

**4QMMT Reconsidered:
Is It Really a Sectarian Text?**

Teppeï Kato

Abstract:

This paper takes up two topics concerning the so-called *Miqtsat Ma'asei Ha-Torah* (4QMMT): a general overview of the related research history and the ongoing discussion over its sectarian nature. The text has usually been considered a sectarian document sent by the leaders of the Qumran sect to the leaders of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem, as seen, for example, in the discussion between Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. However, this assumption should be reconsidered. According to the research trends of recent years, for example the works by Steven D. Fraade, Adele Reinhartz, and Maxine L. Grossman, almost all of the commonly accepted theories about 4QMMT, including the definition of the genre, the date of the document, and the identification of the personal pronouns' antecedents, have come into question.

Keywords:

4QMMT, Qumran, sectarianism, Essene Hypothesis, Sadducean Hypothesis

Introduction

The so-called *Miqtsat Ma'asei Ha-Torah*, or 4QMMT, is one of the most important but problematic texts discovered at Qumran. Norman Golb expressed his vivid impression of the text by saying, "Once read...such a manuscript can never be entirely 'forgotten.'"¹ Moreover, Charlotte Hempel raised the issue of the text's problematic nature: "MMT, perhaps more than any other text from Qumran, was read in light of a number of preconceptions."²

This paper mainly covers two topics involving this text. First, I give a general overview of the research history of 4QMMT, especially the research trends in recent years, to demonstrate that almost all of the commonly accepted theories about 4QMMT in the early period of this research—the definition of the genre, the date of the document, the identification of the antecedents of personal pronouns "we," "you," and "they" —are in question these days. Second, I deal with the presumed sectarian nature of 4QMMT. 4QMMT is usually considered a sectarian text³ in scholarly discourse, for example in the discussion between Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam on the identification of the Qumran community. Although their discussion relies such an that assumption, the notion itself that 4QMMT is a sectarian text should be reconsidered.

The Structure of 4QMMT

4QMMT consists of six manuscripts, numbered 4Q394, 4Q395, 4Q396, 4Q397, 4Q398, and 4Q399, found in Cave 4 in 1953. According to the paleographic dating, these manuscripts were produced from 75 BCE to 50 CE, but even the oldest preserved manuscript is unlikely to be an autograph. Since all of the manuscripts are fragmentary and none of them contains the entire corpus, in volume 10 of DJD, published in 1994, John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron created a composite text, that is, a hypothetical text eclectically reproduced.⁴

This composite text has three parts: a calendar with introductory remarks (section A), a list of laws (section B), and a hortatory epilogue (section C). Just like the calendars of the *Community Rule* and the *Temple Scroll*, the calendar of section A, which is attested in only one copy (4Q394), adopts a 364-day soli-solar calendar system, which is one of the characteristics of the Qumran community.

The list of laws (section B) is reconstructed from 4Q394, 4Q395, 4Q396, 4Q397, and 4Q398 1-3. In this section, we can find writings on twenty issues of Jewish law: 1. The offering of the wheat of the Gentiles (B 3); 2. The sacrifice of the purity offering (B 5); 3.

The sacrifice of the Gentiles (B 8); 4. The sacrifice of peace-offerings (B 9-10); 5. The purity of the heifer used of the sin-offering (B 13); 6. The skins of the cattle and sheep (B 18); 7. The skins and bones of unclean animals (B 21); 8. The skin of the carcass of a clean animal (B 22-23); 9. ... (B 24); 10. Pregnant animals (B 36); 11. Eating pregnant animals (B 37); 12. The Ammonite, the Moabite, the bastard and the man, whose testicles have been crushed and one whose penis has been cut off, who enter the congregation (B 39-40); 13. The blind (B 49); 14. The deaf (B 52-53); 15. Pouring of liquids (B 55); 16. Dogs are not to be brought into the sacred camp (B 58); 17. The planting of fruit trees in the land of Israel (B 62); 18. The lepers (B 64); 19. The impurities of a man (B 72-73); 20. Fornication practiced by the people (B 75).

As clearly seen from this list, the object of concern in section B is not theological matters but issues of Jewish law. Moreover, here the “we” group explains the laws to the “you” (pl.) group, whereas the “they” group commits such a serious legal violation that the “we” group cannot overlook it.⁵

The epilogue (section C) is reconstructed from 4Q397, 4Q398 11-17, and 4Q399. In comparison with the list of laws, the discourse in the epilogue is more dialogical. Furthermore, not only a “you” (pl.) group but also a specific “you” in singular can be found, while a “they” group only infrequently appears. At the beginning of the epilogue, the “we” group gives the famous statement of separation, saying “you know that we have separated from the mass of the people...and from mingling with them in these matters and from being in contact with them in these matters” (C 7-8). Furthermore, “you should understand the Book of Moses and the Books of the Prophets and David and all the events of every age” (C 10-11), since otherwise “you will depart from the way and...evil will befall you” (C 12). The author also refers to the kings known from the history of Israel, alluding to Deuteronomic theology. These kings are described as “seekers of the Law” (C24), whom “you” must remember and whose works “you” must understand. By following “some of the observances of the Law” (מקצת מעשי התורה; C27) as “we” taught, you and your people will be benefited.

Accepted Theories of 4QMMT and Their Dissolution

Since the text was officially introduced to the scholarly community in 1984,⁶ 4QMMT has been researched in various ways. Many scholars have tried to determine various aspects of 4QMMT such as the definition of the genre, the date of the document, and the identification of the antecedents of the personal pronouns “we,” “you,” and “they.”⁷

However, these accomplishments in the early period of this research history have been put into question these days.

The early editors of 4QMMT, John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron, determined the genre, the date of the document, and other characteristics as follows: 4QMMT is a halakhic letter sent by the leaders of the Qumran sect to the leaders of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem.⁸ More precisely, the author who calls his group “we” is actually the Teacher of Righteousness, while the addressee “you” in either singular or plural is the author’s opponent, a Hasmonean high priest in Jerusalem who was later called the Wicked Priest. If this is the case, it is reasonable to estimate that 4QMMT is dated to around 150 BCE, namely, the time when the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the community according to the *Damascus Document* (CD-A, col. I, ll. 6-9). Moreover, since “we” addresses “you” in a conciliatory tone in the epilogue, the members of the community are likely to have not yet completely separated themselves from Jerusalem, when 4QMMT was formed. In other words, Strugnell and Qimron regarded 4QMMT as an extramural document sent by the Qumran community to the outsiders against them.

Steven D. Fraade, however, conducted a “rhetorical experiment,” in which he demonstrated that 4QMMT could be read as an intramural document.⁹ According to Fraade, “we” as a collective persona actually never criticized the addressees but rather positively tried to include them. Also in the statement of separation in the epilogue, the authors separated themselves from the mass of the people, not from the addressee. In other words, 4QMMT is a document that is more pedagogical than polemical. Accordingly, Fraade concludes that 4QMMT is a pseudo-letter, that is, a document composed not as a letter for communication with outsiders but as a text for sectarian instruction. Furthermore, according to Fraade, there are only two parties in 4QMMT, since the “you” group is in fact a part of the “we” group (the “we” group encompassing the “you” group as opposed to the “they” group).

Adele Reinhartz in particular pays attention to the designations of “we,” “you,” and “they” in 4QMMT.¹⁰ As seen above, some scholars, including Fraade, assume that 4QMMT refers to two parties, while others believe it refers to three parties. For the scholars who believe the two-party hypothesis, “the addressee is part of the same movement as the writer, but geographically and/or theologically somewhat removed from the author’s group.”¹¹ However, the scholars who believe the three-party hypothesis remain in the majority. Among these scholars, some consider the “we” group to be members of the Qumran sect including the Teacher of Righteousness, the “you” group a currently sympathetic Hasmonean leader, and the “they” group the multitude of the people

(the Pharisees or the proto-Pharisees).¹² Other supporters of the three-party hypothesis, on the other hand, reverse the identification of the “you” group and the “they” group, i.e., the “you” group includes the Pharisees and the “they” group includes the pro-Hasmonean Temple establishment.¹³ Reinhartz herself, however, agrees with the two-party hypothesis based on her analysis of pronoun usage in some New Testament letters. In other words, like Fraade, Reinhartz also considers 4QMMT to be an intramural document written by the community for the instruction of its own members or potential members.

Under the strong influence of the “rhetorical experiment” of Fraade, Maxine L. Grossman examined the genre of 4QMMT.¹⁴ Grossman presupposed three genres that were likely to be suitable for 4QMMT and analyzed how different each case would be depending upon the difference in genre. First, if we read 4QMMT as an epistle, it can be assumed that there are specific authors and addressees living in different places spatially and conceptually but nevertheless contemporaneously. Accordingly, the logical conclusion of reading 4QMMT as an epistle leads us to regard the probable author as the Teacher of Righteousness and the probable addressee as the Wicked Priest in the period of the community’s foundation. Second, if we read 4QMMT as a treatise written in the period of foundation, it can be observed that the authors tried to be reasonable with their opponents, who were originally insiders, by telling the history of the community’s foundation in a conciliatory voice. In this case, the addressee is not necessarily always the Wicked Priest, since the document can be interpreted as a compilation of general issues, not as the product of one specific conflict. Third, if we read 4QMMT as a document-after-the-fact, the author is not a member of the community in the early period. Accordingly, this way of reading does not tell us who established the community and when this person did it but how the later generations remembered and constructed the history of the community. Based on an analysis of these three cases, Grossman concluded that 4QMMT can be read in various ways depending on how readers identify its literary genre.

From reading the above three recent studies, we learn that we have no certainty at all about 4QMMT.¹⁵ Almost all aspects of the commonly accepted theories are now in question: 4QMMT might be a polemical-extramural letter or a pedagogical-intermural treatise; there might be two parties or three parties; the author might be the Teacher of Righteousness or someone else; the addressee might be the Wicked Priest or someone else; the document might be dated to the early period of the community around 150 BCE or to the later period or perhaps even to the pre-Qumranic period.

Discussion between Schiffman and VanderKam

Before moving on to the sectarian nature of 4QMMT, we clarify the discussion between Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam on the identity of the Qumran community, since this discussion relies upon the assumption that 4QMMT is a sectarian text.

The crucial point of Schiffman's argument is that the earliest members of the Qumran community must have been the Sadducees, not the Essenes, in light of the list of laws in 4QMMT. According to Schiffman, at least four of the twenty laws agree with the opinions attributed to the Sadducees in tractate *Yadayim* 4.6-7 in the Mishnah (hereafter, m. Yad.).¹⁶

The first is whether books defile the hands. In the Mishnah, the Pharisees believe that the Bible defiles the hands, but secular books do not, whereas the Sadducees believe that all books defile the hands. The decision of the Sadducees here agrees with the laws of 4QMMT B 18-23, namely, the law prohibiting the bringing of skins of animals slaughtered outside the Temple into the Temple, and the law stipulating that such skins defile the person who brings them:

m. Yad. 4.6: The Sadducees say, "We protest against you, O Pharisees, for ye say, The Sacred Scriptures render the hands unclean but the books of the Sectarrians do not render the hands unclean."

4QMMT B 18-23: (18) Concerning the skins of the cattle and the sheep ... from (19) their skins vessels ... they are not to (20) bring them to the Sanctuary ... (21) ... And furthermore concerning the skins and bones of unclean animals, they shall not make from their bones and from their skins (22) handles of vessels and ... And furthermore concerning the skin of the carcass (23) of a clean animals, he who carries their carcass shall not touch the sacred purity.

The second issue concerns the ritual purity of bones. According to the Mishnah, the Pharisees believe that the bones of unclean animals are clean enough to make spoons, but the bones of a human are as unclean as his flesh. The Sadducees, on the other hand, insist that all bones, including those of human, are unclean. This Sadducean view is likely to agree with the discourse in 4QMMT B 18-23 and B 73-74:

m. Yad. 4.6: Rabban Jochanan ben Zakkai said, "... Behold they [the Pharisees] say, The bones of a dead ass are clean, and the bones of Jochanan the High Priest

are unclean after his death.”

4QMMT B 73-74: (73) We say that every bone to which (74) flesh is or is not attached is to be treated according to the law of the dead or slain.

The third issue involves the so-called *Nitzoq*, namely, the dispute over whether a stream of liquids conveys impurity: When pure water is poured from a pure container into an impure container, does the water become impure? The Sadducees believe that such impurity will return from the impure container back to the pure one through the stream, whereas the Pharisees reject this opinion. The same opinion as that advocated by the Sadducees can be found in 4QMMT B 55-58:

m. Yad. 4.7: The Sadducees say, “We protest against you, O Pharisees, for ye pronounce clean the interrupted flow [of liquid from vessel to vessel].”

4QMMT B 55-58: (55) And furthermore concerning the pouring (of liquids), we say that it contains no (56) purity. And furthermore the pouring does not separate the impure (57) from the pure for the poured liquid and that in the receptacle are alike, (58) one liquid.

The fourth issue has been taken as counterevidence of the third issue. The Pharisees in the Mishnah criticize the Sadducees for claiming that the water run-off from a burial ground is not impure. This statement of the Sadducees is inconsistent with their assertion that a pure container will become impure because of its connection to an impure container through a stream. Accordingly, this contradiction is used as proof by the Pharisees that the Sadducees maintain an inconsistent attitude in light of the third issue:

m. Yad. 4.7: The Pharisees say, “We protest against you, O Sadducees, for ye declare clean the channel of water that comes from a burial ground.”

According to Schiffman, the author of 4QMMT accepts the Sadducean viewpoint with respect to these four issues but denies the Pharisaic opinions. Since Schiffman considers 4QMMT to be a sectarian document, he identifies the Qumran community as, in fact, the Sadducees, rather than the Essenes as usually assumed.

Based on his viewpoint of 4QMMT, Schiffman built up his hypothesis regarding the

development of the Qumran community:¹⁷ The earlier members of the community were the Sadducees, and they were opposed to accepting the Hasmonean authority that replaced the Zadokite high priesthood after the Maccabean revolt (168-164 BCE). Then, some Zadokites who were dissatisfied with the situation separated themselves from the majority in Jerusalem to form their own sect, calling themselves the Sons of Zadok, since they considered themselves to be the true Israel. The Sadduceans who remained in Jerusalem adopted a new order that would be attributed to the Pharisees under the Hasmonean priests, and thus they no longer practiced the old Sadducean teachings. Although the Sons of Zadok initially intended to reconcile with the priests in Jerusalem, they gradually abandoned such hope and eventually became so radical that they cut off their connection with the outside world. Thus, since the original Sadducean people were isolated, they changed their attitudes to conform with the Essene sectarian manners and eventually formed their own community.

The scholar who entirely disagrees with Schiffman's theory is James C. VanderKam.¹⁸ Following the conventional theory, VanderKam claims that the Qumran community is that of the Essenes, based primarily on evidence from the Roman geographer Pliny the Elder and the contents of the scrolls themselves as opposed to the descriptions of Essene beliefs and practices left by Josephus and others. According to VanderKam, there was no reason for Pliny to make a fake report, and there are many points of similarity between the descriptions of the Essenes in Josephus' *Jewish Wars* and those in the *Community Rule*. However, VanderKam acknowledged that three of Schiffman's four points give proper evidence of similarity to the Sadducean opinions in 4QMMT (VanderKam questions only the first issue, in which the defilement of hands is discussed). Nevertheless, VanderKam still claims that Schiffman's theory is an ill-founded argument for three reasons: first, there may well have been many areas in which the Sadducees and the Essenes agreed with one another; second, it is no simple matter to decide how much credence to give to the record of Sadducean-Pharisaic disputes in the Mishnah; and third, Schiffman ignores not only the numerous testimonies of Pliny and Josephus about the Essenes but also the non-Sadducean doctrines found in the Qumranic sectarian texts. According to these reasons, VanderKam concludes:

The evidence from people like Josephus and Pliny (or his source), who had actually witnessed the ways and theology of the Essenes, and the data from central Qumran texts can hardly be outweighed by the few legal details on which Schiffman relies.¹⁹

In other words, VanderKam confirms the Essene hypothesis because the evidence that supports it is more convincing than that of Schiffman's theory. Accordingly, VanderKam rejects Schiffman's theory, although he does not disprove it, or rather he partially admits its validity.

Is 4QMMT Really a Sectarian Text?

Schiffman's theory and VanderKam's adherence to the conventional theory are irreconcilable. As VanderKam claims, Schiffman's theory cannot be posited without ignoring Pliny and Josephus as witnesses; on the other hand, as Schiffman argues, the similarity to Sadducean views in 4QMMT is so apparent that even VanderKam has no choice but to accept it. Just as parallel lines never converge, so Schiffman and VanderKam will never succeed in narrowing their differences on the identification of the Qumran community. However, there is one necessary precondition that both sides must meet in order to validate their theories: verifying the sectarian nature of 4QMMT. 4QMMT is clearly considered a sectarian text, since both Schiffman and VanderKam found points of similarity between 4QMMT and various sectarian texts (e.g. the *Temple Scrolls*), especially with regard to the 364-day soli-solar calendar system.²⁰

It remains in question, however, whether 4QMMT actually is a sectarian text.²¹ In the early period of this research history, the sectarian nature of 4QMMT was taken for granted, since the editors Strugnell and Qimron regarded the author as the Teacher of Righteousness and the addressee as the Wicked Priest. However, we should recall that the accepted theories of 4QMMT have drastically changed. If 4QMMT were not a sectarian text, Schiffman's theory and VanderKam's refutation would both be reasonable, since the identification of 4QMMT and that of the Qumran community would have turned out to be incorrect.

There are two reasons why we need to question the sectarian nature of 4QMMT: First, some scholars conclude that the calendar of section A does not apply to the rest of the sections.²² The major part of the calendar appears only in fragments 4Q394 1-2 (originally numbered 4Q397), and the brief ending part is preserved at the beginning of 4Q394 frgs. 3a-4 col. i, 1-3. Since the manuscript 4Q394 also contains the beginning part of section B, the calendar has been considered a part of 4QMMT. However, the only thing this fact proves is that one of the manuscripts of 4QMMT preserved the calendar. It is still uncertain whether another manuscript also contained it. Moreover, the paleographical analysis makes it difficult to believe fragments 4Q394 1-2 were truly part of manuscript 4Q394.

Accordingly, it is impossible to assert that 4QMMT is a sectarian text by simply raising the fact that the composite text of 4QMMT contains the calendar.

Second, in neither the list of laws nor the epilogue do we find any technical terminology that suggests the characteristics of sectarian texts.²³ Henry W. Morisada Rietz proposed the methodology and criteria of categorization between the documents that were actually composed by members of the Qumran community and the documents that functioned as traditional writings for use by the community but that did not originate within the community.²⁴ According to Rietz (and his predecessor Devorah Dimant), the most useful criterion for determining Qumran authorship is the distinctive use of certain technical terms.²⁵ In the so-called sectarian documents produced in the Qumran community, we usually find the following terminologies: יחד, סרך, מבקר, משכיל, פקיד, הכוהן, איש/מטיף הכזב, מורה הצדק, דורשי החלקות, בני שחר, בני צדק, בני חושך, בני אמת, בני אור הרשע. Moreover, the terms related to dualism, predestination (תעודה), and biblical exegesis (פשר) also frequently appear. 4QMMT obviously does not contain any of these terms. Steven Fraade pointed out that some expressions found in 4QMMT, such as “to understand” (הבין ב-), also appear in the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*,²⁶ but it is still debatable whether these expressions can really be used as keywords. 4QMMT is more likely to fit the category of documents that functioned as traditions for the community but did not originate within the community. According to Rietz, three criteria should be applied to confirm whether a document has been actually used in the community:²⁷ first, the number of extant manuscript copies; second, evidence that the manuscripts were copied at Qumran; and third, references, allusions, or quotations found in Qumran writings. In examining 4QMMT, we find no evidence that it meets the second and third criteria, but it might be fair to say that 4QMMT played an important role in the Qumran community because at least six copies of the manuscript remain.

Conclusions

Given the two reasons for concern discussed above, the sectarian nature of 4QMMT is cast into doubt. If 4QMMT is not a sectarian text, some features attributed to the Sadducees in Schiffman's theory might not pertain to the Qumran community but to another community established in the pre-Qumranic period.²⁸ Furthermore, if 4QMMT is not a sectarian text, the Qumran community can still be identified as Essene without ignoring the witnessing of Pliny, as VanderKam claims. Throughout the development of the research history of 4QMMT, the accepted theories regarding the definition of the genre,

the date of the document, and the identification of the personal pronouns' antecedents have come into question. Consequently, the sectarian nature of 4QMMT must also be extensively reconsidered.

Notes

- * This article is based in part on a paper written under the guidance of Prof. John Kampen in preparation for his seminar on "The Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," which was held at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, in the Spring Semester 2015. I would like to thank Prof. Kampen for his teaching and encouragement. My gratitude also goes to Prof. Ada Taggar Cohen, who invited me to contribute to this journal.
- ¹ Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995), 315.
 - ² Charlotte Hempel, "The Context of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (Charlotte Hempel, ed., Leiden: Brill, 2010), 289.
 - ³ As for the term "sectarian texts," I follow the usage of Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, Jr., and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (Revised Edition; New York: HarperOne, 2005), 13, who give a careful but general definition, stating that these texts "presuppose a particular kind of organization and share a distinctive set of doctrines, a unique theological vocabulary, and a special perspective on history, things absent from other Qumran texts and other sort of Judaism in general ... These texts, it seems clear, were the central documents of the group or groups behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, and these are the ones we would designate as sectarian."
 - ⁴ Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell eds., *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994). For philological criticism on the reconstructed texts, see, for example, Miguel Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1997): 191-205; Idem, "4QMMT: Linguistic Analysis of Redactional Forms Related to Biblical and Rabbinic Language," in *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages* (Takamitsu Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 33; Leiden: Brill 1999), 205-22; Ian Werret, "The Reconstruction of 4QMMT: A Methodological Critique," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Anders K. Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige, and Martin Ehrensverd, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 205-16; Hanne von Weissenberg, "4QMMT—Some New Readings," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 217-21; Elizur A. Bar-Asher Siegal, "Who Separated from Whom and Why? A Philological Study of 4QMMT," *Revue de Qumran* 25 (2011): 245-46.
 - ⁵ 4QMMT B 80-82: "And you know that some of the priests and [the people mingle] [and they] unite and defile the [holy] seed and also their [seed] with whores f[or] ..." All of the English translations of 4QMMT in this paper follow Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English: Revised Edition* (London: Penguin Books, 2011).
 - ⁶ Before the official publication, a "bootleg" version of the text was available, and an increasing number of scholars became aware of its importance. See Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* 270-72.

-
- ⁷ Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 8.
- ⁸ 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* (Janet Amitai, ed., Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 400.
- ⁹ Steven D. Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," *Revue de Qumran* 19 (2000), 507-26.
- ¹⁰ Adele Reinhartz, "We, You, They: Boundary Language in 4QMMT and the New Testament Epistles," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 89-105.
- ¹¹ John Kampen, "4QMMT and New Testament Studies," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein, eds., SBL Symposium 2; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 129-44, esp. 131. For another example of the two-party hypothesis, see George J. Brooke, "Luke-Acts and the Qumran Scrolls: The Case of MMT," in *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (Christopher M. Tuckett, ed., The Library of New Testament Studies 116; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 72-90.
- ¹² 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* (Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, eds., Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 57-73; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts," in *Reading 4QMMT*, 81-98.
- ¹³ Hanan Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT*, 53-65; Daniel R. Schwartz, "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees," in *Reading 4QMMT*, 67-80.
- ¹⁴ Maxine L. Grossman, "Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History," *Revue de Qumran* 20 (2001), 3-22.
- ¹⁵ Recently, Gareth Wearne more radically proposed a thought experiment, questioning: What would it look like if we viewed MMT as a letter sent not *from*, but *to* a separatist community (from the Temple Establishment)? See his "4QMMT: A Letter to (not from) the *Yahad*," in *Law, Literature, and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran* (Jutta Jokiranta and Molly M. Zahn, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 128; Leiden: Brill, 2019), 99-126. For similar perspectives, see Lester L. Grabbe, "4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89-108, esp. 90-91. The situation of the research on 4QMMT is seemingly getting more and more chaotic.
- ¹⁶ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (George J. Brooke, ed., Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 239-55.
- ¹⁷ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 53 (1990), 64-73; Idem, "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls Sect," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Hershel Shanks, ed., New York: Random House, 1992), 35-49; Idem, "Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, eds., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:558-60.
- ¹⁸ James C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 50-62; Idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2nd ed.; Grand

Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 97-126. On the other hand, John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 45, takes a more moderate and conciliatory step, saying "...the halakhah of this tradition [= examples in 4QMMT] seems to disagree consistently with the positions later attributed to the Pharisees, and, at least in a number of striking cases, to agree with that of the Sadducees. This does not necessarily mean that the authors were Sadducees, only that they shared a tradition of legal interpretation with the Sadducees. This observation does not preclude the possibility that the authors might be Essenes, or belong to some other sect, since other factors would have to be taken into consideration to establish sectarian identity."

¹⁹ James C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 60.

²⁰ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Place of 4QMMT," 81-98; James C. VanderKam, "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 58.

²¹ Charlotte Hempel, "The Context of 4QMMT," 290; Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 19-20, 234-35.

²² Charlotte Hempel, "The Context of 4QMMT," 290; Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 33-38.

²³ John Strugnell, "Additional Observations on 4QMMT: Appendix 3," in *Qumran Cave 4.V*, 205; cf. Charlotte Hempel, "The Context of 4QMMT," 284, n. 39; Hanne von Weissenberg, *4QMMT*, 20.

²⁴ Henry W. Morisada Rietz, "Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice as a Test Case," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (Michael T. Davis and Brent A. Strawn, eds., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 29-52. For other technical terminologies, see Brent A. Strawn with Henry W. Morisada Rietz, "(More) Sectarian Terminology in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: The Case of תמימי דרך," in *Qumran Studies*, 53-64.

²⁵ As for the stylistic features of the sectarian texts, Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58, propose the following three categories: first, they are written in Hebrew, not in Aramaic; second, they do not belong to the genre of apocalypse; and third, even though they do not contain specific terminologies, they are taken as halakhic, calendrical, chronological, or astrological texts. 4QMMT probably fits into the third category, but Dimant only refers to 4Q251 and the Temple Scroll as examples.

²⁶ Steven D. Fraade, "To Whom It May Concern," 514.

²⁷ Henry W. Morisada Rietz, "Identifying Compositions," 41.

²⁸ Florentino García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," in *Reading 4QMMT*, 15-27.