

# “The place which He has chosen” The Identification of the Cult Place of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 in 4QMMT

Reinhard G. Kratz

Many of Devorah Dimant’s works are devoted to the interpretation of biblical texts in ancient Judaism, both inside and outside the Bible; her fine article about the techniques of and tendencies in the interpretation of biblical writings in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha comes readily to mind.<sup>1</sup> One passage that deserves special attention from this perspective seems to me to be the identification in 4QMMT of the central cult place in Deut. 12 and Lev. 17 with Jerusalem (B 27–35; see also B 58–62).<sup>2</sup> Not only does this passage contribute something – for its time – quite new to the topic of sacrifice,<sup>3</sup> it is above all – as far as I am aware – one of the few instances we know of that makes this explicit identification. In view of the fact that the location of the place of sacrifice, whether on Mount Zion or Mount Gerizim, was contested in antiquity (John 4:20–21), as it still is today, this seems to me to be remarkable. I want to investigate both matters more closely here, not least of all in order to demonstrate how fluid the transition from scriptural exegesis within the Bible to scriptural

- \* I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. John Bowden, London, for his thoroughly translation of this article.
- 1. D. Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha”, in M. J. Mulder & H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2,1, Assen & Philadelphia 1988, pp. 379–419.
- 2. References and quotations follow the edition by E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4, V: Miqṣat Ma’āse Ha-Torah*, DJD 10, Oxford 1994.
- 3. A slightly different view takes Qimron in DJD 10, pp. 156–157: “Our fragmentary text does not contribute anything new on the subject of slaughtering”.

exegesis outside it could be. To do this I shall concentrate on (1) the text in question, (2) the Temple Scroll, (3) the biblical basis and (4) the biblical and parabiblical parallels.

#### 4QMMT B 27–35: The Text

After the halakhot about various types of sacrifice – regulations which are apparently intended specifically for the priests as they deal with the sacrificial animal and the assessment of its corpse<sup>4</sup> – there follows in 4QMMT B 27–35 a halakha about the place of the sacrificial cult, before the text continues with regulations about the conditions for taking part in the sacrifice. This halakha is distinct from the other halakhot as its subject is a scriptural passage instead of a case, as is usual otherwise.<sup>5</sup> This also distinguishes the passage from the other use and exegesis of scripture in MMT.<sup>6</sup>

The text of B 27–35 is attested by two manuscripts: 4Q394 3–7 14–19, and 4Q397 3 2–6 (= B 27–34). On the basis of the overlap between 4Q394 8 iii and 4Q397 4–5 with 4Q396 1–2 i and the contact between the themes, the lines 4Q396 1–2 i 1 (= B 35) can also with some probability be included in this halakha, as the composite text in *DJD* 10 intends. The text itself is severely damaged and therefore not easy to understand. This

4. B 3–13, B 13–17 and B 17–27: all three excerpts close with the formula: **כי לבני אהרן/הכוהנים ראוי ל...**
5. See **ועל** or **על** **ואף על** in B [3, 5,] 8, [9,] 13, [18,] 21, 24, [36, 37, 49,] 52, 55, 62, 64, 72, 75, 76, 77; C 4.
6. On this, see M. J. Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations”, in J. Kampen & M. J. Bernstein (eds.), *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, JBL Symposium Series 2, Atlanta, Georgia 1996, pp. 29–51; G. J. Brooke, “The Explicit Presentation of Scripture in 4QMMT”, in M. Bernstein et al. (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995*, *STDJ* 23, Leiden 1997, pp. 67–88; R. G. Kratz, “Mose und die Propheten. Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C”, in F. García Martínez et al. (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, *STDJ* 61, Leiden & Boston 2006, pp. 151–176.

raises the question what actually the problem in the scriptural passage was that the halakha is discussing.

B 27–28 (4Q394 3–7 ii 14–15) provides the first clear evidence of the citation formula, which is used many times in MMT.<sup>7</sup> Introduced by ועל שא כתוב Lev. 17:3 is cited:

4Q394 3–7 ii 14–15

[ועל שא כתוב] איש כי ישחט במחנה או ישחט [מחוצ לסחנה שור וכשב ועז

Lev. 17:3

איש איש מבית ישראל אשר ישחט שור או כשב או עז במחנה או אשר ישחט מחוץ למחנה

As emerges from the textual comparison, so far as the text has been preserved it is not just a “paraphrase”<sup>8</sup> but rather a word-for-word citation, though it is not completely literal.<sup>9</sup> Only the positions of the object and adverbial definition of the place have been exchanged, and instead of the particle או the copula ו appears in the list of objects. The transposition might be caused by the fact that the formulation in Lev. 17:3 leaves open the possibility that the animal is slaughtered elsewhere and then brought to the “tent of meeting”.<sup>10</sup> With this transition it is clear that the passage is about the place where animals are slaughtered (שחט) that are fit for sacrifice and consumption. These may be slaughtered and offered as sacrifices neither “in the camp” nor “outside the camp”, but rather, as Lev. 17:4 states, exclusively at the “entrance of the tent of meeting” and “before the abode of YHWH”. The deviation in the list of sacrificial animals could be a textual variant (see below, 2).

Lev. 17:3–4 raises a series of exegetical questions whose difficulty preoccupied ancient readers long before it did present-day interpreters; this may well have moved the author of MMT to make them the subject

7. The formula is usually supplemented also in B 10 (4Q394 3–7 i 13), but see Booke, “Presentation”, p. 71.

8. Thus Qimron in *DJD* 10, p. 156; Bernstein, “Employment”, p. 39, following Qimron (*DJD* 10, pp. 140–141), though B 27–28 is not discussed there.

9. Brooke, “Presentation”, p. 72.

10. See M. Noth, *Das 3. Buch Mose. Leviticus*, ATD 6, Göttingen 1962, p. 111.

of his halakha. Thus it sets out to explain what is meant by the “camp” and by the “tent of meeting” – last mentioned in 1 Kings 8:4, and here transported from the City of David to Zion – and how both are related to the “abode of YHWH”. The answer is made more difficult by the fact that in Lev. 17 not only is a distinction made between the central cult place and other localities, but there is also a further differentiation between the areas in which no sacrifice may be offered. It is not clear from the text where the border runs between “inside” and “outside the camp” and the legitimate cult place, the “tent of meeting”. Moreover, the differentiation between sacral and profane slaughtering made in Deut. 12 seems to have been done away within Lev. 17:3–4,<sup>11</sup> raising the question how this regulation relates to its parallel in Deut. 12.

MMT gives a first indication of how to answer the question in B 28. Introduced by כִּי (4Q394 3–7 ii:15), the typical opening of a “judificatory clause”,<sup>12</sup> the legitimate place of sacrifice mentioned in Lev. 17:4, the “entrance of the tent of meeting”, is defined with the direction “in the north of the camp” (4Q397 3:2). Lev. 1:11 might have prompted this information. The place of sacrifice is thus connected with the altar and itself distinguished from the “camp”.

However, the halakha proper follows only in the further explanations which identify the localities mentioned in Lev. 17:3–4. The explanations are introduced with the formula customary in MMT, וְאֵנְחָנוּ חֹשְׁבִים שׁ, and thus characterized as interpretation of the Torah (see below). The “camp” (מַחֲנֶה) is expressly equated with Jerusalem; it follows from this that “inside” and “outside the camp” are also to be referred to the city. “The camp of their cities” (הוּא מַחֲנֶה עִרְיָהֶם) and the entire area “outside the camp”, where the ashes from the altar are burned, are in turn distinguished from this (B 29–32 = 4Q394 3–7 ii 16–19 + 4Q397 3 4–5; cf. Lev. 4:12; 6:4). It is likely that in the lacuna that follows the sanctuary (הַמִּקְדָּשׁ) mentioned in B 29 (4Q394 3–7 ii 16) was identified with the “abode of YHWH” and/or the “tent of meeting” of Lev. 17:4.

11. See Noth, *ibid.*; K. Elliger, *Leviticus*, HAT I,4, Tübingen 1966, pp. 226–227; E. S. Gerstenberger, *Das 3. Buch Mose. Leviticus*, ATD 6, Göttingen 1993, pp. 216–217.

12. *DJD* 10, pp. 135–136.

Accordingly, there can no longer be any doubt about which localities we should think of in Lev. 17:3 and where “slaughterings”, sacral or profane, are and are not allowed. No animals fit for sacrifice may be slaughtered in and around Jerusalem, but only at the Temple. MMT thus confirms the rigorous attitude of Lev. 17:3–4 and relates it expressly to the Jerusalem temple.

At the same time, the halakha makes a recognizable gradation within the areas in which slaughtering is forbidden. The text deals in detail with the area “outside the camp”, which is differentiated not only from the sanctuary but also from the area “inside the camp”, i.e. from Jerusalem itself. The city to some degree occupies an intermediate place between the sanctuary and the area “outside the camp”; since the Temple is in Jerusalem, this is quite understandable. MMT takes account of this in that the halakha identifies Jerusalem, “the camp” of Lev. 17:3, with the central cult place of Deut. 12; this can easily be inferred from the parallel in B 60–61: “[for Jerusalem] is the place which [He has chosen] from all tri[bes of Israel]”.<sup>13</sup>

The formulation “from all tribes of Israel” shows that only Deut. 12:5 is in question as a point of reference.<sup>14</sup> Here, as in all other passages in Deuteronomy, the chosen place is no more identified than are the “camp” and “the tent of meeting” in Lev. 17:3–4 and is therefore open to manifold interpretations. The author of MMT, whom the connection between the two passages did not escape, must have faced the same difficulties as the modern exegete. The different terminology and the divergent regulations regarding sacral and profane slaughtering not only stand in the way of deciding where the central cult place was precisely located, but also make it difficult to reduce both regulations to a common denominator.

MMT solves the problem by equating the “camp” of Lev. 17:3, and not the “tent of meeting” where the sacrifice must be offered, with the chosen place of Deut. 12 and identifying both with Jerusalem. In terms of

13. 4Q394 3–7 ii:19 **הי**א המקום אשר; 4Q397 3:5 [טי ישראל] **מכ**ל שב[טי ישראל]. The supplementary text reads the perfect, as in B 60–61, although unlike the short form **ש**, the long form of the conjunction **אשר** would also allow the future as in Deut. 12:5, 11, 14 etc.
14. See also Deut. 12:14, further 1 Kings 8:16//2 Chr. 6:5–6; 1 Kings 11:32; 14:21//2 Chr. 12:13; 1 Kings 21:7//2 Chr. 33:7.

modern scholarship, the exegesis balances the different terminology of Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writing. It decides to understand the whole city as the “place” in Deut. 12, taking into account that according to Lev. 17:3–4 the sacrificial definitions from Deut. 12 do not relate to the chosen place in its entirety, but only to the sanctuary, the holy place in the chosen place. However, this also evaluates the area “inside the camp” of which Lev. 17:3 speaks in an opposite way. Indeed, slaughtering, sacral or profane, may not be done outside the sanctuary, but what applies to the area “inside the camp” is by no means what applies to the area “outside the camp” and in the “camp of their cities”. In the view of MMT, each passage of the Torah interprets the other, so that both remain right and all obscurities are removed.

The solution of B 29–35 agrees with the topography of the halaka in B 58–62.<sup>15</sup> Here too there is a threefold gradation between the sanctuary (B 59), Jerusalem as the “camp of holiness” and “place which He has chosen from all tribes of Israel” (B 60–61), and the “camps of Israel”, with Jerusalem designated its “head”. But unlike B 29–35, the topography here is not the theme of the halakha; rather, it serves as the reason for the precept that no dogs are allowed into the “holy camp” of Jerusalem (see Matt. 7:6). The topography, specially developed in B 29–35 by means of scriptural exegesis, is regarded as self-evident. But how self-evident was it?

#### 4QMMT and the Temple Scroll

With the formula **ואנחנו חושבים** “but we think” or **ואנחנו אומרים** “but we say”, the author of MMT usually introduces his own standpoint, attempting to convince those for whom the work is written – whom he addresses in the second person plural or even in the second person singular – that his interpretation of the Torah is the right one and to dissuade them from the deviant views of his opponents – of whom he speaks in the third person plural.<sup>16</sup> So we are to begin by assuming that

15. 4Q394 8 iv:8–12//4Q396 1–2 ii:9 – iii:2// 4Q397 6–13:2–4. On this see *DJD* 10, pp. 143–144, 162–164.

16. See *DJD* 10, pp. 110–111, 113ff.

the exegesis of Lev. 17:3–4 and Deut. 12:5 was also contested and that the halakha in 4QMMT B 39–35 is intended to clarify, if not serve as polemic. Other identifications of the central cult place, opposed by MMT, must have been under discussion besides the view put forward in MMT.

The textual tradition perhaps makes a first reference to this discussion. Not only the transposition of object and indication of place in the quotation of Lev. 17:3 but also the replacement of the conjunction “or” (או) by the copula “and” (ו) could be an indication of this. The latter phenomenon can also be observed in other passages in which the Septuagint (LXX) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) deviate from the Masoretic Text (MT) and attest a textual form that the Temple Scroll (11QT) also seems to presuppose.<sup>17</sup> So it is not surprising that particularly in Lev. 17:3–4 there are surplus texts in LXX and SP, which on the one hand (in assimilation to Lev. 17:8, 10, 13 MT) extend the “house of Israel” to the proselytes and denizens, and on the other (along the line of Lev. 17:5–9 and in agreement with 11QT 52:15) defines the gift (קרבתן) for YHWH mentioned in v. 4 as burnt or shelamim offering. We need not consider here such text-critical questions as which reading is original or whether we have real variants at all and not rather sporadic changes and additions. The only important thing is that the passage Lev. 17:3–4 and its relationship to Deut. 12 obviously gave rise to discussions which have left their traces here and there in the textual tradition.

However, what these discussions were about is not easy to say. The Dead Sea Scrolls – apart from MMT – do not often deal with the “camp” in connection with the “tent of meeting” or the “place which He has chosen”.<sup>18</sup> Qimron<sup>19</sup> cites the Temple Scroll as a parallel to MMT and

17. In 11QT 52:4–6 we read שור או שיה ועז and שור וכשב ועז as well as ושור ושה. Here use is made of Deut. 17:1 (שור ושה) and Lev. 22:27–28 (v. 27 שור או כשב או עז; v. 28 שור או כשב או עז; v. 28 שור או כשב או עז, *sam* and LXX ושור ושה as in 11QT and Lev. 22:23 MT); see also the unique combination in 11QT 52:13 (שור ושה ועז), which picks up Lev. 17:3 and perhaps was formulated under the influence of Deut. 14:4.

18. See, on the one hand especially 4Q367 2a–b:1 (Lev. 15:14–15) and 4Q365 8a–b:3; 12a i:6; 26a–b:4; 31a–c:5, 16; 4Q367 1a–b:9; 2a–b:1; further 4Q276 1:5; 4Q491 1–3:9; 4Q522 9 ii:2, 12, 13; on the other, 4Q364 32:3 (Deut. 14:25); 11QT52:9, 16; 56:5; 60:13–14; further 4Q375 1 i:8 and 4Q504 1–2 iv:3–4 (of the city of Jerusalem).

19. *DJD* 10, pp. 143–146.156–157.

refers to the laxer definitions of the rabbis. This reference can presumably be made more precise. For apart from the Reworked Pentateuch (4Q364–367), the Temple Scroll (11QT) is not only the most important parallel but is itself concerned with the interpretation of Lev. 17:3 and Deut. 12. But its solution to the exegetical problem by no means agrees with MMT in everything, so that it is possible to deduce from the differences the front against which the author of MMT is writing.

The Temple Scroll<sup>20</sup> also recognizes the differentiation of Jerusalem into gradated holy precincts and the distinction between areas inside and outside the Temple city (11QT 46). However, the sacrificial regulations in 11QT 52–53 provide for a somewhat different division of areas: clean and flawless sacrificial animals may not be slaughtered profanely within the radius of a three days' journey; they must exclusively be slaughtered at the sanctuary (זִבְחֵי) and offered and consumed as burnt or shelamim sacrifices (11QT 52:13–16; see also 52:9, 53:9–10). Sacrificial animals with a blemish are to be slaughtered (זִבְחֵי) and consumed together with the unclean animals, far from the sanctuary, outside a zone of 30 “ris” (סָבִיב שְׁלוּשִׁים) (רֶס), according to the regulations of Deut. 12 (11QT 52:16–19; cf. 52:9–12; 53:3–8). The profane slaughter of clean sacrificial animals and the consumption of their meat are forbidden inside the city and the restricted area of 30 ris; these must be slaughtered at the sanctuary and offered as sacrifices (11QT 52:19–21).

It is evident that the author of the Temple Scroll also had to struggle with the exegetical problem that arises from the parallels of Lev. 17 and Deut. 12.<sup>21</sup> Unlike MMT, however, he does not start from Lev. 17:3–4 but from Deut. 12 and the distinction between sacral and profane slaughtering made there, and allows the concept of Lev. 17:3–4 to slip in. This solution results in a certain terminological imprecision regarding the topography of Deut. 12. It is clear that the “place which I will choose” and at which the sacrifices are offered (Deut. 12:5, 11, 14, etc) can only be the sanctuary (11QT 52:9, 16; 53:9–10). It is also clear that “gates” which lie around the central cult place and in which profane slaughter is allowed

20. See Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, Jerusalem 1983, vol. 1, pp. 312–320; vol. 2, pp. 231ff.

21. See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 316.

(Deut. 12:15) can only mean the areas outside the restricted area around the sanctuary (11QT 52:10–11, 14, 17; 53:4). However, an area that has something of both characteristics lies in between: this area consists of the Temple city (“the city of my sanctuary” or “my city”),<sup>22</sup> of which it is said – as of the chosen place in 11QT 52:16 – that YHWH will give his name to it (11QT 52:19–20),<sup>23</sup> and the “gates” (11QT 52:14), both lying outside the chosen place, but within the area of a three days’ journey for clean animals and the restricted area of 30 ris for those with a blemish.<sup>24</sup> In 11QT it is this terminological inconsistency which devalues rather than enhances the Temple city; however, it is taken into account in order to balance Deut. 12. with Lev. 17:3–4 and to allow for a gradation of the holy precincts.

One striking feature which 11QT has in common with 4QMMT is that both solutions are interested in the gradation of areas according to the degree of their holiness. In 11QT the areas inside and outside the restricted area around the sanctuary correspond to the areas “inside” and “outside the camp” in Lev. 17:3–4 and MMT. In both cases, a sacrifice may be offered only at the sanctuary and nowhere else. And in both cases, different regulations apply “inside” and “outside” the area immediately adjacent to the sanctuary: “inside”, no sacrifice may be slaughtered, nor may profane slaughtering be carried out; “outside”, the disposal of sacrificial remains and the profane slaughtering of clean and unclean animals are possible.

But there are also differences. They relate not only to the terminology, which in 4QMMT follows the basic material in Lev. 17:3–4 (שחט, מחנה) and in 11QT the basic material in Deut. 12 (זבה), and in the formula about election changes tense or number. Rather, the decisive difference

22. See עיר מקדשי in 47:9, 13, עירי in 47:15; 52:19.

23. See שמו שם (את) referring to “the place which YHWH will chose” in Deut. 12:5, 21; 14:24; similarly לשכן שמו שם in Deut. 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2 and 12:5, taken up in 11QT 52:6; 60:13–14 for the sanctuary, 45:11–14; 47:3–4, 10–11 for the city.

24. The boundary is also blurred in that – as in the case of Jerusalem (45:13–14; 47:3–6, 10–11, 18) – the cities in the surrounding area are also to be clean (47:3; 48:15; 51:7–8), though of course the difference remains (47:7–10, 14–15); Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 279f.

lies in the point of reference: in 11QT 52 it is the sanctuary alone, in 4QMMT the sanctuary and the holy city. Thus in 11QT the chosen place is the sanctuary, but in 4QMMT the chosen place is the Temple city that is equated with the “camp” from Lev. 17 and therefore also provides the connecting point between “inside” and “outside”, while in 11QT together with other localities (“gates”) the holy city lies inside the restricted area, which has wider dimensions; as a result, for all the holiness which is attributed to the Temple city as distinct from other localities in 11QT, it somewhat loses its meaning as a yardstick for holiness.

After all, it cannot be said that 4QMMT and 11QT present the same solution to the exegetical and practical problem in the exegesis of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17. Moreover, the cardinal difference regarding the identification of the “place which YHWH will choose” prescribed in Deut. 12 seems to me to reveal the background to the halakha of 4QMMT B 29–35 that is in question. It is not that MMT engages in direct polemic against the view of the Temple Scroll. The common features are too great for that. But at one point the solution of 11QT touches so closely on the much more pragmatic use of the legal regulations attested in (later) rabbinic sources that attempts to reconstruct the view which MMT opposes can be made from here.

Thus the identification of the chosen place with the sanctuary in 11QT opens up the possibility of practicing things in the Temple city, which according to the view of MMT and its exegesis of Lev. 17 and Deut. 12 would simply be ruled out. The mere formulation of the prohibition against eating the meat of clean animals appropriate for sacrifice in the holy city (11QT 52:19–21) already allows the interpretation that this prohibition applies only to the act of slaughtering and not to the (subsequent) consumption of the meat which has previously been sacrificed in a due way. The relative clause: *אשר לוא יבוא לתוך מקדשי* can be interpreted both as a general exclusion of slaughtering and consumption<sup>25</sup> and also as a condition for the consumption of the

25. Thus A. Steudel, *Die Texte aus Qumran II. Hebräisch/Aramäisch und Deutsch*, Darmstadt 2001, p. 113, who translates as a final clause, “so that it does not come into my sanctuary”.

sacrificial meat in the holy city.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, once the chosen place and the "camp" are identified with the Temple, all the regulations that apply to the area outside the chosen cult place can also be applied to the city of Jerusalem in a very wide-ranging interpretation: if Jerusalem is not identical with the chosen place or the "camp", it may fall under the "gates" or the area "outside the camp".

This, of course, is not the view of the Temple Scroll, according to which the city of Jerusalem lies in the intermediate area between the chosen "place" and the "gates" and to which different laws therefore apply from those for the surrounding localities. But the identification of the chosen cult place with the sanctuary made in the Temple Scroll could reflect a widespread view that entailed the consequences indicated above. Precisely this corresponds to the view of the rabbis, who understand by the "camp" and the chosen "place" the Temple and not the holy city as a whole, and thus put forward a pragmatic exegesis of Deut. 12 and Lev. 17, which must have been the dominant view in the time of the Second Temple.<sup>27</sup> This interpretation handed down by the rabbis and the practice based on it corresponds with the view of 11QT as far as the identification of the chosen place is concerned, but not with that of 4QMMT: here the identification of the Temple city as the "camp" and "place which He has chosen" is much more precise and clear, but also stricter; it recurs – as so often – among the later Karaites.<sup>28</sup>

### Biblical Basis and Textual Tradition

4QMMT is finally also concerned to bring clarity to the question which exactly the city is indicated by the "camp" of Lev. 17 and the chosen "place" of Deut. 12. This question is also answered clearly:

B29–30 (4Q394 3–7 ii 17)

[י]רושלי[ם] מחנה היא

26. Thus evidently Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 318f.
27. See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 319; *DJD* 10, p. 144; further G. Langer, *Von Gott erwählt – Jerusalem. Die Rezeption von Deut. 12 im frühen Judentum*, ÖBS 8, Klosterneuburg 1989, pp. 122–302, especially pp. 196–197, 207, 211–212.
28. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 279 n. 6; pp. 319–320.

B32–33 (4Q394 3–7 ii:19; 4Q397 3:5)

כי ירושלים היא המקום אשר [בחר בו] מכול שב[טי ישראל]

B 60–62 (4Q394 8 iv:10–12)

ירושלים היא מחנה הקדש  
והיא המקום שבחר בו מכל שבטי [ישראל]  
[כי] ירושלים היא ראש מ[חנות ישראל]

There would hardly have been dissent with the addressee(s) of MMT on this question. The identification of the Temple city with Jerusalem is not the subject of the halakhic teaching. The name appears more in passing in the course of the identification of the Temple city with the “camp” and the “place which He has chosen”. Nevertheless, the mention by name in this particular context is of great significance which, as far as I can see, has hardly been recognized hitherto. In view of the many exegetical problems that the centralization formula in Deuteronomy still poses, and in view of the Samaritan alternative, the explicit location of the cult place prescribed in Deut. 12 is quite striking. The halakha does not aim directly to refute differing opinions or the Samaritan claims, and one would not in fact expect that here,<sup>29</sup> but MMT gives a piece of information that we are not otherwise given by the tradition with this clarity and which therefore also indirectly represents a milestone in the history of the exegesis of Deut. 12 inside and outside the Bible.<sup>30</sup>

This history of exegesis begins in Deuteronomy itself. As is generally recognized, the commandment for the centralization of the cult in Deut. 12 is indebted to a re-writing of the law of the altar in Ex. 20:24–26.<sup>31</sup> The law of the altar already represents a redactional addition to the Book of the Covenant in Ex. 20–23 and has in turn been subjected to various

29. Thus, rightly, Qimron in *DJD* 10, p. 144.

30. Langer, *Von Gott erwählt*, passim.

31. See J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1899<sup>3</sup>; repr. 1963<sup>4</sup>, p. 203; idem, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, Berlin 1905<sup>6</sup>, p. 32; R. G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, translated by J. Bowden, London & New York 2005, pp. 117–118, 210–211; B. M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*, Oxford 1997, pp. 23–52.

revisions.<sup>32</sup> The addition in Ex. 20:24b, which forms the basis for the formulation of the commandment for centralization in Deut. 12, goes back to one of these revisions. It restricts the freedom to sacrifice everywhere to the cult places where the name of YHWH is called on, but does not make any changes to the multiplicity of legitimate cult places (כל (המקום)<sup>33</sup> customary in Israel and Judah in the pre-exilic period.<sup>34</sup> By contrast, Deut. 12 introduces the distinction between just any cult place (כל מקום) and the one place chosen by YHWH (יהוה אשר יבחר יהוה), and thus opens a new chapter in the cult history of Israel. This seems to have been the point of departure for the reformulation of the Book of the Covenant in Deuteronomy.<sup>35</sup> However, this necessarily raised the question how the commandment to centralize the cult in Deut. 12 relates to the law of the altar in Ex. 20 and above all to the many sanctuaries mentioned in the patriarchal narratives and the historical books from Joshua to Kings.

But things in Deut. 12 itself are by no means as clear as they seem. The mere fact that this chapter needs three attempts to provide grounds for the commandment about centralization arouses the suspicion that the formulation was not unproblematical in the first place, and that further exegesis was felt to be necessary. By comparison with the simple commandment in Deut. 12:13–23, which has been given many glosses, in 12:2–7 and 12:8–12 we have two later variants, which not only fill out the original formulations of the regulation from vv.13–14 but also attach new conditions.<sup>36</sup> But none of the three variants indicates the

32. Kratz, *Composition*, pp. 140–144 and the literature mentioned here (n. 47).

33. The ambiguous determination ("in the whole place" or "at just any place"), which is missing in the versions (LXX, Peshitta, Targum), could have been a basis for the reinterpretation in Deuteronomy or is a dogmatic correction; see J. Schaper, "Schriftauslegung und Schriftwerdung im alten Israel. Eine vergleichende Exegese von Ex 20,24–26 und Dtn 12,13–19", *ZAR* 5 (1999), pp. 111–132.

34. See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 29, though he correctly writes that this restriction "has no further significance". L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20:22–22:33)*, *BZAW* 188, Berlin & New York 1990, pp. 279–280, takes a rather different view.

35. Kratz, *Composition*, pp. 114–132, especially pp. 117–126.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 119; for a detailed analysis of Deut. 12 see E. Reuter, *Kultzentralisation. Entstehung und Theologie von Dtn 12*, BBB 87, Frankfurt a.M. 1993.

identity of the cult place. The fact remains that the choice is still to be made, as seems to be hinted at by the preformative tense (or future) **יבחר** in the centralization formula in respect of the historical fiction of Deuteronomy.<sup>37</sup>

The formula itself<sup>38</sup> does not help any further with the identification either. The commentaries on Deuteronomy usually take it for granted that the chosen place means Jerusalem,<sup>39</sup> but that is anything but self-evident. The formulation, especially the definition of the place “in one of your tribes” in 12:14, allows the formula to be understood not exclusively but distributively, and to refer to various shrines.<sup>40</sup> At any rate, the expression **המקום** recalls the many resting places and legitimate cult places of the patriarchs (Gen 12:6; 13:3–4; 22:3–4; 28:11, 16–17, 19; 32:3, 31; 35:7, 13–15). Moreover, from the formula itself and its context does not emerge whether it designates the central sanctuary or the city where the sanctuary is. The answer to this question depends not least on whether we have to understand the infinitive of the long form as final (“in order to”) or as consecutive-modal (“so that”/“in that”).<sup>41</sup> Depending on the choice one can (also) refer the formula to the city or merely to the sanctuary. It

37. Kratz, *Composition*, pp. 123–124.

38. As is well known, it is attested in many variants, as a short form in Deut. 12:14, 18, 26; 15:20; 16:7, 15–16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 31:11; as a long form (with the extension **לשום/לשכן** [את] **שמו** **שם**) in Deut. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23–24; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2. For the analysis of the formula and its individual elements, see Reuter, *Kultzentralisation*, pp. 115ff.

39. See, for instance, S. R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC, Edinburgh, 1902<sup>3</sup>, p. 140; P. M. Miller, *Deuteronomy (Interpretation)*, Louisville 1990, pp. 130–131; T. Veijola, *Das 5. Buch Mose. Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1–16,17*, ATD 8,1, Göttingen 2004, p. 267.

40. See A. Rofé, “The Strata of the Law about the Centralization of Worship in Deuteronomy and the History of the Deuteronomistic Movement”, in idem, *Deuteronomy. Issues and Interpretation, Old Testament Studies*, London & New York 2002, pp. 97–101; B. Halpern, “The Centralization Formula in Deuteronomy”, *VT* 31 (1981), pp. 20–38; for the rabbinic discussion, which – with a basis in Jer. 7:12 – differentiates between Shiloh and Jerusalem in Deut. 12 itself, see Langer, *Von Gott erwählt*, pp. 169–171. Against this, see Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 23–24 n. 1; on the problem of Deut. 12:4, see Reuter, *Kultzentralisation*, pp. 65–67, 132.

41. See Reuter, *Kultzentralisation*, pp. 119–120.

could well be that the secondary expansion of the short form by the infinitive and the definition of the locality “in one of your tribes” (Deut. 12:14) or “from all your tribes” (Deut. 12:5) was originally meant to make identification easier, but both merely raised yet more questions, as the further history of exegesis shows.

The authors and tradents of Deuteronomy will certainly have had a precise idea of the identity of the chosen place. But the greater the distance from the original situation, the greater will have been the need to anchor this understanding in the text itself. As we saw, the traces of this reach right back to the literary formation of Deuteronomy and continue in the textual tradition.<sup>42</sup>

A main characteristic of the textual tradition, which is evident in various witnesses (Qumran, SP and LXX), is harmonization.<sup>43</sup> The tendency can already be observed in the few places where the centralization formula has been preserved in the Deuteronomy manuscripts from the Dead Sea:<sup>44</sup> in 1QDeut<sup>a</sup> fr. 14 a retrospective **בו** has been added in Deut. 16:6, which assimilates vv. 6 and 7 to other passages (12:11, 18; 17:8); the same thing occurs in LXX and SP with Deut 16:16 (but not with 17:8). 4QDeut<sup>h</sup> reads with LXX the plural **תקראו** in Deut 31:11b, continuing the phrase **יבחר (המקום אשר)**, and diverges from MT (**תקרא**) and SP (**לויקרא**) in assimilating the verse to v. 10.

The harmonization also has an effect on the infinitive of the long form, in which, apart from Deut. 12:5, SP always reads **לשכן** and not **לשום** (or **לשים**), and LXX renders both with no distinction by **ἐπιταλασθῆναι**, again with the exception of 12:5, where in the first place **ἐπονομάσαι** occurs (for

42. See N. Lohfink, “Zur deuteronomistischen Zentralisationsformel”, in idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur 2*, SBAB 12, Stuttgart 1991, pp. 147–177, here 153–161; Langer, *Von Gott erwählt*, pp. 95–121.

43. See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis, MN 1992 (GT: *Der Text der Hebräischen Bibel. Handbuch der Textkritik*, Stuttgart 1997, p. 96).

44. According to the list in E. Tov, *Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, *DJD* 39; Oxford 2002, pp. 189–190, the following manuscripts were checked: 1QDeut<sup>a</sup> (*DJD* 1) for Deut. 14:24–25; 16:6–7; 4QpaleoDeut<sup>f</sup> (*DJD* 9) for Deut. 12,1–5, 11–12; 14,26–29; 4QDeut<sup>c</sup> (*DJD* 14) for Deut. 12:18–19, 26; 16:2–3, 6–11; 4QDeut<sup>f</sup> for 18:6–10; 4QDeut<sup>g</sup> for Deut. 26:1–5; 4QDeut<sup>h</sup> for Deut. 31:9–11; 4QDeut<sup>k2</sup> for Deut. 26:1–5; MurDeut (*DJD* 2) for Deut. 12:25–26.

(לשום), as in Ex. 20:24 (for זכר), and in the second ἐπικληθῆναι (for לשכנו), as in Ex. 29.45–46. However, in both cases a substantial concern goes hand in hand with the harmonization. With the “dwelling” (of the name or of God) SP introduces a concept which also occurs in the Masoretic tradition of Deut. 12:5 and throughout the Targums.<sup>45</sup> The latter render the infinitive of the long form without distinction with the aphel of שרא, “make to dwell”, and supplement the formula with the object of the “(glory of the) Shekhina”: למישרייה אית איקר) שכינתיהו תמן; whether deliberately or not they thus assimilate the text to the concept of Lev. 17:4. In contrast to this, LXX uses the infinitive-expansions in the sense of calling on the name of God and thus replaces the idea of the dwelling (of the name or of God) in the sanctuary. Apart from Ex. 20:24, the model is evidently also the cult places of the patriarchs (Gen. 4:6; 12:18).

A kind of reconciliation of the various interpretations of the long form occurs with Jerome in the Vulgate; he preserves the wording of the MT, translates it literally in 12:5, assimilates it to 1 Kings 8:16 and 2 Kings 23:7 in 12:11, 21, follows MT in 16:2, 6, 11, 16, and follows the rendering by LXX in 14:23; 26:2. Both the idea of the dwelling of God and the calling on the name in worship suggest the Temple rather than the city.

As is well known, SP clearly locates the chosen place; here it could possibly base itself on a proto-Samaritan variant in Deut. 27:4.<sup>46</sup> Scholars like to connect with this tendency the peculiarity that in the centralization formula SP almost always changes the future tense of בחר into the perfect. In view of the surprising parallel in 4QMMT (B 60–61), this appears in a new light. Whereas the Temple Scroll keeps the future tense and only changes it into the first person – in accordance with its stylization as words of God – 4QMMT, like SP, evidently begins definitively from the fact that the choice of the place has already been made. This cannot be

45. They also diverge in Deut. 12:5, like MT, SP and LXX, from the terminology otherwise normal, but at quite a different point, namely in the rendering of the word המקום, which here is rendered with ארעא “the land” instead of אתרא “the place”; see Langer, *Von Gott erwählt*, p. 107.

46. See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, p. 94 (GT: pp. 77–78); I. Hjelm, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism. A Literary Analysis*, JSOT.S 303 (Copenhagen International Seminar 7), Sheffield 2000, pp. 91–92.

explained in 4QMMT, as it can in SP, with the historical fiction of the Pentateuch narrative that according to Gen. 12:6; 33:18–20 Shechem had already been chosen in the time of Moses. Rather, the perfect in MMT takes account of its own time, and this can probably also be assumed for SP.

It is no coincidence that the text-critical phenomena described here accumulate with the centralization formula. Not all of them contribute to the solution of the question of the location of the chosen place. But they do show “that the Deuteronomic centralization formula was evident highly explosive theologically and gave rise to far-reaching interpretative and perhaps also textual interventions – more than the normal state of the text of the book”.<sup>47</sup>

We will have to say the same of the exegesis within the Bible which Deut. 12 experienced in Lev. 17:3.<sup>48</sup> Here, the “place which YHWH will choose, to make his name dwell there” is translated into the language of the Priestly Writing and equated with the “tent of meeting” and the “abode of YHWH”. Instead of the opposition of “place” and “gates”, we have the contrast between “tent of meeting” and “camp”. Moreover, the regulation of Deut. 12 is sharpened, in that Lev. 17 ignores the difference between sacral and profane slaughtering; it views each slaughtering as sacrifice and consequently moves it to the shrine. Lev. 17 therefore establishes itself and relates the centralization formula to the shrine. However, it does not follow from the passage itself that here we have the Temple in Jerusalem; at most it becomes clear from the (secondary) literary reference to 1 Kings 8:4 and an exegesis that combines the passages in a similar way, for example, to the Apocryphon of Joshua (5Q522 9 ii), edited by the scholar to whom this Festschrift is dedicated.<sup>49</sup>

47. Lohfink, “Zentralisationsformel”, p. 153: “daß die deuteronomistische Zentralisationsformel offenbar theologisch hochbrisant war und zu tiefgreifenden interpretatorischen und vielleicht auch textlichen Eingriffen Anlaß gegeben hat – mehr als der normale Textbestand des Buches”. The conclusions against literary criticism derived from the text-critical evidence (ibid., p. 161) are not illuminating, given this evidence.

48. See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 51f; A. Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium. Eine vergleichende Studie*, AnBib 66, Rome 1976, pp. 149–178.

49. D. Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua”, in E. G. Chazon et al. (eds.), *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and*

### Biblical and Parabiblical Parallels

Because the identification of the chosen place of Deut. 12 does not result from the context or the internal rewriting of Deuteronomy, nor from the textual tradition, nor from the reception of Lev. 17, we are dependent on the context of the Bible as a whole. It often serves as an argument for the exclusive exegesis of the formula and its interpretation in terms of Jerusalem: throughout the Old Testament the divine election, insofar as it does not relate to the king (David), the people or the priests but to the topography of the cult place, is connected exclusively with Jerusalem.<sup>50</sup> But, seen more clearly, the argument does not get very far. With few exceptions, the relevant instances do not have the “place” but “the city”, “Jerusalem” or “Zion” as the object;<sup>51</sup> moreover they are all, including Psalms 78 and 132,<sup>52</sup> later than Deuteronomy.

Individual elements of the formula, like the idea of the divine election or the significance of the name of God for the cult (Ex. 20:24), may be older, but the conceptual setting of the idea of election and the combination of the individual elements are the achievement of Deuteronomy. As far as I can see, the centralization formula originated in the course of the exegesis of Ex. 20:24–26 in Deut. 12:13–14 and has no pre-history, but rather a subsequent history in the Old Testament.<sup>53</sup> For this reasons the other examples are hardly suitable for explaining the evidence in Deuteronomy itself, but are to be seen more as a reaction to

*Related Texts at Qumran*, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Group on Qumran 15–17 January, 2002; STDJ 58, Leiden & Boston 2005, pp. 105–134.

50. See Lohfink, “Zentralisationsformel”, pp. 171–172; Reuter, *Kultzentralisation*, pp. 116ff, 121ff; Levinson, *Deuteronomy*, p. 23–24 n. 1.
51. Joshua 9:27; 1 Kings 8:16, 44, 48; 11:13, 32, 36; 14:21; 2 Kings 21:7; 23:27; Zech. 1:17; 2:16; 3:2; Ps. 78:68; 132:13–14; Neh. 1:9; 2 Chr. 6:5–6, 34, 38; 7:12, 16; 12:13; 33:7; 35:19LXX; Tob. 1:4; 1 Macc. 7:37; 2 Macc. 5:19; 3 Macc. 3:9.
52. See H. Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart. Eine Theologie der Psalmen*, FRLANT 148, Göttingen 1989, pp. 140, 148.
53. See H. Weippert, “‘Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen’. Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Formel”, *BZ* 24 (1980), pp. 76–94.

Deut. 12 and consequently as a later interpretation of the centralization formula.

In this perspective it is not a little surprising that in the biblical tradition the combination of the notion of election with the city of Jerusalem predominates. Despite the clear cultic connotation of the prescription in Deut. 12 and despite the even clearer concentration of the command about centralization on the sanctuary in Lev. 17, in the tradition the – implicit – identification with the whole city becomes established. This tradition of interpretation appears to have begun in the (late) Deuteronomistic revision of the books of Kings.

In 1 Kings 8, given the occasion, the primary mention is indeed of the Temple, but the individual elements of the centralization formula are consistently distributed between city and sanctuary: the election is explicitly associated with the city (and with David), the name of God, taken from the long formula, is associated with the Temple (vv. 44 and 48) or with both (v. 16).<sup>54</sup> Certainly 1 Kings 8:29 indicates that the “place” of the centralization formula (המקום אשר) can also be understood as the sanctuary, but this (still) remains without consequences. The terminology of 1 Kings 8 is continued in 2 Kings 21:7 and 23:27. In both texts “the house” and “Jerusalem” stand in parallel and make a statement about the “house” (2 Kings 21:7), previously mentioned, or “the city” (2 Kings 23:27), but here too the relative clause about the election in one case is attached directly to Jerusalem, and in another to “the city”.

The background to this interpretation of Deut. 12 becomes apparent in 1 Kings 11 (vv. 13, 32, 36) and in 1 Kings 14:21. As in 1 Kings 8:16, in chap. 11 the promise to David and the election of Jerusalem are intertwined. For the sake of David, who wanted to build a temple but was not allowed to, Jerusalem and not the sanctuary is regarded as the chosen place. The phrase “from all your tribes” (Deut. 12:5; see 1 Kings 8:16; 14:21) or “in one of your tribes” (Deut. 12:14; see 1 Kings 11:13, 32, 36), which occurs only occasionally as an element of the centralization formula, is given a new meaning in the light of the promise to David. In Deut. 12 this element merely designates the context of the election, but in 1 Kings 11 it relates to the “one tribe” which remains to the house of

54. Thus with or without the reading of the LXX and the parallel in 2Chr. 6:5–6.

David for the sake of David and Jerusalem. Following 2 Sam. 5, it goes without saying that the election referring to David and the city of David is formulated in the perfect in all these passages in the Book of Kings.

The election of Jerusalem in 1–2 Kings is always expressed without direct reference to the “place” of Deut. 12. An identification results only if we read the books in their literary context and connect the relevant passages with one another. In this case they interpret one another: in 1–2 Kings, the election of Jerusalem seems to be the fulfillment of the precept of Deut. 12, and in Deuteronomy the “place which YHWH will choose” seems to be a foreshadowing of the election of Jerusalem in 1–2 Kings.

Once the notion of election had been connected with Jerusalem, it attached itself to the city even without the literary connection with Deut. 12 and was immediately modified. This can be observed especially well in the book of the prophet Zechariah. Here it is self-evident that Jerusalem is chosen (Zech. 3:2), but it will be chosen again in the coming time of salvation: *ובחר עיר בירושלים* (Zech. 1:17; 2:16). All the passages occur in secondary texts: in the exegetical supplements to Zech. 1–2, which make the connection with the visions of the building of the Temple and the Book of Haggai, and in the vision of the high priest which has subsequently been inserted (Zech. 3).<sup>55</sup> It is striking that, as with the parallel Zion/Jerusalem in Zech. 2:16, the sanctuary (again) comes into the foreground as the decisive characteristic of the chosen city.

Psalms 78 and 132 go even further: the derivation of the Deuteronomistic tradition is here easy to identify. Psalm 78:67–68 links up with the separation of the “one tribe” in 1 Kings 11 and declares that Judah, too, is “chosen”; as in 1 Kings 11, this and the building of the sanctuary are linked with the election of David. Psalm 132 is also inspired by the promise to David, which in v. 7 recalls 1 Kings 11:36 and in vv. 10–12, as in 1 Kings 11:11 and in many other parallel passages (late-Deuteronomistic and Chronistic), is made dependent on obedience to the law; the Deuteronomistic idea of the “rest” of the people of Israel (Deut. 12:9; 1 Kings 8:56) is related to the Temple in Ps. 132 as in 1 Chr. 28:2. At the same time, however, the two psalms go their own ways: instead of

55. See R. G. Kratz, “Serubbabel und Joschua”, in idem, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*, FAT 42, Tübingen 2006<sup>2</sup>, pp. 79–92.

Jerusalem, they also say **הר ציון** (Ps. 78:68; 132:13) and thus, as with the reference to the "sanctuary" in Ps. 78:69 and to the "dwelling" in Ps. 132:13–14 emphasize the place of worship. Insofar as Ps. 132:5 designates the "dwelling" as a "place for YHWH" (**מקום ליהוה**), a connection to Deut. 12 is made.

The modifications in the Book of Zechariah and the two Psalms show a certain trend towards the idea of the election of the sanctuary, which will increase in later passages. An awareness seems to have developed of the problems surrounding Deut. 12 – perhaps under the influence of Lev. 17:3–4. That is evident not least from the fact that the tradition increasingly speaks of the "place" to which the election applies, with an explicit allusion to Deut. 12. The allusion can favor the identification with the city of Jerusalem, as seems to be the case in the penitential prayer in Neh. 1:9, which stands in the Deuteronomistic tradition. Here the long form **המקום אשר בחרתי לשכן את שמי שם** quoted from Deut. 12:11 etc. replaces the land of the fathers from Deut. 30:5, to which YHWH promises to bring back those who have been dispersed. But the chosen "place" is also identified directly with the Temple, as we find in 2 Chr. 7:12, 16. This instance is illuminating, since here Chronicles adds the reference to the election against the passage in 1 Kings 9:3 on which it is based, whereas it agrees with the text in 1–2 Kings in the other passages.<sup>56</sup> The late addition in Josh. 9:27, which, referring to the later altar, anticipates the centralization ("to the present day") and accordingly again uses the future tense, follows the same line.

With the instances in 2 Chr. 7 and Neh. 1 just mentioned we are gradually approaching the period 4QMMT also dates from. The state of the discussion at this time, as it developed in the course of the biblical tradition, is not exactly unitary. It knows the identification – tacit and occasionally made evident by literary references – of the cult place of Deut. 12 with Jerusalem, the city of David, associated with the election, but entails as well as the exclusive identification of the cult

56. 2 Chr. 6:5–6, 34, 38//1 Kings 8:14LXX, 44, 48; 2 Chr 12:13//1 Kings 14:21; 2 Chr. 35:19LXX//2 Kings 23:27.

place with the sanctuary that is developing and aims at terminological clarity.

This discussion seems to continue throughout the Hellenistic-Roman era. It is reflected by a few but quite striking instances in the post-biblical writings. With the election of the city, the tribe of Judah and David, 4Q504 1–2 iv 3–4 attaches itself to the Deuteronomistic tradition. By the “chosen place” 2 Macc. 5:19–20 understands the city (see v. 17). Like 1 Kings 8, Tob. 1:4 and 3 Macc. 2:9 (see also 1:9–10) differentiate between the chosen city and the Temple as the “dwelling of the Most High” and the holy “place” for his name; Sir. 24:10–11, with its recourse to the idea of the Tabernacle, is similar.

But there are also other voices. 1 Macc. 7:37 takes up the indication in 1 Kings 8:29//2Chr. 6:20 and follows 2 Chr. 7:12, 16. Basing itself on the long form of the centralization formula in the version of the LXX (with ἐκκληθῆναι for the calling on the name), 1 Macc. 7 speaks of the “house” that God has chosen, and means the Temple. Jub. 1:10, where the idea of the Tabernacle is taken up from Lev. 17 and the election is replaced by the “sanctification” of the shrine (see 1 Kings 9:3//2Chr. 7:16), is similar. Both passages consequently agree with 11QT.

The Testament of Levi represents a kind of mixed tradition. In TestLev. 15:1 there is mention of the temple “which the Lord has chosen” (ὁ ναός, ὃν ἐκλέξεται κύριος). By contrast, in TestLev. 10:5, with reference to the book of Enoch the Righteous,<sup>57</sup> it is said that the “house which the Lord will choose will be called Jerusalem” (Ὁ γὰρ οἶκος, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξεται Κύριος, Ἱερουσαλήμ κληθήσεται). The Testament of Zebulon is similar in 9:8, according to which the Lord will choose something, the name of which is Jerusalem.<sup>58</sup> Both interpretations of Deut 12. are finally also to

57. See 1 Enoch 89:50, 54, 56, 66–67, 72–73. Here “the house” (Jerusalem) and “the tower” (temple) are differentiated; in 1 Enoch 90:36, 40, presumably, the tabernacle and in 90:26–27, 28–29, 33–34, 36 the old and the new Jerusalem are meant by the “house”.

58. The text is damaged at this point, and the many variants are no help. See R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908; repr. Darmstadt 1960<sup>2</sup>, p. 129. H. W. Hollander & M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary*, SVTP 8, Leiden 1985, p. 271, conjecture ἐν ναῶ (ὃν ἐκλέξετα...), but that is very uncertain.

be found in Philo and Josephus: one brings the sanctuary<sup>59</sup> and the other the city<sup>60</sup> into the foreground.<sup>61</sup>

From the Hellenistic era at the latest, and possibly even earlier, there is also claim of the Samaritans, whose relationship to Judah must have been much closer than the anti-Samaritan polemic in the Old Testament suggests.<sup>62</sup> Their specific exegesis of Deut. 12, which has found its way into the text of SP, is perhaps attested in a Hebrew inscription from the second century BC, which can easily be completed to בַּחֲרֵי אֵשׁ[ר].<sup>63</sup> The Samaritan option must also be taken into consideration with respect to 4QMMT, not least because of the manifold relations which at the level of textual transmission can be observed in biblical manuscripts from the Dead Sea.

It is this state of the discussion that prompted the halakha in question in 4QMMT to be formulated. The identification of the “camp” of Lev. 17:3–4 with the “place which He has chosen” in Deut. 12 and of both with the city of Jerusalem, as made in MMT, is aimed at tackling a topical problem at the time and presents a solution of unsurpassable clarity. The solution takes up the (Deuteronomistic) tradition of exegesis and refers the centralization formula of Deuteronomy to Jerusalem. What is new, though, is that this tradition is balanced with Lev. 17:3–4. Thus MMT is in a position also to take up the other tradition of interpretation with a

59. Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 1.66ff, here especially 1.67.

60. Josephus, *Ant.* 4.100–201, 203 (8.5 and 8.7); the “one temple” with no reference to the city *Ap.* 2.193.

61. The rabbinic discussion should also be noted; here many questions arise (again) which already played a role in the biblical and parabiblical interpretation; see Langer, *Von Gott erwählt*, pp. 122ff, especially p. 171.

62. G. N. Koppers, “Revisiting the Samaritan Question in the Persian Period”, in O. Lipschits & M. Oeming (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, Winona Lake, IN 2006, pp. 265–289.

63. See J. Naveh and Y. Magen, “Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions of the Second-Century BCE at Mount Gerizim”, *Atiqot* 32 (1997), pp. 10–17, here p. 15; also E. and H. Eshel, “Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch’s Compilation in Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls”, in Sh. M. Paul et al. (eds.), *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, VT.S 94, Leiden & Boston 2003, vol. 1, pp. 215–240, here p. 239; for the corresponding reading in SP see *ibid.*, pp. 218–219.

Priestly stamp, which identifies the chosen place of Deut. 12 with the Temple. Lev. 17:3–4 makes it possible to take both into consideration, in that the Temple as the “dwelling of God” and part of the chosen place is equated with the “tent of meeting”, and the chosen place itself with the “camp”.

This solution also ensures that the status of the city as the holy city and “place which He has chosen” is precisely fixed: the city is not identical with the central cult place, which is what the traditional identification requires, but consists of the area immediately surrounding the Temple, which for the sake of the Temple must be kept clean and holy – in contrast to what the identification of the central cult place with the Temple requires. In this way the meaning of the centralization formula of Deut. 12, which hovers between city and Temple, is made quite clear, and two competing regulations of the Torah are reconciled with each other. From all that we have seen the exclusion of the Samaritan alternative that necessarily entails is not intended, but in view of the state of the discussion in the third and second century BC it is nevertheless significant: כי ירושלים היא המקום אשר בחר מכול שבטי ישראל.