

Bibliographische Dokumentation

Qumran

Matthias Hoffmann, Loren Stuckenbruck, Mark Vincent (Durham)

Martin G. Abegg: *4QMMT C 27, 31 and "Works of Righteousness"*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 139-147.

Abegg offers some considerations concerning the proximity of Paul's 'works of the law' (Rom 3.20,28; Gal 2.16; 3.2,5,10) and 4QMMT C 27 (4Q398 14-17 ii,3). Paul's expression ἔργα νόμου is mostly likely a translation from the Hebrew מעשי התורה which can only be found in 4QMMT C 27. This same passage in 4QMMT 'also echoes the language of Gal. 3:6b where Paul quotes Gen. 15:6 and argues that righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, צדקה) is reckoned (λογίζομαι, חשב) on the basis of faith' (139). The echo in both 4QMMT and Paul of Ps 106.31 (cf. Num 25.1-8) strengthens the notion that Paul's understanding is formulated in direct contrast to the idea preserved in the text from the Dead Sea. An additional parallel given in both texts is the reference to the paradigm of blessings and curses (as in Deut 27-28). Abegg considers the significance of these parallels, while shunning a simple 'parallelomania'. The fact that the religion of Paul and 4QMMT are conceptually related might help to understand the kind of Judaism with which Paul was interacting. Abegg follows J.D.G. Dunn's most recent suggestion that this kind of Judaism was established on 'an unconditional commitment to maintain Israel's distinctiveness, to prevent the purity of ist covenant set-apartness to God from being adulterated or defiled' (147). He concludes that Paul was not responding to a Judaism which favoured salvation through works but to a Judaism which understood Israel's distinctiveness in terms of the Torah and its interpretation.

M.H.

Joseph M. Baumgarten: *Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 184-191.

The difference of celebrating Yom Kippur between the Qumranic society and other contemporary Jews is quite obvious. One of the main reasons for this is naturally the use of different calendars among these groups. A closer look at Qumran and Second Temple literature might provide another clue for this obvious confrontation: Similar to Jubilees, where Yom Kippur is regarded as a day of mourning and self-affliction (Jub 34:19), other texts of Qumran describe it as a 'Day of Affliction' (as a יום התענית, CD vi,18-19; cf. תענו את נפשתיכם, Lev 16.29) or in similar terms combined with תענית, as in 4Q508 2 2-4 (מועד תענית); 4Q509 16 iv 2-4 (תעניתם על תעניתם); 4Q510 1 5 (תענית תענית); and 4Q171 1-2 ii 8-11 (מועד התענית). By contrast, the Yom Kippur in mishnaic literature (m.Yoma 7.4 or m.Ta'an 4.8) is depicted as 'days of rejoicing' (ימים טובים). One might

conclude, therefore, that the difference of understanding Yom Kippur (being described in terms of a clash between the Wicked Priest and the Righteous Teacher in 1QpHab xi,4-8) might not only concern the calendar, but also the nature of the feast.

M.H.

Jonathan Ben-Dov: *A Presumed Citation of Esther 3:7 in 4QD^b*. DSD 6/3 (1999) 282-284.

The article provides the reader with some evidence of the possibility of some familiarity of the book of Esther by scribes in Qumran, though no copy of this book has been found there. The scroll 4Q267 (published as 4QD^b by J. M. Baumgarten) has a number of parallels to 4Q266, 270 and CD v-xiv. 4Q267 9 i is a parallel to CD ix,6-14 concerning the law of re-proof. An interesting divergence is preserved by line 1 of 4Q267 9 i: [מחודש לחודש]. For the lacuna, Baumgarten has suggested a reconstruction of מיום ליום מחודש לחודש. The expression, מיום ליום occurs also in CD vii,3 in similar context and is obviously derived from Num 30.15. But according to Ben-Dov this connection of a term used in a law concerning vows made by women barely makes sense in 4Q267. This twofold locution offered by Baumgarten's reconstruction is a hapax legomenon, as well as the phrase מחודש לחודש. It occurs only in Esth 3.7, but in a meaning completely different from its judicial use in Num 30.15. Ben-Dov argues that this phrase, despite its meaning, must have been inserted by mistake by the scribe of 4Q267 who, in turn, was familiar with Esther.

M.H.

M. Bockmuehl: *Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS)*. RQ 18/72 (1998) 541-560.

Bockmuehl summarises the debate on the composition and redaction history of 1QS, approaching the issue by a discussion of the textual relationship between 1QS and recently published fragments from Cave 4. Bockmuehl supports the priority of the latter (in particular 4QS^{b,d}), contending that 1QS represents a relatively late stage of redaction (he concedes the opposite may be true, but that a mediating position is unlikely). This is followed by a redaction-critical case study of 1QS v-ix. This tends to the conclusion of a progressively tighter religious practise in which atonement and forgiveness are increasingly limited to the sect itself.

M.V.

D. Instone Brewer: *Nomological Exegesis in Qumran Divorce Texts*. RQ 18/72 (1998) 561-580.

The author begins with a discussion of nomological exegesis, a term used by Brewer to describe an exegetical method of the Pharisaic and Saducean scribes in Palestine, the precursors of the Talmudic rabbis, in which the Biblical text – even non-legal material – is read as a legal document written by an infallible legal genius. The suggestion is that exegesis at Qumran often has more in common with this technique than is usually recognised. Brewer then examines CD iv,20-v,6 and 11QT lvii,15-19, showing that the exegetical techniques and assumptions employed there are similar to those used in first century rabbinic sources, and that although some exegetical techniques at Qumran are totally contrary to

nomological assumptions, on other occasions Qumran exegetes were able to restrict themselves to this style when they wished. Brewer argues that the passages he examines prohibit only polygamy, not divorce or remarriage.

M.V.

D. Dimant: *4Q386ii-iii – A Prophecy on Hellenistic Kingdoms?* RQ 18/72 (1998) 511-529.

The author presents the fragments of 4Q386ii-iii along with translation and commentary. From the fragments discussed and parallel passages from 4Q385 2 + 3 and 4Q388 8, the sequence and content of the three columns of 4Q386 can be established (Pseudo-Ezekiel is also represented in 4Q488, 4Q391 and perhaps also 4Q387). The work rewrites and expands Ezekiel's canonical prophecies, and its background is proposed to be events involving the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms during the period 170-140 BCE; it was composed no later than the second century BCE. 4Q386 is particularly rich in potential historical allusions, and its first fragment is the largest to have survived from all the copies of Pseudo-Ezekiel. This fragment contains the upper parts of columns i-iii, but since D has dealt with col i elsewhere, this article only examines the more difficult columns ii and iii.

M.V.

Michael C. Douglas: *The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis revisited: New Data for an old crux.* DSD 6/3 (1999) 239-266.

M. C. Douglas attempts to provide new evidence to substantiate his claim that the Teacher of Righteousness is the author of the Hodayot from Cave 1. His starting point is an overview of the history of research: He presents an assessment of data beginning with E. L. Sukenik's first attempt to identify the Teacher of Righteousness (partially) as the Hodayot's author, continuing with further debates by J. Licht or S. Holm-Nielsen opposing this idea. He especially focusses on the research made by G. Jeremias, J. Becker, H.-W. Kuhn and G. Morawe. Morawe's and Holm-Nielson's suggestion that the Hodayot be distinguished in two genres attracts his attention, because this could not only mean that the Hodayot is a "unity" or "plurality", but might rather be a "duality" (two blocks of material). He finds proof for the idea of a duality in the research of Becker and Jeremias, who found decisive criteria in the text's use of the first person singular and in its linguistic character (in some compositions the first person makes striking claims while in other compositions the claims would be appropriate for any member of the community). Beyond the arguments of predecessors, Douglas offers new arguments to strengthen the hypothesis concerning the "Teacher Hymns". In particular, he focusses on a literary examination of 1QH x-xvii and disagrees with Jeremias' way of distinguishing between the "Teacher Hymns" and the "Community Hymns". Douglas classifies the words catalogued by Jeremias as too common to be of any use (e.g. רחמים, צדק, בין, ספר, צבא, חלל). Accordingly Douglas himself tries to focus on a more rarely attested expression like הגבירכה בי which he claims to be the teacher's "signature phrase". On the basis of this point, Douglas presents an extensive list of other expressions that are not commonplace and are only to be found in the mentioned compositions. He takes this literary evidence as proof that x,22f.; x,23-33; x,34-xi,6; xii,7-31a; xiii,7-21; xiii,22-xv,7 and xv,8-27 were composed by a single author.

Douglas draws further evidence for his theory by applying a model of social conflict to the Hodayot. Indebted to V. Turner's model of social conflict, Douglas highlights some aspects of the social context in cols x and xii indicating the Hodayot's origin to be in the very early stage of the sectarian movement, which also suggests the author of Hodayot is the Teacher of Righteousness himself.

M.H.

Yaakov Elman: *MMT B 3-5 and its Ritual Context*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 148-156.

Elman tries to demonstrate that rabbinic halakhic material may be taken into account when one reconstructs fragmentary Qumranic halakhic texts. Rabbinic parallels may help provide the context of Qumran statements, whether they are in agreement with them or not. Nevertheless, a particular interpretation or reconstruction may not be preferred merely on the basis of a parallel. In particular, alleged rabbinic parallels need to be scrutinized with precision if they are to provide insight into a Qumran text. Elman illustrates this with by means of an example in 4QMMT B 3-5. The reconstruction of Qimron and Strugnell (DJD 10) maintains that the passage is a discussion on the purity of heave offerings of gentiles' grain (רעל תרומה ד[גן ה]גורים), a discussion which they claim is not attested in rabbinic literature. Elman doubts this interpretation, not only for the amount of letters being reconstructed, but also for the lack of parallels. A comparison with rabbinic texts leads him to propose that MMT B 3-5 deals instead with the grain tithes of the Levites (רעל מעשר ד[גן ה]לויים). Those tithes are in danger of becoming impure when touched by certain people, namely those from the household of the farmer growing the grain or even those from the family of the Levite. Although Qimron's reconstruction might be 'graphically possible' (156), Elman argues for an alternative which seems culturally and legally more plausible.

M.H.

P.W. Flint and A.E. Alvarez: *Two Scrolls from Nahal Hever (XHev/SeNumb and XHev/SeDeut)*. RQ 18/72 (1998) 531-540.

Flint and Alvarez present an edition of these scrolls with background, translation and notes. XHev/SeNumb consists of a large fragment preserving portions of Num 27.2-13 and 28.11-12, and is one of three scrolls from locations other than Qumran to preserve text from Numbers. The only other Judean desert scroll to preserve text from Numbers 27-28 is 4QNumb. The script is probably late Herodian (c. 50-68 CE), and there are no variant readings against other Judean desert scrolls or MT. XHev/SeDeut preserves portions of Deut 9.4-7, 21-23 in a single fragment, once again one of three scrolls to preserve text from Deuteronomy from non-Qumran locations. Textually there is little of significance here against other mss of Deuteronomy.

M.V.

Steven D. Fraade: *Shifting from Priestly to Non-Priestly Legal authority: A Comparison of the Damascus Document and the Midrash Sifra*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 109-125.

Fraade argues that a comparison between the legal texts from Qumran and rabbinic Judaism is promising if one wishes to 'highlight not only lines of continuity between the two communities, but also the distinctive contours of each community's legal self-understanding,

organization, rhetoric, and practice' (109-110). After a comparison of CD xiii,2-7, Mishnah Nega'im 3.1, and Sifra Tazri'a Parashat Nega'im pereq 1.8-10, Fraade rather cautiously concludes that the traces of similarities and differences make it impossible to delineate the continuity and discontinuity between the rabbinic and Qumran literature. Fraade does not advocate instead that the prior tendency to dissociate Qumran from rabbinic literature be replaced by a myopic view that they are continuous. Trying to remain methodologically careful, Fraade describes the existing continuity in terms of a parallel phenomenon of two communities whose learning is rooted in the scriptures they shared. Differences and similarities, e.g. in legal authority (of a בִּרְוּךְ, whose role is variously reduced in the later texts), might be due to the nature of their respective audiences and paedagogical purposes.

M.H.

Betsy Halpern-Amaru: *Bilhah and Naphtali in Jubilees: A Note on 4QTNaphtali*. DSD 6/1 (1999) 1-10.

This article provides a comparison of genealogical material concerning Bilhah, mainly focussing on 4QTNaphtali and Jubilees. The Bilhah genealogy of 4QTNaphtali (frgs. 1 and 2) can also be found in the Greek Testament of Naphtali in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (1.10) and in Bereshit Rabbati (29). An absence of this genealogy in Jubilees is, therefore, noteworthy because the author of Jubilees normally demonstrates a strong interest in maternal genealogy (esp. 34.20-21) and, in addition, also shares in a tradition that ascribes some prestige to Naphtali. A familiarity with Bilhah material in 4QTNaphtali is reflected by linguistic similarities between its depiction of Bilhah's mother and the status of Zilpah and Bilhah in Jubilees. This indicates a deliberate omission of maternal genealogical material by the author of Jubilees, who instead generally presents maternal lineage in marriage announcements (stressing the paternal background of the wife) than in birth. The omission of a marriage announcement in case of Bilhah – especially in light of the attention given to Naphtali – is remarkable and best explained as deliberate as well, for the author of Jubilees is concerned with matters of sexual purity. Accordingly, Bilhah as a woman who is violated by Jacob's son Reuben is an unsuitable wife for a patriarch. She is therefore described in a concubine terminology (שפחה, reconstructed from Ethiopic *la'ekt*, cf. Jub. 28.3, as opposed to אמה) though her innocence in the violation is still stressed). In this way a balance between Bilhah as a violated woman and as the mother of Naphtali is maintained.

M.H.

James E. Harding: *The Wordplay between the Roots כשל and שכל in the Literature of the Yahad*. RQ 19/73 (1999) 69-82.

Harding argues that the authors of the Qumran literature made use of wordplays to demonstrate their self-understanding and to define themselves over against other groups. In case of the expressions בני בליעל and בני אור or בני השחת and בני השחר this is rather obvious. Harding assumes that another wordplay between the roots כשל and שכל is attested among the Qumran texts. Accordingly he wants to prove that this wordplay belonged in the same lexical field as similar wordplays in the Hebrew Bible (as for instance שכל and סכל in Ps 94.8, Prov 10.18-19 and 23.9, or the very same wordplay of כשל and שכל in the poetic texts of Jer 20.11 and Ps 64.9-10, and in the prosaic text Dan 11.33,35). Harding

demonstrates that the wordplay between the roots of כשל and שכל is also present in 4QFlor (4Q174) which associates כשל with the Sons of Belial and שכל with the Sons of Light by alluding to the closing chapters of Daniel (11-12). In the Serekh ha-Yahad the terms כשל and שכל are also present, but their proper character as a wordplay depends on the linguistic and metaphorical opposites of 'stumbling' in 1QS (so e.g. iii,18,20-1; iv,2-22). A major key for understanding is the idea of 'walking': the Sons of Righteousness walk in ways of light and thus 'have insight' (שכל), whereas the Sons of Injustice walk in ways of darkness and are thus prone to 'stumbling' (כשל). Harding also manages to trace back the biblical origins of the opposition between כשל and שכל, indicating that the use of those roots in 1QS is dependent on the Book of Daniel (e.g. Dan 9.2) and Jeremiah (e.g. Jer 20.11).

M.H.

Martha Himmelfarb: *Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees*. DSD 6/1 (1999) 11-36.

The relationship between the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees has been studied on the basis of the shared legal traditions of both documents. Whereas more recent studies have focussed primarily on their use of a similar calendar, Himmelfarb considers the laws governing sexual relations and purity in order to illustrate the fundamental differences between both documents. At first sight both texts seem to regard ordinary Jews more like priests (though not in the same way). Himmelfarb considers that the differences between the documents has to be understood against the background of the priestly material in the Torah. The different use of the material in P (e.g. Lev 13-14) and H (Holiness Code in Lev 18; 20:10-21) is noteworthy and are especially distinguishable on the basis of their different uses of the terms נדה and טמא. The Temple Scroll probably found P's attitude – restricting the impact of impurity only to the Temple and holy things associated with it – too lenient. Accordingly the influence of H can be seen much clearer here, for in Temple Scroll the realm affected by impurity is more extensive. Jubilees, on the other hand, offers a different model for making ordinary Jews more like priests by claiming that violations of law of prohibited sexual relations affect the Temple itself (as in P). These differences point away from the hypothesis that there is a close relationship between the Temple Scroll and Jubilees, a notion often based on limited considerations of the calendar.

M.H.

Howard Jacobson: *Notes on 4Q303*. DSD 6/1 (1999) 78-80.

Differing from the recent interpretation of 4Q303 by T. Lim (DJD 20), Jacobson offers some supplementary notes and and corrections (especially regarding translation) to this fragmentary 'Meditation of Creation'. On the basis of a comparison with related biblical (wisdom) literature, the fragment clearly belongs to the wisdom genre. This is supported by Jacobson's reinterpretation of Lim's rendering of מבינים שמעו on line 1 ('having understood, they listened') as 'you who understand, pay heed' and by 'God's creation theme' throughout the fragment.

M.H.

William John Lyons: *Clarifications concerning 4Q285 and 11Q14 arising from Discoveries in the Judean Desert 23*. DSD 6/1 (1999) 37-43.

This article aims to discuss the suggestions concerning 4Q285 and 11Q4 made by F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude in DJD 23. At first, the identification of these document fragments has to be clarified, as the re-naming of them has caused some confusion. When 11Q14 was first published (by van der Woude) it was designated 11QBer, whereas 4Q285 was initially named 4QBerakhot-Milhamah (BM), and thereafter identified as 4QSefer ha-Milhamah by Milik and referred to as 4QSefer ha-Milhamah by García Martínez (also calling it 4QM^B). In their attempt to demonstrate that the two manuscripts belong to the same document, van der Woude and García Martínez have now renamed 11Q14 as 11QSefer ha-Milhamah. Lyons is reluctant to identify the manuscripts with each other; it is not certain that they are exactly the same, and using a common designation commits one to a particular view of how the texts are related. Hence it is safer simply to refer to them as 4Q285 and 11Q14. Despite some striking similarities with respect to content (e.g. the וַיַּחַדְנוּ הַיְהוָה kills the leader of the community's enemy in 11Q14 i and 4Q285 5), Lyons considers this evidence for a shared identification too vague. According to him, van der Woude and García Martínez' reconstruction of 11Q14 is based only on a few letters (five letters in col. i, i.e. three in line 7 and two in line 10) and is therefore dubious. Although the existing evidence would be consistent with van der Woude and García Martínez' reconstruction, this hardly constitutes proof. Moreover, their translation of the blessing needs to be clarified in 11Q14; the fulfillment of the blessings is not considered a future event, as indicated by the perfect verb שָׁבַחְתָּהּ in 11Q14 ii,13. Finally, Lyons rejects the attempt by van der Woude and García Martínez to explain the longer line in the 4Q285 5 2-3 (corresponding to 11Q14 ii,9) as a variant. He suggests instead that the previous reconstructions of the layout of this part of 4Q285 may have been incorrect.

M.H.

Catherine M. Murphy: *The Disposition of Wealth in the Damascus Document Tradition*. RQ 19/73 (1999) 83-129.

In this article Murphy analyses the legislation of wealth (e.g. הוֹן) in the Damascus Document, which refers to wealth about 25 times in different contexts illustrative of communal history, relations, boundaries and ideals. A diachronic development of legislation is not apparent among the manuscripts of the same passage, but a development may be discerned between various passages, since these derive from different redactional stages and genres in the document. Murphy's study presents the passages on wealth in terms of their distribution across the editorial layers and literary genres of the Damascus Document and then organizes these passages into three groups according to their content. There are passages which describe wealth as an aspect of communal history (e.g. CD xix,5-11; xix,15-24 [par. viii,3-12] and xiii, 9-10), as a subject of legislation for communal relations (e.g. 4QD^b iv,8-11; CD ix,8-16; and xiv,20-21) and as a communal boundary marker (e.g. CD xii,6-11; 4QD^c 7 i,11-13; and CD xx,6-10). Within the Damascus Document the issue of wealth is present in all the redactional stages and is mentioned in almost every generic category. These discussions of wealth played a role in shaping the community's identity and reflect an

eschatological perspective which, despite circumstances in the present, anticipates wealth in the future.

M.H.

Jacqueline C.R. De Roo: *David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. DSD 6/1 (1999) 44-65.

This article attempts to explain the meaning of מלכד דם אוריה ויעלו מעשי דויד in CD v,5b-6a through comparisons with other Qumran documents, especially 4Q174 and 4QMMT. The meaning of this sentence poses problems, a difficulty that is reflected by the numerous different translations offered by scholars. In particular renderings diverge for the verb ויעל. It is possible to translate this verb as qal, nifal, pual, or hofal (hifil and piel can be excluded due to a missing object in this sentence of CD). De Roo argues that a qal or hofal form is most likely here on the basis of the usage of this form among the DSS, the Hebrew Bible, and rabbinic literature. The expression מלכד דם אוריה is easier to explain, as it is most likely a reference to David's murder of Uriah (2 Sam 10-11; 1 Kgs 15.5; 1 Chr 28.3). The most difficult expression to translate, however, is ויעזבם לו אל. The translation by Vermes ('and God left them to him', which has the pronominal suffix refer to the deeds of David) seems to be the most literal one. De Roo provides further evidence for this translation by comparing verbal and conceptual connections of CD v,5b-6a, 4Q174 and 4QMMT. The interpretation of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174 iii,6b-7a - this describes the 'house' promised to David as 'a temple consisting of human beings' - may possibly be understood as a symbolic representation of the Qumran Community. The same text (and similarly the expression מעשי התורה related to David in 4QMMT C 27) also refers to the deeds of David as 'works of law' (though some scholars read התורה instead of התורה). In addition to the sacrificial connotations of the terms עלה and דם in CD v,5b-6a, one might conclude that David's works may be interpreted as sacrifices to God. The author gives evidence that the verb עזב most likely has a positive connotation here and that the combination עזב + direct object + preposition ל is - in analogy to Neh 13:14 - best understood as 'to leave something to someone's benefit'.

M.H.

Jeffrey L. Rubenstein: *Nominalism and Realism in Qumranic and Rabbinic Law: A Reassessment*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 157-183.

Rubenstein evaluates D.R. Schwartz's article 'Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law' and focusses on the concept of distinguishing between the realism of Qumran-Sadducean law, on the one hand, and the nominalism of Pharisaic-rabbinic law, on the other. Rubenstein considers this distinction to be overstated; the conflict between nominalism and realism, though discernible among some of the legal texts of these communities, remains too schematic, and so one cannot expect it to have been carried through consistently. Rubenstein argues against or modifies Schwartz's position in relation to six categories (polygamy; slaughter of locusts - משפט בריאתם in CD xii,14-15, analogous to the phrase נבראת מן in b.Hul 27b; marriage with nieces; impurity of animal bones; water flowing from a pure to an impure vessel - נצוק; and penal law). Rubenstein still accepts Schwartz's theory, but in a weaker form; he admits that Pharisaic-rabbinic law may be, on

the whole, more nominalist than Qumran-Sadducean law. A better key for understanding the differences, however, might be a consideration of the biblical (Pentateuchal) view of law, which is realist. Due to varying experiences of Qumran and rabbinic societies, the worldviews of both groups became distinguishable from one another and from the worldview of Pentateuchal law. Accordingly those differences made room for legal nominalism.

M.H.

Aharon Shemesh: *'Three-days' Journey from the Temple: The Use of this Expression in the Temple Scroll*. DSD 6/2 (1999) 126-138.

The purpose of this article is to determine the use of the expression 'three-days' journey from the temple' (דרך שלשת ימים); see 11QTemple xlili,12; lii,14) by examining its origin, its meaning, and its halakhic implications. Shemesh wishes this term to be understood as an idiom for the boundaries of the land of Israel. Accordingly, a journey that requires more than 3 days simply means 'outside the country'. Consequently he examines the two passages of the Temple Scroll containing this idiom. 11QTemple lii,13-16 prohibits slaughter of animals within a three-days' distance of Jerusalem. This prohibition is most likely to be understood as the prohibition of sacrificial slaughter, for this is restricted to the Temple only. 11QTemple xlili,12-16 may be interpreted in the same way: a dispensation is granted to those who live further than a three-days' journey, and so they are permitted to sell the tithe and to bring money to the Temple instead. This ruling has to be understood in the light of Deut 14.24-25, in which a distinction is made between produce grown in Israel (which, as a tithe, must be brought to the Temple) and produce grown outside (which may be changed into monetary value). Shemesh concludes that the use of the idiom 'three-days' journey from the temple' furnishes insight into the Qumranic understanding of the Torah: some Pentateuchal laws were to be in force only in the land of Israel, as for instance is also the case in 4QMMT, where the law of fourth-year fruit is related to 'the trees for fruit planted in the Land of Israel' (4QMMT B 62-63). Accordingly the author of the Temple Scroll understood the law of centralization of the cult only in the surroundings which are "three-days' journey from the temple", that is, in the land of Israel.

M.H.

H. Stegemann: *More Identified Fragments of 4QD^d (4Q259)*. RQ 18/72 (1998) 497-509.

Stegemann discusses fragments 10, 12-14 and identifies two further fragments, 15 and 16, of 4QD^d (4Q259). The first part of the article is primarily a demonstration that fragment 10 has been placed in the correct location as part of 4QD^d. The remainder is a discussion of fragments 15 and 16 which contain the conclusion of the text. Stegemann suggests that the title of the work occurs at the end of the text as well as the beginning, as is also the case in Jubilees.

M.V.

Eibert Tigchelaar: *More Identifications of Scraps and Overlaps*. RQ 19/73 (1999) 61-68.

Tigchelaar presents some identifications of fragments that have either not been properly recorded or have simply been overlooked thus far. He gives good reason to consider the fragment 4Q439 (4Q Lament by a Leader) 1 i and 4Q469 (4QApocryphon ?) 3 as overlapping: many of the words are identical (for example פוהיים אב in line 7) and both fragments share an allusion to Zeph 3.3-4. Similarly 4Q462 (4QNarrative C) 1 lines 2-4 and 4Q467 (4QText Mentioning Light to Jacob) seem to match each other on the basis of many shared words (e.g. ליעקוב and לישראל) and both alluding to Jacob (more likely to Isa 60.1-4,5 than to Gen 32.32). Between 4Q419 (4QSap. Work B) 1 lines 10-12 and 4QMisc (PAM 43.679 Fragment 10) the overlap is minimal, but the combined text of both fragments makes good sense. Tigchelaar also comments on some fragments belonging to IQM xviii and discusses their position in the reconstructed text. He offers new proposals for the position of certain fragments and reconsiders a rather doubtful position of some of the fragments in another case (frag. 3). Tigchelaar's final considerations concern the possible combination of two fragments of 4Q269 (14 + 11 i,1-2) and two fragments of 4Q270 (5 + 10,13-15) which he proposes to put together each.

M.H.

E. Jan Wilson: *The Yods and Waws of 4QTestimonia and the use of digital imaging techniques*. DSD 6/3 (1999) 324-327.

E. J. Wilson provides a new method for dealing with the problem of distinguishing between *yods* and *waws* in Dead Sea writings, especially in 4QTestimonia (4Q175). He gives a detailed list of different variants on words from 4QTestimonia from Allegro and Strugnell (disagreeing with Allegro's reading of some of the words) concerning the difficulty of distinguishing *waw* and *yod*. In order to illustrate the problem he provides a detailed list of different readings of words from 4QTestimonia based on the publications of Allegro (1956, republished 1968) and Strugnell (1970). The following words are difficult to read: line 2 אלוכה/אליכה; line 3 ויהוה/ויהיה; line 10 העון/העין; line 12 אשירנה/אשורנה; line 15 אבו/אביו; line 15 נסית/נסיתו; line 15 ותרבה/ותרבהו; line 16 לידעתיהו/לאדעתיהו; line 21 בתהלותוהי/בתהלותיהו; line 22 בבכורי/בבכורו; line 23 ווסדנה/ויסדנה. Wilson's aim therefore was to identify characteristics which make it possible to distinguish *waw* and *yod*. He isolates clear instances of each of these letters in 4Q175 and worked out their measurements by considering angles and ratios of the length of the stem compared to the length of the short arm of each. Despite being able to describe basic features of each letter, he is forced to admit a variety of exceptions and some uncertainties.

M.H.

Géza Xeravits: *Précisions sur le texte original et le concept messianique de CD 7:13-8:1 et 19:5-14*. RQ 17/73 (1999) 47-59.

As well known, the text of the Damascus Document of the Cairo Genizah is preserved in two different versions (A and B) of the introduction. But the question, which of these ver-

sions is the older and the 'more original', is rather difficult to judge. Even the fragments of Cave 4 (4Q266 and 4Q269) are not helpful in solving this problem because they do not contain columns xix-xx and have suffered too much damage. Nevertheless, the Qumran materials confirm the ancient origin of the introduction of this document. In addition, a comparison between the versions A and B and the Qumran materials (e.g. iv,12b-19, vi,2-viii,3, 4Q173 or 4Q175) may provide evidence that version B is the older of the two Cairo manuscripts. This becomes clearer when one subjects the 'Amos-Numbers Midraš' in CD vii,9-viii,1a and xix,5b-14a to analysis: although some have maintained that the messianism in B seems to be derived from that of A, it seems that the relationship between the versions should be conceived the other way around. However, the missing messianic allusion in A is the result, not of an editorial reduction from B but rather is the result of scribal error.

M.H.