

## The Dead Sea Scrolls Sect as a Replacement Temple

Lawrence H. Schiffman

In Second Temple times, the Temple in Jerusalem was the paramount location in which God, although transcendent, was also most immanent. Here was the pipeline through which the Divine emanated into the world, to be spread out to the land of Israel and from there to all the nations of the world. Here the sacrifices were offered along with the songs and prayers that accompanied them. Here the priests and Levites ministered to connect the sanctity of God with the holiest place on earth, His House in Jerusalem.

Since the Dead Sea Scrolls sect had willfully withdrawn from Temple worship and repaired to the desert, how did they manage to make this connection with the Divine? After all, they were without temple priests and sacrifices, and their settlement at Qumran was not the “place that God had chosen.” We shall see how the sect reconfigured their theology to meet their new situation. They developed a particular relationship with the concept of holiness that allowed them to both establish a replacement for the Temple that they eschewed in the short run and, at the same time, pray for the restoration of the Temple cult at the end of days that would be conducted according to their requirements for all eternity. When that day came, they would joyfully resume their participation in the Temple in Jerusalem that now would be under their control. In order to accomplish their short-term goal, they reconfigured the idea of holiness and were thus able to relocate its center to Qumran.

### The Holy Community

A long passage in column 8 of the Rule of the Community (1QS) will be our starting point. The passage begins by setting out the nature of a community council (8:1–4) of twelve representatives, presumably one for each tribe, and three priests, presumably for the clans of Gershon, Kehat, and Merari. The text continues that when this council is formed, the community as a whole (*atzat ha-yahad*) will be “founded on truth, as an eternal plantation, a holy house for Israel, and the foundation of the holy of holies for Israel...the most holy dwelling for Aaron, with all their knowledge of the covenant of justice (1QS 8:5–9 = 4Q259 ii 13–17).<sup>1</sup> The text then tells us that after the council has been organized for two years, “they will be separated as a sanctuary in the midst of the council of the men of the community” (1QS 8:11 = 4Q258 vi 5).<sup>2</sup> Further, once this wider community is established, anyone who purposely violates a commandment “may not touch the pure food of the men of holiness” (1QS 8:17 = 4Q258 vi 9).<sup>3</sup> In 8:20 (= 4Q258 vi 11), a long section, termed the sectarian penal code, then starts off by stating: “These are the regulations by which the men of perfect holiness shall conduct themselves.”<sup>4</sup>

These passages afford us a detailed sense of what holiness and sanctity meant to Qumran sectaries, in addition to what ideas about holiness they had inherited from the traditions of the Bible. The sect itself is seen as a holy house—which means, for all intents and purposes, that the sect itself replaces the actual physical holy house, the Jerusalem Temple (which the sectarians have shunned because, in their view, it is in violation of the Torah’s laws).<sup>5</sup> Further, for the Aaronide priests who constituted the founders and earliest leaders of the sect, the group (or perhaps its council) constituted the true holy of holies. In fact, it is only the sect that makes possible atonement (lines 6–7; not quoted above).

We can already observe that the sectarians have transferred the sanctity of the Jerusalem Temple, usually understood as spatial and as typifying holiness of place, to their group. Just as priests ministered in the Temple, so they themselves led the sect. Just as the sacrifices were supposed to bring atonement for the people and their land (line 6), so

the life of the sect performed the same function. It is in consonance with this ideal that the sect never established a sacrificial cult at Qumran.

Another extremely important aspect of the life of the sect and its holiness is its separation from the rest of Israel, described in 1QS 8:12–13 (= 4Q258 vi 6–7<sup>6</sup> = 4Q259 ii 3–4<sup>7</sup>): “When these have become a community in Israel...they are to separate (*yibbad’lu*) from the midst of the assembly of the men of iniquity to go to the desert....” This second aspect of sectarian holiness picks up on the root meaning of *kof-dalet-shin*, “to separate,” here expressed with the Hebrew root *bet-dalet-lamed*. However, whereas in the Bible and rabbinic literature separation is from that which is impure or evil, here it is from the “people of iniquity.” This concept is closely linked with the idea of the sect as temple. Spatial sanctity of the temple is transferred to the group. What is inside is holy, as led by priests and the sectarian officials, but what is outside is not holy, and therefore to be separated from. The boundaries of a physical temple with its *temenos* and courtyards are here imitated in the life of the group. Its boundaries are understood to be those of the temple. The pure food of the sect (line 17) was equivalent to the sacrifices, and the sectarians were called “holy men.” Those who followed the way of the sect were termed “men of perfect holiness” and the sect is a “council of holiness” (lines 20–21).

The Qumran sect also saw holiness as closely linked with ritual purity. From this point of view, like the members of the *havurah* discussed in rabbinic literature, the sectarians sought to observe the laws of temple purity in their regular daily lives. For the sectarians, the system of ritual purity was intimately connected with membership in the sect<sup>8</sup>—which, as we have seen, was tantamount to entry into the holy Temple itself. Effectively, purity functioned in the life of the sect in a way very similar to its role in the Temple: as a sign of greater sanctity and closeness to the Divine.

However, in addition, purity statutes served as a means of demarcation of levels of sanctity and, hence, sectarian status. This

was the function of purity as a boundary marker in the Temple—here transformed to the life of the sect.

The Rule of the Community describes the process of admission to the sect (1QS 6:13–23).<sup>9</sup> The first step toward entry into the sect was examination by the *pakid b'rosh ha-rabbim*, the “official at the head of the community.” If this official approved the candidate, the novice took his oath of admission and was then taught the sectarian regulations. Only then did the *moshav ha-rabbim*, the sectarian assembly, render a decision regarding the candidate, presumably based upon performance to date. If this examination was passed, the candidate attained a partial status. The novice was not permitted to touch the pure food of the community for one year until examined by the *moshav ha-rabbim* once again. If this examination too was passed, the novice was elevated to a higher status in which personal property was temporarily admitted into communal use, but the novice still was not permitted to touch the liquid food of the community for another year. Only after the third examination by the *moshav ha-rabbim* could the novice be admitted as a full member of the sect with all attendant privileges, including entry into the sectarian assembly.

All these stages serve to link the instruction in sectarian teachings with the initiation into the sect through the medium of ritual purity. While gaining knowledge of the sect’s interpretations of biblical law and passing examinations, the novice was gradually admitted into greater confidence amongst the members, and gradually rose in ritual purity until finally being able to partake of all the pure food and drink of the sect.

Jacob Licht explains that the process of initiation accords well with tannaitic *halakhah*, according to which liquids are more prone to contract and transmit impurity than are solids.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the touching of liquids is the last stage to which the novice was admitted.<sup>11</sup> Also, this theory explains why a member of the Qumran sect who sinned was removed from partaking in pure food, as a punishment. Since ritual purity was, to the sectarians, a symbol of inner, spiritual purity,

one who transgressed slid back down the ranks through which he had risen. He is once again forbidden from the food of the sectarians until he repents and regains his pure religious state.

Effectively, what has been created here by means of purity is a set of boundaries of increasing sanctity. Entering the sect is like entering the *temenos*, and proceeding through the levels of initiation is like entering further into the courts of the Temple, then into the Temple itself, and finally into the holy of holies. These purity rules and their connection with the initiation rites were what made the Qumran sect truly a Holy House.

### Sacred Space

The Temple, in certain Dead Sea Scrolls, is equivalent to the tabernacle in the desert camp. This desert sanctuary was remembered by all Second Temple Jews as concretized in the First Temple and then in the Second. When the Qumran sectarians contemplated the ideal temple, as we see in the Halakhic Letter (4QMMT), they determined that it was equivalent to the tabernacle that stood in biblical times: “But we hold the view that the Temple is [the (equivalent of the) tabernacle of the Tent of Meeting, and Jerusalem is the camp, and outside the camp [is (equivalent to) outside Jerusalem]; it is the camp of their cities” (4QMMT B29–31).<sup>12</sup> Following the prescriptions of the desert camp as a pattern for the present allows the concept of spatial holiness from the Bible to be transferred to the present. As a foundation document of the sect, 4QMMT also opens the way for the sect to replace the Jerusalem Temple, where it no longer worshipped.

In the four copies of the Halakhic Letter found at Qumran, the text lists matters in which the sectarians did not agree with how the Temple worship was being conducted—and were the reason that they had left the Temple service. They write to some official in the hope that he will change the way the Temple is run and will

conduct the rituals according to the sectarian rulings. This text dates to 150 B.C.E. and represents a formation document of the sect, in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt—by which time Pharisaic rulings (as opposed to the Sadducean view) had become the norm in the Temple. These nascent sectarians were protesting and leaving the Temple as a result of their disagreements.<sup>13</sup> Once they stopped participating in the Temple cult, they began to explain their own life as a substitute Temple.

Finding a replacement for the Temple, the central institution of Jewish life at the time, was not so unusual. When the Temple was physically destroyed in 70 C.E., the rabbis similarly would seek to explain Torah study, prayer, and the Jewish home as symbolic replacements for the Temple. Lighting the Sabbath candles recapitulated the lighting of the *menorah*; putting the challah bread on the table beforehand would stand in for setting the bread on the showbread table. This kind of symbolism already goes back to these early ideas:

When the time comes that men such as these are in Israel, then the council of the Yaḥad will be truly established, an eternal planting, a temple for Israel, and a council of the holy of holies for Aaron; true witnesses to justice, chosen by [God's] will to atone of the land and to recompense the wicked their due...a dwelling of the holy of holies for Aaron, all of them knowing the covenant of justice and thereby offering a sweet savor. They shall be a blameless and true house in Israel, upholding the covenant of eternal statutes. They shall be an acceptable [sacrifice], to atone for the land and to decide the verdict against evil. When these men have been grounded in the foundation[s] of the Yaḥad for two years—provided they be perfect in their conduct with no iniquity—they shall be set apart as holy in the midst of the council of the men of the Yaḥad. (1QS 8.4–11)

In this passage there is some garden imagery, reflecting the notion of the sect as an eternal planting. This garden is reminiscent of the Garden

of Eden, the first home of humanity, where Adam and Eve lived with no iniquity. The “dwelling of the holy of holies for Aaron, all of them knowing the covenant of justice and thereby offering a sweet savor” is the substitution of the Temple sacrifices and priesthood by Aaron and his “sweet savor,” which accomplish atonement within the sect that replaces the Temple. However, it is understood that this solution only obtains in the short term. In the long term, the Temple will be purified in the end of days (a time period that the Qumran sectarians saw as not a very long way off), and the sect would be able to go back to worshipping there in the holiness that would be reestablished.

### **The Temple Scroll**

The transferal of the biblical tabernacle into the ideal Temple is accomplished most particularly by the Temple Scroll, a composition found at Qumran the sources of which predate the founding of the sect. The Temple Scroll presents an ideal vision of Israel as it should build its Temple, worship its God, maintain ritual purity to the utmost degree, be governed by its king, and observe the laws of the Torah.<sup>14</sup> This ideal plan, according to the explicit statement of the scroll (11QT 29:2–10), was intended for the present age, not for the eschatological future. It was the intention of the author/redactor to put forward his scroll as an alternative to the “constitution” of Israel, religious and political, which was in place in the Hasmonean period. He called for a new temple building and for new settlement patterns as well.

In the area of temple building, settlement patterns, and his approach to the land of Israel, the author took a distinctly utopian view. Throughout, the author is informed by a notion of concentric spheres of holiness,<sup>15</sup> as well as by distinct concern for the sanctity of the entire land as sacred space.

### **The Temple City**

For the Temple Scroll, the central point of the land of Israel and the source of its sanctity was the temple and the surrounding complex.<sup>16</sup>

This new temple, of very different proportions from those obtained in First or Second Temple times, would be characterized by the enclosure of the temple building itself by three concentric courtyards.<sup>17</sup>

The Inner Court (11QT 36:3–7) was to measure some 280 cubits square, with four gates representing the four groups of the tribe of Levi: the Aaronide priests on the east, the Levites of Kehat on the south, Gershon on the west, and Merari on the north. This arrangement corresponds exactly to that of the desert camp as described in Numbers 3:14–39.

The Middle Court (38:12–15) was to be concentric with the Inner Court, 100 meters further out. The entirety was to be 480 cubits square, with three gates on each side. The gates (39:11–13) were to be distributed among the twelve tribes of Israel, each having its own gate.<sup>18</sup>

The Outer Court (40:5–11) was also concentric, with sides measuring some 1600 cubits. This wall would also have twelve gates (40:13–41:11) which are distributed such that they correspond exactly to those of the Middle Court.<sup>19</sup> The chambers in the outer wall that faced inward (41:17–42:6) were to be apportioned (44:3–45:2) to the various tribes as well as to the priestly and levitical groups mentioned above. Aaron is assigned two groups of chambers: as a member of the tribe of Levi as well as one of the levitical priests, and as a firstborn entitled to a double portion.

This unique temple plan represents the layout of the tabernacle and camp of Israel in the desert combined. The architect of this temple plan sought to place the camp of Israel within the expanded *temenos*. Hence, he called for a temple structure that made access to the tribes and even symbolic dwelling places for them, as a basic principle of design. Each tribe was assumed to enter the *temenos* through its prescribed gate and to proceed initially to its chambers. From there all members of the tribe or levitical clan could circulate in the Outer Court. Those not disqualified by some impurity from entry into the Middle Court<sup>20</sup> could then proceed into that court, again through their respective gates. Only priests and Levites could



proceed through their gates to the Inner Court, wherein the temple and its furnishings were located.

Underlying this entire plan is the assumption that the temple is the center of sanctity, which can be reached by entering further and further into the concentric spheres of holiness of the *temenos*. The scroll makes clear repeatedly that it is the indwelling of the Divine Presence in the temple that imparts to it this level of sanctity.<sup>21</sup> The addition of the third court was intended to provide further protection for the sanctity of God's precincts. God is to dwell in the temple, among the Israelites forever, according to many passages throughout the Temple Scroll.<sup>22</sup>

### Installations Outside the Temple City

Beyond the *temenos* just described were a few installations designed to ensure the sanctity of the holy place. Among them was the place for the latrines (*m'kom yad*), to be located northwest of "the city" (i.e., the temple city), at a distance of three thousand cubits (46:13–16),<sup>23</sup> probably derived from Numbers 35:4–5.

Further, the scroll requires (46:16–47:1) that outside the temple city, specific locations be assigned to the east for three groups that are impure: those with the skin disease *tzara'at* (usually mistranslated as "leprosy"), those with abnormal genital discharges, and those who had had a seminal emission. Actually, the intention of the scroll is to locate the entire residence area outside of the temple city, and to expand the *temenos* to include the entirety of what was Jerusalem in the author's time.<sup>24</sup> In this view, there would be no residents of the temple city, but those who came to the temple for their seven-day purification rites would stay in these areas during the rituals and then enter the temple to offer their sacrifices when their rites were completed and they had attained a state of purity. Clearly, the exclusion of these various groups was intended to guarantee the holiness of the temple precincts.

Beyond the temple city dwelled the tribes, each of whose territory was located directly opposite its respective gate. Indeed, it was through these gates that the tribal territory was to be tied to the sanctity of the central shrine and the Divine Presence, which dwelled there. Each tribe was apportioned territory such that it would have direct access to the temple, from which holiness emanated to the entire land.

### The Cities of Israel

Beginning with the discovery of the Zadokite Fragments in the late nineteenth century, and again after the publication of the Temple Scroll in 1977, there has been much discussion generated about the meaning of the term *ir ha-mikdash*, literally “city of the sanctuary.”<sup>25</sup> While some have taken this phrase as a reference to the city of Jerusalem as a whole, including the residential areas,<sup>26</sup> we take it as referring only to the temple precincts.<sup>27</sup> Accordingly, the restrictions on entry into the temple city of those with various disqualifications and impurities refer essentially to the *temenos*, the temple precincts.<sup>28</sup> It was the intention of the author of the scroll to expand the size of this *temenos* to cover almost the entirety of what was Jerusalem in his day.

Opposite the temple city were “their cities” (47:8) or “your cities” (47:14, 17) in which, if located more than three days’ journey from the temple, non-sacral slaughter was permitted. These cities are to be distinguished from God’s city, referred to as “My city” or the temple city. Yet even these cities had to observe certain purity regulations. Areas were also set aside for those with impurities outside these cities: for those with various skin diseases (cf. 49:4) or genital discharges, as well as menstruants and parturients. These locations were to be designated for each city (48:14–17). Likewise, burial in the cities was forbidden (48:11); cemeteries were to be set aside, one for each four cities (48:11–13) and equidistant from all of them.

The cities of Israel were apportioned by tribes. That is, each tribal area was expected to have cities in which the people (presumably

of that tribe) dwelled. Not a single passage in the scroll describes anyone as living anywhere but in these cities. Within the cities the residents were all expected to live in stone houses. This is clear from the detailed discussion of the purification of the house in which a dead body had rested (49:5–50:16). The parts of the house and the equipment found in it are also listed in connection with the impurity of the dead.<sup>29</sup>

What was the purpose of this complex geographic master plan? The Temple Scroll called for a total reconstruction of the temple and redistribution of the land around it, so as to grant to all the tribes of Israel direct access to the presence of God and an outflow of holiness to the entire land. Only in this way, the author believed, would the future of Israel upon its land be guaranteed. Holiness and sanctity were the keys to living in the land.

The scroll's plan, as we have examined it here, bears little relationship to the teachings of the Qumran sect as they are known from the sectarian texts.<sup>30</sup> Further, there is no attempt in the architecture of the Qumran structures to follow any ideal blueprint. In this respect, this material supports our general conclusion that some of the sources of the Temple Scroll predate the Qumran sect and that the author/redactor, regardless of his own affiliation, cannot be blamed for having failed to anticipate the ideas of the Qumran sect in his scroll. Neither did our author follow the vision of Ezekiel closely. Yet both he and the prophet shared the desire to see the Jewish people, all twelve tribes, restored to their ancient glory in the sacred land of Israel. One component of this vision was to see the temple and its service conducted at an even greater level of sanctity than was required by the Torah.

### **Holiness of Heaven on Earth**

While we may call the spatial transferring of holiness from the Temple Mount in Jerusalem to the sect and its life a horizontal

transference, we may also speak of a vertical transference (or union), in which the holiness of the sect is the result of an angelic presence.<sup>31</sup> This concept is central to the War Scroll and its portrayal of the eschatological war to be conducted both in heaven and on earth. The Rule of the Congregation (1QS<sub>a</sub> 2:3–11) specifies that eschatological purity requires the absence of those with specific deformities, the impure, and the aged, since the angels are regarded as being present in the assembly.<sup>32</sup> In 1QM 7:6, we find the very same reason for the excluding those impure from a seminal emission from participation in the eschatological battle: “For holy angels are together with their armies.”<sup>33</sup> Baruch Bokser suggested that this is actually a reworking of Deuteronomy 23:15, which explains the requirement of ritual purity in the military camp as resulting from the presence of God. Bokser maintains that the Divine Presence is represented here by the angels.<sup>34</sup>

A parallel to this very concept occurs in 1QM 12:7–8, where it is stated that the angels are fighting among the members of the sect: “A host of angels is mustered with us.”<sup>35</sup> It was a cardinal belief of the sect that just as the world below is divided into the domain of the two spirits,<sup>36</sup> those of good and evil, so was the world of the angels. Just as the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest represented the forces of good and evil to the sect in the present age,<sup>37</sup> so the Prince of Light (the angel Michael) and his enemy, Belial, represent the very same forces on high.<sup>38</sup> These forces would be arrayed against each other in the end of days, just as they are in the present, pre-messianic age.

The great eschatological battle would be fought, therefore, simultaneously both in heaven and on earth. In the actual battle, angels and men would fight side by side. After the long series of engagements described in the War Scroll, the forces of good would ultimately be victorious. For this reason, the sect believed that in the end of days the angels would be present in the military camp described in the War Scroll. At the very same time, the eschatological council would also involve both the earthly and heavenly Sons of Light.<sup>39</sup>

This angelic presence effectively merged the realms of heaven and earth for the sectarians. Living in the present in expectation of the messianic era meant living as though divine representatives were among them. The eschatological dream meant that somehow heaven and earth would meet, and that heavenly sanctity would now be manifest on earth below.

A principle of the Qumran sect was its view that holiness would be perfected only in the end of days. In fact, the perfection of the end of days would involve both the ultimate victory over and elimination of the forces of evil, and also the perfect observance of Jewish law as interpreted by the sectarians. It was believed that when the messianic war would begin, the sect would be mustered to fight the battles against the evildoers and those who do not know the correct interpretation of the Torah, as expounded by the sect. As the sect would finally overcome its enemies and emerge victorious, the righteous of Israel who turn to God and adopt the sectarian way of life would also be included in the sect. Together with the original sectarians, they would constitute the eschatological community. This new community would gather together for the messianic banquet under the leadership of the Zadokite priestly messiah and the messiah of Israel.<sup>40</sup>

The messianic era was understood to constitute the ultimate utopia, a world in which perfection in purity and worship would surpass all of history. The sect of the future age—now really the only Jewish way—would fulfill all the aspirations of “the men of perfect holiness” (1QS 8:10). The end of days was to usher in unparalleled holiness and sanctity as the angels dwelled among the eschatological community.

The sect tried to actuate in the present, pre-messianic age the perfect holiness that they expected in the coming age.<sup>41</sup> For this reason, many of the prescriptions of the War Scroll and the Rule of the Congregation describing the eschatological congregation also parallel regulations found in other texts intended to legislate for the

present age. In order to actualize its dreams for the future age, the sect referred to itself as the Sons of Zadok and held this group of priests in special esteem.<sup>42</sup> They expected that these priests would constitute their leadership in the end of days. Likewise, the levitical age limits of the Bible applied in the Dead Sea Scrolls to the present officials of the sect, the officers of the military units who would participate in the eschatological battle, and the leadership structure of the messianic community.<sup>43</sup>

Disqualifications from the eschatological assembly, as described in the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa), also followed levitical legislation regarding those priests who were unfit for temple service. These were the impure and those who suffered from physical deformities or old age (1QSa 2:3–11; cf. 1:19–22). After all, the sect saw itself as constituting a sanctuary, through its dedication to a life of holiness and purity. At the brink of the dawn of the eschaton, during which they were living, the sect had to maintain the highest standard of purity. They pre-enacted the future messianic banquets in their communal meals by eating with a quorum of ten males, requiring ritual purity of the participants, and performing the blessing of wine and bread presided over by the priest who then apportioned the food according to the status of the members of the community (1QS 6:2–5).<sup>44</sup>

The messianic era is portrayed as a second redemption, the Exodus from Egypt being the prototype. To this end, the sect used biblical terminology to describe the messianic era. The Dead Sea Scrolls speak of the encampments of Israel's wandering in the desert,<sup>45</sup> as well as of the restoration of the ancient monarchy, the high priesthood, and the ancient tribal organization. The first redemption from Egypt represented the ultimate closeness to God and direct divine intervention in history. At this stage, Israel was the most receptive to God's revelation and the most obedient to divine law. The sectarians expected the renewal of this perfect condition in the soon-to-dawn eschaton. In addition, the world would attain a level of purity, sanctity, and observance of the law even more perfect than that experienced in the first redemption. The sectarians strove to live in perfect holiness so that they would experience the eschatological

battles and tribulations of the dawning of the messianic era and the promised glory of the end of days.

### Conclusion

The Qumran corpus as a whole seems to present two basic schemes of holiness and sanctity. According to the sectarian view, the locus of holiness and, therefore, the mode of access to it, is the sect itself, a group of people devoted to representing in their individual lives the commitment to higher levels of purity and, accordingly, to the quest for higher levels of sanctity. This group aspired to the perfection of its holiness and to the fulfillment of its present-day quest in the soon-to-dawn eschaton. Only then would perfect holiness be achieved—not in the temple sancta, but in the life of the group and its victorious members.

The Temple Scroll, however, deriving from sources close to the Sadducean priesthood, hews more closely to the spatial aspect of holiness as known from the concepts of holy land, holy city, and holy temple in the Bible. As a result, it maps out holiness and sanctity in geographical terms, rather than in human or group terms.

Both conceptual frameworks of sanctity do exist in the Bible, and all Jews would have espoused them. What is significant here is the clearly differing emphases in the Temple Scroll and sectarian organizational texts.

This same distinction exists regarding the relationship of sanctity to the human being. Cultic, spatial sanctity maps out an area that a person enters in order to access an already-existing, prepared, perhaps waiting, presence of God. Purity is required of those who seek to enter, as they must qualify to enter the sanctified realm.

Individual or group sanctity required that the individual or the aggregate group of individuals create in themselves a holiness and

sanctity that is not externally defined. It comes about only through striving for spiritual and religious growth. Hence, purity—or, more precisely, purification—is a step toward that greater closeness to God. Together, the members of the group seek to raise themselves to approach a deity whom they effectively must bring down into their own daily, mundane lives. For them, the group and its religious life replace the temple and its *temenos*.

These two approaches to holiness existed in Qumran texts as in Judaism as a whole. God and the Divine Presence might occupy a holy place, but the ultimate shrine is constituted of the hearts and souls of those individuals who committed themselves to seeking God's presence, both in this era and in the end of days.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: Serekh Ha-yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 139–44; cf. 4Q258 vi 1–3 (DJD 26, pp. 105–109) and 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules) in Joseph M. Baumgarten, et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XXV: Halakbic Texts* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), pp. 69–72. DJD references the scholarly series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* published by Oxford University Press over the last sixty-odd years.

<sup>2</sup> DJD 26, pp. 105–109.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, and cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 155–159.

<sup>5</sup> Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

<sup>6</sup> See especially DJD 26, p. 107, on the variant readings of the manuscripts.

<sup>7</sup> DJD 26, pp. 144–148.

<sup>8</sup> Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, pp. 161–165.

<sup>9</sup> Partially paralleled in 4Q256 xi 11–13 (DJD 26, pp. 55–57); 4Q261 3 1 (DJD 26, pp. 177–178).

<sup>10</sup> Jacob Licht, *M'gillat Ha-s'rakim Mi-m'gillot Midbar Y'hudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), pp. 294–303.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Chaim Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957); Saul Lieberman, “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline,” in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1951), pp. 199–206; rpt. in *idem, Texts and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974), pp. 200–207.

<sup>12</sup> Translated by Lawrence H. Schiffman in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), p. 389.

<sup>13</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, pp. 83–95.

<sup>14</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983).

<sup>15</sup> Wayne O. McCready, “Temple and Temple Scroll: A Sectarian Alternative,” *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Bible and its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990), p. 203.

<sup>16</sup> See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 177–276; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Architecture and Law: The Temple and its Courtyards in the Temple Scroll,” in *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism: Intellect in Quest of Understanding: Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox*, eds. Jacob Neusner, Ernst S. Frerichs, and Nahum M. Sarna (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), vol. 1, pp. 267–284; Johann Maier, “The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of

the Temple Scroll,” in G. J. Brooke, ed., *Temple Scroll Studies* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), pp. 23–62; Johann Maier, “The *Temple Scroll* and Tendencies in the Cultic Architecture of the Second Commonwealth,” in Lawrence H. Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp. 53–82; Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985); Hartmut Stegemann, “The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll,” in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (Leiden: E. J. Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Yad Ben-Zvi, 1992), pp. 146–185.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Johann Maier, “Die Hofanlagen im Tempel-Entwurf des Ezechiel im Licht der ‘Tempelrolle’ von Qumran,” in John Adney Emerton, ed., *Prophecy: Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), pp. 55–67.

<sup>18</sup> The apportionment of gates to the twelve tribes is found in regard to the city of Jerusalem in Ezekiel 48:31–34 and Revelations 21:12–14. Fragments of virtually the same text are found in 4Q365a, published under the title “4QTemple?” by Sidnie White (Crawford), in Harold Attridge, et al., *Qumran Cave 4. VIII, Parabiblical Texts Part I* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 323–333. These are probably from the same manuscript as 4Q365 (Reworked Pentateuch). The relation of this manuscript to the Temple Scroll was already noted by Jean Starcky, “Jerusalem et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte,” *Le Monde de la Bible* 1 (1977), pp. 38–40. On the relation of these texts to the Temple Scroll, see White, DJD 13, pp. 319–320.

<sup>19</sup> I am unconvinced by Margaret Barker, “The Temple Measurements and the Solar Calendar,” in Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies*, pp. 63–66, who sees the gates of the Outer Court as symbolizing the calendar and serving as a device for its calculation.

<sup>20</sup> See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the Temple Scroll,” in *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985), pp. 303–306.

<sup>21</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Theology of the Temple Scroll,” in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994), pp. 118–121.

<sup>22</sup> This theme appears in the conclusion of the festival calendar of the scroll (29:3–4, 7–8), the purity laws (45:12, 13–14, 46:11–12, 47:10–11), the commands for the construction of the temple (46:4 [partly restored]), the laws of forbidden food (51:7–8), the prohibition of non-sacral slaughter (52:19–20, 53:1 [restored]), the ban on the skins of such animals in the temple city (47:18), the laws of oaths and vows (53:9–10), and the authority of priests, Levites, and judges (56:5).

<sup>23</sup> See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 294–304, and his earlier article, “The Gate of the Essenes and the Temple Scroll,” in his *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1975), pp. 90–

91. Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), pp. 93–94, where 2000 (in relation to the 11QT) must be corrected to 3000.

<sup>24</sup> Schiffman, “Exclusion,” p. 317; cf. Magen Broshi, “The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll,” in *Biblical Archeology Review* 13:6 (November/December 1987), pp. 36–37. McCready, “Temple and Temple Scroll,” p. 203 suggests that this was essentially a protest against the nature of Second Temple period Jerusalem as a commercial and governmental center.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “*Ir Ha-Miqdash* and Its Meaning in the Temple Scroll and Other Qumran Texts,” in Alberdina Houtman, Marcel Poorthuis, and Joshua Schwartz, eds., *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 95–109.

<sup>26</sup> Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, pp. 277–285.

<sup>27</sup> Baruch A. Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 232 (1978), pp. 14–15; Schiffman, “Exclusion,” pp. 301–320.

<sup>28</sup> See the complete list in Schiffman, “Exclusion,” pp. 314–515.

<sup>29</sup> Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Impurity of the Dead in the *Temple Scroll*,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 135–156.

<sup>30</sup> Stegemann, “Institutions of Israel,” pp. 162–166.

<sup>31</sup> For a somewhat different perspective on the priestly aspects of this notion, see Rachel Elijor, *Mikdash U-merkavah, Kobanim U-malakhim, Heikhal V’heikhalot Ba-mistikah Ha-y’budit Ha-k’dumah* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002), pp. 174–202.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 37–52.

<sup>33</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* [hereafter War Scroll], trans. Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 290–291. Cf. 4Q491 1, 2+3 line 10 (M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520) (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982)*, pp. 13–18. On angels in the War Scroll, see Yadin, War Scroll, pp. 229–242.

<sup>34</sup> Baruch M. Bokser, “Approaching Sacred Space,” in *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985), pp. 279–299.

<sup>35</sup> Yadin, *War Scroll*, 316317; cf. 4Q491 1, 2+3 line 10.

<sup>36</sup> 1QS 3:13–4:26. Cf. Schiffman, Reclaiming, pp. 149–150; Jean Duhaime, “Dualism,” in Lawrence Schiffman and James VanderKam, eds., *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), vol. 1, pp. 215–220.

<sup>37</sup> Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, pp. 117–121, 231–235.

<sup>38</sup> Yadin, *War Scroll*, pp. 232–236.

<sup>39</sup> In addition to those with deformities, the impure, and the aged, 1QM 7:3–4 states that women and children are also to be excluded from the military camp. It is most likely that the very same regulation was in force regarding the eschatological council. Although women and children would be part of the sect,

as is evident from 1QSa 1:6–11, their presence among the angels in the council of the community would not be allowed, nor were they permitted in the military camp during the battle at the end of days.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Messiah, Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 116–129.

<sup>41</sup> Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, pp. 68–71.

<sup>42</sup> Schiffman, *The Halakbah at Qumran*, pp. 70–75; Eilior, *Mikdash U-merkavah*, pp. 202–211.

<sup>43</sup> Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, pp. 32–35.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. 1QSa 2:11–22 for the eschatological banquet; Schiffman, *Eschatological Community*, pp. 53–67.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, “The ‘Desert Motif’ in the Bible and in Qumran Literature,” in Alexander Altmann, ed., *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 216–254; rpt. in idem, *Literary Studies in the Hebrew Bible: Form and Content: Collected Studies* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), pp. 55–63.