

- Porten, Bezalel. "The Structure and Orientation of the Jewish Temple at Elephantine: A Revised Plan of the Jewish District." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 81 (1961), 38–42.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "The Three Temples of 4 Q Florilegium." *Revue de Qumrân* 10 (1979), 83–91.
- Schwartz, Joshua. "Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56 (1985), 63–85.
- Schmidt, Francis. *La pensée du temple, de Jerusalem à Qoumrân: Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien*. La librairie du XXe siècle. Paris, 1994.
- Steudel, Annette. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrange-meinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b})*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 13. Leiden, 1994.
- Tuell, Steven Shawn. *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40–48*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, 49. Atlanta, 1992.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati, 1974.
- Wentling, Judith L. "Unraveling the Relationship between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *Revue de Qumrân* 14 (1989), 61–73.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 49. Chicago, 1990.
- Wolff, Christian. *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 118. Berlin, 1976.
- Yadin, Yigael. *Megillat ha-Miqdash I–III*. Jerusalem, 1977.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll I–III*. Jerusalem, 1983.

JOHANN MAIER

TEMPLE SCROLL. A rewriting of the canonical Torah from the end of *Exodus* through the end of *Deuteronomy*, Temple Scroll has been one of the compositions most intensively studied among those recovered at Qumran (for a bibliography see García Martínez, 1996.)

Preserved Manuscripts and Editions. Five manuscripts, three from Cave 11 and two from Cave 4, have been published as containing remains of this previously unknown composition. Of these, only two (Temple Scroll^a [11Q19] and Temple Scroll^b [11Q20]) are certainly copies of the Temple Scroll while a third one (4QTemple Scroll^b 4Q524) could possibly be a very fragmentary copy of the last part of it. The relationship of the two other manuscripts (Temple Scroll^c [4Q365a] and Temple Scroll^d [11Q21]) to the Temple Scroll is most uncertain.

Temple Scroll^a (11Q19). The best preserved manuscript is Temple Scroll^a (11Q19), which is also the largest of all the Qumran scrolls with more than 8 meters (26 feet) extant. The inner portion, which contained the end of the composition, is fairly well preserved with the lower part still intact, although the upper section has been lost. The exterior part, however, which included the beginning, has suffered considerable damage and is only fragmentarily preserved. With the beginning of the manuscript lost, the narrative framework is no longer extant, and since the end of the composition was located in the

upper section it, too, is lost. The final preserved column (col. lxvi) is followed by a new sheet of leather with no writing on its lower portion, which shows that only a few final lines are missing.

Temple Scroll^a was apparently discovered in 1956 with the other Cave 11 scrolls, but remained in the possession of an antiquities dealer in Bethlehem until its confiscation by the Israeli army in 1967 (Yadin, 1985, pp. 8–44). In the same year, Yigael Yadin presented an early description of its contents, and then published the *editio princeps* in 1977 in Hebrew, which was translated into English in 1983. This fine three-volume edition includes an extensive introduction and detailed commentary in modern Hebrew and a photographic supplement. Since the English translation adds a section of Addenda et Corrigenda (vol. 1.405–19) and many corrections and revised readings (vol. 2), it is to be preferred above the *editio princeps*. E. Qimron, who contributed the majority of these new readings, published his own edition with alternative readings and substantial reconstructions in 1996, thereby improving considerably on Yadin's edition (Qimron, 1996).

Nineteen thin sheets of leather have been recovered from Temple Scroll^a, ranging between 39 centimeters (15 inches) and 61 centimeters (24 inches) in width, with each containing three or four columns of writing, except for the last column, which is blank in its preserved section. Because of damage to its upper section, the manuscript's preserved height varies between 10 centimeters (4 inches) and 20 centimeters (8 inches), but according to Yadin's calculations the original height was probably between 24 centimeters (9 inches) and 26 centimeters (10 inches). The remains of sixty-six columns have been preserved, with a width ranging from 9 centimeters (4 inches) to 12 centimeters (5 inches) (including margins). The number of lines per column, as far as reconstruction allows, varies between twenty-two (cols. vi–xlvi) and twenty-eight (cols. xlix–lx; sheets 14–16). The scribe left the final marked line blank for columns xlv–xlvi, but wrote it from column xlix on. He then added two more lines of text in the lower part of the column and reduced the spacing between each line from 1.1 centimeters (0.4 inches) to 0.8 centimeters (0.3 inches). The change from twenty-eight to twenty-two lines at the beginning of column lxi (the first of sheet 17) is clearly seen in the increase of distance between lines to 1.1 centimeters (0.4 inches).

Temple Scroll^a was copied by two different scribes, with the largest portion of the manuscript (cols. vi–lxvi) in a middle Herodian formal hand dating to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE. However, columns ii–v (the first preserved sheet)

were written in a late Herodian formal hand, clearly distinct and more evolved, and dating to the first half of the first century CE. This difference in writing and the fact that part of column v coincides with the beginning of column vi allows us to conclude with Yadin that the first sheet was added later, probably to repair the beginning of the scroll, which had been damaged.

Temple Scroll^b (11Q20). Another fragmentary copy of the Temple Scroll allows us to replace several lost sections of the first scroll. Temple Scroll^b (11Q20), which was also discovered in 1956, was acquired in 1962 as part of the Dutch allotment of manuscripts from Cave 11. The preliminary publication appeared in 1992, and the *editio princeps* in 1998 (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1998, pp. 357–409, plates xli–xlvi). From this manuscript, forty-two fragments have been recovered, thirty of which have been identified due to overlap with Temple Scroll^a. Portions from columns xv to lv of Temple Scroll^a are preserved in fragments of Temple Scroll^b, which contains remnants of every section of the Temple Scroll. Despite its fragmentary character, there is no doubt that Temple Scroll^b comprises the same text as Temple Scroll^a and that both are copies of the same composition. Temple Scroll^b was written in a developed Herodian formal hand, which dates to the second quarter of the first century CE (c.20–50) and is very similar to the first hand of Peshar Habakkuk (1QpHab), with several shared characteristics suggesting that both were copied by the same scribe.

4QTemple Scroll^b (4Q524). A possible third copy of the Temple Scroll is a very fragmentary manuscript with very few portions extant. 4QTemple Scroll^b (4Q524) was first published in 1997 by Émile Puech, and has since appeared in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series (Puech, 1998, pp. 85–114, plates vii–viii). From the thirty-nine fragments, only two groups (frgs. 6–13 and frgs. 15–22) and fragment 14 clearly correspond with the preserved material in Temple Scroll^a and Temple Scroll^b. Fragments 6–13 preserve part of Temple Scroll^a lix.17–lx.6; fragment 14, part of Temple Scroll^a lxiv.6–11; and fragments 15–22, part of Temple Scroll^a lxvi.8–17, but with significant variants. The biggest of the recovered fragments (frg. 25) has no correspondence in the known text of the Temple Scroll, and all the other remains are so minute that they are of no real help in identifying the text. The paucity of material and the fact that all the identified fragments come from the final part of the composition would allow us to conclude that 4Q524 is not a copy of the composition known from Temple Scroll^a and Temple Scroll^b, but represents another unknown composition or one of the sources used by the author of the Temple Scroll for the last part of the work. Since the end of a scroll is usually preserved when it is rolled up (i.e., with

the end in the inner portion), and the variants preserved are of the sort that usually appear during the copying process, the editor reasonably concludes that 4Q524 represents another copy of the same work.

Significant features of this manuscript include its writing (a semi-cursive hand of the early Hasmonean period, dated c.150–125 BCE), the divine name being represented by four dots (frg. 6.4), and the orthography which, though not completely consistent, corresponds to what Emanuel Tov has termed the *Qumran system*.

4QTemple Scroll^a (4Q365a). Two other manuscripts have been presented as possible copies of the Temple Scroll, but these are most probably not copies of the same work, and their “official” designations should be viewed only as rough indications that their contents are somehow related to the Temple Scroll.

4QTemple Scroll^a (4Q365a) was first considered to be a Hebrew translation of the Aramaic composition known as New Jerusalem. Subsequently, Yadin published three of its fragments as a copy of the Temple Scroll (Yadin, 1983, vol. 3, suppl. 38, 40), one of them as corresponding to columns xxxviii and xli–xlii of Temple Scroll^a, and the other two without a precise location within the known text. Sidnie White Crawford has attributed to it five fragments and has published them in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 13 as *Temple Scroll?* (White, 1994). She is perfectly aware of the problems posed by this identification, because only one of the five fragments overlaps (and not completely) with the known text of the Temple Scroll, and concludes that “if these fragments do constitute another copy of the Temple Scroll, it must have been a copy different from Temple Scroll^a and Temple Scroll^b.” But as I have demonstrated elsewhere (García Martínez, 1998, pp. 230–48), this text is part and parcel of *Reworked Pentateuch*^c (4Q365) and there is no reason to separate these five fragments from it. *Temple Scroll?* (4Q365a) thus belongs to a copy of the *Reworked Pentateuch*, which incorporates materials related to biblical manuscripts, to other compositions such as the Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem, and also to previously unknown works. The composition from which these fragments come is especially interesting since it may represent one of the sources used by the author-redactor of the Temple Scroll, or may be a witness to a common ancestor: however, it cannot be considered a copy of the work represented by Temple Scroll^a and Temple Scroll^b. [See *Reworked Pentateuch*.]

4QTemple Scroll^c? (11Q21). This text, first published by Qimron as a copy of the Temple Scroll (Qimron, 1995, pp. 473–476), 11Q21 was identified as Temple Scroll^c(?) (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, 1998, pp. 411–414, plate xlvi). The problems presented by this text are simi-

lar to those presented by Temple Scroll? (4Q365a). Of this manuscript only three very small fragments have been preserved. Their physical appearance, the ruling, and the writing are very similar or even identical with those of Jubilees (11Q12), from Cave 11 at Qumran to which they were formerly attributed, although their contents do not correspond to the known text of *Jubilees*. Of these three fragments, only seven letters of fragment 1 overlap with the known text of Temple Scroll^a iii.14–17 (but the words of the overlap are extremely common, and the key words of this fragment are not preserved on Temple Scroll^a). The other two fragments contain material compatible with the Temple Scroll (cols. ix and xlvii–xlviii), but with no overlapping text. There is thus no reason to consider these small fragments as another copy of the Temple Scroll. If Qimron's designation of these three fragments as 11QTemple^c(?) has been retained it is for two reasons: the impossibility of locating their contents in the known text of *Jubilees*; and to underscore that shared vocabulary with the Temple Scroll indicates that they may preserve missing parts of this composition or another work dealing with similar themes.

The Contents of the Temple Scroll. The systematic manner in which the redactor has organized the components of Temple Scroll^a facilitates a description of its contents. Although the beginning is lost, column ii suggests that the narrative framework, which integrates the body of concrete laws forming the work, was similar to that in *Jubilees* and in the Sinaitic covenant (as in *Ex.* 34 and *Dt.* 7). The author goes so far as to change the biblical idiom from the third to the first person, thus transforming *Deuteronomy's* message from Moses to the people to a direct discourse from God to the people. He thereby presents his work as a divine word, like a new Torah for the entire nation of Israel coming directly from the mouth of God. At times, however, the author or redactor forgets this pseudepigraphical fiction and retains the third person of the biblical text. This new "*Deuteronomy*" systematically integrates the various laws concerning the temple and its sacrifices as found in *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Numbers*. At times these are reproduced in a literal manner, but at other times in modified form with numerous additions not found in the biblical text, thereby being fashioned as a new version of *Deuteronomy* 12–23.

Surveying the preserved columns of Temple Scroll^a one by one (Yadin, 1983, pp. 46–70; Maier, 1985, pp. 8–20), we ascertain that the author has grouped the laws around four main themes. The first is the construction of the temple, with the relevant rules concentrated in two blocks: columns ii–xiii (construction of the sanctuary and the altar), and columns xxx–xlv (construction of the temple's courtyards and various buildings in them). Between

these two blocks, the second theme (cols. xiii–xxix) has been inserted: the cycle of festivals throughout the year with the sacrifices that correspond to each festival, including the festivals of new wheat, wine, and oil, and the festival of the wood offering.

The third theme consists of the purity rules for both the temple and the holy city, as well as general rules. The author is concerned with safeguarding the purity of the temple area and the city where the temple should be constructed in columns xlv–xlvii, and with the more general purity rules in columns xlvi–li. The fourth theme occupies the remainder of the manuscript (cols. lii–lxvi) and comprises a rewriting of *Deuteronomy* 12–23, with the same diversity of contents found in the biblical text: rules regarding judges, idolatry, the slaughter of animals, curses, false prophets, rights of priests and Levites, witnesses, the slave taken in war, the rebellious son, crimes of betrayal, the defamed virgin, incest, etc. Among these themes the following are highlighted: an extensive treatment dedicated to *Deuteronomy* 17.14–20, known as the "King's Law" (cols. lvi–lix); further details on the Levites (l.1–11); and crucifixion as a form of capital punishment (lxiv.6–13).

Sources Used. The same themes suggest the general outline of the sources used by the author-redactor to write the Temple Scroll (Wise, 1990; García Martínez, 1991). First, the redactor relied on the Torah, particularly *Deuteronomy*, which he edited extensively for his purposes by combining several biblical formulations, which he harmonized, clarified, completed, or modified as he saw fit. The redactor also relied on and incorporated four other sources in his work: a written source with instructions for construction of the temple; another written source containing a "festival calendar" that differs from the usual one by including new festivals and presupposing a 364-day calendar as found in other Qumran documents (this material was inserted in the preceding source dealing with the temple); a source dealing with purity rules in force within the author's group and for which he provides only a summary; and a Midrash to *Deuteronomy*, from which he took the "King's Law" and amplifications pertaining to the Levites and to crucifixion as a form of capital punishment. Throughout his work, this redactor has taken great care to insert various legal prescriptions in use within the group to which he belongs. These prescriptions serve to unify the whole and to present them as part of the Torah obligatory for all Israel.

The identity of the author-redactor who gathered these materials, and with them the Temple Scroll, is obviously unknown to us; thus this work is as anonymous as other prominent Qumran documents. The scroll's authoritative character, the redactor's profound knowledge of the bibli-

cal text, and his audacity in rewriting the biblical text, might suggest as the author the strong prophetic personality of the priest known in Qumran texts as the *Teacher of Righteousness*, but none of the preserved data confirms this supposition.

Even if there is uncertainty regarding some details—such as the precise limits of some sources, the relative chronologies of these sources, or the extent of the author's redactional activity—the foregoing attempts to be a fair summary on which there is general consensus among scholars. The same cannot be said of the following points, since the composition's literary genre and its relationship to the biblical text, its origins, and date have been hotly disputed during the last twenty years with no consensus reached to date.

Literary Genre and Relationship to the Biblical Text. It is difficult to determine the literary genre of the Temple Scroll. For Yadin (1983, vol. 1., pp. 392 and 418) the author (and the members of the sect) considered it as a "proper Torah, albeit hidden and known only to the sectarians." For Hartmut Stegemann this is indeed a sixth book of the Torah, a new biblical text intended to complete the existing Pentateuch. For B. Z. Wacholder, the author viewed the Temple Scroll as the only valid Torah, designed to replace the Mosaic one which inspired it; for him Moses received from God on Mount Sinai a second Torah that was to be revealed once the Mosaic Torah was shown to be temporary as a result of the nation's transgressions (Wacholder, 1983). For many other scholars, such as Swanson, the Temple Scroll is above all a rewritten Torah designed to unify, homogenize, and resolve the difficulties of the biblical text (Swanson, 1994).

Until the publication of 4QTemple Scroll^b 4Q524 the use of the Tetragrammaton in Temple Scroll^a and in Temple Scroll^b was one of the strongest arguments for understanding the Temple Scroll as a "biblical" work. We now know, however, that the oldest exemplar avoided the use of the sacred name, and is in this aspect similar to other nonbiblical scrolls.

The fundamental relationship between the Temple Scroll and the biblical text lies at the level of interpretation, which was considered revealed and thus normative, thereby enabling the redactor to transform even his biblical starting point. The work is certainly presented as normative, and so may be defined as a legal text; thus a classification as *Torah* is not totally inadequate. Yet the essential features of its relationship to the Mosaic Torah are that it does not seek to be an alternative nor a complement, but as being the only valid interpretation, and that it is this element that determines its literary genre. This "normative" character of interpretation within the group is heightened in that the copies from the Herodian period (Temple Scroll^a and Temple Scroll^b) no longer write the

divine name in Paleo-Hebrew characters but transcribe the Tetragrammaton as in the biblical texts.

The addition in Temple Scroll^a of the quotation from *Deuteronomy* 21.23 as a proof text, specifying the use of crucifixion as a form of capital punishment (absent in halakhic text 4Q524), is one of the most revealing indicators that this composition was not understood as a new Torah intended to complete or to supersede the Mosaic one. Moreover, it clearly shows that the basic relationship of the Temple Scroll to the Bible is in the realm of interpretation, as a composition intended to bring out the true meaning of the sacred text.

As a normative interpretation of *Deuteronomy*, the Temple Scroll could be classed, following Michael O. Wise's suggestion, as a new *Deuteronomy*. But unlike Wise I would not define it as a new *Deuteronomy* that was intended to substitute for *Deuteronomy* 12–26 "at the end of time"; even the temple described in the Temple Scroll will be replaced at the end of time by a new one created directly by God (xxix.8–10). In reality, for its author this composition contains the only legitimate way for understanding the true sense of the biblical text that pertains in the present, and should be applied as soon as circumstances may permit.

Origins and Relationship to Other Qumranic Writings. The origins of the Temple Scroll have been debated as much as its literary genre or date. While some scholars, such as Stegemann postulate an origin completely independent of the Qumran community, many others, starting with Yadin, situate its origin within the Qumran community itself. The work is earlier than the community's installation in the desert, but certainly had its origin in the priestly circle from which the community would later emerge. It belongs, therefore, to the community's formative period.

The Temple Scroll's interest in the architectural elements of the temple, the temple rituals, and the polemics regarding the details of the sacrificial system and of the purity levels points to priestly circles as the most likely originators of the composition. For these priestly circles these were the most important issues at hand.

The same elements account for the purpose of the Temple Scroll. Differences from the existing temple are easily apparent, but the author does not present his detailed plan as a prophetic vision of the temple that God himself will construct at the end of time, as does *Ezekiel*; instead, he presents it as a real program of construction that was revealed at Sinai and is therefore normative. His presentation enhances the discrepancy between the existing temple and the normative one, and shows up the inadequacy of the existing temple as against the future one that will be built according to revealed precepts.

The few concrete details from the *midrash* to *Deuteron-*

omy that help determine the Temple Scroll's setting direct us to these same priestly circles. The prescription of compulsory monogamy for the king is likewise reflected, of course, in the Damascus Document. Furthermore, the division of powers between the king and high priest is also found in Rule of the Blessings (1Q28b), together with the subordination of king to high priest. These elements may indicate a certain opposition to the existing situation during the Hasmonean period in that they favor a king subject to the priesthood and free from all cultic activities. The need for reformulating the biblical data with respect to royalty seemed more pressing once the Maccabees attained national independence than had been the case during the Persian period or under Ptolomiac or Seleucid dominion.

Yet this does not mean, as has been erroneously claimed, that the work's origins are to be placed during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (Hengel, Charlesworth, Mendels). Mercenaries were continuously present from the time of John Hyrcanus; all the Hasmoneans were involved in offensive and defensive wars, taking advantage of the spoils of those conquered, and throughout this period there was the constant threat of danger from the Egyptians. The moderate character of the polemic present in the text accords better with the early period of national independence secured by the Maccabees than with a period that saw the transformation from Hellenistic rule to Hasmonean power. In any case, this polemic is a far cry from the anti-Hasmonean polemic found in other Qumran writings such as the *pesharim*. Yet it directs us to the same priestly circles as a possible locus for the origin of the Temple Scroll.

On the other hand, various elements confirm its relationship to writings that are generally acknowledged as specific to the Qumran community. The most interesting of these are: affinity to the Damascus Document regarding prohibitions against polygamy, marriage between uncle and niece, and sexual relationships in the temple city; similarity to the War Scroll (1QM) with respect to the exclusion of women from the holy city, encampment during the eschatological war, military organization, and the location of the lavatories; the shared reference with Peshar Nahum (4Q169) to crucifixion as a form of capital punishment; and references to the 364-day calendar, including mention of the oil festival on the twenty-second day of the sixth month (also found in Calendrical Document E^b [4Q327]). Several other common factors may be added: those who are excluded from participation in the community at the end time in Rule of the Congregation (1Q28a) are the same ones who, in the Temple Scroll, are prohibited entrance into Jerusalem; the names used for the door to the temple's courtyard are the same as those used for the gates of Jerusalem in the New Jerusalem; as in other

Qumranic texts the Levites may impart the blessing in the Temple Scroll; and the composition of the king's council and the community council reflect the same pattern.

Although these similarities are impressive, a further list of elements prevents us from concluding that the Temple Scroll was composed when the community was already founded and installed at Qumran after breaking away from the Jerusalem Temple: the interests evident in the sectarian scrolls are very distinct from those of the Temple Scroll; its method of scriptural interpretation is equally distinct; its *halakhah* includes several elements that cannot be reconciled (Schiffman, 1989); a principal Qumranic festival (renewal of the covenant) is missing from our text; there are notable differences in vocabulary (e.g., designation of the High Priest); and the basic positions *vis-à-vis* the temple and the authorities are hardly compatible (Schiffman, 1989).

Both lists of observations can nevertheless be reconciled if one assumes that the Temple Scroll arose among the emergent community, yet before the community's installation at Qumran. This solution explains the similarities and differences by allowing us to take into account the inevitable evolution, modifications imposed due to the break from the Jerusalem Temple, and ideological and halakhic developments that arose in the new situation. With these considerations in mind, the data at our disposal are best explained by an origin for the Temple Scroll among priestly circles connected with the Temple, and from which the Qumran community would later emerge. Such an origin enables us to understand the surprising parallels in vocabulary, content, and *halakhot* between the Temple Scroll and *Miqtsat Ma'asei ha-Torah*, hereafter 4QMMT (Schiffman, 1990).

Date. It is as difficult to determine the date of the composition of the Temple Scroll as to establish its origin. Dates have been proposed as early as the fifth to fourth century BCE (Stegemann) or as late as the first century CE (Thiering in Brooke, 1989, pp. 99–120) although most scholars are inclined, with Yigael Yadin (1983, vol. 1, p. 390) to date the work "in the days of John Hyrcanus or shortly earlier." Since the redactor used diverse sources his work was necessarily later than the composition of these sources, and the work itself must be earlier than the most ancient preserved copy.

The paleographical dating of the oldest copy is of crucial importance with respect to the date of the composition itself, since this provides a fixed point and physical evidence of the work's existence in the second half of the second century BCE. It thus automatically excludes all proposals dating the Temple Scroll to the time of John Hyrcanus or later periods. Theories positing a composition in the fifth/fourth century BCE are not excluded, of course; but these are disqualified by indicators of a rela-

tionship with the group from which the Qumran group would emerge, and of sources which are apparently later in date.

The festival calendar depends on the Enochic calendar, remains of which have been preserved in the Aramaic fragments from Qumran, and which may date back to the fourth century. The festival calendar in the Temple Scroll, therefore, is later than these dates. Yet this calendar includes elements earlier than the most concrete form of the same calendar used in *Jubilees* and in other Qumranic texts, including the still imprecise manner of designating the dates of the festivals. The composition of this source of the Temple Scroll, then, should be dated to somewhere in the third or early second century BCE.

In similar fashion, the "Temple Source" contains few concrete details that may help to date it precisely. However, one apparently innocuous point may offer an indication. Column xlvi of Temple Scroll^a includes the prohibition of introducing animal skins into Jerusalem, even the hides of ritually clean ones, if they have not been sacrificed in the Temple. This text thus goes beyond Antiochus III's decree that prohibits the introduction of impure animal skins. A relationship to the Temple Scroll seems clear, although one open to interpretation; the Temple Scroll's strictest legislation can be viewed as a hardening of a previously existent norm, which would make it later, as Yadin claims. But it is equally possible that Antiochus III would have accepted only in part the requirement presented before him, imposing a measure less severe than what was demanded, which would imply the priority of the formulation as found in our text. In any case, the relationship between the two documents points to the period of the Seleucid dominion as the most plausible background for the "Temple Source."

Another source of the Temple Scroll is the block of purity laws, which contains no concrete elements pointing to a date or a specific origin. We can only cite an increased sensitivity toward purity problems as a consequence of the Antiochan crisis; the desecration of the Temple, as the center of the purity system, must have acted as a powerful catalyst. In fact, the rededication of the Temple by Judah Maccabee is presented as its purification, just as the conquest of other cities by the Maccabees is seen as a purification of the country. Moreover, the origins of the various sects and their reinterpretation of the purity rules are placed by Josephus precisely in this period, as are the disputes between Sadducees and Pharisees on the purity laws according to rabbinic tradition. The period of the Antiochan crisis provides an appropriate setting for the formulation of the ideas on purity reflected in this source.

The *midrash* on *Deuteronomy* contains in the "King's Law" some elements that point to a later dating. The discussions preceding the investiture of Simon, which ap-

pear indirectly in *1 Maccabees* 14.48, for example, may have provided the occasion for formulating the ideas found within this source.

If this be the case the relative chronology of the various sources used by the redactor of the Temple Scroll may be as follows: the festival calendar would be the oldest element, followed by the source pertaining to the purity laws, and then the *midrash* of *Deuteronomy* that includes the "King's Law."

Since this final source apparently dates back to the Maccabean period, it is obvious that the Temple Scroll's date of redaction cannot in itself precede these dates. And since, as we have indicated, the composition must be earlier than its oldest copy (4Q524, second half of the second century BCE), a date toward the mid-second century BCE seems assured.

This implies that the composition of the Temple Scroll is more or less contemporaneous with 4QMMT, and can be situated within the same priestly circles from which the Qumran community was later to emerge. According to 4QMMT, a well-defined group existed within these priestly circles. This group was already considered distinct and separate from both a hostile group (which may be defined as "proto-Pharisaic") and another, less differentiated, group (termed "proto-Sadducean"). This group would eventually end up withdrawing to the desert and forming the community of Qumran. It is here that the origins of Temple Scroll are to be found, within a group of priests who disagreed with the status quo of the existing Temple and dreamed of a future temple that would be in accordance with the divine norms. They also envisaged a cult in harmony with the revealed festival calendar, living in a Jerusalem and country where the strictest purity rules would be followed exactly and where the king's authority would be subordinate to the divine rules interpreted by the priests. And since the Temple Scroll, unlike 4QMMT, is neither presented as the work of one specific group nor directed to any other specific group, but rather to all Israel, we may presume that it was redacted sometime before 4QMMT.

Whatever the case, the anonymous person who redacted the Temple Scroll about the middle of the second century BCE, using earlier written sources, succeeded in creating one of the most interesting documents for understanding the Judaism of his period. Despite disagreements among scholars concerning specific points of interpretation and differing views on details and more general points, the importance of the Temple Scroll is unanimously acknowledged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS OF THE TEXTS

García Martínez, F., E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude. *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 20-31*. Discoveries in the Judaean

- Desert, 23. Oxford, 1998. *Editio princeps* of Temple Scroll^b and Temple Scroll^c?. See pp. 357–409, 411–414 and pls. xli–xlvi.
- García Martínez, F., and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol. 2: 4Q274–11Q31. Leiden, 1998. Bilingual edition of all copies of the Temple Scroll and related documents.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 25. Oxford, 1998. *Editio princeps* of 4Q524, pp. 85–114, plates vii–viii.
- Qimron, E. *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*. Jerusalem, 1996. Critical edition of the Hebrew text of Temple Scroll^a, completed with Temple Scroll^b, 11Q21, 4Q365a, and 4Q524, with many readings different from the *editio princeps*.
- White, S. "4QTemple?" In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, edited by H. Attridge et al. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 13. Oxford, 1994. See pages 319–333 and pls. XXXIII–XXXIV. *Editio princeps* of Temple Scroll?
- Yadin, Y. *The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols. and supplement. Jerusalem, 1983. Revised English version of the *editio princeps* of Temple Scroll^a published in Hebrew in 1977 with the title *Megillat ha-Miqdash*.

STUDIES

- Brooke, G., ed. *Temple Scroll Studies*. Journal for the Study of Pseudepigraphic Supplement, 7. Sheffield, 1989. Collection of papers presented to a symposium in Manchester, which deals with most aspects of the Temple Scroll.
- García Martínez, F. "Sources et composition du Rouleau du Temple." *Henoch* 13 (1991), 219–232. Analysis of the redaction process of the Temple Scroll.
- García Martínez, F. "A Classified Bibliography." In *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*, edited by E. Qimron, pp. 95–121. Jerusalem, 1996. A bibliography thematically arranged and complete until 1994.
- García Martínez, F. "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Perspectives on the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*, edited by Florentino García Martínez and E. Noort, pp. 230–248. Leiden, 1998. Proves that 4Q365a is not a copy of the Temple Scroll.
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement, 34. Sheffield, 1985. The first edition was published in German in 1978. A new third edition appeared in German in 1998, and included the study of the New Jerusalem.
- Qimron, E. "Chickens in the Temple Scroll (11QT^c)." *Tarbiz* 64 (1995), 473–476 [Hebrew]. First publication of Temple Scroll^c? as a copy of the Temple Scroll.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Law of the Temple Scroll and Its Provenance." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989), 85–98. Places the halakhic elements of the Temple Scroll in the context of rabbinic law.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumrân* 14/55 (1990), 435–457. Comparative analysis of the Temple Scroll and the halakhic letter from Cave 4.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Theology of the Temple Scroll." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 85 (1994), 109–123.
- Stegemann, H. "The Origins of the Temple Scroll." In *Congress Volume Jerusalem*, edited by J. A. Emerton, pp. 235–256. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, 40.
- Swanson, D. D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 14. Leiden, 1995. Detailed analysis of the relationship of the Temple Scroll to the biblical text.
- Vivian, A. *Rotolo de Tempio*. Brescia, 1990. Italian translation and commentary with special attention to the calendar and the sacrifices mentioned in the Temple Scroll.
- Wacholder, B. Z. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Hebrew Union College Monographs, 8.

- Cincinnati, 1983. Thorough but idiosyncratic treatment of the Temple Scroll as a Qumranic composition.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC, 49. Chicago, 1990. Analysis of the sources used and of the composition process leading to the redaction of the Temple Scroll.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. London, 1985. Popular presentation of the scroll.

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ
Translated from Spanish by Andrea E. Alvarez

TESTAMENT OF _____. See under latter part of name.

TESTAMENTS. A number of texts from Qumran that either mention their speakers as figures from Israel's ancestral period or can be logically assigned to such persons have been designated at one time or another by those who have commented on them as *testaments*. They include works attributed to Jacob (Apocryphon of Jacob, 4Q537), Levi (Aramaic Levi, 1Q21, Aramaic Levi^{a-c}, 4Q213–214), Judah (Testament of Judah[?], 3Q7, Apocryphon of Judah, 4Q538), Naphtali (Testament of Naphtali, 4Q215), Joseph (Apocryphon of Joseph, 4Q539), Kohath (Testament of Qahat, 4Q542), and Amram (Visions of Amram^{a-f}[?], 4Q543–548). This article assesses the reasons for and the legitimacy of designating each text as a testament, and considers the possible role in the life of the community played by some of these texts that are closely associated with one another principally by reason of subject matter.

A testament is defined not by specific content but by its narrative framework. The subject matter of testaments varies considerably and cannot be used to establish the presence of the genre; although a testament often includes the speaker's narration of events and visions from his life, exhortations to his children, and eschatological predictions regarding his descendants (e.g., *Testament of Levi*), in some cases only one or two of these elements appear (e.g., *Testament of Asher*; *Testament of Job*; *Testament of Moses*). By contrast, the narrative framework of testamentary literature is relatively consistent. A testament is almost always a first-person deathbed address, which is introduced by a description of the context for the address and concluded by a narration of the speaker's death (Collins, 1984).

Two of the Qumran works labeled *testaments* seem to possess at least some aspects of this narrative framework. They are the works attributed to Kohath (4Q542) and Amram (4Q543–548). Although the remains of the Testament of Qahat (an Aramaic text in Hasmonean script) provide neither an introduction certifying the context as a deathbed speech by Kohath nor a concluding narration of Kohath's death, the text that survives makes it clear