 140, 166, 169, 172, 174, 189, 206, 207, 216, 226, 227, 228, 229	14-17 14-17 i 14-17 i 1 14-17 i 1-4 14-17 i 1-5 14-17 i 1-8 14-17 i 2 14-17 i 2-3 14-17 i 2-4 14-17 i 3 14-17 i 4 14-17 i 5 14-17 i 5-8 14-17 i 6 14-17 i 6-7 14-17 i 7 14-17 i 8 14-17 ii 14-17 ii 1 14-17 ii 1-8 14-17 ii 1b-8 14-17 ii 2 14-17 ii 2-7 14-17 ii 2-8 14-17 ii 3 14-17 ii 3-4 14-17 ii 4 14-17 ii 5 14-17 ii 5-6 14-17 ii 5-8 14-17 ii 6 14-17 ii 7 14-17 ii 7-8 15 16 17	40, 53, 54, 59, 86, 88, 94, 228 26, 27, 58, 59, 70, 88, 229 59, 90 47, 70 87 47, 92 59, 82 166 90, 92, 97, 103, 139, 204, 227 60 60, 67, 82 70, 80, 87 47, 90, 97, 110 61 87, 126 80 61, 71 58, 62, 71 47, 62, 80, 87, 185 84, 90, 98, 110 213 81 87 47, 71, 93 62 180 62, 81 62, 81 47 47, 52 189 62, 81 215 54 54 54, 67
1-3	40, 41, 43, 46, 74, 108		
1-3 1-2	46		
1-3 3	46		
1-9	42, 91, 228		
1-10	42		
2-3	42		
4-10	41		
5	42, 43		
7	42, 43		
10	42		
11-13	26, 27, 40, 45, 47, 53, 55, 68, 69, 70, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 96, 99, 109, 119, 181, 194, 228, 229		
11-13 01	55		
11-13 01-7	182		
11-13 1	55, 86, 87, 126		
11-13 1-3	52		
11-13 2	56		
11-13 2-4	87		
11-13 3	56		
11-13 3-4	126, 172		
11-13 3-5	188		
11-13 4	172		
11-13 5	56		
11-13 5-7	87		
11-13 6	57		
11-13 7	57		
11-17	40, 41, 42, 43, 91, 228		
14	54		

264 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

4Q399 (4QMMT ^f)	38, 41, 43, 62, 63, 71, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 93, 95, 101, 104, 105, 110, 113, 138, 139, 140, 169, 203, 213, 215, 226, 227, 228	4Q504 (4QDibHam ^a)	188
i	64,	5Q11 (5QRule of the Community)	
i 1-8	47	1 I-II	186
i 9-ii 5	47, 93, 228	7Q2 (7QEpistle of Jeremiah)	154
ii	64, 140	11Q5 (11QPsalms ^a)	
ii 1	81	27	133
ii 2	81	11Q19 (11QTemple ^a)	
ii 2-5	47, 52		125, 197, 217,
ii 3	120	2	230
ii 4	47, 64, 81	2.9-10	197
iii	64	47.7-18	191
4Q400-407 (4QShirShabb)		50.11-66	108
	44	52.13-21	217
		52.13-53:8	108
		53.7	123
		55.14	217
		57-59	217
4Q448 (4QApoc Psalm and Prayer)		59.17	217
	13, 39, 40	63	217
		63.8	217

Rabbinic Writings

<i>t. Menahot</i>		<i>m. Teharot</i>	
110a	223	8:9	108
<i>m. Parah</i>		<i>m. Yadayim</i>	
2:1	75	4:7	108
3:7	107		
4:1	75	<i>Tg. Ruth</i>	
<i>t. Sanhedrin</i>		2:10-13	77
2:6	10		

Classical Authors

Josephus		Philo	
<i>Jewish War</i>		<i>Every Man is Free</i>	
2.17.2	107	1:1	160
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		<i>On Rewards and Punishments</i>	
13.9-10	195	1:3	160
Ptolemy		<i>On Abraham</i>	
<i>Letter to Flora</i>	157	1:2	160

Other Ancient Literature

1 Baruch		Sirach	
6	154	44:19-21	216
		44-50	183
Epistle of Jeremiah		45:23-24	216
	153, 159	47:23b-25	184
43-44	154		
		<i>2 Baruch</i>	
1 Maccabees		78-86	151
	154, 155, 185		
2:27	185	<i>1 Enoch</i>	
2:42	185		154
2:52	215		
		<i>Jubilees</i>	
2 Maccabees			133, 188, 230
	150, 155	1:10	130, 131
1:1-9	155	14	130, 131
1:1-10	155	30:2-4	195
1:10-2:18	10, 151, 155, 156		
9:19-27	155	papMas Ep gr	
11:16-21	155	1039-307/1	148
11:22-26	155		
11:27-33	155	MasOstr	
11:34-38	155	16-89/1	148

MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M. 5, 6, 8, 133, 186, 215
Albertz, R. 184
Alexander, P. S. 132, 149, 150, 151,
154, 155, 156, 158, 162, 187
Attridge, H. W. 157, 160
Avery-Peck, A. J. 214
Baillet, M. 3, 4, 154
Bakhtin, M. 177
Baltzer, K. 127, 128, 131, 132, 135,
142, 167
Baumgarten, A. 202
Baumgarten, J. M. 4, 19, 26, 107,
109, 111, 116, 125, 163, 222
Beattie, D. R. G. 5
Ben-Dov, J. 33, 36, 132
Benoit, P. 3
Bernstein, M. J. 3, 7, 11, 12, 14, 27,
28, 33, 43, 89, 99, 100, 109, 124,
127, 134, 171, 172, 173, 176,
177, 185, 189, 190, 191, 215
Berthelot, K. 205, 206
Betz, O. 4, 5, 12, 140
Bickermann, E. 155
Blenkinsopp, J. 214
Borgen, P. 160
Bowden, J. 148
Braulik, G. 193, 195, 211, 212
Brin, G. 24, 159
Brooke, G. J. 14, 20, 22, 24, 100,
117, 124, 125, 126, 153, 159,
163, 168, 171, 172, 173, 174,
176, 178, 184, 185, 191, 209,
210, 211, 212, 224
Burgmann, H. 16
Callaway, P. 14, 36, 37, 42
Carmichael, C. M. 1, 5
Chalcraft, D. J. 202
Charlesworth, J. H. 3, 26, 32, 38, 55,
59, 62, 65, 160
Chazon, E. G. 19, 20, 111, 178
Christiansen, E. J. 188
Clements, R. A. 23, 178
Collins, J. 152, 153, 223
Cotton, H. 148
Cross, F. M. 2
Cryer, F. H. 188
Davies, P. R. 8, 19
De Troyer, K. 129
Deissmann, A. 146, 147
Dimant, D. 8, 20, 118, 175, 178
Doering, L. 154
Dombrowski, B. 6
Donner, H. 195
Doty, W. 147
Doubinsky, C. 179
Dunderberg, I. 157
Dunn, J. 8, 215, 216
Eisenman, R. H. 5, 12, 28, 34, 50,
56, 99
Elgvin, T. 32, 60, 61
Elledge, C. D. 170, 172
Elman, Y. 107
Elwolde, J. 73
Eshel, H. 13, 16, 19, 21,
Falk, D. 20, 124
Fischer, T. 155
Fishbane, M. 124, 173, 174, 175,
184, 190
Fitzmyer, J. 146, 147, 148, 149, 150,
152, 162
Flint, P. W. 8, 9, 22, 114, 177, 186
Fraade, S. D. 14, 22, 23, 24, 117,
135, 141, 142, 145, 164, 200,
222, 224, 225, 235
Freedman, D. N. 20
Frey, A. 154
García Martínez, F. 1, 3, 5, 6, 13,
14, 20, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 81,
99, 102, 103, 104, 109, 115, 116,
125, 127, 130, 185, 187, 189,
207, 220
Geiger, J. 148

- Genette, G. 179
 Glessmer, U. 33
 Goldstein, J. 154, 155, 156, 158
 Goodman, M. D. 8
 Gora, T. 177
 Gounelle, R. 154
 Grabbe, L. 13, 14, 140
 Grayston, K. 160
 Grossman, M. 14, 23, 24, 142, 145,
 159, 161, 222, 224, 235
 Habicht, C. 155
 Halpern, B. 20
 Harrington, H. 108, 109, 114, 115,
 116, 125, 153, 202, 219
 Hartman, L. F. 153
 Hempel, C. 19, 25, 79, 93, 109, 111,
 114, 115, 117, 118, 134, 140,
 163, 186, 202
 Hengel, M. 128, 129, 148, 149, 150,
 151, 173, 176, 183, 185, 227
 Herbert, E. D. 171
 Himmelfarb, M. 115, 116
 Høgenhaven, J. 13, 164
 Holladay, W. L. 151, 152
 Hultgren, S. 14, 16
 Jardin, A. 177
 Jastrow, M. 73
 Jokiranta, J. 134, 202
 Joüon, P. 81
 Kampen, J. 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 22,
 33, 109, 127, 134, 135, 184
 Kapera, Z. 1, 4, 6, 14, 37
 Kister, M. 87, 116, 161, 220
 Klawans, J. 115, 116, 195, 196
 Knohl, I. 16
 Koester, H. 157, 160, 195
 Koskenniemi, H. 150, 162, 164
 Kratz, R. 27, 44, 88, 205
 Kristeva, J. 177, 179
 Kugler, R. 109, 123, 223
 Kutscher, E. Y. 39
 Labahn, M. 157
 Lange, A. 15, 129
 Levinson, B. 129, 193, 194
 Lim, T. H. 1, 5, 129, 171, 205
 Lindenberger, J. M. 14, 146, 148,
 162
 Lohfink, G. 144
 Lundbom, J. R. 152, 153
 MacQueen, H. L. 1, 5
 Makkonen, A. 179
 Malherbe, A. J. 150
 Marböck, J. 216
 Marz, C. P. 157
 Mayes, A. D. H. 193
 McKane, W. 151, 152
 McNamara, M. J. 5
 Medala, S. 19
 Meier, J. P. 25
 Menken, M. 129
 Metso, S. 32, 44, 132, 133, 177,
 187, 188, 230
 Milgrom, J. 199
 Milik, J. T. 3, 4, 33, 133, 154
 Miller, O. 177
 Mittmann-Richert, U. 15
 Morag, S. 81, 85
 Moyise, S. 129
 Mulder, J. 175
 Muraoka, T. 81
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 147, 156
 Naveh, J. 148
 Neusner, J. 214
 Newman, C. 179
 Newsom, C. 20, 44
 Nisula, T. 150, 154, 155, 164
 Olyan, S. M. 200
 Pardee, D. 146, 147, 148, 149, 162,
 163
 Peel, M. L. 157, 158
 Pérez Fernández, M. 12, 27, 28, 43,
 89, 113, 119, 120
 Pfann, S. J. 32, 38
 Pinnick, A. 19, 111
 Popović, M. 101
 Porten, B. 87
 Porter, S. E. 186
 Propp, W. 20
 Puech, E. 13, 101, 205, 206
 Qimron, E. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10,
 11, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 32,
 33, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 48, 50,
 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62,
 65, 66, 67, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76,
 77, 80, 81, 82, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89,
 94, 95, 100, 105, 122, 144, 165,
 172, 173, 190, 198, 216, 228, 229
 Quispel, G. 157

268 4QMMT: REEVALUATING THE TEXT, THE FUNCTION AND
THE MEANING OF THE EPILOGUE

- von Rad, G. 193
Rappaport, U. 8, 20,
Regev, E. 9, 14, 17, 106, 115, 136
Reinhartz, A. 22, 23
Ringgren, H. 199
Robinson, J. M. 5
Roo, J. C. R. de. 186
Rose, M. 193
Rosel, M. 124
Roth, M. 127
Roudiez, L. S. 177
Ruckstuhl, E. 157
Sáenz-Badillos, A. 73
Sanders, E. P. 107
Sanders, J. A. 133, 177, 180
Sanderson, J. E. 181
Saukkonen, J. M. 9
Schiffman, L. H. 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 13, 16,
18, 19, 20, 21, 106, 107, 108,
114, 116, 118, 125, 133, 135,
140, 176, 184, 187, 220
Schunack, G. 160
Schwartz, D. R. 16, 19, 21, 23, 114,
202
Shanks, H. 5
Sharp, C. J. 200
Skehan, P. W. 181
Smith, M. S. 8
Stegemann, H. 5, 12, 18, 27, 39, 44,
70, 87, 88, 89, 94, 181, 229
Stemberger, G. 223
Studel, A. 13, 39, 40, 44, 188, 189,
190
Stirewalt, M. L. 156
Stone, M. 149, 175
Strugnell, J. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10,
11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25, 26,
27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 41,
44, 48, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 57, 60,
61, 62, 66, 67, 70, 71, 74, 75, 76,
77, 81, 82, 87, 88, 89, 94, 100,
105, 117, 122, 136, 137, 144,
159, 161, 163, 165, 181, 184,
198, 229
Sussmann, Y. 7, 12, 19, 21, 115,
116, 134, 220
Swanson, D. 197, 221
Taatz, I. 152, 154, 155, 156
Talmon, S. 33, 36, 129, 186
Thompson, T. L. 188
Tigay, J. 120, 194, 211, 212
Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 6, 13, 32, 33, 45,
50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60,
61, 62, 67, 102, 103, 104, 127,
185, 207
Tov, E. 5, 15, 32, 33, 61, 118, 171,
176
Trebolle Barrera, J. 115, 117
Ulrich, E. 4, 5, 32, 50, 51, 59, 60,
67, 72, 84, 128, 170, 174, 181,
205
VanderKam, J. C. 4, 8, 9, 19, 22, 33,
34, 35, 36, 37, 114, 118, 130,
131, 160, 176, 186, 188, 195,
220, 230
Vaux, R. de. 4, 154
Vegas Montaner, L. 117
Veijola, T. 128, 181, 190, 193, 198,
210, 214, 215, 220
Vermes, G. 8, 132, 187
Wacholder, B. Z. 5, 6, 133
Wassen, C. 202
Watson, W. G. E. 6
Weinfeld, M. 127, 128, 132, 192,
209, 211, 212, 214, 216
Werrett, I. C. 116, 123
Westermann, C. 215
Wevers, J. W. 181
White, J. L. 146, 150
White-Crawford, S. 128, 217
Wise, M. O. 5, 12, 28, 34, 50, 56, 99
Woude, A. S. van der 16
Yadin, Y. 148
Yardeni, A. 2, 48, 53
Zangenberg, J. 157
Zenger, E. 216