Volume 3 in the series The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations includes critical editions of the Damascus Document from Cave 4 (4Q266–273), Some Works of the Torah, 4QMMT (4Q394–399, 4Q313), Miscellaneous Rules (4Q265), Halakah A, B, C (4Q251, 4Q264a, 4Q472a), and Harvesting (4Q284a). As we have come to expect from this series, the present volume provides reliable Hebrew texts, excellent English translations, rich footnotes, and informative introductions with helpful bibliographies. The editors of the series are to be commended for organizing the documents in volumes according to themes and genres. Hence vol. 3 covers documents of generally halakic nature, which makes for a highly valuable collection of texts for anyone interested in legal matters, or, for that matter, in sectarian Qumran documents in general.

The emphasis in this review will be on the presentation of the two longest documents, 4QD and 4QMMT. Since the main editors of three of the documents, Joseph Baumgarten (4QD and 4Q265) and Elisha Qimron (4QMMT), were also responsible for the editio princeps of these documents, it is interesting to make some comparisons between the editions.

The 4QD fragments are edited by Baumgarten with James Charlesworth, Lidija Novakovic, and Henry Rietz. CD A and B and some 4QD fragments were published in vol 2. There must be logistical reasons behind the choice of publishing CD and 4QD in different volumes, because it would have been beneficial to present these two sets of manuscripts together. The introduction pertains to the texts, date, and structure and is less extensive than that for 4QMMT because CD has already been introduced in depth in vol. 2. It should be noted that the order of topics of the document presented in the introduction differs slightly from the one in vol. 2. The authors explain very well the sectarian nature of the document and the relationship between the two main parts of D, the Admonition and the Laws.

The Hebrew text follows the minimalist principle stated in the Foreword to only include “obvious restorations of lacunae” that are based on comparisons with similar texts in the Qumran corpus. In cases of multiple copies of the same text, such as 4QD, these are presented separately with critical apparatus in the footnotes. The result is that the main texts often contain much less text than the DJD volumes. Hence, textual restorations of the 4QD fragments that are based on parallel texts from CD and other copies of D from Cave 4 are relegated to the footnotes. While on some level it may be beneficial to be reminded about how
little text there really is, in this choice of format it gets cumbersome to check the footnotes for the full restoration and readers will still have to consult the reconstructions in DJD 18.

There are no big surprises in either transcription or translation compared to DJD 18. The differences in the translations mostly appear as different synonyms, e.g., “statutes” rather than “laws” and “atone” instead of “forgive.” Given the avoidance of restorations in the main text it is surprising to see an explanatory comment put within brackets in the translation for the fragmentary line 4Q266 6 ii 11, “the child to a nurse (who can nurse it) in purity,” especially since there are other possibilities as to what the meaning is here.

In spite of the stated principle concerning restoration it still happens that the suggested reconstructions determine the translation of the main text. In 4Q265 3 3, for example, the translation reads “young lad nor a woman eat [of] the paschal [sacrifice]” when no negative particle is extant. This reading depends on the speculative restoration [‘] provided in the footnote. Also surprising is the change in the quotation from Isa 54:1–2 to “sons” in 4Q265 1 4 from the gender inclusive “children” in DJD 35 given that the original context strongly suggests that “children” is the accurate connotation. As a side note, the translators of LXX, over 2000 years ago, in this case chose the more inclusive tekna over hyioi.

4QMMT is presented by Qimron with Charlesworth, Douglas Hume, John Miller, Stephen Pfann, and Rietz. In the introduction, the authors argue well for the identification of 4QMMT as a sectarian document in spite of the lack of typical sectarian terminology. By listing halakic differences between the author’s group and that of the addressees, 4QMMT provides important clues to the history of the Qumran movement. Given the wide range of scholarly opinions on this issue, any suggestion as to the provenience of 4QMMT is bound to be controversial. Rietz et al. reiterate the position in DJD 10 that the author may have been the Teacher of Righteousness and the addressee a king of Israel. Since the polemical tone is moderate, the editors propose an early date of composition in the history of the community. Comparing the statement “we have separated from the mass of the [people]” (C 7) to similar expressions of separation found in CD (8:16; 19:29) and S (the famous interpretation of Isa 40:3 in 1QS 8:12–14), which they understand as veiled references to Qumran, they conclude that 4QMMT should be dated to a time shortly after the move to Qumran. These traditional interpretations of the references in CD and S are problematic in light of Jodi Magness’s redating of the settlement at Qumran to ca. 100–50 B.C.E., i.e., to a later time than the common date for the composition of both D and S. It is time that scholars consider the consequences of Magness’s new dating (or provide evidence for why they disagree with her) rather than repeating old interpretations, seemingly unaware of the problem. Another contested issue is the genre of MMT. Here the authors nicely describe the literary characteristics of the document without making a final decision between the proposals “letter,” “epistle,”