This chapter will take up a number of laws found in column 52 of the Temple Scroll dealing with animals. These laws are part of the Deuteronomic Paraphrase at the end of the scroll and, as such, are closely based on the book of Deuteronomy.\(^1\) We have suggested that the Deuteronomic Paraphrase was composed by the author/redactor of the Temple Scroll in order to round out the treatment of the Torah’s legislation and to give the impression that the newly redacted scroll was a “complete Torah,” to borrow a phrase from the rabbis.\(^2\)

Among the topics to be discussed in this chapter are the prohibition on sacrificing blemished animals, the law of first born animals, the prohibition on muzzling an ox, and that forbidding plowing with diverse animals. These laws are grouped in the scroll together with the laws of slaughter which we have discussed elsewhere.\(^3\) This study will deal with the relationship of these laws to the text of Deuteronomy, emphasizing the exegetical process that led to their formulation. It will compare these prescriptions with those of rabbinic literature and will place these laws within the context of the Deuteronomic Paraphrase and the legislation of the Temple Scroll as a whole.

---


\(^2\) b. B. Bat. 116a, b. Menah. 65b.

Prohibition of Sacrificing Blemished Animals (11QT 52:3–5)

Immediately after discussing the law of idolatry (Deut 16:21–22, parallel to 11QT 51:19–52:3), the text of the Deuteronomistic Paraphrase continues directly by dealing with Deut 17:1:

And you shall not sacrifice to Me an ox or a sheep in which there is any serious blemish, for they are an abomination to Me. The addition of the conjunction waw at the beginning of this text is typical of the compositional style of the scroll. MT does not have it and it is not attested in the versions. Further, the verse begins בְּמַסְיָהּ אֵל in 4QDeut 30 + 32 ii 7. The addition of the conjunction waw is in consonance with the absence of a space denoting a new paragraph before this commandment. A closed paragraph space is found in MT. The replacement of the third person with the first for God is the usual pattern in the scroll. Harmonistic tendencies were certainly at work in the author’s change of MT אָשֶׁר הָיְתָה בְּמַסְיָהּ כָּל בֵּרוּ בּוּ to אָשֶׁר הָיְתָה בְּכָל מָוֶה בּוּ. The author was certainly influenced by רָע מָוֶה כָּל בּוּ in Deut 15:21. Yet here the efforts were clearly directed at removing the potential ambiguity of MT. As it stands, it is not clear from MT that מָוֶה and בּוּ are one and the same. Indeed, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan took them as two separate restrictions and translated, מָוֶה גּוֹר אֵל סְמוּי כָּל מָדָע, “blemish, lameness or blindness, or any evil thing (namely, that it was stolen or forcibly taken).” Our text here

---

5 This translation follows Y. Yadin, The Temple Scroll, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), II, 232–3 exactly. All translations found below are my own. This passage is also discussed in Schiffman, Deuteronomistic Paraphrase, 532–4.
6 S. White Crawford in DJD 14, 26. None of the biblical passages discussed in this article is paralleled in the Reworked Pentateuch published by E. Tov and S. White in DJD 13, 188–351. It is unfortunate that, by coincidence, the overlaps between what is preserved of that text and the Temple Scroll are minimal except in the case of the well known additions published by them as 4Q365a, texts which many believe to stem from a manuscript of the Temple Scroll or one of its sources.
9 Yadin II, 232 also compares Lev 22:20–21 which does not seem to us to have had any direct influence. Note that 4QDeut*, line 5, has בּוּ, as in MT.