

REVUE DE QUMRAN

NUMÉRO 76

DÉCEMBRE 2000

TOME 19

FASCICULE 4

PUBLIÉ AVEC LE CONCOURS DU CENTRE NATIONAL
DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUEFlorentino GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Adam Simon van der Woude (1927-2000)*..... 501

ARTICLES

Steven D. FRAADE, *To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)*..... 507Devorah DIMANT, *Resurrection, Restoration and Time-Curtailing in Qumran. Early Judaism, and Christianity*..... 527Andrew FINCKE, *4QSam^a Cols. I-IV*..... 549

NOTES

Émile PUECH, *Sur la dissimilation de l'interdentale δ en araméen qumrânien. À propos d'un chaînon manquant*..... 607Émile PUECH, *Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit^a de l'Écclésiaste (4Q^aohéiet^a ou 4Q^ai10)*..... 617Émile PUECH, Annette STEUDEL, *Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 418)*..... 623Magen BROSHI, *Matrimony and Poverty: Jesus and the Essenes*..... 629

RECENSIONS

Émile PUECH, Loren T. STUCKENBRUCK, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*..... 635Émile PUECH, Stefan ENSTE, *Kein Markustext in Qumran*..... 639

TABLES DU TOME 19

Cortado MARTONE, *Auteurs cités. — Références Bibliques. — Textes de Qumrân. — Apocryphes. Littérature rabbinique*..... 641

GABALDA

18, rue Pierre et Marie-Curie, 75005 Paris

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: 4QMMT AND ITS ADDRESSEE(S)

1. Introduction

LONG before its official publication in 1994, (1) and even before its debut in 1984, (2) 4QMMT 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: Miqṣat Ma'ase 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.

(3) For a concise statement of the generally held view of 4QMMT, see James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 59-60. The earliest notices of 4QMMT are as follows: P. Benoit *et al.*, "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran," *BA* 19 (1956): 94 (report of John Strugnell, August 1955; the same in French in *RB* 63 [1956]: 65); J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 1959; French orig., 1957), 41, 130; idem, "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits du Désert de Juda," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1956* (VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 24; idem, in DJD III (1962): 225; Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *JJS* 31 (1980): 163-64; Yigael Yadin, ed., *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 2:213; Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (ed. Janet Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 400-407; idem, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," *Israel Museum Journal* 4 (1985): 9-12. More recently, the consensus view has been most strongly advocated by Lawrence H. Schiffman: "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987* (ed. George J. Brooke; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 239-55; "Miqṣat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 435-57; "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 53 (1990): 64-73; "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Hershel Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 35-49; "New Halakhic Texts from Qumran," *HS* 34 (1993): 21-33; "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 1 (1994): 285-99; *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of*

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 Hasmonean 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 late second temple Jewish law and institutions. (5) While there have

Qumran (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 73-76, 252-55; "Origin and Early History of the Qumran Sect," *BA* 58 (1995): 37-48; "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 81-98; "Miḳṣat Ma'asei Ha-Torah," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 558-60. For the anti-Pharisaic (or -rabbinic) polemic of 4QMMT's Sadducean halakhah, see in particular Yaakov Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls — Preliminary Observations on *Miḳṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990): 11-76. For an English translation of the same, but without many of the notes, see DJD X:179-200. The most recent and detailed treatment of 4QMMT as an extramural polemical letter to opponents of the Qumran sect (although not with an early Hasmonean dating) is that of Menahem Kister, "Studies in 4QMiḳṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 68 (1998-1999): 317-71. Although Kister's study appeared after the present article was completed, I have added references to it in the notes that follow.

(4) This connection is first drawn by J. Baumgarten and Yadin, and then elaborated by Qimron and Strugnell, and most fully by Sussmann. For references, see previous note. More recently, the extent of convergence between 4QMMT and the mishnaic disputes has been questioned by Yaakov Elman, "Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition, Or, When Is a Parallel Not a Parallel?" in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. Kampen and Bernstein, 99-128; Lester L. 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. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89-108; and by Kister, "Studies in 4QMiḳṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 325-30.

(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-Qumranic) 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 founding 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 4Q394-399. 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 Scripts," 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 ("MMT: 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, especially 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 Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. Kampen

what this early, extramural document is doing in multiple copies at Qumran in the first century BCE/CE. I conducted a rhetorical experiment: What would happen if we were to bracket for a moment everything we have been told about 4QMMT 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? 4QMMT 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 אַתָּה ("you"), in the phrase אַתָּה יודעים שֶׁ ("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 handbook or text for its members... the document no longer served its original purpose of a letter addressed outside of the community, and had become a basic treatise 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 *Doresh* to the *Moreh*," *RevQ* 14 [1990]: 649) goes a step further in arguing that 4QMMT was never addressed to an opposition audience, but, "Its addressees were in all likelihood potential adherents of the writer's legal perspective." For a recent exploration of the variety of ways that 4QMMT 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 4QMMT" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2000), esp. 92-94. Israel Knohl ("Review Essay: Re-Considering the Dating and Recipient of Miqṣat Ma'ase 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 4QMMT. 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 one sent to a party 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 4QMiqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 324-325) has reaffirmed 4QMMT'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. Sussmann, "The History of *Halakha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls," 23 n. 27; cf. below, n. 59). 2. 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 (340-42) gives only one (but to my mind not persuasive) example of the last: B 49-54 (the exclusion of

even in these restorations the addressees are simply said to know the rule being enunciated or the misdeeds of others. Nowhere else in Section B is the second person form of address employed.

What about the first person pronoun אֲנַחְנוּ ("we"), in the phrases אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים שֶׁ- ("we are of the opinion that ...") and אֲנַחְנוּ אומרים שֶׁ- ("we say that ...")? (9) While some have taken these phrases to be inherently polemical, in the sense of "we, unlike you," (10) they could just as easily denote "we, unlike them," where "them" refers to an out-group distinct from the addressees. To the limited extent that practices contrary to those enunciated by the document are explicitly specified, they are attributed to a third person "they" and/or "the priests." (11) In other words, there is nothing here to preclude an intramural, dialogical rhetoric whereby "we," the collective persona of the community, seeks to include "you," the addressees. There is no reason to presume that second person forms of address require this to be a polemical "letter" to an extramural addressee. (12)

Thus, notwithstanding characterizations to the contrary, we find nothing in Section B rhetorically analogous to the mishnaic expression (*m. Yad.* 4:6,7,8): ... קוֹבְלִין אֲנוּ אֵלֵיכֶם פְּרוּשִׁים שֶׁאַחֶם ("We cry out against you Pharisees, for you ..."). Rather, Section B contains a list of rules, occasionally enunciated in the voice of the first person plural "we," even less often addressed to a "you" (plural), about whom nothing else is said, with infrequent reference to the contrary practices of an un-

the blind and deaf from the sanctuary, because of their incapacities 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 אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים שֶׁ- see B 29, 36, 37, and 42 (חוֹשְׁבִים אֲנַחְנוּ שֶׁ-). For אֲנַחְנוּ אומרים שֶׁ- 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 אֲנַחְנוּ חוֹשְׁבִים. Despite initial claims that 4QMMT was a "letter" from the Teacher of Righteousness to the Wicked Priest (purportedly referred to in 4QpPs^a [4Q171] 3-10 iv 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 4QMMT may have been pseudepigraphically identified with the Teacher of Righteousness in 4QpPs^a.

(10) See J. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," 164.

(11) For "they" (הֵם, הֵמָּה) 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 pronominal suffix (אֵינֶם) 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 (רָאוּ) of the priests, and only in the last to the contrary behavior of "some of the priests" (מִקְצֵת הַכֹּהֲנִים).

(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 *מקצת הכהנים* ("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 addressor and the addressees. 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 dialogical 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 *ואתם יודעים* ("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: *ואתם יודעים שפרשנו מרוב העם* ("[And you know that] we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people"); and *ואתם יודעים שלא [מ]צא בידנו מעל ושקר ורעה כי על [א]לה [א]נחנו נותנים [א]ת ליבנו [א]ת* ("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, extramural 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,

(13) On the use of Scripture in *4QMMT*, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in *4QMMT*," in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. Kampen and Bernstein, 29-51; George J. Brooke, "Explicit Presentation of Scripture in *4QMMT*," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, ed. Bernstein, García Martínez, and Kampen, 67-88.

(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 *4QMiqsat Ma'asei 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 addressor 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 *אנחנו* appears three times in Section C: C 9 (*אנחנו נותנים*), C 20 (*אנחנו כחבנו*), C 26 (*אנחנו כחבנו*). On the last, see below, n. 32. For other first person plural forms, see C 7 (*פרשנו*), C 9 (*בידינו*), C 10 (*כתבנו/כתבנו*), C 27 (*השבנו*), C 27 (*השבנו*), C 27 (*השבנו*), C 30 (*דברנו*), C 30 (*שרנו*).

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): *ואתם [כתבנו] אליכם: דור ודור שחבנו בספר משה [ו]בספר [הנ]ביאים ובדו[ו]י [ד] [במעש] דור ודור* ("[...And] we have [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

(16) Schiffman ("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; "Miqsat Ma'asei 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 *מקצת דבריו* (mimicking *Deut* 1:1: *אלה הדברים*), and ending with *שראל* (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 *Damascus 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 *כתבנו*, "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 *אליכם* ("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, here 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 addressor and that the document is extramurally 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 *התורה*. (22)

Although the combination of subjects of study is unique to this text, the use of the verb *הבין* 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, 4QD^e (4Q270 2 II, 21): *וְבַהֲבִינְכֶם בְּמַעֲשֵׂי דָוִד וְדָוִד* ("by consid-

you"). See DJD X:37. The word *אליכיה* (and *אליך* 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 *הבין* [כחבן], modeled after C 26, could just as easily be *הבין* (see DJD X:59, note ad loc.), and *במעשה* [שנה] could be *שנה*, based on *Deut* 32:7. See Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 49.

(21) See DJD X:112 (§4.1.4.2). See also: James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 387-88; George J. Brooke, "Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT," 85-86; Gershon Brin, review of DJD X, *JSS* 40 (1995): 341-42; Jonathan G. Campbell, "4QMMT^d and the Tripartite Canon," *JSS* 51 (2000): 181-90.

(22) For a ritualized communal setting for such combined study of *התורה* and *מספוט* and *הורדה*, see *IQS* VI, 6-8.

(23) For the force of the *hip'il* of *בין* as penetrating study, akin to *דרש*, 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 *הדגני*, see CD X, 6; XIII, 2, 5; XIV, 7. For other examples of *הבין* for communal study and learning, including the instruction of neophytes, see *IQS* III, 13; IV, 22; VI, 15; *IQSa* I, 5. This use of *הבין* is equivalent to *הבין* that of *הבין* in *IQSa* I, 7. See further, Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 322 n. 16. Note also Kister's suggestion (351) to fill the lacuna at the beginning of C 23 with *הבין* *החכם* ("the wise will understand"), based on *Dan* 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.

ring the deeds of each generation"). (24) Similarly, our passage could simply be setting forth the pedagogical, rather than polemical, purposes of the 4QMMT: to instruct members, or prospective members, in the "correct" understanding of Israel's sacred scriptures and history.

The next instances of second person verbal forms come in several paraphrases of Deuteronomistic verses. Note in particular C 15-16: *ושבתהו [אלו בכל לבבך ובכונן] נפשך* ("and you will return unto Him with all your heart and with all your soul"), which reworks *Deut* 30:2, but is also reminiscent of *IQS* I, 1-2, *לדרוש אל בכול לב ובכול נפש* ("to seek God with [all the heart and soul]") in setting forth the principles of entering the community. (25)

The next uses in Section C of second person address are in the form of a two-time imperative *זכור* (C 23, 25): *זכור את מלכי ישראל* ("Think of the kings of Israel and contemplate their deeds"); and *זכור את דוד שהיה איש חסדים* ("Think of David who was a man of righteous deeds"). Preceding these imperatives, in an extended reworking of *Deut* 30:1-3 (with *Deut* 4:29-30 and 31:29), our text sets forth the providential lessons to be learned from attention to Israel's sacred history. The blessings and curses enumerated at the end of the Book of Deuteronomy, to be fulfilled at the "end of days" (C 14, 21; cf. *Deut* 4:30; 31:29), have been partly realized in the history of the Israelite monarchy: those kings who feared God and obeyed God's Torah (Solomon and David) were blessed and spared calamity while those who did not (Jereboam and Zedekiah) were not. (26) This scriptural pattern of blessings and curses is now being consummated in the present "end of days." (27) The message is clear: in order to obtain divine forgiveness, you had better "return to Him with all your heart and with all your soul" (C 15-16) one last time (C 22), (28) language very reminiscent of the

(24) DJD XVIII (1996): 145. This fragment is thought to preserve part of the end of the *Damascus Document*. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. Magen Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 59.

(25) The restoration of *IQS* I, 2 is based on 4Q5^a (4Q255 1 2) and 4Q5^b (4Q257 1 I, 1-2). Compare as well *IQS* V, 8-9, *לשוב אל תורה משה ככול אשר צוה בכול לב ובכול נפש* and *CD* XV, 9-10, *לשוב אל תורה משה ככול לב ובכול נפש*, both of which describe the process of joining the community. In 4Q5^b (4Q256 4 IX, 7) and 4Q5^d (4Q258 1 I, 6), parallel to *IQS* V, 8, the words *אשר צוה* are missing. In each case the language is Deuteronomistic, but the usage is similar. Besides *Deut* 30:2, 10, see 4:29; 6:5; 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 (4Q398 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 García Martínez ("4QMMT in a Qumran Context," in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. Kampen and Bernstein, 19) to read C 24 as, "feared 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 4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 351.

(28) For this understanding of C 21-22 (contrary to that of Strugnell and Qimron in DJD X:61), see García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," 19: "When they return

oath taken by newcomers to the community. (29) I see no reason to conclude, as some have, that the exhortation to the addressee to be mindful of what befell the Israelite kings and David, and to follow the example of the latter, is warrant for concluding that the addressee was himself a leader of royal (or near royal) status. (30) By this logic, we should conclude that the whole Deuteronomistic history (and much second-temple literature) was addressed to Israelite royalty alone. (31)

This brings us to the concluding lines of 4QMMT (C 26-32), which are thankfully intact and particularly pertinent to the question of the identity of the addressee(s) and his/their relation to the addressor:

ואף אהנו סתבו (32) אלך מקצת מעשי התורה שחשבנו לפניך ולעמך (33) שר[א]ינו עמך ערמה ומדע תורה הבן בכל אלה ובקס מלפני שיהוקן את עצהך והרחיק ממך מחשבת רעה ועצת בליעל בכל שחשבנו באחרית העת במצאך מקצת דברינו (34) כן ונתחשבה לך לצדקה בעשותך הישר והטוב לפני לטוב לך ולישראל

We have (indeed) sent you some of the precepts of the Torah according to our decision. (35) for your welfare and the welfare of your people. For we have seen (that) you have wisdom and knowledge of the Torah. 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, finding that some of our practices are correct. And this will be counted as a virtuous deed of yours, since you will be doing what is righteous and good in His eyes, and for your own welfare and for the welfare of Israel.

in Israel to the law (תורה),” with ולא ישובו אחור[ר] being its “antithesis”; Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT,” 49; Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” 348-51. Cf. *IQS* I, 16-17 (ולוא לשוב מאחור) in the context of entering the community) and *IQM* XV, 8-9 (ואל תשובו אחור).

(29) See above, nn. 25, 28.

(30) DJD X:117, 121, 185; Schiffman, “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,” 67-68; *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 87; “Miqsat Ma’asei Ha-Torah,” 559; Daniel R. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, ed. Kampen and Bernstein, 77-79.

(31) For a sustained critique of this view, with several counter examples, see George J. Brooke, “The Significance of the Kings in 4QMMT,” *Qumran Cave Four and 4QMMT: Special Report* (ed. Zdzislaw J. Kapera; Cracow: Enigma, 1991) (= *Qumran Chronicle* vol. 1, no. 2/3, Dec. 1990/April 1991), 109-13. See also Grabbe, “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society,” 90-91; Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” 62.

(32) MS f (4Q399 I, 10) has כתבנו אהנו.

(33) The word עמך is missing in MS f (4Q399 I, 11). However, even in MS e (4Q398 14-17 II, 2) the final kaf is indistinct.

(34) MS f (4Q399 II, 3) has in place of דברינו מקצת דברינו.

(35) I do not understand this translation. I would think that שחשבנו (C 27) goes with what follows: “which we have reckoned for your welfare....” as in the passive construction לצדקה (perhaps under influence of *Gen* 15:6; *Deut* 6:25; *Ps* 106:30-31) a few lines further down (C 31).

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 אהנו כתבנו אליכה (C 26), translated by the editors as “we have sent you,” can just as well be translated, as the editors themselves suggest, “we have written for your benefit.” (36) The phrase דברינו (C 30) (37) echoes מקצת מעשי התורה (C 26), which in turn hearkens back to מקצת דברינו (B 1), with which Section B (and according to one manuscript, the whole of 4QMMT) began. Thus, מקצת דברינו 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 הבין ב, used here in בכל הבין ב (C 28). (38) Similarly, the verb מצא, used here in כן במצאך מקצת דברינו (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 מצא in *IQS* VIII, 11-12 of איש הדורש (“the one who studies”) and in *CD* VI, 19 of בארץ דמשק (“those who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus”). (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 רעה מחשבת רעה (C 29) with *IQS* I, 4, לרחוק מכול רע, and לרחוק מכול רע (C 31) with *IQS* I, 2, לעשות הטוב והישר (cf. *Deut* 6:18; 12:28, especially as cited in *11QT* LIII, 7-8). In *IQS* 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 irenic and only moderately dualistic nature of the rhetoric: the “we” are confident that the

(36) See above, n. 19.

(37) But see above, n. 34.

(38) See above, n. 23.

(39) However, for *CD* VI, 19, note the emended text suggested, I think unnecessarily, by Elisha Qimron in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 21. Cf. Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 25, note ad loc. A similar usage occurs in *4QD^a* (4Q266) 11 6; *4QD^b* (4Q270) 7 I, 20. For מצא in 4QMMT see DJD X:93 (§3.5.2.22).

(40) Note in this regard C 15-16 compared to *IQS* I, 2, cited above, at n. 25.

"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 their dualistic ideology had hardened. (41) However, were we not to assume this to be an extamural 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 (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" (*IQS* III. 21-25):

ובמלאך חושך תעות כול בני צדק וכול זכאתם ושונתם ופסעו
מעשיהם בממשלתו לפי רזי אל עד קצו וכול נועתם ופועי צרותם
בממשלת משטמתו וכול רוחו גורלו להכשיל בני אור ואל ישראל ומלאך
אמתו עזר לכול בני אור

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 Schiffman (see above, n. 3, for publications). Kister ("Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase 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, *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 *IQS* I. 18, 23-24; II. 19; *IQM* XIV. 9-10; XVIII. 1. For other second temple period sectarian texts (especially *Jub.* 1:20-21) that concord with the terms of *4QMMT* C 27-32, see Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 352-54. 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 to himself both *4QMMT* and *IQS*, whatever their prior histories of composition 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 לטוב לך ולעמך ("for your welfare and for [that of] your people," C 27) and לטוב לך ולישראל ("for your welfare 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 ולעמך 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

(43) Schiffman ("The Place of *4QMMT* in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," 97; "Miqsat Ma'asei Ha-Torah," 560) claims that the absence of parallels to *IQS* is proof of the early dating of *4QMMT*. Part of the reason Schiffman finds no parallels is that the rules included in *4QMMT* are of a very different domain than those of *IQS*. But the two documents certainly share some important terminology (see above, nn. 23, 25, 42, 43) and ideology. Another set of passages worth comparing is *4QMMT* C 28-29 and *IQS* I. 12-13. In pointing out these instances of shared language I do not claim any direct influence or genealogy between the two documents, only that they could have emerged from and been addressed to the same "community of readers."

(44) For the Deuteronomic basis of לטוב לך, see *Deut* 6:24; 12:28. For the addition of the welfare of Israel, compare the conclusion of one of the Bar Kokhba letters: אודוה ישראל שלום וכל בית ישראל (Mur 42 7 [DJD II/1 (1961): 156]).

(45) See DJD X:62, note ad loc.: "The addressee may have been a ruler, since his conduct had bearing on the welfare of the people of Israel." See also DJD X:117-118. For others, see above, n. 30. For dissenters, see above, n. 31.

(46) *4Q399* I, 11. In its place there is a space.

(47) *4Q398* 14-17 II, 3. The editors (DJD X:38) have no note to the reading here. I have examined both Plate VIII in DJD X and the photographs of PAM 42.368, 42.838, 43.491, and IAA 190452 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (ed. Emanuel Tov; Leiden: Brill, 1993), fiches 47, 59, 76, 132. In *4Q398* the downstroke of the final *kaf* is always long (see DJD X:33), but is not apparent for this word in the photos, the papyrus being damaged where the *kaf* would be expected. Another possibility would be to read the letter as a *waw* and the word as עמו, meaning "his (God's) people," as Israel (and possibly the elect community) is referred to elsewhere in the sectarian scrolls. The fact that there is no prior reference to God as the antecedent to this third personal singular pronominal suffix should not cause any difficulty since in the very next line we find מלפניו/מלפני ("before him"), and a few lines down, לפניו/לפני, certainly referring to God, but also without an explicit antecedent.

word עם and the proper name ישראל 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), עמכם ("your people") appears to refer to the priestly addressee's fellow elect, אל אנשי עצה אל ("the men of the Council of God"). (49)

However, even if we take עמך and ישראל 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 בית אמת לישראל ("House of Truth for Israel,"

It appears that *4QMMT* avoids explicit reference to "God" (אל). See below, n. 59. For examples of עמו elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls referring to Israel, see *CD* VI, 16; *IQpHab* 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 (ברית היתה) is to be accompanied by the (re)establishment of the kingdom of his people (מלכות עמו) forever. Note also the use of עמו for God's people (the "sons of light") in *IQM* VI, 6; XVI, 1.

(48) For עם 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 דעם , even though several lines earlier in XIX, 29 (= VIII, 16; cf. XX, 24), דרך דעם refers to the way of the rest of Israel. In *4QMMT* 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 X:86 (§3.5.1.18), 94 (§3.5.2.25). Compare the use of the Greek λαός for the local community in Jewish inscriptions, as at Caesarea (Lifshitz #64) and possibly Hulda (Lifshitz #81). For discussion, with other examples, see Lea Roth-Gerson, *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz-Israel* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 1987), 55, 112. Note also the phrase τῷ λαῷ χαίρειν , at the conclusion of gravestone inscriptions from Larisa (*CIJ*, ed. Frey, vol. I, nos. 700-702, 704-708). Compare the use of Aramaic עמא 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 *1 Chr.* 16:6, appears in its inscriptional context to refer to the local Jewish community. For ישראל used in the scrolls to refer to the sectarian community, or the laity thereof, see *IQS* II, 22; V, 5 (where $\text{ישראל} = \text{בית ברית עולם}$) (cf. *4QS^d* [*4Q258* I 1, 4]), 22; *CD* III, 13 (but in III, 14 ישראל refers to the rest of Israel); XIV, 4,5 (where ישראל is the equivalent of דעם of *IQS* II, 21; III, 9). For other usages of ישראל in *4QMMT* see: B 53, 61, 62, 63, 76, C 21, 23, where it refers to Israel overall.

(49) See Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 376. Similarly, J. T. Milik (DJD I [1955]: 126); James Charlesworth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume I: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck); Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 127). But Florentino García Martínez (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* [2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 433) translates עמך here as "with you," as does Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* [San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1996], 149).

4QS^d, (50) a בית קודש לישראל ("House of Holiness for Israel," *IQS* VIII, 5), a בית היחד לישראל ("House of Community for Israel," *IQS* IX, 6). (51) Thus, were the addressee to accept in study and deed the aforementioned החורה , it would be to his benefit as well as לישראל , 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 *4QMMT*, 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 *4QS^b* (*4Q256* 4 IX, 5-6). *IQS* V, 6 has בית דאמת לישראל .

(51) Similarly, $\text{בית המים ואמת בישראל}$ ("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 council (or initial core group) in relation to the larger sectarian community (referred to overall as ישראל), or to the community as a whole in relation to the larger 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: $\text{והבא בברית לכל ישראל לחוק עולם}$ ("And whoever enters the covenant, for all of Israel for an eternal law").

(52) See DJD X:14. MS a (*4Q394* 3-7 I, 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 si[xty four] days"). The manuscript remains of *4Q395* (MS b) are too fragmentary to permit a definitive judgment whether this version of *4QMMT* began with B 1 (אלה מקצת דברינו), or whether B 1 was preceded by a calendar. The five-column calendar which Strugnell and Qimron place before this, denoted by them as *4Q394* 1-2 1-V (DJD X:7, 44, and Plate I), is elsewhere referred to as *4Q327* (*Calendrical Doc. E^b*). 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 *4QMMT*," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 293-97; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Place of *4QMMT* in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," 82-86; idem, "Miqsat Ma'asei Ha-Torah," 558. Note in particular John Strugnell's changed opinion of the relation of the calendar to Sections B and C. In his and Qimron's first description of *4QMMT* ("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 *4QMMT* 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 Strugnell expressed doubts that the calendar had ever been intrinsically part of *4QMMT*. See Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 61-62; idem, "Appendix 3: Additional Observations on *4QMMT*," DJD X:203-204. However, it appears that Qimron ("Appendix 2: Additional Textual Observations on *4QMMT*," DJD X:201) continues to defend the attachment of *4Q327* to *4QMMT*. Kister ("Studies in *4QMiqtat Ma'ase 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 very 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 tradent 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-polemical" 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 "polemical" 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 quarters, in other words, a basic outline of the $12 \times 30 + 4 = 364$ -day solar calendar used by the Qumran community, 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 calendar 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 parenthesis 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 (מעשי) in order to advance through their stages of candidacy and communal rank. (55) Par-

gral part of 4QMMT, predicated largely on his assumption that the document is a personal polemical letter, in which the solar calendar, given its polemical importance, must have had a prominent place. However, this necessitates his assuming, like Strugnell and Qimron originally, that the calendar must itself have been preceded by a personal introduction to the "letter," for which, of course, we have no textual evidence. Michael Chyutin ("The Controversy of the Calendars in Miqṣat Ma'aseh ha-Torah" [Hebrew] *Bei Mikra* 158 [1999]: 209-14) similarly argues for the calendar belonging to 4QMMT and being central to its polemic, but identifies the object of the calendrical polemic as being not a group (such as the Pharisees) who followed a 354-day lunar calendar, but one (as yet unknown) that followed a variant solar calendar (that lacked the four epagomenal days between the quarters). For such a polemic, see *1 En.* 75:1-2; 82:4-6.

(53) John Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 62; idem, "Appendix 3: Additional Observations on 4QMMT," DJD X:203. See also DJD X:109-110. Kister (see previous note) solves the problem by arguing the precise opposite: that the calendar is polemical and was preceded by a personal opening to the adversarial addressee.

(54) For an alternative, see the article by Chyutin, referred to above, n. 52.

(55) See *IQS* V, 7-10, 20-24; VI, 13-23. Cf. *IQSa* I, 6-9. For discussion see Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 53-56.

ticularly for candidates and neophytes, familiarity with the basic structure 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 consequences 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 renewed covenant.

5. Language

The language of 4QMMT displays, among the Dead Sea Scrolls, a unique combination of proto-mishnaic, Aramaic, and biblicalizing elements, making it difficult to locate within the history of ancient Hebrew. (56) Shelomo Morag has characterized the Hebrew of 4QMMT as a low-level variety of spoken Hebrew, in contrast to the more "literary" language of the central sectarian texts (*IQS*, *IQSa*, *IQH*, *IQM*). On the basis of its language, he argues that 4QMMT could not have preceded 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 characterization 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 instrument for the teaching of candidates and/or neophytes to the community. Perhaps, 4QMMT's complete avoidance of using any divine name or epithet points to a similar pedagogical usage. (59)

(56) See Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 355-59.

(57) Shelomo Morag, "Language and Style in Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah — Did *Moreh Ha-Sedeq* Write This Document?" (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 65 (1996): 209-23. By contrast, Elisha Qimron (DJD X:108; but cf. DJD X:112, §4.5.1) attributes (but cautiously) the uniqueness of 4QMMT's language to its early date. Similarly, Schiffman, "Miqṣat Ma'asei 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 pronominal 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 $\text{קָנַח}(\text{ } \text{וְ} \text{קָנַח})$ (see DJD X:60, 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 32-33 (restored), 61. I hesitate, however, to build too much upon this observation, considering the fragmentary condition of 4QMMT. Thus, F. García Martínez (see above, n. 26), supplies "God" to the lacuna in C 24. Y. 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 reuse, that is, a reading of the text by members 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

(60) This approach is suggested by Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean 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 pedagogic 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-

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 prefaced 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 *IQS*) 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 sacro-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 officiating 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,

tinguish) 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).

(62) I should stress that these options need not be mutually exclusive. For example, texts of intramural exhortation commonly adapted or mimicked rhetorical elements of genuine letters so as to dialogically engage their readers/students through the fictionalized presence of both "author" and "audience." This appears to have been a common strategy in Greco-Roman philosophical pedagogy, which provided models for the Pauline and deutero-Pauline writings. In particular, the Greco-Roman *protreptic* discourse, directed at potential students via an imaginary "you" interlocutor, may prove an apt rubric for viewing the combination of a digest of precepts and dialogical persuasion in 4QMMT. For discussion, see the works of Stowers cited in previous note, as well as Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1981); Mark D. Jordan, "Ancient Philosophical Protreptic," *Rhetorica* 4 (1986): 309-333; David E. Aune, "Romans as a Logos Protreptikos in the Context of Ancient Religious and Philosophical Propaganda," in *Paulus und das antike Judentum: Tübingen-Durham-Symposium im Gedenken an den 50. Todestag Adolf Schlatters* (ed. Martin Hengel and Ulrich Heckel; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1991), 91-124. As noted earlier, the difficulty in applying such models to 4QMMT is the absence of analogous epistolary phenomena in ancient Hebrew or Aramaic.

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 *מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה*, but to unequivocal identification with its *אֲנַחְנוּ*? 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) I, 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 *מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה* or *מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה* ("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 *תּוֹרָה*. In either case, my argument here would remain the same.