TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

4QM MT AND ITS ADDRESSEE(S)

1. Introduction

Long before its official publication in 1994, (1) and even before its debut in 1984, (2) 4QM MT had been characterized as a polemical communication (or "letter") between the sectarian leadership of the Qumran community, or some precursor, and the mainstream priestly or Pharisaic leadership in Jerusalem. (3) This framing of the document

(1) Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'asit Ha-Torah (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), henceforth referred to as DJD X.

(2) See articles jointly authored by Qimron and Strugnell in next note.

overall was facilitated in large measure by similarities between a few of its rules and positions attributed to the Sadducees in mishnaic accounts of their disputes with the Pharisees. (4) While discussion of 4QMMT has accelerated since its unofficial and then official publication, the overall character of the document has remained that set by its pre-publication notices. Most scholarly discussion has sought to identify more specifically to which adversary the document was addressed and when in the history of the sect it was composed. The preponderance of opinion has favored an early Hasمونean High Priest as the addressee at some time prior to the establishment of the sectarian community at Qumran and the crystallization of its sectarian ideology under the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness and his successors. Within this generally accepted framework, scholars of 4QMMT have concentrated on elucidating 1) the contours of Sadducean religious law, as adapted by the Qumran community; 2) the early stages of development of the Qumran community and its sectarian ideology; 3) early rabbinic accounts of pre-Rabbinic sectarian controversies; 4) the influence of the Pharisees and their teachings on later second temple Jewish law and institutions. (5) While there have


(5) Other areas not addressed here, for which 4QMMT has been important are the nature of its scriptural citation and exegesis, the history of ancient Hebrew dialectology, the sectarian festival calendar, the relation of the document to other sectarian documents, especially the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document, and its relation to the New Testament.

been dissenters to specific aspects of this construction, the overall framework for understanding 4QMMT has remained largely intact.

My own entry into this discussion begins with consideration of two aspects of the extant manuscript evidence that pose challenges to the consensus. By all accounts, our only physical evidence for 4QMMT are fragmentary remains of six copies of the document, a significantly large number of copies for a non-biblical sectarian text, which range in date from 75 BCE to 50 CE.(6) Whatever the prior histories of composition and transmission of these extant texts, it is safe to assume that in their present forms they bear witness to the active intramural employment of 4QMMT as an important text of communal study in the first century BCE and CE. If, as some have argued, 4QMMT represents an early (pre-Qumranian) stage in the development of Qumran sectarian law and ideology, directed at its extramural opponents, how would it have functioned intramurally at such a later stage in the community's history? Did the members of the community in the first century not realize that they constituted a later stage of sectarian development, for which 4QMMT was no longer suitable? (7) One response might be that the members of the community, in copying and studying this text at least a century after its composition, were quite aware that they were studying a document from an earlier stage and context in their community's history, a sort of foundering document of their movement. However, the relatively large number of extant copies and what we know of the ritualized nature of Qumran communal study suggests that this was an important communal text, which would have been studied not just as a relic of the past, but for its ability to address and reinforce communal self-understanding and identification in the present as well. (8) In responding to the question of

(6) The six manuscripts are 4Q194-99. For the dating of the manuscripts to 75 BCE to 50 CE, see DJD X.109, as well as Ada Yardeni's paleographic descriptions of the individual manuscripts in DJD X. chap. 1. Frank Moore Cross Jr., "Development of the Jewish Scriptures," in The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright [ed. G. Ernest Wright; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961], 149 fig. 4 line 4, 186-88) paleographically dates one of the manuscripts to ca. 50-25 BCE. John Strugnell ("4QMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," in The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls [ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994]. 70) states that the earliest copy is to be dated to 50 BCE. Strugnell says that "it was frequently copied among them and even held nearly canonical rank."

(7) Albert I. Baumgarten (The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation [Leiden: Brill, 1997]) has used an early date for 4QMMT as the basis for his developmental model of Qumran and more general Jewish sectarianism in second temple times.

(8) Additional possibilities will be suggested below, as at nn. 60-62. While others have noted that the extant manuscripts provide evidence that 4QMMT was studied within the community in the first century BCE, they do not pursue the implications of this. See Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," 90-91 n. 5; Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonaean Period," in Reading 4QMMT, ed. Kampen.
what this early, extramural document is doing in multiple copies at Qumran in the first century BCE. I conducted a rhetorical experiment: What would happen if we were to bracket for a moment everything we have been told about QMmT and try to listen to it as if we were studying it as members of the Qumran community during the first century, heuristically placing ourselves in the position of the text's addressees? QMmT then becomes remarkable as much for what it says as for what it does not say.

2. The Legal Core (Section B)

To begin with, of the approximately twenty extant rules contained in Section B of the composite text, not one identifies an opposing practice of the addressees (contrary to the impression gained from the characterizations of the text by scholars stressing its polemical nature). The second person pronoun נֶאֶה ("you"), in the phrase נֶאֶה תֹּלְדָה נֵאֶה ("you know that "), appears only twice in Section B, in one instance asserting that the addressees know the correct rule (B 68-70), and in the other (partly restored) that the addressees know of the misdeeds of the priests (B 80-82). In two other places in Section B the editors have restored this phrase to the text, but on purely conjectural grounds (B 38, 46). But

and Bernstein, 55, 56 n. 12; Gershon Brin, review of DJD X, JSS 40 (1995): 335: "it may have served as a halakhic handout or for its members... the document no longer served its original purpose of a letter addressed outside of the community, and had become a teaching text aimed at teaching its members the fundamental principles which distinguished the sect from the other groups in Judaism." Phillip R. Callaway ("Qumran Origins: From the Doreseh to the Moreh," RevQ 14 [1990]: 649) goes a step further in arguing that QMmT was never addressed to an opposition audience, but, "its addressed in all likelihood potential adherents of the writer's legal perspective." For a recent exploration of the variety of ways that QMmT could be read, including intramurally ("reading five"); see Maxine L. Grossman, "Reading the History of the Righteous Remnant: Ideology and Constructions of Identity in the Damascus Document," Chapter Two, Part Two: "Reading history and communal identity in QMmT" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania. 2000), esp. 92-94. Israel Koehl ("Review Essay: Re-Considering the Dating and Recipient of Miqrat Marâ'a Ha-Torah," HS 376 [1996]: 119-25) is the only one, of whom I am aware, to suggest a Herodian dating for the composition of QMmT. While Strugnell and Qimron originally dubbed the document a "letter," they (especially Strugnell) later recanted this designation, not finding in it any of the formal signs of a letter per se. Instead they suggest the designation "treatise," but still only one to part outside the community. See DJD X:113-114, 121, 204 (with which compare DJD X:1); Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 63, 72. Kister ("Studies in QMmT Marâ'a Ha-Torah," 324-325) has reaffirmed QMmT's identity as an outwardly-directed letter, giving five principal characteristics of the text which he claims, are at least consistent with that assumption: 1. The absence of any divine names (also argued by Y. Sussman, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 23 n. 27; cf. below, n. 59). The paraphrastic and allusive "citation" of Scripture (cf. below, n. 13). 3. The relative absence of sectarian theological language (cf. below, nn. 23, 25, 29, 38-40, 42, 43, 48, 49, 51). 4. The language and informal style of the document (cf. below, section 4). 5. The manner in which particular laws are presented in order to convince an extramural addressee. Kister (340-41) gives only one (but to my mind not persuasive) example of the last: B 49-54 (the exclusion of the blind and deaf from the sanctuary, because of their incapacity to differentiate between purity and impurity, rather than their infirmities as actual sources of impurity, as elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls). As I shall argue, these features, to the extent that they are as present and distinctive as claimed, can also be viewed as being consistent with the document as an intramural pedagogic instrument, especially if directed at neophytes.

(9) For נֶאֶה תֹּלְדָה נֵאֶה see B 29, 36, 37, and 42 (łe מַנְּאָה תֹּלְדָה נֵאֶה). For נֶאֶה תֹּלְדָה נֵאֶה see B 55, 64-65, 73. While these require varying degrees of restoration, they appear fairly certain. In B 2 and 8, however, the editors entirely or almost entirely restore נֶאֶה תֹּלְדָה נֵאֶה. Despite initial claims that QMmT was a "letter" from the Teacher of Righteousness to the Wicked Priest (purportedly referred to in 4QpPr 4Q171 3-10 v 8-9); see E. Qimron - J. Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," in Biblical Archaeology Today, 400; in Israel Museum Journal 9; DJD X:119-20), the first person singular ("I") never appears. Strugnell ("MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 72) later suggests that QMmT may have been peopledographically identified with the Teacher of Righteousness in 4QpPr. (10) See J. Bauwens,"The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," 164.

(11) For "they" (נֶאֶה, נֶאֶה) in this sense (followed by a plural participle), see B 3 (restored, antecedent unclear), 6-7, 8 (restored), 10 (plural participle alone), 18 (restored), 24. Similarly, note the third person plural pronoun suffix (נֶאֶה) in B 35. For the behavior of the priests, see B 12, 16-17 (partly restored), 26, 80. In the first three instances, reference is to the proper behavior (נֶאֶה) of the priests, and only in the last to the contrary behavior of "some of the priests" (נֶאֶה). (12) Qimron and Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," Israel Museum Journal, 9.
identified "they," and with one reference to the contrary practice of מנהיגים ("some of the priests," B 80). Of course, much could, and has been, read into the manuscript gaps, as well as between the lines, of Section B, but from what we actually have of it, we cannot infer very much about the identities of the addressee and the addresses. However, we might understand the rules of Section B in relation to the streams of second temple Judaism and later rabbinic halakhah; rhetorically speaking, the "we" of our text seeks to impress upon the "you" the correctness and scriptural foundations (13) of a selection of rules dealing with issues of ritual purity and cultic practice, with which others, including some priests, are in disagreement and/or non-compliance.

3. The Hortatory Conclusion (Section C)

When we turn to the final section of 4QMMT (Section C in the composite text), we find, as befits its parenetic or exhortative, rhetoric, many more instances of second person address. The dialectical character of the speech, somewhat muted in Section B, has now intensified, and with it the absence of any reference to the third person "they" or "priests". The phrase ב יד ה ושעון אבר ("you know that ..."), familiar from Section B, appears twice in the composite text of Section C (C 7, 8), in one of which (C 7) it is entirely restored by the editors, in the other of which (C 8) it is partly, but reasonably, restored. In their restored forms these two read: יד ה ושעון אבר ("[And you know that] we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people"); and יד ה ושעון אבר ("[And you know that] no treachery or deceit or evil can be found in our hand (i.e. in us) since for [these things] we give [...]"). (14) While these juxtapositions of "you" and "we" have been understood in a polemical, extraneous sense, this need not be; they could just as well be construed intramurally as denoting a rhetorical collective "we" that is inclusive of or contiguous to "you." (15) In effect, the addressee is told, "You now know why we separated ourselves from the rest of Israel, and that our motives are pure." There is no reason why this could not have been read intramurally, say, in a pedagogic setting, as rhetorically affirming the raison d'être of the community and dialogically drawing the addressees toward fuller identification with it.

From here on, all second person forms are in the singular. While some scholars have suggested that this difference represents a change of addressee, e.g., from a group of adversaries (Pharisees, Jerusalem priests) to an individual opponent (a particular opposition leader, a High Priest), this need not be. (16) It is commonplace in hortatory speech to switch between plural and singular forms of second person address. This can most clearly be seen in the very section of the Book of Deuteronomy (30-31) upon which so much of Section C is dependent for its scriptural language and allusions. (17) Although Moses there predominantly uses second person singular forms for addressing the Israelite people, he also uses plural forms of address, often with the two intermixed within a single verse. (18) No one would interpret these switches as denoting a change in addressee, but simply a rhetorical device whereby each member of the targeted group feels individually addressed within the collective. As the rhetoric of 4QMMT turns more hortatory and dialogical, it shifts from employing second person plural to second person singular forms of address so as to more directly and personally engage its addressees.

The next instance of second person address comes in the following much discussed, fragmentary sentence (C 10-11): יד ה ושעון אבר ("[And you know that] no treachery or deceit or evil can be found in our hand (i.e. in us) since for [these things] we give [...]"). (14) While these juxtapositions of "you" and "we" have been understood in a polemical, extraneous sense, this need not be; they could just as well be construed intramurally as denoting a rhetorical collective "we" that is inclusive of or contiguous to "you." (15) In effect, the author has written to you so that you may study (carefully) the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and the (writings of) David and the [events of] ages past). (19) A number of these restorations


(14) In both cases, translations are from DJD X:59. However, the Hebrew reconstruction is "we give our hearts." For an alternative reconstruction, see Kister ("Studies in 4QMasoret Marale Ha-Torah," 319 n. 8): "we give our souls." These passages have been commented upon at length by others. My purpose is not to resolve questions of their meaning except to the extent that they bear on the question of the relation of the addressee to the addressee. For "treachery or deceit or evil" as terms for political (rather than religious) rebellion (that is, the lack thereof) on the part of the speaker), see Kister, 321.

(15) The word ב יד is a plural form in Section C: C 9 (אבר), C 20 (אבר), C 26 (אבר), C 30 (אבר). On the last, see below, n. 32. For other first person plural forms, see C 7 (אבר), C 9 (אבר), C 10 (אבר), C 27 (אבר), C 27 (אבר), C 30 (אבר).

(16) Schiefflin ("The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," 94-95); "The New Halakhic Letter [4QMMT] and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," 67; Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls, 86; "Midrashic Masai Ha-Torah," 559 mistakenly characterizes Section C, in contrast to Section B, as being entirely addressed to a singular "you.

(17) It has been suggested that 4QMMT is modeled overall on the Book of Deuteronomy, e.g., beginning with יד ה ושעון אבר (minimicking Deut 11:1: יד ה ושעון אבר), and ending with יד ה ושעון אבר (as does Deut 34:12). See Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 62-63, 67; idem., "Appendix 3: Additional Observations on 4QMMT," DJD X:204-205. The Book of Deuteronomy also figures prominently in many of the laws of Section B and the oratory of Section C, as it does in other scrolls, especially the Domascus Document and the Temple Scroll.

(18) Note the use of second person plural forms, often mixed with singular forms, in Deut 30:18, 19: 31:5, 6, 12, 13, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29. The last example (31:29) is transposed in 4QMMT C 12 from second person plural to second person singular.

(19) MS e (4Q398 14-17 I. 2) has לַעֲרֵבֵּי, "we have [written] them," the pronominal suffix presumably referring back to "these matters" (C 8), the preceding rules and practices. See the note to this line in DJD X:59. It also appears to omit the word לַעֲרֵבֵּי ("to
have been questioned by scholars. (20) and much ink has been spilled on the question of whether this sentence is evidence for a tripartite scriptural canon at Qumran. (21) But for present purposes, I am more interested in the frequently expressed view that the "conciliatory" tone expressed here (and elsewhere) is proof of an early, pre-Qumranic date for the composition of 4QMMT, before sectarian lines had become hardened. After all, the author holds out the hope that the addressee will be led by the present document to study scriptures, presumably so as to recognize the truth of the sectarian rules that have been previously enunciated. But the tone here need only be considered "conciliatory," and the dating pre-Qumranic, if we begin with the assumptions that the addressee is an opponent of the addressee and that the document is extra-murally directed. Once those assumptions are bracketed, there is nothing in the language to preclude this sentence being intramurally directed to those who are, or would be, engaged in the study of scriptures together with the community's messiah (22).

Although the combination of subjects of study is unique to this text, the use of the verb הָּתָּכָה in conjunction with the communal study of scriptural statutes and sacred history appears often in the sectarian scrolls. (23) Note in particular the following phrase from an intramural call to study Torah as the path to redemption and rescue from punishment. 4QDe (4Q270 2 II, 21): יְּהֵסֶכֶךְ מִטָּכָה יְּהוָּא וְיִתְּפָּךְ ("by considering you"). See DJD X-37. The word המְּתָכָה (and יְּהֵסֶכֶךְ in C 26), translated by the editors "to you," can, by their own suggestion, just as well mean "for your benefit." See DJD X-85 (§3.5.1.13).

(20) For example, the restored הָּתָּכָה, modeled after C 26, could just as easily be הָּתָּכָה (see DJD X-59, note ad loc.), and הָּתָּכָה could be הָּתָּכָה, based on Deut 5:27. See Berman, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in Q4MMT," 49.


(22) For a ritualized communal setting for such combined study of הָּתָּכָה and יְּהֵסֶכֶךְ, see IQS VI, 6-8.

(23) For the force of the hip'il of יָכַּה as penetrating study, akin to שֵׁדַע, see DJD X-89 (§3.5.2.3), 132 (§5.2.3). For the same use of this verb elsewhere in 4QMMT, see C 23 (hipo'el), 28, to be treated below. For other uses of this verb in conjunction with the communal study of or learning in the Torah or רְשָׁע, see CD X, 6: XII, 2: 5: XIV, 7. For other roles of הָּתָּכָה for communal study and learning, including the instruction of neophytes, see IQS III, 13: IV, 22: VI, 15: IQS I, 5. This use of הָּתָּכָה is equivalent to הָּתָּכָה of ←2 in IQS I, 7. See further, Kister, "Studies in 4QMegillat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 322 n. 16. Note also Kister's suggestion (351) to fill the lacuna at the beginning of C 23 with הָּתָּכָה ("the wise will understand"), based on Deut 12:10. Kister notes (351 n. 155). "For behold the recipient of the letter is called upon to understand... and it appears that there is a sincere hope that he would be among these wise [and] understanding." This qualification is unnecessary if the addressee were understood to be already a member of the community, as seems to me more likely.


(25) The restoration of IQS 1, 2 is based on 4Q58 (4Q253 1-2) and 4Q57 (4Q257 1-1-2), Compare as well IQS V, 8-9: 4Q58 (4Q256 4 X, 7) and 4Q57 (4Q256 1 I, 6), parallel to IQS 8, the words מְּתָכָה are missing. In each case the language is Deuteronomic, but the usage is similar. Besides Deut 30:2, 10, see 4Q29: 6; 10:12, 13:4; 26:16; as well as 2 Chr 15:12.

(26) I have followed the composite text, with its inclusion of C 18-24 (4Q58 11-13) at this point as befits its contents. For differences of opinion on this placement, see DJD X:201-202. Note the suggestion of Florentino Garcia Martinez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," in Reading 4QMMT, ed. Kampen and Bernstein, 19) to read C 24 as, "fear God and observed the law." For David's being spared punishment for his sins, see CD V, 2-6.

(27) For this understanding of "end of days" here, see Kister, "Studies in 4QMegillat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 351.

(28) For this understanding of C 21-22 (contrary to that of Strugnell and Qimron in DJD X-51), see Garcia Martinez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," 19: "When they return
There are several aspects of this passage that have been critical to an understanding of 4QMMT overall. Before addressing these, let me clarify a few details of textual reading and translation. The phrase אַל יֵלֶדֶת אֶל חָיָה (C 26), translated by the editors as "we have sent you," can just as well be translated, as the translators themselves suggest, "we have written for your benefit." (36) The phrase מַלְכוּת בֵּית (C 30) (37) echoes מַלְכוּת בֵּית (C 26), which in turn hearkens back to מַלְכוּת בֵּית (B 1), with which Section B (and according to one manuscript, the whole of 4QMMT) began. Thus, מַלְכוּת בֵּית refers to the previously enunciated digest of Torah rules, and the hope expressed is not that the addressee will find only some of the communal precepts to be true, but will concur with the previously articulated selection of rules. Thus, it should be translated, "finding (this) digest of our rulings to be correct.

The terms used here for impressing upon the addressee the aforementioned rules are precisely those used elsewhere in the sectarian scrolls for the intramural study activity of the community's members and leaders. I have commented above on הבא אֶל חָיָה ("consider all these things," C 28). (38) Similarly, the verb בָּאָס (used here in the context of בָּאָס אֶל חָיָה ("finding [this] digest of our rulings to be correct," C 30), is used elsewhere in the sectarian scrolls with regard to the esoteric laws "found" (to be correct) by the community and its leaders. Compare in this regard the use of בָּאָס in 1Q8 VIII, 11-12 of שָׁרָיוֹן אֶל חָיָה ("the one who studies") and in CD VI, 19 of בָּאָס אֶל חָיָה ("those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascius"). (39)

Similarly, some of the very terms used in 4QMMT for the behavior desired of the addressee are employed in the Community Rule for that of members of the community. Thus, compare הבא אֶל חָיָה with 1Q8 I, 4; תְּבוּשֵׁת אֶל חָיָה; and הבא אֶל חָיָה (C 29) with 1Q8 I, 2; הָלַךְ אֶל חָיָה; and הבא אֶל חָיָה (C 31) with 1Q8 I, 2; לָשׁוּט אֶל חָיָה (cf. Deut 6:18; 12:28, especially as cited in 1Q8 VIII, 7-8). In 1Q8 these verbs appear as infinitive forms, with the community as a whole as their implied subject, whereas in 4QMMT they employ second person singular forms, dialogically directed at the text's individual addressee(s). (40)

Many scholars have been struck here by the ironic and only moderately dualistic nature of the rhetoric: the "we" are confident that the
"you." being wise and knowledgeable in Torah, will recognize the truth of the aforementioned Torah rules. By so committing to these teachings, the "you" will be fortified against entrapment by Belial, enabled thereby to rejoice in the end of time. This is hardly the sort of communication one would expect from a leader of the "sons of light" to one of the "sons of darkness." For this reason, it has been argued that 4QMMT must date from early in the history of the community, before its split from the Jerusalem priesthood (or Sadducees) was final and before its dualistic ideology had hardened. (41) However, were we not to assume this to be an extramural communication, but an exhortation to a group within the community, then there would be nothing here incommensurate with the "dualistic" teachings expressed in other sectarian texts. In fact, if, as is generally agreed, we were to identify Belial with the Angel of Darkness of the Community Rule (\textit{IQS}), the above lines concord very well with the ideology, if not the language, of the following lines from the "Treatise of the Two Spirits" (\textit{IQS} III, 21-25):

The Angel of Darkness leads all the children of righteousness astray, and until his end, all their sin, iniquities, wickedness, and all their unlawful deeds are caused by his dominion in accordance with the mysteries of God. Every one of their chastisements, and every one of the seasons of their distress, shall be brought about by the rule of his persecution; for all his allotted spirits seek the overthrow of the sons of light. But the God of Israel and His Angel of Truth will succour all the sons of light. (42)

The "sons of light" are constantly in danger of entrapment and persecution by the Angel of Darkness. However, by remaining true to God's commands (as communally taught and practiced), they can be saved by God's grace from the fate of the "sons of darkness," who are completely under the rule of the Angel of Darkness and have no hope of help from God. Is this not precisely what the author of 4QMMT admonishes and wishes for his addressee(s)?

(41) This argument has been advanced especially by Schipman (see above, n. 3, for publications). Kister ("Studies in 4QMiqrat Ma'asei Ha-Torah." 324-25) argues that the absence of sectarian language is not an indication of early dating, but of the letter genre.

(42) Translation from Geza Vermes, \textit{The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English} (New York: Penguin, 1997), 101. The expression "his [the angel of darkness's] dominion" is the equivalent of the "dominion of Belial" in \textit{IQS} I, 18, 23-24; II, 19; \textit{IQM} XIV, 9-10; XVIII, 1. For other second temple period sectarian texts (especially \textit{Jab}. 1:20-21) that convoke the terms of 4QMMT C 27-32, see Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqrat Ma'asei Ha-Torah." 352-34. Kister finds 4QMMT to be less explicitly dualistic than its parallels, which he attributes to its being outwardly directed.

Consider all these things and ask Him that He strengthen your will and remove from you the plans of evil and the device of Belial so that you may rejoice at the end of time... Obviously, the rhetorical settings of the two passages are very different, as is their language, but their underlying ideologies are hardly incommensurate. An intramural addressee, some time in the mid-first century BCE, would have had no trouble studying and applying himself both 4QMMT and I\textit{QS}, whatever their prior histories of compilation and transmission. (43) Only if we assume the addressee to be an extramural opponent, does this section of 4QMMT appear remarkably moderate in its tone and ideology.

Finally, we have the phrases "for [that of your people," C 27] and "for [that of Israel," C 32] at the end of our document. (44) These have been taken to refer to the larger people of Israel of which the addressee is presumed to have been a leader. (45) It should be noted, however, that the word הָעָלָם is completely absent in one of the two extant manuscripts for this section. (46) In the single manuscript where it does appear, the final kaf is difficult to discern. (47) In general, the
word יָדוֹת and the proper name יִשָּׁהַל can refer in the DSS both to Israel as a whole and to the community in particular (as the true Israel), sometimes mixed within a single context. (48) In one other place (IQSb IV, 23), יִדְוָּא הָעָבָר (“your people”) appears to refer to the priestly addressee’s fellow elect, יִדְוָא הַכְּנֶסֶת (“the men of the Council of God”). (49)

However, even if we take יָדוֹת and יִשָּׁהַל here to refer to the larger people of Israel, these expressions need not necessitate that the addressee is a leader or ruler of Israel. Read intramurally, it would be consistent with other sectarian scrolls to presume that the welfare of the people Israel depends on the Qumran community’s proper worship of God, study, and practice of his Torah. This is especially evident in the Community Rule, where the community serves as a human temple on behalf of the rest of Israel: a יִדְוָא הָעָבָר (“House of Truth for Israel.”)

It appears that IQMTM avoids explicit reference to “God” (יה). See below, n. 59. For examples of יָדוֹת elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls referring to Israel, see CD VI. 16: 1QpHab II. 10, V. 3: V. 5; IQSb III. 23: IV. 27, V. 21. In the last two examples, the Zadokite priests are blessed with knowledge of God’s precepts and with holiness in the midst of “his people,” referring either to Israel as a whole or to the elect community. Similarly, in IQSb V. 21, the renewal of the covenant of the Community (יָודִעַ יִדְוָא) is to be accompanied by the (re)establishment of the kingdom of his people (יִדְוָא יִשָּׁהַל) forever. Note also the use of יָדוֹת for God’s people (the “sons of light”) in IQM VI. 6: XVI. 1.

(48) For יָדוֹת referring to the sectarian community, or the laity thereof, see IQS II. 21: VI. 9. Similarly, in CD XIX. 35, the community is referred to as יִדְוָא רָאוּי, even though several lines earlier in XIX. 29 (ט VIII. 16: cf. XX. 24), יִדְוָא יִדְוָא refers to the way of the rest of Israel. In IQMTM the word appears also in B 13, 27, 46, 75, C 7, where it refers to Israel as a whole, or to the laity thereof. See DJD XII 2 (§S. 15.1.18), 94 (§S. 2.2.25). Compare the use of the Greek Λαός for the local community in Jewish inscriptions, as at Cippus St. Helen (Lishitz #84) and possibly Heldas (Lishitz #81). For discussion, with other examples, see Leo Roth-Gerson, The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz-Israel (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 1987). 55, 112. Note also the phrase πάντα λαός, at the conclusion of genealogical inscriptions from Lartis (CII, ed. Fray, vol. I, nos. 700, 702, 704-708). Compare the use of Aramaic מַהֲרָא in the Ein Gedi mosaic inscription, line 16 (Joseph Naveh. On Stone and Mosaic: The Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Ancient Synagogues. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1978), 107), which, while drawn from I Chr. 16:6, appears in its inscriptive context to refer to the local community for מַהֲרָא used in the scrolls to refer to the sectarian community, or the laity thereof, see IQS II. 22: V. 5 (where יָדוֹת = יִדְוָא יִדְוָא הָעָבָר) (cf. IQSb 1, 4), IQSb 2, 11: CD III, 13 (“but in III, 14 יִדְוָא יִדְוָא refers to the rest of Israel”); CD V, 43 (where יִדְוָא יִדְוָא is the equivalent of יִדְוָא II. 21: III. 9). For other usages of יִדְוָא in IQMTM see: B 53, 61, 62, 63, 76, C 21, 23, where it refers to Israel overall.


4Q59), (50) a יִדְוָא יִדְוָא הָעָבָר (“House of Holiness for Israel.” IQS VIII, 5), a יִדְוָא הָעָבָר (“House of Community for Israel,” IQS IX, 6). (51) Thus, were the addressee to accept in study and deed the aforementioned responsibility, it would be to his benefit as well as יִדְוָא יִדְוָא הָעָבָר, whether understood to denote the sectarian community as idealized Israel or the sacro-historical Israel overall.

4. The Appended Calendar (Section A)

I have left for last the first part of the composite text, the 364-day solar calendar, since most scholars agree that it was probably not an integral part of IQMTM, but appended to it, evidenced in only one of the two extant manuscripts (MS a = 4Q394) for the beginning of Section B. (52) However, even if the fuller version of the calendar (4Q327) is

(50) 4Q258 I. 1, 5 as well as 4Q59 (4Q526 4 IX, 5-6). IQS V, 6 has רַע יָדוֹת עָבְר (“a house of perfection and truth in Israel.” IQS VIII, 9). In the context of IQS VIII, 4-10, it is unclear whether the reference is to a smaller community (or initial core group) in relation to the larger sectarian community (referred to as יִדְוָא יִדְוָא הָעָבָר), or to the community as a whole in relation to the state and/or Israel. However, in IQS IX, 3-6 the latter appears clearly to be the intent, especially if taken as a continuation of IQS VIII, 12-16. Thus, Vermes (The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 110) translates IX. 3: “When these become members of the Community in Israel according to all these rules...” See also CD XV, 5: פֹּלְשָׂיִּים נַעְלִיָּה יִדְוָא יִדְוָא הָעָבָר (“And whoever enters the covenant, for all of Israel for an eternal law”).

(52) See DJD X. 14. MS a (4Q394 3-7, 19-21) begins with the last three lines of a 364-day calendar, the number 364 having been partly restored (“And the year is complete — three hundred and sixty four days”). The manuscript remains of 4Q395 (MS b) are too fragmentary to permit a definitive judgment whether this version of IQMTM began with B 1 (4Q395 4-1-2 1-B (DJD X. 7, 44, and Plate I)), otherwise referred to as 4Q327 (Calendrical Doc. E). This is clearly a distinct document. For a detailed discussion, see James C. VanderKam, “The Calendar, 4Q327, and 4Q394,” in Legal Texts and Legal Issues, ed. Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen, 179-94; as well as idem, Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time (London: Routledge, 1998), 75, 120 n. 3. See also Florentino García Martínez, “Don notas sobre IQMTM,” RevQ 16 (1993): 293-97; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMTM in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts.” 82-86; idem, “Miqtat Ma’aseh Ha-Torah,” 558. Note in particular John St Johnav’s changed opinion of the relation of the calendar to Sections B and C. In his and Qimron’s first description of IQMTM (“An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” in Biblical Archaeology Today, 401; in Israel Museum Journal, 9), and as late as their writing of the introduction to their edition (DJD X. 1), they described 4QMTM as originally comprising four parts: (1) an opening formula, now lost; (2) a 364-day calendar; (3) the list of laws; (4) the Hortatory epilogue. However, subsequently St Johnav expressed doubts that the calendar had ever been intrinsically part of IQMTM. See St Johnav, “QMTM: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” 61-62; idem, “Appendix 3: Additional Textual Observations on IQMTM,” DJD X. 203-204. However, it appears that Qimron (“Appendix 2: Additional Textual Observations on IQMTM,” DJD X. 201) continues to defend the attachment of 4Q327 to 4QMTM, Kister (“Studies in 4QMIqat Ma’aseh Ha-Torah,” 360) likewise argues for the calendar having been an inte-
entirely independent of 4Q394, to which the modern editors of 4QMMT
have attached it. 4Q394 does begin column I with the end of a 364-day
(as restored) sectarian calendar immediately preceding the beginning
of Section B. At least, someone saw fit to attach this calendar to the
same scroll as and prior to Section B. Thus, we might ask, in what
context of usage might a scribe or trident have thought the calendar
and 4QMMT to keep good company? John Strugnell, in his “second
thoughts” on 4QMMT, is unable to understand why such a “non-polemi-
cal” calendrical list, “addressed to no ‘opponents,’ ” and forming “no part
of MMT’s loftier polemic or hortatory themes” would find its place
here. (53)

If, however, we begin by not assuming that 4QMMT is a “polemi-
cal” letter addressed to an “opponent,” the combination of calendrical
and legal lists preceding the hortatory conclusion would make perfect
sense. As best it can be reconstructed, the calendar contains a monthly
list of the dates of the Sabbaths, the festivals, and the four epagomenal
days added to the end of the quarter, in other words, a basic outline of
the 12 x 30 + 4 = 364-day solar calendar used by the Qumran commu-
ity, without inclusion of the cycle of priestly courses. Just as Section B
is a digest of purity and sacrificial rules warranting the sect’s separation
from the “multitude” of Israel, Section A contains a digested solar calen-
dar that similarly necessitated and justified the sect’s separation from
those who followed a 354-day lunar calendar. (54) A likely audience for
both lists, as for the parenesis of Section C, would have been neophytes
or candidates to the community, who, as we know from other scrolls,
especially the Community Rule, were required to study the community’s
rules in order to pass tests of knowledge and practice (ךשׁלָם לָם) in order to
advance through their stages of candidacy and communal rank. (55) Pur-
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cularly for candidates and neophytes, familiarity with the basic struc-
ture and outline of the community’s 364-day solar calendar would have
been an essential part of their socialization to the community’s separatist
practice and self-understanding. For such newcomers, the social conse-
quences of adherence to the community’s solar calendar, as to its purity
rules, would have been a particularly significant and difficult boundary
to cross in marking their separation from the “multitude” of Israel under
the leadership of the Jerusalem priesthood, and their entry into the re-
novated covenant.

5. Language

The language of 4QMMT displays, among the Dead Sea Scrolls, a
unique combination of proto-mishnaic, Aramaic, and biblicizing ele-
ments, making it difficult to locate within the history of ancient
Hebrew. (56) Shelomo Moran has characterized the Hebrew of 4QMMT
as a low-level variety of spoken Hebrew, in contrast to the more “liter-
ary” language of the central sectarian texts (IQS, IQSa, IQH, IQM).
On the basis of its language, he argues that 4QMMT could not have pre-
ceded these other sectarian texts and that it could not have issued from
the circle of the Teacher of Righteousness. However, he accepts the
conventional characterization of 4QMMT as an extramural letter and
does not suggest an alternative addressee. (57) If his linguistic character-
ization is correct, we might suggest that the “low-level” Hebrew of
4QMMT, its vernacular character, and its inconsistent orthography,
make it suitable not to an official letter or epistle, nor to a “canonical”
communal treatise, (58) but to a “low-level” intramural pedagogical in-
strument for the teaching of candidates and/or neophytes to the commu-
ity. Perhaps, 4QMMT’s complete avoidance of using any divine name
or epithet points to a similar pedagogical usage. (59)

(57) Shelomo Moran, “Language and Style in Miqrat Ma‘ase Ha-Torah — Did
By contrast, Elisha Qimron (DJD X:106; but cf. DJD X:112, §4.5.1) attributes (but cautiously)
the uniqueness of 4QMMT’s language to its early date. Similarly, Schiffman, “Miqrat
Ma‘ase Ha-Torah,” 560.
(58) For the term “canonical” applied to 4QMMT, on the basis of its relatively large
number of extant copies, see above, n. 6.
(59) Note in particular the use of third person singular pronoun suffixes referring
to God, but without an explicit antecedent: C 15, C 28, C 31. Similarly, in C 20 God would
appear to be the unstated subject of the verb כָּלָה (see DJD X:56, note ad loc).
Furthermore, verses such as Deut 4:30 and 30:1-2, which contain divine names,
are paraphrased by 4QMMT (C 12:16) in such a way as to avoid them. Similarly, compare Deut 12:14
with B 32:5 (restored); 61. I hesitate, however, to build too much upon this observation,
considering the fragmentary condition of 4QMMT. Thus, F. Garcia Martinez (see above,
n. 26), supplies “God” to the lacuna in C 24. F. Sussmann and M. Kister (see above, n. 8),
see the absence of divine names as a consequence of its being an extramural letter.
6. Conclusions

In summation, I shall sketch weak, strong, and intermediate versions of my conclusions. At the very least we can say that, notwithstanding a possible pre-Qumranic dating and extramural addressee for 4QMMT or its antecedents, and barring evidence for a compulsive communal office manager, the extant textual evidence attests to the use of the text for intramural sectarian instruction in the first century BCE/CE. I have demonstrated that there is nothing within 4QMMT that precludes such an intramural use, that is, a reading of the text by members of or candidates to the community, standing now in the place of the text's addressees. Latter-day students of the text would apply to themselves the call of 4QMMT to study its rules in conjunction with their study of sacred scriptures and history, thereby identifying with the community's separation from the rest of Israel, especially its temple and priesthood, and dedicating themselves to the disciplined practice of the community's rules. In so doing, they would be ensured participation in the divine blessings of the righteous in the end of days. I find unlikely the yet weaker proposal that 4QMMT would have been studied intramurally at Qumran in the first century simply as a venerated relic of earlier times and circumstances, but without its latter-day audience feeling themselves to be addressed by the text. (60)

As an intermediate version of this conclusion, I might suggest that 4QMMT was composed as a "pseudo-letter," that is, that it was composed with intramural study as its function, but in the form of a communication between the leadership of the community and its extramural opponents. (61) However, since, as I have argued, there is nothing in the text of 4QMMT, as we have it, that necessitates an extramural addressee (whether real or imagined), I favor the strong version of these conclusions, that 4QMMT was not composed as a "letter" or communication to an extramural addressee at all, but to members or potential members of its own community, most likely neophytes or candidates for membership. It is they who would be called upon to study its digest of rules, with its emphasis on matters of ritual purity (as perhaps its prefixed calendar), as a way of reinforcing the process of social separation and religious return that they had begun. (62)

We might ask whether other types of rules, such as those found in the Community Rule, governing the internal workings of the community and the behavior expected of members toward one another, would not have been more appropriate for instructing neophytes and/or candidates in the core requirements of the community. Of course, one need not assume that 4QMMT was the only vehicle for such instruction, and, indeed, parts of other sectarian texts (especially 1QS) have been suggested as once having played such a role. However, the central rhetorical message of 4QMMT, as expressed in Section C, is to justify, and convey the socio-historical significance of, "our" separation from the "multitude" of Israel. That separation would have been felt most acutely with respect to the community's separation from the central temple cult, its officializing priesthood, and festival calendar, as necessitated by the community's understanding of the divinely revealed rules of purity and sacrifice (as digested in Section B), and possibly ritual calendar (as prefaced in Section A of one manuscript). Joining the community required, inguish) letters in the Greco-Roman world, see the survey of Stanley K. Stowers in the ABD, 4:290-93; and more extensively in Stowers, Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).

(60) This approach is suggested by Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonaean Period," 55. Presumably, the Pauline corpus of letters, as literary works, would similarly have circulated among other church communities and under different circumstances than those for which they were originally composed. Such epistolary reuse is explicitly enjoined by Paul in Col 4:16: "And when this letter has been read among you, have it read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and see that you read also the letter from Laodicea." As noted by Strugnell and Qimron (DJD X:113-114), there is a significant obstacle to situating 4QMMT within an ancient epistolary literary rubric (aside from our lacking its opening); the relative paucity of corporate epistles in Hebrew and Aramaic, as compared to the wealth of the same in Greek and Latin, especially in the Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters of the New Testament. For a concise summary of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek and Latin ancient letters, see entries by D. Pardee, Paul E. Dion, and Stanley K. Stowers in ABD 4:282-293.

(61) See Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," 90. Pseudo-letters are common in the Greco-Roman context; but not in Hebrew or Aramaic. They were used especially as pedagogical instruments within philosophical schools (especially Stoic, Cynic, and Pythagorean), and were adapted by early Christian writers, beginning with the deutero-Pauline letters, to create a "fiction of personal presence." The latter, it may be noted, pseudepigraphically used the dialogical rhetoric of the letter as a frame for authorizing rules of conduct and structures of organization ("household codes") for the nascent Christian communities. For the rhetorical aspects of genuine and fictional (often difficult to dis-
more than anything else, crossing the fraught boundary between the defiled “sanctuary of Israel” in Jerusalem and the divinely ordained “sanctuary of man” (4QFlor 1:6) of the community. (63)

The short but eventful modern history of 4QMMT, and the grand theories of the history of the Qumran community and its laws that have already been build upon it, may make it difficult to read this text immediately in a manner different from that to which we have been accustomed. All three versions of my conclusions require that this important but difficult text be read, firstly, not for what it can tell us about earlier stages in the Qumran community’s history, or relations between that community and its opponents, or the relation of its rules to those of other branches of ancient Judaism (whether second temple or rabbinic), but for how it would have functioned as a pedagogical communication internal to the Qumran community, in the form and from the time that we have it. How would it have rhetorically worked to dialogically draw its addressees not just to adherence to its הדרהש הנクラス, but to unequivocal identification with its הדרה. In other words, we need to reframe our view of 4QMMT from extramural polemic to intramural parenesis.

Steven D. Fraade.

(63) For other examples of the community as substitute temple, see Fraade, “Interpretive Authority at Qumran,” 63-64, n. 57. According to 4QFlor (4Q174 1-2) 1. 6-7, “He has commanded that a Sanctuary of men be built for Himself, that there they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of Law” (Vermes, The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 493), where the concluding words of the Hebrew are either הדרהש הוכל or הדרהש הוכל (“works of thanksgiving” [García Martínez, The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated, 2nd ed., 136]), it not being clear whether the final word has a dalet or a resh. For the most recent discussions, with reference to others, see John Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in Reading 4QMMT, 138-39, n. 40; F. García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in Reading 4QMMT, 24. I have reexamined photographs of the passage, including computer enhanced digitized images, and, notwithstanding the contrary views of others, remain convinced that the word is הדרה. In either case, my argument here would remain the same.