

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**



**"A Nation Of Priests"  
The World-View of The *Temple Scroll*  
and its Application to the Way of Life Prescribed in the Sectarian Scrolls from Qumran**

**Maria Mamfredis**

**A Thesis  
in  
the Department  
of  
Religion**

**Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

**August 2000**

**© Maria Mamfredis, 2000**



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-54387-0

Canada



## ABSTRACT

"A Nation of Priests" The World-View of the *Temple Scroll* and its Application to the Way of Life Prescribed in the Sectarian Scrolls from Qumran

Maria Mamfredis, Ph.D.  
Concordia University, 2000

Too often in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls is dismissed as minimal, or non-existent due to one of two general lines of reasoning. The first line of reasoning begins with the premise that whereas the *Temple Scroll* is concerned for the most part with laws pertaining to the construction and maintenance of the ideal Temple the sectarian scrolls are concerned with the laws pertaining to a particular community or communities. It is assumed that, just as the *Temple Scroll* shows no concern with the creation or maintenance of a community without a Temple, so too the sectarian scrolls betray little or no interest with the running of the Temple. The second line of reasoning assumes that a relationship may exist, but in this case the *Temple Scroll* is seen as prescribing an eschatological ideal, whether this is the Temple or the Law for the Land.

My thesis contends that the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls is both immediate and intimate. It argues that the specific world-view introduced by the *Temple Scroll* is evident in the sectarian scrolls and that this very world-view is essential for creating the framework upon which the way of life prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is modeled.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is dedicated to my family for their unconditional love, support and encouragement. To my mother, Irene Yiassemi Mamfredis, my father, Demetrios Mamfredis, my sister, Vouli Mamfredis, my husband Yaakov Goldhacker, and my daughter, Maytar, who, by her every word and action fills my life with joy and wonder.

This work would not have been possible without the help and support of many people. First of all I want to thank my advisor Professor Jack Lightstone for his insight, encouragement and never-ending patience not only during the time spent working and reading every section of my thesis but from the beginning of my graduate studies. He taught me how to learn, how "to describe the familiar so as to make it appear strange, problematic, and requiring explanation" (Lightstone *Society* 19). Without his help none of this could have been accomplished. I want to thank Professor Frederick Bird who over the years has always found the time to help me with working out my ideas and developing lines of thought which, even to me, often appeared convoluted, for reading my thesis and providing invaluable advice and for always recommending the perfect reading material. I want to thank Professor Michel Despland for his kindness and support and I want to thank both him and Professor Ira Robinson who were always there to answer my questions. I want to thank Professor Michael Oppenheim and Professor Leslie Orr for their advice and support and Professor Norma Joseph and Rabbi Howard Joseph for introducing me to the subject of Judaic studies and for making it so exciting for me from the start. I also want to thank Rabbi Pinchas Giller for his much needed and appreciated encouragement at the very start of my graduate studies. I want to thank all my friends and colleagues in the Department of Religion at Concordia University all of whom provided a comfortable and inspirational environment. In particular I want to thank Johanne Rabbat and Marlene

Bonneau who were always available to lend support and encouragement and Tina Montandon and Munit Merid who smoothed out every day's rough spots. Finally I want to thank my students whose excitement for the progress of my work and confidence in my abilities was such a wonderful incentive. I am also grateful to the Fonds pour la Formation de Chercheurs at l'Aide a la Recherche, (FCAR), for their financial support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transliterations .....	viii
Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION	
1. Introduction .....	1
2. Criteria and Methodology .....	10
3. Review of the Literature .....	12
4. My Response .....	28
5. Dating the <i>Temple Scroll</i> .....	31
6. Relevance of Dating to my Study .....	37
7. Summary of the Chapters .....	39
Chapter 2. THE <i>TEMPLE SCROLL</i>	
1. Introduction .....	42
2. Temple Plans .....	46
3. The <i>Temple Scroll</i> is to the Sectarians as the Mishnah is to Rabbinic Judaism ..	53
4. The World-View of the <i>Temple Scroll</i> .....	59
5. The Covenant with Jacob at Bethel .....	99
6. The Process of Initiation .....	112
7. Conclusion .....	128
Chapter 3. THE COMMUNITY OF THE SCROLLS	
1. Introduction .....	132
2. Methodology: The Use of Empirical Studies .....	133
3. Westhues' Study and its Application to the Sectarian Scrolls .....	138

4. Kanter's Study and its Application to the Sectarian Scrolls .....	153
5. The Community of the Scrolls .....	163
6. Communication of Holiness in the Sectarian Scrolls .....	168
A. Methodology .....	168
B. Literature as Communication .....	171
C. Hierarchy as Communication .....	177
D. Systems of Reward and Punishment as Communication .....	183
7. Conclusion and Summary .....	187
Chapter 4. THE SACRIFICIAL CULT AT QUMRAN	
1. Introduction .....	192
2. The Temple Cult in the Scrolls: A Summary .....	195
3. The Sacrificial Cult in Ancient Judaism .....	199
4. The Sacrificial Cult in the Sectarian Scrolls .....	202
5. The Community as Temple and as Offering in the Sectarian Scrolls .....	210
6. Conclusion .....	229
Chapter 5. CONCLUSION .....	237
Bibliography .....	249
Appendix 1 .....	257
Appendix 2 .....	267

## Transliterations

𐤏 = '	𐤌 = l
𐤁 = b	𐤍 𐤎 = m
𐤂 = g	𐤏 𐤎 = n
𐤃 = d	𐤐 = S
𐤄 = h	𐤑 = '
𐤅 = w	𐤒, 𐤓 = p
𐤆 = z	𐤔 𐤕 = ts
𐤇 = ch	𐤖 = q
𐤈 = T	𐤗 = r
𐤉 = y	𐤘 = s
𐤊 𐤋 = k	𐤙 = t

Adapted from Lightstone (*Society* xiii)

## Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1. Introduction

This study is an exploration of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and other scrolls, those generally recognized as sectarian, from Qumran. Too often, as will be outlined further down, the relationship between these sectarian scrolls and the *Temple Scroll* has been dismissed as minimal. The reasons usually given are in some sense based on what is perceived as a lack of common concerns. The *Temple Scroll* is clearly concerned, in large part, with the building and running of the Temple. The sectarian scrolls are clearly concerned with laws relating to the running of a community or communities and, for the most part, *appear* to exhibit a lack of interest for the concerns so central to the *Temple Scroll*. Assumptions such as these, however, are based on investigations of all these scrolls, including the *Temple Scroll*, which, although they present us with unparalleled analysis of the details often do so at the expense of the larger picture, the world view, which each of these scrolls takes as a given. The central concern of the present study, then, is just such an investigation of that which is assumed in each of these scrolls, that which is implicit: the world view upon which the structure, organization, identity and hierarchy of the community being outlined in these scrolls is based. This world-view, as will be shown, originates in the *Temple Scroll*.

In *Society, the Sacred and Scripture in Ancient Judaism*, Jack Lightstone discusses the need to recognize "the implicit meanings (which) remain distinct from the particular content" (5). He then explains the need to "explore *how* what is ... communicated appears to be self-evidently appropriate within its socio-cultural setting" (5 italics added). To this end he turns to Clifford Geertz:

C. Geertz in his treatment of religion 'as a cultural system' proposes that religious knowledge finds its rationality in a mutually confirming relationship with other aspects of the cultural system. He states:

In religious belief and practice a group's ethos is rendered intellectually reasonable by being shown to represent a way of life ideally adapted to the actual state of affairs the world-view describes, while the world view is rendered emotionally convincing by being presented as an image of an actual state of affairs peculiarly well arranged to accommodate such a way of life. This confrontation and mutual confirmation has two fundamental effects. On the one hand, it objectivizes moral and aesthetic preferences by depicting them as the imposed conditions of life implicit in a world with a particular structure, as mere common sense given the unalterable shape of reality. On the other hand, it supports these received beliefs about the world's body by invoking deeply felt moral and aesthetic sentiments as experiential evidence for their truth. Religious symbols formulate a basic congruence between a particular style of life and a specific (if, most often, implicit) metaphysic, and in so doing sustain each with the borrowed authority of the other (Geertz "Religion as Cultural System," in M. Banton, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion* London: Tavistock, 1966, 3-4)

Geertz here makes four theoretical points germane to our enterprise. First, the beliefs and practices of religion are integrally related to style of life, or ethos, on the one hand, and to world-view, on the other. Second, he describes these relationships as one of 'congruence.' Third, these beliefs and practices *implicitly* communicate a 'metaphysic,' or 'world-view.' Fourth, this congruence of religion, style of life and world-view correlates with strong collective sentiments of an aesthetic and moral nature. Fifth, the overall effect is to 'sustain,' that is, to render plausible, both world-



view, on the one hand, and style of life, on the other (5-6).

In this examination I will show that it is the *Temple Scroll* which provides the 'world-view' upon which the 'ethos' or 'style of life' modeled in the sectarian scrolls is founded. The 'beliefs' and 'practices' of the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls 'implicitly' communicate the 'world-view' introduced in the *Temple Scroll*. "The overall effect is to 'sustain,' that is, to render plausible, both world-view, on the one hand, and style of life, on the other" (Lightstone 6).

The scrolls which concern me in this study, in addition to the *Temple Scroll* (11QT), are those sectarian scrolls which purport to inform us about the origins and purpose of a particular community, the organization and structure of this community and the requirements for membership. These include the *Damascus Document* (CD), the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *Rule of the Congregation* (or *Messianic Rule* 1QSa), *MMT* (4Q399), and *4QFloreligium* (4Q174). I will also be dealing with other sectarian scrolls to a lesser extent. These scrolls either explicitly concern themselves with the discussion of the rules of a specific community or tacitly refer to these same rules in descriptions of different aspects of this community. In either case they all advocate a very stringent application of a particular interpretation of the biblical laws of purity and ritual which are traditionally understood to apply only to priests within the context of the performance of the Temple cult. This very stringent interpretation is transferred, in the case of the scrolls, to the entire Community of the scrolls outside of the context of the existing Temple in Jerusalem or its cult. Ideally, for the scrolls, this very stringent interpretation would apply, and will one day apply, to all of Israel, both the Land and the People. These scrolls provide the, to use Clifford Geertz's word, "ought" for the community. In discussing religion Geertz has explained:

The holy bears within it everywhere a sense of intrinsic obligation: it not only encourages devotion, it demands it; it not only induces intellectual assent, it enforces emotional commitment. Never merely metaphysics, religion is never merely ethics either. The source of its moral vitality is conceived to lie in the fidelity with which it expresses the fundamental nature of reality. The powerfully coercive "ought" is felt to grow out of a comprehensive factual "is," and in such a way religion grounds the most specific requirements of human action in the most general contexts of human existence. (Geertz *Interpretation* 126)

These particular scrolls then are the "ought" of the Community, the ideal. How close to this ideal did the lived reality of this Community correspond we cannot say for certain. In Chapter Three, "The Community Of The Scrolls," I deal with this issue. I investigate the Community as prescribed in the sectarian scrolls in terms of those characteristics and mechanisms discovered through empirical studies as "ideal requisites" for the formation and maintenance of alternative communities. I make use of two specific studies, first of all Kenneth Westhues' analysis of the formation of countercultures, *Society's shadow: Studies in the Sociology of Countercultures*, as well as Rosabeth Moss Kanter's article, "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities" in Westhues' book. If the rules of the community prescribed by the scrolls correspond to these characteristics and mechanisms then, I argue, it is likely that the sectarian scrolls were meant to provide instructions for a concrete community. Further, I argue, that if the behavioral characteristics of real alternative communities and the mechanisms shown to contribute to successful utopian communities are central to the structure of the community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls it is highly probable that these scrolls are not merely *prescribing* but also *describing* the intended reality of the lived community.

Such an investigation of the sectarian scrolls themselves becomes necessary in understanding the sectarian community in large part because the material evidence of the archaeological site believed by most to be the remains of the community responsible for the scrolls has not yet provided us with any conclusive answers as to the details of the lived reality of the community. Any information gleaned from this material has been interpreted in ways which often speak more of the interpreter's assumptions and/or belief system. However there is little disagreement, with a few exceptions to be discussed further down, amongst those who study the scrolls as to the fact that much of this sectarian literature (again with some exceptions) contains within it that which the sect considered to be the ideal design for the community, the "ought." My concern in this study is the relationship between this "ought" and the "is," the "reality" which the "ought" is supposed to represent. I will show that this "reality," this world-view which provides the basis from within which the "ought," the ideal social structure as well as identity of the community are understood to originate as well as of which they are understood to be representative and, in turn, reflect is the *Temple Scroll*.

Discovering that which provides the blueprint for the organization, identity and hierarchy of the community will help us to understand the logic of the community. But furthermore such a study can help to situate this community within the wider study of other Second Temple communities for which the Temple, or some expansion of the Temple as symbol, is the ideal upon which lived reality must be modeled and also the standard by which lived reality is measured.

I will show that the sectarian scrolls present us with the evidence that the community sees itself as the Temple. The community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls has replicated not only the ritual activities of the Temple cult within its every day life but it has also modeled

its social structure and organization after the physical architecture of the ideal Temple. This includes a vocabulary which originates in Temple architecture as well as in the Temple cult but which is here used to designate social entities whether structures of organization, figures of authority, systems of reward and punishment as well as the process of initiation into the community and, especially, the function for which this community is intended.

In Chapter Four, "The Sacrificial Cult At Qumran," I demonstrate that this does not mean that the need for the physical Temple has disappeared. Despite the replacement of the cult and despite the Community's belief that the physical performance of the cult alone is ineffectual without the requisite humility and willingness to be purified by the Truth, as the Community understands it, the Community documents also repeatedly indicate the belief that the ideal is comprised of living according to this Truth but also according to the precepts concerning *all* of God's laws, and these must include the plan for a valid Temple and cult. The optimal situation would include a valid Temple within which is practised a valid cult controlled by those to whom the blueprint for both has been vouchsafed for the simple reason that *all* of God's laws have to be observed. In the meantime the community lives according to the laws of purity which they will someday apply to the Temple. However, as I will repeatedly emphasize throughout this investigation, this meantime is not perceived by the Community as being, in any practical way, less potent or effective than the performance of the physical cult in a physical Temple. The observance of these laws and the execution of the ritualized activity representing the activity of the Temple cult is understood by the Community to be as effective in the real world in real time as will be the performance of the cult in the valid Temple.

The question of the possible relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian Community at Qumran has been of concern from the earliest days of the discovery of the

*Temple Scroll* for a number of reasons. Among the first in order of importance would have to be the possibility held out by the discovery of the scroll that it contains the law or the conditions for the covenant with which, at the very least, the religious experts of the community of the sectarian scrolls and, at the very most, all of Israel are meant to be familiar. In the sectarian scrolls the existence of just such a law is discussed both explicitly (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:393-397) and implicitly. The explicit identifications include, according to Yadin,: 1) the mention of the Book of *Hagu* in both the *Damascus Document* as well as the *Community Rule* (i.e. CDC x:4-6, xiii:2-3 and xiv:6-8; 1QSa i:6-8 discussed in *Temple* 1983 1:393-394); 2) the "Sealed Book of the Law" in the *Damascus Document* (CDC v:1-5 in *Temple* 1983 1:394-395); and, 3) the "Book of the Second Law" in the *Pesher on Psalms* (DJD IV 11 6-8 and 13-14 in *Temple* 1983 1:396-397)

The discovery of a document containing the Law of the sect would prove of great service in the study of the scrolls in at least two ways: first, it is well known that due to the ravages of time many of the scrolls exist as fragments. Even those which have been found more intact are missing sections, large or small, the absence of which frustrates attempts to read the scrolls and, as Yigael Yadin has observed, "...the gaps occur in the most inconvenient places" (*Temple* 1985 227). Discovering the community's law could help to fill in some of these lacunae as well as provide a key to help in the interpretive reconstruction of those sections where knowing the intended meaning of a section may lead to properly replacing a missing letter, word or phrase. The second way that such a discovery could be of help would be in the opportunity it would provide for us to understand the community of the scrolls: their world view, their purpose and their motivation. It would provide for us the "is", the ultimate reality upon which they are modelling their lived reality. Such a discovery would yield the foundation for the community's belief structure as well as a framework for the community's social organization. Mary Douglas has said that:

the logical patterning in which social relations are ordered affords a bias in the classification of nature, and that in this bias is to be found the confident intuition of self evident truth. And here, in this intuition, is the most hidden and inaccessible implicit assumption on which all other knowledge is grounded. It is the ultimate instrument of domination, protected from inspection by every warm emotion that commits the knower to the social system in which his knowledge is guaranteed. Only one who feels coolly towards that society can question its self-evident propositions (Douglas *Implicit Meanings* 209 also cited in Lightstone *Society* 7).

The discovery of the "is," that upon which the community's "ought," is grounded would therefore provide the blueprint according to which the community is implicitly as well as explicitly organized. Jack Lightstone has added to Douglas' discussion in order to expand beyond the "classification of nature to include all structured patterning of the world and of objects in it, including highly patterned texts." (*Society* 7) It is his contention, with which I agree and which I adopt in this treatment, that "the more patterned systems in the cultural setting which structurally mirror one another, the stronger will be the sense of self-evidence guaranteeing any one patterned system." (*Society* 8) That, as Lightstone explains,

these consistent patterns encode meaning (as does language) and thereby make statements about how the world is, about the location of the group in that world, about the nature of the interaction within and among realms in that world. In other words, these patterns convey and constitute knowledge of the topography of the socially constructed world and of relationships and processes within that topography. Scripture, once adopted as such, ostensibly provided the immutable, official map of things (*Society* x).

My study agrees that the scripture adopted by a community, especially when, as in this case,

it takes the form of revelation and when this revelation is prescriptive, provides "the immutable, official map of things" (*Society x*). My study argues that, in addition to the canonical Torah of Moses, the *Temple Scroll* is the scripture upon which the structure, organization and norms of the Community as described and prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is modeled.

## 2. Criteria and Methodology

I propose two groups of criteria which must be met in order for my thesis to be proven. The first group includes finding similarities between the *Temple Scroll* and the other sectarian scrolls under consideration in the following: a) figures and/or objects of authority; b) definitions and uses of terms, such as, i.e., Israel, covenant, purity, sacrifice, priest etc., particularly as these relate to obligations and actions in the real world and the result of such actions; and, c) core concerns. By core concerns I understand what Ben Zion Wacholder (*The Dawn of Qumran* 15) explains in discussing the *Temple Scroll*: "the author appears to have invested most of his efforts in subject matter that interested him, thus the laws of ritual impurity and ecclesiastical perquisites form the core of the *Temple Scroll*." I will show that it is these same concerns which are at the centre of the sectarian scrolls.

The second group of criteria which would have to be met would act as a safeguard against the danger of finding 'evidence' of common concerns between the *Temple Scroll* and other sectarian documents which may not be exclusive to these two groups of documents but which may be common to Second Temple Judaism(s). Since the goal of this thesis is to prove the connection between the *Temple Scroll* and the community responsible for the sectarian scrolls at Qumran concerns which are part of the common backdrop of Second Temple Judaism would not serve as proof. As such it becomes necessary to introduce a set of criteria which, when examined in conjunction with the first group, would prove that the *Temple Scroll* was necessary to the development of the particular understanding of the world which exists within the sectarian scrolls and the community's view of its own purpose within such a world. Part of this second group of criteria has already been introduced by Yigael Yadin. He has stated that "In general, the connection of the scroll with the writings of the sect is perceptible from the nature of the laws contained in it, as well as from the use of



terms peculiar to the sect." (*Temple* 1983 1:398) My investigation would build upon the foundation laid down by Yadin and others and would include the following: First of all a brief examination of the laws which exist in the *Temple Scroll* as well as in other sectarian documents which are either unknown to contemporary groups or stand in opposition to the prevailing interpretation(s) of the time. Yigael Yadin as well as others have indicated the existence of such laws. Further exploration of these laws and their implications for the self-understanding of the community will also help to support my thesis. My exploration will include not only the laws concerning ritual purity but also the laws concerning Temple architecture as prescribed in the *Temple Scroll*, especially as these relate to the physical layout of the courts and the requirements of purity associated with each. As stated above I will show that the Temple as discussed in the *Temple Scroll* in terms of ritual, world-view as well as architecture provides the blueprint for the community of the sectarian scrolls.

The most important part of this second set of criteria, however, is concerned with the world-view of the *Temple Scroll* as well as the world-view of the sectarian scrolls. My investigation of the *Temple Scroll* will show that it introduces a very specific and particular understanding of the coalition of cult and covenant as well as a new understanding as to how this combination affects the obligation of the People of Israel to God. I will explore the sectarian scrolls under consideration in order to see if this same understanding can be shown to exist in them. In particular to see if we can find specific concepts, activities and structures which betray an implicit knowledge and acceptance of just such a world-view as is introduced in the *Temple Scroll*. My investigation of the world-view of the sectarian scrolls will show that it is the same world-view which is introduced in the *Temple Scroll*, and that such a world-view is necessary for the creation and maintenance of the Community of the sectarian scrolls. I will show that the way of life of the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is supported by this world-view. That there is between the two a

relationship of "congruence" (*Lightstone Society* 6) and that "the overall effect is to 'sustain,' that is, to render plausible, both world-view, on the one hand, and style of life, on the other" (*Lightstone Society* 6).

### 3. Review of the Literature

A number of other studies have also examined the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian documents from Qumran. The most common conclusions reached by these must be briefly discussed before proceeding. Yigael Yadin, the first to have studied the *Temple Scroll* since antiquity as well as the first editor of a contemporary publication considers the possibility that the scroll, even if composed by the Qumran sect, "also embodies - to a greater or lesser extent - the teachings of a wider movement, which is not (strictly speaking) a sect, one from which the Qumran sect developed in the course of time." (*Temple* 1983 1:398) However the *Temple Scroll* is in his opinion not merely a part of the corpus of sectarian literature of the community at Qumran but its "basic 'Torah'." He explains:

the Temple scroll was in fact the basic 'Torah' of the Essenes, and was referred to by them as the Book of *Hagu* - which had to be 'meditated upon' and in which all had to be 'instructed' - or as the Second Torah, a Book of the Second Law which had been revealed only to the sect, and which was considered by them accordingly as 'canonical'. The revelation had come to the founder of the sect, Zadok. It would be legitimate, then, to suggest that our scroll was really the hidden 'Torah' of the Essenes, as holy to them as the canonical Torah (*Temple* 1985 229).

The arguments upon which he bases the above will be discussed at some length later. It is necessary however to indicate at this point that, despite the fact that my study accepts that many of the scrolls found at Qumran were produced by and for a particular community this

community does not have to be the Essenes. Nor is it an essential component of my study to prove or disprove the identification of the community with the Essenes. For our purposes it is sufficient that the sectarian scrolls are written by and for a particular community which is separate from the remainder of Israel. A community for which the scrolls are prescriptive and, I will show, to a large extent, descriptive.

The question of whether or not the *Temple Scroll* is a sectarian document of the Qumran Community has been subsequently debated by a number of other scholars. There are rarely clear boundaries separating these scholars into clearly defined groups. Rather we usually see a range of opinions building upon each other even in disagreement. There are however a few exceptions. Dwight D. Swanson, for one, sees the *Temple Scroll* as a polemic against the Qumran sectarians. His argument is based on the hypothesis that 11QT 29:10 "like the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel," is a polemic against Jer. 31:32 which states: "not like the covenant which I made with their fathers" ("A Covenant Just Like Jacob's' the Covenant of 11QT 29 and Jeremiah's New Covenant" 273). He asserts that the *Temple Scroll* argues against the schism represented by the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Damascus Document*, both of which, in his view, champion the idea that Jer. 31:32 introduces a new covenant or a new interpretation of the covenant which supersedes the one of the ancestors (280-284). The problem with his argument is that one *must* accept 11QT 29:10 as being a polemic against Jer. 31:32 and those who understood the latter as a new covenant otherwise the argument fails. Swanson has not proven his case that Second Temple Jewish groups would in fact have understood this reference as being a polemic. In his conclusion he claims:

this survey of the literature indicates that Jeremiah 31 was understood by some groups of people, from an early date, to speak of a complete break with the past - of a 'new' rather than 'renewed' covenant. ... the writer of Hebrews understood as

clearly as the redactor of the *Temple Scroll* that Jeremiah spoke of discontinuity with the old covenant (286).

However, other than discussing the citing of Jer 31:31-34 in Hebrews 8 in the New Testament, he has not provided any evidence that this was an issue to contemporary Jewish groups. Nor has he presented a convincing argument that this was in fact the issue of concern in 11QT 29:10. In addition too much of his argument is based on his assumption that certain conclusions reached by other scholars are correct. These conclusions, if one were to follow the different lines of reasoning, are very often tenuous at best. Lastly in placing so much importance on what he perceives to be a direct reference to Jer.31 and on what he perceives to be its implications he appears to be disregarding, by providing a mere passing mention to, the much more obvious connection between 11QT 29:10 and Leviticus 26:42. It is in this section of Leviticus of course where God explains that after Israel has been punished for their iniquity and they have atoned: "Then I will remember My covenant with Jacob; I will remember also My covenant with Isaac, and also My covenant with Abraham; and I will remember the land." M.O. Wise's explanation (discussed further down) of the passage in 11QT 29:10 as: "God promised them his presence and the land; in exchange they were to worship and obey him," (Wise *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* 161) is more in keeping with the core concerns of the *Temple Scroll*.

Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls*, does not believe that there is evidence of any sect at Qumran let alone one which was responsible for the scrolls. His 'proof' includes the absence of 'autographs,' by these he means letters or documents which were written in the hand of the person to whom these were original (46). He argues against the identification of the site with the Essenes, seeing in this an attempt to force the evidence to comply with pre-existing assumptions (16-18). In fact in a related discussion of 4QMMT

he builds an argument that the ideas presented in it as well as the tone in which it is written conform the most to the Pharisees "less with that attributed to the Essenes, and least with that of the Sadducees." (195-199) In building this argument he never acknowledges that his reliance on Josephus exclusively as *the* authority about the Essenes and Sadducees may be problematic. In addition his argument that the caves served as a safe repository for the texts of a *variety* of Jewish groups is based on his attack of the belief that *one* sect (ie: the Essenes) was responsible for all the scrolls at Qumran. He believes that a one-sect theory assumes "that all of the literature of first century Palestine Jews other than the Essenes had simply disappeared" (104), and he asks, why did not other Jews similarly hide their manuscripts in caves? (104). His dispute is in large part with the personalities involved in Qumran research and what he considers to be unfounded assumptions. As a result he often appears to be inattentive to the evidence of the scrolls themselves. For example in his attempt to disprove the one-sect theory and prove the multiple origin theory for the scrolls he disregards the similarities which are clearly evident in those scrolls commonly attributed to the sect.

Neil Asher Silberman (*The Hidden Scrolls Christianity, Judaism, & the War for the Dead Sea Scrolls*) has not written extensively on the scrolls. His book on the Dead Sea Scrolls provides a survey of the history of the discovery of the scrolls, some of the most interesting characters within that history as well as some of the better known theories as to the identity of the community of the scrolls as well as the meaning of the scrolls. His argument is based in large part on Robert Eisenman's understanding of the scrolls and he makes his own bias clear early on in his book:

I had come to New York with the highest regard for the scholars that Eisenman had been relentlessly attacking and had been convinced that Eisenman was nothing more than a troublemaking gadfly. Yet as we talked, I recognized how Eisenman honed in

precisely on the dubious assumptions, shaky logic, simplistic readings of ancient sources, and pseudo-scientific dating methods for handwriting that supported the whole superstructure of Qumran research (22).

It also becomes clearly evident that his support of Eisenman's theories is in large part his motivation for writing this book. I include him here because of his discussion of Robert Eisenman's theory as to the mis-dating of the scrolls. However beyond his stated agenda he occasionally speaks eloquently about other issues concerning the study of the scrolls. Here, for example, he discusses the symbolism inherent in the ideal vision of Ezekiel's Temple: "Just as the ritual calendar was meant to represent the divine division of time, this ideal temple,..., was meant both to represent and embody the divinely decreed articulation of sacred space" (165). The same could of course be said about the Temple described in the *Temple Scroll* and Silberman agrees: "the Temple Scroll contains an amazingly comprehensive vision of the order of time, space, and leadership" (167). Silberman appears to accept the possibility that the Qumran community was aware of and influenced by the *Temple Scroll*. Unfortunately he becomes too engrossed with proving Robert Eisenman's theory that the Qumran scrolls as well as the sect have been mis-dated and that they in fact originate not in the Hasmonean but in the Herodian period. Had he not been so engrossed perhaps he would have taken the opportunity to explore the implications of the community having access to a scroll, the *Temple Scroll*, which, in his own words, provided them with such an "amazingly comprehensive vision of the order of time, space, and leadership." As it is his concern with re-dating the scrolls results in his view that:

The latter-day scholarly idea that Essenes of Qumran rejected the Temple worship because they had perfected a more spiritual ritual is nonsense. Visions of the Temple were dreams of Judean independence. And many believed that the messianic age would come only when righteous priests reformed and purified Temple observance - and had deposed the clique of soulless empty suits who called

themselves High Priests (169).

He continues:

In their apocalyptic message, the scrolls give a voice to a group that felt dispossessed and disenfranchised in a world turned upside down. They express a rage against invaders and contempt for collaborators, who are only interested in personal gain. In reaction and in defense, they wrap their community in a defensive cocoon of national laws and traditions (255).

At least two problems lie at the foundation of Silberman's discussion and they both have to do with methodology. First he presents his theories without supportive evidence from the scrolls. One usually does not know which passage he is discussing and therefore one does not know why or how Silberman has arrived at his particular interpretation. Second it soon becomes evident that many of the ideas and beliefs which he is ascribing to 'the scrolls' or to 'the community' originate in the *War Scroll*. There is a problem with assuming that the lived reality of the Community can be found in this one document which in fact concerns itself with anything but the everyday lived reality of the Community. He is of-course echoing Eisenman's own ideas about the militant nature of the Community:

This elite seems to have inhabited 'desert camps', where they were actually 'preparing' to be joined by the Angels, referred to by them as 'the Heavenly Host', and for what appears to be a final apocalyptic Holy War against all evil on this earth. This would appear to be the reason they are practising the regimen of extreme purity in the wilderness in these texts... This movement consists of a small cadre of committed 'volunteers' or 'Joiners for war', of 'Holy Ones' or 'Saints' - Messianic 'shock-troops' if one prefers - preparing in the wilderness through 'Perfection of the Way' and 'zeal for the Law for the time of the Day of Vengeance' (Eisenman, Robert and Michael Wise *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* 11-12).

Hans Burgmann ("11QT: The Sadducean Torah") does not believe that the *Temple Scroll*, other than for the short section of 11QT 29:7-10 which deals with the eschatological building of the Temple by God, is a sectarian creation (258). He believes that the sectarian documents show a community which believes itself to be the Temple of God and which, therefore, by his reasoning can have "no need for any other Temple." (259) and can therefore not be responsible for the creation of a document which deals exclusively with the Temple. His reasoning betrays a profound misunderstanding of the sectarian documents, for which living as the Temple in the present does not preclude the desire for the ideal Temple in the future. It also betrays a profound misunderstanding of the *Temple Scroll* which lends itself to an application of the Temple purity and sanctity laws to the People of Israel and therefore to the Community of the scrolls apart from contact with the Temple. But even beyond this the methodology used by Burgmann is questionable. For example, his major argument as to the non-sectarian nature of the *Temple Scroll* is based on the fact that its laws do not correspond to what Josephus has to say about the Essenes therefore, in his view, it can not be a sectarian document.

Lawrence Schiffman does not see a direct connection between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. He believes that the *Temple Scroll* predates the sect and that its sources "stem from the Sadducean heritage of those who founded the sect." (Schiffman "The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of Its Law: The Status of the Question" 47-48) In other words for Schiffman any similarities which can be seen to exist between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls are due solely to the fact that both originate from within groups which can be traced to common ancestors. Part of this view is not inconsistent with my thesis: whether or not the *Temple Scroll* is a document which originated from within the community responsible for the sectarian documents is irrelevant to my discussion. My



position is that, no matter what its provenance, the *Temple Scroll* was held by the Community as canonical.

I can see two points of disagreement between my thesis and Lawrence Schiffman's work. The first issue of Schiffman's theory with which I find myself to be in disagreement originates from my conviction that the *Temple Scroll*, was held as canonical by the Community. As such it became for them the "is," the reality which their "ought," their ideal perception of organization, structure and morality is meant to reflect. Schiffman, in the following observation, exhibits the essence of my disagreement with his opinion on this issue:

The *Temple Scroll* concerns matters that are, for the most part, not treated elsewhere in the scrolls. Although the sacrificial service and the sanctuary were not part of the life of the sect, the scroll nonetheless seeks to define their details. Ironically, the *Temple Scroll* is curiously silent about carrying on Temple practice through observing ritual purity in everyday life, a central concern of the sect (Schiffman *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* 258).

As already mentioned I contend that the *Temple Scroll* does concern itself with the idea of purity and sanctity of the People Israel in everyday life even apart from the Temple. I will also show that "the sacrificial service and the sanctuary," were in fact part of the life of the sect.

Even though Schiffman believes that the community of the sectarian documents is living in a state of preparation for the end times in his discussion of the *Manual of Discipline*, also known as the *Community Rule* (1QS), (in *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*) he appears to be arguing very much as I do for the need to understand the lived reality of the community as the actual, not metaphorical, application of the laws of purity and

requirements of perfection:

After all, the sect saw itself as living on the verge of the end of days and must have attempted to realize in the sectarian life of the *Manual* the very same level of perfection and purity which was to characterize the future age. The community described in the *Manual* is an attempt to create messianic conditions, even before the coming of the eschaton, and to realize the sectarians' dream of the future in the present (9).

However, for Schiffman, the ultimate perfection is to be achieved in the end of days. He sees the activity of the community as prescribed in the sectarian scrolls as an imitation of the ideal:

If the ultimate perfection was to be achieved in the end of days, then the life of the sectarian in this world would have to be an imitation, however pale, of those ideals. Like all Jewish groups of the Second Commonwealth, the sectarians of Qumran dreamed of a better future, one which would make possible the proper observance of the law as they interpreted it, one which would strengthen the bond between the Israelites and their creator and Lawgiver, a life of purity and perfection (*Eschatological* 10).

Jacob Neusner, in a discussion which is relevant to our present topic, (in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Israel*) comments upon his reasons for avoiding the use of the word "ritual" as an adjective to create such terms as "ritual purity" and "ritual impurity." He explains:

It first requires the definition of 'ritual' and implies a distinction between 'ritual' and something-other-than-ritual - 'substantive,' 'real,' or 'moral,' for example. So that distinction in our culture will carry in its wake the assertion that 'ritual' stands against 'real' or 'substantive,' 'meaningful' or 'actual,' as though for the ancient Israelite 'ritual impurity' were somehow not real or substantive or actual, as if it bore

no material meaning. But if impurity has concrete and important effects in practical, everyday affairs, and if a concrete act ('ritual') of purification has to be undertaken to remove those effects, then it hardly constitutes something not real, substantive, or actual (Neusner 1973, 1).

I have no problem with using the word 'ritual' as an adjective as long as that which it describes is understood within the context of the particular community under investigation. Neusner's explanation, however, is germane to understanding the difficulty I have with those interpretations of the sectarian scrolls which make a distinction between "ritual" or "symbolic" action and "real" or "substantive" action. The scrolls themselves do not make such a distinction and neither can we. Lawrence Schiffman appears to be coming close to such a distinction in his above cited discussion (*Eschatological* 10). This is especially obvious when he contrasts "the ultimate perfection," of the end days to the pale "imitation" of those ideals as exhibited in the life of the Community. I will show that the community believed that "ultimate perfection was to be achieved" not in the end of days but in the present. Therefore, my second point of disagreement with Lawrence Schiffman is that I contend that the particular manifestation of the Temple cult, including its laws of ritual purity, which is exhibited in the sectarian scrolls was not held to be less efficacious by the Community than was the Temple cult.

Hartmut Stegemann agrees with Yadin that the *Temple Scroll* was intended as the sixth book of the Torah "and with the same level of authority." ("The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status in Qumran" 127) However he does not believe that one can see evidence of any connection at all "between the Qumran community and the composition of the Temple Scroll; it must have been composed quite independently of that specific group of Second Temple Judaism" ("The Literary..." 127) He believes the *Temple Scroll* is a collection of priestly material which was not included in the Pentateuch. This material was

collected by a member (members) of a priestly family living in Jerusalem. This sixth book of Torah was written for all of Israel with Jerusalem at its centre. Unlike the spirit of the sectarian scrolls from Qumran Stegemann explains that "the spirit of the Temple Scroll is not yet separatistic, but includes the whole of Israel as a homogenous entity" ("The Literary..." 131). However an argument could be made that the sectarian scrolls are not in the strictest sense separatistic either. In fact they express a desire that all of Israel will return to the proper understanding of the covenant with God. Before we can fully explore the "spirit of the *Temple Scroll*" or any of the documents it is necessary to understand their own definitions of such important terms as "Israel."

Stegemann, in addition, sees no evidence of wide-spread knowledge of the *Temple Scroll* in the community. This he explains can be deduced by the fact that only two copies of this scroll were found in the caves ("The Literary..." 126), but also because no basic similarities can be found between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian documents. He provides a list of issues which, in his mind, prove that there is no connection between the *Temple Scroll* and other sectarian scrolls ("The Literary..." 127-128). These issues include: 1) the fact that the *Temple Scroll* is not mentioned in the other scrolls; 2) the absence of quotations from the *Temple Scroll* in the sectarian documents; 3) the difference in "halakha, style, terminology and other linguistic and literary traits" ("The Literary..." 128) between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls; and, finally, 4) no interest in the architectural features of Jerusalem or of the Temple in other sectarian scrolls. The problem with the first three issues will be dealt with in my examination of the world-view in evidence in the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. Regarding my problem with the fourth issue, let me once again state, at the risk of being redundant, that I will show that the interest with the architectural features of the Temple provide the central concern of the community as described in the sectarian scrolls.

Stegemann, in discussing the orientation of the "Essene Qumran community," ("The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll") explains that "even though they simultaneously regarded their community as the 'temple of God' on earth, it was by the Torah that God dwelled within this kind of temple" ("Institutions..." 158). However he does not see that the *Temple Scroll* could have been instrumental in creating and reinforcing such an orientation because in his view the *Temple Scroll* stands in opposition to the community-as-Temple idea. For Stegemann the *Temple Scroll* must be understood literally: "...God will not dwell in the Torah, in the community, in synagogues, or in the hearts of pious people, but ...[only]... in a real temple building. There will never be any other way for Him to dwell among the people of Israel than this very particular and traditional one" ("Institutions..." 164). In large part Stegemann's insistence that the *Temple Scroll* be understood as referring to a literal Temple is based on his interpretation of 11QT 29:7-10:

- 7      And I will accept them (?), and they shall be (?) my people, and I will be theirs for ever, [and] I will dwell
- 8      with them for ever and ever. And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle
- 9      my glory, until the day of blessing on which I will create my temple
- 10     and establish it for myself for all times, according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob at Bethel (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:128-129)

According to Stegemann "this 'covenant with Jacob at Bethel' is ... nothing other than God's promise to dwell with Israel for ever, or, as the author of the *Temple Scroll* understood it, God's promise to have a real temple in His 'Holy City' for all time." ("Institutions..." 164) However it is not as indisputable as Stegemann suggests that the author of the *Temple Scroll* understood God's promise to "dwell with Israel for ever," to necessarily include the creation of a physical Temple building. A careful reading of the *Temple Scroll* in chapter 2 will show that even though the existence of such a building functioning under the laws

prescribed in the *Temple Scroll* represents the optimal situation, it is not understood by the *Temple Scroll* as representing a necessary condition before God will dwell among the People of Israel.

Among those who believe that the covenant "with Jacob at Bethel" includes the promise of a future Temple are Johann Maier and Yigael Yadin. Johann Maier, in discussing the above *Temple Scroll* passage, explains:

A comparison should ... be made with 5Q13 2.6 ...: '...to Jacob you made known at Bethel...', which Yadin restores to '...at Bethel your covenant'. Since the fragments of 5Q13 also contain instructions relevant to the cult, the establishment of 'correct' regulations for the cult was traced back specifically to the covenant with Jacob where they were linked with the eschatological promise of a Temple created directly by God ( Maier *The Temple Scroll An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* 86).

Yadin also believes that the covenant "with Jacob at Bethel" must be understood as a promise made by God to Jacob that God would build a Temple: "The creation of the future Temple is the fulfilment of the promise pledged by the Lord in his covenant with Jacob at Bethel." (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:184 also cited in Wise *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* 160 note 15) M.O. Wise critiques this view, explaining that "Yadin's interpretation has a major problem... God does not promise to build a future temple when he talks with Jacob at Bethel. Therefore, Yadin turns to extrabiblical sources to find a promise to build such a temple." (Wise *A Critical* 160 note 15) The extrabiblical source Wise is here referring to is Jubilees 31-32 which, Wise further explains, citing Maier (*The Temple Scroll An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* p.86), is also "...not so concerned with the building of the temple" (*A Critical* 160). For Wise the covenantal promise is interpreted by the redactor of the *Temple Scroll* as the promise of two things, God's "presence and the

land; in exchange they were to worship and obey him." (*A Critical* 161) He continues:

But the redactor apparently interpreted the covenant with the patriarchs as narrowly applicable in his day only to the CD community, the true 'Israel: (and, perhaps, to similar groups), and in the eschaton only to those obedient to the TS requirements.

It would be a covenant for life with God, a life in the land (*A Critical* 161).

This covenant, according to Wise, therefore, includes two sets of laws; one set, evident in the *Damascus Document*, which he believes predates the *Temple Scroll*, is to be obeyed by the Community in the hope that by so doing they would "persuade God to end his lawsuit with Israel and grant the land to the righteous once again" (*A Critical* 183). The second set of laws is contained in the *Temple Scroll*. In Wise's view the *Temple Scroll* was written by the individual who claimed to be the Teacher of Righteousness for whom the Community of the *Damascus Document* had been waiting. The *Temple Scroll* then contains the eschatological law for the land. It is this law which Israel must obey in the eschaton in order to be considered as part of the covenant. The problem with Wise's argument is twofold. First of all his conclusion that the *Temple Scroll* is the eschatological law for the land is based on a number of lines of reasoning which are not always as obvious as he claims. For example, he believes that he can discern the redactor's ideology, which is "centred on providing an eschatological law for the land," (*A Critical* 167) by the three ways in which the redactor deals with Deuteronomy 12-26, "the biblical 'laws for the land'" (*A Critical* 167). The third and most important of these for Wise's argument, as it relates to our present discussion, is "omission." "The redactor left out all portions of D which would cease to function in the 'end of days'" (*A Critical* 168). However the redactor is not always consistent in omitting such laws, a fact that Wise himself recognizes (*A Critical* 175). His explanation for these inconsistencies however is not always convincing. Another example of a line of reasoning which is essential to accepting his view that the *Temple Scroll* provides the eschatological law for the land is the following discussion:

The most frequently repeated 'redactional phrase' in the TS is ... ('for I, Yahweh, dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel') and its variants. This phrase is actually only one-half of a verse; judging by the fact that he repeats it eight times, it served the redactor as a primary conceptual guide when he shaped his work. The verse is Num 35:34: 'And you shall not render impure the land which you are going to indwell, in whose midst I dwell, for I, Yahweh, dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel.'... The importance of this verse in the TS, focusing as it does on the land, argues that the redactor wanted to create a law for the land (*A Critical* 161).

In Chapter Two, "The *Temple Scroll*," I show that this same passage from Numbers is used in the *Temple Scroll* to apply to the People of Israel, the Temple as well as the Land independent of each other. In effect it points to the sanctity of the People of Israel even without the Temple or the Land. The law, therefore, is not a law for the Land but rather a law for the People Israel.

Ben Zion Wacholder believes that the *Temple Scroll* which according to him would be better named "11Q Torah" or "*Qumranic Torah*," (*The Dawn of Qumran the Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* 21) is understood by the Community as one of two Torot given by God to Moses on Mount Sinai. Wacholder claims that 11QT discusses the period after Israel has violated the covenant, that God, knowing that Israel would violate the covenant presented Moses with a second Torah which calls "for a renovation of the covenant," (*Dawn* 25) and according to which Israel should live in preparation for the eschaton (*Dawn* 24). He explains:

a single theme governs the entire scroll: to reproduce in the holy land the sacred camp in Israel as it stood before the Lord on Mount Sinai. The attainment of the highest degree of Kedusah (sanctity) was necessary to prepare the community for



the impending epiphany (*Dawn* 16).

Wacholder concludes that 11QT is the basis for many of the sectarian scrolls. However, in his view, the community lives in preparation for the eschaton. He sees any reference to sacrifice, holy of holies, and offerings as referring to a future time when the community will have access to a valid Temple and sanctuary. (*Dawn* 87) He explains: "...whereas other Jews regarded Jerusalem's temple as the center of Judaism, the Qumran sect for all practical purposes did not have a current temple, but rather waited for an eschatological one" (*Dawn* 87). He offers the following passage from 1QS as illustration:

- 4     ...When these become in Israel
- 5     - the Council of the Community being established in truth - an eternal plant,  
the House of Holiness consisting of Israel, a most holy assembly
- 6     for Aaron, (with) eternal truth for judgement, chosen by (divine) pleasure to  
atone for the earth and to repay
- 7     the wicked their reward. It shall be the tested wall, the costly cornerstone.
- 8     Its foundations shall neither be shaken nor be dislodged from their place.  
(They shall be) a most holy dwelling
- 9     for Aaron, with all-encompassing knowledge of the covenant of judgement,  
offering up a sweet odor. (They shall be) a house of perfection and truth in  
Israel
- 10    to uphold the covenant of eternal statutes. They will be accepted to atone  
for the land and to decide judgement over wickedness; (1QS 8:4-10  
Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35)

Wacholder explains, that "it may be presumed, therefore, that the main purpose of the Yahad was to prepare the members of the Commune for God's eternal house" (*Dawn* 88). His assumption being that the "eternal house" would be the eschatological Temple. Even

though I am in agreement with Wacholder as to the nature of the relationship which exists between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls, I disagree with him as to the purpose of the Community. He sees the Community as a means to an end, that end being "to prepare the members" for the eschatological Temple. I will show that the Community which is discussed in the sectarian documents, despite its anticipation of the eschaton, saw itself as much more than a means of preparation for the eschaton. Once more the problem is one of definitions. It is paramount to understand the Community in its own terms, to define those terms as the Community would have done. Therefore, for example, I will show that Wacholder's assumption that the "house" must be understood as the eschatological Temple is not supported by evidence from the scrolls themselves.

#### 4. My Response

It must be said at this point that there are at least three issues which, in combination, form the core of my argument and the combination of which the authors so far discussed have not considered. First, it is important in a study such as this, which concerns itself with the possible impact of the *Temple Scroll* on the sectarian scrolls, to keep the focus on whether and how the sectarian scrolls adopted it and used it for their own purposes irrespective of its provenance or the original intent of its author/s. In other words the *Temple Scroll* does not have to have been written by the Community of the sectarian Qumran scrolls. What is important is that the sectarian scrolls knew the *Temple Scroll* and that it provided for them and for the Community which they prescribe the ideal world order, "the immutable, official map of things." (Lightstone *Society* x) It is necessary to keep this in mind because so many of the theories which claim to prove that no relationship exists between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian Qumran scrolls do so based on their belief that the *Temple Scroll* predates the Community at Qumran. Having arrived at this conclusion they will not consider the

possibility that, this being the case, the *Temple Scroll* may have still been influential in the creation of the ethos of the Community.

Second, the sanctity and purity which the *Temple Scroll* attributes to and makes mandatory for the Temple and its city it also attributes to and makes mandatory for the People of Israel, with or without a Temple, as will be shown in Chapter Two. The pre-requisite for God dwelling within the community of Israel is not the Temple but rather the proper application of the covenant, as prescribed in the *Temple Scroll*.<sup>1</sup> The *Temple Scroll* therefore does not merely provide the architectural blue-print for the creation and upkeep of the ideal Temple building and Temple city. It also provides the blueprint for the creation and upkeep of the ideal Community. Once this is thoroughly demonstrated and understood many of the arguments presented so far become obsolete, for example Stegemann's interpretation of the fulfilment of the "covenant with Jacob at Bethel" (11QT 29:7-10) as impossible without a Temple building, but also Schiffman's assertion that "the ultimate perfection was to be achieved in the end of days" (*Eschatological* 10) with the creation of the eschatological Temple.

Third, despite the absence of an explicitly stated concern with the Temple and its architecture in the sectarian documents these same documents prescribe a Community, the organization of which is based upon the architecture as well as organization of the Temple prescribed in the *Temple Scroll*. Many of the authors who see no connection between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls from Qumran do so on the basis that the sectarian scrolls appear to have no interest in the architecture and maintenance of the Temple. The

---

<sup>1</sup>The same conclusion was reached by J.L. Wentling ("11QT The Eschatological Temple...") as well as B. Gartner (*The Temple and the Community* esp 16-46). I will be discussing Gartner's book further in the Appendix.

assumption being that if the *Temple Scroll* was known by and was important to the sectarian scrolls then these other scrolls must show evidence of a preoccupation with the Temple. In fact the sectarian scrolls do show such evidence. But their pre-occupation with the Temple does not have to manifest itself as a concern with the architecture and purity laws as they apply to the Temple building and Temple city. Instead it can clearly be found in the sectarian scrolls' concerns with the application of these laws and prescriptions for the organization and maintenance of the Community of the scrolls.

## 5. Dating the *Temple Scroll*

Before I begin the examination of the scrolls themselves I will briefly examine some of the different theories as to the dating of the Community of the scrolls and how the different proposed dates and their historical and political contexts affect the understanding of the Community responsible for the scrolls. I will place particular emphasis upon the relationship understood to exist between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian documents within each of these theories. As well I will focus some attention on how different dates are adopted by different scholars in order to situate the scrolls within a particular historical/political context so as to provide a particularly hospitable environment for their own theories. Finally I will discuss the effect which the different results of dating the manuscripts have on my current investigation.

In attempting to date the scrolls as well as the Community for which they were authoritative scholars are often divided along lines very different to those earlier mentioned. For example Lawrence Schiffman who disagrees with Yigael Yadin's views as to the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the other sectarian scrolls none-the-less arrives at a date for the Community which is similar to Yadin's, if for different reasons. On the other hand Ben Zion Wacholder who agrees with Yadin's view of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the other sectarian scrolls arrives at a very different date.

Yigael Yadin, as earlier mentioned, believes that "the Temple scroll was in fact the basic 'Torah' of the Essenes," (Yadin *Temple* 1985, 229) and that further this scroll was a product of the sect itself (*Temple* 1985, 230) which, as the earlier passage makes obvious, he identified as the community of the Essenes, (also Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:398-399). Yadin dates the scroll to the Hasmonean period. This is based on his analysis of the language,

palaeographic studies as well as some of the major concerns of the scroll, which are particularly relevant to that specific historical period. He explains that it is "the Hasmonean period - particularly its beginning or middle - ...(which)... appears to be the most fitting time for renewed concern with questions involving the plan of the Temple and the mode of worship in it." (*Temple* 1983, 1:387) Yadin further explains:

We may not be straying far from the truth if we suppose that the real incentive to write the scroll as it was written stemmed from opposition to laws - whether oral or written - that did not expressly embody the commands of God as He spoke them according to the belief of those who transmitted them (*Temple* 1983, 1:87).

Wacholder disagrees with the dates arrived at by Yadin. He claims that both sets of arguments used by Yadin, the palaeographic as well as historical, can be proven wrong (Wacholder *Dawn* 202-210). Wacholder, like Yadin, believes that the *Temple Scroll* was seen by the Community of the sectarian scrolls as Torah and in turn this Torah influenced and shaped the other sectarian scrolls. However he dates the *Temple Scroll* to sometime around 200 BCE. His reasons for this dating are based entirely on his claim that the Teacher of Righteousness is the Zadok who is mentioned in *Abot de-Rabbi Nathan*.

Wise, like Wacholder, believes that the *Temple Scroll* was written by the Teacher of Righteousness. However for Wise the Teacher of Righteousness, as earlier discussed, was a member of the already existing community of the *Damascus Document* who accepted both "their basic doctrine about the 'end of days,'" (Wise *A Critical Study* 184) as well as his own role "as the long-awaited 'prophet like unto Moses,' a role which, typologically, required him to present a law just as did the first Moses" (Wise *A Critical Study* 184). Wise dates the *Temple Scroll* to around 150 B.C.E. based on two lines of argument. The first is that the *Temple Scroll* contains a number of similarities with 1Maccabees 10 which,

he explains, relates information on events which happened around 150 B.C.E.:

Comparing 1 Macc 10:34-35 and TS 43 and 52, what emerges is the following.

Both deal with pilgrimages. Both stipulate a three-day pilgrimage. Both reflect the desire of the temple elite - the redactor on the one hand, and Demetrius's Jewish contacts on the other. And again, legislation mandating or encouraging three-day pilgrimages as normative appears in no other source, classical or Jewish. Two points are especially significant regarding the festal lists in the two documents.

First, both are blanket lists, covering all the festal occasions of the calendar. Second, they agree in urging many more pilgrimage occasions than the biblical and later Tannaitic texts. In those sources only the three feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles required a pilgrimage to the temple. In view of these strong commonalities, it is reasonable to conclude that the two texts are in some way connected. It is entirely possible, since he was one of the temple elite, that the redactor of the TS was an advisor in the concessions which 1 Macc reports (*A Critical Study* 193).

Wise recognizes the problems inherent in his assumption that similarities must necessarily indicate association. He therefore qualifies this method of attempting to date the scroll with the following:

Of course, it cannot be ruled out that the idea of a three-day pilgrimage for many festival occasions was widespread, perhaps a general tenet of the period's priestly mentality. In the face of our ignorance of the detailed history of this period, one should certainly not rely overmuch on this parallel between the two texts when seeking to date the final form of the TS. Yet this parallel is strikingly corroborated by another way of dating the scroll, namely, that of dating the T of R (*A Critical Study* 193).

At this point Wise explains his second line of argument which is attempting to reach a date for the Teacher of Righteousness. This line of argument is based on "broad scholarly consensus... (which)... locates him in the middle of the second century B.C.E., in conflict with at least one early Hasmonean high priest. A date of ca. 150 B.C.E. is therefore consonant with previous conclusions" (*A Critical Study* 193). In fact Wise's dating of the *Temple Scroll* in the end returns to the traditionally held view that the beginning of the Community of the sectarian documents can be traced to a conflict between founding members of the early Community and the Hasmonean status quo.

Neil Asher Silberman, as earlier discussed, relies heavily on Robert Eisenman. Both believe that the Community of the sectarian scrolls can be traced to the turn of the millennium. Their claims are largely based on one line of thought. The contention that the Community of the scrolls represents "...the angry imams of their people, the rage-filled voice calling for resistance to the innovations and to the influence of the Great Satan from the West." (Silberman *Hidden* 4) The group is identified as "part of a larger movement of national resistance." (*Hidden* 6) Silberman discusses Eisenman's theory in the following way:

What Eisenman was suggesting was both blasphemous and revolutionary: that both Christianity and Judaism as we now know them are fraudulent debasements of an earlier messianic faith. He was convinced that both Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism had survived and gained adherents primarily because they were systematically stripped of all the teachings of the earlier Jewish messianic movement that questioned or threatened the status quo. Put simply, Eisenman was asking the world to look back and see that our understanding of the early history of Judaism and Christianity was a calculated misrepresentation, fostered and disseminated by priests and rabbis willing to ensure their own survival through smarmy accommodation or even conspiracy with the powers that be (*Hidden* 18-19).



As earlier explained most of the evidence upon which Silberman, as Eisenman before him, grounds his argument comes from the *War Scroll*, a scroll which had little to do with the day-to-day life of the Community of the scrolls. The problem with the above line of argument is that the sectarian scrolls do not demonstrate a real concern with non-Jews or with collaborators. Rather the enemy for the Community of the sectarian scrolls are those who have mis-interpreted the covenant. The Sons of Darkness are those who are responsible for the misinterpretation of the covenant as well as the perpetuation of this misinterpretation. Lawrence Schiffman explains the importance of having the knowledge to properly interpret law for the sect at Qumran in the following way:

The sect also held meetings of their assembly, the *moshav ha-rabbim*, at which they studied the Bible, explained it, and fixed the law. In their view God inspired the expounder of the law so that he would properly explain each passage. These correct interpretations, the *nistar* ('hidden'), God had kept secret from the Sons of Darkness. Only the members of the sect, the Sons of Light, understood the Scriptures and their legal traditions correctly. The Sons of Darkness knew only the *nigleh* ('revealed'), which they interpreted for themselves in an incorrect manner (Schiffman *Sectarian Law* 15).

Lawrence Schiffman traces the beginning of the Community at Qumran to the Maccabean revolt and "after the Hasmoneans had taken over the high priesthood, about 152 B.C.E." (Schiffman *Reclaiming* 95). He bases much of his argument on his analysis of the *Halakhic Letter* (4Q394-399). He claims that the views attributed in the letter to the sect are similar to those attributed to the Sadducees in early rabbinic literature while at the same time the opinions attributed to the opponents of the sect are those which rabbinic texts attribute "to the Pharisees or the early Rabbis." (*Reclaiming* 87) He explains:

Only one possible explanation can be offered for this phenomenon: The earliest

members of the sect must have been Sadducees unwilling to accept the status quo established in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt. The Maccabees, by replacing the Zadokite high priesthood with their own, reduced the Zadokites to a subsidiary position for as long as Hasmonaean rule lasted (*Reclaiming* 87-88).

As already discussed, a number of scholars trace the origins of the Qumran community to the Maccabean revolt and its aftermath. A number of these scholars even trace either the early Qumran community or its pre-Qumranic antecedents to the Sadducees. Schiffman associates the opponents of the Community with the Pharisees and traces the origins of the Community to their inability to accept "the imposition of Pharisaic views in the Temple under the Hasmonean priests" (*Reclaiming* 88). For Schiffman the *Halakhic Letter* like the *Temple Scroll*, as earlier discussed, derive from the tradition of the Sadducean Zadokite priesthood (*Reclaiming* 89). The sectarian views of the Community, according to Schiffman, began to develop shortly after this break between the Sadducean Zadokite priests and the Pharisaic tradition as imposed by the Hasmonean priesthood. And after the attempt at reconciliation which he sees in the *Halakhic Letter* were rejected by the Hasmonean authorities. The sectarian views and the move to the site of Qumran, he believes, happened about a generation later, both influenced by the Teacher of Righteousness (*Reclaiming* 90). In fact he accepts as historically accurate the "some twenty years" between the Community's separation from the rest of Israel and the coming of the Teacher of Righteousness as presented in the *Damascus Document* 1:10-11 (*Reclaiming* 87).

Joseph M. Baumgarten raises some questions regarding Schiffman's theory of the Qumran/Sadducee opposition to the Hasmonean/Pharisee control of the Temple. He asks:

- (1) How reliable is the evidence that the early Hasmoneans were specifically committed to Pharisaic traditions?
- (2) Since the Hasmoneans under John Hyrcanus

and more so during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus did abandon the Pharisaic regulations ... and aligned themselves with the Sadducees (*Antiquities* 13.10.6), would this not have inclined the Zadokites toward rapprochement with the establishment rather than radicalized isolation? Moreover, in the sphere of theology, the deterministic doctrines set forth in the *Serekh ha-Yahad* and the *Hodayot* appear diametrically opposite to what Josephus tells us about the Sadducees:

The Sadducees... do away with Fate... altogether... They maintain that man has the free choice of good or evil...(*Jewish Wars* 2.8.14)' (Baumgarten *The Community* 30-31).

## 6. Relevance of Dating to my Study

The exact dating of the scrolls and the Community for which they were authoritative is not a necessity for my present study. Knowing what the exact historical context was would of course be more than just interesting. Since much of how a group defines itself is related to that against which it defines itself, knowing the historical situation would help to better understand the Community mandated by the scrolls. However at present it remains beyond the scope or even the requirements of a study such as mine to enter into this particular discussion. The only information, as far as the dating of the scrolls is concerned, which is necessary for my present study is that the Deuteronomical and Priestly books of the Torah pre-date the *Temple Scroll* and were known to its author(s); and that the *Temple Scroll* pre-dates the sectarian scrolls. About the first requirement there is no disagreement. As far as the second requirement is concerned most scholars agree that the *Temple Scroll* pre-dates the sectarian scrolls, Wise being a notable exception. Wise, as earlier discussed believes that the *Temple Scroll* was written by the Teacher of Righteousness who was a member of the community of the *Damascus Document*. However my examination will show that the

world-view introduced in the *Temple Scroll* provides the necessary framework upon which the way of life mandated in the other sectarian scrolls, including the *Damascus Document*, is modeled.

My study will remain limited to the information which the scrolls readily provide about the Community's perception of their identity as well as the dispute that the Community was having with their contemporary world. These disputes are evident in the scrolls both explicitly as well as implicitly, in the scrolls' polemical rhetoric. In this way, by discussing the points of contention, at least as perceived by the sectarian scrolls, I hope my study may prove helpful to those better equipped to attempt to identify the exact personalities of those involved.

The sectarian scrolls understand the Community in terms of its relationship and association with the "sons of Zadok". The use of this term conveys a particular message to the Community about itself and its identity as well as about those outside the Community. The Community of the scrolls was meant to be organized according to the plan of the Temple as provided in the *Temple Scroll*. The message of the *Temple Scroll*, therefore, the polemic directed against the status quo of the Temple authorities, the Temple's architecture, organization as well as performance of the cult is adopted by the Community of the scrolls. The *Temple Scroll* claims to provide a direct revelation from God as to the proper architectural design as well as performance of the cult of the Temple, a revelation which is at odds with contemporary practise. The creation of the Community prescribed by the scrolls according to the design revealed by God in the *Temple Scroll*, was a statement to the members of the Community as well as to those outside. A statement about the illegitimate nature of those controlling the Temple and its cult, but even more a statement about the true nature of Israel. For Israel, according to the revelation of the *Temple Scroll*, as in Leviticus

(11:44-45), is holy and sanctified to the Lord and must so remain in order for the Lord to therein reside. The illegitimate leaders of Israel against whom the polemic of the scrolls is directed have not only lead the People astray but have polluted the Temple and the nation so that God can no longer reside in either. By physically removing themselves from the remainder of the nation the Community is expressing the impurity of the status quo, both the nation and the Temple. But it also provides another piece of evidence for the attentive investigator: that for the Community of the sectarian documents physical acts have sacramental efficacy. Actual, not symbolic, physical separation is necessary if God is to dwell within the Community.

## 7. Summary of the Chapters

It is my argument, therefore, that not only do the sectarian scrolls adopt the *Temple Scroll* as the foundation upon which to base the structure of the Community which they prescribe, but that no violence is made to the integrity of the *Temple Scroll* by such an adoption and adaptation. In Chapter Two, "The *Temple Scroll*," I provide a summary and discussion of this scroll's central concerns. I then discuss what it is that these concerns tell us about its author(s) as well as its intended audience. It will become evident that the *Temple Scroll* lends itself to the particular interpretation which, I hold, exists in the sectarian documents. The *Temple Scroll* deals with the construction and running of the Temple at Jerusalem. In chapter two I analyze the rhetoric of the *Temple Scroll* in order to identify certain recurring traits and devices which inform its structure. It is through an investigation of these rhetorical traits and devices that we can begin to arrive at an understanding of the ways in which the community at Qumran used the image of the Temple as a blueprint upon which to structure itself. This analysis of the *Temple Scroll* will show that when the *Temple Scroll* is speaking about the Temple it is also speaking about the People of Israel.

It is the adoption of these changes and their application to Israel, the People, without the physical Temple which the sectarian scrolls advocate. Chapter Three, "The Community of the Scrolls," focuses on the Community prescribed by the sectarian scrolls. At the risk of being accused of stating the obvious, it is important to underline the fact that the scrolls were never meant to be reading material but rather documents which prescribed the norms intended to be applied to the lived reality of a particular Community. It becomes fundamental, therefore, to understand the Community for which the scrolls are authoritative as a living Community. Before I begin the examination of this particular Community I present a short discussion, as already mentioned, of empirical studies performed on living, successful alternative communities. Included in this section are issues such as motivation to leave one community for another; how the individual and/or the community understands and approaches conversion as well as initiation. Finally how one is motivated to stay in a particular community: are there mechanisms in place within the organization of the community which can be understood to serve to keep the community united? This more general discussion is followed by a summary and discussion of the structure of the Community as treated in the sectarian scrolls which contain the rules by which the Community is to live. The examination of the Community as an anthropological case study will show that the ritualized activity of the Community is not a temporary replacement for the cult, that the life of the Community is understood by the scrolls as the cult. Finally, I conclude this chapter with a consideration of what is communicated by the structure, organization and rhetoric of the Community. This will involve an investigation of issues such as figures of authority, hierarchy, the process of initiation, reward and punishment, as well as others. These will be examined as necessary parts of the structure and organization of the Community but also for the information which they implicitly communicate about how the Community understands itself, its world, identity, as well as its purpose.

Once it has been established that the sectarian scrolls are prescribing the laws for a Community which perceives itself as the Temple as described in the *Temple Scroll* I will deal with the issue of sacrifice. In Chapter Four, "The Sacrificial Cult at Qumran," I briefly discuss sacrifice within Judaism, for example, the Temple cult, the types of sacrifice and their objectives. I then explore the definition of Temple, as well as the definition and purpose of sacrifice within the Community of the sectarian scrolls as discussed in these scrolls. Finally in concluding this chapter I discuss the reasons why the sectarian scrolls identify the Community as priests and why the authority figures are understood to be the sons of Zadok. I illustrate by examples from within the sectarian scrolls: how these scrolls perceive and define the sons of Zadok and I explain the two different understandings of the sons of Zadok, one from the book of the prophet Ezekiel, the other from within Hebrew Scriptures, which are combined in the scrolls. I then examine how the sectarian scrolls provide the continuity for the leap they make from the role of the sons of Zadok in Ezekiel as those who safeguard the charge of the sanctuary to their role in the scrolls as those who safeguard the proper interpretation and observance of the laws of the covenant.

In Chapter Five, "Summary and Review of the Evidence", I elaborate on the two sets of criteria proposed in the first chapter and briefly review the different instances from within the scrolls which have met the requirements of these criteria and how these have been dealt with in the different chapters. I then discuss how my methodology shaped my examination of the scrolls. I close with a brief summary of my thesis and argument as to the necessity of the *Temple Scroll* for the creation of the sectarian scrolls under investigation.

## Chapter 2. THE *TEMPLE SCROLL*

### 1. Introduction

The *Temple Scroll* found at Qumran deals with the construction and running of the Temple at Jerusalem, and yet the Community of Qumran sectarians had no active role in the Temple. Can this document tell us anything about this Community? In this chapter I begin by briefly analysing the rhetorical style of the *Temple Scroll* in order to identify certain recurring traits and devices which inform its structure. I then investigate these rhetorical traits and devices and explore the information implicitly communicated by them especially the world-view which is being introduced. I will show that it is this same world-view which is fundamental to understanding the Community being prescribed in the sectarian scrolls.

In organizing my analysis of this chapter I decided on a specific investigation of selected features. In so doing I began with a set of questions: 1) is a particular image of the Temple being developed in the *Temple Scroll*, and 2) can this image be understood as a model by which to organize the lived reality of the People of Israel even without a Temple? As I shall show, the answer to both questions is yes. Even a cursory reading of the scroll demonstrates the necessity for answering the first question in the affirmative, further probing of the material demonstrates the necessity for answering the second question in the same manner.

To begin with, the polemical rhetoric of the scroll makes it obvious that the *Temple Scroll* is at odds with at least certain practices of the Temple and that it purports to be in possession of a set of rules by which the Temple should be run. The most immediately obvious rhetorical trait of the scroll is its use of the first person voice of God, it is presented as



though spoken by God. As such the rules it contains are presented as unmediated revelation, the words are the words of God as spoken by God and therefore beyond contention. This device serves to place the scroll beyond the sphere of theological debate, for those of course who would have believed in its divine origins. The scroll however uses other devices by which to persuade its audience that it is in fact divinely inspired. Such phrases as "statutes for ever throughout their generations," and "according to the ordinance," are used systematically in the scroll and relate to information which originates in the Pentateuch. The first is borrowed from the biblical texts which deal with immutable laws and is used in the same way in the scroll but with the difference that it ascribes this sense of immutability also to laws which are not prescribed in the Pentateuch. The second phrase serves as a type of shorthand in describing the long list of Pentateuchal details on how to present the offerings on a number of different occasions. The scroll however uses this second phrase both in instances where the "ordinance" under consideration is traditionally understood to apply as well as to those which are introduced by the scroll. The *Temple Scroll* assumes that its audience is familiar with the Pentateuchal regulations otherwise a phrase such as "according to the ordinance" becomes nonsensical. The scroll then draws from the Pentateuch for formulae which will imbue non-Pentateuchal material with an aura of authority. This illustrates the fact that the audience for which the *Temple Scroll* was intended held the Pentateuch as sacred and authoritative and were familiar with the context from within which the key phrases were taken. If this is the case how could they have accepted and even advocated alterations and additions to it? Yadin has explained that the *Temple Scroll* presents itself as a more complete Torah of Moses. Yigael Yadin explains,

it seems that in light of the analysis of the contents of the scroll and the method of its editing, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the author - and, *a fortiori*, the members of the sect - regarded it as a veritable Torah of the Lord. This assumption

finds some support in the fact that each time the Divine Name - the Tetragrammaton - is mentioned (...), the scribe wrote it in the square script, that is, the same script used throughout the scroll. This practice is prevalent in all the 'canonical' books found at Qumran. On the other hand, many Qumran scribes used the paleo-Hebrew script when writing the Tetragrammaton in commentaries and scrolls of which the contents, even in their eyes, were not 'canonical' (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:392).

Further investigation of the *Temple Scroll* will show that the scroll assumes the existence of the Torah of Moses but also implicitly communicates knowledge of a subsequent history during which the people of Israel strayed from it and then presents a formula for restoration as does Deuteronomy. In this case then the *Temple Scroll* is presented as divine revelation very much in the same category as Deuteronomy, a second giving of the Law. This scroll, as does Deuteronomy, which introduces a number of new issues regarding the relationship between God and the People of Israel, also introduces a new approach to this relationship, especially regarding its unique view of the correspondence of cult and covenant. It is this particular issue which, I will show, provides the logic upon which the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is founded. In addition, I will show, the *Temple Scroll* provides the origin of the laws espoused by the Community as well as the motivation and justification for its continued existence.

Before discussing the Temple Plan in the *Temple Scroll* I need to point out one more feature which, from the very beginning of the scroll, provides us with an essential piece of evidence in understanding its world-view. The first preserved column, which Yadin identifies as column two, provides us with information about the "covenant between God and Israel, following in general Ex. xxxiv:10-16 and Deut. vii:1 f" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:40). Immediately following upon the introduction of the covenant, in the following

column, comes "the command to build the Temple" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:40), not, as one may expect, commands relating to the conquest and possession of the Land. From the very beginning, then, the scroll intends to direct its audience to a particularly intimate connection between the covenant and the cult.

I will show that the rhetoric of the *Temple Scroll* cannot but lead its audience *beyond* a polemic directed toward those who administer the Temple in Jerusalem. Rather, the Temple in the scroll, becomes emblematic of the society at large. The Temple becomes a metaphor of reconciliation and holiness and eligibility to approach and interact with it is gained by the Children of Israel who live according to laws often more stringent than those set out for the priests in the Pentateuch.

The rhetoric of the *Temple Scroll* provides us with a series of clues to just such an understanding in the group of phrases used in association with the peremptory commands. These phrases are often used to reinforce the application of a very stringent interpretation of certain commands. An example of such a phrase used often with these commands is some combination of "I dwell...", or "where I will settle...", and is always used in connection with the Temple or the Temple city but also in connection with the Children of Israel, the nation itself independent of the Temple. Holiness then is ascribed to the people of Israel as well as to the Temple. God resides in both. This idea is reinforced by the application of the word holy to the Temple, the Temple city as well as to the People of Israel throughout the scroll. The rhetoric of the scroll points the way to the application of the laws of purity and holiness to the People of Israel even when disconnected from the Temple. In other words the establishment of and interaction with the physical Temple as described in the scroll does not appear to be a singular pre-requisite for the people of Israel living a pure and holy life according to the laws of the scroll.

Who then are the people who regard the *Temple Scroll* as authoritative? Are they, in their own minds, the last remnant of the righteous or the advance guard of a new and more profound relationship with God? Probably a combination of both. The *Temple Scroll* provides them with a blueprint for much more than the building of the Temple. It also provides them with a blueprint for living and with different levels of reinforcement and justification for their election to safeguard and apply such a blueprint.

## 2. Temple Plans

The *Temple Scroll* provides an elaborately detailed architectural plan for the Temple compound, the Temple city as well as, in a less detailed fashion, the Temple itself. In this investigation I am particularly concerned with the spatial divisions and the specific requirements for permission to enter each of these divisions, which also happens to be a principal concern of the scroll. Primary among these divisions are the courts which are square and arranged concentrically. The scroll in its discussion of these courts presents us with prescriptions pertaining to the required ritual purity for admittance into each. Requirements which become more stringent as one approaches the center of this system of courts within which we find the Temple itself as well as the altar. As already mentioned the *Temple Scroll* does not provide as much detailed attention for the Temple itself as it does for the courts. Yadin stresses this and explains that "the author's primary purpose was to describe the courts, since it was here that the main worship took place" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:177). The purity of the Temple does, however, receive a large amount of attention. The detailed description of the courts serves to highlight this concern since it is the physical layout as well as the prescriptions for ritual purity demanded for each of these courts that serve to safeguard and guarantee the purity of the Temple and the altar.

In his discussion of the Temple city Yadin explains that:

The cardinal prescription of the scroll - and its innovation - is that there shall be *three square courts around the Temple*: inner, middle and outer. Furthermore, to ensure the purity of the Temple itself and of its courts, the scroll ordains two additional precautions: an inner wall is to be erected around the Temple ..., and *around the outer court a fosse...* is to be made (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:188).

The plan of the Temple Compound and city in the scroll contains both points of similarity as well as of difference with other known plans. For example it, like the plan in Ezekiel, focuses more attention to the details of the courts than the details of the Temple itself, both envisioned square courts and, despite the fact that Ezekiel's plan has only two courts, Ezekiel's plan also has the inner court in the center of the other (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:190-191). Ezekiel's inner court, however, contains the altar and not the Temple, the *Temple Scroll* includes both in the inner court (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:191). Furthermore, as J. Maier explains, in "The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of the Temple Scroll", not only do the "position of the altar and the Temple house differ in the two designs" (34) but, he continues, "(t)his remarkable difference, a shifting of the cultic focus, means that in the Temple Scroll the centre of the whole scheme is in the entrance to the Temple house (the *ulam*) while in Ezekiel's design it coincides with the altar"(34). This I find to be significant and further proof that the Community of the Scrolls as discussed in *Community Rule* (9:3-6) as well as *Florilegium* (4Q174 1:1-7) is organized according to the plan of the *Temple Scroll*. This will be further discussed in the next chapters but I need to briefly mention that in both these passages we have a description of the Community as *bt*, House, commonly used to refer to the Temple both in Hebrew Scripture as well as in 11QT (i.e. 51:14), to the setting up of a sanctuary as well as to the sacrifices to be performed in the Holy of Holies by those who make up this House and the sanctuary. In 1QS it is the

House, which contains the sanctuary and, particularly, the Holy of Holies, as will be discussed later on, which is found at the center, the inner-most part, of the Community. The designations in 1QS are not, or not necessarily, geographical, we do not know with any certainty where the different groups so named would have physically gathered or met. The designations are, rather, organizational. In other words, the *centre* of the Community refers to that segment of the Community *entrance to which* was accomplished only by the most adept and ritually pure, according to the judgement of the Community. In the plan of the *Temple Scroll* the very "*centre* of the whole scheme is in the *entrance* to the Temple house" (Maier "The Architectural History..." 34 italics are added). Therefore, despite the cultic centrality of the Temple and sanctuary for all the known plans, there is only one about which we can say with certainty that the symbolic centrality, the ideal, was meant to be made manifest in the physical world. This is an expression of the *Temple Scroll's* literal approach to Scripture. This same literal approach to Scripture is manifest in the sectarian scrolls which deal with the rules by which the Community is to be structured and organized.

Comparison between the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* and the Temples which actually existed can often be rather difficult. This is because we do not always have as much information, especially contemporary information, about both plan, particularly the plan of the courts, a vital concern of the *Temple Scroll*, as well as ritual. The material that we have about Solomon's Temple, which "is briefly described in I Kings and the parallel text in 2 Chronicles" (Yadin *Temple* 1985, 164), contains very little information about the courts (i.e. Yadin *Temple* 1985, 163-165). And Josephus' description of Solomon's Temple Compound (*Antiquities* 8:61 ff) which, as Yadin states, could be understood as discussing either three concentric or three adjacent courts (Yadin *Temple* 1983 1:192-193) is first of all very late but also probably influenced either by what he knew of Herod's Temple or, as Yadin believes, by information he received as a young man who "spent a good deal of time

in Essene circles in his youth" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:193-194), thus, according to Yadin, influenced by "the description of the Temple" in the *Temple Scroll* (Temple 1983, 1:194). The information we have about the pre-Herodian Second Temple is too meagre for any conclusive remarks as to its plan. "The structure of which most is known is the one built by Herod, for that has the most detailed descriptions both in the Mishnah and in the works of Josephus" (Yadin *Temple* 1985, 164). This Temple Complex included three courts which, according to both Josephus and the Mishnah, were "not concentric but ... adjacent to one another" (Yadin *Temple* 1985, 168). In either case, whether concentric or adjacent, the approach to the holiest area, the Temple necessitates physical movement through a sequence of successively more stringent requirements as to ritual purity. The requirement for concentric courts in the *Temple Scroll*, however, corresponds to the scroll's identification of the "camp of the Pentateuch with the entire Temple city" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:279). Yadin, who, as already discussed, identified the Qumran sectarians with the Essenes, explains:

The Essenes, following the plain and straightforward meaning of the Pentateuchal text, held that the ordinances on ritual purity had applied to the entire wilderness camp, with its three components: the divine camp (the Tabernacle) in the centre, the camp of the Levites around it, and the camp of the tribes of Israel around the Levites. They therefore maintained that these very laws were applicable in their own day to the Temple (the divine camp), the Temple precincts (the Levitical camp) and the Temple city (the camp of Israel). This strict approach finds expression in our Temple scroll (Temple 1985, 170).

This same representation of Israel as the three camps is also found in the sectarian scrolls and will be discussed further down in this chapter. Yadin adds to the above discussion by explaining the different approaches to the application of the laws of ritual purity. He cites

G. Alon in discussing two Second Temple approaches to the application of the pentateuchal laws of purity:

It is generally accepted that the pentateuchal laws of purity are applied, in the halakhic tradition, only to priests, entry into the Temple and eating of holy things. The halakhah reinterprets the literal meaning of these biblical passages that seem to refer to uncleanness outside the Temple or to the ban on uncleanness from any source, even for ordinary Israelites, and applies them to the Temple and its priests...On the other hand, there was from earliest times another approach to these laws, one that aimed to apply the purity commands to all Israel and to extend priestly holiness to the entire people. One may therefore surmise that both approaches had many adherents during the Second Temple period: one minimalist, limiting the laws of purity to the area of the Temple and the priests; the other maximalist, extending the laws of purity to all Israel. (G. Alon, *Studies in Jewish History*, I, Hakibutz Hameuchad, 1957, pp 148, 149, 175 as cited in Yadin, Yigael *The Temple Scroll* 1983, 1:277).

A plan with concentric courts serves the added purpose of providing, to use Yadin's phrase in discussing the outer court which is not existent in Ezekiel's plan, "protective ring[s] to safeguard the purity of the Temple compound within the precincts of the city" (*Temple* 1985, 167).

Yadin's discussion of the two approaches to purity continues by explaining the difficulty involved within the Biblical texts from within which the concern with purity originates:

the pentateuchal verses do not specify these bans in the context of the Temple, the Temple city and the cities, but refer to the subject as it pertains to the purity of the



Tabernacle and the camp. In other words, the application of the pentateuchal bans related to the Temple, the Temple city and other cities was influenced by the two approaches defined so precisely by G. Alon... (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:278)

Yadin explains that rabbinic halakha interprets purity according to the "minimalist" approach. By this he means that it limits the purity laws and bans related to them "to the Temple alone" (*Temple* 1983, 1:278). The *Temple Scroll*, on the other hand, as already mentioned, indicates a "maximalist" approach. According to Yadin,

this scroll identified the camp of the Pentateuch with the entire Temple city and maintained that every ban involving the former applies to the Temple city as well. This is, in fact, asserted several times in the scroll, wherein it is emphasized time and again that the entire Temple city is to be holy and pure:

so that they will not defile the city in which I dwell; for I, the Lord, dwell among the children of Israel for ever and ever (Col. XLV:13-14).

And the city, which I will hallow by settling my name and [my] temp[le within (it)], shall be holy and clean/ of any unclean thing with which they may be defiled; everything that is in it shall be/ clean (Col. XLV!I:3-6).

And you shall not defile the city in which / I settle my name and my temple (Col. XLVII:10-11).

Similarly, the cities (Col. XLVII:3) in which the Children of Israel dwell must also be pure:

For I am the Lord, who dwells / among the children of Israel; and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and they shall be holy (Col. LI:7-8).

Hence most of the prohibitions, which in the Pentateuch apply to the camp alone, apply as well to the other cities, wherein unclean persons 'may not enter...and defile them' (Col. XLVIII:15). Although the cities must be clean, the degree to which they must be pure is obviously less stringent than that for the Temple city; despite their

cleanness, things that must be done in the Temple city may not be carried out therein instead:

And you shall not purify a city / of your cities to (be) my city (Col. XLVII:14-15...) (*Temple* 1983 1:279-280).

For the same reason that the maximalist approach to ritual purity is seen to apply to the wilderness camp in the Torah it is understood by the *Temple Scroll* to apply to the Community of Israel: "For I am the Lord, who dwells among the children of Israel." This statement, found in a number of instances in the *Temple Scroll* (ie:51:7-8, *Yadin Temple* 1983, 2:227), is used in the Torah to punctuate laws which apply to the camp in the wilderness:

The LORD spoke to Moses, saying: Instruct the Israelites to remove from camp anyone with an eruption or a discharge and anyone defiled by a corpse. Remove male and female alike; put them outside the camp so that they do not defile the camp of those in whose midst I dwell (Numbers 5:1-3).

This statement is also used to reinforce those laws which apply to the camp preparing for war:

When you go out as a troop against your enemies, be on your guard against anything untoward...Since the LORD your God moves about in your camp to protect you and to deliver your enemies to you, let your camp be holy; let Him not find anything unseemly among you and turn away from you (Deuteronomy 23:10-15).

The feeling of the immediacy of the Divine Presence which is evident in the *Temple Scroll* can be understood to be analogous to the feeling of immediacy of the Presence which is evident in the wilderness camp or in other times of exigency such as the war camp. The very rhetoric used in the *Temple Scroll* reveals, quite explicitly, the driving force behind its

logic. Phrases such as "...for you are a people holy to the Lord your God," (48:7 and 10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:208-209) or "...and they shall be holy, and let them not make themselves abominable with everything that I have set apart for them to hold unclean; and they shall be holy," (51:8-10 Yadin *Temple* 1983 2:227) are quite evidently based on the belief that Israel is a nation set apart as holy to the Lord. This view originates in the pentateuchal: "...you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exodus 19:6).

We can will see two similarities between the perception of the structure of the world as it exists in the *Temple Scroll* and as it exists in the sectarian scrolls. These two similarities are: first of all the divine Presence is in both cases understood to dwell within the "camps" of the children of Israel, this results in the "maximalist" approach to the interpretation of the Pentateuchal laws of purity; and second, there is a distinction made between the "camps" and the "camp" which is Jerusalem, the holy city of the Temple and the degree of purity required for each. In addition the sense of urgency evident in the context of the wilderness camp and the war camp (as in the above passages from Numbers and Deuteronomy) is also evident in the sectarian scrolls as well as well as the *Temple Scroll*. This urgency has to do with the immediacy of the Divine Presence as well as with the creation of sacred, ritually pure space within which the Divine can dwell. This is even more significant when we take into account the belief expressed in the *Community Rule* as well as the *Damascus Document* that outside of this sacred space is to be found the lot of Belial, the environment of the sons of the pit.

### 3. The *Temple Scroll* is to the Sectarials as the Mishnah is to Rabbinic Judaism

The earlier statement regarding the holiness of the nation of Israel (Ex. 19:6) is not original to the sectarians at Qumran, nor is the attempt to apply it to the lived reality of the

community of Israel unique to the sectarians. In fact this statement is often understood to be the driving force behind the early rabbinic form of Judaism. For the rabbis it was the entire nation, not a remnant as it is for Qumran, which was ultimately considered as holy. To this end they believed "that man's task and the community's undertaking are to seek to sanctify this life, to serve God always and everywhere, and to do so in small as well as large matters" (Neusner *Understanding* 25). The rabbinic approach to this ideal was "minimalist" compared to the Qumran sectarians. By this I mean, as Yadin explained, that they made a distinction between those laws of purity to be strictly applied to the Temple cult and made adjustments of these when they were meant to be applied to the purity of the children of Israel outside the Temple. The application of the purity laws was often made to conform to the lived reality of the People. I have no intention here to compare and contrast the rabbinic manifestation of a Judaism without a Temple to that of the sectarians at Qumran. I do believe, however, that since for both "(more or less the same) scripture is a formative element of perception" (Lightstone *Society* 10), there is/are one or many points of contact at the origin, both in the scripture which is seen as authoritative, but also points of similarity in application. It is in understanding the different application that we can better understand the Community of the scrolls. Jacob Neusner, in discussing the concerns of the Judaism expressed in the Mishnah explains:

Now let us take note. This language does not speak of sacred symbols but of pots and pans, of menstruation and dead creeping things; of ordinary water which, because of the circumstance of its collection and location, possesses extraordinary power; of the commonplace corpse and ubiquitous diseased person; of genitalia and excrement, toilet seats, and the flux of penises; of stems of pomegranates and stalks of leeks; of rain and earth and wood, metal, glass, and hide. This language is filled with words for neutral things of humble existence. It does not speak of holy things and is not symbolic in its substance. This language speaks of ordinary things, of

things which everyone must have known. But because of the peculiar and particular way in which it is formed and formalized, this same language not only adheres to an aesthetic theory but expresses a deeply embedded ontology and methodology of the sacred, specifically of the sacred within the secular, and of the capacity for regulation, therefore for sanctification, within the ordinary: All things in order, all things then hallowed by God who orders all things, so said the priests' creation tale (Neusner *The Mishnah a New Translation* xxviii).

Some of the subject matter with which Mishnah is concerned in the above could apply to the laws set out in the sectarian literature of Qumran. This is to be expected because it is these very issues with which the Pentateuchal laws deal. The introduction to the subject is in the Torah of Moses it is with its expansion or application that the different communities concern themselves. It bears repeating that the community which claims Mishnah as authoritative sees in it "a deeply embedded ontology and methodology of the sacred, specifically of the sacred within the secular, and of the capacity for regulation, therefore for *sanctification*, within the ordinary: All things in order, all things then hallowed by God who orders all things, so said the priests' creation tale" (Neusner *Mishnah* xxviii italics are added). The Community of the scrolls has its own document, comparable to the Mishnah, which it holds as authoritative and which presents it with an "ontology and methodology of the sacred... and of the capacity for regulation, therefore for sanctification, within the ordinary: All things in order, all things then hallowed by God who orders all things..." (Neusner *Mishnah* xxviii). This document, I will show, is the *Temple Scroll*.

It is the order of things as presented in the *Temple Scroll* which provides the foundation for the structure of the Community as ordered by God. The *Temple Scroll* is direct revelation from God. This leads to one fundamental difference between the Mishnah, the earliest non-biblical book which rabbinism claims for itself, and the sectarian literature of Qumran. This

difference has to do with the language used and with the method by which laws are arrived at: "while Mishnah everywhere is substantively dependent upon scripture, particularly upon the legal materials of the Pentateuch, Mishnah hardly cites or otherwise acknowledges its dependence upon the biblical texts" (Lightstone *Society* 65). In fact in the Mishnah laws are shown to be arrived at largely through methods of organization and list-making (Lightstone *The Rhetoric* 181-182). In the *Temple Scroll* the situation is very different. Any reformulation, re-interpretation or evolution of a pentateuchal law relating to purity is written in language reminiscent of the Torah and, through the use of the first person voice of God, is intentionally made to appear as though it too is revelation. This issue provides us with further evidence of the necessity of understanding the *Temple Scroll* as a foundational text of the Community. It is in this scroll that we find statements without which a number of the interpretations of the ritual purity laws found in the sectarian documents as well as the perception of the Community itself as itself constituting the Temple, a perception evident in the other sectarian documents, as well as the structure and organization of this Community, appears ungrounded and tenuous. It is also in this scroll that we find statements which lead the Community of the sectarian documents on a path different from that which originates in the Mishnah.

In the earlier description of the language of the Mishnah Neusner (*Mishnah* xxviii) explains that this language "does not speak of holy things and is not symbolic in its substance." This is not true of the language of the sectarian scrolls which not only imbues the everyday with holiness but speaks of it in language original to the Temple cult and its ritual purity. It is only with the acceptance of the fact that the Community of the sectarian scrolls was aware of and dependent on the *Temple Scroll* for its self understanding, its world-view and its organization and structure that the process of understanding this organization and structure becomes unobstructed and unhindered by unnecessary and convoluted explanations.

One more similarity as to the foundational beliefs of the two groups can be mentioned here. The *Community Rule* (1QS 9:4-5) tell us that prayer and perfection can be substituted for Temple sacrifice:

- 4        they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that  
          (God's) favor for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings  
          and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of  
5        the lips for judgement (is as ) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the  
          Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering (1QS 9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead  
Sea Scrolls* 39)

*The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* attributes a similar statement to Rabbi Johanan ben Zakai:

Once as Rabban Johanan ben Zakai was coming forth from Jerusalem, Rabbi Joshua followed after him and beheld the Temple in ruins.

'Woe unto us!' Rabbi Joshua cried, 'that this, the place where the iniquities of Israel were atoned for, is laid waste.'

'My son,' Rabban Johanan said to him, 'be not grieved; we have another atonement as effective as this. And what is it? It is acts of loving-kindness, as it is said, 'For I desire mercy and not sacrifice'(Hos. 6:6)' (Goldin, Judah trans. 34)

And yet despite these and many other similarities the two communities developed in extremely different ways. What is the reason for this difference? Jack Lightstone has explained that "how scripture is perceived, a quite separate issue from how its verses are interpreted, depends upon the various groups' structured patterns of perceiving the world" (*Scripture* 9). It is at this point, the point of perception based on the group's "structured patterns of perceiving the world" that these two communities, despite their common origin

part ways. It is at the point of understanding the "groups' structured patterns of perceiving the world" that we can begin to explore the structure of the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls and understand why it is that people would choose to remain (or perhaps feel that they had no choice but to remain) in a Community within which the meticulous observance and conformity with the smallest details of daily existence was ritualized. And expulsion, even temporarily, from the rigorously punctilious observance of the cycle of ritualized actions was seen not as a relief or release but as the worst punishment imaginable.

The rabbinic manifestation of the notion of the holiness of Israel was applied to a world which was perceived as ultimately good, provisions were even made as to the requirements for righteousness for gentiles implying that all people could achieve righteousness not only Jews. The rabbis adapted Judaism so that it could exist without the Temple and its cult and also without the Land of Israel. It was always hoped that the Messiah would come quickly but the rabbis planned for the eventuality that this may not happen as quickly as was desired.

The sectarians at Qumran, on the other hand, were not planning for the long-term. They perceived the world as having been usurped by Belial. The *Community Rule* (1QS) speaks of "the reign of Belial" (1:18 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9), and "the dominion of Belial"(1:23-24 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 1:23-24). It is those who have crossed "over into the covenant" (1:16, 18, 20, 24 etc. Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9), who are seen as representing the last remnant: the Community of the Scrolls.



#### 4. The World-View of the *Temple Scroll*

The scroll begins with the introduction of the covenant and then immediately, as already mentioned, presents the commands for the building of the Temple. The essential framework of the plan of the *Temple Scroll* includes three concentric courts at the geographical centre, the cultic focus, of which is the entrance to the House of the Temple. The *Temple Scroll* works its way from the inner-most to the outer-most, both in terms of structure as well as of requirements for ritual purity.

After the discussion of the requirements for both the structure of the Temple, its courts and the city of the Temple it moves outwards to the purity requirements for the cities in the Land of Israel. In this scroll, however, laws pertaining to ritual purity and laws pertaining to the way of life of the People Israel are presented as part of a whole. There is an assumption of an organic relationship between the cult, laws originating particularly from Leviticus, and the Deuteronomic understanding of the covenant. This interrelationship represents an essential feature of the world-view of this scroll which is also central to the world-view of the sectarian scrolls. Briefly the way of life of the People of Israel is presented, in both cases, as equal to the cult as that which directly affects and brings into effect the ritual purity of People, Land and sanctuary. (See Appendix 2)

Despite the fact that such a large proportion of the scroll deals with the Temple and its city, the scroll, through its use of language, directs our attention to the portions which deal with the purity of the Children of Israel in general, whether in the city of the Temple or in other cities, i.e.:

- 5       ...And you shall warn the
- 6       children of Israel of all the uncleane{s}s. And they shall not defile

themselves with them, which

7 I tell you on this mountain, and they shall not be unclean. For I am the Lord, who dwells

8 among the children of Israel: and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and they shall be holy... (51:5-8 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:226-227).

Many of the laws pertaining to the Temple are directly connected with the requirement for the purity of the People, i.e. "And they shall not come into my temple in their *niddah*-like uncleanness and defile (it)" (45:10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:192). The purity of the Temple is also directly affected by the *moral* purity of the People, i.e.:

11 You shall appoint judges and officers in all your towns, and they shall judge the people

12 with righteous judgment. And they shall not show partiality in justice, and shall not take a bribe, and shall not

13 pervert justice, for the bribe perverts justice, and subverts the cause of the righteous, and blinds

14 the eye of the wise, and causes great guilt, and defiles the house because of the sin of

15 iniquity (51:11-15 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:227-229).

Particularly significant for our present discussion is the fact that the source for the above precepts pertaining to courts of justice (Deut. 16:18 f) does not include the connection to the "house," i.e. the Temple. For the scroll purity of the Land, the People and the Temple are one. This echoes the Deuteronomic ideology within which the Land can only be retained by the People *if* they live according to the laws of the covenant of Sinai. But unlike Deuteronomy, which only *introduces* the idea of the one and only central sanctuary, the scroll makes the immediate causative connection between the ability, and willingness, of the People to live according to the covenant and the purity of the sanctuary. Deuteronomy does

not make such a connection. Deuteronomy is concerned with the ability of the People to live according to the covenant so that they may remain in the Land. This last concern is as evident in the scroll as it is in Deuteronomy. Immediately after the above section the *Temple Scroll* adds, directly from Deuteronomy (16:20),

15     ...Justice, and only justice, you shall follow, that you may live and come  
and inherit

16     the land which I give you to inherit for all times (51:15-16 Yadin *Temple*  
1983 2:229).

The direct connection between the actions of the People and the purity of the Land is also made explicit in this scroll in a way that does not originate in Deuteronomy. Earlier in the scroll (col.88) in a discussion of prohibitions originating in Deuteronomy (14:1-2) and Leviticus (19:28 and 11:5) we find an interesting innovation:

7       ...You are the sons  
8       of the Lord your God; you shall not cut yourselves or make any baldness on  
your foreheads  
9       for the dead; you shall not make any cuttings in your flesh on account of the  
dead, nor shall you tattoo any marks  
10      upon you, for you are a holy people to the Lord your God. *And you shall*  
*not defile*  
11      *your land.*" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:208-209 italics are added)

The last sentence originates not in Deuteronomy but in Numbers (35:34). There the defilement of the Land is a direct consequence of murder. This is also the only instance in the Pentateuch where we are provided with, one may argue, a sacrifice, the blood of the guilty party, the direct consequence of which is to remove impurity from the Land. This is an issue of some importance and will be dealt with in chapter Four. But in the interest of illustrating the significance of this passage as evidence of the centrality of this scroll to the

sectarian Community I will anticipate my argument and provide a brief explanation.

In Chapter Four I argue that the type of sacrifice which is presented in the *Community Rule* (col.8 and 9) is understood by the Community to have the same efficacy as the blood sacrifice in the physical Temple. The purpose of this sacrifice, however, is original to that scroll. This purpose being to obtain God's favour for the land (9:4) and even more explicitly, "to atone for the land" (8:10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35). This, again is a purpose of sacrifice which can not be found anywhere in the Pentateuch, with the possible exception of Numbers (35:34). In Deuteronomy remaining in the Land is associated with the People's ability to live by the covenant. In Leviticus the purpose of sacrifice is to atone for the People of Israel, individually or as a group. The express declaration of a sacrifice *for atoning for the Land* specifically is not Pentateuchal. But neither, one may argue, does the *Temple Scroll* mention such a sacrifice. This is true, except that in the *Community Rule* the "sacrifice" which is offered up to atone for the Land is the way of life of the Community. The direct causal relationship between the way of life of the People and the purity of the Land is introduced here, in the *Temple Scroll*. Further, pollution and defilement of the Land, as well as expiation for the Land, occur in the above passage from Numbers through the shedding of *blood*:

You shall not pollute the land in which you live; for blood pollutes the land, and no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it (Num. 35:33).

In the passage from the *Temple Scroll* it is caused not through blood but rather by the People's actions, a Deuteronomic idea. Therefore we have in the *Temple Scroll* a direct citation of an essential aspect of the only passage in the Pentateuch which explicitly discusses the pollution of the Land. This pollution is caused by the shedding of innocent blood and "no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by

the blood of the one who shed it" (Num.35:33). Therefore, in this Priestly document, blood both defiles and expiates. The *Temple Scroll*, however, in citing this passage does not connect the defilement of the Land with the shedding of blood but rather with the inability or unwillingness of the People to live by the laws of the covenant. My discussion of the *Community Rule* in Chapter Four will show that that scroll also perceives both the defilement as well as the purification of the Land as being caused not through the shedding of blood but by lives lived either in contradiction to or in accord with its stringent understanding of the covenant.

The above discussion introduces another pivotal issue which lends support to my contention that a fundamental relationship exists between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. In his examination of "the composition and editing of the scroll" (*Temple* 1983, 1:71-88) Yigael Yadin introduces the different forms of editing evident in the scroll. These he summarizes as:

drafting the text in the first person with the object of establishing that it is God Himself who is the speaker; merging commands that concern the same subject; unifying duplicate commands, including those that contradict one another; modifying and adding to the commands in order to clarify their halakhic meaning; appending whole new sections (*Temple* 1983 1:71).

He approaches his subsequent discussion of these different issues in two ways: he cross-references each line of each column with possible Scriptural sources as well as with other ancient sources, including the Dead Sea Scrolls; he also provides his own analysis as to the reasons for the merging, unifying and modifying. I will only present a very brief summary of those of Yadin's conclusions as to the reasons for the particular editorial methods of the author which are relevant for my present study. Yadin sees the editing of the scroll based in large part on the author's attempt to present a book of law for the People of Israel in the

Land. To this end, he explains, the scroll presents us with an attempt to harmonize duplicate or contradictory Pentateuchal commands (*Temple* 1983, 1:73-77), as well as to clarify and explain the meaning of commands which may be vague or obscure (*Temple* 1983, 1:77-81). Finally the scroll contains supplementary laws relating to a number of issues, but of particular significance for the purposes of my investigation laws relating to the sanctity and purity of the Temple and the Temple city (*Temple* 1983, 1:86-88). Yadin's analysis of the scroll, especially his comments in situ, provide an invaluable point of departure for further study. His explanation as to the reasons for the merging or unifying of commands on the same subject originating from different Pentateuchal sources, however, can be taken a few steps further than he did. Yadin explains the repeated pattern evident in the *Temple Scroll* of combining material originating in Priestly sources with material originating in Deuteronomy in the following way:

the author's purpose was to present a sort of expanded and fully supplemented Deuteronomy - or *Mishneh Torah* - that is, a complete written law of God, by which one is to conduct oneself in the conditions of life prevailing in the Promised Land. These conditions, by their very nature, required that the laws given in the priestly sources be applied to the Temple, the Temple city and the other cities (*Temple* 1983, 1:87).

One can not argue with this conclusion but one can take the next logical step and ask is the author's intent only to harmonize, merge and clarify for the purposes of providing an "expanded and fully supplemented Deuteronomy," or can we see in his particular way of merging and harmonizing an attempt to present something far more complicated and subtle?

Before this question can be answered we need to briefly explore the two sources from which the author most often takes his material and which he most often combines. These are the Priestly and Deuteronomical. Moshe Weinfeld, in *Deuteronomy and the*

*Deuteronomical School*, discusses a number of differences in these two sources, differences which have a bearing on my analysis of the *Temple Scroll*. These include their perception of "the divine abode" (191-209), of "sacrifice and holy donations" (210-224), of purity, impurity and holiness (225-232) and, finally, of "sin and punishment" (239-243). I will begin my brief review of his examination by returning to the earlier cited passage from Numbers (35:33-34). He regards this passage as pivotal in beginning to understand some of the major differences between the two sources. He contrasts this passage with Deuteronomy 19:10, the "deuteronomic law of asylum" (225) and concludes:

The law in the book of Numbers closes with the exhortation (vv.33-4) not to permit spilt blood to pollute the *land*, whereas the deuteronomic law concludes with the warning not to allow innocent blood to be shed in the land lest the bloodguilt fall upon the *people* (19:10). A comparison between Deut. 21 and Num. 35 seems to reflect the same conception. Deut. 21:8 reads: 'Forgive *your people* Israel', whereas in Num. 35:33 we read: 'And *the land* can have no expiation' (225-226).

Holiness, he explains, in Deuteronomy has to do with the setting apart of the *people* by God. The *people* of Israel are holy because God chose this particular nation. *Because* the People are holy they must live by a particular set of laws, laws which guard against defilement (226-227). He adds,

Purity according to the book of Deuteronomy ... is not the prerequisite of holiness, but rather an obligation which holiness imposes upon the Israelite: 'you shall not cut yourselves... you shall not eat anything that dies of itself *because you are* a holy people' (by divine election) (228).

In the Priestly view, on the other hand, holiness is a *result* of cult and ritual (226-227).

"The Priestly document conceives holiness to be contingent upon physical proximity to the divine presence and the preservation of that proximity through ritual means" (227).

Furthermore, according to Weinfeld's argument, holiness, in the Priestly view, attaches to the

Land of Israel. He adds, "...laws concerning incest, purity, and defilement, which are set forth in the same context and coupled with murder, are all conceived as sins which contaminate and pollute the land" (240). He gives as examples the passage from Numbers 35:33-34 as well as Leviticus 18 which provides a list of sins the punishment for which is: "...the land will vomit you out for defiling it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you" (18:28). Hence the concern about defiling the Land in Num. 35:33-34 as opposed to the concern about defiling the People in Deuteronomy.

I will not enter the debate as to which of the two traditions is older since what concerns me at present is the fact that both were known by, and influenced the *Temple Scroll* as well as the other sectarian scrolls. What I do argue is that the particular fusion of the two traditions which is evident in all the sectarian scrolls as well as the *Temple Scroll* testifies both to a dissatisfaction with the separate world-views of each of the traditions, Deuteronomical and Priestly, *as separate*, as well as to evidence of common concerns which are satisfied by a particular combination of the two traditions. The question one may ask is why would documents which manifest such a priest and cult centred perception of the world, as do all the above mentioned scrolls, feel a need to include such large sections of Deuteronomy and of Deuteronomic world-view the result of which is to, in effect, diffuse the gravity of the cult? The answer, I will show, is that the intent of these documents is different. The additions can not be seen as an attempt to supplement one or the other of the two, rather, by incorporating the two the result is a new world-view, one which infuses the Priestly nature of the *people*, a concept central to the Deuteronomic theology, with cultic implications and responsibilities. Thus emphasizing the unity of cult and covenant. A concern which, as will be further discussed in chapter Four, is also central to the prophetic books of Hebrew Scripture.



A brief discussion of the use made in the *Temple Scroll* of God's dwelling place will serve to better illustrate my point. Weinfeld (*Deuteronomy*) explains that the two sources, Deuteronomical and Priestly, exhibit very different ways of understanding the concept of God's dwelling place. He begins his discussion with the book of Deuteronomy:

It is interesting to note that the very book which elevates the chosen place to the highest rank of importance in the Israelite cultus should at the same time divest it of all sacral content and import. With remarkable consistency it resorts again and again to the phrase 'the place which he shall choose to cause his name to dwell there' ... so as to emphasize that it is God's name and not himself who dwells within the sanctuary, as against the Priestly tradition which speaks of God's dwelling in the midst of the children of Israel (Exod. 29:45; 25:8; Lev. 26:11; Num. 16:3). Indeed all sacral activity performed in the tabernacle as described by the Priestly writings is ... based on the assumption of God's actual immanence in the sanctuary (*Deuteronomy* 197).

In the *Temple Scroll* we find references to both "the place which he shall choose to cause his name to dwell there," as well as to "God dwelling in the midst of the children of Israel." We also find mention of "the city in which I dwell" (45:13 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:193) which Yadin explains "follows Num. v:3, referring to the expulsion of impure persons from the camp" (*Temple* 1983, 2:193), but does not have a parallel, as far as God dwelling in the city, in the Pentateuch. The *Temple Scroll* uses all of the above, often in combination as in this passage:

- 11 And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not  
come into any part of the city
- 12 of the temple, *where I will settle my name*, for three days. No blind man
- 13 shall enter it all their days, so that they will not defile *the city in which I*

*dwell;*

- 14 for I, the Lord, *dwell among the children of Israel* for ever and ever (45:11-14 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:193 italics are added).

The above passage is interesting because it makes use of three different phrases to describe God's dwelling place, the first Deuteronomical, the last Priestly and the second original to the scroll but with Priestly connotations, a comparison can be made to Exodus 25:8, a Priestly tradition, "And have them make me a sanctuary, so that I may dwell among them". This passage becomes more interesting when we consider the equation offered between the first, Deuteronomic, and the second, Priestly, descriptions of God's abode, the two are presented as interchangeable. And it becomes yet more interesting when we realize that the third is here presented as interchangeable with the first two. Yadin, in discussing the above passage (11QT 45:11-14 in *Temple* 1983, 2:193) explains that "(e)mphasis that the holiness of the Temple city emanates from God's dwelling there recurs frequently in the scroll." I would add that the scroll emphasizes also that holiness of the People of Israel "emanates from God's dwelling" within the community of the People of Israel. The following passage illustrates this point:

- 7 ...For I am the Lord, who dwells  
8 among the Children of Israel; and *you* shall consecrate (*them* therefore), and  
they shall be holy, and let them not make themselves  
9 abominable with everything that I have set apart for them to hold unclean;  
and they shall be  
10 holy (51:7-10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:227 italics are added).

The fact of God's presence requires purity. The holiness of the People is a given, consistent with Deuteronomical ideology, as explained above, separation from "all I have set apart for

them to hold unclean" is required of the holy nation. Yet the imminence of God is in accord with Priestly ideology. A passage similar to the above is found in Lev.11:44: "For I am the LORD your God; sanctify yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy." Two main differences are immediately obvious. The first is that this section, as is all of the scroll, is written in the first person the commands are therefore given directly by God. The second difference is that whereas in the passage from Leviticus despite the mediation of Moses as the one to whom God speaks and who must then speak God's commands to the People, these commands are directed to the People: "The LORD spoke to Moses and Aaron, saying to them: Speak to the people of Israel, saying..." (Lev. 11:1-2. The exception to this is the laws pertaining to skin afflictions in Lev. 13-14, responsibility for diagnosing and dealing with these is given directly to the priests). The People as individuals and as a group are given the responsibility for living by these commands, thus sanctifying *themselves*. In the scroll the commands are spoken by God directly to some intermediary to whom responsibility is given for the People: "*you* shall consecrate (*them* therefore)" (italics are added). This intermediary must be understood as Priestly.

The superiority of the Priestly class over judges and even the king is made explicit in the scroll, as in the following section dealing with all decisions made by a king related to a "war of choice" (Yadin *Temple* 1983,1:352):

- 18 And he shall not go out until he comes before the high priest, who shall inquire for him by the judgement of the Urim
- 19 and the Thummim. At his word he shall go out, and at his word he shall come in, both he and all the people of Israel with
- 20 him; he shall not go out by the counsel of his heart until he inquires by the judgement of the Urim
- 21 and the Thummim (58:18-21 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:264-265).

Yadin explains the above by adding,

The overall approach of the scroll respecting the king and his subordination to the decisions of the priests is repeated in the scrolls in connection with 'the Shoot of David who will arise at the end of days': ...

And as it says, 'Not/ [by what his eyes see shall he judge] or decide by what his ears shall hear';

its interpretation is that/ [...] and according to what they (the priests!) teach him, so shall he judge, and according to their command/ [...] *with him*, one of the priests of renown shall go out with garments of [...] in his hand [...]

(*Pesher on Isaiah*, DJD, V, No. 161, Fragments 8-10, p.14. ll.21-24)

(*Temple* 1983, 1:352).

Two more aspects of the column 58 passage just cited are important to point out because we find analogous statements in the sectarian scrolls. These are, first of all, the phrase referring to "the counsel of his own heart," and then the use of the Urim and Thummim, "the sacred lots" (*Oxford Bible* 106 OT note to 28:15-30), as that which decides the judgement. In the *Community Rule* we find the same emphasis being placed on the importance of not following the "stubbornness" of one's own heart (5:4) and an emphasis being placed on submitting one's will to the "Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant" (i.e. 5:2 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19). The emphasis being, just as in the *Temple Scroll*, on the authority of the priests as opposed to the judgement of one's own inclination. Further, we are told, "The sons of Aaron alone shall rule over judgement and property. According to them the lot (*grl*) shall be cast concerning every norm of the men of the Community" (1QS 9:7 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39). The superiority of the priest is understood, in both cases, as having to do with the fact that the priest has direct communication with God, often described as some type of *lot*.

The priority of the priest can also be seen in the use made by the *Temple Scroll* of a variety of passages originating from Deuteronomy. Most of these passages are reproduced in the scroll with no, or minor, changes. The adjustments, when they do occur, serve to emphasize the importance of the priests, as in the following section from column 51, the beginning of the section identified by Yadin as the "statutes of the king":

- 20     And when he sits on the throne of his kingdom, they shall write  
21     for him this law in a book from that which is in charge of the priests (Yadin  
       *Temple* 1983, 2:254).

This passage is similar to the passage in Deuteronomy (17:18) except that the deuteronomic *ktb* can be understood as "he wrote for himself" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:344) or at least as the king commissioning the writing of the law for himself, as in the *Oxford* translation: "When he has taken the throne of his kingdom, he shall have a copy of this law written for him in the presence of the levitical priests." The scroll takes away all authority in the matter of writing down of the law from the king: "*they* shall write *for* him." The emphasis of this statement as prescribed in the scroll is on the authority and activity of the priests. They are in charge of the law, they shall write it for the king. The king is a passive recipient of that which is controlled by the priests.

In contrast the Deuteronomical emphasis is different. Weinfeld, in discussing the role of the priests as "guardians of the Law," in Deuteronomy explains that the title can not be understood as implying any functional judicial authority in Deuteronomy:

This specific function of *the priests the Levites* is mentioned only in Deuteronomy and always in reference to a written and fixed Torah (Deut. 17:18; 31:9 and 26). The book of the Law then was *entrusted* to the Levitical priests but it did not *originate* with them. The book of Deuteronomy, which frequently refers to the

writing of the Torah, does not so much as once associate the Levitical priests with the writing of it. Moses writes the Torah and entrusts it to the Levitical priests (31:9). *The king writes a copy of the book of Deuteronomy* (presumably by means of his scribes) 'from that which is in charge of the Levitical priests' (17:18), *but they themselves do not act as writers or copyists* (*Deuteronomy 53 italics are added*).

The authority of the priests, therefore, as understood in Deuteronomy, in relation to the Torah, has to do with the guarding of the document as a physical entity no authority is implied as to the control of the Law, as separate from the physical document. The *Temple Scroll* expands the authority of the priests as is evident for the following passage from 56:3-5 which deals with the issue of the judgement of difficult cases. Deuteronomy 17:8-9, the starting point of the discussion reads:

If a judicial decision is too difficult for you to make between one kind of bloodshed and another, one kind of legal right and another, or one kind of assault and another - any such matters of dispute in your towns - then you shall immediately go up to the place that the LORD your God will choose, where you shall consult with the Levitical priests and the judge who is in office in those days; they shall announce to you the decision in the case.

The passage from 11QT 56:3-5 includes modifications to Deuteronomy which again serve to highlight the authority of the priest.

- 3      Then you shall do according to the *law* that they declare to you and  
according to what  
4      they say to you from the *book of the law* and declare to you in sincerity  
5      from that place on which I shall choose to settle my name (11QT 56:3-5  
Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:251-252)

The parallel passage from Deuteronomy reads as follows:

Carry out exactly the *decision* that they announce to you from the place that the

LORD will choose (17:10).

The passage from 11QT reiterates the authority of the priests as well as the judge, something which already exists in the Deuteronomy passage, but highlights the authority of the priest by replacing the *decision* (*db*) of Deuteronomy 17:10 with *law* (*twrh*) in line 3 and by emphasizing that this *law* is from the *book of the law* (line 4), a fact not mentioned in the Deuteronomy passage. The Deuteronomy passage includes the word *law* (*twrh*) in verse 11. Within the section of 11QT (56:1-11) which includes the laws of Deuteronomy 17:9-13 the word *twrh* has been included three times, as opposed to the one in Deuteronomy. And one of these three times in the passage from 11QT emphasizes *the book of the law*. The significance of this is that whereas the Deuteronomy passage presents the near-equality of the priests and the judges, even though the priests are mentioned first, the passage from 11QT brings the supremacy of the priests to the forefront by emphasizing that the judgement is a law "from the book of the law," a document which, even Deuteronomy, places in the guardianship of the priests. In the *Temple Scroll* every time but one (59:9-10) that *twrh* is mentioned it is in connection with priest or cult. The priests are not only the guardians of the physical document they are the guardians of the *Law*. This is implied by their authority to interpret it, as is evident in the already cited passage referring to the king (59:18-21). The interpretation of the law, as God's command in that passage, is effected through the use of the Urim and Thummim, an oracular device implying the immediate presence of God, as in the following from Exodus:

In the breastpiece of judgement you shall put the Urim and the Thummim, and they shall be on Aaron's heart when he goes in before the LORD; thus Aaron shall bear the judgement of the Israelites on his heart before the LORD continually (28:30).

The use of the Urim and the Thummim for decisions relating to war is common in the Priestly sources. Weinfeld writes that "military operations cannot be conducted without the presence of the high priest bearing the Urim (Num. 27:21)" (*Deuteronomy* 185), and that

"Saul and David conduct their military campaigns according to the instructions provided by the Urim" (*Deuteronomy* 186), (i.e. 1 Sam. 14:41-42). This is echoed in the Priestly belief as to the need to bring particularly difficult legal cases before God. Weinfeld contrasts the different perceptions of the judicial process in Priestly sources and in Deuteronomy, which removes the need of the presence of God thus secularizing the judicial process.

The secular aspect of the judicial function in Deuteronomy becomes especially clear when one compares Exod. 18:19 with Deut. 1:17. According to the former source, major disputes have to be brought to Moses, who brings them before God for final decision. In the latter the detail about the disputes being brought before God was omitted by Moses (*Deuteronomy* 233).

Deuteronomy thus removes the need for that group which can interpret direct revelation. In Deuteronomy the People are responsible for the covenant, they are responsible for knowing the Laws and for effecting the process which will actualize the laws of the covenant:

Then Moses wrote down this law, and gave it to the priests, the sons of Levi, who carried the ark of the covenant of the LORD, and *to all the elders of Israel*. Moses commanded them: 'Every seventh year, in the scheduled year of remission, during the festival of booths, when *all Israel* comes to appear before the LORD your God at the place that he will choose, you shall read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Assemble the people - men, women, and children, as well as aliens residing in your towns - so that they may hear and learn to fear the LORD your God and to observe diligently all the words of this law, and so that their children who have not known it, may hear and learn to fear the LORD your God, as long as you live in the land that you are crossing over the Jordan to possess (Deut. 31:9-13 italics are added).

The priests in Deuteronomy have ritual functions but these functions are largely symbolic.



The process can unfold without them. This is evident in the already mentioned role of the priests as guardians of the Torah as physical document as opposed to being guardians of the Torah as law. This is also evident in the Deuteronomic view that God requires proper observance of (the non-cultic aspects of) the covenant, it is observance of these, after all which will guarantee the Peoples' possession of the Land. Again it is interesting, as earlier mentioned, that the book of the Pentateuch which places such emphasis on the centralization of the cult has no information about "sacrifice practised for its own sake ... Neither is there any mention of the sin and guilt offerings designed to atone for involuntary sins, ritual impurity, perjury, theft, and deception" (Weinfeld *Deuteronomy* 210). The function of sacrifice in Deuteronomy is, for the most part, eucharistic:

The gifts of Yahweh to Israel ought to call up feelings of gratitude and joy; and so in Deuteronomy sacrifice is preeminently regarded as a joyful feast eaten before Yahweh and in remembrance of what he has done. To sacrifice, to eat before Yahweh, to rejoice before Yahweh, have here become synonymous (Gray *Sacrifice* 47).

The one instance in Deuteronomy which

does mention a rite analogous in character to the sin and guilt offering is in the law of unsolved murder (Deut.21:1-9). Yet interestingly enough it is precisely this law which reflects Deuteronomy's special attitude towards sacrifice. The rite conducted here does not consist of a sacrificial offering complete with ceremonial slaughter and blood sprinkling, but calls only for the breaking of a heifer's neck in an uncultivated valley. The priests are present during this act, not because they play any part in the execution of the ritual, for this is carried out entirely by the elders, but merely to guarantee the religious aspect of the ceremony by presiding over it (Weinfeld *Deuteronomy* 210-211).

The priests' presence is necessary as is the elders'. Deuteronomy does not do away with the

ritual requirement for the presence of the priest but the priest's presence is not sufficient. The *Temple Scroll* shifts the balance. In the earlier passage (58:18-21) it is the high priest who decides all matters related to a "war of choice" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:352).

The make-up of the "Judicial Council" (Yadin's phrase) is original to the scroll and also serves to punctuate the authority of the priests and Levites. Here we have a council of thirty six members made up of twelve leaders of the people, twelve priests and twelve Levites (57:11-13). The priests and Levites on the council out-number the elders of Israel. It is this council that shall

14     ...(declare the decisions of) the law, that his heart may not be lifted up  
          above them, and that he may not do anything

15     by any counsel apart from them (57:14-15 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:258).

The power and authority given to the priests and Levites by this scroll certainly outweighs the power they have in comparable Deuteronomical passages.

To summarize the above, the *Temple Scroll* presents us with a combination of Priestly and Deuteronomic ideologies. The focus of the Priestly world-view is cult, of the Deuteronomical, covenantal responsibility, especially how this is manifest within the human sphere. Or, as Weinfeld explains, "...the ideological realm of the Priestly document has a religious-theocentric orientation, while the deuteronomic world has a religious-anthropocentric orientation" (*Deuteronomy* 185). In the *Temple Scroll* we find a cosmology within which the two approaches are not merely combined but united in order to produce one whole within which the two become indistinguishable. Thus it endorses the Deuteronomic idea of the one central shrine and speaks about it in Deuteronomic terms as the city upon which God will settle God's name (11QT 45:12), but also in Priestly terms as the city within which God lives (11QT 45:13). It speaks of the ethical responsibilities of the

covenant and the breaking of these as defiling the Temple (11QT 51:11-15), the Land (11QT 48:7-10) as well as the People. The holiness associated with God's presence exists in both the People, a Deuteronomic belief, *and* the Land, part of the Priestly ideology as discussed earlier. Holiness requires ritual purity (11QT 51:8-9), again a Deuteronomic belief, but at the same time it is both the proper performance of the cult which induces God to accept the People (11QT 29:1-6) and the following of the commands of "this Torah" (11QT 29:4; 59:9-10) which makes the People acceptable to God.

As earlier explained, a fact that can not be stressed enough, many of these commands originate in the Pentateuch but the originality of the scroll is in the choosing of the commands it did, in the way these are combined and, perhaps the most unique, in the context within which these are presented: the plan for the Temple. That the author presents us with priestly laws in a scroll the central focus of which is the Temple plan can not shock us. That so many of the laws which are included in the scroll are Deuteronomical should also not surprise us, since it is in Deuteronomy that the idea of one central shrine is introduced. And yet surprise us it does for the very reason that, as Weinfeld explains in discussing Deuteronomy:

The very book which is so centrally concerned with 'the chosen place' has almost completely ignored the sacral institutions which the chosen place must necessarily imply and without which the conduct of sacral worship is unimaginable (*Deuteronomy* 188).

The surprise is not so much that the *Temple Scroll*, a document concerned for the most part with the Temple, includes a discussion of some of the laws pertaining to the Land and the People. Rather it is in the assumption that it makes that the actions of the People, even when not in the environs of the Temple can defile the Temple. And that the purity of the People, even when not in the vicinity of the Temple safeguards the Temple's purity. The scroll also

claims that God resides in the People of Israel as much as in the Temple and for this reason the same type of ritual purity is demanded of the People as is demanded of the priests. And yet the greatest innovation of the *Temple Scroll* is none of the above. The greatest innovation is in the fact that its Deuteronomic ideology appears to be directed to a particular community of Israel which will *never* break the laws of the covenant. This is indicated by the use of the word *`wlm* ('forever') and the phrase *kwl hymym* ('for all time' or 'all the days') in contexts within which it does not appear in the Pentateuch.

The scroll uses these words in a variety of contexts. The first of these is consistent with Pentateuchal usage, it refers to the commands for the practice of the cult, the offerings and practices related to festivals as well as prescriptions for the People as a holy People (i.e. to not eat blood, 53:7, cf Deut. 12:23; to destroy those cities worshipping other gods 55:10, cf Deut. 13:16). This use is evident in a large number of passages which provide the rules and regulations for cultic issues originating in the Pentateuch (15:8; 27:4; 52:7). But these terms, and in particular *`wlm*, are also used in mandating the rules and regulations for the offerings of Feasts which are not mandated in the Pentateuch (possibly 29:9, according to Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:106-108; 20:14 and 21:9 mandating commands for the "Feast of First Fruits of Wine," according to Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:108-111; 22:14 "Feast of First Fruits of Oil" according to Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:111-114). The use made by the author of the scroll of Pentateuchal rhetorical formulas in mandating these non-Pentateuchal festivals imbues them with the prescriptive qualities of the Pentateuchal mandates.

Another use made of this word, *`wlm*, in the scroll is consistent with the Pentateuchal, i.e. to prescribe that particular practices related to the cultic purity of the People of Israel are to be practised for all time, but the prescriptions it so mandates are original to the scroll. These include the commands related to a woman who is pregnant "and her child dies in her womb" (50:10-19 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:336-338). Yadin explains that "This section has no

parallel whatsoever in any biblical text" (*Temple* 1983, 1:336) and Yadin adds that it has clear polemical overtones. Another use of this phrase occurs in 39:8 prescribing a law which also has polemical overtones. This is the law of the half-shekel ransom which in the *Temple Scroll* appears (*appears* must remain as the operative word because a crucial segment is missing in this line) to be prescribing as a once in a lifetime obligation and which was an annual obligation according to Nehemiah (10:32). Yadin supports his assertion that the scroll is discussing a once in a lifetime tax by pointing out that the use of the phrase *chwq `wlm* (a statute forever), as has already been illustrated by our discussion, is often used by the scroll when introducing issues or laws which were meant to be polemical (*Temple* 1983, 2:166). We can find the same law relating to the ransom as a once in a lifetime event in 4Q159, to which Vermes gives the title *Ordinances or Commentaries on Biblical Law* (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 357-359). It states:

Concerning... the money of valuation that a man gives as ransom for his life, it shall be half [a shekel...] He shall give it only once in his life (4Q159 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 357-358).

The use, then, of the word *`wlm*, or a phrase including it such as *chwq `wlm*, which is Pentateuchal in origin, is used in the *Temple Scroll* to emphasize the requirement for the perpetual observance of particular cultic events, whether these originate in the Pentateuch or not. The use of this phrase in mandating non-Pentateuchal laws adds to them an aura of authority and prescriptiveness associated with the Pentateuch.

All the above mentioned instances, whether mandating Pentateuchal laws or not, use these phrases in the context within which they are used in the Pentateuch. There are however a number of instances when these words are used very differently in the scroll. It is in these instances that we see the innovation of the scroll of, first of all, using phrases originating in Priestly or cultic material to communicate a cultic context to non-cultic ideology but also to

suggest, as earlier mentioned, that these laws are intended for a community which will never break the covenant, in other words a community for which the threat of the Deuteronomic curses is not necessary. There is one major exception to this suggestion. An exception which relates to the authority of the priests and which will be discussed further down. An exception which is adopted by the sectarian scrolls and which becomes pivotal in the self-understanding of the Community of these scrolls.

Perhaps the most glaring use made by the scroll of a phrase signifying 'forever' with the result of changing the meaning of a Pentateuchal passage is the following:

- 15     ...Justice and only justice, you shall follow, that you may live and come  
          and inherit  
16     the land which I give you to inherit for all time. (51:15-16 Yadin *Temple*  
          1983, 2:229).

This section, as Yadin indicates (*Temple* 1983, 2:229) originates in Deuteronomy (16:20):

Justice, and only justice, you shall pursue, so that you may live and occupy the land  
that the LORD your God is giving you.

But this passage in Deuteronomy does not include "for all time" or "all the days" (*kwl hymym*). Yadin (*Temple* 1983, 2:229) comments that this last phrase follows Deuteronomy 12:1. But the Deuteronomic passage adds (to *kwl hymym*) '*shr-'tm chyym `l-h'dmh* (all the days that you live on the earth). The presence of this phrase, in Deuteronomy, results in the following:

These are the statutes and ordinances that you must diligently observe *in the land that the LORD*, the God of your ancestors, *has given you to occupy all the days that you live on this earth* (Deut. 12:1 italics are added).

The absence of this last phrase in 11QT implies that the inheritance is, literally, for *all time*. The *Temple Scroll* is consistent in fact in expressing God's commands and Israel's

acceptance and submission to them as unequivocal.

Even though the above use of a phrase signifying 'forever' may be the most glaring, the following may be the most significant for understanding the scroll. It also happens to be the first time the word *wlm* is used in the scroll as we have it. This occurs in column 29. Yadin stresses the significance of this column, particularly "the lower portion. This section is crucial for understanding of the scroll in general, and, in particular, for understanding the nature of the Temple as conceived by the author" (*Temple* 1983, 1:125). He attempts to summarize the upper part of the column, "of which almost nothing has survived", by saying that it "must have completed the details of sacrifices for the Feast of Booths and the concluding Eighth Day of Assembly" (*Temple* 1983, 1:125). The existing parts of the column are as follows:

- 1      and [their] drink offering [for the bull, for the ram and for the male lambs  
and for the male goat, according to their ordinance.]
- 2      These [you shall offer to the Lord at you appointed feasts ]
- 3      for your burnt offerings(?) and for your drink offerings(?) [    ]  
in the house upon which I shall [settle]
- 4      my name [    ] burnt offerings, [each] on its [proper] day, according to  
the law of this ordinance,
- 5      continually from the children of Israel, besides their freewill offerings for all  
their offerings,
- 6      for all their drink offerings and all their gifts which they will bring to me  
that th[ey] may be accepted (*lrtswn lhmh*).
- 7      And I will accept them(?) (*wrtsytym*), and they shall be(?) my people, and I  
will be theirs for ever (*l`wlm*), [and] I will dwell
- 8      with them for ever and ever (*l`wlm w`d*). And I will consecrate my

- [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle
- 9 my glory, until the day of blessing on which I will create my temple
- 10 and establish it for myself for all times, according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob at Bethel (Yadin *Temple* 1983,2:127-129).

The significance of understanding this column, as Yadin has explained, cannot be overemphasized. It follows a column "devoted to the Feast of Booths and its sacrifices according to its successive days" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:121), and its "upper part", as earlier explained, "must have contained the details of sacrifices for the Feast of Booths and the concluding Eighth Day of Assembly" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:125). This column appears to be discussing the list of offerings to be presented on the Eighth Day of Assembly according to Numbers 29:35-39 (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:125; 127), but in doing so it uses phrases borrowed from Ezekiel chapters 43 and 44 (Yadin *Temple* 1983,2:128).<sup>2</sup> These passages from Ezekiel discuss the erection and purification of the altar according to his vision. The 11QT passage reads as follows:

- 7 And I will accept them, and they shall be my people, and I will be theirs for ever, [and] I will dwell
- 8 with them for ever and ever. And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle
- 9 my glory, until the day of blessing... (29:7-9 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:128-129).

Compare the above lines with "...and I will accept you says the LORD God" (Ezek. 43:27); "He said to me: Mortal, this is the place of my throne and the place for the soles of my feet, where I will reside among the people of Israel forever" (Ezek.43:7); and , finally, "...the

---

<sup>2</sup>J.L. Wentling has also found similarities between 11QT 29:8b-9a and Ezek.37:28 ("11QT, The Eschatological Community...", 67-69).



glory of the LORD filled the temple of the LORD" (Ezek. 44:4). The passage from 11QT, in using language borrowed from Ezekiel, is laying the ground work for an interpretation, of the ritual being described, based on Ezekiel's vision. Therefore, despite the apparent similarity between the ritual in 11QT and the one described in Numbers 29, one could understand this ritual as being not only the order of offerings to be made on the Eighth Day of Assembly but rather the offerings to be made on the eighth day after the seven days of purification of the altar in a *rebuilt*, thus *new*, Temple as described in Ezekiel's vision (43:18-26). We must keep in mind that Ezekiel's vision speaks of a new Temple at a time when none exists, after the destruction of the First Temple. The *Temple Scroll*, however, in borrowing from Ezekiel, describes the dedication of a new Temple at a time when another Temple *does* exist. The procedure for the eighth day, in Ezekiel, part of which has already been cited, reads as follows:

When these days are over, then from the eighth day onward the priests shall offer upon the altar your burnt offerings and your offerings of well being; and I will accept you, says the Lord GOD (43:27)

Ezekiel's vision continues:

The LORD said to me: Mortal, mark well, look closely, and listen attentively to all that I shall tell you concerning all the ordinances of the temple of the LORD and all its laws; and mark well those who may be admitted to the temple and all those who are to be excluded from the sanctuary (44:5).

Further down the vision explains:

But the levitical priests, the descendants of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the people of Israel went astray from me, shall come near to me to minister to me; and they shall attend me to offer me the fat and the blood, says the Lord GOD (44:15).

It is in the sectarian scrolls that we are told more about the sectarian Community's perceived

relationship with the Sons of Zadok. The *Temple Scroll* makes no direct connection. The absence of any mention of the Sons of Zadok may be seen as a problem in accepting the *Temple Scroll* as canonical for the Community of the sectarian scrolls. But we must remember that the sectarian scrolls include a large corpus of exegetical material. James C. VanderKam (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*) explains,

We know that the residents of Qumran spent a portion of each day in scriptural study and that the ancient revelations were central to the life and teachings of the community. As the Manual of Discipline (1QS) says: 'And where the ten are, there shall never lack a man among them who shall study the Law continually, day and night, concerning the right conduct of a man with his companion. And the Congregation shall watch in community for a third of every night of the year, to read the Book and to study the Law and to pray together' (6.6-8). The centrality of the scriptures comes to light in a number of ways, the most obvious of which is the quantity of biblical manuscripts found in the eleven caves. Another way in which it finds expression is in the commentaries on biblical books found there. A term that recurs in these texts is the Hebrew word *peshar* (plural *pesharim*), which means 'interpretation' (43-44).

Knowing the value which the Community of the sectarian scrolls placed on the study of Scriptures and its interpretation the significance of the *Temple Scroll* for the Community of sectarians can be judged by whether or not we see evidence in the sectarian scrolls of concepts and laws which are derived from the *Temple Scroll*. The *Temple Scroll* need not contain explicit references to these concepts and laws, although it often does, it needs to introduce a framework, a world-view the application of which is evident in the sectarian scrolls.

Lawrence Schiffman (*The Halakhah at Qumran*) provided a list of the main areas of Qumran *halakhah*:

(1) organization of the sect, (2) Sabbath, (3) Calendar, (4) ritual purity, (5) oaths and vows, (6) courts and testimony, (7) cult and ritual, (8) war, and (9) the eschatological ritual. There is one other area of *halakhah* which has recently been shown to be fertile ground for study - the scribal practice. This area differs in that the implied *halakha* which guided the scribes of Qumran must be extracted from the study of their manuscripts (9).

I can not deal with all ten of the above "main areas of Qumran *halakhah*." I will, however, deal with a number of them and especially show that the "halakha" of the sectarian scrolls is grounded in the world-view introduced by, and central to, the *Temple Scroll*.

It is in their "halakha", to continue Schiffman's use of the term, and their world-view that we find evidence of the significance of the *Temple Scroll* to the sectarian scrolls. A community which we know placed such emphasis on study and exegesis of Scripture would have been aware of the context from within which the phrases in column 11QT 29 have been taken and the continuation of that particular section of Ezekiel. The use of language originating from this *particular* section of Ezekiel within this *particular* section of the *Temple Scroll* (col. 29) is very significant. It is here that the scroll introduces the dedication of the Temple it prescribes as well as the acceptance of both it and the People of Israel by God. That the book of Ezekiel provided for them an identifiable ancestry, the identification with the Sons of Zadok and their particular function, to be fully discussed in the next chapters, is obvious from the *Damascus Document* (3:21-4:4) which first cites Ezekiel 44:15 and then provides the interpretation of this passage. An interpretation which *directly* connects the Community with the Sons of Zadok. Ezekiel provides a link to Scriptural evidence of their identity as well as supports their belief in their worthiness for the task they have been called to fulfil.

In the next chapter I will explore the Community of the scrolls and their way of life, an integral part of which involves the separation of themselves, as representatives of the Sons of Zadok, from the People of Israel who went astray. This is done *so that* they will be suitable for the task which Ezekiel's vision mandates for the Sons of Zadok: they "shall come near to me,; and they shall attend me to offer me the fat and the blood, says the Lord GOD" (44:15). This passage from Ezekiel which provides the Community with their identity as well as their purpose is not even mentioned in the *Temple Scroll* and yet it is to the *Temple Scroll* that we must trace its significance for the Community. It is the *Temple Scroll* which provides the Community with the particular world-view which is so essential to their perception of themselves as is evident for the sectarian scrolls. A world-view within which cult and covenant are one. A world-view within which God dwells amongst the People of Israel and within which a breach of the moral precepts of the covenant impart the type of ritual impurity which is evident in the Pentateuch only in cases of cultic negligence or misconduct. And it is in the *Temple Scroll* that the use of language originating in Ezekiel is found in *precisely* the same section which introduces both: the concept of God dwelling with the People of Israel "forever and ever" as well as the consecration of the new Temple by the presence of God's glory (11QT 29). The use of the book of Ezekiel then becomes just one more of the units of Scripture which the author removes from its original context and places in a new one, always in the first person voice of God. Again we can not know the intent of the author in including passages from Ezekiel in this section of the scroll. We can however see the way the sectarian scrolls interpreted the use of these passages. This column is crucial in helping us to understand how the sectarians of Qumran understood the nature of the Temple and how they made use of this scroll as a blueprint upon which to base the structure and organization of their community. Column 29 introduces a new Temple and its dedication. A Temple which is to be built and run according to the laws prescribed in this scroll. Laws which are directly revealed by God. Furthermore, as is evident from the

similarity between the language of the column and Ezekiel, one can easily make the connection that this Temple should be run by the Sons of Zadok, the only ones fit to approach God in Ezekiel.

Considering that the *Temple Scroll* begins with Deuteronomical concerns, i.e. the entry into the Land and the encounter once there with its inhabitants it is significant that it includes the Deuteronomic curses in only one section, this is at the end of the section which Yadin calls "the Statutes of the King." After the scroll's discussion of the laws pertaining to the king, laws which originate in Deuteronomy as well as new laws, the scroll presents the curses which, as Yadin explains, are "to fall upon king and people if the king does not observe the statutes of the Lord, and the blessing to come 'if he will walk in my statutes'. The text is based primarily on Deut. xxviii" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:265). From the start it is obvious that this section is an innovation of the scroll since the laws of Deut. 28 are directed at the People if *they* do not live by God's statutes. The same theme, of the Peoples' responsibility for their own actions, is evident throughout the Deuteronomic histories. 1 Samuel, a Deuteronomic book, includes a warning by Samuel within which we find mention of a relationship between the positive or negative actions of the king and the reward or punishment of Israel. But the reward or punishment of the People is not based on the actions of the king alone, rather the People themselves are ultimately responsible for their fate:

If you will fear the LORD and serve him and heed his voice and not rebel against the commandments of the LORD, and if both you and the king who reigns over you will follow the LORD your God, it will be well; but if you will not heed the voice of the LORD, but rebel against the commandments of the LORD, then the hand of the LORD will be against you and your king (1 Samuel 12:14-15).

The book of 1 Kings, another Deuteronomic history, does include condemnation of the kings of the Northern Kingdom and does hold them responsible, in part, for causing the People to sin. But again ultimately the People are held responsible for their own sins and the king is held responsible for his own sins:

The word of the LORD came to Jehu son of Hanani against Baasha, saying, 'Since I exalted you out of the dust and made you leader over my people Israel, and you have walked in the way of Jeroboam, and have *caused my people Israel to sin*, provoking me to anger with their sins, therefore, I will consume Baasha and his house, and I will make your house like the house of Jeroboam son of Nebat. Anyone belonging to Baasha who dies in the city the dogs shall eat; and anyone of his who dies in the fields the birds of the air shall eat' (1 Kings 16:1-4 italics are added).

The innovation of the scroll, at first glance, appears to be in holding the People of Israel responsible for the king's sins. But the scroll is in fact introducing something more, something which becomes very significant for the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls. The first column dealing with the "statutes of the king" (56:12 ff) includes laws originating in Deuteronomy (17:14 ff) (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:250). The next two columns begin with a continuation of the laws of this section of Deuteronomy and then introduce the "additional laws" (Yadin's phrase, *Temple* 1983, 2:250). These two columns also include the prescriptions already discussed which treat the priest and Priestly judgement as superior to the king and the king's judgement. Column 58, the column directly preceding the column which introduces the curses ends with the following statement:

- 18     And he shall not go out until he comes before the high priest, who shall  
       inquire for him the judgement of the Urim  
19     and the Thummim. At his word he shall go out, and at his word he shall  
       come in, *both he and all the people of Israel with*

- 20     *him; he shall not go out by the counsel of his heart until he inquires by the judgement of the Urim*
- 21     and the Thummim. *And prosperous will be all his ways which he set forth by the judgement which*" (58:18-21 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:264-265 italics are added).

Unfortunately the rest of the column is not preserved. The curses, however do parallel Deuteronomy 28. Yadin explains the use of this section of Deuteronomy by the scroll's author by saying that the author "used Chap. xxviii, as it can be construed as applying to the king who obeys the voice of the Lord and the king who does not, and dealt with the victories in battle of a king who follows the Lord's ways (vv.7 f.) and the failures of the king who does not obey the Lord's commandments (vv. 25 f.)" (*Temple* 1983, 2:265). The Deuteronomical passage in question, as already mentioned, does not discuss blessings and curses related to the king's willingness or unwillingness to follow God's commandments but rather related to the People's willingness to do so. But following upon Yadin's comments it would not be inconsistent with the theme so far expressed in this column to suggest that the missing section stated that the judgement which will make all the king's ways prosperous is the judgement of the priest according to the Urim and Thummim. It would also be consistent with the theme of this column to suggest that there then followed a statement regarding the king who does not plan his actions according to the judgement of the priest and that it is precisely such a *king's* unwillingness to do so which introduces the curses of the following column. However if we keep in mind the physical condition of the scroll: that it is the top parts of the columns which are missing, and that column 58 ends abruptly with the words "And prosperous will be all his ways which he set forth by the judgement which -" it follows that it would be at the top of the next column that we would find the explanation as to "which" judgement. It also follows that it would be at the top of the next column that we would find the introduction of the subject of the king who does not follow such

judgement and the result of this. Yadin explains that there are six lines missing from the top of column 59 (*Temple* 1983, 2:265). I feel that these lines may have included the argument which I have suggested above. The question which can not be answered is whether these lines also included infractions performed by the People of Israel which would have led to their punishment as outlined in this column. If such infractions were included they could not have been different in substance from those of the king, first of all the consistency of the world-view as expressed in the scroll would not allow it but also because there is simply not enough space to introduce a new topic. That the People's actions would have been judged according to the degree to which they acted according to the judgement of the priest has already been introduced: "At his word he shall go out, and at his word he shall come in, both he and all the people of Israel with / him" (58:19-20 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 265). It is therefore not simply living by God's commandments, the concern of Deuteronomy 28, which the scroll prescribes but living by these commandments *as interpreted by the priests*: "by the judgement of the Urim and Thummim." It is precisely this very interpretation of observance of the commandments which is central to the sectarian scrolls of Qumran. The judgement delivered by the priests through the use of the Urim and the Thummim as that which will enlighten the Community is mentioned specifically in 4Q164. However the belief that the Community is to live by the Torah of Moses as interpreted by the priests, and specifically the sons of Zadok, about whom much will be said later, is a central precept of the sectarian scrolls. There are too many examples of this requirement made in the scrolls, but the following may help to illustrate:

- 7       ... every one who enters into the Council of the Community,
- 8       shall enter into the covenant of God in the sight of all those who devote themselves. He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the Torah of Moses, according to all which he has commanded with all
- 9       heart and with all soul, *according to everything which has been revealed*



*from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep his covenant and seek his will... (1QS 5:7-9 Charlesworth Dead Sea Scrolls 21-23 italics are added)*

And,

- 20 ...And they shall examine  
21 their spirits within the Community, between (each) man and his neighbour according to his insight and his works in the Torah, *under the authority of the Sons of Aaron who dedicate themselves within the Community to establish*  
22 *his covenant and to observe all his statutes which he commanded to do...*  
(1QS 5:20-22 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 25 italics are added).

And,

- 1 And this (is) the rule for all (in) the Congregation of Israel in the end of days: When they gather [as a Community to walk continuously  
2 *according to the judgement of the Sons of Zadok, the priests... (1QSa I:1-2 Charlesworth Dead Sea Scrolls 111 italics are added).*

And,

- 22 Words of blessing for the M[aster to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests whom  
23 God chose to restore his covenant [...]hwn all his *precepts* in the midst of his people, and to instruct them  
24 as he commanded (1QSB III:22-24 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 127 italics are added. Charlesworth notes that the word he has translated as 'precepts', *mshpT*, could also be translated as 'judgements.')

And, finally,

And where the ten are, there shall never be lacking a Priest learned in the Book of

Meditation; they shall be ruled by him (CD 13:2-3 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 111).

The fact that it is only and specifically in this context in the *Temple Scroll* that we find the curses is paralleled in the sectarian scrolls by the fact that the curses are reserved for those outside of their Community, the Sons of Darkness or the Lot of Belial. These people have one thing in common, they refuse to accept the interpretation of the Torah of Moses as it has been revealed to the sons of Zadok, the priests. The *Community Rule* tells us,

- 11     ...they cannot be accounted in his covenant, since they have neither sought  
nor inquired after him through his statutes, in order to know the  
hidden(ways) in which they erred
- 12     incurring guilt, nor the revealed (ways) in which they treated with an  
arrogant hand, (thus) arousing anger for judgement and taking vengeance  
by the curses of the covenant (5:11-12 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23).

The hidden and revealed ways are, as earlier stated in the scroll, "everything which has been revealed ... to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will" (5:9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23).

Column 59 is the only place in 11QT where we find specific mention of curses. We also do not find elsewhere in the scroll the Deuteronomical pattern introducing blessings and curses, "if you do x then blessings" and "if you do not do x then curses" as in the following passage from Deuteronomy,

See, I am setting before you today a blessing and a curse: the blessing, *if you obey the commandments of the LORD your God that I am commanding you today; and the curse, if you do not obey the commandments of the LORD your God, but turn from the way that I am commanding you today...*(Deut 11:26-28 italics are added).

We do find passages, to be sure, within which God's presence or favour for the People

appears to be conditional on their actions but a closer reading indicates that the words do not imply this type of conditionality. In other words we do not see statements of the "if x then y" pattern. Rather we see formulas which indicate not conditionality so much as *causality* such as "w, that (i.e.: so that) x, and (i.e.: therefore) x, and (i.e.: and then) y, and (i.e.:and then) z etc." The following passage is written according to this formula.

- 6      ...and all their gifts which they will bring to me *that* ('shr) th[ey] may be  
accepted.
- 7      *And* I will accept them(?), *and* they shall be(?) my people, *and* I will be  
theirs for ever, [and] I will dwell
- 8      with them for ever and ever. *And* I will consecrate my [t]emple ... (29:6-8  
*Yadin Temple* 1983 2:127-128 italics are added).

The above passage appears to be introducing a chain of events which is necessary in order for God to dwell within the community of Israel and in order for God to consecrate the Temple. But it is not formulated in conditional terms, the list of events is presented as inevitable, i.e. 'you *will* do this, and this and then *I* will do that.'

The holiness of Israel, as earlier mentioned, in Priestly sources is a result of the cult and necessary for living in proximity to God, it is not automatic due to God's choosing of Israel, as it is in Deuteronomic sources. The following passage, however, implies both: Israel is holy and *therefore* should not defile themselves but at the same time it is the separation from all that God has "set apart for them to hold unclean" which "*shall*" make them holy.

- 6      ...And they shall not defile themselves with them, which
- 7      I tell you on this mountain, and they shall not be unclean. For I am the  
Lord, who dwells
- 8      among the children of Israel: and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and  
they shall be holy, and let them not make themselves

9       abominable with everything that I have set apart for them to hold unclean;  
and they shall be

10       holy (11QT 51:6-10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:227)

As already discussed, the only group which is presented as being both capable and authorized to provide the judgement of what it is that God has set apart for them to hold unclean are the priests. The argument is presented as circular and therefore closed.

This attempt to create a seamless whole of the divergent Deuteronomic and Priestly world views is central to the *Temple Scroll*. The belief in the indivisibility of cult and covenant is not, as has been mentioned and will be discussed in chapter Four, original to the *Temple Scroll*. This belief is pivotal to the prophetic books and implied in Deuteronomy itself by the Deuteronomic use of the word 'abomination' to describe deceptive and hypocritical practices. Weinfeld explains this in his discussion of the relevance of the use of the word 'abomination' in Deuteronomic material and particularly in the book of Deuteronomy itself. According to Weinfeld, "the large majority of the interdictions accompanied by the rational 'it is an abomination to God' concern practices which are fundamentally hypocritical and deceptive in character" (*Deuteronomy* 267-268). Weinfeld provides a list of practices which are described as abominations in the book of Deuteronomy, this list corresponds with the list in 11QT with a few exceptions. These exceptions are often in the form of additions made by the scroll to the list in Deuteronomy. One of these is found in the list of prohibited sexual unions in column 66. This list, written in the style of Deuteronomy, includes prohibitions originating in Leviticus (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:299). It is important again to mention that the lists of these abominable practices which correspond to the Deuteronomic world view are collected from a variety of chapters in Deuteronomy as well as Leviticus and placed in the scroll within the specific context of Temple and cult. The addition of a form of the word abomination or abominable, a word originating in the

Deuteronomic world view, serves as a device, both in terms of style and concept, to unify the collection.

To briefly summarize, the result of the above is a set of prescriptions within which the People are understood to be holy because of their election by God and must therefore be pure (a Deuteronomic concern) but at the same time it is their proper observance of the cult (a Priestly concern) *and* covenant (an innovation of the scroll) which makes them fit to exist in proximity to God. The concept of the hypocrisy of living a life of wickedness while performing the requirements of the sacrificial cult is not explicitly introduced in the scroll. But 11QT does lay the groundwork, by its very understanding of the unity of cult and covenant, for the ideology evident in the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*. It is in these two documents that we see the very explicit connection being made between way of life and cult and the hypocrisy of participating in the cult while living a life of deceit, often described in these other scrolls as an abomination. The *Damascus Document* states, "For it is written, The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination, but the prayer of the just is an *agreeable offering*' (CDC xi:20-21, paraphrasing Prov. xv:8)" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:402 italics are added). Proverb 15:8 in fact reads, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD, but the prayer of the upright is *his delight*" (italics are added). The substitution of *agreeable offering* for *delight* is consistent with the understanding of the sectarian scrolls that prayer, properly offered by one living a life according to the mandates of the Community, corresponds in all respects to sacrifice properly performed by the righteous. The *Community Rule* echoes the same sentiment. This scroll provides a description of the "Spirit of Deceit" (4:9). The description includes,

- 9       greed and slackness in *righteous activity*, wickedness and falsehood, pride  
          and haughtiness, atrocious disguise and falsehood,
- 10       great hypocrisy, fury, great vileness, shameless zeal for abominable works

in a spirit of fornication, filthy ways in *unclean worship*... (1QS 4:9-10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 17 italics are added).

The scroll continues in its description of the "two spirits" and then adds,

- 20 Then God will purify by his truth all the works of man and purge for  
himself the sons of man. He will utterly destroy the spirit of deceit from the  
veins of
- 21 his flesh. He will purify him by the Holy spirit from all ungodly acts and  
*sprinkle upon him the Spirit of Truth like waters of purification*, (to  
purify him) from all the abominations of falsehood and from being polluted
- 22 by a spirit of impurity (4:20-22 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9 italics  
are added).

Thus not only is "unclean worship" equated to "slackness in righteous" activity but "the abominations of falsehood" and "a spirit of impurity" are understood to convey pollution. The description of the act of purification to be performed by God is composed of cultic terminology and processes but the cultic apparatus, in this case "waters of purification", is replaced by "the Spirit of Truth." The same use of cultic terminology in stating non-cultic transgressions is evident earlier in the scroll in the discussion of the process of entering the Community. One who attempts to enter the Community with no intention of submitting to the covenant as understood by the Community is described as *worshipping the idols of his heart* (1QS 2:11). Later the scroll tells us, again using cultic terminology while replacing the physical trappings of cultic performance with non-tangible concepts,

- 5... Unclean, unclean is he, as long as he rejects the judgments of
- 6 God, so that he cannot be instructed within the Community of his (God's)  
counsel. For it is by the *spirit of the true counsel of God* that the ways of  
man - all his iniquities -
- 7 are *atoned*, so that he can behold the light of life. It is by the *Holy Spirit of*

8      *the Community in his (God's) truth that he can be cleansed from all his iniquities It is by an upright and humble spirit that his sin can be atoned" (1QS 2:5-8 Charlesworth Dead Sea Scrolls 13).*

All of the above material originates in some form, even if only as a concept or terminology, in Hebrew Scriptures. The originality of the *Temple Scroll* is not in its introduction of material which is previously unknown or unheard of. Rather its originality lies in its choice of material from Hebrew Scriptures as well as in the particular way this material is edited. It does not tell us directly that cult and covenant are one. It instead uses the device of God speaking in the first person, *revealing* familiar scriptural material. But this material is presented differently than in Hebrew Scripture. The choice of material results in a collection which forces the audience to reconsider specific aspects of revelation. The context of Temple and cult within which this, often non-cultic, material is placed directs the audience to rethink its assumptions about Israel's relationship with God, covenantal responsibility and cultic obligation. The result of the above is an unstated but understood world-view within which cult and covenant are one. The world-views of Priestly and Deuteronomic ideology are united into an inescapable closed circle which can be summed up as: 'Israel is holy because I, God chose them. I, God, dwell among them. They will therefore properly observe *all* the commandments, cult and covenant, so that they do not become abominable and they shall remain in proximity, or community, with me.' There is no doubt of Israel's acceptance and submission to God's will, again as long as they follow the judgement of the priests, *because Israel is "a holy people to the Lord your God"* (11QT 48:7 and 10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:208 but also 11QT 51:8 and 10) and therefore "shall be blameless before the Lord your God" (11QT 61:21 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:275). It is this exact inevitability of the closed system which we also find in the other sectarian documents. The other scrolls, however, make a clear distinction between the Israel which accepts this

understanding of God's Law, as revealed to the priests, the sons of Zadok, and the Israel which does not. The first are the Sons of Light, the second are the Sons of Darkness. The Laws as understood by the scrolls are directed to the first group, the true community of Israel, "the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God," with them "He made His Covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray" (*Damascus Document* 3:12-14 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99). For the second group the scrolls reserve only curses:

- 4       ...Then the Levites shall curse all the men of
- 5       Belial's lot; they shall respond and say: 'Cursed be you in all your guilty  
(and) wicked works. May God give you up
- 6       (to) terror through all the avengers. May he visit upon you destruction  
through all those who take
- 7       revenge. Cursed be you without compassion in accordance with the  
darkness of your works. Damned be you
- 8       in everlasting murky fire. May God not be compassionate unto you when  
you cry out. May he not forgive (you) by covering over your iniquity.
- 9       May he lift up his angry countenance to wreak his vengeance upon you.  
May there be no peace for you according to all who hold fast to the fathers'  
(1QS 2:4-9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9-11)

The division of the two groups as understood in the sectarian scrolls is absolute and eternal. There is no compassion for the Sons of Darkness, there is no desire or attempt to atone for their sins, even the sacrifice of 1QS 9 atones, surprisingly, for the Land, not for those who have committed the sins which have polluted the Land, but about this more will be said in Chapter Four. This group has no place in the Community's world-view other than *outside* the boundaries the Community so carefully creates around itself. This group is beyond the Community within which God dwells, they have no part in the Community of God. The



sectarian scrolls, then, adopt the "maximalist" approach to purity as well as the closed system of cult and covenant which originates in the *Temple Scroll* and apply it to their Community, the only real Israel.

## 5. The Covenant with Jacob at Bethel

As already discussed it is in column 29 of the *Temple Scroll* that we are introduced to the Temple and its dedication. This column is also significant (as was outlined in the previous chapter) in the discussion as to whether the Temple being discussed is a physical Temple and, if a physical Temple, is it to be built by people or by God, i.e. the eschatological Temple. I have already reviewed the arguments advanced by scholars about the phrase "according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob at Bethel," as well as my critique of these. However this column includes one more phrase which has been used to support the contention that the scroll can only be referring to a physical Temple to be built by God eschatologically and that, therefore, this scroll can not be understood as introducing the concept of a "Temple of men" (*4 Q Florilegium*)<sup>3</sup> The phrase in question is: "And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle / my glory, *until the day of blessing on which I will create my temple / and establish it for myself for all times*, according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob at Bethel" (29:8-10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:128-129 italics are added). Yadin argues that the laws regarding the Temple plan in this scroll are meant to be understood as laws to be applied to the Temple to be built by the Children of Israel. His reasons for this are twofold. First of all, he explains, "the Temple laws presented in the scroll are those conveyed by the Lord to Moses - as are the laws of the

---

<sup>3</sup>As translated by B. Gartner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, Cambridge 1965, p.34; J. M. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4 Q Flor.", RQ, VIII (1972), p. 94; and G. Vermes *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Pelican Books, 1962, p.243. These are cited in Yadin *The Temple Scroll* 1983, 1:186-187, note 12.

Tabernacle - as an eternal command for the Children of Israel," furthermore, all "the Temple laws are formulated in the first person, as pronouncements of the Lord addressed to Moses..., precisely as are the Tabernacle laws in Exodus. Thus, insofar as content and style, the Tabernacle laws were the model for the commands presented in the scroll..." (*Temple* 1983, 1:182). The second reason he gives as evidence that the laws of the scroll were meant to be applied to the Temple to be built by the Children of Israel is the section from column 29 cited above. It is in that section, he explains, that the scroll informs us that there will be *another* Temple to be built by God at the "End of Days," Yadin's understanding of the phrase "day of blessing" (*Temple* 1983, 1:183). I need not disagree with Yadin's argument as far as the *Temple Scroll* is concerned. I need not prove that the *Temple Scroll* itself prescribed a "Temple of men." I need only prove that the *Temple Scroll* provides a world-view which could be so interpreted and that the sectarian scrolls adopt this world view and adapt it to their Community as a "Temple of men."

Despite the fact that I have not, and will not, discuss the *pesharim* from Qumran in any depth I will at this point include sections from *Commentaries on Isaiah* (4Q161-4) in order to illustrate that the method of interpretation used by the Community indicates that it is highly likely that the Community interpreted the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* as a "Temple of men", as well as perceived the supremacy of the authority of priests in a way which corresponds to that found in the *Temple Scroll*.

And as for that which He said, *He shall not [judge by what his eyes see] or pass sentence by what his ears hear* (Isaiah XI:3): interpreted, this means that ...[the Priests]... As they teach him, so will he judge; and as they order, [so will he pass sentence] (4Q161 Frs.8-10:21-24 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 321)

The Passage from Isaiah (11) does not mention priests, rather it discusses the shoot which "shall come out from the stump of Jesse" and explains that "The spirit of the LORD shall

rest on him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD" (11:2). This "spirit" is transferred in the *peshet* from the "stump of Jesse", i.e. a Davidic king, to the priests, betraying a world-view consistent with that of the *Temple Scroll*. The second passage from Isaiah deals with the afflicted Jerusalem, "the holy city" which "the uncircumcised and the unclean shall enter ... no more" (Isaiah 52:1). The passage from 4Q164 reveals an interpretation based on the understanding of the Community as Temple, i.e. the Temple imagery is applied to the Council (foundation) and to the congregation which is described as sapphires among the stones of the Temple. In addition, this passage also serves to reinforce the authority of the priests:

*Behold, I will set your stones in antimony* (liv, 11b).

[Interpreted, this saying concerns] ... all Israel is like antimony surrounding the eye.

*And I will lay your foundations with sapphires* (liv, 11c).

Interpreted, this concerns the Priests and the people who laid the foundations of the Council of the Community ... the congregation of His elect (shall sparkle) like a sapphire among the stones.

*[And I will make] all your pinnacles [of agate]* (liv, 12a).

Interpreted, this concerns the twelve [chief Priests] who shall enlighten by judgement of the Urim and Tummim ... (4Q164:1-5 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 322-323).

These sections from Isaiah which are being interpreted speak specifically of a physical Jerusalem. They make no mention of Priests and they include no intimation of an identification of the Temple as a "Temple of men." The interpretations of Isaiah in this *peshet* are consistent with the world-view evident in the sectarian scrolls under consideration in my study. They consistently, and this will be explored in depth in the next

chapters, speak of their Community as analogous to the Temple and of the rituals performed by the Community as analogous to the rituals performed by the priests in the physical Temple. Further, as will be fully discussed in chapter Four, the rituals about which they speak are believed to have the same efficacy as the rituals performed by the priests in the physical Temple. The sectarian scrolls, as is illustrated by the above sections from 4Q161-164, consistently use material originating from Hebrew Scriptures and apply it to their own situation. But the way this material is used reveals a perception of reality which is not, or not often, evident in the original material but which informs us of the world-view taken as a given in the sectarian scrolls.

So, to return to my discussion of Yadin's argument, whether the *Temple Scroll* does or does not speak of a "Temple of men" is of no importance. The sectarian scrolls of the Community do. On the other hand the *Temple Scroll* is vital to understanding where this world-view originates. It is in the *Temple Scroll* that we find the application of the "maximalist" approach which is also evident in the sectarian scrolls. It is in the *Temple Scroll* that we find the authority of the priest as superior to that of the king. And, most importantly, it is in the *Temple Scroll* that we are provided with a collection of material from Hebrew Scriptures presented not as interpretation or as commentary, not even as mediated revelation meant to clarify or to set Israel on the right path, but rather as direct, unmediated revelation from God. It is in the choice of material which is included in this revelation as well as in the context within which this material is placed, the Temple and its city, that the world-view of the *Temple Scroll*, a world view identical with that of the sectarian scrolls, becomes evident. This is a world-view based on the belief that Israel, as a whole, is "a priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Ex. 19:6), and that they dwell in the immediate vicinity of the Tabernacle. That, further, their choseness by God obligates them to ritual purity, which the scroll equates to moral and ethical obligations, and that this purity, both ritual and

moral, confirms their status as sanctified to God and thus entitles them to live in community with God.

The section of the *Temple Scroll* with which we began this discussion does, however, appear to be closing one topic, the Temple which God will consecrate by God's glory, and to be introducing something new:

- 7      And I will accept them(?), and they shall be(?) my people, and I will be  
         theirs for ever, [and] I will dwell  
8      with them for ever and ever. And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my  
         glory, (the temple) on which I will settle  
9      my glory, until the day of blessing on which I will create my temple  
10     and establish it for myself for all times, according to the covenant which I  
         have made with Jacob at Bethel (29:7-10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:128-129).

At this point I need to briefly review the discussion I presented in the previous chapter as to the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel. I argued that the assumption made by Yadin that this covenant includes a Temple is based on his interpretation of other material and is in fact tenuous. The covenant at Bethel (Gen. 28:13-22) includes promises of the Land and promises of redemption. It does not include mention of a Temple being made *by God*. Further, if we are to assume that it implies the building of a Temple this Temple would have to be built at Bethel as the only reference to "house of God" in this section is the one made by Jacob and is very site-specific. It reads:

Then Jacob woke from his sleep and said, 'Surely the LORD is in *this place* - and I did not know it!' And he was afraid, and said, 'How awesome is *this place*! *This* is none other than the *house of God*, and *this* is the gate of heaven.' So Jacob rose early in the morning, and he took the stone that he had put under his head and set it up for a pillar and poured oil on the top of it. He called the place *Bethel* ...

Then Jacob made a vow, saying, 'If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then the LORD shall be my God, and *this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house...*(Genesis 28:16-22 italics are added)

The language used in the *Temple Scroll* to refer to the Temple and Temple city is too Deuteronomic. The Temple city is often referred to as the place upon which God will choose to place God's name. There can not be any question that *if* a physical Temple is being prescribed it must be in that place upon which God will choose to place God's name according to the Deuteronomic editors, i.e. Jerusalem. To understand the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel as including a promise made *by God* for a Temple would have to include the place upon which this Temple would be built as Bethel. This would in turn imply a polemic against Jerusalem, against the Levitical priests and against Judah in support of the Northern Kingdom. In 1 Kings we read, in reference to Jeroboam and his instituting of the shrine at Bethel:

So the king took counsel, and made two calves of gold. He said to the people, 'You have gone up to Jerusalem long enough. Here are your gods, O Israel, who brought you out of the land of Egypt.' He set one in Bethel, and the other he put in Dan. And this thing became a sin, for the people went to worship before the one at Bethel and before the other as far as Dan. He also made houses on high places and appointed priests *from among all the people, who were not Levites*" (1 Kings 12:28-31 italics are added).

Such a polemic which would have to be assumed *if* the scroll was mandating for a Temple at Bethel against Jerusalem as *the place upon which God will settle God's name*, and against

the Levitical priests is inconsistent with the remainder of the scroll. In fact the scroll presents us with no such polemic. The Levitical priests are named specifically as authorities and nowhere does the scroll intimate that a place other than the one implied by the Deuteronomic writers is being considered. However one does not have to accept that the covenant at Bethel includes a Temple. In fact this is not how the covenant with Jacob is understood in Leviticus. Yadin mentions this chapter in Leviticus in his in situ discussion of the column but does not explore the possible implications involved with understanding this as the starting point of the discussion of the covenant with Jacob in 11QT. In Leviticus (26:40-45) we are presented with a retelling of the promises made by God to Jacob at Bethel. There is no mention of a Temple, rather the emphasis is here placed on the covenantal responsibilities incumbent on the People of Israel *if* they expect God to remember the covenant. It is interesting that in the listing of the names of the ancestors in this section it is Jacob's name that is mentioned first, thus perhaps echoing the same sentiments which are prevalent in 11QT as to the importance of the covenant made with Jacob. Leviticus reads, "...then will I remember my covenant with Jacob; and I will remember also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham, and I will remember the land" (26:42). The emphasis in this section of Leviticus is, as stated, on covenantal responsibility and obligation, for both partners of the covenant: Israel and God. The chapter ends as follows:

...but I will remember in their favor the covenant with their ancestors whom I brought out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the nations, to be their God: I am the LORD. *These are the statutes and ordinances and laws that the LORD established between himself and the people of Israel on Mount Sinai through Moses (Lev. 25:45-46 italics are added).*

The covenant with Jacob as understood in this chapter of Leviticus then has nothing to do

with the Temple, rather the focus is on the covenant as the way in which Israel is to live in order for them to remain God's People and in order for God to remain their God. A fundamental aspect of the relationship is that when Israel goes astray, and they will, God will remember the covenant "if they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their ancestors ... if then their uncircumcised heart is humbled and they make amends for their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant..." (40-41 italics are added). I must add that this chapter in Leviticus is of particular relevance to my discussion in chapter Four because it introduces a significant part of the framework for the Community's way of life as explained in the *Community Rule*. This includes the requirement for realizing and confessing one's own as well as one's ancestors' iniquity and then circumcising, i.e. humbling, one's heart to the Community's interpretation of the covenant.

We can not be certain that the author of the *Temple Scroll* had the above passage of Leviticus in mind, we can however be fairly certain that he did not intend to imply the polemic that the association between a physical Temple and the location of Bethel would. If the Community of the sectarian scrolls understood the reference made to the covenant with Jacob at Bethel in the way that it is understood in the above Leviticus chapter, as is evident in the *Community Rule*, we can come to a different conclusion than the one reached by Yadin, at least as far as his argument against the interpretation of *mqds 'dm* in 4QFlorelium (4Q174) as "Temple of men." He argues, again in reference to 11QT 29:9-10, that if "the belief of the sect were," that the Temple which God will create on the "day of blessing" is to be a Temple "made up of *men* - or that its ritual will be different, namely, that actual sacrifices will not be offered in it ... the author of the scroll would have had an excellent opportunity here to emphasize the disparity in its character and ritual" (*Temple* 1983 1:187). The assumption made by Yadin is that the *Temple Scroll* was created by and for a community synchronous with the Community of the sectarian scrolls, and that



therefore, any interpretation or understanding of the *Temple Scroll* would have existed from its beginnings. This is not an assumption I make. To make such an assumption would be tantamount to assuming that all subsequent interpretations of Hebrew Scripture were imagined by its authors/editors at the beginning or that all subsequent commentaries of the Mishnah were known by its authors/editors at its inception. I argue that the *Temple Scroll* was adopted by the Community of sectarians and that this is evident in the corresponding world-views which we find in both, 11QT and the sectarian scrolls. I argue that the world-view developed in the *Temple Scroll* lends itself to the interpretation of Temple which is evident in the sectarian scrolls, namely, "Temple of men." I further argue that the *Temple Scroll* provides the most evident starting point for the sectarian understanding of itself as a "Temple of men" more than does any other document found at Qumran. This is because of the equivalency, expressed in the cultic terminology of ritual purity, of cult and covenant in the *Temple Scroll*. This identification of cult and covenant leads to the sectarian perception of their way of life, a way of life founded on strict covenantal observance, *as cult*.

Let us now return to the discussion of the use of terms conveying 'for ever' in the *Temple Scroll*. These terms, as already discussed, serve a number of purpose. They convey a sense of absoluteness, i.e. prescriptiveness to both Pentateuchal as well as non-Pentateuchal laws; they are also used as editorial devices to join together laws originating from different sections in the Pentateuch but also from within different contexts as far as the type of responsibility which is being demanded on the part of Israel towards God. But the use of these terms also serves the purpose of removing the idea of conditionality as it relates to God remembering the covenant. The implication of the scroll is that the relationship *is* and *is for all time*. Except for the one instance, already discussed, it does not stipulate for the possibility that Israel will break the terms of the covenant. The laws are directed to that community in Israel which will not break the laws of the covenant. The scroll also

introduces the idea that the community of Israel to which it is being directed is expected to live ritually pure lives even when not in contact with the physical Temple. After all living a life which contravenes the, non-cultic, laws of the covenant is understood to impart ritual impurity in the same way as situations in the material world are understood to do so in the Priestly material of the Pentateuch. Evidence of this can be seen in the use of the phrase *l'wlm w'd* (for ever and ever) in 45:14. It is here, as earlier discussed, that the scroll reinforces the association of the purity of the Temple its city and the People of Israel. It is here also, as earlier discussed, that the, apparently, indiscriminate use of statements as to God's dwelling place portray Priestly as well as Deuteronomical world views. And it is here that we find a particularly stringent interpretation of two matters of ritual purity, being applied to the Temple, its city and the People of Israel. The first, which will be further discussed in the next two chapters, has to do with the man who has a nocturnal emission (line 7) and the man who "lies with his wife and has an emission of semen" (line 11). The second has to do with the exclusion of the blind man from the city of the Temple (line 12-13). This will also be further discussed in chapter 4. Both of these prohibitions testify to the "maximalist approach" of the *Temple Scroll*, both of these prohibitions can be found in sectarian scrolls.

The first is stated as follows in the *Damascus Document* (12:1-2): "No man shall lie with a woman in the city of the Sanctuary, to defile the city of the Sanctuary with their *niddah*-uncleanness" (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:288). This statement has a parallel in Leviticus (15:31). Leviticus 15, the chapter dealing with ritual impurity resulting from bodily discharges including emission of semen and women's monthly flow as well as contact with such people, details the procedure which one must undergo in order to return to ritual purity. It then adds,

Thus you shall keep the people of Israel separate from their uncleanness, so that

they do not die in their uncleanness by defiling my tabernacle that is in their midst (31).

The statement is directed to the people living in the wilderness camp in the midst of which is the sanctuary. The discussion of the "maximalist" approach of the *Temple Scroll* serves to explain how that scroll would understand the city of the Temple as being under the same laws regarding ritual purity as was the wilderness camp. The same world-view is apparent in the *Damascus Document*. The second prohibition, as to the blind, can be found in the *War Scroll* as well as in the *Rule of the Congregation (Messianic Rule)*. At this point it is only important to point out that both of these prohibitions originate in Priestly sources. Their prescriptiveness is punctuated in the scroll by "so that they will not defile the city in which I dwell; / for I, the Lord, dwell among the children of Israel for ever and ever" (45:13-14 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:193). This formula is similar to the formula used in the Pentateuch to punctuate laws which apply to the camp in the wilderness (i.e. Numbers 5:1-3), the place within which God dwelled in proximity to the People of Israel. In the *Temple Scroll* as well as in the sectarian documents we find the same prohibitions being expanded to include all of Israel. The reason for the prohibitions has to do with the Priestly concern already mentioned: proximity to God.

The sectarians of Qumran are understood, by Yadin, to represent the "maximalist" approach. Their adaptation of the Temple purity laws to a world, for them, without a Temple shaped their entire reality, from social structure and ritual to the most fundamental aspects of existence. But, I would add, their extreme application of the purity laws was also reinforced by their belief that they were the Temple since the physical Temple was now invalid. This belief that the physical Temple is defiled is made explicit in the *Damascus Document* where the community is the "House of Separation who went out of the Holy City and leaned on God at the time when Israel sinned and defiled the Temple," (CD version B 2:23 Vermes

*Dead Sea Scrolls* 105) a reference reminiscent of Ezekiel's description of the actions of the Sons of Zadok "who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the people of Israel went astray from me" (Ez. 44:15).

The sectarian scrolls make a distinction between the different communities of the settlements of the Children of Israel. 4QMMT (2:34-36) divides Israel into three sections, the Temple, Jerusalem and the remainder of Israel: "We reckon that the Temple [is 'the Tent of Witness,' while] Jerusale[m] is the 'camp.' 'Outside the camp' [means 'outside Jerusalem'.] (It refers to) the 'camp of their cities,' outside the 'ca[mp]' (which i[s] [Jer]u[salem].)..." (Eisenman and Wise, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* 194). Here there is a distinction being made between the Temple, the 'camp' which is Jerusalem and the other 'camps,' the 'camp of their cities.' This conforms with the discussion in the *Damascus Document* of the rules appropriate to those who "live in camps according to the rule of the Land..." (8:6 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 102) as well as to its discussion of the "Rule for the assembly of the camps" (12:21-22 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 111). The implicit understanding as it relates to the three different segments identified by 4QMMT is that since the 'camp' which is Jerusalem contains "the Tent of Witness" the holiness of this particular 'camp' is superior to the holiness of the other 'camps.' The laws of purity which are to be applied to this camp must also, therefore, be more stringent than those to be applied to the other camps. We see reference to different sets of laws to be applied to the "camps according to the rule of the Land" and to the other camp implied in the *Damascus Document*. Here it is only by the use of "if"(CD 7:6), as will be discussed in the next chapter, that another way of life, one where it is possible to not "live in camps according to the rule of the Land" (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 102), is implied. The *Damascus Document*, therefore, concerns itself with the larger community of the "congregation of the camps." But what about the "camp" which is Jerusalem and the Temple which is the Tent of

Witness? The community of the *Community Rule* must be understood as the "camp" of Jerusalem, within this sacred space is to be found the "Tent of Witness" of 4QMMT and the "Sanctuary of men" of *Florilegium* (4Q174):

And strangers shall lay it waste no more, as they formerly laid waste the Sanctuary of Israel because of its sin. He has commanded that a Sanctuary of men be built for Himself, that they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the Law (4Q174 1:5-7 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 353).

In fact the *Community Rule* (9:4) continues, in agreement with 4Q174, "The proper offerings of the lips for judgement (is as) righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering" (9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39). The "Way" is earlier defined (in 1QS), in reference to the prophecy of Isaiah (40:3), as "the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do" (1QS 8:15 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 37). There is therefore in both these scrolls a homologous connection being made between the traditional offering of sacrifice, whether animal or incense, in the Temple and this other type of sacrifice, the "works of the Law," in and by the "Sanctuary of men". This other type of sacrifice is discussed in these scrolls as being as efficacious as the traditional one. The activities performed by this group, therefore, as earlier mentioned, have sacramental efficacy, they atone for the land *in the present*, they are not a dim reflection of the ideal future.

The laws to be applied to the community in the *Community Rule* have a different focus than those to be applied to the "congregation of the camps" in the *Damascus Document*. The rules in the *Community Rule* are directed to a group of, what we could call, "religious virtuos" (to use Max Weber's term, i.e. in "The Social Psychology of the World Religions" 287ff) who have to undergo instruction as well as testing before they can be admitted to the community. There is no concern here with those outside the 'camp' of the Presence, no

concern with families and no concern with Gentiles, concerns we do find in the *Damascus Document*. The *Community Rule* contains the rules for those who live in the most sacred space, for those responsible for atoning "for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (*God's*) favour for the land (*is obtained*) without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices" (9:4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39 italics are added).

The organization of the Community in the *Community Rule* further serves to reinforce my contention that it prescribes the laws for the Community which is to serve as the Temple. The dynamics of the Community which is prescribed in the sectarian scrolls will be discussed in the next chapter, at this point I will introduce the subject of the structure and organization of the Community as a reflection of the Temple architecture of the *Temple Scroll*. As earlier discussed this plan is based on the belief that the Temple corresponds to the sanctuary in the wilderness camp. The requirements for ritual purity which are incumbent on the People of Israel in the Camp *because* God's sanctuary is in their midst are thus applied by the *Temple Scroll* to the entire city of the Temple as well as to all of Israel.

## 6. The Process of Initiation

One more issue must be introduced before I begin the discussion of Community organization in the *Community Rule* as Temple organization in the *Temple Scroll*. The Community prescribed in the *Community Rule* is meant to *function* as Temple. The rituals it performs are said, in the *Community Rule*, to have the same efficacy as those performed in the physical Temple. We cannot expect that the Community structure will conform to the *details* of Temple architecture. Rather we should identify and examine those features of the Community which serve the same purpose as particular features of the Temple plan in the *Temple Scroll*. The primary features I will be examining are those which convey two of the

major concerns of the *Temple Scroll*, the purity requirements meant to safeguard the Temple, and particularly the sanctuary, and the equality expressed in that scroll between cult and covenant. We must also keep in mind that the *Temple Scroll* provides the instructions for something *fixed* and *static*, the Temple, its city and the purity requirements of these as well as of the People of Israel. In the sectarian scrolls we are provided with the laws for the Community which perceived itself as the Temple and its way of life as the sacrificial offering. These scrolls exhibit an understanding of the divisions between the categories of priest and Israel as not being fixed. In other words this Community takes the definition of Israel as "a priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Ex.19:6) as essential and unequivocal. Priests, therefore, for this community are, according to the definition of the *Damascus Document*, a definition which is compatible to the purpose of this community as expressed in other scrolls, not exclusively the subsection from within the tribe of Levy which is the traditional definition of priest. Rather the community's definition of priest is: "the converts of Israel who departed from the land of Judah" (CD 4:2-3 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99). The reason they departed is because, according to the vision of the prophet Ezekiel (44:15) as cited in the *Damascus Document*, "the children of Israel strayed from" (CD 4:1 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99) God. They become, therefore, part of that group which has the exclusive right and authority according to the prophet Ezekiel to approach God and to offer God the fat and the blood. This group, despite its designation as priests are not so according to the traditional genealogical definition. They are so because they chose to leave behind the Israel that had sinned and because they also chose to live according to the understanding of the Torah as it has been revealed to the Sons of Zadok who, according to the citation of Ezekiel in the *Damascus Document*, "kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from me" (4:1 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99). The definition of priest in the sectarian scrolls then has three requirements, first of all one must be from within Israel, the nation of priests, then one must be willing to learn and live by the Torah as

revealed to the Sons of Zadok, and finally this training will result in one being qualified to approach God and to offer God the fat and the blood. The definitions of both priest and Temple in the sectarian scrolls therefore, are functional. The Community is involved in a process which is intended to train the converts of Israel to become qualified to perform the only valid sacrifice. To learn from the Sons of Zadok in order to become qualified to take responsibility for the obligations which God has already placed upon them, as a "nation of priests".

The sectarian scrolls' adoption and adaptation of the *Temple Scroll's* Temple and its laws must therefore be understood within the context of the Community's process of learning, training and becoming. In the following examination of the process of initiation prescribed in the *Community Rule* we cannot look for particular details of the Temple plan. Rather we will be examining the process as a movement towards the inner most part of the Temple plan, the sanctuary. At the center of the physical plan in the *Temple Scroll* and at the center of the Community, as the purpose of that community, in the *Community Rule*. The movement through the system of concentric courts and safeguards of the plan in the *Temple Scroll* is evident in the movement of the initiate through the different levels of initiation in the *Community Rule*. At the center of both systems is the entrance to the sanctuary, the Holy of Holies within which only the most ritually pure, only those authorized and qualified may approach God in order to offer God the fat and the blood. The process of initiation as outlined in the *Community Rule*, then, corresponds to the plan of the *Temple Scroll* in the sense that it provides for and serves as a system of safe guards and impediments which serve the same purpose as the system of concentric courts and the safeguards of the plan in the *Temple Scroll*, namely to guarantee that only those who are sufficiently ritually pure to enter each court, or, in the *Community Rule*, each level of initiation, do so in order to guarantee the purity of the sanctuary at the center. The definition of ritual purity in the



Community of the sectarian scrolls is based on the notion of the combination and interchangeability of cult and covenant which we saw introduced in the *Temple Scroll* and is expressed in the *Community Rule* as a learning process the end result of which is becoming "the perfect of the Way" (1QS 9:4-5), as earlier discussed.

The plan of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* includes three courts around the Temple plus a number of additional safeguards to ensure its purity. The process of initiation as discussed in the *Community Rule* closely parallels the plan of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll*. Five steps are discernable, these begin with a decision by the initiate to separate from all that is outside this sacred space. Permission must be given to begin the approach to this Temple, then the scroll outlines three levels of initiation which correspond to the three courts and finally a fourth level which corresponds to that which lies at the very center of both systems, in terms of position and sanctity as well as purpose: the sanctuary, the Holy of Holies.

The first step required of all initiates by the *Community Rule* is the acknowledgement that that which lies outside of the Community is evil, that it is all that God "has rejected" (1QS 1:4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 7). The scroll demands that before the process of initiation begins one must deliberately choose to leave that world behind. This is evident in the scroll's requirement that "all those who are entering *shall cross over* into the covenant before God by the Rule of the Community" (1:16 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9 italics are added). Later in the scroll we are also told, "This (is) the rule for the men of the Community who devote themselves *to turn away from all evil* and hold fast to all which he has commanded as his will: *they shall separate themselves from the congregation of / the men of deceit*" (5:1 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19 italics are added). And again further down in the same column we find: "He shall take upon his soul by covenant *to separate from all the men of deceit* who walk / in the way of wickedness. For they cannot be

accounted in his covenant, since they have neither sought nor inquired after him through his statutes" (5:10-11 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23 italics are added). The ceremony prescribed for the members of the Community in the *Community Rule* (1-2) reinforces that this conscious, deliberate choice be made annually. The ritual is carried out in language reminiscent of Leviticus 26:40-42 (discussed earlier in this chapter in connection with the covenant made with Jacob) and explicitly states that this is the community of those "who cross over into the covenant" (1:18 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9) thus supporting my earlier discussion as to the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel. The *Community Rule* reads:

- 22 ...Then the Levites shall enumerate
- 23 the iniquities of the sons of Israel and all their guilty transgressions and their sins during the dominion of
- 24 Belial. [And al]l those who cross over into the covenant shall confess after them (by) saying: 'We have perverted ourselves,
- 25 we have rebel[led], we [have sin]ned, we have acted impiously, we [and] our [fath]ers before us, by our walking
- 26 [...] True and righte[ous] is the [Go]d of [Israel and] his judgement against us and [our] fathers" (1:22-26 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9).

Compare the above with the following from Leviticus 26:

- 40 But if they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their ancestors, in that they committed treachery against me and, moreover, that they continued hostile to me -
- 41 so that I, in turn, continued hostile to them and brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised heart is humbled and they make amends for their iniquity,
- 42 then will I remember my covenant with Jacob;

The section of the scroll which describes the four levels of initiation (6:13-24) begins with the understanding that the initiate has chosen to separate himself from all that which is outside of the Community: "And (regarding) each one who freely offers himself from Israel / to join the Council of the Community..." (6:13-14 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29). It is only after this separation has been affected that the initiate is given permission to approach the Community. Thus the *Community Rule* explains,

- 13     ...And (regarding) each one who freely offers himself from Israel  
14     to join the Council of the Community, the Overseer at the head of the Many  
       shall examine him with respect to his insight and his works. If he is suited  
       to the discipline he shall permit him to enter  
15     into the covenant to turn to the truth and depart from all deceit; he shall  
       instruct him in all the precepts of the Community. And later, when he  
       enters to stand before the Many then they shall be asked  
16     concerning his affairs, and as the lot comes out according to the counsel of  
       the Many, he shall approach or withdraw (6:13-16 Charlesworth *Dead Sea  
       Scrolls* 29).

This first step, after the intent of the initiate to separate from the outside has been expressed, involves the beginning of the process of his instruction. At this point the initiate has not entered that segment of the Community which is analogous to the outer court of the *Temple Scroll*. If anything this stage serves the same purpose as the terrace to be built around the outer court as prescribed in the *Temple Scroll*:

- 5     And you shall make a terrace (...) around, outside the outer court,  
6     fourteen cubits wide, according to the entrances of all the gates. And  
7     you shall make twelve steps to it, for the children of Israel to *ascend to it*

- 8        *to enter into my temple* (46:5-8 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:197-198 italics are added)

The initiate has approached the gate of the outer wall, permission to do so has been granted by the "Overseer". But it is the "Many" who make up this Temple. The initiate therefore cannot *enter* into the outer court until he is permitted to do so by the Community, the Many. Incidentally, that the judgment of the "Many" must be performed at the gates of the city is fully compatible with the system in evidence within the biblical world-view of the *Temple Scroll*. We see evidence of this, for example, in the following:

- 2        If a man(?) has a stubborn(?) and rebellious son, who will not(?) obey(?)  
the voice of his father or the voice of(?) his mother(?),  
3        and, though they chastise him, [will] not give heed to them, then his father  
and his mother shall take hold of him and bring him out to  
4        *the elders of his city at the gate of...* (64:2-4 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:288  
italics are added)

And,

- 7        ... If any man takes a wife, and goes in to her, and then spurns her, and  
charges her with shameful conduct,  
8        and brings an evil name upon her, saying, 'I took this woman, and when I  
came near  
9        her, I did not find in her the tokens of virginity', then the father of the  
young woman or her mother shall take and bring out  
10       the tokens of her virginity to the *elders in the gate* (55:7-10 Yadin *Temple*  
1983, 2:294 italics are added).

In addition the judgement by the Many, in the *Community Rule*, serves the purpose of an

added safeguard for the Temple. The *Temple Scroll*, after describing the terrace, continues to describe just such an added safeguard, the fosse:

- 9      And you shall make a fosse (...) around the temple, one hundred cubits  
wide, which will  
10     separate the holy temple from the city, so that they may not come suddenly  
into  
11     my temple and desecrate it (46:9-11 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:198).

The next step of the initiation process, according to the *Community Rule*, after one has been examined by the "Many" and once the lot comes out in his favor is to enter that part of the Community which is in proximity to the Council. At this stage, however, the initiate still has no rights as a member of the Community:

- 16     ...When he approaches the Council of the Community he must not touch the  
pure-food of  
17     the Many, until he has been examined concerning his spirit and his work  
until one full year is completed, nor shall he have any share in the property  
of the Many (1QS 6:16-17 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29).

In the next chapter I will discuss the significance of being permitted to share in the food and the property of the Community. For now it is sufficient to mention that until one can begin to do so one remains an observer. A highly privileged one to be sure, since one is permitted to continue learning as well as to observe. This stage of the initiation process corresponds to the outer court in the *Temple Scroll*. Unfortunately the section of the *Temple Scroll* which deals with those permitted to enter this outer court is badly fragmented:

- 5      [       ] and you shall make a thi[r]d court [   ]  
6      [       and] to their daughters and to the aliens who we[re] born

[ (40:5-6 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:170)

Yadin understands the above as follows: "On the basis of the prohibitions regarding the middle court (Col. XXXIX:5-11), we may assume that those allowed to enter are boys under the age of twenty who have not yet been mustered, women and third generation 'aliens who we[re] born [to them]'" (*Temple* 1983, 2:170). At first glance therefore the step of initiation from the *Community Rule* which I have included above does not appear to correspond to the outer court of the *Temple Scroll*. However this is not necessarily so when we stop again to consider the purpose of the particular Community which is being prescribed in the *Community Rule*. As earlier mentioned, and will be further explored in the next chapter, it is in the *Damascus Document* that we find rules for the other communities, those who "live in camps according to the rule of the Land..., marrying ... and begetting children" (7:6-7 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 102). The laws of the *Community Rule* are intended for that Community which *functions* as the Temple. The Community of this scroll is intended for a purpose, they are the priests who will make atonement for the land (1QS 9:3-5)). This is urgently required in this time of Belial. The process being discussed in the *Community Rule* is just that, a process of initiation, it is not a description of a fixed, static community as is the community of Israel being described in the *Temple Scroll*. Those involved in this process are moving toward the center, the sanctuary, the Holy of Holies within which is performed that ritual of atoning for the land so urgently required and so much the purpose of this Community. That this first step of initiation, after the separation from the outside has been affected and permission to enter past the gates has been granted, is analogous to the outer court of the *Temple Scroll* becomes more evident when we consider the next steps.

It is in the next step of initiation that the individual's property is held in trust by the Community. It is also in this next level that the individual is, presumably, permitted to "touch the pure food of the Many" (6:16 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29) This can be

deduced from the injunction to not do so in the level that the initiate has just completed and from the absence of such a prohibition at this next level which is replaced by the prohibition against touching "the drink of the Many":

- 18     When he has completed one year within the Community, the Many shall be  
asked about his affairs with regards to his insight and his works in Torah.  
If the lot should go out to him
- 19     that he should approach the assembly of the Community  
according to the priests and the multitude of the men of their covenant, then  
both his property and his possessions shall be given to the hand of the man  
(who is)
- 20     the Examiner over the possessions of the Many. And he shall register it into  
the account with his hand, and he must not bring it forth to the Many. He  
must not touch the drink of the Many until
- 21     he has completed a second year among the men of the Community (6:18-21  
Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29).

To enter this level the initiate must be judged according to "his insight and his works in the Torah." These are the same two issues according to which the initiate is judged from the beginning by the Overseer (i.e., 6:14). It is these two also which the individual contributes to the Community once he becomes a member. This level of initiation corresponds to the middle court in the *Temple Scroll* within which are permitted only ritually pure Israelite men:

- 4     ... this court [               ]
- 5     ... [               ] ... fou[rth] generation, a son of
- 6     Israel(?) ... [               ] to bow down before me, all the con[grega]tion of
- 7     Israel ...[               ] a woman and a child shall not(?) enter it until the day

8        that he shall fulfil the law [     ] for himself(?) to the Lord, half a shekel, a statute for ever... (39:4-8 Yadin *Temple 2*:1166).

The reasons that this level of initiation corresponds to the middle court can again be best understood if we look at the prescriptions in the *Community Rule* as a *process* of initiation, a *process* intended to transform the initiate into one capable and authorized to perform the ritual of atonement in the sanctuary. The categories of Israel and priest for this scroll, as for other sectarian scrolls (i.e. the *Damascus Document*) are not fixed, not static. One who is not a priest according to the traditional definition *can* become eligible and authorized to perform the ritual of atonement prescribed in 1QS 9. The reason for this is that the sectarian scrolls take the definition of Israel as a "priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Ex. 19:6) as being essential. All of Israel is obligated to the cult, but a cult which can be viably expressed through covenantal observance, a concept which is implied in the *Temple Scroll*. The *Temple Scroll*, on the other hand, despite its implicit understanding of the unity of cult and covenant, and of the expressed belief that infractions in the observance and practice of *both* will impart ritual impurity, provides prescriptions of the Temple based on the static divisions of Priest and Israel. And again I must mention that my present study is concerned with tracing the origin of the world-view of the sectarian scrolls, not with the intentions of the author of the document, i.e. the *Temple Scroll*, to which this origin can be traced. This level of initiation, then, corresponds to the middle court because it is only at this level that the initiate is considered ritually to be at that level of the process which is not yet analogous to the priest, the next level, and yet beyond the wider community of Israel, the community which is interested but not yet sufficiently trained. The wider community of this outer court, is analogous to the women and children of the outer court in the *Temple Scroll*, which intends to live by all of God's laws, hence their presence in the outer court, but which is incapable of entering the middle court.



It is at the next level of initiation, the one corresponding to the inner court, that the individual becomes a full member of the Community;

- 21 ...When that second year has been completed he shall be examined  
according to the Many. If the lot goes out to him
- 22 to approach the Community, he shall be registered in the order of his rank  
among his brothers, for Torah, judgement, and purity, and his property  
shall be assimilated (into that of the Many). His counsel
- 23 and his judgement shall belong to the Community (6:21-23 Charlesworth  
*Dead Sea Scrolls* 29).

It is at this level that the individual is fully incorporated into the Community. He is permitted to touch the pure-food and the pure-drink, his property and his insight become part of the communal whole. This level corresponds to the inner court of the *Temple Scroll*. This is the group of ritually pure priests.

Qualification in "Torah, judgement and purity" is absolutely necessary for membership to the Community. Insight in judgement is necessary because it is through this insight that the member contributes to the decision making process of the Community. It is only after one becomes a member, and is a member in good standing, that "he may be asked concerning judgement" (7:21 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 33). And it is only after one is a member in good standing that he can "*afterwards* be enlisted in his rank for the Community of Holiness" (9:2 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39 italics are added), the center of the Community which will be discussed shortly, the purpose of which is:

- 4 they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness. so that  
(God's) favor for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings  
and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of
- 5 the lips for judgment (is as) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the

Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering" (9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39).

The "Way", as has already been explained, is the proper "study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time" (8:15 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 37). Hence the requirement for insight and proper works of the Torah. It is through insight that the Community interprets the Torah, it is a Community living according to this proper interpretation of the works of the Torah which is being offered up as sacrifice to atone for the land, but about this more will be said in chapter four. The level of initiation therefore corresponding to the inner court is not the inner-most center of the Community. Just as the inner court of the *Temple Scroll* contains at its center the entrance to the Temple so too this level of the Community contains at its center the "House of Holiness for Aaron, for the Community of the most Holy Ones, and a house of the Community for Israel" (1QS 9:6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39). It is in this section that the scroll informs us of the purpose of the Community:

- 3      *When*, according to all these norms, these (men) become in Israel a foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,
- 4      they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God's) favor for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of bunt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of
- 5      the lips for judgement (is as) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering. *At that time* the men of the Community shall separate themselves
- 6      (as) a House of Holiness for Aaron, for the Community of the most Holy Ones, and a house of the Community for Israel; (these are) the ones who walk perfectly (9:3-6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39 italics are added).

The very language of this section of the *Community Rule* (9:3-6) is the language of Temple cult and architecture. In addition to the cultic language, discussed above, which permeates this section of 1QS as well as to the explicitly stated intent of the scroll as to the purpose of the described ritual I need mention one more significant aspect of this section in terms of its relationship to the Temple and cult as described in the *Temple Scroll*. Within the above discussion of the purpose of the community's way of life we find the following:

5       ...At that time the men of the Community shall separate [ybdylw]  
          themselves

6       (as) a House of Holiness for Aaron, for the Community of the most Holy  
          Ones, and a house of the Community for Israel; (1QS 9:5-6 Charlesworth  
          *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39)

"At that time," refers to the time when the men of the Community are ready to perform the rite of atonement (9:3-5), this rite will be fully explored in chapter Four. It is at this time that "the men of the Community shall separate" into two houses, one for Aaron and one for Israel. The scroll adds, "The Sons of Aaron alone shall rule over judgement and property" (9:7), and then continues to discuss the role to be played by the House of Aaron in matters of judgement "concerning every norm of the men of the Community" (9:7). The importance of the role of the sons of Aaron as authorities and leaders of the Community will be explored in the next two chapters and can not be overemphasized. However the separation of the Community into two houses serves more than this purpose. In chapter Four I develop my argument for considering the life of the Community as the only valid sacrifice, according to the Community, for atonement, an argument which I cannot fully develop at this point of my discussion. However, if we can, at this moment, consider the possibility that the life of the Community is being offered up as an atoning sacrifice it is in the *Temple Scroll* that we must look for the particular details of this sacrifice as outlined in the *Community Rule*, especially in understanding the need for the two Houses, one for

Aaron and one for Israel.

Leviticus 16, in prescribing the offerings to be made on the Day of Atonement, mentions separate sacrifices to be offered for Aaron "and for his house" (16:6) and for the community of Israel. But the issue of keeping these sacrifices *separate*, the root used in 1QS 9:5 is *bdl*, although indicated, is never brought up as an explicit and specific concern in Leviticus. It is however an issue which is explicitly and specifically repeated at least two times as a fundamental concern in the *Temple Scroll*, in the first passage the same root *bdl* is used as in 1QS 9:5:

- 10 And you shall make a place west of the *hekhal* around, a stoa of standing columns
- 11 for the sin offering and the guilt offering, separated from one another  
[*mwbdlym zh mzh*]: for the sin offering of the priests and for the male goats
- 12 and for the sin offerings of the people and for their guilt offerings, and all of them shall not be mixed one
- 13 with another, for their places shall be separated from one another  
[*mwbdlym zh mzh*] so that
- 14 the priests may not err with the sin offering of the people... (11QT 35:10-14 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:150-151 italics, except for line 10, are added).

And,

- 11 ...and [there shall be] no mixing of the sacrifices of
- 12 the peace offerings of the children of Israel with the sacrifices of the priests  
(11QT 37:11-12 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:159).

When the Community is sufficiently ready to fulfil its purpose, "to atone for the land" (1QS 8:10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35) the two sacrifices, one for Aaron and his house

and the other for the community of Israel, 1QS tells us, must be kept separate. This separation is not explicitly specified in Leviticus but it is prescribed in the *Temple Scroll* for the sacrifices to be offered on the Day of Atonement.

To briefly summarize, therefore, that the above process of initiation corresponds, and is intentionally meant to do so, with the plan of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll* becomes fully evident when we consider the last step which results in the level of initiation which corresponds to the sanctuary. The concentric plan of the *Temple Scroll* is the only Temple plan, as far as we know, which has the entrance to the Temple, within which is the Holy of Holies, right at its center. It is in the *Community Rule* that we find the analogy of this Temple plan in the model for the Community. It is in this scroll that we find a community structure at the centre of which is explicitly said to be the sanctuary within which is performed the sacrifice of atonement. It is to this center that the process of initiation in the *Community Rule* is directing the initiate in the same way as the concentric courts of the *Temple Scroll* have as their objective progressively increasing ritual purity requirements at the very center of which is the Temple, within which is the sanctuary. Each different level of initiation in the *Community Rule*, in the same way as the courts in the *Temple Scroll*, includes its own purity requirements but also privileges. Both the requirements as well as privileges are representative of the initiate's status, the intended objective of which, as becomes evident in the *Community Rule*, is the type of Priestly virtuosity in matters of both cult and covenant which is so essential to the world-view of the *Temple Scroll*. It is only upon entering the very center, the sanctuary, that one may perform the function for which the Community is intended, the sacrifice of atonement for the Land.

The most hidden information is only for the benefit of those who have already undergone a full conversion. It is from among the initiates who have reached the third level of initiation,

the one corresponding to the inner court, that the House of Holiness is created:

- 10 When these are established in the principles of the Community for two years  
among the perfect of the Way
- 11 they shall be set apart (as) holy in the midst of the Council of the men of the  
Community. Everything which has been concealed from Israel and is found  
by somebody
- 12 who studies - he shall not conceal it from these out of fear of a backsliding  
spirit (1QS 8:10-12 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35)

The most hidden information then relates to the activities performed by and within the House of Holiness, the sanctuary of the Community. This sanctuary is surrounded by those who walk in perfection. Israel, for this scroll, at least the Israel which is of any consequence, is the community of ritually pure adult males who have joined the Community. This group is identical with the definition of priests provided in the *Damascus Document*: the "converts of Israel who departed from the Land of Judah." (CD 4:4 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99) It is these priests who make up the House of Community as discussed in the *Community Rule* and who surround the sanctuary. In other words the mapping of the Community with which this scroll presents us is a community made up of priests surrounding the House of Holiness within which those to whom is revealed "Everything which has been concealed from Israel," (8:11 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35) officiate in their capacity as guardians, servants and ministrants of the sanctuary.

## 7. Conclusion

That the *Temple Scroll*, a document so much of which deals with the Temple, is concerned with ritual purity requirements based on proximity to God can not surprise anyone. Nor can the fact that similar stringent purity requirements are applied to the People of Israel

beyond the Temple. After all, and especially because of the "maximalist approach" to ritual purity, the concern with purity does not end with the Temple or its city. God dwells amongst the People of Israel as God so dwelt in the camp in the wilderness. The scroll tells us explicitly that God dwells within the community of Israel. God's proximity to the People is not restricted to the environs of the Temple. Yadin's discussion of the "maximalist approach" stresses the fact that the extension of purity requirements serves as rings of purity around the city of the Temple and the Temple itself in order to guarantee and safeguard the purity of the sanctuary. One can not argue with this but the scroll itself also informs us that God dwells *with the People of Israel*. In addition the scroll uses the same language to speak of consecrating the People as it does of consecrating the Temple. In 29:7-9 we read:

- 7       And I will accept them(?), and they shall be(?) my people, and I will be theirs for ever, [and] I will dwell
- 8       with them for ever and ever. And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle
- 9       my glory... (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:128-129).

In 51:7-8 we read:

- 7       ...For I am the Lord, who dwells
- 8       among the children of Israel; and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and they shall be holy... (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:227).

In the first instance, as earlier discussed, we have a statement which, Yadin explains, is not "found in the Bible; the closest biblical text has to do with the Tent of Meeting..." (*Temple* 1983, 2:129) he refers to Exodus 29:43-45: "I will meet with the Israelites there and it shall be sanctified by my glory; I will consecrate the tent of meeting and the altar...", verse 45 adds, "I will dwell among the Israelites, and I will be their God."

The second instance, about the People, does have a Biblical parallel, Leviticus 11:44: "For I am the LORD your God; sanctify yourselves therefore, and be holy, for I am holy." But this passage does not include any information as to God's dwelling among the Israelites. In addition in neither of these passages are we told that God will dwell with the Children of Israel *forever*. That the author has borrowed the statement about God dwelling within the community of Israel can not be perceived as accidental. The language used, the context of consecration to God as well as the addition in both cases of the phrase *forever* point to an underlying understanding as to the analogy between the People and the Temple: both are to be consecrated to God, God dwells in both, and God will so dwell forever. Further testimony to this identification between the People of Israel and the Temple can be seen in the use made of the words *ky* and '*shr* (for) as in the following examples:

- 13     ...so that they will not defile the city in which I dwell;
- 14     for (*ky*) I, the Lord dwell among the children of Israel for ever and ever  
(45:13-14 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:193)

And,

- 11     ...They shall consecrate my temple and fear my temple,
- 12     for ('*shr*) I dwell among them... (46:11-12 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:198-199)

Finally we have the passage (51:7-15), already discussed, within which we are told that perversion of justice defiles the "house." The non-cultic activities, in this case the activities of "judges and officers in *all your towns*" (11 italics are added), therefore not even of the judges in the city of the Temple, has a direct effect on the "house," the Temple. Morality, therefore, has the same power in defiling the Temple, as does cult-related activity. In addition, as earlier discussed, activities which violate the covenant such as cutting and tattooing of the flesh have the power to defile the Land (i.e. 48:7-11). The world view underlying these statements is one within which the separation between cult and covenant is blurred. Morality, an issue related to the covenant and infractions of those aspects not



directly related to the cult, affects the purity of the Temple. The Pentateuch speaks specifically of the defilement of the Land only in the case of murder (Num. 35:33-34), and provides for the means of expiation only the shedding of the blood of the guilty party. In the *Temple Scroll* the way of life of the People is perceived as a cause of defilement both for the Temple and the Land. In both cases the reason is that God dwells in both the Temple and the People.

In Numbers 35:34 the reason for not defiling the Land is given as: "you shall not defile the land in which you live, in which I also dwell; for I the LORD dwell among the Israelites." God's immediate presence both produces sanctity and introduces the requirement for appropriate activity. But the fact must again be emphasized that the almost anthropomorphic immediacy of God's presence is an aspect of Priestly ideology. Ritual purity and the cult are perceived as the means by which to guarantee the purity of the People *so that* they may approach the Deity, or at least exist in physical proximity to Him. In the *Temple Scroll* it is the way of life of the People *as well as* the correct practice of the cult which guarantee the purity of the People so that they may live in proximity to God, or rather both way of life and cultic practice are necessary *because* God dwells amongst the People.

### Chapter 3. THE COMMUNITY OF THE SCROLLS

#### 1. Introduction

The central concern of this chapter is what it is that the particular structure of the Community of the scrolls tells us about the Community's perception of the world and how in turn the Community's perception of the world instructs and supports the structure of the Community. I begin my investigation of this topic by exploring how the structure of the Community as well as those texts which the Community considers as authoritative communicate, inculcate and reinforce the holiness to which the Community is aiming. I focus on the idea of holiness being communicated in the scrolls because it is through their perception of holiness that we can more clearly perceive "the ontology and methodology of the sacred... and of the capacity for regulation, therefore for sanctification, within the ordinary..." (Neusner *Mishnah* xxviii).

The structure of the Community by reinforcing a particular perception of the world makes this particular perception appear inevitable. Despite the attendant hardships members of this Community imagine living outside of the Community and outside this perception of the world as the worst possible punishment. In fact the very forms of reward and punishment: progressive inclusion into ever-increasing aspects of the communal life vs different levels of exclusion from the Community, serve to reinforce this notion. Holiness is a central concern for the Community prescribed by the scrolls. In a number of cases the scrolls identify this Community as Temple and sanctuary. It will become apparent that the very structure prescribed by the scrolls for the Community reinforces the identification of this Community as Temple and sanctuary and that this very identification supports and is supported by the scrolls' understanding of holiness. In the next two chapters I further examine the structure

of the Community and show that it is identical to the structure of the Temple in the *Temple Scroll*.

## 2. Methodology: The Use of Empirical Studies

Before exploring the topic of how holiness is communicated in the Community and the importance of such communication in supporting the structural framework of the Community I would like to introduce and briefly discuss the issue of the use of particular mechanisms in the formation and maintenance of new communities and alternative movements. If the rules of the Community as prescribed in the scrolls correspond with those characteristics and mechanisms discovered through empirical studies as being necessary mechanisms for the formation and maintenance of new communities, then it is more likely that the scrolls themselves were meant to provide instructions for a concrete community.

In this discussion of the Community of the scrolls as concrete community I will be looking at two things, first of all the behavioral characteristics of alternative movements and then at those mechanisms necessary for the maintenance of these movements. I will, in large part, be using Kenneth Westhues analysis of the formation of countercultures, *Society's Shadow: Studies in the Sociology of Countercultures*, Rosabeth Moss Kanter's article "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities," included in Westhues' book, as well as Westhues' discussion of this article.

The discussion of the conclusions arrived at by Westhues and Kanter after their investigation of successful communities is necessary for my study, even though it is not often doubted that the scrolls reflect the authoritative texts of a particular community,

perhaps Norman Golb being a well known exception. Questions can be raised, however, whether the scrolls reflect the requirements for the lived reality of this Community or the ideal. This issue must be resolved before I continue my investigation of the scrolls because if the scrolls can be shown to correspond to the requirements of the lived reality of a specific Community we can explore the actions prescribed for this Community not merely as ideals to be aimed for, even though some element of that must be retained, and definitely not as instructions for the eschaton. When we can explore the prescriptions of the sectarian scrolls as mandating concrete actions intended to be undertaken in real time we can approach the Community as an anthropological case study.

It is only then that we can begin to arrive at a more precise understanding that individuals *did* choose to live the very austere and regimented lifestyle mandated by the scrolls and examine the reasons for these choices. Once the Community becomes real and the structure becomes real we can begin to examine why living in this particular way makes sense to the individual members of the Community. We can then better explore the question of whether the information the scrolls contain as to the purpose of this way of life is meant metaphorically: the scrolls prescribe the spiritual goals of the Community; or literally: the Community believes that they are identical to the Temple and that their actions will have the same immediate effect on the real world in real time as would an unadulterated Temple cult. These goals, in both cases, remain purity and holiness but in the first possibility, the metaphorical one, the physical regiment, by enforcing and guaranteeing the Community's holiness, prepares the Community for the eschaton. The distinction between the two possibilities may at first appear subtle but is, in fact, elemental. Jacob Neusner in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Israel* discusses this very issue of literal and metaphorical interpretation of the Temple and asks, "(w)hat does the Hebrew Bible tell about purity to those various individuals and groups whose writings are in our hands?" (11) His answer is at the heart of

the distinction just mentioned:

The biblical corpus of ideas about purity may be divided into two distinct parts, the interpretation of purity and impurity as a metaphor of morality, on the one hand, and the specific laws about purity and impurity in connection with the Temple cult, on the other (11).

For this second group purity or impurity is not, or *not only*, an ethical or moral concern it produces direct effects in real space and real time. Purity, for this group, allows physical, not metaphorical, proximity to the cult. The cult, in turn, is a physical not metaphorical reality. Neusner explains this in the following way,

the terms 'pure' and 'impure' originally had no ethical value. That is to say, a woman in her menses or a man suffering a flux in the law is not... held in the priestly law-code to be ethically or morally impure. That a man is impure means only that there are certain things he must not do, others he must do in order to return to a state of purity (11).

That the Community *prescribed* in the scrolls is congruent with both, or at least not *only* the first, perceptions of purity is not often doubted. What is put to question is what the goal of such a Community is. If the scrolls *prescribe* an ideal to be aimed for which will come into existence in the eschaton then one can argue that the Temple is used as metaphor for the Community. If, on the other hand, we can show that the Community as prescribed in the scrolls was intended to exist in real space and time then the scrolls can be scrutinized as providing the requirements and the norms intended to be applied to, and "regularly invoked" by, a real community in real time (Bird, Frederick "How do Religions Affect Moralities?"). If the scrolls present us with a model of a Community that aimed, in a very literal sense, to live according to the purity laws incumbent in the Torah only to the priests while performing their cultic service, and believed this to be possible, then we must reconsider the explanation often advanced by scholars that the service the Community is offering, to atone for the land

"without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices," (1QS 9:4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39) is symbolic. Neusner appears to be advancing this very idea of symbolic representation when he says, comparing the Community of the scrolls with early Christianity and finding similarity in their use of Temple as metaphor, "(i)n some measure, this represents a 'spiritualization' of the old Temple, for the Temple now is the community, and the Temple worship is effected through the community's study and fulfilment of the Torah" (*Purity* 50). This type of understanding of the Community of the scrolls ignores the very real probability that the Community for which the scrolls were authoritative lived literally as priests performing the cultic service, that the scrolls do not only prescribe an ideal, whether in real time or in the eschaton, but prescribe *and* describe the requirements for the lived reality of the Community. Of course it is always necessary to keep in mind that those norms which a community, any community, perceives as its "ought", to use Geertz's term, are not usually, if ever, fully achieved. But the community must believe that they are achievable in this world in real time. These norms are, therefore, the measuring rod by which a community judges its actions. Frederick Bird (in "How do Religions Affect Moralities? A Comparative Analysis") has described norms in the following way:

Moralities inherently incorporate two different kinds of standards; namely, both behavioural standards (i.e. norms) identifying how to act, as well as communicative standards (beliefs and reasons) indicating how to identify what ought to be done and how to justify this conduct and persuade others to act accordingly ("How do Religions..." 292).

The laws which are being mandated by the sectarian scrolls become the norms of a living community if they are regularly invoked by the community, if they become the "justifying reasons for action" (Bird "How do Religions..." 292)).

I have decided to use the conclusions garnered by Westhues and Kanter because they are the result of their investigation of real and successful communities. In both cases the categories are not hypothetical, "what should be" but rather "what is," based on empirical evidence. Kanter's investigation in particular, of "successful utopian communities" informs us of what works in inculcating and maintaining commitment in these communities. If the scrolls can be shown to exhibit the behavioral characteristics as well as to include the commitment mechanisms otherwise observed as *necessary* in living communities we can, with some certainty, conclude that they also describe the "ought" of a real community, the "norms" which this community would have invoked on a regular basis (Bird "How do Religions..."). We can also begin to consider the possibility that the final version of these prescriptions as outlined in the scrolls were written after both the origin of the idea as well as the creation of the earliest proto-movement based on this idea, perhaps even after the establishment of the earliest Community.

If the behavioral characteristics of real alternative communities and the commitment mechanisms shown to contribute to successful utopian communities are central to the structure of the Community *prescribed* in the sectarian scrolls there is a greater likelihood that they must also be *describing* the *reality* aspired to by this Community. The categories arrived at by Westhues and Kanter are too reflective of and specifically necessary to the maintenance of existing communities. It is therefore unlikely that they were accidentally arrived-at by someone creating an ideal world.

After fully exploring how these two studies can be applied to the Community of the scrolls I will then begin an investigation of the structure of the Community as real community as an attempt to arrive at the world-view which it reflects.

### 3. Westhues' Study and its Application to the Sectarian Scrolls

Westhues' original claim that "a counterculture rejects, particularly at its beginning, rationality itself, the fundamental root of societies..."(10) could be only inaccurately applied to the Community of the scrolls. Westhues does, however, later explain that this stage "must be a transient one if the movement is to survive" (41). He adds, "A counterculture arises among people whose structure of experience does not make plausible society's ideology, but it can be maintained only by the creation of a new structure of experience that makes plausible the new definition of reality"(42). His definition of counterculture includes the following observation:

A counterculture is basically an idea; it is something that happens in people's heads. A counterculture comes into existence when a group of people emancipate their thinking from the ideology of their society and come to believe with utter finality that everything they have been taught to be true is in fact false. A counterculture is born when people suddenly discover that they no longer can speak society's language, nor comprehend its logic, nor be governed by its norms. The origin of a counterculture lies in an ineffable moment of freedom from all the sham and hypocrisy of society, a moment in which a new reality is discovered, *the absolute reality* (40).

Just such moments of discovery are discussed in the *Damascus Document* as well as in the *Community Rule*. In the first the moment is that of the revelation upon which the Community is founded:

But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray...



...and He built them a sure house in Israel whose like has never existed from former times till now (*Damascus Document* 3: 12-20 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99).

These moments of discovery are discussed in the *Community Rule* as those upon which the individual bases his joining the Community. But here, as in the *Damascus Document*, above, the moment of discovery is not discussed as a mystical experience, rather it is the moment when the individual chooses to accept the true revelation and to be taught and live by its precepts:

- 1        This (is) the rule for the men of the Community who devote themselves to turn away from all evil and hold fast to all which he has commanded as his will (1QS 5:1 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19).

Unlike the possible problems inherent in Westhues' definition of a counterculture there are none in his discussion of the "behavioral characteristics of the counterculture" (15-20). In keeping with the above stated objectives of this chapter, to discover whether or not the scrolls describe and prescribe the norms to be applied to a concrete Community, the use of his discussion of the "behavioral characteristics of the counterculture" serves as an heuristic device in coming to terms with the behavioral characteristics of the Community of the scrolls *as community*. Westhues lists seven behavioral characteristics of the counterculture. I will very briefly indicate how these are evident in the Community of the scrolls, at the same time providing an introduction of the life of the Community. Westhues' first characteristic is that, "Relationships among members of the counterculture approach economic communism" (15-16). This characteristic relates to the idea of unity with those within as well as the rejection of the value placed on competition by those outside (15-16). Full membership to the Community of the scrolls involves just such an economic communism. The *Community Rule* dictates that the initiate must spend a minimum of two years with the Community

before he may be considered a full member. Once he is accepted as a full member his property becomes the property of the Community and he in turn may fully share in the common property of the Community (*Community Rule* 6:13-25). The concept of the ideal of communism is reinforced by the fact that it is not until his property is joined to the communal property that he is recognized as eligible to offer his counsel and judgement: "His counsel / and his judgement shall belong to the Community" (6:22-23 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29). Thus both the physical and the ideological become communal property. The instructions relating to property in the *Damascus Document* are somewhat different. The *Damascus Document* instructs that each member of the Community

shall place the earnings of at least two days out of every month into the hands of the Guardian and the Judges, and from it they shall give to the fatherless, and from it they shall succour the poor and the needy... (14:12-15 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 112-113)

The *Damascus Document*, however, further directs the members of the Community that no decision relating to property may be made by an individual of the Community without direct consent of the leadership: "No man shall form any association for buying and selling without informing the Guardian of the camp..." (13:15-16 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 112). The ideal of Community is further reinforced by the following precept: "No member of the Covenant of God shall give or receive anything from the sons of the Pit except for payment" (CD 13:14-15 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 112; this prohibition is also found in the *Community Rule* 5:16-17). The requirement of payment from or to anyone outside the Community serves to establish a tangible boundary between those inside and those outside. The act of the transference of property and possibly services is a concrete event identifying those who are entitled to it, the Community, and those who must pay or be paid for it, those outside.

Westhues' second behavioral characteristic is, "(s)exual relationships among members of the counterculture deviate from the nuclear family model and usually from monogamous marriage" (16-17). The deviation from the norm could result in celibacy or its opposite, free love or any variation between the two. It is not important which of the variations a counterculture chooses rather what is important is the fact that a choice is made *against* the nuclear family, the norm of the larger society, and what this choice against the norm implies: the rejection of society's values, as well as what such a choice means for the organizational reality of the counterculture. Westhues explains, "Both celibacy and free love serve the same purpose: 'They assure that a person's total loyalty and affective involvement remains within the group and at the disposal of the leadership' (Coser, Lewis "The Political Functions of Eunuchism," *American Sociological Review* 29 (December, 1964): 880-85.[17])" (17).

It has been a long held assumption that the Community of the scrolls chose celibacy as a lifestyle. This assumption was largely based on the evidence found in ancient sources in reference to the Essenes and the subsequent identification of the Community of the scrolls with the Essenes. Pliny the Elder, writing after the Destruction of the Temple, "describes Essenes in his description of the Dead Sea region. There he says of the 'tribe of the Essenes' that 'it has no women and has renounced all sexual desire'" (Pliny *Natural History* 5,73 in Schiffman *Reclaiming* 127). Philo (*Hypothetica* 11:14 cited in Schiffman *Reclaiming* 128), and Josephus (*War* 2:120-121 cited in Schiffman *Reclaiming* 128), also describe the Essenes as living celibate lives. The reason given by Philo for the celibacy of the Essenes bears repeating because it relates with Westhues' explanation of the choice against the norm of the nuclear family made by countercultures. Philo writes:

Furthermore they abstain from marriage because they plainly perceive it to be the *only or the primary danger to the maintenance of the communal life*, as well as

because they especially practice continence (*Hypothetica* 11,14 cited in Schiffman *Reclaiming* 128 italics are added).

Josephus, however, speaks of one group of Essenes who does marry (*War* 2, 160-161 cited in Schiffman *Reclaiming* 128-129). I have earlier explained that I make no assumptions in this study as to the accuracy of the identification of the sectarians with the Essenes. I can therefore not accept the above as evidence as to the practices of the Community of the sectarian scrolls but must look to the information provided by the scrolls themselves.

The assumption that the *Community Rule* is directed to a celibate Community of men is widely accepted, largely due to the identification of the Community with the Essenes as described by the above ancient historians. The scroll itself makes no such explicit claim. The argument advanced by Vermes in support for celibacy that "...the word *isha*, woman, occurs nowhere in the Community Rule. Or rather, to be more exact, it is encountered once in the final Hymn, in the cliché, 'one born of woman' (1QS XI, 21)" (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9) is incomplete. It is in the absence not only of the word *isha* but in the absence of any concern with rules relating to anyone other than the very specific Community which is to atone for the land (9:4) that we can begin to consider the Community of 1QS as celibate. If, as the scroll itself explains, "all those who are entering shall cross over into the covenant before God by the Rule of the Community, in order to act / according to everything which he has commanded" (1QS 1:16-17 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9) the absence of any rules guiding the behaviour of women and children as well as rules relating to marriage and family life further support the argument for celibacy. At least for celibacy within the confines of the physical, isolated Community preparing the way of the Lord as prescribed in the *Community Rule* (8:14). It is in the directives for this Community which are specifically meant in this scroll as the way to make them suitable for the particular offering of 1QS 9:4

that we can understand this Community as they understood themselves, as priests separating themselves from all that may make them impure and therefore unsuitable for cultic service. This requirement for the separation of the priest from his wife, while in the city of the Temple, can be traced to the *Temple Scroll*:

- 11 And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not  
come into any part of the city  
12 of the temple, where I will settle my name, for three days (45:11-12 Yadin  
*Temple 2:193*).

Yigael Yadin explains the above passage as follows:

Hence, according to the laws of the sect, all males residing in the Temple city must abstain from having sexual relations therein. Therefore, this ban is tantamount to ordaining complete celibacy for them... Similar prohibitions are found in the *War Scroll*, where women and children are forbidden to enter the battle camps (vii:3-4 ...). Moreover, the fact that in the scroll menstruating women and women after confinement are not given places in the Temple city as they are in other cities proves that the doctrine of the sect deemed it necessary to ban women from permanent residence in the Temple city (*Temple 1:288-289*).

The issue of celibacy entered the arena of debate in large part due to the excavation of some graves of women and children at Qumran. In addition, the *Damascus Document* as well as the *Rule of the Congregation* (*Messianic Rule* 1QSa or 1Q28a) both refer to families, women and children. It is in comparing the particular references to women, children and families in these two scrolls to the absence of the same in 1QS that we can find further support for the argument of celibacy at least for a segment of the Community.

I would like to deal with the problem raised by the *Rule of the Congregation* (*Messianic Rule*) first. This document which is accepted as having been "copied on the same scroll as

*Rule of the Community*" (Schiffman *Reclaiming* 133), "...describes the messianic Community embodying the perfect holiness of the End of Days" (Schiffman *Reclaiming* 133). As a result Schiffman arrives at the conclusion that,

If the sectarians anticipated in the End of Days a society based on marriage and family and if that society represented for them the perfection of what already existed in their own world and their own community, then it is hard to escape the conclusion that the Qumran sectarians lived in a normal society that included marriage and family (*Reclaiming* 135).

I find this conclusion untenable on a number of fronts. First of all the *Rule of the Congregation* (*Messianic Rule*) begins:

- 1 And this (is) the rule for all (in) the Congregation of Israel in the end of days: When they gather [as a Community to wa]lk continuously
- 2 according to the judgement of the Sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men of their covenant who have tu[r]ned away from walking in the] way of
- 3 the people. These are the men of his (God's) counsel who have kept his covenant amidst evil to ato[ne for the lan]d.
- 4 When they come, they shall assemble all those who enter, (including) children along with women; and they shall read in [their] h[earing]
- 5 [al]l the statutes of the covenant, and instruct them in all [th]eir judg[ments] lest they err g[reatly]. (1QSa 1:1-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 111).

Just from the above few lines it is evident that the scroll explicitly refers to a situation different to the one which has existed up to this point. It specifically refers to "the end days: *When they gather....*," thus a new context, the end days, is introduced. A context which presupposes the existence of the Community of the sons of Zadok. The instructions which will follow are intended for these last days. In addition we are told that "When they

gather [as a Community to wa]lk continuously / according to the judgement of the Sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men of their covenant who have tu[r]ned away from walking in the] way of / the people. *These are the men of his (God's) counsel who have kept his covenant amidst evil to ato[ne for the lan]d*" (italics are added). It is this Community according to whose judgement the Congregation of Israel shall walk which has been performing the ritual (to be discussed in the next chapter) to atone for the land. In the *Community Rule* this ritual is discussed as something to be done by the Community in the future: "When, according to all these norms, these (men) *become* in Israel a foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth, / they *shall* atone..." (1QS 9:3-4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39 italics are added). The *Community Rule* (1QS) makes a further distinction between the Community of the present and that of the End Days:

- 9       ...They shall not depart from any counsel of the Torah
- 10       to walk in all the stubbornness of their heart. They shall be judged by the
- first judgements in which the men of the Community began to be instructed,
- 11       *until* the coming of the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (9:9-11 Charlesworth
- Dead Sea Scrolls* 41 italics are added).

*Florilegium* (4Q174), which also provides information about the Last Days makes a similar distinction between the present and the Last Days by referring to the coming of two Messiahs, one of the line of David and one identified as the "Interpreter of the Law" (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 354), in the Last Days. Furthermore the *Rule of the Congregation* (*Messianic Rule* 1QSa 1:4), when referring to the children and women who will come, does not mention their inclusion as part of the status quo but rather as a new reality, it reads: "they will assemble all those who come, from the children to the women, and they will read into their ears all the laws of the covenant...." (my translation). This section of the scroll introduces a new context and therefore a new reality, the coming of the children

and women, which is relevant to this new context. Nowhere does it assume that this is the reality as it exists prior to the End Days. In addition there is no need to assume that simply because the ideal society of the end of days includes women and children so too must have the Community of the scrolls. As an illustration I would like to provide the example of the camp preparing for war. For this camp too the ideal would be a Community which included women and children, in fact it was in large part for this Community of their families, one would assume, that they engaged in war. This did not however mean that women and children would have been welcomed in this camp preparing for war.

Again Lawrence Schiffman's argument assumes the "less-than" or "in-the-meantime" quality of the present reality of the Community of the scrolls and contrasts this to the ideal of the End Days attempting to find in the present reality a less clear reflection of the perfection of the End Days. In fact for the Community the present and the apocalyptic future are two separate contexts, the present, and its strictly prescribed ritualized activities, has a purpose all its own. The *Damascus Document*, unlike the *Community Rule*, which has no references to marriage, and unlike the *Rule of the Congregation (Messianic Rule 1QSa)*, which is obviously meant for a different context, does, unequivocally, refer to marriage. The issue is introduced in 7:6-7, "And *if* they live in camps according to the rule of the Land ..., marrying ... and begetting children..." (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 102 italics are added). The use of *if* is very important. It implies that this was one of the possible ways one could choose to live after joining the Community of the new covenant. In other words, there are those *who do not* "live in camps according to the rule of the Land..., marrying..." etc. This group is not presented as deviant rather by the use of *if* it is the others, those who choose to live "according to the rule of the Land..., marrying..." etc, who are presented as the exception to the rule. I feel therefore justified in forgoing any further discussion of the *Damascus Document* and how it relates to Westhues' second behavioral characteristic, the



deviation from the norm of nuclear families, because whether or not the group in its entirety espoused celibacy, a portion of it did and is not portrayed in the *Damascus Document* as radical, but rather as a viable option.

Westhues' third behavioral characteristic is that the "counterculture maintains its superiority over dominant society without seeking to impose on everyone its way of life" (17). He explains,

Most countercultures see themselves as a spiritual elite (virtuoso religiosity, in Weber's terms) and the continued existence of unenlightened men serves only as the grey background against which the purity of their truth appears even more radiant.... To attempt to practice the behavior of the counterculture without grasping the depth of its world-view brings confusion and failure... (17-18).

This characteristic too is evident in the scrolls. The central premise of the *Damascus Document* is the creation of this Community as "the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God," and with which God then

made His Covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them the hidden things in which *all Israel had gone astray*. He unfolded before them His holy Sabbaths and his glorious feasts, the testimonies of His righteousness and the ways of His truth, and the desires of His will which a man must do in order to live (3:12-16 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99 italics are added).

The *Community Rule* reinforces this idea that the Community of the scrolls is privy to knowledge necessary for the proper interpretation of the covenant. This knowledge is controlled especially by an elite group to which everything has been revealed, the Sons of Zadok (ie: 5:8-9, but also in *Damascus Document* ie:3:21-4:4 and in *Rule of the*

*Congregation* ie: 1:1-4)). There can be no doubt that the Community of the scrolls considers itself to be an elite, they alone have the knowledge necessary for the proper interpretation of the covenant. Those outside the Community, and therefore outside its knowledge and practice of the truth, are "the congregation of / the men of deceit" (*Community Rule* 5:1-2 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19), "the congregation of traitors" (*Damascus Document* 1:12 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 97) as well as "the sons of the Pit" (*Damascus Document* 13:14 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 112). The ideal is a time when all of Israel will return to (ie: *Community Rule* 5:8) or join (ie: *Rule of the Congregation* 1:1) this proper interpretation of the covenant. But the Community of the scrolls knows that this will never happen, that, inevitably a war will be fought against all those who "depart from the way and abhor the Precept" (*Damascus Document* 2:6 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 98). And in the end it is the members of the Community who "will prevail over all the sons of the earth" (*Damascus Document* version B 2:34 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 105).

In agreement with Westhues' explanation above, joining the Community is not a simple matter of concrete action alone. One can only join the Community once one has grasped "the depths of its world-view:"

- 4        he cannot be purified by atonement, nor be cleansed by waters of  
         purification, nor sanctify himself in streams and
- 5        rivers, nor cleanse himself in any waters of ablution. Unclean, unclean is  
         he, as long as he rejects the judgements of
- 6        God, so that he cannot be instructed within the Community of his (God's)  
         counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that the ways of  
         man - all his iniquities -
- 7        are atoned, so that he can behold the light of life. It is by the Holy Spirit of  
         the Community in his (God's) truth that he can be cleansed from all

- 8 his iniquities. It is by an upright and humble spirit that his sin can be  
atoned. It is by humbling his soul to all God's statutes, that  
9 his flesh can be cleansed...(Community Rule 3:4-9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea  
Scrolls* 13-15).

The Community of the scrolls cannot "impose on everyone its way of life," because one must choose this way of life freely and one cannot choose it unless one first chooses the world-view upon which it is founded. Weber's description of a sect is particularly relevant at this point. Weber explains that "a sect ... is a voluntary association of *only those who, according to the principle, are religiously and morally qualified*" (Weber "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism" 306).

Westhues' fourth characteristic relates to the counterculture's political involvement. He states that the "counterculture is only marginally political, if at all" (18). Other than some polemic directed at those whose interpretation of the covenant is wrong and who lead people astray the political concerns, if one can even call them this, of the scrolls are twofold: clearly eschatological on the one hand or concerned with persecution from the outside political establishment, on the other. Evidence of the latter can be seen in the *Pesher Habakkuk*:

...this concerns the Wicked Priest who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to the house of his exile that he might confuse him with his venomous fury. And at the time appointed for rest, for the Day of Atonement, he appeared before them to confuse them, and to cause them to stumble on the Day of Fasting, their Sabbath of repose (11:5-8 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 346).

The *Halakhic Letter*, explaining the laws of the sectarians, appears to be directed to some figure or figures of authority. Schiffman explains these to be "their erstwhile colleagues in

Jerusalem and the Hasmonean leader to effect a reconciliation that would allow them to return to their role in the Temple. Needless to say, reconciliation means accepting the views this document put forth" (*Reclaiming* 84). Hanan Eshel in "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period" (in Kampen and Bernstein, eds 1996 53-65) examines the "possibility suggested by J. Strugnell and E. Qimron, that the 'Law and the Torah' mentioned in 4QpPsa is *Miqsat Maase Ha-Torah* (MMT)" (53), or the *Halakhic Letter*. This identification, if correct, is significant because it is in *Pesher Psalms A* (4QpPsa or 4Q171) that we are told that the Teacher of Righteousness sent "the Law and the Torah" to the Wicked Priest who, as a direct result then, attempted to have him killed:

The wicked watches for the righteous, seeking to [put him to death. The Lo]rd [will not abandon him (the righteous) to his (the wicked's) power, he will not let] him be condemned in judgement.' (Ps 37:32-33)

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Pr[iest] who sp[ied on the Teac]her of Righteousn[ess and tried] to put him to death [because of the la]w and the Torah which he had sent to him... (4QpPsa IV:5-9 cited in Eshel 54)

Whether "the Law and the Torah" is to be identified with 4QMMT or if, as Yadin suggested (in *The Temple Scroll* 1983, 1:396 also mentioned in Eshel 54) with the *Temple Scroll*, the fact remains that the Community felt persecuted by the establishment, in this case the Wicked Priest, a person of some power and influence, for their beliefs. However, other than the attempt made in 4QMMT to inform and, supposedly hopefully, convince the Wicked Priest of their interpretation of the Torah, we see no other political overtures being made by the scrolls. The scrolls therefore clearly exhibit Westhues' fourth behavioral characteristic.

The fifth characteristic, "Members of the counterculture reject certain of the rewards and status symbols of the parent society" (18-19), Westhues explains, "may be seen from either an economic or an ideological perspective" (18). He adds, "What may be economically

necessary is also often ideologically affirmed" (19). We do not have enough information from the scrolls as to the Community's economic pursuits. We do however know that in the *Community Rule* all goods of those identified as full members of the Community were held in common. And, as already discussed, it is only when one arrives at this stage, when his goods "are merged," that "he shall offer his counsel and judgement to the Community" (6:24 *Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls* 78). Therefore the economic necessity of communal property is homologous with the ideological ideal of communal counsel. The *Damascus Document* says of those outside the Community,

Furthermore, they defile their holy spirit and open their mouth with a blaspheming tongue against the laws of the Covenant of God saying, 'They are not sure.' They speak abominations concerning them; *they are kindlers of fire and lighters of brands* (Isa. I, 11), *their words are spiders' webs and their eggs are vipers' eggs* (Isa. lix, 5). No man that approaches them shall be free from guilt..." (CD 5:11-15 *Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls* 101).

The *Damascus Document* as we have already seen, eschews the receiving of "anything from the sons of the Pit except for payment" (13:14-15 *Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls* 112). The *Community Rule* is even more explicit:

- 14     ...No one must be united with him in his duty or his property, lest he  
burden him
- 15     (with) guilty iniquity. But he shall keep far away from him in everything,  
for thus it is written: 'Keep far away from everything false.' No man of the  
men of
- 16     the Community shall respond to their utterance with respect to any law or  
judgement. No one must either eat or drink anything of their property, or  
accept anything whatever from their hand

- 17     without payment, as it is written: 'Have nothing to do with the man whose  
breath is in his nostrils, for wherein can he be accounted?'(Isa. 2:22) For  
18     all those who are not accounted within his covenant, they and everything  
they have must be excluded. The man of holiness must not lean on any  
worthless works,  
19     for worthless are all those who do not know his covenant (5:14-19  
Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23).

Nothing which originates from the outside can therefore be used for the benefit of the Community, except for some material goods and possibly services and these only for a price. The idea of rejection of the "rewards and status symbols of the parent society" must be seen as implicit in the rejection of utterance, laws and judgements.

I will only briefly review Westhues' sixth characteristic, "Members of the counterculture look to spiritual leaders who embody basic countercultural phenomenology" (19) since my examination of the issue of the leaders of the Community of the scrolls forms such a central part of my present study and has been and will be discussed further, particularly in the next chapter. Westhues' examination of this characteristic concerns itself mainly with the types of arguments which these leaders provide for their followers, arguments which often have to do with a "transcendental" experience (19). The knowledge controlled by the Sons of Zadok, the leaders of and authoritative interpreters for the Community discussed in the scrolls, is received through, and based upon, revelation. As Westhues explains, "Such leaders are in sharp contrast to political ones, who rely on revelation of factual knowledge and at least superficially logical arguments to convince their followers of the ideas they propose"(19).

The last of Westhues' behavioral characteristics is again evident from our discussion so far

and will become even more evident by the end of this chapter. He says, "As a result of the foregoing characteristics, the counterculture exists in social isolation from the dominant culture and develops distinctive folkways and mores"(19).

I have offered Westhues' discussion of the characteristics of countercultures as part of my examination of the Community prescribed in the scrolls because it is important that we recognize that the sectarian scrolls intended that this Community be put into effect as a lived reality. It is only when we recognize this that we can begin to perceive certain ritualized activities as the Community would have lived them, not as *merely symbolic* even though the symbolic element can not be underestimated, but as having sacramental efficacy. In other words, if the Community described and prescribed in the scrolls exhibits all the behavioral characteristics found to be common to living countercultural communities we cannot look at the information regarding structure and organization in the abstract. It is unlikely that one imagining an ideal community would create one that so accurately conforms with the empirical model so far outlined.

#### 4. Kanter's Study and its Application to the Sectarian Scrolls

The remainder of this chapter will begin to explore the world view of the Community of the scrolls and how the structure of the Community reinforces and is in turn reinforced by it. To this end I will begin this section with Rosabeth Moss Kanter's article "Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities" (in Westhues 49-71). Commitment she explains "as a process binding actors into social systems" (71). In her definition "utopian communities" are those communities which "represent attempts to establish ideal social orders" (49). "A case was considered a utopian Community as long as all relevant relations among members were centrally controlled by a single organization" (50). She further

looked only at "successful cases." "Success was measured by length of time in existence; a system had to exist as a utopian Community for at least 25 years in order to be considered successful (a sociological definition of a generation)" (50). All the above conditions for inclusion as a successful utopian Community apply to the Community of the scrolls. Her discussion, when applied to the Community of the scrolls, proves that the prescriptions for this Community conform to those mechanisms found by Kanter to be necessary for inculcating and fostering commitment in the communities she studied.

Kanter looked at three types of commitment mechanisms, "cognitive-continuance, cathectic-cohesion, and evaluative-control" (52). For each of these "two processes were conceptualized - one a dissociative process, which would operate to free the personality system from other commitments, and one an associative process, operating to attach the personality to the current object of commitment" (52).

The first commitment mechanism, the mechanism "to continued participation," she explains, "involves securing a person's positive *cognitive* orientations, inducing the individual to cognize participation in the organization as profitable when considered in terms of rewards and costs" (53). To this end she discusses two processes, one dissociative, "sacrifice," the other associative, "investment" (53). The first process requires the initiate to agree to give up something which he/she considers "valuable or pleasurable in order to belong to the organization" (53). The bigger the sacrifice, in other words, the bigger the cost one has to pay in order to be permitted to join the organization, "the more 'valuable' he will consider" joining the organization, "in order to justify the psychic 'expense'..." (54). The act of voluntarily giving up those things which one would have traditionally held to be valuable or pleasurable serves to separate the initiate from his/her former life but at the same time to reinforce the value attached to membership in the new group (54). This act of "sacrifice" is



evident in the scrolls not only in the separation from the Community of origin which one must voluntarily choose to undertake but also in the very stringency and regimentation of the style of life mandated by the scrolls.

The second process which is necessary for this first mechanism, which commits one to continued participation in the new group, is "investment." This involves not only an investment of property but also "time and energy" (54). The individual thus not only gains "a stake in the fate of the organization," (54) but even more by the combination of "sacrifice" and "investment" the individual is closing other potential options and avenues, in effect aligning her/his future with the future of the new organization (55). "The individual who makes a cognitive-continuance commitment finds that what is profitable to him is bound up with his position in the organization, is contingent on his participating in the system - he commits himself to a role" (53). This type of commitment must be seen as rewarding in order to contribute to the continuance of the organization. The reward associated with "sacrifice" and "investment" is evident in the scrolls. As discussed above this becomes explicit in the rules for initiates in the *Community Rule* (6:15-25). It is here that we see the juxtaposition of the merging of the individual's property with the communal property and the merging of the individual's ideas and judgements with those of the Community. The surrender of property to the Community is not something that one may do spontaneously. It is a *reward* reserved for those who are approved for membership. It is only at this point, after a long period of initiation and testing, that one is permitted to surrender his property to the Community that one may *also* contribute one's ideas and judgement to the Community.

The second type of commitment mechanism of successful utopian communities, "cohesion," she explains,

involves the attaching of an individual's fund of affectivity and emotion to the group; emotional gratification stems from participation in and from identification with all the members of a close-knit group. Cathectic-cohesion commitment is commitment to a set of social relationships. The individual cathects each member of the group, and his loyalty and allegiance are thus to the group as a whole (56).

This mechanism, again, involves two processes, "renunciation (of other ties) and communion (with the group as a whole)" (58). Both of these two processes are evident in the scrolls and explicitly mentioned as necessary for one who desires to join the Community, for example:

- 1      This (is) the rule for the men of the Community who devote themselves to  
turn away from all evil and hold fast to all which he has commanded as his  
will: they shall separate themselves from the congregation of
- 2      the men of deceit, in order to become a Community, with Torah and  
property, and answerable to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the  
covenant, according to the multitude of the men of
- 3      the Community who hold fast to the covenant. According to their order shall  
go forth the determination of the lot about everything concerning Torah,  
property, and judgement, to do truth (in) unity, humility,
- 4      righteousness, justice, merciful love, (indeed) circumspectly walking in all  
their ways. No man shall wander in the stubbornness of his heart, to  
err following his heart,
- 5      his eyes, and the plan of his inclination. He shall rather circumcise in the  
Community the foreskin of the inclination (and) a stiff neck (*Community  
Rule 5:1-5* Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19-21)

Renunciation includes all ties which may challenge the individual's exclusive loyalty to the

group. This, therefore, includes ties to the outside world but also "individualistic ties" to particular individuals within the group (58-59). The ideal is a rejection of commitment to such ties, thus again, as discussed in regard to Westhues earlier, this type of "renunciation can take the form of free love or celibacy... In both cases, individual ties are structurally minimized and the ties of the actor to the group are thereby emphasized" (59). Renunciation can also involve "insulating boundaries" (58). These can include "geographical isolation," as well as a "special term for the outside world,...[and]...a negative attitude toward the outsider... " (58). We have already discussed the use made by the scrolls of these types of "insulating boundaries." For example the derogatory terms used for those outside of the group, the prohibition against taking anything, whether property or services from those outside other than for a price and the absolute prohibition against taking opinions, ideas or judgements from those outside the Community is contrasted to the ideal of communality for those inside the Community.

This ideal of communion with those within the group forms the second aspect of this commitment mechanism. Communion is inculcated and reinforced through regularized and ritualized activities as well as the very structure of the Community. These can include the following:

regularized group contact, via communal dwellings and dining halls, limited opportunity for privacy, and frequent group meetings which insure participation and involvement. Group ritual, which involves collective participation in ceremonies or recurring events of symbolic importance, also enhances communion. Ritual provides symbols under which 'the group identity is commonly raised to the level of the universal and abiding' (61, citing Boisen, Anton T. "Economic Distress and Religious Experience: a Study of the Holly Rollers," *Psychiatry* 2 (May, 1939): 185-94. [30, 61] and Blumer, Herbert "Collective Behavior," pp.167-222 Alfred M.

Lee, ed., *Principles of Sociology*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1953. [61, 63, 109]).

The use of this mechanism will be discussed later on in this and the following chapters, but for now the following example from the *Community Rule* can serve to illustrate the collective nature of the Community of the scrolls as well as the unmistakable necessity of the presence of the priest, a necessary *symbol* of all communal rituals. The presence of the priest, however, as will be discussed further down, is not only *symbolic*, it is *functional*:

- 1       ...In these (precepts)
- 2       they shall walk in all their dwelling-places. Wherever they are found each one with his respect to his fellow: the lesser one shall obey the greater with respect to work and money. And they shall eat (in) unity,
- 3       say benedictions (in) unity, and give counsel (in) unity. And in every place where there are ten men (belonging to) the Council of the Community, there must not be lacking among them a man (who is)
- 4       a priest. And each member shall sit according to his rank before him, and thus they shall be asked for their counsel concerning every matter (5:1-4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 27).

By use of this mechanism the Community creates a situation whereby the individual relinquishes not only ties which may compete with his/her absolute commitment and loyalty to the group but also a situation whereby the individual by "relinquishing separateness" (60), becomes part of a larger whole: "the mingling of self with the group" (60). Thereby removing even those ties to the individual's will which may compete with or challenge the will of the whole.

The third, and final, commitment mechanism has to do with just this idea of control by the

group resulting in the individual's "obedience" (63) and "submission" to the dictates of the organization (64). In order for this to happen the individual's very "symbolic environment" has to be redefined "so that the system's demands are considered right in terms of his self identity, and obedience to authority becomes a moral necessity" (63). This issue will also be discussed further down in this chapter, but for now I will briefly explain the two processes involved in achieving this end. These two processes are "mortification" and "surrender" (64). The first is meant to strip the initiate of any sense of pride, individuality, and privacy (64) but also to reinforce a sense of humility in the member. This is achieved through a number of different strategies. Kanter lists "confession" and "self-criticism;" as well as "spiritual differentiation," which

is supported by certain kinds of socialization practice: instruction in esoteric Community doctrines, revealing the recruit's ignorance; provision of rules or information which recruits must master; segregation of new members from old; and a formal probationary period.

Mortifying sanctions may also be employed, including public denouncement, removal of some privilege of membership, not allowing a deviant to participate in a valued Community activity, and punishment within the group rather than expulsion (65).

All of the above are strategies used in the Community as described and prescribed in the scrolls. The *Damascus Document*, in presenting the history of all those who did not walk in God's way, accuses them of walking "in the stubbornness of their hearts...and... doing what seemed right in his own eyes" (ie, 3:8-9, but also 2:20-21, 3:7-12 etc Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 98-99). The *Community Rule* also admonishes those who wish to join the Community to "walk no longer with the stubbornness of a guilty heart..."(1:6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 7). And later,

4        No man shall wander in the stubbornness of his heart, to err following his

heart,  
5 his eyes and the plan of his inclination. He shall rather circumcise in the Community the foreskin of the inclination (and) a stiff neck (1QS 5:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21).

The second aspect of this mechanism, "surrender," which is as evident as "mortification" in the above examples, is the process by which the will of the individual which has been expunged through the process of mortification is now replaced by the will of the group. "Surrender involves the attaching of a person's decision-making prerogative to a greater power, total involvement with a larger system of authority which gives both meaning and direction to an individual's life" (65). This larger system of authority in the Community of the scrolls are, in a very concrete way, the priests, the presence of whom is required any time ten men meet. But, even more so, the Sons of Zadok and their special and specific revelation. Kanter' discussion further reinforces this aspect of the scrolls:

Weber has proposed that this experience is transmitted through the quality of charisma, a felt connection with some central and meaningful feature of existence, generally related to the presence of charismatic leaders. But for surrender to result in more or less permanent commitments, persisting over long periods of time and independent of the presence or existence of any one person, charisma diffused throughout the corporate group is required. I call charisma in this form 'institutionalized awe,' a characteristic of an ongoing, formalized social system which imbues the system with power and meaning (67).

This "institutionalized awe" is evident in the communal structure prescribed in the scrolls. It is also evident in the specific definition given in the *Damascus Document* of 'Priest,' Levite' and 'sons of Zadok' (after its citation of Ezekiel 44:15),

and He built them a sure house in Israel whose like has never existed from former times till now. Those who hold fast to it are destined to live for ever and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs. As God ordained for them by the Prophet Ezekiel, saying, *The Priests, the Levites, and the sons of Zadok who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from me, they shall offer me fat and blood* (Ezek. xliv, 15)

The *Priests* are the converts of Israel who departed from the land of Judah, and (the *Levites* are) those who joined them. The *sons of Zadok* are the elect of Israel, the men called by name who shall stand at the end of days (3:19-4:4 *Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls* 99).

The significance of this distinctive definition, one that goes counter to the traditional definition based on lineage, is twofold. First, it provides for the transmission of the authority and privilege attached to these particular priestly groups and their unique relationship to God in performing the sacrificial cult, as described in Ezekiel, to the Community of "converts" in general. But, second, it provides for the transmission of charisma attached to the Sons of Zadok, "the men called by name who shall stand at the end of days." The *Damascus Document* earlier identifies these "men called by name" as those to whom God "made known His Holy Spirit... by the hand of His anointed ones, and He proclaimed the truth (to them)" (2:11-13 *Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls* 98). Therefore in the eyes of the Community these "men called by name" to whom God revealed the truth are the sons of Zadok to whom God has revealed His covenant (ie: *Community Rule* 5:9). We can also see this in the *Blessings Scroll* (1QSb=1Q28b):

- 22 Words of blessing for the M[aster to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests  
whom
- 23 God chose to restore his covenant [...]  
his people, and to instruct them

- 24 as he commanded. And they rose up in truth [...] and with righteousness  
watched over all his statutes and walked according [as]  
25 he chose (3:22-25 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 127).

In fact the definition of priest, Levite and sons of Zadok, cited from the *Damascus Document* 4:2-4 is echoed in the following description of the hierarchy of the Community, in discussing the process of initiation, found in the *Community Rule*:

- 8 ...He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the Torah of  
Moses, according to all which he has commanded with all  
9 heart and with all soul, according to everything which has been revealed  
from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek  
his will, and according to the multitude of the men of their covenant  
10 who devote themselves together to his truth and to walking in his will (5:8-  
10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21-23).

In the *Community Rule* we are further told, in reference to the men of the Community, "According to their order shall go forth the determination of the lot about everything concerning Torah, property, and judgement..." (5:3 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21). In other words the Community, as a collective, has the authority to interpret and apply Torah. Thus the charismatic authority which is given to the sons of Zadok, in Ezekiel in reference to the sanctuary, and in the scrolls in reference to revelation, is now transmitted to the Community as a whole. One must surrender to the will of the Community because it is only within community that one can know and understand God's revelation. The combination of "mortification" and "surrender" result in the individual's inability to conceive of life without the group. In this sense expulsion as a form of punishment, for one who has fully accepted the "symbolic environment" of the group, may be equivalent to death.



## 5. The Community of the Scrolls

The sectarian scrolls inform us about a Community which believed itself to have access to the only true interpretation of the Torah of Moses as well as the only proper way of understanding the prophetic books of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Sectarian Scrolls which are original to this Community present us with a particular adaptation of Judaism. The Scrolls are concerned with the rules which outline and govern the lived reality of those who accept them as authoritative, whether these individuals live in "camps according to the rule of the Land," the instructions of the *Damascus Document* (7:7), or whether they live within a different type of camp, the injunctions of the *Community Rule*.

These rules govern everything from the political structure of the Community, the way that an individual can become a member, the rewards and punishments to be handed out, as well as the proper way to eat, sleep and study. The Scrolls also provide us with information of the Community's belief as to their reason for existence, their relationship with the rest of Israel past, present and future, the Temple, absolute Good and Evil and, ultimately, God.

The sectarian scrolls, as discussed above and in the previous chapter, imply that those associated with the Community may have included groups living in more traditional ways, i.e. marrying and raising families. The sectarian scrolls prescribe rules appropriate for each group's context and lived reality.

The Community with which I am concerned from here on, however, is that Community which is prescribed in the *Community Rule*. It is this Community which, as already mentioned in the previous chapter, believed itself to be the Temple. And it is this Community which lived within a sacred space created both by its concrete, physical isolation

and separation from those outside as well as by the most extreme regimentation and ritualization of every mundane aspect of daily life. The requirement for this Community to separate from that which is outside is made explicit in the following from the *Community Rule* (1QS):

- 12 ...When these become the Community in Israel
- 13 they shall separate themselves from the session of the men of deceit in order to depart into the wilderness to prepare there the Way of the Lord(?);
- 14 as it is written: 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God' (Isa. 40:3)
- 15 This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time, and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit (8:12-16 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35-37).

Lawrence Schiffman explains the above by saying,

The passage appears to refer directly to the exodus to the dessert. But in fact, this separatism is to be understood *symbolically* as fulfilling the command of Isaiah 40:3 to prepare a way through the wilderness as part of the preparations for the End of Days. The passage then goes on to tell us how to interpret that preparation. To prepare the way in the desert means to interpret the Torah, specifically to explain it according to sectarian interpretation (Schiffman *Reclaiming* 95 italics are added).

As is surely obvious by now it is the term *symbolically* with which I disagree. Lawrence Schiffman does not claim that the Community did not withdraw to the desert, rather he down-plays the significance of the concrete event emphasizing, rather, the symbolic importance of the "desert motif," identifying it with the wandering in the desert and the

reception of the Torah of the Exodus period (*Reclaiming* 95). The symbolic significance of the "desert motif" notwithstanding, the Community *did* choose to physically relocate and we must not underemphasize the gravity of this event.

The sectarians living in the desert believed themselves to be living in sacred space, the only sacred enclosure, the only place of refuge safe from the world of Belial because as the *Temple Scroll* explains God dwells within this sacred enclosure: "...I am the Lord, who dwells among the children of Israel..." (51:7-8 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:227). They are the camp in the wilderness and, as *4QMMT* explains (2:34-35), it is Jerusalem which is the camp and "the Temple [is 'the Tent of Witness,'" (Eisenman and Wise *Uncovered* 194). They have a role in the context of their present reality:

- 3        When, according to all these norms, these (men) become in Israel a foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,
- 4        they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God's) favour for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices (*Community Rule* 9:3-4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39).

The Community as Temple, a connection made explicit in *Florilegium* (4Q174 1:6-7): "He has commanded that a Sanctuary of men be built for Himself, that there they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the Law," (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 353) is not *merely symbolic*. As earlier discussed and as is evident from the above passage from the *Community Rule*, the Community *functions* as Temple.

Those who perform this type of cult are to remain separate from those who are impure:

- 8        ...He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the Torah of Moses, according to all which he has commanded with all

- 9 heart and with all soul, according to everything which has been revealed  
from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek  
his will, and according to the multitude of the men of their covenant  
10 who devote themselves together to his truth and to walking in his will. He  
shall take upon his soul by covenant to separate from all the men of deceit  
who walk  
11 in the way of wickedness. For they cannot be accounted in his covenant,  
since they have neither sought nor inquired after him through his statutes, in  
order to know the hidden (ways) in which they erred,  
12 incurring guilt, nor the revealed (ways) in which they treated with an  
arrogant hand, (thus) arousing anger for judgement and taking vengeance  
by the curses of the covenant. In them he (God) will execute great  
13 judgements resulting in eternal destruction without a remnant. He must not  
enter the water in order to touch the purity of the men of holiness. For they  
cannot be cleansed  
14 unless they turn away from their wickedness, for (he remains) impure  
among all those who transgress his words (1QS 5:8-14 Charlesworth *Dead  
Sea Scrolls* 21-23)

This can be compared to the injunction repeated in the *Temple Scroll* relating to the purity  
which applies to the cities "in which the Children of Israel dwell...:

- 7 ...For I am the Lord, who dwells  
8 among the children of Israel; and you shall consecrate (them therefore), and  
they shall be holy, and let them not make themselves  
9 abominable with everything that I have set apart for them to hold unclean;  
and they shall be  
10 holy (51:7-10 Yadin *Temple* 2:227).

This injunction is repeated in the *Temple Scroll* on a number of occasions (ie: 45:13-14; and 47:3-6, 47:10-11 referring to the city of the Temple, as discussed in Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:279) contrasting the requisite purity of the cities of the Children of Israel and the impurity of all that lies outside.

Whatever it is which constitutes ritually clean and unclean it is obvious that in both cases, the *Community Rule* as well as the *Temple Scroll*, that which is ritually pure is to be kept within and that which is not is to be kept without in a *physical not metaphorical* way. In both cases the ideal for the Community being discussed is to live in very real physical isolation, a separation from all which would defile them.

The sectarians' perception of the world, their sense of immediacy of both God and Belial, the belief in the urgency of their particular mission is mirrored in the structure of their Community. The Community's ability to live by laws more stringent than those incumbent on the priests is deemed necessary due to their ultimate and imminent destiny as the remnant and the Temple, "...the place on which I shall choo{se} to put my name" (52:16 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:235). Or, as 4Q174 explains, they are the "Sanctuary of men." "This is the House which [He will build for them in the] last days, as it is written in the book of Moses, *In the sanctuary which Thy hands have established, O Lord, the Lord shall reign for ever and ever* (Exod. xv, 17-18)" (1:1-3 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 353). The structure of the Community is therefore made necessary by their world-view which is implied in the way of life of the Community. Each supports and is sustained by the other. The Community believes itself to be the Temple. Their activities are believed to have the same efficacy as the Temple cult, a topic which will be further elaborated in the next chapter. It is unlikely that a Community whose life is as ritualized and regimented as the Community of the scrolls, and which, in turn, believes itself to be the Temple, would create this Temple

haphazardly. We should be able therefore to discover the plan of this Temple in the structure and organization of the Community as prescribed in the scrolls. We also cannot escape the fact that the severity of the lived reality, for example, would be unlivable if it meant austerity for its own sake with no reward and if it were not supported by and in turn if it did not support a world view. As Jack Lightstone, in a passage already cited, observes: "the more patterned systems in the cultural setting which structurally mirror one another, the stronger will be the sense of self-evidence guaranteeing any one patterned system" (*Society* 8).

## 6. Communication of Holiness in the Sectarian Scrolls

### A. Methodology

The different ways through which the sectarian scrolls communicate holiness to the members of the Community include the following: the language of the scrolls; the use made of Scriptural material; the hierarchy and structure of the Community; and the figures of authority. I will then discuss the different aspects of each of these methods of communication in terms of their locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary aspects as used by Austin and Searle (as discussed by Jurgen Habermas in *Communication and the Evolution of Society* as well as in *The Theory of Communicative Action*). This particular discussion is relevant to this stage of my investigation because the scrolls are meant to produce a specific effect on a specific audience, in this case the sectarian Community.

Briefly, Habermas explains:

Through *locutionary acts* the speaker expresses states of affairs, he says something.

Through *illocutionary acts* the speaker performs an action in saying something.

The illocutionary role establishes the mode of a sentence ("Mp") employed as a statement, promise, command, avowal, or the like. Under standard conditions, the

mode is expressed by means of a performative verb in the first person present; the action meaning can be seen particularly in the fact that 'hereby' can be added to the illocutionary component of the speech act: 'I hereby promise you (command you, confess to you) that *p*.' Finally, through the *perlocutionary acts* the speaker produces an effect upon the hearer. By carrying out a speech act he brings about something in the world. Thus the three acts that Austin distinguishes can be characterized in the following catch-phrases: to say *something*, to act *in* saying something, to bring about something *through* acting in saying something (*Theory of Communicative Action* 288-289).

Habermas' discussion of these particular speech acts is developed within the context of a larger exploration of speech oriented "to consequences," as opposed to speech "oriented to reaching understanding" (*Theory of Communicative Action* 288). Habermas then distinguishes between two forms of linguistic communication relating to illocution and perlocution. The first he calls "communicative action," and describes it as the type of "interaction in which *all* participants harmonize their individual plans of action with one another and thus pursue their illocutionary aims *without reservation*" (*Theory of Communicative Action* 294). The second he calls "linguistically mediated strategic action," and describes it as "those interactions in which at least one of the participants wants with his speech acts to produce perlocutionary effects on his opposite number" (*Theory* 295). The rhetoric used by the scrolls corresponds with the second type of communication, "linguistically mediated strategic action." The scrolls are written with the intent to "produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts or actions of the audience..." (Austin *How To Do Things with Words* 101 cited in Habermas *Theory* 289-290). Understanding the scrolls in this way, as documents intending to communicate something with the purpose of bringing a reality into effect, provides us with another approach to

seeing the Community as tangibly real but also in understanding what and how is intentionally being communicated to this Community and the desired effects.

The ritualized activity of the Community as mandated by the sectarian scrolls, however, corresponds to the "illocutionary" aspect. Frederick Bird ("Ritual as Communicative Action" in *Ritual and Ethnic Identity* Lightstone, Jack and Frederick Bird eds.) discusses the three typologies introduced by Austin and Searle but finds the "illocutionary" best suited for his own study. He explains the first, "locutionary", dimension as being especially suited to "ideological interpretations" (48). These interpretations, he explains, "make sense by identifying the covert messages that ritual scripts ostensibly transmit to the participants" (48). The third, "perlocutionary", is particularly well suited to functional approaches, such as those proposed by Marx and Durkheim (49). These approaches "analyze rituals in relation to their social functions" (49). Bird explains that, according to this approach, it has been shown that "it makes sense to participate in rituals, even though the theological rationales for doing so might seem incomprehensible to non-participants, because rituals have the consequence of promoting identifiable social functions" (49-50). His own approach focuses more on the

illocutionary activity occasioned by actual ritual performances. The fundamental assumption of this approach is that when people participate in rituals they are communicating with each other and with themselves. Moreover, this communication is not primarily discursive and instrumental. It is multilayered, thick and immediate in ways that may make it seem opaque when analyzed in terms of overt or locutionary meanings (50).

My own examination of what is being communicated by the sectarian scrolls and how this is accomplished will take advantage of all three of the above approaches.



## B. Literature as Communication

The first step in examining the ways by which holiness is being communicated in the scrolls must be the very language used by these scrolls. The language which the sectarian scrolls use serves more than the single purpose of communicating the idea which is being literally expressed. The language is intentionally formulated to mirror a particular type of literature: the legal sections of the Torah as well as the prophetic books of the Hebrew scriptures. By the use of this language the scrolls can be shown to be communicating to those familiar with a particular interpretation of Hebrew Scripture a number of latent meanings. The awareness that the use of a particular type of language in creating the sectarian literature is deliberate becomes of value because it implies a prescriptiveness associated with the literature within which this language originates. Hebrew Scripture then is foundational and authoritative for the Community. This becomes all the more interesting in certain instances when the scrolls can be shown to contradict or supplement Pentateuchal laws and yet the language used in order to reinforce and support the right of the particular scroll to make such changes is itself Pentateuchal. It is to the *Temple Scroll* that we must trace the origin of the maximalist interpretation (Yadin *The Temple Scroll* 1983, 1:277) of the laws which becomes common place in the other sectarian scrolls. Because it is the *Temple Scroll*, as discussed in the previous chapter, which uses Pentateuchal language in order to apply to *all* of the people of Israel *all of the time* the maximalist interpretation of the purity laws associated in the Pentateuch with *specific* groups in *specific* contexts.

Besides the Torah the vision and direction of the Community of the scrolls can be found in its unique method of interpreting the prophetic books of Hebrew Scripture. It is also within these books, particularly Ezekiel, that the Community finds its sense of identity by identifying itself with the descendants of Zadok. The name Zadok, the individual who is anointed high priest at the same time as Solomon is anointed king of Israel (I Chronicles

29:22) and establishes a new dynasty of high priests replacing the one of Eli (1 Samuel 2), is not original to Ezekiel, it and a variety of terms indicating those who are the descendants of Zadok can be found throughout Hebrew Scripture. However it is in the book of Ezekiel that it takes on the specific meaning which it has within the sectarian literature of Qumran. In the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel the term *bnei Zadok* (sons of Zadok) occurs three times (at 40:46, 44:15, and 48:11) and *zera-a Zadok* (seed of Zadok) occurs once (43:19). In all these instances this group is referred to as the only ones not only from within Israel but even from within the Levites who are permitted to draw close to God and to serve God. In all these instances, except for 43:19, and even here it is implied by the work they are commissioned to perform, they are referred to as those who are protecting or have protected the proper requirements of the altar or the sanctuary. It is in 44:15 and 48:11 that we are given a clearer picture as to why the sons of Zadok are chosen to perform the most intimate service for the Lord: they alone did not stray from God when the rest of Israel and even the Levites strayed (44:10-14; 48:11). It is this very sense of constancy and consistency in serving the Lord and in living by a specific understanding, for them the only proper understanding, of the Law which the Qumran sectarian literature claims for itself. It is also this very sense of immediacy to and intimacy with the Presence which, for one fully inculcated in and accepting of the world-view of the sect, serves as the most powerful "commitment mechanism."

The literature which the Community holds as authoritative can therefore be divided into three groups. The first is the Torah of Moses. The second are the prophetic books of Hebrew Scripture for which the Community has a unique interpretation which leads to a particular understanding of these books, namely the assumption that the prophets speak directly to them and that any other interpretation is faulty. Within the prophetic books a special place must be given to Ezekiel. The third group of literature which the Community

sees as authoritative is the collection of the sectarian scrolls themselves. Within this last group the *Temple Scroll*, which may not originate from within the Community, has an authority equal to that of the Torah. This last group serves a number of purposes. It is understood to convey information as to the origins and purpose of the Community, the structure and running of the Community, as well as requirements for membership. These scrolls use the language which originates in the Hebrew Scriptures in order to evoke compliance to their unique interpretation of the laws. In addition it is largely due to the use that these scrolls, in particular the *Temple Scroll*, make of rhetorical formulae which originate in Hebrew Scripture that the Community accepts laws which may differ from those found in the Torah.

If we look at the different levels of communication conveyed by the last group of literature, the sectarian scrolls, which is viewed as authoritative by the Qumran Community the locutionary aspect which has to do with the content informs the Community of their special status. The information is conveyed through their belief system. This aspect of the scrolls is fairly straight-forward they are the last remnant with which God has made a new covenant, they are the descendants of Zadok:

the first members of the Covenant sinned and were delivered up to the sword, because they forsook the Covenant of God and chose their own will and walked in the stubbornness of their hearts each of them doing his own will.

But with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His Covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them the hidden things in which Israel had gone astray (*Damascus Document* 3:10-14 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99).

And

Those who hold fast to it are destined to live for ever and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs. As God ordains for them by the hand of the Prophet Ezekiel, saying, *The*

*Priests, the Levites, and the sons of Zadok who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from me, they shall offer me fat and blood (Ezek. xliv, 15) (CD 3:20-4:2 Vermes Dead Sea Scrolls 99).*

The Community is shown to correspond to the descendants of Zadok as explained in Ezekiel. They are a group in exile. Their exile from the Land is voluntary but inevitable given the impurity within which the Land finds itself due to those who control it. They are "...the House of Separation who went out of the Holy City and leaned on God at the time when Israel sinned and defiled the Temple..."(CD version B 2:23 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 105).

These scrolls also convey, as earlier explained, information as to how the Community is to be organized and how it is to function. As earlier mentioned many of the laws by which the Community is expected to live are extremely stringent. Many of these laws have to do with the purity laws and bans applied by the Torah to the priests when performing functions related to the Temple cult. An example of this type is evident in the *Temple Scroll* (45:12-14):

- 12     ...No blind man
- 13     shall enter it all their days, so that they will not defile the city in which I dwell;
- 14     for I, the Lord, dwell among the children of Israel for ever and ever (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:193).

It is in Leviticus (21:17-23) that we find a similar ban but here the ban is meant to apply to priests within a particular context:

The LORD spoke further to Moses: Speak to Aaron and say: No man of your

offspring throughout the ages who has a defect shall be qualified to offer the food of his God... He may eat of the food of his God, of the most holy as well as the holy; but he shall not enter behind the curtain or come near the altar, for he has a defect. He shall not profane these places sacred to Me, for I the LORD have sanctified them.

In the *War Scroll* (*War Rule*, 1QM) we find a similar ban, but this time applied to those preparing for battle:

Any one halt or blind or lame, or a man in whose body is a permanent defect, or a man affected by an impurity of/ his flesh, all these shall not go forth to battle with them. All of them shall be volunteers for battle and sound in spirit and flesh, and ready for the day of vengeance (7:4-5 Yadin *Temple* 1983 1:290).

Yadin explains, "in this passage, the author extended a ban applying to the priests in the Temple to all the warriors, explaining that the warriors, too, must be 'sound in spirit and flesh'" (*Temple* 1983, 1:290). These types of examples which prescribe the laws by which the Community is to be organized and function convey the information to the Community that they are an elite group. The *Rule of the Congregation* (*Messianic Rule* 1QSa) relates a law similar to the one in the *War Rule* (1QM) cited above but in this case the law refers to those who will be allowed to hold office in the Last Days:

- 3       ...But any man who is afflicted with any one of the
- 4       human uncleannesses shall not enter into the assembly of God. And (no)
- 5       man who is afflicted with the (following) afflictions
- 6       shall take (his) stand within the Congregation: And any one who is afflicted
- 7       in his flesh, crippled in the legs or
- 8       the hands, lame or blind or deaf or dumb, or if he is stricken with a blemish
- 9       in his flesh
- 10       visible to the eyes; or a (tottering) old man who cannot maintain himself

within the Congregation:

- 8     these may not en[ter] to stand firm [wi]thin the Congregation of the m[e]n  
of the name, for
- 9     holy angels [(are) in] their [Coun]cil. But if there is [one of] these [(who)  
has a mat]ter to say to the Council of Holiness,
- 10    [then he (the Master)] shall examine [him] directly. But within [the  
Congregation] the man [shall no]t enter for he is afflicted (2:3-10  
Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 115-117).

Due to their citation of the biblical material, especially because of the intentional use of biblical language, these examples can be understood to function not only as conveying information as to the structure of the Community but as evoking in the members of the Community a sense that this particular structure and its associated hardships is as things should be. It is as things should be both for warrior-priests awaiting the final battle (*War Scroll*) but also for the Community which functions as Temple at the time when the Temple is no longer valid, when the physical Temple exists outside of the "camp" in the dominion of Belial.

In the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) the preparations necessary for war, judgement or Council are comparable to the preparation for the revelation at Sinai in Exodus (19:10-11). This reflects the Community's conviction that all these enterprises, all of which are communal, are analogous to the Sinai experience both in terms of the immediacy of God's presence as well as the tangible reality of God's revelation. Their preparation for such events is also very tangible:

- 25     ... And when there will be a convocation of the entire assembly for  
judgement or
- 26     for the Council of the Community, or for a convocation of war, they shall

sanctify them(selves) for three days, so that everyone who comes in  
27 shall be pre[pared for the Coun]cil (1:25-27 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls*  
115).

God is present within the Community, and only within this Community. That which exists outside of their "camp(s)" is the Pit, darkness, the lot of Belial.

The literature of the Community in combination with the structure of the Community then can be understood as an illocutionary means of communicating holiness. The literature evokes and supports the structure and the structure evokes and supports the literature. The perlocutionary aspect, the intent and result of the communication, is both the structure of the Community as well as the desire of its members to live in this particularly stringent form of life because they see in it a purpose this being their present function as the only ones who are the keepers of the covenant and therefore capable of atoning for the Land.

### C. Hierarchy as Communication

The same type of analysis can be performed on the structure of the Community. The first aspect of this must be an examination of the figures of authority. These are the priests but especially the elite group who are identified as the sons of Zadok. As earlier explained the scrolls do not necessarily identify these characters in the traditional genealogical way. The earlier quoted fragment from the *Damascus Document* (3:20-4:2) which refers to the citation from Ezekiel provides the Community's definition of who the priests the Levites and the Sons of Zadok are. However, just as important as the exact identity of these individuals is the fact that Priests, Levites and sons of Zadok are the terms used to represent the authorities of the Community. There is a particular message to be communicated as to the desired forms of holiness which is represented by the term "sons of Zadok," and a particular message to be communicated as to the type of desired society when this society is

made up of "priests" and "Levites." Clifford Geertz has said:

meanings can only be 'stored' in symbols: a cross, a crescent, or a feathered serpent. Such religious symbols, dramatized in rituals or related in myths, are felt somehow to sum up, for those for whom they are resonant, what is known about the way the world is, the quality of the emotional life it supports, and the way one ought to behave while in it. Sacred symbols thus relate an ontology and a cosmology to an aesthetic and a morality: their peculiar power comes from their presumed ability to identify fact with value at the most fundamental level, to give to what is otherwise merely actual, a comprehensive normative import (Geertz, Clifford *The Interpretation of Cultures* 127).

Within the structure of the Community it is the sons of Zadok who are the ultimate figures of authority. It is they who are repeatedly said to be the holders and controllers of the proper interpretation of the law. So for example we see:

- 7       ...every one who enters into the Council of the Community,  
8       shall enter into the covenant of God in the sight of all those who devote  
          themselves. He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the  
          Torah of Moses, according to all which he has commanded with all  
9       heart and with all soul, *according to everything which has been revealed*  
          *from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek*  
          *his will* (1QS 5:7-9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21-23 italics are added)

and also:

- 22       Words of blessing for the M[aster to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests  
          whom  
23       God chose to restore his covenant [...] *hwn* all his precepts in the midst of  
          his people, and to instruct them



- 24 as he commanded. And they rose up in truth [...] and with righteousness  
watched over all his statutes and walked according [as]  
25 he chose (*Blessings* 1QSb 3:22-25 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 127)

In Hebrew Scripture descendants of the line of Zadok can often be found during moments when, after Israel has strayed, some figure serves to re-direct the nation back to God. For example during the religious reforms of King Hezekiah it is Azariah of the house of Zadok who is high priest (2 Chronicles 31:10) and, by association with Hezekiah, a party to the reforms. However it is later (2 Kings 22:8 -23:7) that the high priest Hilkiah of the house of Zadok is portrayed as producing the book of the law upon which the extensive religious reforms of king Josiah are based in a story slightly reminiscent of the re-introduction of the Law by Zadok in the *Damascus Document* (5:2-5):

but David had not read the sealed book of the Law which was in the ark (of the Covenant), for it was not opened in Israel from the death of Eleazar and Joshua, and the elders who worshipped Ashtoreth. It was hidden and (was not) revealed until the coming of Zadok ( Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 100)

In addition a particular relevance is associated with Zadok and his descendants in the Book of Ezekiel, as discussed earlier. A relevance which becomes foundational to the very identity of the sectarians of Qumran. So once again we can discuss the locutionary aspect of communication associated with portraying the central authority figures of the Scrolls with the descendants of Zadok as the information which is transmitted in Torah, Ezekiel and finally in the scrolls themselves as to the importance of this particular family. The illocutionary aspect can be seen in the feelings of righteousness evoked within the Community by being identified with the descendants of Zadok as well as by being constantly reminded of the centrality of the priests by regular communal rituals such as

Community gatherings:

- 22 ...And the Sons of Levi shall take their stand, each in his position,  
23 according to the Sons of Aaron, to bring in and to lead out all the  
Congregation, each according to his (place in the) register, at the hand of the  
heads of  
24 [the magis]trates of the Congregation, as rulers, and judges, and officers,  
according to the number of all their hosts, according to the Sons of Zadok,  
the priests (1QSa 1:22-24 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 115).

Also:

- 3 ...And in every place where there are ten men (belonging to) the Council of  
the Community, there must not be lacking among them a man (who is)  
4 a priest. And each member shall sit according to his rank before him, and in  
thus they shall be asked for their counsel concerning every matter. When  
the table has been prepared for eating, or the new wine  
5 for drinking, the priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand, in order to  
bless the first (produce of) the bread  
6 and the new wine (1QS 6:3-6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 27).

Many more examples of the centrality of the priests for all rituals can be found in the scrolls, however the importance of the priests as figures of authority is perhaps better understood by the following discussing the application of the law of leprosy:

This is the Rule for the assembly of the camps

Those who follow these statutes in the age of wickedness until the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel shall form groups of at least ten men, by *Thousands, Hundreds, Fifties, and Tens* (Exod. xviii, 25). And where the ten are, there shall never be lacking a Priest learned in the Book of Meditation ; they shall all be ruled by him.

But should he not be experienced in these matters, whereas one of the Levites is experienced in them, then it shall be determined that all the members of the camp shall go and come according to the latter's word.

But should there be a case of applying the law of leprosy to a man, then the Priest shall come and shall stand in the camp and the Guardian shall instruct him in the exact interpretation of the Law.

Even if the Priest is a simpleton, it is he who shall lock up (the leper); for theirs is the judgement (CD 12:22-13:7 in Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 111)

The above, of course, is based on Leviticus 13 and 14 which in a fair amount of detail discusses the role of the priest in dealing with afflictions of the skin. These two chapters of Leviticus are particularly interesting and relevant to our discussion because of the explicit requirement for the priest to decide between clean and unclean. In the remainder of Leviticus when the Israelite people are given instructions relating to the laws of purity there is no specific requirement for the presence or judgement of the priest. It is specifically in relation to these two chapters, and only these two chapters, that we can say unequivocally, referring to the priest, "for theirs is the judgement."

However the idea that the priest may be a simpleton and that *even then* "it is he who shall lock up (the leper); for theirs is the judgement," is original to the scrolls, underscoring the ritual significance of the priestly role for the Community. Similar stipulations as to the *ritual* role of the priest are found in the Torah (see for example Deut 21:5) but they do not include statements such as the above as to the intellectual ability of the priest. This example, far from illustrating the *merely symbolic* role of the priest in the Community, must be seen as an example of the *necessity* of the priest both for judgement as well as the implementation of the judgement. The priest as priest is both *necessary* and *sufficient*. It is his presence which imparts authority and legitimacy as well as efficacy to the procedure.

The perlocutionary aspect of the communication is once again the intent as well as the result of accepting the particularly stringent form of life which is mandated by the priests.

The significance of the presence of the priest as priest can perhaps be better highlighted by the different emphasis placed on the presence and role of the priest in the following mishnah:

- 3:8    A.    A priests takes precedence over a Levite, a Levite over an Israelite, an Israelite over a *mamzer*, a *mamzer* over a *Netin*, a *Netin* over a proselyte, a proselyte over a freed slave.
- B.    Under what circumstances?
- C.    When all of them are equivalent.
- D.    But if the *mamzer* was a disciple of a sage and a high priest was an *am haares*, the *mamzer* who is a disciple of a sage takes precedence over a high priest who is an *am haares* (Mishnah Horayot 3:8 Neusner *The Mishnah* 695).

This section is preceded by the following:

- 3:6    A.    Whatever is offered more regularly than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow, and whatever is more holy than its fellow takes precedence over its fellow (Neusner *Mishnah* 695).

Despite the fact that the final editing of the Mishnah is separated from the *Damascus Document* by about three hundred years we can still compare the two very different perceptions of the role of the priest. In the Mishnah the priest, even the high priest, takes precedence *only* if he is learned. In the *Damascus Document* the priest takes precedence *even* if he is a simpleton. In the Mishnah learning takes precedence, in the *Damascus Document* the category of priest takes precedence. The learned Levite can replace the ignorant priest in matters relating to the Book of Hagu which, in other passages from the

*Damascus Document* (10:4-6, 14:6-8; but also in the *Rule of the Congregation* 1QSa 1:6-8), is connected with judgements of the Law or precepts of the covenant. But in the cases dealing with judgements relating to ritual purity, a primary concern of the sectarians, the priest, even a simpleton, is absolutely necessary. Even if he needs to be instructed "in the exact interpretation of the Law," he alone may judge and implement the judgement. The presence of the priest is necessary. It has performative efficacy.

#### D. Systems of Reward and Punishment as Communication

The system of reward and punishment as well as the process of initiation also serve to communicate holiness. For an initiate to become fully a member of the Community takes at least two years. The *Community Rule* (1QS 6:14-24) discusses this process. Geza Vermes describes this process as falling into two stages:

The postulant is first brought into the Covenant, swearing total fidelity to the Mosaic Law as interpreted by the sect's priesthood, and to 'separate from all the men of falsehood who walk in the way of wickedness'(1QS v,10-11). He then secondly embarks on a course of training as a preliminary to joining the 'holy Congregation' (1QS v,20). In other words, entering the covenant and entering the Community was not one act, but two (Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 8).

As discussed in the previous chapter, I see the process as falling into more than Vermes' two stages. First of all we must begin by dividing the separation from the "men of falsehood" and the turning to the Community into two separate stages which are then followed by the different stages of initiation. The *Community Rule* (5:1-2) alludes to these two first stages as being distinct: "...they shall separate themselves from the congregation of/ the men of deceit, in order to become a Community..." (Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 19). This allusion becomes more explicit in 6:13-15:

- 13 ...And (regarding) each one who freely offers himself from Israel  
14 to join the Council of the Community, the overseer at the head of the Many  
shall examine him with respect to his insight and his works. If he is suited  
to the discipline he shall permit him to enter  
15 into the covenant to turn to the truth and depart from all deceit  
(Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 29).

In other words the *Community Rule* does not really concern itself with the initiate until after he has chosen to turn away from the outside world, this being the first stage. It is only at this point that he may enter within the perimeter of the Community, the second stage. These two stages are then followed by the process of initiation which Vermes lumps into one stage but which in reality involve a number of incremental stages. These stages, as already discussed, are a very concrete reflection of the Community's perception of the structure and organization of the ideal Temple. For now, however, I must emphasize that the growing physical proximity with the members of the Community, the merging of property as well as the sharing of the Community's food and drink mirrors and parallels the growing intellectual, emotional and legal involvement of the postulant. His counsel and judgement are not accepted until he has become a full member (1QS 6:24); neither is his testimony accepted as a witness (CD 10:1). Complete involvement in the Community's life *is* holiness. The identification of holiness and Community is complete. This idea is further reinforced by the punishments handed out for any infractions. If proper conduct, leading to holiness, is rewarded by fuller involvement in communal life culminating in full membership then improper conduct, leading away from holiness and threatening to pollute the holiness of the Community, is punished by different levels of removal from communal life. The *Community Rule* (1QS) talks of different punishments for those who have sinned deliberately and for those who have sinned inadvertently. For the first group it mandates the following:

- 21 ...every man of them  
22 who transgresses a word of the Torah of Moses deliberately or through  
negligence, shall be banished from the Council of the Community  
23 and never come back again. No one from the men of holiness shall  
associate with his property or with this counsel concerning any  
24 matter (1QS 8:21-24 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39).

This group is to be considered from now on as equivalent to those in the Dominion of Belial, the men of the Pit. The scroll continues:

- 24 ...But if it is through inadvertence that he does it, then he shall be excluded  
from the *pure-food* and from the *Council*, and they shall study the  
judgment:  
25 'He must *neither judge a man, nor be asked for any counsel* for two years.'  
If his way is perfect  
26 (he may return to participate) in the session, in study, and in the Council  
[accord]ing to [the] Many  
provided that he commit no further inadvertence until he has completed two  
27 years (1QS 8:24-27 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39, italics are added).

The link between inclusion or exclusion in matters of physical sustenance and social/legal/spiritual involvement is constant. It is telling that the members of the Community are only permitted to take from those outside the Community for a price (1QS 5:16-17) and even then only by permission (CD 13:15). Community and sharing are treasured values to be practised only with the deserving. The exchange of goods for a price in this case becomes an additional boundary which serves to separate the members from the non-members by reminding them that they are not of one Community. The *Community Rule* in fact equates the impurity of deeds of the men of injustice with the impurity of their property: "all their works are impure / before him, and all their property is unclean" (1QS

5:19-20 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23-25). The question cannot help but ask is how grave would punishment which involved exclusion from the Community have been for one who believed that life outside of the Community was returning to the lot of Belial?

There is another way in which we can examine the process of entering the Community as a means of communicating holiness. If we return to the structure of the Community we see that at the top of the hierarchy are the "Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will"(1QS 5:9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23) at the bottom are the initiates who are removed from every aspect of communal life other than instruction. The hierarchy of the Community is made physically explicit each time that it assembles. The sitting of each individual "in his order" (1QS 6:9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 27) directly corresponds to and is indicative of, the individual's right to speak and to be heard. The sons of Zadok, at the top of the hierarchy, are also the only ones that, due to their keeping of the charge of the sanctuary "when the children of Israel strayed," may now approach God to offer the "fat and blood." (Ezek. 44:15; also CD 4:1). The sons of Zadok are understood to be in closest proximity to God in terms of understanding: the proper understanding of the Law of Moses has been revealed to them (ie. 1QS 5:9); in terms of spiritual attachment: they kept the charge of the sanctuary when all others went astray; and finally in terms of physical proximity: only they can approach the sanctuary "to offer the fat and blood" to God, in effect they alone can come into contact with the pure food offered to God. Therefore the sons of Zadok portray the ideal. They are in Community with God. To join the Community of which they are the head is to enter the Community of God.

For one who is totally convinced of the correlation between Community, righteousness and proximity to God as opposed to the correlation between that which is outside of the Community and proximity to that which is the direct opposite of God it becomes obvious that another element of the equation is also understood: the correlation between Community



and life (physical and spiritual) as opposed to the correlation between exclusion from the Community of God and therefore death. To remain within the boundaries of the Community is to remain within the boundaries of that which is considered to be most holy.

## 7. Conclusion and Summary

In this chapter I examined the Community of the Qumran sectarians as prescribed in those scrolls which deal with the rules governing the Community. My intent was to show that these scrolls do not only prescribe an ideal, whether by this term we understand a utopian society, the impracticality of which makes of it an improbable vision of perfection, or the instructions for the ideal society, to be realized only in the eschaton. But that they describe the norms which are meant to be implemented by the existing Community in real time. Much of the existing scholarship on the Community of the scrolls begins with the assumption that the metaphor of the Temple exists in the scrolls as an ideal, whether this ideal is a theological consideration or a set of instructions for the eschaton, at which time the perfect, valid Temple will be built and the laws prescribed in the scrolls can be put into effect. The Community is therefore often understood as living in expectation or preparation. Most of the existing studies do not doubt that the scrolls were authoritative for a particular, existing Community and yet these studies usually begin the examination of the scrolls with the scrolls' theological concerns without an examination of the Community *as* community. I believe that we can not arrive at an adequate understanding of the scrolls until we come to terms with the Community for which they were authoritative.

In this chapter, therefore, I set out to better understand this Community. My intention, as stated above, was to ascertain whether the scrolls purely prescribe an ideal or whether they also describe the norms intended to be implemented by a concrete community in real, not

eschatological, time. To this end I introduced the conclusions arrived at by two empirical studies, those of Westhues and Kanter. I demonstrated that the Community prescribed by the scrolls exhibits the behavioral characteristics as well as the commitment mechanisms observed as necessary for the institution and continued existence of successful, living communities by these two studies. The centrality to the structure of the Community of the scrolls of these characteristics and mechanisms indicates the likelihood that the scrolls are not merely prescribing an ideal but also describing the intended reality of this concrete Community. The consonance which exists between particular, necessary features of the structure and organization of the Community as prescribed by the scrolls and those mechanisms and characteristics found to be necessary, through empirical observation, to living communities is too close. It is unlikely that *all* of the same characteristics and mechanisms which have been found through empirical observation to be *necessary* for existing communities to survive successfully were arrived at fortuitously by someone creating a vision of an ideal world.

It is important to understand that the Community of the scrolls lived in real time and space attempting to implement the laws prescribed by the scrolls because it is only by coming to terms with that lived reality that we can best understand whether the information contained in the scrolls as to the purpose of the Community is meant metaphorically or literally. If we can show that a community existed which intended to live according to the rules specified in the scrolls we can study this community as an anthropological case study. This provides us with another method which we can use to approach a better understanding of the Community of the scrolls. An approach which takes into account the lived reality of individuals who made specific choices and the reasons involved in making these particular choices. The scrolls, as descriptions of the norms regularly invoked (Bird "How do Religions Affect Moralities") by a living community, can provide us with an opportunity to

explore the specific details of the lived reality of a Second Temple community. But they can also provide us with the opportunity to better understand the intentions and goals of this Community by using an approach which is not based solely on theological or biblical considerations. We can explore those mechanisms which induced the members to join this alternative community and which compelled them to remain. We can examine not only what the scrolls say, which is the approach often taken, but why the Community chose to live according to the mandates of the scrolls.

As already mentioned in this chapter, "the more patterned systems in the cultural setting which structurally mirror one another, the stronger will be the sense of self-evidence guaranteeing any one patterned system" (Lightstone *Society* 8). If we can prove that the scrolls describe a living community we can study the Community's structure and organization as one more patterned system. Making assumptions about the lived reality of the Community of the scrolls without first establishing that the Community was real and not simply an ideal leads to assumptions of the intentions of this Community based on theological or philological arguments. Establishing that the Community of the scrolls was real encourages us to approach the scrolls first of all, as mentioned above, as case studies but also to examine the intent of their authors.

In this chapter, then, I also examined the scrolls as texts written with the intent of communicating an identity to a particular community with the desired result that such communication would effect a certain reality. The result of this examination was that the literature evokes and supports the structure of the Community which in turn evokes and supports the literature. The literature, the structure of the Community and the hierarchical organization evoke and support a community which perceives itself as the only valid keepers of the covenant and therefore the only ones capable of atoning for the land in real time and

real space, a traditional function of the Temple and its cult.

If these documents are directed to real people in real time living in a real community they must be understood as attempting to bring something into reality. They must be attempting to do so in ways which the individuals making up this Community would find particularly effective. And they must reflect that which, in combination with the structure and organization, the Community believes to be self evident (*Lightstone Society* 4-5). But we can not fully appreciate what the Community believes to be self evident and how the structure and organization reflect this until we examine the Community *as* community.

After exploring the application of the results of the empirical studies to the Community of the scrolls and demonstrating that the norms they prescribe are the "ought", the rules by which a real, living community is to organize and structure itself I began an examination of the world-view of the Community upon which its structure and organization is based and found these to reflect the structure and organization of the Temple. In addition, the identity which the sectarians claim for themselves is associated with cultic expertise and the goal of the Community is made explicit in 1QS as being the same as the goal of the traditional Temple cult. The Community believes itself then as identical to the Temple and, therefore, perceives its actions as having the same immediate effect on the real world in real time as would an unadulterated Temple and cult.

In the next chapter, "The Sacrificial Cult at Qumran," I will show the importance of the issue of sacrifice to this Community and how the strategies used for its replacement communicate their world-view as well as their perception of their identity. In the last chapter I will show that the combination of world-view and Community structure prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is founded upon and presupposes the appropriation of the world-view and Temple

structure evident in the *Temple Scroll*.

## Chapter 4. THE SACRIFICIAL CULT IN THE SCROLLS

### 1. Introduction

In this chapter I examine the concern with the issues of sacrifice and the Temple cult as these are treated in the sectarian scrolls. I review the information provided by the sectarian scrolls as to how to deal with the absence of a viable Temple, especially as this impacts on the sacrificial cult. Such an investigation must take a number of issues under consideration. First of all it is necessary to ascertain if the very topic of sacrifice is understood to be of importance in the scrolls under investigation. An affirmative answer will lead to a discussion of the purpose which sacrifice is believed to serve in these scrolls and whether or not the existence of the Temple and the Temple cult are explicitly or implicitly shown to be necessary for the execution and success of sacrifice. I then consider if the nature or importance of sacrifice changes in the absence of a tenable physical Temple. Finally I examine whether these particular scrolls provide a strategy for effecting the necessary results of sacrifice in the absence of the Temple and its cult and whether any such strategy is presented as a permanent or a temporary replacement for the Temple and its cult.

As part of the discussion I briefly survey some of the main lines of thought as to the perception of sacrifice and the related topic of ritual purity in biblical as well as Second Temple Judaism. This includes the specific terms for sacrifice as well as terms originating from within the sacrificial cult as used in the sectarian scrolls.

In his examination of ritual in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Emile Durkheim discusses the double aspect of cult, "one negative, the other positive" (337). The "negative" aspect of a cult concerns itself with those rites whose function it is to establish and enforce

separation between that which the group considers sacred and that which it considers profane (338). This aspect coincides with the dissociative process (the dissociative and associative processes are present in each of the three types of commitment mechanisms as discussed by Kanter) present in all of Kanter's three types of commitment mechanism, "cognitive-continuance, cathectic-cohesion and evaluative-control," (Kanter "Commitment Mechanisms..." 52) as discussed in the previous chapter. As we already saw, the dissociative feature serves to separate the initiate from those things s/he would normally consider valuable or pleasurable, to renounce all former ties and, finally, to strip the initiate of any sense of pride or individuality and enforce humility and surrender to the group.

The inclusion of Durkheim's "negative" aspect of cult is relevant at this point of my discussion because in the case of the community of the sectarian scrolls separation from one's previous life is analogous to the separation from the profane as understood in Durkheim analysis. It is important also, however, to understand that once the sectarians entered the Community of the scrolls and lived within and by the rules of the Community there was no division of sacred and profane. There were, however, different levels of holiness. The sacred for the Community of the scrolls is the every-day lived reality as prescribed and described by the scrolls. The cult, as communion with God, was the life of the Community not an office to be held and performed by an isolated group of ritual specialists. As we have seen, a hierarchy did exist at the top of which, and in closest proximity to God, were those who held the knowledge necessary for the proper execution of both cult and covenant. But this group was not closed nor did its expertise result in its exclusive performance of the cult.

Durkheim explains the second, positive, aspect of cult as follows:

Whatever the importance of the negative cult may be, and though it may indirectly

have positive effects, it does not contain its reason for existence in itself; it introduces one to the religious life, but it supposes this more than it constitutes it. If it orders the worshipper to flee from the profane world, it is to bring him nearer to the sacred world. Men have never thought that their duties towards religious forces might be reduced to a simple abstinence from all commerce; they have always believed that they upheld positive and bilateral relations with them, whose regulation and organization is the function of a group of ritual practices. To this special system of rites we give the name of positive cult (*Elementary* 366).

The "positive" aspect of cult, then, corresponds to Kanter's associative process which is also present in all three commitment mechanisms. It is through the associative process within each of the commitment mechanisms that one becomes attached to the new community.

The "negative" aspect of cult as well as the "positive", the system of rites and the role it plays in maintaining and enforcing the lived reality of the Community as presented in the sectarian scrolls, were discussed in the previous chapter. The present chapter will highlight the issue of sacrifice as the "positive" cult of the sect. This chapter will show that sacrifice is more than one of the aspects of the ritual activity of the sect as described in the scrolls. Rather ritualized everyday activity is understood by the sectarian scrolls as being sacrifice.

Godfrey Ashby, in *Sacrifice its Nature and Purpose*, discusses sacrifice as relationship. His explanation is germane to understanding the role which sacrifice plays in the sectarian scrolls of Qumran, he says:

What, then, is the coinage of sacrifice? It is an ancient language through which relationship is established and maintained, and communication between the human and the divine carried on in material things... Sacrifice... is the stated means of



converse between God and man, in which the transferring of the thing sacrificed into the domain of the holy is the action through which that most powerful conversation of all flows, the dialogue between God and man, man and his gods (25).

This definition becomes even more compelling when we consider what it is that the sacrificial system, "the stated means of converse between God and man," of the Community described and prescribed in the sectarian scrolls consists of, namely the Community's everyday lived reality. Sacrifice in the scrolls serves as communication between God and the Community as well as communication amongst the members of the Community itself. Sacrifice transfers "the thing sacrificed," the life of the Community, "into the domain of the holy." The Community identifies itself as that group which is authorized to offer the sacrifice to the Lord and it is within this process of offering and the communion with the sacred that it involves, that the Community enters the world of the holy.

## 2. The Temple Cult in the Scrolls: A Summary

I begin the present analysis by providing a short summary of the discussion of the Temple and its cult as it is presented in those sectarian scrolls under consideration. It may be necessary at this point to reiterate why I have chosen to deal with these particular scrolls. As explained in the first chapter I am concerned with those scrolls which meet two criteria: they must be original to Qumran and must deal with the laws pertaining to the organization and identity of this particular Community.

The *Temple Scroll* may not appear at first glance to meet both of the above stated requirements. In fact it is fundamentally different from the other sectarian scrolls found at Qumran. It is not an interpretation of previously existing texts. It is also not a document which explicitly provides the myth of the Community's origins or the rules by which to set

up and maintain a functioning community, as do for example the *Damascus Document* as well as the *Community Rule*. Written in the first person in the voice of God it provides a blueprint for building the Temple in Jerusalem, laws pertaining to its maintenance and upkeep, the laws for the carrying out of its sacrificial cult, and the laws necessary for the preservation of the Temple's and the Temple city's purity. It does not explicitly discuss the existence of any community for which it or the other scrolls may have been authoritative, it also does not explicitly discuss the disqualification of the existing Temple. However the fact that it was written while the Jerusalem Temple was functioning, added to the fact that the instructions it contains, architectural and cultic contradict those in existence at the time of its composition easily identify it as a polemic against the Second Temple and its cult.

The answers to the above questions on the nature and importance of the sacrificial cult as they pertain to the *Temple Scroll* would not be fundamentally different at one level than the answers would be if they were asked of many books of the Torah, especially those exhibiting priestly concerns: the Temple and its cult are necessary for the performance and efficacy of the sacrificial cult. However this scroll makes the assumption that a valid Temple is yet to be built. The question then is: does it give instruction as to the appropriate way to go about living in the meantime? As already discussed, it is my contention that it does provide such instruction in two ways, both of them implicit. The first is in its application to the entire People of Israel, especially within the city of the Temple, of the laws which in the Torah are meant specifically for the priests in their function as cultic experts. The role which sacrifice and the Temple cult played within the world of ancient Israel is discussed by Jacob Neusner in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. He explains that in a single sentence from Leviticus can be found "the complete priestly ideology of purity. All matters of purity attain importance because of the cult" (20). The sentence he has in mind is the following: "You shall keep the people of Israel separate from their uncleanness, lest they

die in their uncleanness by defiling my tabernacle that is in their midst" (Lev. 15:31 cited in Neusner 20). The *Temple Scroll* does not propose an alternative to the sacrificial cult, as described within it, in the absence of a viable Temple. "All matters of purity," do indeed, "attain importance because of the cult." However the *Temple Scroll* mandates for the People of Israel the type of ritual purity required of them when living in the type of proximity to the tabernacle which is implied in Leviticus (15:31). The *Temple Scroll*, by equating the holiness of the people to that of the Temple and therefore by making it necessary that the people live their worldly lives in the state of ritual purity which the Torah demands only of the priests in the performance of the cult, lays the groundwork and makes subsequent sectarian interpretations of sacrifice possible. In addition the *Temple Scroll*, through its claim that immoral or unethical activity on the part of the People can impart to them as well as to the sanctuary the type of ritual impurity which is traditionally, in the Pentateuch, imparted only through cultic infractions reinforces the union of cult and covenant. This correspondence between the two contributes the framework for the next step, as taken by the sectarian scrolls. This next step being that a life lived according to their own stringent interpretation of the covenant, can remove impurity in exactly the same way as can the physical sacrificial cult.

In the *Damascus Document* we are provided with a causative relationship between the mundane activities of Israel and the purity of the Temple. The profanation of the Temple, for example, is not explained as being brought about by some cultic infraction, rather it is "because they do not observe the distinction (between clean and unclean) in accordance with the Law, but lie with a woman who sees her bloody discharge" (5:6 *Dead Sea Scrolls* 100). But more to the point of this chapter it is in this scroll that the association between the myth of origin of the Community and the book of the prophet Ezekiel is explicitly introduced. The Community for which the *Damascus Document* is authoritative believes itself to be

analogous to the sons of Zadok as described in Ezekiel. They are "the House of Separation who went out of the Holy City and leaned on God at the time when Israel sinned and defiled the Temple..." (Version B 2:23 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 105). They also have been given knowledge which the rest of Israel lacks: "...according to the finding of the members of the New Covenant in the land of Damascus" (5:19 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 102).

The question however must be asked: Why the connection with the sons of Zadok? After all the sons of Zadok are specifically associated in Ezekiel with the keeping of the charge of the sanctuary, the most elite aspect of the sacrificial cult, eligibility for which is believed to have been based on genealogical descent. Is the knowledge to which the sons of Zadok have been made privy understood in the sectarian scrolls to be just that: the knowledge necessary for the keeping of the sanctuary? If so then the same question can be asked of this scroll as of the *Temple Scroll*: is the Community nothing more than the guardians and preservers of a ceremonialism which can not be put into effect until the building of a valid Temple? The scroll itself informs us that this is not the case. Note the following definition of priests, Levites and sons of Zadok provided in the *Damascus Document*:

The *Priests* are the converts of Israel who departed from the land of Judah, and (the *Levites* are) those who joined them. The *sons of Zadok* are the elect of Israel...And until the age is completed, ...all who enter after them shall do according to that interpretation of the Law in which the first were instructed (4:2-8 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 99-100)

Later the same scroll explains:

for all among the first and the last who reject (the precepts), who set idols upon their hearts and walk in the stubbornness of their hearts; they shall have no share in the house of the Law (Version B 2:9-10 Vermes *Dead Sea Scrolls* 104).

The "sure house in Israel" which God built is understood in this scroll to be the Community

itself. "The House of Separation" is "the house of the Law." In the *Temple Scroll* the People Israel is equated to The Temple, in the *Damascus Document* it is the Community which is equated to the Temple. The sons of Zadok are to perform the same service for God in this "house" that they would in the other house, the Temple.

*4QFlorilegium*(4Q174), as was already discussed, makes the identification between Temple and Community explicit.

But it is in the *Community Rule* that this identification is fully developed. The *Community Rule*, alone of the sectarian scrolls, provides us with the opportunity to examine the identification of sanctuary and People from a number of perspectives.

### 3. The Sacrificial Cult in Ancient Judaism

Before examining the *Community Rule* and its understanding of sacrifice it is necessary to briefly examine the sacrificial cult, and its related purity laws, and the role it played in the world of ancient Judaism. A number of approaches have been taken by different scholars as to the biblical perception of the need for ritual purity. Baruch A. Levine (*In the Presence of the Lord Aspects of Ritual in Ancient Israel* cited in Neusner *The Idea of Purity* 10) represents the view that demonic forces are understood to exist independent of God and to threaten God's safety. He explains,

The process of expiation bore a practical relationship to the covenant. It was to assure the continued residence of Yahweh in the Israelite community by enforcing the basic precondition for such residence, that is, the purity of Yahweh's surroundings. It is not so much that Yahweh had to be appeased for the offenses committed... His wrath results from a vital concern for his own protection (10).

Neusner adds to this,

Levine thus conceives that priestly literature takes for granted the independent; active existence of demonic forces. Impurity is not a state of being, but an active force.

Impurity is demonic, and demonic forces of impurity endanger men and deities, just as in other ancient Near Eastern religions (*Purity* 10).

Earlier than Levine W. Robertson Smith had a different interpretation. He rejected the view of independent demonic forces. For Smith, according to Neusner,

Levitical legislation reduces the fear of unknown or hostile unclean powers to a matter of God's law: uncleanness is hateful to God and must be avoided by all who have to do with the divinity ...The taboo of the woman in her menses, for instance, is understood as founded on the will of the divinity, not because it involves autonomous action of superhuman agencies of a dangerous kind (*Purity* 9).

Neusner explains that the importance of the difference between these two views has to do with an attempt to understand the relationship between the biblical cult and other contemporary, perhaps polytheistic, cults. Robertson-Smith therefore sees a complete break with these whereas for "Levine the Israelite cult is perceived in the context of the other cults of the same time and place"(*Purity* 11). For my present study it is not necessary to decide between these two. Rather, Neusner's approach is more relevant.

Neusner's examination of "the biblical writings as they would have been known in the third century B.C.,"(*Purity* 11) comes to the conclusion that first of all "the terms 'pure' and 'impure' originally had no ethical value" (*Purity* 11), however "metaphorical usages of pure and impure"(*Purity* 13-15) related to morality and immorality do exist in the prophetic literature. He explains,

The prophetic and sapiential contrast between the ritually pure and the ethically impure requires little imagination... The Temple supplied to purity its importance in

the religious life. As the Temple signified divine favour, and as the cult supplied the nexus between Israel and God, so purity, associated so closely with both, could readily serve as an image either of divine favour or of man's loyalty to God. From that fact followed the assignment of impurity to all that stood against the Temple, the cult, and God...(Purity 15)

Much has also been written on the subject of prophetic judgements made about the sacrificial cult. Scholars often appear to have misunderstood the apparent conflict between prophet and cult. A misunderstanding which has led some to assume a negation or condemnation of the cult by the prophets. Godfrey Ashby's assessment, in *Sacrifice its Nature and Purpose*, after a brief review of the relevant literature, and a rejection of the above assumption, is as follows:

The call from the prophets is to reform sacrifice, not to abolish it. It is sacrifice emptied of its content and detached from its context that is denounced by prophets and psalmists. To have condemned all offering of sacrifice would have been, in effect, to have condemned all public worship - for what public worship was there that was not concerned with sacrifice? The prophets were up against a perennial problem in all organized religion. Acts of the cultus, of any cultus, ceremonial or plain, can easily become a set of duties accepted as discharging the whole of man's obligation to God (45).

#### 4. The Sacrificial Cult in the Sectarian Scrolls

Joseph M. Baumgarten deals with this issue as it relates to the *Damascus Document* 7:14 f. in "Sacrifice and Worship Among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls". Even though I disagree with Baumgarten's interpretation of the existence of laws pertaining to sacrifices in the *Damascus Document*, which, in his view, was "preserved in the hope of some day restoring the worship of the Temple to its proper sanctity" (44), I do agree with his explanation of the perception of the sectarians as to the relationship between sacrifice and morality. He translates this passage (CD 7:14 f.) as follows:

The books of the law are the *sukkat ham-melek* ... *ham-melek* is the congregation, and the *kiyyun has-selamim* are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised, and the *kokab* is the expounder of the Law who came to Damascus (42).

And explains,

The Prophetic deprecation of insincere offerings is thus taken as the basis for abandonment of the Temple worship, which did not agree with the standards of purity observed by the sectarians.

It should be noted that the division was not primarily over the desirability of animal sacrifice, as such. Just as the Prophetic protests were directed against those who would bring offerings to hide evil and injustice, so did these sectarians denounce the transgressions of the priests at Jerusalem, without denying the importance of sacrifice (42).

This type of critique, of sacrifice without repentance, not of sacrifice as an institution, is common to second Temple Judaism, including the Judaism of the sectarian scrolls. The *Community Rule* begins by requiring all those entering the covenant to confess to their sins (1:25). But it continues, perhaps as a polemic directed against those who assume that the



performance of the physical aspects of purification are sufficient to atone for one's sins, to explain that this is not so:

- 4     ...He cannot be purified by atonement, nor be cleansed by waters of  
purification, nor sanctify himself in streams  
5     and rivers, nor cleanse himself in waters of ablution. Unclean, unclean is  
he, as long as he rejects the judgement of  
6     God, so that he cannot be instructed within the Community of his (God's)  
counsel (1QS 3:4-6 in Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 13)

Atonement and purification can only be accomplished by the humble spirit and the desire for truth, as understood by the Community. It is important to emphasize that the scroll does not eliminate the requirement for the physical ritual of the sprinkling of the water. Rather it is shown to be effective only if it is preceded by the requisite change of heart:

- 6     ...For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that the ways of man - all  
his iniquities-  
7     are atoned, so that he can behold the light of life. It is by the Holy Spirit of  
the Community in his (God's) truth that he can be cleansed from all  
8     his iniquities. It is by an upright and humble spirit that his sin can be  
atoned. It is by humbling his soul to all God's statutes, that  
9     his flesh can be cleansed, by sprinkling with waters of purification, and by  
sanctifying himself with waters of purity. May he establish his steps for  
walking perfectly  
10    in all God's ways... (1QS 3:6-10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 13-15).

It is the processes of teaching and learning in and by the Spirit of Truth which become analogous to the process of purification:

- 21    ...He will purify him by the Holy Spirit from all ungodly acts and sprinkle  
upon him the Spirit of Truth like waters of purification, (to purify him)

from all the abominations of falsehood and from being polluted  
22 by a spirit of impurity, so that upright ones may have insight into the  
knowledge of the Most High and the wisdom of the sons of heaven, and the  
perfect in the Way may receive understanding (1QS 4:21-22 Charlesworth  
*Dead Sea Scrolls* 19)

Those who control the information without which one can not be purified and enter the  
Community are the sons of Zadok. It is to the commandments of the Law of Moses as they  
have been revealed to "the Sons of Zadok, the priests, who keep the Covenant and seekers of  
his will," (5:9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 23) that one must return. It is the sons of  
Zadok who are the only proper guardians, interpreters and judges of the covenant. All  
knowledge proceeds from them.

The sons of Zadok have undergone a transformation from the role Ezekiel ascribes to them  
as those who guard and perform the activities necessary for the upkeep of the sanctuary to  
those who guard and perform the activities necessary for the upkeep of the covenant.  
However this is a Community (as prescribed in the *Community Rule*) which

4 ...shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that  
(God's) favour for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-  
offerings and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of  
5 the lips for judgement (is as ) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the  
Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering (1QS 9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead*  
*Sea Scrolls* 39)

Those who are the experts in the procedure necessary to properly offer prayer and in the  
requirements of perfection of way, the replacements for "the flesh of burnt-offerings," and  
"the fat of sacrifices," are analogous to the priests who minister to God in the Temple and,  
according to Ezekiel, the only priests eligible for this task are the sons of Zadok.

At least two aspects of the above sections of the *Community Rule* need to be examined further. The first is the use made in this scroll, as well as the other sectarian scrolls, of the sons of Zadok as the keepers of the covenant. The second is the specific terms used for sacrifice and what these terms refer to.

It is true that in Ezekiel the sons of Zadok are shown to be explicitly connected with the cult but does the shift from cult to covenant represent an innovation by the sectarian scrolls or does it signify a deliberate statement as to the unity of cult and covenant? A statement both about the return by the community to what they perceive as the proper identification between cult and covenant, the type of identification which, as we briefly saw, the prophets demand, but which is also central to the world-view introduced in the *Temple Scroll*, as well as a polemic against those who, according to the scrolls, have separated cult and covenant thus making the first invalid.

George Buchanan Gray, in *Sacrifice in the Old Testament its Theory and Practice*, has shown that the interconnection of the roles of prophet/law-giver/teacher/priest are clearly evident in the person of Moses in the Torah. Gray explains, "Moses the law-giver and Moses the prophet are familiar conceptions: Moses the priest much less so..."(194). And yet during the installation and consecration of Aaron and his sons in Leviticus it is Moses who discharges the priestly functions, the first such functions initiating the office:

...remarkably enough, P does represent Moses as performing the first priestly functions on the newly-erected altar. With the installation and consecration of Aaron and his sons are associated certain sacrifices; and in the offering of these Aaron and his sons play the part of the ordinary worshipper - for they are not yet priests - and Moses discharges for them the priestly function. Aaron and his sons bring, as any other ordinary Israelite was subsequently accustomed to do (Lev. 1:3f.,

4:4f.), to the entrance of the Tent-of-Meeting and lay their hands upon the victims that constitute their sin-offering and burnt-offering: but it is Moses who, as subsequently the priests (Lev. 4:5-7), dips his finger in the blood of the sin-offering and then smears the horns of the altar, pouring away the rest of the blood at the base (Lev. 1:5, 15), and then consumes the fat on the altar: it is Moses again who performs the altar ritual of the burnt-offerings (Lev. 8:20ff); it is Moses finally who obtains the priest's perquisite or strictly part of it, the other part being burnt in the altar fire (v.29). This consecration ceremony extends over seven days (Lev. 8:35): on the eighth day for the first time Aaron undertakes the altar ritual (Lev. 9:7ff.) alike for the offerings which he himself presents and for those presented by the people (195-196).

The *Community Rule* speaks in one breath (IQS 5:6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21) of "covenant" and "atonement," of "a sanctuary in Aaron" and "a house of truth in Israel," all of which are summed up as the "return to the Torah of Moses, according to all which he has commanded" (5:8). All information is received directly through the Sons of Zadok: "according to everything which has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will" (5:8-9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21-23). The priests are not merely experts of the cult, or more correctly, to be an expert of the cult-as-craft misses the point of the unity of cult and covenant as introduced by Moses. To cite Ashby: "Priests were not merely holy butchers. They were guardians of the covenant and its shrine" (*Sacrifice* 39). Ashby, using Gray, explains that eventually the priestly role did become associated more with craft and the prophetic more with charisma (*Sacrifice* 39). "It seems,..., that the craft of the priesthood, as contrasted with the charisma of the prophet, grew out of the need in the community for a statutory ministry in things supernatural" (*Sacrifice* 39).

In relating the origin of both cult and covenant to Moses, in making no distinction between the two, and in using Ezekiel's language of cult and sanctuary in order to speak of covenant the scrolls are deliberately obfuscating the two, because for them they were never two. This idea is, of course, not original to the sect. But understanding the centrality of this idea to the scrolls and their community will help us to overcome many of the objections raised by those who can not reconcile the community of the sectarian scrolls with the *Temple Scroll*. For example Stegemann's literal interpretation of the *Temple Scroll* (as already discussed in chapters One and Two) as referring to a physical Temple leads him to believe that the *Temple Scroll* stands in opposition to the orientation of the sectarian Community. For him this Community, which he identifies as the Essenes, "regarded their community as the 'temple of God' on earth," but "it was by the Torah that God dwelt within this kind of temple" ("The Literary Composition..." 158). The two, the Temple, in the *Temple Scroll*, and the sectarian documents with their Torah-centred ideology are, in his view, opposed to each other. This opposition, however, can only be understood as such if one begins with the assumption that a dichotomy was perceived by the sectarians as existing between cult and covenant. The scrolls clearly indicate otherwise.

It is interesting, and particularly relevant to my discussion, that Michael Wise, in his analysis of *4QFlorilegium* ("*4QFlorilegium* and the Temple of Adam") translates "*msy trwrh*" (*4QFlor.* 7) as "proper sacrifices" ("*4QFlor...*" 106) as opposed to "works of the law," the more common translation. Wise's reason for doing so is based on his understanding of the "*mqds 'dm*" of line 6 as the "Temple of Adam" as opposed to the "Temple of men," of other interpretations. This Temple he understands as referring to a physical eschatological Temple. Further the term "*mqtyrym*" of line 6 which has been often interpreted to mean "to offer as incense" he understands as "to offer." He explains:

Since *mqds 'dm* refers to an actual physical temple, and not to the idea of

'community as temple,' it follows that we should understand *m'sy twrh* and *mqtyrym* in a straightforward and literal sense. It seems that *m'sy twrh* refers to sacrifices, and not merely lawful deeds. This understanding is requisite because of the association of the phrase with the temple,... Since *m'sy twrh* is then a general expression for sacrifices, *mqtyrym* must mean 'to offer' and not 'to offer as incense.' With the solution to *mqds 'dm* these other parts of the puzzle fall readily into place ("4QFlor..." 131-132)

Wise too, therefore, distinguishes between cult and covenant. Terms referring to the cult, in his view, must be referring to a physical temple. He comes close to arriving at an understanding similar to mine as to the correspondence of Torah and cult. But in his attempt to prove that the "*mqds 'dm*" has to be a physical temple he can not consider the possibility that "*m'sy twrh*" as "sacrifices" could refer to the type of sacrifice offered by the Community as Temple.

For the Community of the scrolls, as for the *Temple Scroll*, cult and covenant are one. The Torah of Moses introduces both. The Community exists in communion with God *because*, as we saw in the previous chapter, their way of life makes them eligible, and exclusively so, to approach God. Their sacrificial cult is not detached from their way of life. Terms for sacrifice exist side by side and correspond with terms referring to covenant, Torah and law.

The evidence of the sectarian scrolls does not prove their disinterest with the Temple and its cult, as Stegemann argues. Neither does the use of language originating in the sacrificial cult indicate an exclusive concern with a physical temple, eschatological or otherwise. In fact the evidence of the scrolls proves the opposite. Their voluntary, physical separation from what they considered to be impure, their deliberate creation of sacred space, in *this* physical world in *real* time, within which God can reside, their use of language originating

from within the sacrificial cult all harmonize with what the scrolls explicitly claim the Community is doing, and doing right here, right now:

- 3      When, according to all these norms, these (men) become in Israel the foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,
- 4      they shall atone for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God's) favour for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices (1QS 9:3-4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39).

I can therefore at this point repeat my rejection of Wise's understanding of the *Temple Scroll* as the "eschatological law for the land," I can also reject Wacholder's and Schiffman's understandings of the Community as, to different degrees, living in preparation for the eschaton or living in imitation of the ideal which could only be achieved in the eschaton.

To question the explicit claims made by the scrolls as to their purpose and function, to assign them to the realm of the ideal whether in terms of the utopian vision in front of which the real can only pale by comparison or in terms of the eschatological vision which will be created by God at the end of time may have been possible if we were uncertain as to the lived reality of the Community for which these scrolls are authoritative. But as we saw in the previous chapter the Community prescribed by the scrolls corresponds with those characteristics and mechanisms which studies of living communities have shown to be necessary in creating and sustaining real communities.

As already discussed the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel (11QT 29:7-10) does not require for its fulfilment the Temple as a physical building, as understood by Stegemann and to some extent Yadin. Rather what it requires is sanctity, ritual purity and covenantal

responsibility all of which lead to communion and community with God, all of which the *Temple Scroll* ascribes to the People of Israel as much as to the Temple and its maintenance, and all of which are the pivotal concerns of the sectarian scrolls.

## 5. The Community as Temple and as Offering in the Sectarian Scrolls

In the previous chapter I examined the identification of holiness with the Community. In the remainder of this chapter I will examine in some detail the use made of those terms which originate in the Temple and its cult by the sectarian scrolls as a means to further examine the Community as Temple. To this end I will be focusing my discussion in large part on the *Community Rule* 2:24-III:12, 8:1-10, and 9:3-5. It is in these sections that we are explicitly informed of the cult as performed by the sectarians:

- 24 For they shall all be in the Community of truth, of virtuous humility, of merciful love, and of righteous intention
- 25 [towa]rds one another, in a holy council, and members of an eternal assembly. And every one, who refuses to enter
- 26 [the covenant of G]od (so as) to walk in the stubbornness of his heart, [shall] not [...] his true [Com]munity, for

*Col.3*

- 1 his soul detests instructions about knowledge of righteous precepts. He is unable to repent, (so that) he might live, and he is not to be accounted with the upright ones.
- 2 His knowledge strength, and property shall not come into the Council of the Community, for in the filth of wickedness (is) his plowing, and (there is) contamination
- 3 in his repentance. He is not righteous when he walks in the stubbornness



of his heart. And darkness he considers the way of light; in the fount  
of the perfect ones

4 he cannot be accounted. He cannot be purified by atonement, (*kpwrym*)  
nor be cleansed by waters of purification, nor sanctify himself in streams  
5 and rivers, nor cleanse himself in waters of ablution. Unclean, unclean is  
he, as long as he rejects the judgements of

6 God, so that he cannot be instructed within the Community of his (God's)  
counsel. For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that the ways of  
man - all his iniquities -

7 are atoned (*ykwprw*), so that he can behold the light of life. It is by the  
Holy Spirit of the Community in his (God's) truth that he can be cleansed  
from all

8 his iniquities. It is by an upright and humble spirit that his sin can be atoned  
(*tkwpr*). It is by humbling his soul to all God's statutes, that

9 his flesh can be cleansed, by sprinkling with waters of purification, and by  
sanctifying himself with waters of purity. May he establish his steps for  
walking perfectly

10 in all God's ways, as he commanded at the appointed times of his fixed  
times, and not turn aside, to the right or to the left, and not

11 transgress a single one of all his commands. Then he will be accepted by an  
agreeable atonement (*kpwry*) before God, and it shall be unto him

12 a covenant of the everlasting Community (1QS 2:24-3:12 Charlesworth  
*Dead Sea Scrolls* 13-15).

It is appropriate to note, in relation to the earlier discussion of the connection between cult and covenant, the emphasis placed in the above passage on acceptance of God's statutes in

humility, as understood by the Community, as a prerequisite for atonement. However it is important to also note the cultic elements of the purifying waters as well as the appointed and fixed times. The two, the acceptance of the statutes, representing covenant, and cultic practice are not mentioned as separate. They are parts of the whole, the enactment of which actualizes the Community. The same emphasis on Torah as a whole, covenant and cult can be witnessed in the following passage which provides the information about the make-up of the Council of the Community. Note again the interaction between cult and covenant.

- 1 In the Council of the Community there (are to be) twelve (lay) men and  
three priests, perfect in everything which has been revealed from the whole
- 2 Torah, to perform truth, righteousness, justice, merciful love, and  
circumspect walking, each one with his fellow
- 3 to keep faithfulness in the land with steadfast purpose and a broken spirit, to  
pay for iniquity by works of judgement
- 4 and suffering affliction, and walk with all by the measure of truth and the  
norm of the Endtime. When these become in Israel
- 5 -the Council of the Community being established in truth- an eternal plant,  
the House of Holiness consisting of Israel, a most holy assembly
- 6 for Aaron, (with) eternal truth for judgement, chosen by (divine) pleasure to  
atone (*lkpr*) for the earth and to repay
- 7 the wicked their reward. It shall be the tested wall, the costly cornerstone.
- 8 Its foundations shall neither be shaken nor be dislodged from their place.  
(They shall be) a most holly dwelling
- 9 for Aaron, with all-encompassing knowledge of the covenant of judgement,  
offering up a sweet odor (They shall be) a house of perfection and truth in  
Israel
- 10 to uphold the covenant of eternal statutes. They will be accepted to atone

for the land (*lkpr b`d h'rts*) and to decide judgement over wickedness; and there will be no more iniquity (1QS 8:1-10 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35).

The purpose of the Community, already mentioned in the above passages, is unequivocal in the following:

- 3      When, according to all these norms, these (men) become in Israel a foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,
- 4      they shall atone (*kpr*) for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God's) favour for the land (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings (*bsr `wlwt*) and without the fat of sacrifices (*chlby z`bch*). The proper offerings (*trwmt*) of
- 5      the lips for judgement (is as) righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering (*mnchh*) (1QS 9:3-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39).

The term offering of the lips (*trwmt shptym*) is also used in 1QS 9 and 10 in referring to the offerings which replace the Temple sacrifices which have to do with particular times of the day, month, year and Jubilee calendar. I will include in this section an examination of the specific terms referring to sacrifice or offerings used in these sections. These terms are *kpr*, *`wlh* and *z`bch*. I will not be discussing the terms *trwmh* and *mnchh* which can mean either offering or gift (Anderson *Sacrifices* 27-33 and 137-146; Gray *Sacrifice* 17 and 29; Levine *Presence* 16-17) in any detail.

Before beginning the discussion of these specific terms I need to introduce one more aspect of the Community's life-as-sacrifice. In an earlier chapter I discussed the above segments from 1QS and explained the requirement for ritual purity for a community which considers

itself to be the only valid administrators and ministrants of the sanctuary. The issue of the ritual purity of this group is also necessary, however, when we consider, as we must, that that which they are offering up as sacrifice is themselves, or rather, their way of life. The application of the "maximalist approach" to the purity laws evident in the *Temple Scroll* carries added significance when we take this fact under consideration.

The application of the laws of ritual purity which are prescribed in the Torah for priests while executing the Temple cult are prescribed in the *Temple Scroll* for all of Israel, the land as well as the people. The stringency with which these laws are to be applied decreases the further one is from the Temple and its city. The holiest place and the place within which all these laws are to be applied, often in ways more rigorous than even those required of the priests in the Torah, is in the Temple and, in a slightly less rigorous way but still more rigorous than in the Torah, its city. An example of this extreme stringency in application can be seen in the following passage from the *Temple Scroll* within which we can perceive a requirement never made of the priests in the Torah, a requirement which has contributed to the conclusion reached by many scholars as to the celibacy of the sect:

- 7       ...And if a ma[n] has a nocturnal emission, he shall not enter into
- 8       any part of the temple until [he will com]plete three days. And he shall
- wash his clothes and bathe
- 9       on the first day, and on the third day he shall wash his clothes {and bathe,}
- and when the sun is down,
- 10       he may come within the temple. And they shall not come into my temple in
- their *niddah*-like uncleanness and defile (it).
- 11       And if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen, he shall not
- come into any part of the city
- 12       of the temple, where I will settle my name, for three days. (45:7-12 Yadin

*Temple* 1983, 2:191-193)

As Yadin (*Temple* 1983, 2:193 and 1:288-289) has pointed out the same ban on sexual relations in the city of the Temple, using the same language, is found in the *Damascus Document* 12:1-2. The complications which would arise from any attempt at conjugal life for a community which lived according to these injunctions has led many to believe that the sectarians must have been celibate (ie. see Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:281 and 1: 288-289).

I agree with Yadin's argument (*Temple* 1983, 1:277-280) that the reason for the stringency of application of the purity laws can be traced to the community's perception of themselves as living in the camp in the wilderness, a topic I have already discussed. I also agree with his explanation that the severity of the purification procedure required in the *Temple Scroll* "if a man lies with his wife and has an emission of semen" (45:11) "seems to reflect the biblical text concerning the revelation at Sinai... (Ex. xix:10-15)" (*Temple* 1983, 1:287-288). It is in this section from Exodus that we see evidence of the three day ban on sexual relations, "And he said to the people, 'Prepare for the third day; do not go near a woman'" (Ex. 19:15). The laws pertaining to nocturnal emission found in Deuteronomy (23:10-11) prescribe a one day ban from the camp, in the evening one must wash himself and after sunset may return to the camp. In Leviticus the man and woman who have carnal relations remain unclean for one day (Lev.15:18).

In an earlier chapter I discussed Yadin's explanation that "(w)e are thus presented with a kind of parallel between the Temple Mount -'any part of the Temple'- and Mount Sinai. Hence, the laws applying to Mount Sinai also apply to the Temple" (*Temple* 1983, 1:288). I added to the above that the purity requirements incumbent on the sectarians when they meet as a group are similar to those prescribed in the above excerpt from Exodus because of the Community's contention, as evidenced in the scrolls, that the Community as community

is alone authorized to and capable of interpreting Torah. Thus when the Community meets it is analogous to the revelation at Sinai.

We can now add one more reason for the stringency of the requirements as well as application of the laws of ritual purity for the sectarians. This reason, as mentioned, is that the Community perceives itself not only as the only ones authorized to present the required sacrifices, in the absence of a valid Temple. They also perceive themselves, as well as their way of life, as that which is being offered up. They, as sacrificial victim, must be pure and unblemished.

In Chapter Two I discussed the *Temple Scroll* and showed that it applies holiness to the Temple as well as the People Israel. The requirement for the purity of the People and the Land is due to the fact that, in that scroll, God is shown to dwell within the community of Israel, as God did in the wilderness camp, as much as in the Temple. I then demonstrated how the *Temple Scroll* and its understanding of the application of ritual purity to the community of Israel was used by the other sectarian scrolls to apply this same requirement to the Community of sectarians and to make the identification of Community and Temple. The Community in these other scrolls is identified further with the descendants of Zadok as explained by Ezekiel. Their purity is not required only because they are a community within which God dwells but also because they are the *only* community qualified to

come near to me to minister to me; and they shall attend me to offer me the fat and the blood, says the LORD God. It is they who shall enter my sanctuary, it is they who shall approach my table, to minister to me, and they shall keep my charge (Ez. 44:15-16).

They must remain ritually pure because they alone may or can offer the only acceptable sacrifice. But the ritual purity demanded of them is often even more exacting than that

required by the Torah of the priests officiating at the cult. In chapter Three I showed that these requirements were not merely ideals to be aimed for or rules for the Eschaton but that they are the laws which were meant to be applied to the lived reality of the Community of sectarians.

The "maximalist" approach to ritual purity as discussed by Yadin serves to clarify the fact that the *Temple Scroll* applies to all of Israel the Torah's priestly purity laws and that the sectarian scrolls identify the community of Israel with the wilderness camp. But what about the additional laws, those laws which originate in the *Temple Scroll*? Yadin explained, in discussing these sections, "...it is precisely in the supplementary sections that have no parallels in the versions of the Bible known to us that we find the most distinctive characteristics of the scroll." (*Temple* 1983, 1:81-82) I have dealt with these laws as they relate to the *Temple Scroll* as well as with the evidence of the presence of these laws original to the *Temple Scroll* in other sectarian documents in an earlier chapter. My concern here is more with the way that these innovations were adopted and adapted by the sectarians as evidenced by the sectarian scrolls under consideration. The "maximalist" approach is not a wholly satisfactory explanation as to the use made by the sectarians of purity laws which do not originate in the Torah. I propose that the Community of sectarians, as evidenced in those scrolls dealing with the laws of the Community, accepted these additional laws of ritual purity precisely because they considered themselves not only as the only qualified priests but also as the sacrifice and as such it was essential that they be ritually pure and unblemished. Anything therefore which would render a man unclean in the Torah is perceived by the Community as rendering him unfit as a sacrificial victim. The laws relating to ritual purity which originate in the *Temple Scroll* are appropriated by the sectarians and employed by them because it is in these laws that the sectarians find both the definition of 'ritually pure and unblemished' as it relates to human beings as well as the provisions which

would create and guarantee such a state. It is not only the sectarians' status as priests ministering to God which must be safeguarded, it is also the sectarians' status as fit sacrificial offering. The imperative for the ritual purity of the Community as prescribed in the scrolls and as applied to the living Community for which these scrolls were authoritative appears even more necessary in this light. The two-fold reason for the stringent application of the ritual purity laws would serve to further support and reinforce the Community's sense of what is "self-evidently appropriate within its socio-cultural setting" (Lightstone *Society* 5). It fortifies the "congruence between a particular style of life and a specific ... metaphysic, and in so doing sustain(s) each with the borrowed authority of the other" (Geertz *Interpretation* 90). And again I must stress the point, which has been discussed in chapter Two and will be further discussed in the final chapter, that it is in the *Temple Scroll* that these particular prohibitions originate and that these prohibitions are essential to the structure and organization of the Community of sectarians. As I develop the discussion of the specific terms referring to sacrifice mentioned above we must keep in mind both the Community-as-offering as well as the Community-as-priests.

Levine in *In the Presence of the Lord* begins his discussion of the term "*kpr*" with an examination of the biblical "older, non-cultic vocabulary" (60). In this context, he explains, the term can best be understood as "erased/wiped off" (60-62). "The term *koper* 'ransom, expiation, gift'...", he explains, "...is not a sort of bribe given so as to induce either a deity or another person to overlook or disregard an offense, but is rather a payment made for the purpose of erasing or 'wiping away' guilt incurred by the offense." (61). In the early cultic texts (as in Exodus 30:12) the term takes on the meaning of "expiatory payment"(62):

The cultic texts understood the verb *kipper* primarily in a 'functional, or technical sense: 'to perform rites of expiation,' rather than: 'to cleanse.' Thus *kipper+al* can connote two processes: (1) the relational process, i.e. 'to perform rites of expiation



with respect to-' persons, places, etc. Thus, *lekapper'al bene yisra'el* means: 'to perform rites of expiation with respect to the Israelites,' i.e. in relation to them. It does not mean that such acts were necessarily accomplished over the Israelites, or that any physical contact was involved. It means merely that the effects of these acts accrued to the Israelites. This is shown by the occurrence of two differing constructions in the same verse, Leviticus 16:33:

He shall purify the sanctuary and the tent of meeting and the altar  
(*kipper*+direct object), and shall perform expiatory rites with respect to the  
entire people of the congregation (*kipper*+*'al*).

Here the difference is perfectly clear: The sanctuary, tent and altar received physical action. Blood was dashed upon them, etc., and as a result, they became pure (ibid. 18-20); whereas no acts were performed, in this instance, directly upon the Israelites. They were simply the beneficiaries of the expiatory rites which had been performed. (2) The spatial process, i.e. 'to perform rites of expiation in proximity to, upon-' sacrificial animals, persons, places, etc. When *kipper*+*'al* has this force physical contact, or at least proximity is definitely implied (64-65).

The use of *kpr* in the above sections of the *Community Rule* corresponds with the first of the two processes as discussed by Levine. There is no implication of direct action on that which is to be the beneficiary of the rite. Levine continues his discussion with the following:

Once certain acts are performed, purity resulted, just as in other instances forgiveness resulted. That is to say: As a result of the performance of certain rites, God grants expiation or atonement. In such instances, expiation, forgiveness, etc. are not the direct *physical effects* of the rites performed. Such acts are prerequisite, but not causational. It is God who grants the desired result! ...

The same conception of expiation must be assumed for the construction *kipper+be'ad* which means: 'to secure/accomplish expiation on behalf of' --one's self, another, the people of Israel, etc. (Leviticus 16:6, 11 etc.) (65-66).

This last construction is the one used in the above passage from 1QS 8:10 "They will be accepted (*lrtswn*) to atone for the land (*lkpr b`d h'rts*)..." (Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35). The word used for to be accepted, *lrtswn*, originates in Leviticus (1:3) and is used there in reference to the acceptability of the burnt offering, *`wlh qrbn*:

If the offering is a burnt offering (*`wlh qrbn*) from the herd, you shall offer a male without blemish; you shall bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting, for acceptance in your behalf (*lrtswn*) before the LORD. You shall lay your hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it shall be acceptable (*nrtsh*) in your behalf as atonement for you (*lkpr `lyw*) (Lev. 1:3-4).

The condition for acceptability in Leviticus is that the offering be "a male without blemish." The condition for acceptability in the above passage from 1QS is that the Council of the Community, that whose way of life is to replace both the *`wlh* (burnt-offerings) and the *chlby zbch* (the fat of sacrifices) be as unblemished as the *`wlh* discussed in Leviticus (1:3-4), i.e. "perfect in everything which has been revealed from the whole Torah ..." (8:1-2 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35). Later in the same column we are given a fuller explanation of the Community's understanding of what has been revealed in the Torah and its impact on their way of life:

- 13 they shall separate themselves from the session of the men of deceit in order to depart into the wilderness to prepare there the Way of the Lord (?);
- 14 as it is written: 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God.' (Isa. 40:3)
- 15 This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time

to time,

- 16 and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit  
(Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 37).

That which makes one an acceptable victim according to this scroll, therefore, is living within the Community, according to the norms of the Community and remaining separate from all that which, according to the understanding of the Community, would render one impure. The scroll at this point continues to outline the "precepts according to which the men of perfect holiness shall behave..." (8:20 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 37). And then (9:3-5) further elaborates on the method of the sacrifice, the sacrifice being the purpose of such 'holiness:'

- 3 When, according to all these norms, these (men) become in Israel a  
foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,  
4 they shall atone for iniquitous guilt (*`l 'smt ps`*) and for sinful  
unfaithfulness (*wm`l chtt't*), so that (God's) favor (*lrtswn*) for the land  
(*l'rts*) (is obtained) without the flesh of burnt-offerings (*`wlwt*) and without  
the fat of sacrifices (*chlby zpch*). The proper offerings (*trwmt*) of  
5 the lips for judgement (is as) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the  
Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering (1QS 9:3-5 Charlesworth *Dead  
Sea Scrolls* 39)

The Community's actions in 1QS 9:4 are said to have the same efficacy as the burnt-offerings. Both passages, Lev. 1:3 as well as 1QS 8:10-9:5 speak of the acceptability (*lrtswn*) of the burnt-offering, or that which is to replace it in 1QS.

The purpose of the burnt-offering (*`wlh*) is in all biblical cases to atone or expiate for some action performed inadvertently. "Priestly tradition provides no expiation for sin committed deliberately." (*The New Oxford Annotated Bible* 128 OT, note 4.2) Even the sins of

deception of Leviticus chapter 6 are modified by the actions leading to expiation "when you have sinned and *realize* your guilt" (6:4 italics are added). The implication here being that even the sins of deception are not deliberate in that the one who commits them has not realized her/his guilt. Those who sin deliberately "shall be cut off from among the people." (Nu. 15:30) The sectarian scrolls are in agreement with this. Their punishment for deliberate transgression by the members of the community is banishment, as already discussed in the previous chapter and as spelled out in 1QS 9:1-4.

1QS 9:4 contains a ritual of expiation for sins committed wilfully, the Hebrew *ps`* (9:4) implies a wilful transgression. The fact that this term, *ps`*, is used in connection with a form of the root 'sm is particularly interesting because for the 'sm as well as the *chT`* "inadvertence is common ... as a governing circumstance. It is to be assumed that the intentional commission of the same offenses would warrant specific punishments, including the death of the offender, at least in theory, and would not be corrigible by ritual means at all" (Levine *Presence* 91). But the ritual described in 1QS 9 does not atone for the people who have committed such sins. The scroll shows no concern for atoning for those who continue to live their lives in sin. In fact it is concerned with the opposite:

- 4       ... Then the Levites shall curse all the men of
- 5       Belial's lot; they shall respond and say: 'Cursed be you in all your guilty  
(and) wicked works. May God give you up
- 6       (to) terror through all the avengers. May he visit upon you destruction  
through all those who take
- 7       revenge. Cursed be you without compassion in accordance with the  
darkness of your works. Damned be you
- 8       in everlasting murky fire. May God not be compassionate unto you when  
you cry out. May he not forgive (you) by covering over (*lkpr*) your

iniquity.

- 9 May he lift up his angry countenance to wreak his vengeance upon you.  
May there be no peace for you according to all who hold fast to the fathers'  
(1QS 2:4-9 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9-11).

It is the Land which is the beneficiary of the ritual of expiation. The purpose of the men who, "according to all these norms...become a foundation of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth," (1QS 9:3 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39) is to atone "for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, so that (God's) favour for the *land* (is obtained)" (9:4 italics are added). But the Torah has no corresponding sacrifice for restoring God's favour for the land. Arguably, the closest the Torah comes to a sacrifice for purifying the Land may be found in Numbers (35:33), which speaks of expiation in cases of polluting the Land, specifically in cases of murder. It informs us that, "... no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it."

The words '*sm* and *chT't*' are used in the above passage of the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 9:4) in the way described by Jacob Milgrom (*Cult and Conscience*): not as cultic-specific terms, rather they refer "to the inner experience of ... liability. i.e., 'to feel guilty'" (Milgrom *Cult* 3).

The cultic terms used specifically as cultic terms (in 1QS 9:4-5) are *`wlh* (*olah*), *zbch* (*zebah*), *trwmt* (*terouma*), *mnchh* (*mincha*), in this sequence. Levine discusses this particular order as a pattern common to biblical accounts (*Presence* 24-26). His purpose in this section is to discuss the purpose of the *`wlh* and he explains as follows:

The fact that in so many cases a sequence of composite rites is projected, and not a single sacrifice, indicates just what we are saying, i.e. that the *olah* was normally utilized for the purpose of invoking the deity preparatory to joining with him in a

fellowship of sacrifice, which was the context for petition and thanksgiving, and for the expression of other religious attitudes of this character (Levine *Presence* 26). The *chT't* (*hatta't*) , he explains, also became part of public ritual, often preceding the *`wlh* but, he adds,

the type of *hatta't* which became part of public ritual and which appeared to precede the *olah* and *zebah* in certain cases, was actually a preliminary rite, which did not affect the *olah-zebah* or *olah-selamim* dynamic as we have explained it. The actual approach to the deity began with the *olah*, whereas the *hatta't*, in such cases, was a prerequisite to invoking the deity (*Presence* 26).

As earlier mentioned a form of the term *chT't* precedes the *`wlh* in this section of 1QS. The order of rites commonly involved in public ritual, as discussed by Levine, is here present. The fact that the form of *chT't* is not used as a cultic term but, rather, as an acknowledgment and acceptance of guilt further serves to reinforce my argument that the sectarian form of sacrifice holds sacramental efficacy for this Community. If the *chT't* was that part of the public ritual which, according to Levine's investigation of biblical material, "was a prerequisite to invoking the deity," the *chT't* for the sectarians serves the same purpose. We must remember that acknowledgment of guilt was a prerequisite to joining the Community. In 1QS 1:22-26 the instructions for those who "cross over into the covenant before God by the Rule of the Community" (1QS 1:16 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9), which is also an annual ritual of the community, include the following requirement:

- 22     ... Then the Levites shall enumerate
- 23     the iniquities of the sons of Israel and all their guilty transgressions (*ps`y*  
       *'smtm*) and their sins (*chT'tm*) during the dominion of
- 24     Belial. [And al]l those who cross over into the covenant shall confess after  
       them (by) saying: 'We have perverted ourselves,

- 25 we have rebel[led], we [have sin]ned (*chT'nw*), we have acted impiously,  
we [and] our [fath]ers before us, by our walking
- 26 [...] True and righte[ous] is the [Go]d of [Israel and] his judgement against  
[our] fathers; (1QS 1:22-26 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 9).

The same type of confession is included in the hymn which concludes 1QS:

- 9 ... And I (belong) to wicked Adam, to the assembly of deceitful flesh. My  
iniquities, my transgressions, my sins (*chT'ty*), as well as the perverseness  
of my heart
- 10 (belong) to the assembly of maggots and of those who walk in darkness.  
For my way (belongs) to Adam. The human cannot establish his  
righteousness; for to God (alone) belongs the judgement and from him is
- 11 the perfection of the Way (1QS 11:9-11 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls*  
49).

Both the above passages include the acknowledgment of guilt but also the willingness to accept God's will unequivocally.

The social function of this sentiment, echoed in the prescriptions of the *Damascus Document*, as to the requirement that all initiates renounce their own will and desires, "the stubbornness of your heart," and surrender to God's will as understood by the Community, has been discussed in the previous chapter. My concern here is with the cultic function of the *chT't*. In the use of the different forms of the root *chT't*, as acknowledgment and admission of sin, we find a prerequisite to joining the Community of sectarians as well as a necessary part of the annual covenant renewal ceremony of the community (1QS 1-2), a necessary prerequisite of the Community of holiness. A Community, one of whose main purposes is, as discussed in the previous chapter, communion with God. The first step to such communion and communication with God is this very acknowledgement and

admission of sin.

The forms of the root *chT't* are used here in the way discussed by Levine as "a prerequisite to invoking the deity," this is the first necessary step for any type of communion with God. The purpose for the invocation is to "*atone (lkpr)* for iniquitous guilt and for sinful unfaithfulness, *so that (God's) favor for the land (is obtained)*" (1QS 9:4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39, italics are added). The ritual is therefore one of expiation. Ashby states that "Leviticus 4-5 gives three technical terms" (*Sacrifice* 32) for expiatory sacrifices. These terms are *chT't* (*hatta't*), *'sm* (*asam*) and *kpr* (*kipper*) (Ashby *Sacrifice* 32-33). The significance of the first two terms, especially *chT't*, we have already discussed. The third term, *kpr*, is used in 1QS 9:4 to state the purpose of the Community's sacrifice. Ashby, like Levine, disagrees with the interpretation of *kpr* as "to cover sins" (*Sacrifice* 33). His understanding of *kpr* is very much like Levine's:

It became a technical term and in Hebrew usage meant to eliminate, to cancel or to remove. God, not man, was the subject and the object was some sort of sin or fault.

*Kipper* is a rite of healing for man just as much in things physical as in things moral (33).

The purpose of the rite performed by the Community in 1QS 9:4 however is a rite of healing for the land, "so that (God's) favor for the land (is obtained)" (Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39). The technical terms used are priestly, i.e. originate in Leviticus, but the purpose of the rites to which these terms refer is not the same as the purpose in Leviticus. In Leviticus, as in Deuteronomy, possession of the Land as well as prosperity in the Land is dependent on the People's keeping of God's ordinances and commandments. God's favor for the Land is not dependent on sacrifices. In Leviticus God's punishments, if the People do not live according to His Laws, multiply, the penultimate punishment being the devastation of the Land, the ultimate punishment being their expulsion from the Land. This



expulsion leads to rest for the Land:

Then the land shall enjoy its sabbath years as long as it lies desolate, while you are in the land of your enemies; then the land shall rest, and enjoy its sabbath years. As long as it lies desolate, it shall have the rest it did not have on your sabbaths when you were living on it (Lev. 26:34-35).

Further down in the same chapter we are told:

But if they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their ancestors, in that they committed treachery against me and, moreover, that they continued hostile to me - so that I, in turn, continued hostile to them and brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised heart is humbled and they make amends for their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant with Jacob; I will remember also my covenant with Isaac and also my covenant with Abraham, and I will remember the land (Lev. 26:40-42).

This passage is significant for my study for two reasons. First of all we find here the same requirement for the return of God's favor to the *People* as we do in the *Community Rule*, this being the requirement that they acknowledge and confess their sins and make amends for them. This idea is not original to the sectarians of Qumran. We also find here the statement "and I will remember the land." The Land which has been enjoying "its sabbath years," i.e. resting. God remembering the Land here has no connection with God's favor for the Land, i.e. the Land has not been punished. But the connection is made between the Land and the People. God remembers the Land when God remembers the covenant with the People. This act of remembering is related to the People's return to, and control of, the Land. The Land becomes an active part of the covenantal equation in union with the People. Otherwise it is simply a land not the Land sanctified to the Lord. Maimonides has argued the same point in the *Mishneh Torah* (*The Code of Maimonides Book Eight The Temple Service* Lewittes trans.). He says:

the obligations arising out of the Land as far as the Sabbatical year and the tithes are concerned had derived from the conquest of the Land by the people (of Israel), and as soon as the Land was wrested from them the conquest was nullified.

Consequently, the Land was exempted by the Law from tithes and from (the restrictions of) the Sabbatical year, for it was no longer deemed the Land of Israel (6:16 Lewittes trans. 28-29).

The Land without the People is therefore just a land. Its sanctity depends on the presence of the People Israel, its purity on their ability to live by God's Laws. Their inability to do so, or disregard of these Laws defiles the Land. However nowhere is sacrifice directly prescribed as necessary for the purification of the Land. Sacrifices purify the People, both individually and as a group. It is they who lose God's favor by not upholding His Laws. But the Peoples' purity and sanctity is necessary for the purity and sanctity of the Land. In 1QS 9:4, however, the direct objective of the sacrifice is to atone for the sinful unfaithfulness of the people "so that (God's) favor for the *land* (is obtained)" (Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39 italics are added). It is not only their way of life, as the "Community of Holiness," (1QS 9:2 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39) which preserves the sanctity of the Land but this way of life is explicitly put forth as a sacrifice. This sacrifice purifies the Land, not a direct purpose of sacrifice in the Torah. There is no innovation in the belief that their way of life according to the Laws of God is that which maintains the sanctity of the Land. The innovation is in their understanding their way of life *as* sacrifice and as perceiving this sacrifice as necessary and sufficient to return God's favour to the Land. This connection between the way of life of the people in non-cultic contexts resulting in the type of purity or impurity associated in the Pentateuch with cultic activity I have already shown originates in the *Temple Scroll*.

## 6. Conclusion.

Burton Mack in "Introduction: Religion and Ritual" has discussed the traditional focus on myth as opposed to ritual in the study of religion. He explains,

It is true that ritual has always been recognized as a major datum of religion, but the earlier studies of religion did not explore the behavioral, motivational, and social life of religious actions and rites... The question that exercised scholars was how to account for the origin and plausibility of mythic beliefs and notions, and rituals were regarded mainly as 'responses' to these 'myths' (1).

For the scrolls, other than the *Temple Scroll* which contains ritual but no explicit sectarian myth, myth of origin and ritual can not be separated without doing violence to the integrity of their beliefs. The Community's dependence on the sons of Zadok as myth of origin becomes not only the justification for their separation from the remainder of Israel, the "negative" aspect of cult in Durkheim's definition, but also the image according to which their own life-as-ritual is organized, the "positive" aspect of cult.

Durkheim, in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, discusses three different groups of rites which combine to make up the positive aspect of cult. These three are "sacrifice" (366-392), "imitative rites" (393-413) and "representative or commemorative rites" (414-433). All three of these groups are evident in the Community's use of the myth of the sons of Zadok and the ensuing ritual. We have already discussed "sacrifice" but it is important to briefly discuss the other two groups of ritual as well. The second group, "imitative rites," according to Durkheim, "consist in movements and cries whose object it is to imitate the different attitudes and aspects of the animal whose reproduction is desired" (393). He continues later in the same chapter,

The men who assemble in the occasion of these rites believe that they are really

animals or plants of the species whose name they bear... The totem is their rallying sign;... By this means, they mutually show one another that they are all members of the same moral community and they become conscious of the kinship uniting them. The rite does not limit itself to expressing this kinship; it makes it or remakes it (400).

Highlighting the analogy between imitating the totem and imitating the sons of Zadok as an attempt to create and reinforce a particular identity and reality is certainly not an innovative realization on my part but it does merit mention. It bears repeating that imitative rites serve to make or remake the kinship expressed. This is not a Community commemorating a golden past or symbolically acting out an ideal future. Their rites, which involve not isolated rituals but the ritualization of the most mundane aspects of every-day living, create sacred space within which the covenant is actualized and within which the cult is communion with the sacred.

Durkheim's third group, "representative or commemorative rites," as those rites which "put into action the mythical history of the ancestor" (416), further helps to illustrate the life of the sectarians as cult:

The officiant is one with the ancestor from whom he is descended and whom he reincarnates. The gestures he makes are those which this ancestor made in the same circumstances. Speaking exactly, of course *he does not play the part of the ancestral person as an actor might do it; he is the personage himself* (418 italics are added).

Durkheim continues, "...we have here a whole group of ceremonies whose sole purpose is to awaken certain ideas and sentiments, to attach the present to the past or the individual to the group" (423).

All three groups of rites which make up the positive aspect of cult have the creation and enforcement of a particular identity in common. They correspond to the characteristics and mechanisms examined in the previous chapter and at the same time help us to understand the life of the Community *as* cult. The identification with the sons of Zadok lies at the heart of each of the three groups of rites involved in the positive cult in the Community presented in the sectarian scrolls from Qumran. In addition the identification with the sons of Zadok provides the Community with the motive and justification for its need for separation, the impetus for, and realization of the negative cult. Myth and ritual are one in the Community represented by the sectarian scrolls.

However, the sectarian scrolls provide us with texts within which we can find different combinations of myth and ritual. For example *Temple Scroll* contains ritual but no explicit sectarian myth. But it does introduce the world-view which provides the foundation for the myth of the Community. The *Damascus Document*, on the other hand, contains both the myth of the Community's origin as well as the tradition from the prophet Ezekiel which provides the Community with the authority to interpret and enforce the Law of Moses. The *Damascus Document* discusses the Temple and its purity often in language easily identifiable as referring to the physical Temple but often in language which is ambiguous and can be understood as referring to the physical Temple or to the Temple composed of the men of the Community. The *Community Rule* is the document which contains the explicit identification of the Community with the Temple but also describes the ritual which is to replace the sacrificial Temple cult. The *Community Rule* makes no mention of any Temple other than the one which is composed by the Community itself and when it does make mention of the ritual laws which apply to the sacrificial cult it does so by applying them to its own interpretation of the sacrificial cult without apology and without explanation. Witness for example the following replacement for the burnt offering which was to be

sacrificed at sunrise and sunset every day in the Temple (Numb. 28:3-6) as well as the burnt offering to be sacrificed on the new moons (Num. 28:11 ff):

- 26     ...And in every circumstance he shall rec[ount his (God's) mercies] (with the offering of) the lips. he shall praise him

*Col.10*

- 1     (in accord) with the times which he has decreed: at the beginning of the dominion of light, at its turning point when it withdraws itself to its assigned dwelling, at the beginning of
- 2     the watches of darkness when he (God) opens its treasure and spreads it over (the earth), and at its turning-point when it withdraws itself before the light, when
- 3     luminaries shine forth from the realm of holiness, when they withdraw themselves to the dwelling of glory, at the commencement of the seasons on the days of the new moon... (1QS 9:26-10:3 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 43))

This column continues in the first person voice of the Master of the Community to equate the offerings of the lips with the offerings appropriate for the marking of the different seasons and appointed times:

- 4     ...at the heads of
- 5     seasons in every time to come, at the beginning of months at their appointed times, and on holy days in their fixed order, as memorials at their appointed times.
- 6     (With) the offering of the lips I will praise him according to a statute engraved for ever... (1QS 10:4-6 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 43)

The sacrificial cult is not limited to the activities of the Master of the Community. As earlier

discussed the Council of the Community atones "for iniquity by works of judgement / and suffering affliction," (8:3-4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 35) and "the proper offering of the lips," (1QS 9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39) and perfection of way replace sacrificial offerings.

In the *Community Rule* communion with God becomes the ultimate purpose and reward for sacrifice. It is God's truth which cleanses one not the sprinkling of purifying waters. It is living according to this truth which atones for sins and for the land, not the slaughter and offering of sacrificial victims. One can only live by this truth within the Community which has access to this truth. The living of life according to this truth which has been revealed to the founders of this Community and is hidden from the remainder of Israel is what unites the Community. The sacrificial ritual is not something which happens in the physical environs of the sanctuary *by* the cultic experts *for* Israel. Rather the ritual becomes their way of life according to *the* Truth as they alone know it. Their every action is ritualized and is therefore ritual. They live in the environs of the sanctuary in a state of ritual purity and those whose perfection of life so enables them live within the sanctuary, they become the sacrifice as well as the officiants who offer this sacrifice directly to God. The ritualized life of the members of the Community results in their union with God.

The polemic against the existing Temple cult as well as its interpretation of the law is obvious in all the above discussed scrolls. The polemic implies that not only is the interpretation as it is understood by the status quo flawed but that that status quo is basing its interpretation on the assumption that God can be fooled by a glossy exterior surrounding a core empty of truth.

The Community of the scrolls believes itself alone in the true interpretation of God's laws

because they alone know God due to their proximity to God. Sacrifice rightly performed according to the Community of the scrolls results in community with each other as well as with God. In fact punishment within the Community, as discussed in the previous chapter, is enforced by different degrees of separation from the life of the Community which results in distance from God. Reward is the gradual, progressive admittance to the depths of the Community at the centre of which is the sanctuary within which the sons of Zadok minister directly to God according to the model given by Ezekiel. Closeness to God and God's truth is an end in itself. But we must keep in mind that it is the connection made between cult and covenant in the *Temple Scroll* that provides for the sectarian scrolls the logic upon which they can create this Community the purpose of which is way-of-life, in terms of covenantal observance, *as cult*.

In the scrolls even though obtaining "(God's) favour for the land" (1QS 9:4 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39) is mentioned as one of the results of the Community's type of sacrifice it is not provided as the only reason for performing their type of sacrifice. Instead closeness to God and communion with God is repeated as one of the primary reason for the Community's way of life as an offering. Even in the *Temple Scroll* it is understood that God's laws are to be kept even without the land or the Temple. In none of the scrolls, not even the *Temple Scroll*, is the rebuilding of the Temple a precondition for the return of God to the Land nor is it a precondition for the removal of impurity or sin. God's dwelling place is in the community of the People of Israel as much as in the Temple, in addition the Community which lives in ritual purity and according to the true interpretation of the covenant can atone for the Land and for sins by a different type of offering for which the physical Temple is not required.

Some of the arguments we have already discussed understand the *Temple Scroll* as, in



varying degrees and in different ways, either mandating a law for the eschaton, i.e. Wise, or mandating an essential and necessary aspect of the covenant made with Jacob at Bethel, this being the building of the physical Temple by God, i.e. Stegemann, Wacholder, Maier and Yadin. Some of these also see the Community of the sectarian scrolls as being a Community preparing for the eschaton, i.e. Wacholder and Schiffman. At this point of our investigation we can say that the sectarian scrolls stand in opposition to these. The sectarian scrolls do not present the Temple as a necessary requirement for their type of sacrifice, rather the *Community Rule* explicitly states that their type of sacrifice is equal to, not less than, the physical Temple cult. The laws presented by the sectarian scrolls, both in respect to the Community as well as the performance of their type of cult, are presented as necessary to bring about the desired effect but also as sufficient. There is no implication in the sectarian scrolls that the ideal, the actual sacrifice which will bring about the atonement for the Land, is something that can not be performed in the present because of the absence of the physical Temple. Rather they repeatedly tell us that the Community which they prescribe *is* living in the requisite purity and *is* performing this sacrifice. The sectarian scrolls tell us that their Community *is* the Temple. Why is it so difficult for us to accept that they believe this to be the case?

But the rebuilding of the Temple *is* always seen as the optimal situation by the Community of the scrolls. Not because without it their cult is 'less-than' or ineffective. But because all of God's laws must be put into effect. If, as I am demonstrating, the *Temple Scroll* is canonical to the Community we cannot escape the fact that it presents the plan for the Temple as direct revelation from God. But the necessity for the building of the valid Temple is mentioned in sectarian scrolls other than the *Temple Scroll*. We find discussion of the physical Temple and its laws as pertaining to the acceptability of different sacrifices in the *Damascus Document* (11:17-12:1). The *War Rule* mentions holocausts and

sacrifices which will be offered in the Temple during the final battle between Light and Darkness (2:1-5). One could easily ask what would be the need for a rebuild Temple if the Community has found ways to effectively execute its cult without one? The answer is that despite the adaptation of the cult and despite the Community's belief that the physical performance of the cult alone is not enough without humility and willingness to be purified by the Truth the valid Temple must be build. The scrolls repeatedly state that the optimal situation is to live according to the precepts concerning *all* of God's laws. In none of the sectarian scrolls do we find an argument for the abolition of the laws pertaining to the Temple and its cult, at the most we find arguments for reform of the existing practice.

In the eschaton a valid Temple will exist within which will be practised a valid Temple cult controlled by those to whom the blueprint for both has been vouchsafed. The laws of purity according to which the Community now lives will eventually be applied to that Temple. This does not however mean that until that Temple is built the Community-as-Temple is 'less than' or an 'imitation of' that Temple. The valid physical Temple of the *Temple Scroll* will one day exist because God so ordained. But the Temple is not the single pre-requisite for God's presence, for communion with God, or for atonement, not in the *Temple Scroll* and certainly not in the other sectarian scrolls.

## Chapter 5. CONCLUSION

At the beginning of this examination of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls from Qumran I cited Jack Lightstone's discussion of Clifford Geertz's "treatment of religion 'as a cultural system'" (Lightstone *Society* 5-6). Lightstone introduced Geertz's treatment by saying that it "proposes that religious knowledge finds its rationality in a mutually confirming relationship with other aspects of the cultural system" (*Society* 6). He summarized Geertz's argument by the following four points:

Geertz makes four theoretical points germane to our enterprise. First, the beliefs and practices of religion are integrally related to style of life, or ethos, on the one hand, and to world-view, on the other. Second, he describes these relationships as one of 'congruence.' Third, these beliefs and practices *implicitly* communicate a 'metaphysic,' or 'world-view.' Fourth, this congruence of religion, style of life and world-view correlates with strong collective sentiments of an aesthetic and moral nature. Fifth, the overall effect is to 'sustain,' that is, to render plausible, both world-view, on the one hand, and style of life, on the other (*Society* 6).

Geertz's definition of 'world view' and 'ethos' are as follows:

A people's ethos is the tone, character, and quality of their life, its moral and aesthetic style and mood; it is the underlying attitude toward themselves and their world that life reflects. Their world view is their picture of the way things in sheer actuality are, their concept of nature, of self, of society. It contains their most comprehensive ideas of order. Religious belief and ritual confront and mutually confirm one another; the ethos is made intellectually reasonable by being shown to represent a way of life implied by the actual state of affairs which the world view describes, and the world view is made is made emotionally acceptable by being presented as an

image of an actual state of affairs of which such a way of life is an authentic expression (*Interpretation* 127).

My objective in this investigation has been to show that the 'world view' upon which the 'ethos' of the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is founded is the world view introduced in the *Temple Scroll*. It is this world-view which provides the 'is', the perception of "the fundamental nature of reality" (Geertz *Interpretation* 126). It provides the blueprint for the structure and organization of the Community as well as the rationale for the 'ought,' the "specific requirements of human action" (Geertz *Interpretation* 126) as prescribed in the sectarian scrolls.

I began my investigation with a brief discussion of the different theories as to the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls found at Qumran. I then outlined three points of dissimilarity between my approach to the investigation of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls and those approaches already outlined. First, I explained, for the purposes of my study the provenance of the *Temple Scroll* is not as important as the use made of it by the sectarian scrolls. Second, those arguments based on the assumption that the *Temple Scroll* can have no application to a community without the existence of the physical Temple which it prescribes disregard the fact that the scroll mandates the same laws relating to ritual purity for the People of Israel even without a Temple. In fact it makes the claim that moral infractions impart the same impurity as do cultic infractions. Third, those arguments which claim that no fundamental relationship can exist between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls because the latter show no interest in the building and maintenance of a physical Temple disregard the very explicit claims made by these scrolls themselves about the Community which they prescribe. These claims identify this Community as the Temple and, furthermore, identify

the activity performed by this Community as sacrifice.

I then began my investigation of the *Temple Scroll* itself. I recognized, with help from Yigael Yadin's three volume set, *The Temple Scroll*, that the scroll is very often a collection of material originating from different sections in Hebrew Scripture. I argued, however, that the choice of material in conjunction with its placement within the particular context of Temple and cult and especially because it is presented as revelation being spoken in the first person voice of God results in a document which does not merely serve to harmonize, synthesize and clarify (Yadin *Temple* 1983, 1:73-81) laws originating in the Pentateuch. I argued that the scroll presents us with something new, a world within which the identification of Israel as "a priestly kingdom and a holy nation" (Ex.19:5) is taken as a given and that such an identification includes Priestly obligations. The scroll presents us, however, with an ideology within which cult and covenant are one. This unity of cult and covenant results in an understanding of Israel's relationship with God within which infractions of covenantal obligations result in the type of ritual impurity which in the Pentateuch is shown to be the result of cultic infractions. The *Temple Scroll* also introduces the absolute authority of the priests in all matters of judgement and ties the covenantal curses of Deuteronomy to those actions of either king or People which disregard these judgments. This scroll, therefore, provides the sectarian scrolls with two fundamental starting points. First of all it introduces the ideology so central to the sectarian scrolls that proper covenantal observance is equal in all respects to proper cultic observance and that infractions of covenantal laws lead to the same type of ritual impurity as do infractions of cultic laws. The sectarian scrolls take this to the next logical level: if covenantal infractions result in ritual impurity then proper observance of the covenant brings about the same effects in the real world, in real time as does the proper performance of the cult. Second the *Temple Scroll* provides the foundation for the Community's assertion of the

authority of the priest in all matters whether of cult or covenant. These two in combination lead to a third point, that it is the priests who are the authorities not only for activities related to cult but also to covenant.

In the third chapter I briefly suspended my investigation of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. In this chapter my intention was to show that the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls was intended as a model for an actual living community. This is not a point of contention for most of those involved in studying these scrolls. But sometimes in the investigation of the scrolls as written documents of a community which no longer exists we run the danger of forgetting that the scrolls prescribe choices intended to be made by real people in real time. Recognizing this fact was essential for my study. I therefore turned to conclusions garnered through empirical investigations of real, living, successful utopian communities. I argued that it is highly unlikely that one could have imagined an ideal community which so closely corresponds, as does the Community mandated in the sectarian scrolls, to an empirically based theoretical model of characteristics and requirements for living communities, as arrived at through empirical studies. The significance of this is that we would have to consider the sectarian scrolls not merely as prescribing an ideal community but as describing the 'ought' of a living community. I then began my investigation of the Community as living community. I explored rituals, texts, identity, hierarchy and figures of authority in order to better understand what these communicated to the individual members and how these served to reinforce and to sustain the Community of the sectarian scrolls. This investigation was followed by an investigation of the world-view evident in the sectarian scrolls. I demonstrated that the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls identifies itself as the Temple and perceives its actions to have the same immediate effect on the physical world as does the Temple cult. I further demonstrated that the sectarian scrolls outline a way of life,

an ethos, which supports such a belief. In turn the world-view of the Community, its identification of itself as Temple and of its way of life as the only viable form of sacrifice serves to support and sustain the very stringent form that their way of life mandates.

The next chapter involved a fuller exploration of the way of life, the ethos, of the Community as mandated in the sectarian scrolls and the purpose of such a way of life. As a result of the conclusions arrived at in the previous chapter, i.e. of the Community as a living community, I was able in this chapter to confirm the claims made by the scrolls as to the identity and purpose of the Community. After all, as already established in the previous chapter, it is these very claims which are proposed as the motivation for individuals to choose such a stringent way of life and which served to sustain the Community.

Chapter Two, therefore, introduced the world view evident in the *Temple Scroll* and began the discussion of whether or not such a world view was also evident in the sectarian scrolls. Chapters Three and Four continued this investigation but also began to examine the ethos, the way of life, prescribed in the sectarian scrolls. This way of life was found to be a reflection of the world-view already discussed. This is evident both in the explicit claims made by the sectarian scrolls but also in the implicit assumptions which are made by the scrolls in their mandates as to the organization and structure of the Community.

In the first chapter I introduced two groups of criteria which would have to be met in order for my thesis as to the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls to be substantiated. The requirements of the first group were concerned with finding similarities between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls in their approach to figures of authority, definitions and uses of terms as well as core concerns. I have shown that such similarities exist. For example I have shown that the figures of authority in both the *Temple Scroll* and

the sectarian scrolls are the priests. I have also shown that such authority originates in the *Temple Scroll's* mandate that all actions be carried out in accordance with the judgement of the priests. I have also shown that the definition and use of terms such as Israel, the Israel which is part of the covenantal relationship with God, in both cases refers to those who accept and live by the laws of both cult and covenant as interpreted by the priests. The definition and use of the terms cult and covenant are also the same and originate in the particular union of the two as introduced in the *Temple Scroll*.

The understanding of ritual purity requirements found in the sectarian scrolls can also be traced to the understanding which originates in the *Temple Scroll*, a combination of the "maximalist" approach, as explained by Yadin, and of the union of cult and covenant the result of which is that an infraction of a law of the covenant results in the ritual impurity associated in the Pentateuch with cultic infractions. Additionally this union of cult and covenant results in the belief of the sectarian scrolls that covenantal activity properly performed can have the same results as cultic activity in the real world in real time. I have shown that the specific understanding of the union of cult and covenant found in the sectarian scrolls, even though evident in non-sectarian documents, as for example the prophetic books of Hebrew Scripture, must be traced to the *Temple Scroll* because it is in this scroll that we find the particular association made between such a union and the authority of the priests in the context of the Temple. The sectarian scrolls explicitly speak of the authority of the priests, their Community as Temple as well as of the purpose of their way of life as sacrifice. The particular understanding of the union of cult and covenant as well as of the authority of the priests as spelled out in the *Temple Scroll* result in specific requirements and obligations, the same requirements and obligations can be found in the sectarian scrolls. It is living life according to these requirements and obligations, for example the requirement of a stringent application of the laws of ritual purity even when not



in the proximity of the physical Temple, as well as the obligation to accept the judgement of the priest in all situations, which is evident in both the *Temple Scroll* as well as the sectarian scrolls. It is living life in accord with these requirements and obligations, or, on the other hand, in opposition to them, which brings results in the real world in real time. The last criterion of this first group which had to be met was that similarities be shown to exist between the "core concerns" of the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. By "core concerns" I explained that I borrowed Ben Zion Wacholder's definition of these as they are reflected in the *Temple Scroll*. He explained: "the author appears to have invested most of his efforts in subject matter that interested him, thus the laws of ritual impurity and ecclesiastical perquisites form the core of the *Temple Scroll*" (*Dawn* 15). These same concerns have been shown to be central to the sectarian scrolls, both in terms of the laws of ritual purity and impurity as well as "ecclesiastical perquisites." The adoption and adaptation of the last of these by the sectarian scrolls is particularly significant because at the heart of these perquisites lies the exclusive right of the priests, an identity claimed by the Community of the scrolls for themselves, to be the only ones who are authorized and able to interpret the "Way" as mandated by the Torah.

The second group of criteria which I outlined in the first chapter as being necessary for proving my thesis included first of all the list introduced by Yigael Yadin of the laws which are held in common by the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls and which are either not common to other Second Temple Judaism or which are in opposition to the laws held by other contemporary Jewish groups. Yadin has dealt with these in detail, the type of detail which I could not consider in this study. I therefore only discussed these as they related to my examination especially in their implications for the self-understanding of the Community as outlined in the sectarian scrolls. My discussion of those things held in common followed Yadin's lead in that it included not only the laws but also particular terms

which are common to the *Temple Scroll* and to the sectarian scrolls. Within such a list must be included the terms originating from the "maximalist" approach to ritual purity requirements and an understanding of laws and requirements based on the perception of Israel as the wilderness camp. Such an understanding is evident in discussions of the division of Israel in terms of camps surrounding the sanctuary at the center. This I showed was common to the approach taken by the *Temple Scroll* as well as by a selection of the sectarian scrolls.

The last criterion which had to be met as outlined in the first chapter is in many ways the most important and the one which has shaped my examination of the scrolls. This last has to do with the world-view in evidence in the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls. As already mentioned, I have shown that a common world-view does exist. But the requirements of this criterion extend further than the need to show such a similarity. For the requirements of this criterion to be met it is necessary to have shown that the way of life prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is not only based on the world-view which originates in the *Temple Scroll* but also that the two, world-view and way of life, mirror and support each other, that they "sustain" each other. That the sectarian scrolls exhibit a "congruence of religion, style of life and world-view" (*Lightstone Society* 6), and that this world-view which sustains the style of life in evidence in the sectarian scrolls, and which is *implicitly* communicated by them (*Lightstone Society* 6) is none-other than the world-view introduced by the *Temple Scroll*. To this end I explored the initiation process outlined in the *Community Rule* as an expression of the process of progressing through the courts as described in the *Temple Scroll*, each with its own requirements relating to ritual purity. The goal of both processes being to arrive at the very center, the Temple, the place within which only the most ritually pure can enter, the place within which those are to "come near to me; and they shall attend me to offer me the fat and the blood, says the Lord GOD" (Ezek.

44:15). This sacrifice is said in the *Community Rule* to be analogous to the sacrifice of the Community, a sacrifice "without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of / the lips for judgement (is as) a righteous sweetness, and the perfect of the Way (are as) a pleasing freewill offering" (1QS 9:4-5 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 39). I have shown that the identity claimed by the Community of the sectarian scrolls, as heirs to the Sons of Zadok, originates in the book of Ezekiel as cited in the *Damascus Document* but becomes part of the world-view of the *Temple Scroll* by this scroll's use of language originating in Ezekiel to introduce the dedication of the Temple. Furthermore it is through the union of cult and covenant developed in the *Temple Scroll* that the "charge of the sanctuary" which is bestowed to the Sons of Zadok in the book of Ezekiel becomes one and the same as the charge of the covenant and the authority to properly interpret it, both of which are assumed to belong to the Sons of Zadok as the leaders of the Community in the sectarian scrolls. It is the Community's identification with the Sons of Zadok and their purpose, to separate from the Israel which has gone astray, so that they too, as the Sons of Zadok, may become entitled to perform the same service, which supports the extremely stringent style of life prescribed for this Community by the sectarian scrolls. It is also the perception of themselves as Temple and of their way of life, a way of life structured according to the ritual purity laws prescribed in the *Temple Scroll*, as sacrifice which reinforces this way of life and sustains the Community. And, finally, it is the inference which can be arrived at by the *Temple Scroll's* application of the Deuteronomical curses only to those who do not live according to the judgement of the priests which reinforces the Community's perception of themselves as the last remnant.

Throughout this exploration of the relationship between the *Temple Scroll* and the sectarian scrolls from Qumran I have often stated the importance of separating the intent of the

author(s) of the *Temple Scroll* from the use made of it by the sectarian scrolls. One more issue must be commented upon at this point because it too is related to contemporary approaches to the scrolls. This issue has to do with the question of whether or not the *Temple Scroll* mandates a physical Temple.

In the previous pages I have shown that the *Temple Scroll* prescribes the same ritual purity requirements for Israel, the People, with or without a Temple. I have also shown how the sectarian scrolls then adopted and adapted this ideology to the rules necessary for the running and maintenance of the Community. The Community mandated by the scrolls in fact believes itself to be the Temple and perceives its practices and activities as *sacrifice* with the same immediate effects as the physical Temple cult. This does not, however, mean that in either case, whether that of the *Temple Scroll* or of the sectarian scrolls, the desire for the physical Temple is discarded. For the Community outlined in the sectarian scrolls it is not an "either or" situation, and neither is it for the *Temple Scroll*. Just as the *Temple Scroll* provides laws for the ideal physical Temple at the same time as it provides the laws for the community of Israel apart from such a Temple so too the sectarian scrolls mandate the laws for the Community without the physical Temple but believe that such a Temple will be built one day. The reason for both cases is the same and best summarized by the following from the *Temple Scroll* and the *Community Rule*.

- 9       ...Then they will return  
10       to me with all their heart and with all their soul, according to *all* the words  
of this law (11QT 59:9- 10 Yadin *Temple* 1983, 2:267-268 italics are  
added).

And,

- 7       ...every one who enters into the Council of the Community,  
8       shall enter into the covenant of God in the sight of all those who devote

themselves. He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the Torah of Moses, according to *all* which he has commanded (1QS 5:7-8 Charlesworth *Dead Sea Scrolls* 21 italics are added).

The purpose of the Community, other than to perform the sacrifice of 1QS 9, is to

- 13 ...separate themselves from the session of the men of deceit in order to depart into the wilderness to prepare there the Way of the Lord(?);
- 14 as it is written: 'In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God' (Isa. 40:3).
- 15 This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time,
- 16 and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit (1QS 8:13-16 *Dead Sea Scrolls* 37).

The above passage is by now familiar as is the Community's perception of its life as sacrifice. In another sectarian scroll, the *War Scroll* (1QM), we are given a very different description of the Temple cult which will be practised during the eschatological war, a war within which God must be an active participant. The Temple described in this scroll is the physical Temple in Jerusalem within which are performed all the sacrifices necessary for the cult. The two cults do not have to be perceived as contradictory. The Community of the sectarian scrolls never makes the claim that their particular sacrifice will replace the physical sacrifice of the Temple cult, and neither can we. The recognition that the *Temple Scroll* is an essential piece of the puzzle of understanding this Community supports my assertion that the Community can believe itself to be the Temple and believe its activity to have the exact same efficacy as the physical Temple cult and at the same time believe that the Temple prescribed in the *Temple Scroll* will one day come into existence. The reason for this is not because, as B.Z. Wacholder and M.O. Wise believe, the *Temple Scroll* provides the

eschatological law for the Community. Rather the Community is in possession of the *whole* Torah of Moses. Their Torah includes all the laws, cultic and covenantal. At the present they cannot perform the proper cultic service in the existing Temple in Jerusalem and yet the Temple can be nowhere else. But the relationship between the Community as it existed and its eschatological expectations is also not as Lawrence Schiffman expressed it in *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*:

If the ultimate perfection was to be achieved in the end of days, then the life of the sectarian in this world would have to be an imitation, however pale, of those ideals. Like all Jewish groups of the Second Commonwealth, the sectarians of Qumran dreamed of a better future, one which would make possible the proper observance of the law as they interpreted it, one which would strengthen the bond between the Israelites and their creator and Lawgiver, a life of purity and perfection (10).

The life of the Community, I have argued, had achieved "the proper observance of the law as they interpreted it." Their lived reality was not a pale imitation of the ideal, they lived "a life of purity and perfection" in the present. The desire for the eschaton and for the creation of the ideal physical Temple and their belief that their present life is "a life of purity and perfection" do not have to be perceived as mutually contradictory. Both the Community and the physical Temple perform the same service, both types of service have the same efficacy and, in a perfect world, both types of service will be performed as part of the complete Torah of Moses. The Community knows this because they have direct revelation from God to that effect in the *Temple Scroll*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allegro, J.M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harmondsworth: Penguin 1958.
- "An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)." *Journal of Semitic Studies*. 6-7 (1961-1962):71-74.
- Amitai, Janet, ed. *Biblical Archaeology Today*. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology Jerusalem, April 1984. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, in cooperation with the American Schools of Oriental Research, 1985.
- Anderson, Gary A. *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel Studies in their Social and Political Importance*. Atlanta: Georgia Scholars Press, 1987.
- Ashby, Godfrey. *Sacrifice Its Nature and Purpose*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1988.
- Barrera, Julio Trebolle, Luis Vegas Montaner, eds. *The Madrid Qumran Congress*. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991, vol.two. Studies in the Desert of Judah, Ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Vol. X. New York: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4QFlor." *Revue de Qumran* 8(1972):87-96.
- . "Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4." Amitai 390-399.
- . "The Laws of the Damascus document in Current Research." Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* 51-62.
- . "Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law". Ulrich and VanderKam 27-36.
- . *Studies in Qumran Law*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24, ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- Ben Maimon, Moses. *The Code of Maimonides (Mishneh Torah) Book Eight The Book of Temple Service*. Trans. Mendell Lewittes. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Berger, Klaus. *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Truth Under Lock and Key?* Trans. James S. Currie. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Bird, Frederick B. "How do Religions Affect Moralities? A Comparative Analysis." *Social Compass* 37(3), 1990: 291-314.
- . "Ritual as Communicative Action". *Ritual and Ethnic Identity A Comparative Study of the Social Meaning of Liturgical Ritual in Synagogues*. Ed. Jack N. Lightstone and Frederick Bird. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1995. 23-52.

- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Sage Priest Prophet Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. Library of Ancient Israel Douglas A. Knight, General Editor. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Braun, W. "Were the New Testament Herodians Essenes?" *Revue de Qumran* No.53, Tome 14, (June 1989):75-88.
- Brooke, George J. "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts." Barrera and Montaner 317-338.
- . "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991):215-231.
- , ed. *Temple Scroll Studies*. Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 7, ed. James H. Charlesworth. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . "The Textual Tradition of the *Temple Scroll* and Recently Published Manuscripts of the Pentateuch", Dimant and Rappaport, 261-282.
- Brooke, George J., Martinez, Florentino Garcia, eds. *New Qumran Texts And Studies*. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Paris 1992. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A. S. Van Der Woude, Vol. XV. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Broshi, Magen, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.
- . "The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll", Shanks 113-115.
- Burgmann, H. "The Sadducean Torah." Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies*. 257-263.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations vol.1 Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, ed. James H. Charlesworth. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- . *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Toronto: Doubleday, vol 1, 1983. vol.2, 1985
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd. Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- . "The Historical Context of the Scrolls". Shanks 20-34.
- Davies, Philip R. *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Brown Judaic Series 94, ed. Jacob Neusner. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.



- De Vaux, Roland. *Ancient Israel Its Life and Institutions*. Trans. John McHugh. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961.
- . *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Schweich Lectures 1959. London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1973.
- . *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.
- Dimant, Devorah and Uriel Rappaport, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van Der Woude. vol. X. New York: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Dimant, Dvorah, Schiffman, Lawrence H., eds. *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van Der Woude, Vol. XVI. New York: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- Douglas, Mary. *Implicit Meanings, Essays in Anthropology*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.
- . *Purity and Danger, An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Trans. Joseph Ward Swain. New York: The Free Press, 1965.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings* Second Edition. New York: Oxford, 2000.
- Eisenman, Robert H., Wise, Michael. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. New York: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Evans, Craig E. and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Martin G. Abegg, Jr. and Peter W. Flint, General Editors. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- Flanders, Henry Jackson, Crapps, Robert Wilson, Smith, David Anthony. *People of the Covenant: An Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Frey, J.B. *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions*. Rome, Pontifical Institute 1936, repr. New York: KTAV, 1975.
- Garcia Martinez, F. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*. Trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Gartner, Bertil. *The Temple and The Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

- Gavin, F. *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*. New York: KTAV Publishing House Inc., 1969.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1973.
- Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Goldin, Judah, trans. *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*. Yale Judaica Series, vol X. Ed. Julian Obermann. New Have: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Goodenough, E.R. *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York: Pantheon-Bollingen, 1956-1968.
- Gottwald, Norman K. *The Hebrew Bible, a Socio-Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Gray, George Buchanan. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament Its Theory and Practice*. The Library of Biblical Studies Hary M. Orlinsky ed. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1971.
- Habermas, Jurgen. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Translated and with an Introduction by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Jay, Nancy. *Throughout Your Generations Forever Sacrifice Religion and Paternity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Kampen, John, Moshe J. Bernstein, eds. *Reading 4QMMT New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Symposium Series Society of Biblical Literature. Gail R. O'Day, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." Selection from "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities," *American Sociological Review* 33 (August, 1968): 499-517. Rpt. in *Society's Shadow: Studies in the Sociology of Countercultures*. Kenneth Westhues. 49-71.
- Kister, Menahem. "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah", *Barrera and Montaner* 571-588.
- Koester, Helmut. *Intoduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Leaney, A.R.C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*. London: SCM Press LTD, 1966.
- Levine, Baruch A. *In the Presence of the Lord A study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, ed. Jacob Neusner, Vol. Five. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

—. "Prolegomenon" Gray vii-xliv.

Lightstone, Jack N. *Commerce of the Sacred: Mediation of the Divine in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora*. Program in Judaic Studies Brown University, Brown Judaic Studies ed. Jacob Neusner et al. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1984.

—. *The Rhetoric of the Babylonian Talmud, Its Social Meaning and Context*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism / Etudes sur le christianisme et le judaïsme: 6. Waterloo: Published for the Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion / Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses by Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1994.

—. *Society, the Sacred, and Scripture in Ancient Judaism, A Sociology of Knowledge*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism no. 3. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1988.

Mack, Burton. "Introduction: Religion and Ritual". *Violent Origins* Walter Burkert, Rene Girard, and Jonathan Z. Smith on Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation. Ed. Robert G. Hamerton-Kelly. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1987.

Maier, Johann. "The Architectural History of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Light of the Temple Scroll." Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies* 23-62.

—. *The Temple Scroll An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. Trans. Richard T. White. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 34. Ed. David J.A. Clines and Philip R. Davies. Sheffield England: JSOT Press, 1985.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Cult and Conscience: The 'Asham' and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, ed. Jacob Neusner. Volume 18. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

—. "4QTohora: An Unpublished Qumran Text on Purities." Dimmatt and Schiffman 59-68.

Milik, J.T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Studies in Biblical Theology 26. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Neusner, Jacob. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. The 'Haskel Lectures, 1972-1973. With a Critique and Commentary by Mary Douglas. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity From the First to the Seventh Century, ed. Jacob Neusner. Volume One. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

Neusner, Jacob, ed. *Understanding Rabbinic Judaism From Talmudic to Modern Times*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1974.  
—. *The Mishnah, A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Neusner, Jacob, ed. *Understanding Rabbinic Judaism From Talmudic to Modern Times*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1974.

*The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocryphal / Deuterocanonical Books*. New Revised Standard Version.  
Ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Qimron, Elisha, John Strugnell. "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran". Amitai 400-407
- Seltzer, Robert M. *Jewish People, Jewish Thought: The Jewish Experience in History*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.
- Shanks, Hershel, ed. *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*. New York: Random House, 1992.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Architecture and Law: The Temple and its Courtyards in the *Temple Scroll*." *From Ancient Israel to Modern Judaism, Intellect in Quest of Understanding*. Essays in Honor of Marvin Fox Vol. One, ed. Jacob Neusner et. al. Brown Judaic Studies 159. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, No. 38, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the Temple Scroll". Reuben Ahroni, ed. *Hebrew Annual Review vol.9, 1985 Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of S.D. Goiten*. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Language and Literatures, The Ohio State University, 1986. 301-320.
- . "The Furnishings of the Temple According to the *Temple Scroll*", Barrera and Montaner, 621-634.
- . *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 16. Ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Foreword by Chaim Potok. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994.
- . "The Sadducean Origin of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect". Shanks 35-49.
- . *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. Brown Judaic Studies 33, ed. Jacob Neusner. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . "The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of Its Law: The Status of the Question". Ulrich and VanderKam 37-46.
- . "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period." Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies* 239-254.
- Silberman, Neil Asher. *The Hidden Scrolls: Christianity, Judaism, & the War for the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1994.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Institutions of Israel in the *Temple Scroll*" Dimant and Rappaport 156-185.

- . "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran." Brooke, *Temple Scroll Studies* 123-148.
- . "The Origins of the Temple Scroll" *Congress Volume Jerusalem 1986*. Ed. J.A. Emerton. Suppl. to VT 40. New York: E.J.Brill, 1988. 235-256.
- . "Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah - Lost for 2,500 Years?" Shanks 126-136.
- Strugnell, John. "MMT. Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition". Ulrich and VanderKam 57-76.
- Swanson, Dwight D. "A Covenant Just like Jacob's' The Covenant of 11QT 29 and Jeremiah's New Covenant." Brooke and Martinez 273-286.
- Schwartz, D.R. "The Three Temples of 4qFlorilegium." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1979):85-91.
- Thiering, Barbara. "The Date and Composition of the Temple Scroll." Brooke *Temple Scroll Studies* 99-120.
- Throckmorton, Burton H., Jr. ed. *Gospel Parallels A synopsis of the First Three Gospels*. New York: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1967.
- Ulrich, Eugene, and James Vanerkam, eds. *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series, Volume 10. Series ed. Gregory E Sterling. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- . "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?" Shanks 50-62.
- van Genep, Arnold. *The Rites of Passage*. Trans. Monika B. Vizedom and Gabrielle L. Caffee. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English Revised and Extended Fourth Edition*. Toronto: Penguin Books, 1995.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The Dawn of Qumran The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
- . "Ezekiel and Ezekielianism as Progenitors of Essianism." Dimant and Rappaport 186-196.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.

Wentling, Judith L. "Unraveling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community." *Revue de Qumran* No. 53, Tome 14 (June 1989): 61-73.

Westhues, Kenneth. *Society's Shadow: Studies in the Sociology of Countercultures*. Montreal: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1972.

Wilson, A.M., Wills, L. "Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll." *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982):275-288

Wise, Michael O. "The Covenant of *Temple Scroll* XXIX, 3-10." *Revue de Qumran* No. 53, Tome 14 (June 1989): 49-60.

---. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.

---. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *Revue de Qumran* No.57-58, Tome 15, (September 1991): 103-132.

Yadin, Yigael. *The Message of the Scrolls*. New York:Simon & Schuster, 1957.

---. *The Temple Scroll* 3 Volumes. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Shrine of The Book, 1983.

---. *The Temple Scroll The Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. New York: Random House, 1985.

---."The Temple Scroll-The Longest Dead Sea Scroll". Shanks 87-112.

## Appendix 1

### 1. Bertil Gartner's *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*

When I first came across Bertil Gartner's book *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* I dismissed it as one of the corpus of studies attempting to connect the Dead Sea Scrolls with early Christianity, a very interesting topic but not particularly relevant for my present study. It was not until I read Judith L. Wentling's article "Unravelling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community," unfortunately after finishing my dissertation, that I realized that a large part of Gartner's book was concerned with the perception of the Community, as prescribed in the sectarian scrolls, as Temple. It is therefore appropriate and necessary in this appendix, which was intended to briefly discuss the different approaches to and uses made of Temple symbolism by other second Temple Jewish groups, to include a discussion of Gartner's book.

Gartner, in writing this book, did not have access to the *Temple Scroll* a fact which makes it all the more interesting that he reached the conclusions which he did. His understanding of the Community prescribed in the sectarian scrolls is not that different from mine. He explains that this is a community which understands itself as Temple and for whom the offerings of prayer and way of life have the same significance as well as end results as the Temple sacrifices. He explains:

the community's concentration on the Law must not be allowed to obscure the importance of the ideology connected with the temple and the cultus. For the community did not consider itself to have broken with the temple and the cultus in all its forms; instead they transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem

temple to the community. This undoubtedly meant that some measure of 'spiritualization' had taken place, since the idea of the temple was now linked with the community, and since the temple worship was now performed through the community's observance of the Law and through its own liturgy and cultus. *The use of the word 'spiritualization' must not be taken to mean that the 'temple' which was the community was thought of any less realistically than the Jerusalem temple, or that the community's life of obedience to the Law was considered to be any less real than the blood sacrifices.* The word is used to indicate the transference of the concrete entity, the temple building, to a more 'spiritual' realm in the living community, and of the sacrifice of deeds in the life according to the Law (18-19 italics are added).

The above is indeed very similar to the conclusions I arrived at in the previous pages. He indicates, as did I, that the polemic directed against the Temple in Jerusalem is not directed against the cult *as cult* but rather against those who are controlling the cult and the Temple. He also compares this to the attitude of the prophetic books of Hebrew Scripture within which the cult itself *as cult* is not attacked but rather "any form of temple service which fails to take account of justice and righteousness according to the demands of the Law" (46).

There are also a few differences between his conclusions and mine. Principal among these is his understanding that "(t)his complex of ideas seems to have applied only to the interim period preceding the final re-establishment by God of the temple and its cult, once all his enemies had been overcome" (21). I, as already explained, do not understand the life of the Community as an 'interim' accommodation. Rather the life of the Community as sacrifice is equal to the blood sacrifice of the physical Temple cult. As such both will be continued



even in the eschaton because both types of sacrifice are necessary for the fulfilment of the Law of the Torah. The difference between Gartner's explanation and mine stems from our different understandings of the use made by the sectarian scrolls of the concept of the 'Law'. According to Gartner (using Wenschkewitz, *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe*, Angelos-Beiheft IV (1932), 22f.) the Temple cult and the Law represent two different foci within the history of Judaism. The latter, according to this view, begins to gain prominence as the Temple and its cult become more spiritualized:

The Law came gradually to occupy a more prominent position, resulting in a diminution of the influence of the priests and the emergence of the scribes as the leaders of the people. This alteration in the balance of power provides one of the reasons why the destruction of the temple proved less of a catastrophe for Jewish religion than might have been expected: the scribes - the expositors of the Torah - were thereby given the chance of developing and extending their influence. This development from the Maccabaeen age down to the Rabbinic period was closely followed by a spiritualizing of the temple and the terms of the cultus (18).

The above explanation may be relevant in explaining the shift to Rabbinic Judaism. To use it to explain the understanding of the relationship between Law and Temple cult in the sectarian scrolls is to try to understand one group by categories relevant to another. Gartner to some extent does this. He continues throughout his study to perceive the Law and the Temple cult as two different foci. In fact the two are indistinguishable in the sectarian scrolls, a reflection of the world-view introduced in the *Temple Scroll*.

He adds to his discussion of the relationship between Law and Temple cult something with which I agree:

The reason why the community, though isolated from Jerusalem, did not wholly

abandon the temple ideal seems to have been that the entire fulfilment of the Law - the condition on which victory in the final conflict depended - demanded the fulfilment of the Law in respect to the temple as well (21).

In my discussion of the Community as prescribed by the sectarian scrolls I have explained that the "entire fulfilment of the Law", both cult and covenant, is necessary.

## 2. The Use of Temple Symbolism and Imagery by Other Second Temple Jewish Groups

Gartner's ultimate aim is to show the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christianity. He attempts to connect these two ideologies early on in his discussion of the 'spiritual' sacrifices made by the Community:

When we speak of the 'sacrifices' offered through the works of the Law this is not merely a metaphor; both actual and 'spiritual' sacrifices were regarded as being equally 'real' in the eyes of God. The problem recurs in the N.T. (45, note 2).

His concern here is that "the Pauline sacrificial terminology" will be regarded "as no more than an extended metaphor" (45, note 2). In his desire to show the connection between the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christianity Gartner sometimes performs a disservice to the scrolls. The evidence of this is often subtle but, nonetheless present. One example is in relation to the above cited reference. In this very section of his discussion he makes a statement which, although not inaccurate, speaks of the demands made by the scrolls in categories which originate in Pauline Christianity, thus, perhaps, suggesting more of an association between the two than can be supported by the evidence. He says, in reference to the prescriptions of the scrolls, "(t)he works of the Law were useless without an inward turning to God" (45). Strictly speaking, for the sectarian scrolls, it is the works of the *cult* which are "useless without an inward turning to God" (i.e 1QS 3:4-5; 5:13-14). Also,

strictly speaking, for the sectarian scrolls the following is just as true: an inward turning to God is useless without the "works of the Law". The "works of the Law", if such a term can be used in discussing the sectarian scrolls, is the "Way of the Lord", the Community's interpretation of the covenant, and implies a "turning to God":

- 15     This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through  
Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time  
to time,  
16     and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his Holy Spirit.  
No man of the men of the Community of the covenant of  
17     the Community, who *strays from any one of the ordinances* deliberately  
may touch the pure-food of the men of holiness  
18     nor know any of their counsel, until his works have become purified from  
all deceit by walking with those perfect of the Way (1QS 8:15-18  
Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 37, italics are added).

In the same scroll we are also told:

- 9     ...May he establish his steps for walking perfectly  
10    in all God's ways, as he commanded at the appointed times of his fixed  
times, and not turn aside, to the right or to the left, *and not*  
11    *transgress a single one of his commands* (1QS 3:9-10 Charlesworth, *The*  
*Dead Sea Scrolls*, 15, italics are added).

And,

- 20    ...And they shall examine  
21    their spirits within the Community, between (each) man and his neighbor  
according to his insight and his *works in the Torah*, under the authority of  
the Sons of Aaron who dedicate themselves within the Community to  
establish

22 his covenant and to observe all his statutes which he commanded to do  
(1QS 5:20-22 Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 25, italics are added).

The possible dichotomy between "works of the Law" and "turning to God" originates largely from within Pauline Christianity and can not accurately be used to describe the intent of the prescriptions of the scrolls. Prayer and acts of righteousness are not sufficient in themselves to effect the ritual of atonement as prescribed in the *Community Rule*. It is necessary that these offerings be made within a Community which lives in a very tangible and concrete way according to a very stringent interpretation of the laws of ritual purity. This entire "complex of ideas" can be termed "works in the Torah".

To attempt to provide an exploration of the Temple symbolism in the New Testament would of necessity include a book by book investigation. Such an investigation is beyond the immediate scope of the present study. That the image of the Temple and Temple symbolism is not only evident but essential to early Christianity cannot surprise us. The importance of the Temple is evident in all the gospels, not only by the explicit words and actions relating to it which are attributed to Jesus but also by the very fact that all of them present Jesus' journey as necessarily ending there. The attack made in the gospels against the Temple and its cult is similar in intent to the one made in the sectarian scrolls, in other words it is not the Temple *as Temple* or the cult *as cult* which is being attacked but rather the misuse of these by the authorities at the time.

Jacob Neusner, in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*, has explained in reference to Second Temple Jewish groups:

Every important sect had to define its relationship to the Temple, and one predominant question concerned actually keeping or not keeping the purity laws,

making them into a metaphor for the ethical life, or otherwise reinterpreting them (33).

This is as good a point of reference as any in coming to terms with the use made of Temple symbolism and imagery by these groups. The Community of the sectarian scrolls, as we have already discussed, identified itself as the Temple and adopted the Temple purity laws in a concrete way in its own life. The early Christian world, as is evident from its literature, also adopted Temple symbolism. Neusner explains:

For Paul in I Cor. 3:16-17 the Church is the new Temple. Christ is the foundation of the 'spiritual' building. The deuteropauline Ephesians 2:18ff. has Christ as the corner-stone of the new building, the company of Christians constituting the Temple. It is within this context that the role of purity in early Christianity is to be interpreted (59).

However, despite the concept of the community of early Christians or the Church as Temple the application of Temple and cult symbolism and imagery is not adopted by early Christianity in the same way as in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This has a lot to do with each group's understanding of the Law. As we saw in the sectarian scrolls every commandment of the Torah is interpreted very literally and concretely as absolutely necessary. In early Christianity we find a different interpretation of the requirements of the Torah. The requirements concerning ritual purity begin to be interpreted metaphorically as moral as opposed to physical demands. Jacob Neusner discusses this in relation to the gospels, in particular to Mark 7 as well as Matthew 15 (61-62). Both these sources discuss the requirement of the ritual washing of hands before eating. Neusner concludes his discussion of these with the following, as understood by the two gospels: "Washing was never part of God's will - the Torah; unclean food was part of the Torah but was meant to teach a moral lesson, and not to be interpreted in a literal way" (62). The same can be said of the gospel

of Luke. Particularly evident examples of just such an understanding are the Epistle to the Hebrews (63), already mentioned, as well as the Epistle of Barnabas. In both cases the purity laws are understood metaphorically. But even Paul betrays such an understanding because for Paul in the end the Law is Love. Paul's Letter to the Romans illustrates his understanding of the "true" Law. In this Letter he uses the word Law sometimes in the traditional Jewish understanding and sometimes to introduce a new interpretation. For example in 3:31 he says: "Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law." It is in chapters 12 and 13 of this Letter that he fully explains what this new understanding of Law is. He explains:

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for the one who loves has fulfilled the law. / The commandments, 'You shall not commit adultery; you shall not murder; You shall not steal; You shall not covet'; and any other commandment, are summed up in this word, 'Love your neighbor as yourself.' / Love does no wrong to a neighbor, love is the fulfilling of the law (13:8-10).

The tendency of the New Testament, therefore, is a move away from the literal interpretation of Temple, ritual purity and Law in general and towards a metaphorical one where Law still exists but it is enacted through ethical actions and intentions.

Rabbinic Judaism presents a different interpretation again. Rabbinic Judaism retains Temple symbolism and imagery as do the other two groups. Neusner explains that the Pharisees, a pre-Rabbinic group which influenced early Rabbinic Judaism, believed that, even outside of the Temple, in one's own home, a person had to follow the laws of purity in the only circumstance in which they might apply, namely, at the table. They therefore held one must eat his secular food *as if one were a Temple priest*. The Pharisees thus arrogated to themselves - and to all Jews equally - the status of

the Temple priests and did the things which priests must do on account of that status. The table of every Jew in his home was seen to be like the table of the Lord in the Jerusalem Temple. The commandment, 'You shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation,' was taken literally. The whole country was holy (Neusner, *Purity* 65-66).

The movement that developed into Rabbinic Judaism "affirmed the Torah as the continuing and permanently valid will of God" (Neusner, *Purity* 107). Neusner in contrasting Paul and the rabbis explains that Paul "did not believe the laws of the Torah remained valid as a mode of salvation. And every rabbi believed exactly that" (Neusner, *Purity* 107). Neusner's explanation of Judaism after the destruction of the Temple adds to the above discussion.

He says:

Rabbinic Judaism claimed that it was possible to serve God not only through sacrifice, but also through study of Torah. There is a priest in charge of the life of the community - but a new priest, the rabbi. The old sin offerings still may be carried out, through deeds of loving kindness (*Understanding* 12-13).

In Rabbinic Judaism the Laws of the Torah are retained in full, even supplemented. But these are applied to a community which, even though ideally is perceived as "a nation of priests," in reality is made up, in large part, of lay-people. The sectarian scrolls of the Dead Sea, especially the *Community Rule*, assume a community of "religious virtuosi" (to use Weber's term). The early Christian literature retains the *Law* of the Torah but not, in its understanding, the *laws*.

That the world-view of Temple and cult were fundamental to self understanding for all Second Temple Jewish groups is made evident by each group's attempt to define itself and

to create its community in ways which both mirror and assume just such a world-view. It is the ways of interpreting this world-view and applying it to the group's lived reality which changes.



## Appendix 2

Jacob Neusner in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Israel* has briefly introduced the topic of the actual, as opposed to metaphorical, impurity which results from covenantal infringements in the sectarian scrolls. He explains:

The second innovation in the *yahad's* view of purity seems to me entirely without parallel. Its importance was pointed out to me by Prof. A.R.C. Leaney, Nottingham University, in a lecture at Brown University. The *yahad's* laws treat committing a sin not as a metaphor for becoming unclean, but as an actual source of uncleanness. If one transgresses any part of the law, he is excluded from the "Purity" of the sect. It is not *as if* he were unclean, as with the biblical metaphor. He is *actually* unclean and requires a rite of purification (54).