1. The Higher Status of the Levites

Of the many innovations found in the recently published Temple Scroll, the higher status accorded the Levites is one of the more startling, for it goes far beyond the status the Levites possessed at any time during their history and even beyond the idealistic demands of the Bible itself. The references to the Levites in the Temple Scroll are as follows:

(1) The central gate of the eastern sides of the middle and outer courts is named for the Levites (39:12; 40:14). The priests (and Moses) were encamped in this position in the wilderness camp (Num 3:38).

(2) Three sections of chambers are assigned to the three families that comprise the tribe of Levi (Kohath, Gershon, and Merari), the priests received two sections and the tribes one apiece (44). The location of the levitical chambers are in accord with the position of the levitical families in the wilderness camp (Num 3:23, 29, 35).

(3) It is the first of the tribes to have the privilege of offering sacrifices on the Wood Offering festival (23:9–24:11). Again, there is no biblical precedent: the tribe of Levi never appears in a ritual in consort with other tribes nor does it ever appear first in a tribal list.

(4) During the New Wine and New Oil festivals, one pair of the fourteen lambs and fourteen rams is given to the Levites, one for the priest and one for each tribe (21:1; 22:12). Since Levi is also one of the twelve tribes — Manasseh and Ephraim always being subsumed under Joseph in the scroll — it follows that Levi receives a double portion of the sacrifices. There is no biblical support for either the sacrifices or the Levites’ share.

(5) The word “Levites” is inserted into the citation for Deut 19:17 so that judges will be chosen from Levites as well as priests (61:8–9). There is

---


2 It is not insignificant that according to Jubilees, whose doctrinal similarities to the teachings of Qumran are well-known, the patriarch Isaac blessed Levi with his right hand and Judah with his left (Jub. 31:13), thereby indicating that the chief blessing, perhaps even primogeniture, was imparted to Levi (cf. T. Judah 21:2; Gen 48:17–21). This would also explain why Levi followed by Judah are the first two tribes to offer sacrifices during the Wood Offering festival (no. 3, above) as well as why the Aaronic messiah precedes the Davidic messiah in Qumran protocol (e.g. 4QSa 2:11–12).
no variant reading in the versions that might posit another Vorlage for this addition. Possibly, the author of the scroll deduced from another deuteronomistic verse dealing with the judiciary, Deut 17:9 (and reading reading, "the priests or the Levites"; cf. Syr.; also 56:1), that the Levites must be included in the judiciary.

(6) There is equal representation for priests, Levites and Israelites in the king’s cabinet whose decisions he is enjoined to obey (57:12–15). There is no biblical warrant.1

(7) The levitical perquisites are: the first tithe, the shoulder of the well-being offering, one hundredth of the spoil and hunt, one tenth of the wild honey, one fiftieth of the wild doves (60:6–9) and two pairs of the fourteen lambs and fourteen rams offered on the New Wine and New Oil festivals (see above). The first tithe and the share of the spoil is ordained by Scripture (Num 18:21–24; 31:30), the others are innovations. However, historical evidence certifies that the priests had preempted the levitical tithe at some point during the Second Temple period (Yebam. 86b; cf. Jub. 13:24–26) and there is no record that the law of the spoil was ever observed. Thus every item in the perquisites listed by the scroll for the Levites would have constituted an innovation for its day. The most radical innovation, however, is the assignment of the shoulder of the well-being offering to the Levites. Neither is the shoulder ever considered a sacred portion nor are the Levites ever awarded sacrificial flesh. The sect’s ruling can be shown to be based on its interpretation of Deut 18:1–3.4

(8) Levites perform the sacrificial slaughter in the regular cult (22:4).5 Here too the scroll polemicizes against contemporary temple practice. Early in the Second Temple period, sacrificial slaughter at least, on occasion,6 had been performed by the Levites (cf. Ezek 44:10–11; 2 Chr 30:17; 35:6, 10–11). However, toward the end of this period, at the time of the scroll, the slaughtering was performed by the priests. Though the later rabbinic rulings declare that slaughtering may be done by a non-priest (e.g., m. Zebah 3:1), in practice, only priests perform the slaughtering (cf. m. Yoma 2:3; m. Mid. 4:7; 1

---

1 It may have been modeled on the Chronicler’s conception of Jehoshaphat’s central tribunal (2 Chr 19:5–11); cf. J. M. Baumgarten’s study of 4QpHab. “The Decennial Courts of Qumran, Revelation and the Sanhedrin,” JBL 95 (1976) 59–78.


3 For this reason I differ with Yadin who places the house of slaughter within the inner wall of the inner court (3, 159, fig. 9), an area out of bounds to the Levites. Moreover, the scroll itself stipulates that the “most sacred” area of the inner court encompasses the altar, the sanctuary, the laver, and the stoa (35:8–9); by inference the house of slaughter is excluded. Zeckel solved this problem by prescribing that the sacrificial slaughter take place on tables set outside of or within the northern inner gate (Lek 40:38–42), an arrangement by which the Levites were still excluded from the inner court. However, that the Temple Scroll still ordains that the Levites perform the sacrificial slaughter in the house of slaughter, presumably located inside the inner court (but outside the inner wall), constitutes a major concession.

4 Cf. J. Lauer, Chapters in the History of the Priests and Levites (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1968), 223 (Heb.).
b. Ketub. 106a) Thus the scroll’s assignment of the sacrificial slaughter to the Levites constitutes an innovation.

(9) Most significant of all: Levites are assigned priestly functions. Since the sect had the Levites pronounce the curses during the annual initiation rites for new members (1QS 2:5) — a function derived from Deut 27:14 — it also may have deduced for the Levites the equal right to pronounce the blessing (1QS 1:18–20, despite 1QS 6:5; IQSa 2:19–20). Moreover, it would have had a specific biblical verse to support this claim: “At that time, the Lord set apart the tribe of Levi . . . to bless in His name” (Deut 10:8, cf. 18:5 LXX; Sam). The designation of “the tribe of Levi” can only mean that all Levites have the inalienable right to offer the blessing.8 True, as non-priests, Levites are forbidden at pain of death to gain access to the altar (34:4–9) but presumably they might pronounce the blessing elsewhere in the sacred precincts.9 The scroll also assigns Levites the duty πως, which, however, in this case can only mean “assist” (cf. 60:14; Num 18:2).10

Thus the Levites have been elevated to a status which further separates them from the laity by being assigned new perquisites from sacrifices and offerings and totally new judicial and cultic duties, including at least one heretofore held exclusively by the priests.

The quantity and thrust of these innovative rules are not the product of abstract speculation but are a polemic whose historical background can readily be discerned. It is a protest against the Wicked Priest (Jonathan Maccabees?) who usurped the high priesthood and displaced the true Zadokite line.11 At some point, the priests had usurped the levitical tithe and the levitic role as sacrificial slaughterers; the scroll demands their restoration to the Levites. The scroll also insists that the foreleg portion assigned to the priests from the sacrifices does not include the shoulder (20:14–16; 21:02–05;


9 Strikingly, the Chronicler omits the words “and to bless in His name” from his quotation of Deut 10:8 (1 Chr 15:2), an indication that in the Chronicler’s time, the priests continued to fulfill the exclusive function of offering the blessing (cf. 1 Chr 23:13).


11 Even the rabbis distinguish between the priestly blessing and the other rites performed by the priests by allowing blessed priests to offer the blessing (t. Sota 7:8) even though they must ascend the inner court of the temple, an area otherwise forbidden to them (m. Kelim 1:9). Also, the priestly blessing, in contradistinction to other rites, could be offered in the city of Jerusalem outside the temple (m. Sota 7:9).

12 However, the possibility must be entertained that ρως means “to obliterate,” i.e., that the Levites had the right, at least theoretically, to obliterate in the altar. The scriptural basis for sharing this ultimate priestly prerogative with the Levites would, then, have been: “The priests and (with Vg. Syr.) the Levites and the sons of Zadok . . . they shall offer to me sust and blood” (Ezek 44:15; cf. CG 3:21–42).

II. *The Shoulder for the Levites and the ינשאכ

Yadin differs with me on my interpretation of the levitical prebend of the shoulder from the well-being offering in three minor points:

1) Whereas I contend that the author of the scroll derived the need to provide the Levites sacrificial flesh from Deut 18:1, and the whole tribe of Levi... shall live only off the Lord's fire offerings,” Yadin proposes an alternate source: the term יְסֵם, “portion.” Though in the Pentateuch it refers solely to the priestly prebends of the thigh and chest of the well-being offering (Exod 29:26; Lev 7:33; 8:29), in the postexilic literature it exhibits a wider range (2 Chr 31:4-6; cf. Neh 12:44; 13:10). Hence, when the scroll refers to the shoulder as a ינשאכ of the Levites (21:02-05; 22:8-11), it has this late biblical usage in mind (1. 122).

2) I have contended that the entire foreleg was viewed as a sacred portion for the deity in the ancient Near East, but the scroll ordains that the יינשאכ assigned to the priest (Deut 18:3) does not include the uppermost part of the foreleg, the shoulder, which is reserved for the Levites. On the other hand, Yadin argues (1. 123-24) that the author of the scroll could not assign the Levites a portion not specified in the Torah. He therefore required of the priests to give a part of their prebend, the shoulder or the upper part of the animal’s foreleg, to the Levites. Hence, this priestly portion is called ינשאכ, “the foreleg until the shoulder bone” (20:16), implying that the entire foreleg is called יינשאכ. Abetting this interpretation is the designation of the Levites’ portion as ינשאכ הדפסי, וּגְפָּרוּ בָּנָי, “the shoulder which remains from the foreleg” (21:04).

3) Since the time Yadin graciously showed me the four citations dealing with the shoulder (20:14-16; 21:02-05; 22:8-11; 60:6-7), he has restored in one text the word ינשאכ (22:9) which he interprets to mean that the foreleg, cheek and stomach assigned to the priests (Deut 18:3) and the shoulder to the Levites only stem from the ינשאכ, “the first fruits” well-being offering, i.e., only from the well-being offering sacrificed on the First Fruits festivals but not from any other well-being offering (1.121). The term ינשאכ is to be associated with the first fruits in Num 18:12-13 and it is included in the same context of the shoulder both in the Bible (Deut 18:4) and the Mishnah (Hil. 11:1; Nid. 6:7).

---

1. J. Milgrom, “A Shoulder for the Levites.”

2. I cite the usual translation for ינשאכ, however, see the NEB, following J. Hoffmeier, “Das sogennante Ledeveeck,” VTSup 16 (1967) 114-34; G. R. Driver, “Ugaritic and Hebrew Words,” Ugaritic 6 (1928) 181-84.

3. The verse (1.132) should be corrected to ינשאכ הדפסי.

I shall reply to his points seriatim:

(1) The term נֵזֶב in the Bible, even in the later books, never refers to sacrificial flesh. In 2 Chr 31:4-6 the levitical נֵזֶב is clearly the תֵּית רֹאשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל, “the tithe from everything.” In Nehemiah, the “Torah’s portions” (12:44) for the Levites can only refer to the “tithes” (ibid.) since the same pericope speaks of the Levites “sanctifying (from their portions) for the Aaronides” (12:47) which can only refer to the tithe the Levites are required to set aside for the priests from own tithes (Nun 18:25-32). The remaining mention of the levitical נֵזֶב, Neh 13:10, clearly refers back to v 5 and forward to v 12, both of which specify the portion assigned to the Levites as their tithes. Thus the term נֵזֶב in reference to the Levites is limited solely to tithes; it never refers to any sacrificial flesh, much less to the foreleg of the well-being offering.

(2) From the start it was obvious to me that the language שלֶשֶׁת הַלְוֵיָּהּ (21:04) would favor the interpretation that the shoulder is part of the לֶשֶׁת. I chose, however, to render the preposition ℌ “apart from, without,” even though this meaning is infrequent (e.g., Isa 22:3; Jer 48:45; Job 21:9), for more compelling reasons. The Bible explicitly assigns the לֶשֶׁת to the priests (Deut 18:3). I submit that it would be inconceivable for the author of the scroll, a literalist in the interpretation of Scripture, to dare reduce the divinely ordained priestly revenue in order to benefit the Levites. His only recourse would have been to define the לֶשֶׁת as extending as far as the shoulder, thereby freeing the shoulder for the Levites. Furthermore, he also had to contend with the other portions assigned to the priests in the same verse, the cheeks and the stomach (Deut 18:3). By all counts, these portions are meagre, if not miserable. How then could the entire foreleg, including the shoulder—one of the richest meats of the animal—be assigned to the priests? Thus in keeping with the modesty of the cheeks and stomach, the author reduced the size of the לֶשֶׁת to encompass only a small portion of the animal’s flesh.

(3) The attempt to apply the term לֶשֶׁת to the well-being offerings of the First Fruits festivals is singularly unsuccessful. The term לֶשֶׁת in Nun 18:12 refers both to the first and best of the wheat, grapes and olives which have been processed into grain, must and oil. The first fruits of Deut 18:4 is a discrete gift and has no connection with the foreleg mentioned in the previous verse. As for the rabbinic citations, the first shearing of the sheep is mentioned together with the gift of the foreleg for the reason peculiar only to the early rabbis who hold that both gifts do not stem from sacrifices but from profusely slaughtered animals. Finally, and most important of all, the phrase

---

1 This key phrase is missing in Yadin’s text.

2 On the significance of the presence of the root לֶשֶׁת in Nun 18:25-32 and its absence everywhere else in connection with the Levites in the priestly writings, see J. Milgrom, Studies in Levitical Terminology, 29 in. 103; idem, Cult and Conscience (Lundt, 1981), 57.

3 In truth, the plain meaning of לֶשֶׁת would seem to be the part of the leg below the knee, i.e., the shank, in accordance with the view of R. Judah (in Hal. 10:4).

4 Cf. provisionally, J. Milgrom, “First Fruits, OT” IDBSup, 316-31.
lays to rest any doubt that the shoulder for the Levites is taken from every well-being offering. The passage in which this phrase is found deals with a summary of the priestly and levitical prebends and no qualification whatsoever is placed on the source of the shoulder for the Levites. דמלת הבנייה is an idiom clearly borrowed from Deut 18:3 שאש ל electrónico מנהaned דמלת הבנייה. The almost verbatim repetition of this clause in 1 Sam 2:13 is further corroboration that the reference is to all sacrifices brought to the sanctuary whose flesh is eaten by the offerer. This can be nothing else but the offering of well-being in all its forms.

### III. The Purpose of the דמלת הבנייה of the Inner Court

You shall fashion a place west of the sanctuary and of equal length, a colonnaded stoa for (animals reserved for) purgation and reparation offerings so that the purgation offerings of the priests, the he-goats, the purgation offerings of the people and their reparation offerings will be kept apart from each other and one kind will not mix with the other. Indeed, their locations shall be separate from each other in order that the priests shall not err with any of the purgation offerings of the people or with any of these reparation offerings for which they will bear grievous sin (33:10-15).

Among the unusual installations prescribed by the Temple Scroll for the inner court of the temple compound is the דמלת הבנייה or stoa, the colonnaded structure to the west of the sanctuary, whose purpose, as expressed in the above citation, is to keep apart the purgation offerings of the priests and the he-goats from the purgation offerings of the people and their reparation offerings. The four enumerated sacrifices need be clarified.

1. **Purgation offerings of the priests.** These must refer to the purgation offerings brought on behalf of the priests. Their cause may be the inadvertent wrong of the individual priest, requiring a female of the flock or a bird (Lev 4:27-35; 5:1-13) or the inadvertent wrongdoing of the high priest, requiring a bull (Lev 4:3-12) or the ritual for a specific occasion such as the purgation bull sacrificed on behalf of the priests at the annual priestly consecration (Lev 8:14-17; cf. 11Q Temple 15:18-16:03) and the purgation call offered on behalf of the priests at the initiation of the tabernacle cult (Lev 9:8-11). Some of these sacrifices are burned outside the camp (cf. Lev 4:12; 8:17; 9:11)—though normally they would constitute a priestly perquisite (Lev 6:19, 22; cf. 10:18)—either because it is improper for the priests to benefit from sacrifices brought for their own wrongdoing or because the blood of the purgation animal is used to purify the sanctuary (Lev 6:23; 10:18).

---

1. The absence of the priest (but not the high priest) from the list of individuals who bring the purgation offerings (Lev 4:1, 5:13) can only mean that the priest is subject to the same procedures as the Levites.
2. It is nowhere explicit but can be inferred from Lev 6:16, 9:11, etc.
(2) *He-goats.* These clearly refer to the purgation offerings required in the fixed cult of the calendar year for the inauguration of the public cult, new moons and festivals (Lev 9:3; Num 28:15, 22, 30, 29:4, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38; cf. 11 Q Temple 4:18; 17:13–15; 18:4 6; 25:5 6; etc.). They can also include the purgation offering of the *šâwûli*, the tribal chieftain (Lev 4:22–26) and of the individual (according to Num 15:24–26). The he-goats are eaten by the priests since they are brought on behalf of the Israelites (Lev 10:10–18; Ant. 3:249; cf. m. Men. 11:7; Men. 100a).

(3) *Purgation offerings of the people.* These refer to the purgation offerings of the individual Israelite brought for inadvertent wrongdoing (Lev 4:27–35; 5:1–13) or for severe ritual impurity (birth, Lev 12:6–8; leprosy, Lev 14:10, 19, 30; gonorrhea, Lev 15:14–15, 29–30, etc.). These animals are either males of the flock or birds and are eaten by the priests (Lev 6:19–22). If provision also has to be made for the inadvertent wrongdoing of the entire community, then a bull is set aside which is burned outside the camp (Lev 4:13–21).

(4) *Their separation offerings.* The *šâwûl* is an individual sacrifice brought for inadvertent sacrilege committed either against the Lord's sancta or His name. The sacrificial animal is always a ram or a male lamb and is eaten by the priests (Lev 7:6).

Now it is possible to understand how the priests could make a mistake with purgation offerings. Both they and the people would use the same animals, females of the flock, birds, or bulls, for their personal offerings. Moreover, as noted, the he-goat could be offered either for the community in the regular cult or brought by the chieftain and individual for their individual inadvertence, thereby providing another opportunity for sacrificing the wrong animal. The consequences of admixture would be severe. A sacrifice offered for the wrong party would automatically be invalidated (cf. m. Zebah. 1:1–3). Furthermore, detestation might occur because it would be offered improperly, for it would be possible for a purgation offering to be eaten by the priest when it should have been incinerated and vice-versa.

The author of the scroll would have been quite aware of the dire consequences of such an error, since such a notorious case is cited in the Torah: Aaron and his remaining sons burn the people's purgation offering instead of eating it, bringing down upon them the wrath of Moses (Lev 10:16–20). Moreover, according to the Temple Scroll, the priests are admonished in an explicit statement in the Torah not to allow the admixture of purgation animals. Indeed, the final statement in the above-cited passage (35:13–15) can

---

2The continued existence of the office of chieftain is presumed by the Scroll (cf. 21:5, 42:14, 57:12). The fact that the term *šâwûl* does not modify priests or people as in the case of the purgation offering (cf. *šâwûl* from Exod 31:1) would also indicate the likelihood that it covers more than one category.

3All the separation offerings are discussed in my *Cult and Conscience*

only be understood as the scroll’s exegesis of Lev 22:15-16. The two passages follow side by side:

Lev 22:15-16

Similarly, ... their own sacred donations.

However, the author of the scroll understood this passage differently. He took the particle as a reflexive, referring back to the priests. Indeed, this is precisely how many of the versions understood it (e.g., “so shall they bring upon themselves the iniquity of trespass,” LXX; similarly the targums: Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan and Neofiti). It is also found in early rabbinc exegesis: “. . . this is one of the three occurrences of פשע which R. Ishmael interpreted. By the same token the חטאת פשע (Lev 22:16). Others do not bring it (the punishment) on them; rather, they bring it on themselves” (Sifre Nosha 32).

In keeping with the interpretation of פשע as a reflexive, the author of the scroll would have rendered the Leviticus passage as follows: “The priests shall not deface the sancta of the Israelites . . . by bringing on themselves a grievous sin when they (the priests) eat their (own) sancta.” As indicated, the priests may not eat any of the expiatory sacrifices which they bring on their own behalf. The only way in which such an error could happen would be through the intermingling of the purgation offerings of the priests and people and where the priest mistakenly eats of a priest’s animal, thinking that it belongs to the people. Thus Lev 22:15-16 warns, according to its interpretation by the Temple Scroll, that Aaron’s mistake can happen any time unless steps are taken to keep apart the purgation offerings of the priests and the people.²⁶

According to Yadin’s rendering, the scroll also prescribes that the reparation offerings of the people be segregated from the priests’ purgation animals. However, there is no point in such a ruling. Even if these animals intermingled, there is no chance of error since the reparation animals can only be rams or male lambs from which the purgation offerings may never be taken (cf. m. Zebah 8:2). For the solution to this problem, I propose a different rendering. The antecedent of ה_INCREFה“their reparation offerings” (35:12) is not just the people but also the priests. Thus the reparation animals of the priests and people need be segregated from each other. Indeed, this inter-

²⁶See J. Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, 161-64.
²⁷See now for the case of various repairs in the previous context.
²⁸Is the change from הربح to הربح יבין for the purpose of alluding to the previously mentioned הربح יבין and הربح יבין?
interpretation would correspond to the stated program of the stoas, i.e., the separation of the purgation and the reparation animals. It would also correspond with the end of the passage which I would render “with every purgation offering of the people and with all these reparation offerings,” thus framing the entire passage in an inclusio.

IV. The Consecration of the Priests

Yadin’s interpretation of the rite for the consecration of the priests in the Temple Scroll (1: 76–77 on 15:3-17:5) may be in need of small refinements.

(1) Yadin points to the innovation of the scroll in prescribing that the offerers of the sacrificial ram, i.e., the priestly consecrants, execute the קדשה, the “elevation rite” (15:11), whereas in the biblical text, this rite is performed by the officiating, Moses (Exod 29:24; Lev 8:27). First let it be noted that, on this point, the scroll is truly an exception. In all attested cases of the קדשה, the officiating priest performs the rite. True, the objects undergoing קדשה must be brought by the offerers and, in some cases, the text insists that the priest perform the rite while the objects are still in their hands (e.g., the priestly consecration, Exod 29:24-25; Lev 8:27-28; the Nazirite who has completed his term, Num 6:19-20). However, even in these cases, the priest places his hands under those of the offerer and initiates the elevation. Ostensibly, the breast of the well-being offering is elevated by the offerer himself without the assistance of the priest. However, in the text dealing with this ritual, וְיָהְנָה, referring to the verb must be rendered as a passive (pace Yadin). And the early rabbis and the later Karaites were certainly correct in assuming that in this case too the priest placed his hands under those of the offerer and thereafter executed the elevation (Sifra Zav: 113; Sefer Hama'am, ad. loc.). Thus the scroll’s demand that the offerers—who in this case are priests—perform the elevation by themselves is truly an exception to the rule. How can it be accounted for?

I would suggest that the key to the solution is found in the fact (noted by Yadin) that in the consecration of the high priest the latter begins to officiate as soon as he is consecrated by the blood of the consecration ram (16:6, 14-18). Now it should be observed that the scroll’s account of the priestly consecration is severely truncated and deliberately so. The scroll says nothing about the purgation bull(s) (cf. Exod 29:10-14; Lev 8:14-17), the whole offering ram (cf. Exod 29:16-18; Lev 8:18-21) and what is its most striking omission—the blood ceremonial: the daubing of the blood of the consecration ram upon the extremities of the priests and sprinkling the altar blood upon

---

them and their clothing (cf. Exod 29:19-21; Lev 8:22-24). The scroll only deals with the following section, the sacrifice of the consecration ram (cf. Exod 29:22-25; Lev 8:25-28). The reason for these wholesale omissions is not too difficult to discover.

The author of the scroll wrote down only the parts of the consecration ceremonial which were at variance with the accepted interpretation of the ritual in his own time. In other words, his text is a polemic. This is strikingly evident in the description of the consecration of the high priest, which prescribes the sacrifice of a second purgation bull, a matter that is not explicit in the biblical text. The fact that the priests themselves conduct the elevation rite alone, then, is what constitutes the innovation in their ritual. What basis did the author of the scroll find for it in Scripture?

As noted, the high priest takes over the officiating from the elders of the priests as soon as he is consecrated by the blood of the consecration ram, though in the middle of the ritual. By the same token it can be assumed that the priests consecrates officiate as priests as soon as they are consecrated by the sacrificial blood. Since the biblical text ordains that the blood ceremonial take place before the elevation rite (cf. Exod 29:20-21; 23-24; Lev 8:24, 27) then the priests execute the elevation rite not just as offerers but also as officiants, in agreement with all the other cases of קָטַבִּים which show that the rite is performed by the officiating priest.

It must therefore be presumed that, in disagreement with his contemporaries, the author of the scroll read the biblical prescription for the elevation ritual as follows: וַיָּפֶת אֵלֶּה הָעֵדֶת הַעַרְבָּא נַפְּלֻהַ מָאָר הַצְּלוֹחַ וּכְתַבּוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיָּפֶת אֵלֶּה הָעֵדֶת הַעַרְבָּא וַיָּפֶת אֵלֶּה הָעֵדֶת הַעַרְבָּא וַיָּפֶת אֵלֶּה הָעֵדֶת הַעַרְבָּא. And you shall offer (and he offered) all these on the palms of Aaron and on the palms of his sons and designated them (he designated them) as an elevation offering” (Exod 29:24; Lev 8:27). And he would have had irrefutable biblical support for his rendering. In the induction service for the Levites, Moses again is the subject of the elevation מַקְדֵּשׁ הָיְתָה הַנִּשָּׁפַת (Num 8:13, 15) even though, in actuality, it is Aaron who performs the ritual (Num 8:11, 21). Moses, then, merely serves to order the elevation of the Levites. For the author of the Temple Scroll a similar procedure is invoked for the consecration of the priests: Moses ordered the elevation rite, but it is the priests themselves who execute the ritual.

(2) If the reconstruction יִרְאֶה יְהֹוָה כָּל מְתָתוֹ (16:4) is correct, then it implies that the prohibitions of Lev 21:10-15 are in force for the entire lifetime of the high priest and not just the seven days of his consecration. This is also the plain meaning of the biblical text: the high priest may not leave the sacred precincts to attend the burial rites even of his parents.11

---

10 In Leviticus, the sprinkling of the blood on the priests and the clothing takes place after the elevation rite (Lev 8:30). Clearly, the author of the scroll followed the Leviticus procedure.

11 Yadim’s discussion, 167

12 See M. Haran, "Milha im," Encyclopaedia Biblica (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965) 1040 (Hebr.).
The prohibition for a high priest even to view a corpse is not unique to Israel. It is attested ubiquitously in antiquity. The alarm is sounded when Dummuz returns from the land of the dead: "O temple of Ut! Lock your house, city lock your house! You eunuch-priestess must not go out of her house..." The dead must be kept away from the city and temple, but the chief priestess may not even expose herself to the open air of the street. The vulnerability of the most venerated realm reaches down to the end of pagan times: the Roman high priest sins as did his ancient Babylonian counterpart if he but glances at a corpse. In pagan Syria of the common era, a priest who looks at a corpse is unclean for the day and is banned from the temple until the following day and must purify himself in the interim. This view is also attested in rabbinic teaching. M. Sanh. 2:1 merits quotation in full: "If any of his (the high priest's) near of kin die, he may not follow after the bier, but he may go forth with the bearers as far as the city gate, if he and they come not within sight of one another." So R. Meir (italics mine). But R. Judah says: He may not go forth from the temple, for it is written, "neither shall he go out of the sanctuary (Lev 21:12)." Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Judah do not differ at all. As the Roman and Babylonian parallels teach us, R. Meir is citing the correct reason for the biblical prohibition.

Thus the Temple Scroll was only observing an ancient and universal obsession to prevent the high priest from being contaminated by a corpse— even on sight.

(3) The prescription to burn the purgation offering "in the place set aside for purgation offerings, there they shall burn it" (16:12) is by its redundancy clearly intended as a polemic. The polemic is not difficult to determine. According to the biblical text, the purgation offering was burned outside the camp at the "ash heap" (Lev 4:12), clearly the place where the ashes from the altar were deposited. In other words, the ashes of the purgation offering were to be mixed with the ashes of the other altar sacrifices (cf. Rashi ad loc.). This is also the view of the Tannaim who call this place "the great ash heap" (m. Zebah. 12:5) or "the great dung heap" (t. Yoma 3:17). However, the

47 Lucan, De Nerva Post 2 60.
48 Cf. S. Lieberman, Tosefta Kilshuta IV (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1963: 247 (Hebrew)
opposing viewpoint is also registered in rabbinic sources that the ashes of the purgation offering were to be kept apart (Zebah. 104b). Thus the controversy among the rabbinic sages clearly had ancient precedents, as now proven by the Temple Scroll. Indeed, the controversy may reach back to the days of the Bible and beyond it, since it can be shown that the ashes of the purgation offering had to be isolated because they were believed to possess residual power which, in the pagan world, was held to be black magic but which, in the Bible—evicerated of demonic content—was held to be ritually defiling.

V. First Day Ablutions and the Purification Scheme of the Temple Scroll

A. Nocturnal Emission

If a man has a nocturnal emission he shall not enter into the entire sacred area until he completes three days. He shall launder his clothes and bathe on the first day. On the third day he shall launder his clothes and bathe and after that may enter the temple. They shall not enter my temple to pollute it with their impure flow (45:7-10).

B. Sexual Intercourse

If a man has sexual intercourse with his wife he shall not enter the entire temple-city, on which I shall cause my name to dwell, for three days (45:11-12; cf. CD 12:1-2).

C. Corpse-contamination

As for persons: whoever was in the house and whoever enters the house shall bathe in water and launder his clothes on the first day (49:16-17).

D. Corpse-contamination

If a woman is pregnant and her child dies in her womb... whoever enters the house with her shall be impure for seven days. He shall launder his clothes and bathe on the first day (50:10-14).

E. Corpse-contamination

After they have withdrawn from the slain towards the encampment... In the morning they shall launder their garments, wash themselves of the blood of the guilty cadavers (IQM 14:2-3).

"Accepted by Maimonides as the law, cf. Code, The Book of Temple Service, "Sacrificial Procedure" 7:4-4

The Temple-city

You shall set up three quarters east of the city at a distance from each other to receive lepers, gonorrhoics, and men who have a seminal emission (Ex 16:18).

G. Other Cities

In every city you shall set up quarters for those afflicted with skin eruptions and scabs so that they shall not enter your cities and pollute them. The same (should be done) for gonorrhoics and women in their menstrual impurity and in their purification that they not pollute their surroundings with their impure flow (Ex 15:17).

The distinction between the ritual status of the temple-city and other cities is fundamental to the understanding of the purification system of the Temple Scroll. The most glaring distinction, one that ostensibly differs with Scripture, is that the temple-city requires a three day purification rite for those who incur nocturnal emissions (נודו ריקוי) and have sexual intercourse (שׁבָּת) (quotes A, B), whereas, according to the Torah, their impurity lasts only one day (Lev 16:18). However, as Yadin has correctly noted (1, 224), the three day purification imposed for the temple-city is modelled after the Sinaitic encampment where Israelites are commanded to undergo a three day purification consisting of ablutions, laundering, and sexual abstinence (Exod 19:10-15). Thus, not only the mountain but also the camp, situated in its proximity, is endowed with a sacred status. Once the tabernacle is built it virtually becomes a portable Sinai, endowing the wilderness camp with Sinaitic sanctity (e.g., “Remove from the camp the leper, gonorrhoic, and the corpse-contaminated ... so that they do not defile the camp of those in whose midst I dwell,” Num 5:2-3). It is therefore only logical that in the land the city that houses the temple will be endowed with an equal degree of holiness and will require the same ritual purification.

The above cited passages from the Temple Scroll, however, reveal another aberration from the Torah that is not as easily resolved. Specifically, why does nocturnal emission in the temple-city require two ablutions, on the first and third day (A), and why does corpse-contamination (נה.wordpress) in any other city require ablutions on the first day (A, B, D, E)?

The answer I would like to suggest is that each ablution serves a specific function: to remove a layer (or degree) of impurity. This, in submit, is the key to the ablation regimen in the Priestly Code of the Torah, a subject which, however, requires monographic treatment. Let it suffice for this paper to apply the hypothesis to the Temple Scroll.

Since the temple-city is holy it cannot tolerate impurity even of the slightest degree and all its residents who incur impurity of any kind are banished to special installations built for them east of the city (F). However, one ablution is not enough. It would suffice to reestablish non-sacred contacts with persons and objects (i.e., in the
ordinary city), but to be admitted to the higher level of holiness of the temple-city an extra ablution is required.

The fact that the Temple Scroll increases the severity of the Torah's purificatory procedure regarding nocturnal emissions from one to three days is matched by its procedure for the purification of the leper. According to the Torah, the healed leper submits to ablutions (and other rituals) on the first and seventh days. After the first day he is permitted to enter the camp/city but not his home (Lev 14:8). However, the Scroll mandates that the leper spend all seven days of his purification outside the temple-city: בהזה לא יSetColorי ויהיו רוב하게 נוסע פגע פליאו  רשע יש על מבאר ויהיו יעץ ידיהו . "All afflicted with leprosy shall not enter it (i.e., the temple-city) until they are purified. And when he is pure he shall sacrifice ..." (45:17 18) Thus, whereas the scroll presumably will follow the Torah in allowing the healed leper to enter the camp/city after the first day ablutions, it does not permit him to enter the temple-city until the second set of ablutions on the seventh day. Since the scroll also requires two ablations for someone incurring a nocturnal emission to enter the temple-city, it follows that two ablutions are a minimal requirement for admission into the temple-city.

For the sectaries of Qumran, the war camp also bears the same holy status as the temple-city. Its holiness can be deduced from the War Scroll which speaks of "holy angels" in the midst of the camp (1QM 7:5-6, modelled on Deut 23:15) and which prohibits those possessing physical defects from entering the camp (ibid., 4:5) just as the Temple Scroll prohibits the same persons from entering the temple-city (45:12-14). It is no less significant that the Qumran sectaries enjoin the same prohibition as an entrance requirement into the assembly of the sect in the messianic age (1QSa 2:4-11). The purification ceremony for soldiers returning from battle is also prescribed in the War Scroll (1QM 14:2-3) but, unfortunately, it is only partially preserved. Ablutions are required for the first day (E) and it must be assumed, with Yadin, that the sect also followed the Torah's injunction that the soldiers remain outside the camp for seven days until their purification is complete (Num 31:24). Again, this latter requirement would have given the author of the Temple Scroll an adequate reason for imposing it upon the analogue of the war camp, the temple-city.

When we turn to the ordinary city, we note that the ablutions function in the same way but because the city enjoys a different status — profane (75)

---

71The phrase יָדוֹת יָדוֹת והָיוּ אֲנָשָׁה (45:15-17) where it can only mean "until they are purified," i.e., they complete their purifications, pace Yadin (on 45:18).
72Yadin is surely right (1:224-25) in considering the blind person (45:12) a catch-all for other physically impaired persons.
rather than holy (טְהֵרָה) the consequences are different. First, two facts need to be established: (1) nocturnal emission and corpse-contamination are missing from the list of those impurity bearers who are expelled from the city (G), and (2) those incurring nocturnal emission or corpse-contamination wash off on the first day, as specified in the Torah (Lev 15:16–17) and in the Temple Scroll (C, D). These two facts are related and lead to but one conclusion: the purpose of the first day ablution is to allow the impurity bearer to remain in the city. The implications of this conclusion need be elaborated. The absence of the corpse-contaminated from the list of those quarantined or expelled (G) corresponds with the historical reality at the end of the Second Commonwealth. We know from Josephus (Ant. 3:261) and the Mishnah (Nid. 7:4) that those incurring severe impurity were quarantined or banished from the city. They are the leper, the gonorrhceus, and the parturient. Josephus claims that the corpse-contaminated required isolation (ibid., 262) but, as we have seen, it is not required by the Temple Scroll. How could the secratries of Qumran have envisaged the corpse-contaminated to have free mobility within the city during the seven days of his impurity? The Temple Scroll has an answer: ablutions on the first day. These ablutions delude the impurity of its contagious power and allow its bearers to remain in the city.

That the corpse-contaminated had to be expelled from the temple-city is clear from the prescription of Num 5:2, 3; but what might have been the scriptural basis that would have permitted the author of the Temple Scroll to grant the corpse-contaminated to remain in other cities, even with an initial ablation? I suggest that it was his reading of the purification procedure of the corpse-contaminated in Num 19:14, 22, a reading that, in fact, corresponds to the pshat, its plain meaning. He would have been quick to notice the absence of the phrase הָבָשׂ הָבָשׂ הָבָשׂ הָבָשׂ "and then he may return to the camp," a phrase found in other cases where purification expressly takes place outside the camp (Num 19:7, 14, 24; cf. Lev 14:8, 16, 26, 28). He would also have noticed that the waters of lustration, containing the ashes of the red cow deposits outside the camp (Num 19:9), are brought to the impurity bearer (ibid., 17:18a), implying that the latter remains where he is inside. Finally, he would have found support from the scriptural statement that failure to be aspersed with these waters "defiles the Lord's sanctuary/tabernacle" (ibid., 13, 20), a consequence that can be effected only if he remains in the ramp but not if he is outside. Investigation according
to the canons of biblical criticism might lead to the conclusion that Num 5 calling for expulsion and Num 19 implying that none is required stem from different periods, Num 5 being the older tradition of the wilderness camp and Num 19 reflecting the later, urban setting of Canaan. The scroll would strikingly reach a similar conclusion but from different premises: the law of Num 5 deals with the wilderness camp and its tabernacle whereas the law of Num 19 projects "the law for all time" (Num 19:21), i.e., Israel and its cities. Thus, the corpse-contaminated bathes immediately in order to remove his impurity contagion precisely as those who have had a nocturnal emission or sexual intercourse (Lev 15:16-18) but whereas the latter's impurity lasts only until the evening, the former's persists for seven days requiring a second ablution on the seventh day as well as aspersions with the lustral waters on the third and seventh day (Num 19:19).

The text dealing with the bearers of severe impurity in cities other than the temple-city (G) warrants an additional deduction: the leper is a discrete case, separated from the gonorrhoeic, menstruant, and parturient. The wording of the text makes the distinction explicit: lepers are isolated that "they shall not enter their cities" whereas other impurity bearers "shall not contaminate in their midst." The implication is clear: lepers are banished and the others are quarantined. The latter corresponds, as noted, with conditions which prevailed at the end of Second Temple times as recorded by the Mishnah and Josephus (above). The isolation of impurity bearers, especially of women with flux, as a prevalent custom in other cultures, e.g., special huts are set aside for menstruants, parturients, and gonorrhoeics among the Samaritans and the Falashas, pre-Islamic Arabs and, to select randomly from remote but ancient peoples, the Nuer of Africa and the Hindu of India. The significance of these similar but independently derived taboos requires investigation along anthropological and comparative religious lines.

Thus, the purification system of the Temple Scroll begins to emerge. In the temple-city all impurities cause their bearers to be banished, requiring a minimum of two ablutions for passage through the two stages of impurity (582032) to prolateness (57) to holiness (2777). In other cities only lepers are...
expelled and gonorrheics, parturient, and menstruants are quarantined but the corpse-contaminated can remain within his community provided he submits to ablutions on the first day of his week-long purification.

Here is a postscript on an ancillary problem. Ostensibly, there is a difference between those incurring the impurity of nocturnal emission and sexual intercourse (A, B). The former is proscribed from entering "the entire temple" (שֶׁפֶר וּרְאֵי לְבָנָה) and the latter from "the entire temple-city" (שֶׁפֶר וּרְאֵי לְבָנָה). This difference in wording would imply that nocturnal emission bears a lesser degree of impurity than sexual intercourse. If so, it would run counter to the Torah which considers them impurities of the same degree, i.e., one day impurity requiring ablutions and laundering (Lev 15:16-18). Yadin toys with the idea of a scribal error— the omission of ריא, "city," from the case of nocturnal emission—but rejects it, correctly I believe, because the sequence speaks of the prohibition to enter "the temple" and "my temple" (1, 222). His solution is that the scroll indeed posits a difference: the first day ablution qualifies one who has a nocturnal emission to enter the temple-city but not the temple (ibid., 222-23). That the impurity bearer is enjoined from "the entire temple" means, according to Yadin, that though he is admitted to the temple-city itself he must beware of entering the outermost limits of the temple complex, i.e., between the outer wall and the moat (ריא) which surrounds the entire complex.

If Yadin's solution is accepted, it would jibe very well with our proposed purification system: the first ablution to enter the city and the second to the temple. However, certain problems are left unanswered and new ones are raised: (1) what is the basis for distinguishing between the temple and the temple-city, a distinction which is lacking with any other impurity; (2) what is the basis for the implied gradation in holiness at the outer limits of the temple compound, i.e., within and beyond its outer wall; and (3) if the first day ablution qualifies the one with a nocturnal emission to enter the temple-city, why dispatch him to an outer installation where he will not spend even a single night? As with other cities let the impurity bearer bathe immediately and be permitted to remain.

An alternate solution suggests itself on the basis of the location of the impurity: nocturnal emission takes place inside the temple-city and sexual intercourse, outside. The absence of any installation for those having sexual intercourse points to this distinction. Indeed, as Yadin has correctly concluded, the absence of any installation for impure women indicates that women were prohibited from residing in the temple-city (1, 224). Since the writer of the scroll, for stylistic reasons, wished to use the same verb ריא, "enter," he therefore had no choice but to distinguish the two cases from their point of origin: the one who has a nocturnal emission in the city may not enter the temple and the one who has sexual intercourse outside the city may not enter the city. The writer may have added "the entire temple" to the former case by which he means the entire sacred area, a designation which includes the temple-city, implying that the impurity bearer must leave the city.
VI. Some Brief Notes on the Temple Scroll

References are to the volume and page of the Hebrew editio princeps.

(1) 1:85. The method used by the Temple Scroll to count the 50 days between the first-fruit festivals may throw light on the vexed problem of the Jubilee year. According to Lev 25:10 the Jubilee year also reoccurs in cycles of 50. However, since the Sabbatical year is in force at the same time (vv 1-7, the same pericope), the land ostensibly will have to lie fallow for two consecutive years, the 49th and the 50th. For an agricultural economy, this would be disastrous and it has led scholars to maintain, among other reasons, that the Jubilee never left the realms of utopia. However, as is well known, the Book of Jubilees predicates the Jubilee cycle as 49 and not 50 years. Since the Dead Sea sectaries adopted Jubilees’s solar calendar in its entirety, they would have maintained a Jubilee cycle of 49 years. How then can this be reconciled with the fiftieth-year provision of Lev 25:10? The fifty-day intervals between the first-fruit festivals posited by the Temple Scroll points the way. The date of the festival served both as the last day of the previous cycle and the first day of the new cycle. For example, the Festival of the New Wheat (Shabuot) was the 50th day, starting the count with the New Barley (Omer) Festival, and at the same time the first day for the counting until the New Wine Festival, leaving an interval of 49 days between the festivals. By the same procedure, one can assume that the Jubilee year was both the last year, the fiftieth, of the previous cycle and the first year of the new cycle (implied also by 1QS 10:8). In this manner, the 49th year, a sabbatical year, will coincide with the Jubilee and the land need not be left fallow for more than a single year.

(2) 1:89. I would suggest the restoration of רכש הקבלים (or רכש הקבלים) in 29:1-2 and 22:23 (cf. 20:14-15; 22:24). These two passages would then refer to the 14 rams and 14 lambs of the offering of well-being, כָּלִיא, eaten by the priests, Levites and Israelites in the outer court at the climax of the New


Wine and New Oil Festivals (21:06-3; 22:11-13). The reference to these sacrifices in 21:06-3 (cf. also 20:15) would therefore not constitute "additional" well-being offerings.

(3) 1. 92: on 22:11-13. Levi is clearly one of the 12 tribes, shown by having its name attached to one of the 12 tribal gates of the middle and outer courts and by its participation, the first of the tribes, in the Wood Offering Festival. On the New Wine and New Oil Festivals 14 rams and 14 lambs are sacrificed as well-being offerings, one pair each for the priests and Levites and the remaining 12 pairs for the 12 tribes. Since Levi is also one of the 12 tribes, this would mean that the Levites receive a double portion. If so, it would be consistent with the lofty status bestowed upon the Levites elsewhere in the Temple Scroll (cf. no. 25 below).

(4) 1. 94. Pace S. Lieberman, the second title cannot be regarded as "סמחה of rejoicing." They are eaten only on pilgrimage festivals, but the second title may be eaten on every festival and on Sabbaths as well (43:2-3).

(5) 1. 96. Yadin suggests that the scroll's designation of the first title as "all tithes from the land... are the Lord's; they are holy to the Lord" (Lev 27:30). The Karaites also interpret Lev 27:30 as referring to the levitical title and that the verse supplements the main text of the levitical title, Num 18:21-24, teaching that the title is redefensible (Sefer Hamishra, ad. loc.).

On the other hand, the author of the Temple Scroll could just as well have derived the sanctity of the first title from Deuteronomy, the book which provides the basis for most of the laws in the Temple Scroll. The title of the third and the sixth year is called "holy" by the book of Deuteronomy (Deut 26:13) and Israel is commanded to bring out "all the tithe of your yield" (Deut 14:28; 26:12). It is thus possible that the term "all" might have been interpreted as referring to all the tithe of those years, i.e., the levitical (first) title. Indeed, this is precisely how the Karaites understood it (Sefer Hamishra, ad. loc.).

In any case, neither the first nor the second title would ever become the perquisite of the priests. Yet another text of the scroll explicitly states that the priests are assigned tables in the inner court for the purpose of eating the sacred portions which include נפשו כותב "and for the tithe" (37:10). Moreover, the plural implies that the priests are entitled to more than one title! The problem can be resolved by recalling that two titles are indeed ordained for the priests: the title of animals (Lev 27:32) and the title of the levitical title (Num 18:25-32). The animal title is not explicitly mentioned in the available text of the Temple Scroll, but it should be expected not only because of the historic reference to it in the Bible (2 Chr 31:6) but it also forms a distinct priestly perquisite in the book of Jubilees (Jub 32:15), whose affinity to the teaching of Qumran, especially the Temple Scroll, is amply at

See section 1 above.
tested. Indeed, in a summary enumeration of all the priestly perquisites at the end of the scroll, we read הָעֲדֵנָהֵשׁ (60:2–3), the restoration נשפָּה, I submit, is uncontestable.

(6) 1:147 (1). It seems to me that Ezekiel's temple blueprint called for the sanctuary as well as the altar to be located within the inner court, but the difference between the two temples is in another matter. The altar is the geometric center in Ezekiel's plan, but for the Temple Scroll it is the (porch of?) the sanctuary.

(7) 1:186. The source for the two sacrificial altars, I submit, is not 1 Kgs 8:64, which only speaks of the sanctification of an area of the inner court for the exceptional needs of the dedication service, but rather 2 Kgs 16:14–15, which explicitly states that in the reign of Ahaz two sacrificial altars came into use. The fact that in this latter verse the older altar is twice referred to as the bronze altar implies that the new, Damascus altar was probably made of stone—an exact correspondence with the two altars of the Temple Scroll.

Additional proof is furnished by Ezek 9:2, “And they (the six executioners) went in and stood beyond the bronze altar.” Since the executioners entered by the north gate, the bronze altar near which they took their stand also must be in the north. If so, this position accords precisely with Ahaz's bronze altar, which was placed “on the north side of his (i.e., the new) altar” (2 Kgs 16:14).

(8) 1:226, 256. The distinction between אמרה הרמה "the entire temple" and אמרה הרמה "the entire temple-city" bears on the scroll's purification scheme and has been discussed in part V, above.

(9) 1:226. That the gonorrhoeic must launder and bathe in fresh water on the seventh day of his purification need not be deduced analogously from the purification procedure for sexual intercourse (Lev 15:15) or for the corpse contaminated (Num 19:19) but is an explicit stipulation of the text itself: “he shall count seven days for his purification, wash his clothes and bathe his body in fresh water” (Lev 15:13).

(10) 1:248. Lev 17:15–16 does not prohibit the eating of carcasses, but the neglect to purify oneself afterwards. The omission of the clause “give it (the carcass) to the ger in your community to eat” (Deut 14:21) is probably due to the change in the status of the ger by the time of the Qumran sectaries; he was no longer the biblical resident alien but the convert to Judaism.39

(11) 1:253. The prohibition of self-mutilation is enjoined upon priest and Israelite alike by the Priestly Code of the Torah (Lev 19:28, 21:5) and is, hence, not the innovation of the Temple Scroll.

(12) 1:256. The mathematics for the division of the spoil are in need of correction. According to Num 31:27, 34, the soldiers receive:

\[ \frac{1}{500} \left( \frac{\lambda}{7} \right) = \frac{499}{1000} \lambda \]

and the home front receives:

\[ \frac{1}{50} \left( \frac{\lambda}{2} \right) = \frac{490}{1000} \lambda . \]

The difference between their shares is:

\[ \frac{499}{1000} \lambda - \frac{490}{1000} \lambda = \frac{9}{1000} \lambda . \]

This last figure is significant. It means that for every 1000 persons or animals taken captive the soldiers receive nine more than those at home. Despite this paltry difference, the Temple Scroll ordains, on the basis of the parity demanded by King David's Law (1 Sam 30:24 25), that the spoil be reapportioned so that the shares are exactly equal.

(13) 1. 277. David's Law for the division of the spoil is echoed in an interesting way in the midrash: "'and so it was from that day and above that he made a statute' (1 Sam 30:25) R. Judah said It is not written, 'from that day onward,' but 'from that day and above: from whom did he learn? From his ancestor Abraham who said, 'Save only that which the young men have eaten . . . [also] let Aner, Eschol, and Mamre take their portion' (Gen 14:24)' (Gen. Rab. 43:24). Thus Rabbah Judah held that David's Law was not his innovation but was an ancient tradition stemming back to Abraham and, presumably, is as eternally valid as a Mosaic law. His position would accord completely with the view taken by the Temple Scroll.

(14) 1. 291. It would seem to me that הָרָעַב הָשָׁם also "and if there are two" (CD 9:20) refers to the witnesses, not the deeds. Otherwise, what does הָרָעַב הָשָׁם in the following phrase mean?

(15) 2. 52. תמונת לְאָדָם "in a place set apart for purgation offerings." (16:12). A polemic is implied here, dealt with in part III above.

(16) 2. 81. מֵאֵשׁ "at the first third of the day" (25:8). If the first quarter of the day falls at 9:00 A.M. (cf. 20:06), the first third cannot go beyond 10:00 A.M. and fall at noon.

(17) 2. 105. The reason that improperly dressed priests are to be put to death is not Num 18:3, despite the similarity between its wording אֲרוֹן תַּחַת יָדָיו and the wording of the scroll תַּחַת יָדָיו (35:7), since Scripture calls for death by God (יָוהי, qal) whereas the scroll mandates death by man (יָוהי, hiphil). Rather, the improperly dressed priest falls into the category of the רַע "stranger" and is subject to the law תַּחַת יָדָיו, "the encroaching stranger shall be put to death" (cf. Num 18:7).89

(18) 2. 111. 13. תֵּן מִצְלָא "the well-being offerings of the Israelites" (37:5) may not be eaten by Israelites in the inner court to which they...
have no access. Rather, this phrase refers to the priestly portions of the well-being offering, i.e., the breast and the right thigh (Lev 7:29–34) and the cheeks, stomach and a portion of the foreleg, according to the Temple Scroll (cf. 20:14–16; 21:02 05; 22:8–11). The section 37:11–14 warns the priests, who alone may cook their priestly portions in the inner court (37:14), not to mix their well-being offerings with those of the Israelites which are eaten only in the outer court (cf. 21:06 3). Thus in this regard there is no difference in principle between the Temple Scroll and Ezekiel; both proscribe the Israelites from entering the inner court and prescribe that they eat their well-being offerings in the outer court (cf. Ezek 46:19–24).

(19) 2. 137. The lepers are prohibited from entering the temple-city "until they are purified" (45:18). This qualification refers to the end of their seven-day purification and not to the end of their illness.61

(20) 2. 143. The use of the verb בּוּז for both profane and sacred slaughter (46:7, 11, 12, 16; cf. 52:5, 6, 13), as in the book of Deuteronomy (e.g., Deut 12:21; 17:1), lends support to the theory that the slaughtering technique developed in the temple was also prescribed for profane slaughter.62

(21) 2. 160. The scroll's inclusion of the skin and nails of dead animals among the causes for contamination may be based on its interpretation that בּוּז "carcass" (Lev 11:25; cf. vv 28, 40) encompasses not just the meat but all parts of the animal. Abetting this interpretation is the language of 51:4 רְוֹצֵי יְבֵשָׁם יִבְּשֶׁת עֲרוֹצָן ("whoever carries of its bones or of its carcass, skin or flesh or a nail") (51:4), i.e., the skin and nails just as the flesh are part of the carcass.

(22) 2. 164. The psalm of Lev 22:28 is changed to בְּרֵאשִׁי (52:6) so that the profane and sacred slaughter will be subject to the same procedure (cf. on Number 20 above).

(23) 2. 177. The wording of Deut 17:12 "should a man act presumptuously and disregard" is transposed to read בְּרֵאשִׁי (52:8) "should a man disregard and act presumptuously" (52:8) possibly in order to emphasize that capital punishment may not be imposed without prior warning,63 a view which concurs with that of the rabbis (cf. T. Sanh. 11:1–5).

(24) 2. 180. I presume that בְּרֵאשִׁי (57:3) was based on יִבְּשֶׁת עֲרוֹצָן ("army commanders shall be appointed over the troops") (Deut 20:9). Deuteronomy predicates a civilian militia whose ranks and officers are only called up in time of emergency.64 However, this procedure would not do for the Hasmonene kings, who kept a standing army and even mercenaries.

61 See note 5 above.
63 An observation I owe to my son, Elan Chaim Milgrom.
64 J. Milgrom, "The Ideological Importance of the Office of Judge in Deuteronomy," in J. Neubauer, Festschrift (forthcoming)
The scribe therefore erased the way to allow the king, at the time of his coronation, to appoint his military officers. For this reason, I would suggest that the verb indicating the census for the military draft should also be restored in the singular (משנה) (57.1) so that the entire action will be performed by the king.

(25) 2. 192. The Levites as well as the priests are entitled "to serve and bless My name" (60:11), probably on the basis of the verse, "the Lord set apart the tribe of Levi . . . to stand in attendance upon the Lord and to bless his name until this day" (Deut 10:8; cf. 18:5 LXX, Sam), a priestly function (cf. Num 6:22-27). Furthermore, if the verb לה־_hero means "serve" (e.g., Exod 28:35) and not "assist" (e.g., Num 18:2), then the Levites are even given the right to officiate on the altar. This accords with other new privileges and perquisites for the Levites in the Temple Scroll.

(26) 2. 195. אַלּ תֵּעַל "that prophet shall die" (Deut 18:20) is changed to אַלּ תֵּעַל "that prophet shall be slain" (61:2). A similar change is made from בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "shall die" (Deut 22:22) to בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "shall be slain" (66:2) and from בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "shall die" (Deut 22:35) to בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "shall be slain" (66:5) and the reverse change from בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "shall be slain" (Deut 21:22) to בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה "that he may die" (66:11). These changes show that the Temple Scroll distinguishes very carefully between the qal and hiphil of בֵּית הַגֶּדֶנֶה, the former implying death by God and the latter death by man, a distinction consistently found in the priestly texts but ignored in Deuteronomy.

(27) 2. 195. The word אַלּ from Deut 18:22 is mistakenly omitted in the text at 61:4. It is clearly present in the plates.

(28) 2. 199. Why is אַלּ תֵּעַל רֹאֶּהֶה רֹאֶּה (Deut 21:4) transposed to read אַלּ תֵּעַל רֹאֶּהֶה "which is not sown or tilled" (63:2)? Possibly, because the author of the scroll assumes that sowing or planting precedes tilling (cf. Deut 28:39).

(29) 2. 200. Handlaying with one hand (e.g., Lev 4:29) and two hands (e.g., Lev 24:14) must be distinguished from each other. A better analogy to the handlaying ceremony on the broken-necked heifer would be the same ceremony performed on the scapegoat (Lev 16:21).

---

66 Cf. section 1 above.
67 Ibid.
THE INTERCHANGE OF L, N, AND R
IN BIBLICAL HEBREW

ALOYSIUS FITZGERALD, FSC
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20064

The interchange of l, n, and r in the same word as represented in different
Semitic languages (e.g., Heb. hasil = grasshopper = Ug. hun) and within
the same language (e.g., Akk. lamsatu = fly = namsatu) has been often
observed. The latter situation is much more characteristic of some languages
(Aram., Akk., Arab.) than others. On a limited scale it occurs in OT Hebrew
and the instances are recorded in the dictionaries: e.g., laylah and liun;  bikkâ and
miskâ; Nênikadâ'ssar and Nêbakdâ'ssar; mazzalôî and mazzârôî.

Examples of this type are ignored here. The concern is rather with
instances of abnormal forms of roots showing a similar interchange of
consonants in poetic texts which manage at times to be suggested and
suggested again as a solution for a crux; and then are forgotten or ignored.

The examples for the most part are not new, but they have apparently
never been examined before as a collection. This would seem to be the reason
why such a solution to a problem in a particular case is so readily set aside.
Collecting the instances has the advantage of putting the examples side by side
where a probable argument in one instance helps strengthen the argumentation in all the others. Furthermore, this review will make clear that
what the poet is doing is using a dialectal form that fits better the sound-
patternings of his line. The fact that in each case the appearance of the
abnormal form can be simply explained by the recognition of the intent of the
poet, is another argument for the legitimacy of the forms and the
interpretations they will be given.

Isa 13:22 will serve as the first example since it is an instance of such a shift
that has found more general acceptance:

wânh yâyôn b'lammayyé
swayên bôyklê'ng
Desert beasts will howl/dwell in his towers,
jackals in the delightful palaces.

(If e.g., C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen
Sprachen I (Berlin: Reuther and Reichard, 1908) §84.
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FURTHER STUDIES IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL

By Jacob Milgrom, University of California, Berkeley

The following observations are the results of a second reading of the Temple Scroll during the summer of 1979.¹ The numerals cited at the beginning of each item refer to the volume and page of the editio princeps.²

(1) II, 2 לָא חַקּ מִמַע do not take from it (2:9)

The expression is based on Josh. 7:11 לָא חַקּ מֵהָרָה rather than on Deut. 7:25b לְליַחֲקָה. By using the preposition מ the Scroll leaves no doubt that the reference is to herem.

(2) II, 5 לָא יִימוֹשׁ מֵהָמָקֵדֵשׁ it may not be moved from the sacred area (3:11)

With Yadin, I agree that the bread of presence is implied. But the prohibition is that it must not be removed from המָקֵדֵשׁ, which cannot denote the table, המָקְדֶשׁ. Hence the reference may be to the old bread of the previous week, and המָקֵדֵשׁ would imply that the priests must eat it “in the sacred precinct” (Lev. 24:19). True, מָקֵדֵשׁ in the Scroll usually denotes the entire Temple complex (e.g. 43:12, 46:9-10, 47:18), but it can also indicate the inner court (e.g. 47:12, 52:15), where the priests eat their sacred food (37:10-14). On no account does המָקֵדֵשׁ refer to the Temple building itself.³

(3) II, 24  וְלֹא כְּמֹאת הַקְּצֵרָה
on the altar of incense (8:11)

The reference here is to the frankincense accompanying the bread of presence, which according to the Scroll should be burnt on the inner incense altar and not on the outer, sacrificial altar, as maintained by the Rabbis (Tos. Men. 11:13 [Zuck. 530]). Yadin conjectures that the Scroll based its ruling on the term לֹא כְּמֹאת הַקְּצֵרָה, "pure frankincense", found only in connection with incense (Exod. 30:34) and the bread of presence (Lev. 24:7), and he is correct. Superior incense is of the same degree of holiness as other superior ingredients employed in the Sanctuary, such as שמן זית, "clear oil", used exclusively in the menorah (Exod. 27:20; Lev. 24:2) over against the ordinary oil used in the meal offering on the outer altar (e.g., Lev. 2:1); ובת המחרא, "pure gold", used on the inner sancta, i.e., the ark, קַפְפוֹרֶת, table, menorah (Exod. 37:2,6,11,17, etc.) and on the high priest's vestments, i.e., the breastplate chains, the bells of the robe, and סִפְּרוּת (Exod. 39:15,25,30), in contrast to the ordinary gold used on the Tabernacle's planks and pillars.⁴

(4) II, 27  וּמֵה
on this side (9:4)

This new reading⁵ requires a different reconstruction. I would suggest שלושה כְּמֹאת הַקְּצֵרָה מַה שָּׁלָשָׁה כְּמֹאת הַקְּצֵרָה מַה, in conformance with Biblical usage, e.g., the cherubim, כֶּרֶב חַזְיָא מַכְעָה מַה כֶּרֶב חַזְיָא מַכְעָה מַה (Exod. 25:19; 37:8) and the Tabernacle sides, וּלְצֵי הַמַּחֲרָה מַה מַה (Exod. 26:13). Its use is amply attested in Rabbinic Hebrew, e.g., Mid. 3:1,7; Ohol. 1:8.

⁵ E. Qimron, "On the Text of the Temple Scroll", (Hebrew), Leshonenu, 42 (1978), 137.
(5) II, 32

This new reading provides the only word in its line, and with דומד (10:4) the only words in the immediate context. Yet the content can be surmised. The preceding column (8) gives a description of the menorah, and the following columns (11-12) speak of the construction and use of the sacrificial altar. It thus stands to reason that col. 10 (and perhaps the missing top of col. 11) completes the description of the Temple furnishings. Col. 10 has preserved the terms for pillars, gate, and the various colored wools, and thus corresponds to the pillars and curtains, both of which conclude the description of the Tabernacle (Exod. 26:36-37) and precede the description of the sacrificial altar (Exod. 27:1-8). But what is לָכֵרץ doing here? It does not occur in the Tabernacle accounts or in the description of Solomon’s Temple.

The answer, I submit, is to be found in the use of לָכֵרץ in the next dealing with the census: וְאֶל חַסְפֵּי הַמַּסָּרִים מַאת בֵּין שִׁירָאָל מַהָת אָרֶץ שְׂכֵרַת אַל עֲבֹרָה אָהֳל מִשְׁכָּב ה ולָכֵרץ לָכֵר צֵל שְׂכָרָה על מַסָּרִים יְבַשְׂרֵי יְהוָה. “You shall take the ransom silver from the Israelites and assign it the construction of the Tent of Meeting; it shall serve the Israelites as a reminder before the Lord, as ransom for your lives” (Exod. 30:16). Thus לָכֵרץ is connected with the Tabernacle by means of the silver half-shekels collected during the census and used in the construction of the Sanctuary. What precisely was done with this silver is described later: ‘The silver of those of the community who were recorded ... was for casting the sockets of the Sanctuary and the sockets for the veil ...

---

* E. Qimron, op. cit., p. 138.
8 עֲבֹדֲעַה in the Priestly texts means “work” in general and “Tabernacle construction” in particular, cf. Milgrom; Levitical Terminology, pp. 60-82.
hooks for the pillars, overlay for their tops, and bands around them’’ (Exod. 38:25-38). Specifically, the silver was used to fashion the sockets of the interior pillars and the decorations (hooks, overlay, bands) for the exterior pillars (cf. Exod. 26:32, 36:38, and 27:17, 38:19). The principle behind this distribution of the silver is clear. The inner sockets, not visible from outside of the Tent, were of silver and their decorations of gold (Exod. 26:32); the outer visible sockets were of bronze and their decorations of silver (Exod. 27:17). That this distinction is consistently followed is shown by pillars at the entrance to the Tent, whose sockets are visible but whose decorations are not; accordingly, the sockets are of bronze but the decorations are of gold (Exod. 26:37).9

The Scroll also calls for pillars (בָּדְרֵי, lines 4, 11), gates (ֹּרַשׁ, lines 8, 9), and overlays (ֹּשְׁנָר, line 12; cf. Exod. 32:38) in its Temple. In the Jerusalem Temple the gates to the inner court and Temple building boasted of magnificent curtains (Josephus, Wars, 5:212; Shek. 8:5; B. Yoma 54a) which had to be supported by pillars. Furthermore, the Scroll ascribes pillars to other installations in the inner court: the House of the Winding Staircase (30:9) and the parwār (35:10). Since the former was made of gold, we can assume, on the analogy of the Tabernacle, that its sockets were of silver. The parwār pillars, also invisible to the laity, would have had silver sockets. The pillars of the Slaughter House (34:2,3,15), however, being accessible to the Levites and possibly to the laity,10 would have had bronze sockets and silver decorations (cf. Exod. 27:17).

Fortunately, the Scroll tells us how the silver is to be assembled. Again, the Tabernacle serves as the model. The half-shekel is to be the contribution by every male upon reaching the age of twenty (4Q 159:6-7).11 The wording is

9 Though Haran’s analysis of P’s system of graded holiness is complete in every other respect, he does not identify this distinction.
11 Ibid., p. 502, n. 5.
striking: מ בכתב השקל ולכרכן, “half shekel as a memorial” (39:9). The census passage (Exod. 30:12-16) is thus reinterpreted to denote a one-time tax to the Temple, a clear polemic with Rabbinic Judaism which required an annual tax (ber. R.H. 7a). It is therefore just as likely that, in keeping with the census passage, the Scroll requires also that the silver be employed for the continuous ornamentation and repair (Rabbinic bedek habhayit) of the Temple pillars.

(6) II, 48 לְמָלֵא צֵל מְשָׁרֶת הָדוֹרֶת
to ordain for their lives (15:14)

This expression is a conflation of לְמָלֵא דֶּרֶךְ הַנּוֹחַ יָכְרֵם עֲלֵי מְשָׁרֶת (Exod. 29:35) and לְמָלֵא צֵל מְשָׁרֶת (e.g., Lev. 17:11). Both terms occur in the priestly consecration (Exod. 29:33b; cf. Lev. 8:33b-34). The point of the conflation—a new coinage of the Scroll—is to show that the consecration ram and basket of breads fulfill both an expiatory and consecratory function.

(7) II, 49-50 וְסֵפֶר כֵּן הַכְּתָלִים אֶזְרַע הַשָּׁמָרָה עֲלֵי רַבָּא וְאִישָׁר אָחָיו עָשָׂר הַכְּתָלִים

and the elders of the priests shall lay their hands on its head and after them the high priest and all the priests (15:18-16:01)

Why do the priestly elders also perform the hand-laying ceremonial? That the priestly consecrands perform it is understandable, since the purgation bull is their sacrifice. Similarly in the Biblical consecration service it is the consecrands, Aaron and his sons, who perform the hand-laying (Exod. 29:10; Lev. 8:14). But why do the already consecrated priestly elders join in this ceremonial?

The answer is that this purgation bull performs a different function. For the elders merely begin the hand-laying ceremonial; they are followed by the high priest, and if the reconstruction is correct, the entire priestly corps. Thus the purgation bull is intended not only for the consecrands but also for all the priests, as is shown by the preceding sentence.
a bull for all the people and one for
the priests were offered, that for the priests being offered
first (15:16-18). Hence, just as all the people are expiated
by a purgation bull, so, we must assume, all the priests are
expiated by their purgation bull. Now, however, a new
question must be faced: just as the people’s elders perform
the hand-laying on their behalf (Lev. 4:15), should not the
priestly elders act on behalf of the rest of the priests? The
answer is that the two groups of elders are not alike in their
powers. The people’s elders are indeed empowered to repre-
sent the people, but the priestly elders hold only temporary
powers; indeed, no sooner do the priestly elders consecrate
the high priest with the blood of the consecration ram, then
the high priest immediately begins to officiate on behalf of
his fellow priests and the people. 12

(8) II, 52 וה апрפה淦ז אלול שמה
and all of it shall be burnt there (16:13)

The plural verb shows that the burning of the purgation
bull is not done by the high priest. Is it then done by the
elders of the priests? Probably not. Rather, the model is
Lev. 16:27-28 והปรา הבא והפורה את מה, where the plural
must be rendered as a passive, ‘(the bull) . . . shall be con-
sumed by fire’. Hence the burning is performed by an un-
named third party.

9) II, 58 לחם חמש שתיים (עשר זיתות של שפרים
wheat bread, 12 loaves, two tenths (18:14-15)

This restoration seems both ingenious and logical. Since
the twelve tribes are charged with the responsibility of bring-
ing the new wine and new oil for their respective festivals,
they should also be expected to bring the bread loaves, one
per tribe, for the New Wheat Festival. However, doubt lin-
gers for the following reason:

The new wine and new oil brought by the tribes (1/3 hin and 1/2 hin, respectively) are sacrificial accompaniments to the twelve whole-offering rams (19:16), as shown by the absence of the term המכמת in the phrase המכמת לאלים המנהמה (20:01). The missing wine libation is alluded to by the expression על נשך (20:02), "in addition to this libation", which can only refer to the wine contributed by the tribes. Thus the new wine must be the libation accompaniment to the twelve rams. Similarly, the new oil is also a sacrificial accompaniment, probably of the מָז (22:02), because the next line contains the words בצן הזבח וה냐, 'with this oil, 1/2 hin' (22:03), the precise amount required for a herd animal (Num. 15:9). Any doubts about the new oil being sacrificed on the altar are dispelled by the later description of this festival as ביום הַכּוּבְּרָת הָשָּׁם על המזבח "the day of offering new oil upon the altar" (43:9-10). The Biblical basis for offering the new crop on the altar is clear. Since the minhah for the First Barley requires 2/10 (Lev. 23:13), 1/10 more than necessary (Num. 15:4-5), the additional tenth must have comprised the 'omer-sheaf offered by the Sanctuary (cf. Men. 10:4). Thus, since the new barley was used in composing the sacrificial accompaniment, so were the new wine and oil similarly employed.

In contrast, the twelve rams of the New Wheat Festival are accompanied by המנהמה המכמת (19:4), which implies that the sacrificial accompaniment was not brought by the tribes. Clinching the argument is the fact that the loaves by their nature were ineligible for sacrifice, since they were leavened (Lev. 23:17; cf. 2:11).

It is not even certain that the twelve loaves were brought by the tribes, since this assumption rests on a restoration בהיו המכמת ראויה המנחת, "the heads of the tribes shall bring them" (18:16). If they did bring the loaves, it would have

---

18 There is no notice of the 12 whole-offering rams in the New Oil Festival, but we can assume that they were mentioned in one of the lacunae.
constituted a major innovation, since the Bible expressly requires two loaves (Lev. 23:17). The innovation would have had to be explained at least by additional wording such as שְׁנֵי עֵשְׂרֵה בֵּרָכָה (шекים תשרים ברכה) אֲחַד עֵשְׂרֵה בֵּרָכָה אֲחַד עֵשְׂרֵה בֵּרָכָה שָׁנָה, “twelve loaves from all the tribes of Israel, one loaf per tribe, two tenths semolina” (cf. 19:14-15 on the new wine).

A preferable restoration for 18:15 would be either פַּרְעֹה תְּנַשֵּׁב (פַּרְעֹה תְּנַשֵּׁב) or פַּרְעֹה תְּנַשֵּׁב, “two wheat breads [baked into loaves, two] tenths...” or פַּרְעֹה תְּנַשֵּׁב, “two wheat breads [baked with leaven, two] tenths...”. Either restoration would correspond to the syntax and vocabulary of the Biblical precedent לְחָם נֶפֶשׁ שֵׁם עַשֵּׂרִים בֵּרָהוּ עֲשֵׂרִים בֵּרָהוִים (Lev. 23:17). Each would have the additional virtue of including the word תְּנַשֵּׁב from the Leviticus source, which is indispensable for knowing how the flour is converted into bread.

(10) II, 64 אֲשֶׁר קָרָב עֵשְׂרֵה בֵּרָכָה אֲרַבָּת every meal offering, whether it is sacrificed with frankincense or is dry (20:10)

Yadin, basing himself on the Biblical text כל מונת 변화 (Lev. 7:10), suggests that the Scroll changed the formula in order to include the dry but spiced minhāh (apparently taking יְ as equivalent to יָ) among the priestly perquisites. However, this type of minhāh is expressly awarded to the priest (Lev. 6:8) and would not require special mention by the Scroll. Rather, the expression must mean: every minhāh which has frankincense (either dry or oily) or which is dry (even without frankincense). The latter would refer to the meal offering of the suspected adulteress (Num. 5:15) and the purgation offering of the indigent (Lev. 5:11), neither of which contain oil or frankincense.14 Thus the

14 It could not refer to the two Pentecostal loaves which also contained no oil or frankincense, but being leavened, could not be burned on the altar (Lev. 23:17).
Scroll's wording actually embraces every sacrificial minhāh except the accompaniment to the sacrificial animal, which contains no frankincense (Num. 15:4-10) and which is not eaten by the priests but is wholly burned on the altar (Lev. 14:20, cf. Men. 6:2). All other minhāh offerings brought by Israelites15 do indeed become the perquisites of the priests (they are enumerated in Men. 5:3). Thus the wording in the Temple Scroll is concise and precise, a credit to its author.

(11) II, 69 ... shall rejoice . . . shall rejoice (21:8-9)

As shown in no. 9, above, the new wine is used first in the sacrifice before the people may drink of it (20:9-10; 21:3-10; the same rule obtains for the new oil, 21:15-16; 22:14-15). A fitting analogy is Jub. 7:1-6. Noah first offers a wine libation on the altar hearth, and only then is he permitted to drink of it. Jubilees also supports the Scroll's view that the wine is poured on the altar fire (34:13-14), in opposition to the Rabbinic view (B. Suk. 48b-49b; cf. Yadin's discussion, I, 118-19). Finally this Jubilees passage ends on a note of happiness, ṭem ham mishmamah . . . mishmamah (Jub. 7:6), as does the Scroll, ṭem ham mishmamah . . . mishmamah (21:8-9; cf. 22:16).

(12) II, 72 ... afterwards they shall take them out to the Israelites, and the Israelites shall give to the priests (22:11-13)

The redundancy of ben yisra'el is meant to emphasize that the well-being offerings are the property of the Israelites. The law of this sacrifice is that its meat belongs to its offerers except for the prescribed priestly (and in the Scroll, Levitic) perquisites. The Torah itself makes this point emphatic when

15 The meal offering brought by the priest is also burned on the altar (Lev. 6:12-16), although it contains oil and frankincense (cf. Men. 5:3), but this case is not considered by the Scroll.
it speaks of the well-being offering as נבות שלמים (Lev. 2:32, 34) and especially as קרבן בַּכֹּל היִשְׂרָיֵל (Lev. 22:2,5,16), in contrast to the other sacrifices which are called קִרְבּוֹן (e.g., Lev. 5:15). Thus, since the meat belongs to the Israelites, it is they alone who determine who may eat it.

and they shall eat them on this day in the outer court before the Lord (22:13-14)

The subject of the verb embraces priests and Levites as well as Israelites. On the New Oil Festival (and on the New Wine Festival, 21:6-6) all of Israel, including women and children, may partake of the well-being lambs and rams in the outer court. Though ordinarily priests eat their perquisites from the well-being offering in the inner court (37:10-14), on these festival days they join the common feast in the outer court. This they may do because well-being offerings can be eaten anywhere in a state of purity (Lev. 7:19), and its priestly prebends may be shared with the priestly family (Lev. 10:14). There is, however, one distinction between these well-being offerings and all others: they are eaten וּרְאוּ, "on this day", and thus resemble the נְדֵבָה, the thank-offering, which must also be eaten on the day it is sacrificed (Lev. 7:15). Thus the Scroll disagrees with the Rabbis who ordained that these festival offerings could be eaten anywhere in Jerusalem and over a two-day period (Zeb. 5:7).

for on this day they will ransom (sacrificially) the entire oil crop of the land before the Lord once yearly and rejoice (22:15-16)

for on this day they will ransom (sacrificially) the

wine crop and the Israelites will rejoice before the Lord (21:7-9)
כְּבֵית בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל... לְסֹהָרָהוֹת אֲלֵיכָם...
בֵּשֵׁם... לְפָם הַתְּמָרִים
for on this day purgation will be performed on your behalf... to purify you... once Yearly...
... you will be purified before the Lord (Lev. 16:30,34)

The comparison with the passage from Leviticus indicates the close association of the verb kippër with the verb tībêr, i.e., the first fruits, as it were, “purify”17 the rest of the crop. There is, however, an important difference to be reckoned with. Here the means of purification is the same as the object of it. Whereas the purgation animal purifies the Sanctuary on behalf of the people, the first fruits release the rest of the crop for profane use.18 This usage of kippër, to my knowledge, is not attested in the Bible. Its equivalent would be the non-priestly term hillel, “desanctify” (e.g., Deut. 20:6), and it must be accounted as an innovation by the Scroll. Perhaps, inasmuch as the effect of offering the first fruits is to release the rest of the fruits, the rendering “ransom” is best, a meaning attested for kippër (e.g., Num. 8:19)19 but in quite different contexts.

(15) II, 75 הַכְּסִיָּה שְׁעָלֵיהֶם ולְאָדוֹת
of wood, as a whole offering to the Lord (23:3)

This restoration depends on the fragment Rockefeller 42.178 (pl. 38:1*) לְאָדוֹת הַכְּסִיָּה, implying, according to Yadin, that on the Wood Festival the wood was brought as an הַכְּסִיָּה, a whole offering, i.e., it was actually sacrificed on the altar. He bases this interpretation (I, 100) on another

19 Cf. n. 7, above.
fragment, Rockefeller 43.666 (pl. 40:1)*, resulting in the rendering, “they will sacrifice the wood as a whole offering to the Lord”.

However, an alternate solution is possible: קָרַכְך can mean not “to sacrifice” but, as attested frequently, “to contribute” (e.g., Num. 7:3.10), and the noun קָרָכִי can mean “contribution, gift” (e.g., Num. 7:13, 31:50). Furthermore, the hapax legomenon קָרַכְךָ העצים (Neh. 10:35) surely refers to periodic contributions of wood and not to their sacrifice. Accordingly, Rockefeller 42.178 can also be restored as follows: קָרַכְךָ בָּמֵשָׁהּ קָרַכְךָ העצים, so that “wood” is part of the festival name and the whole offering refers to the בִּכְסָא, אֵיל, לְמַ, צָעָר, animals which are mentioned in the following lines (4,6). Thus the translation would be, “on the Wood Offering Festival they shall sacrifice as a whole offering to the Lord . . .”.

(16) II, 75 שֵׁיָר שֵׁיָר יָהֶשׁ לְ two he-goats (23:4) two goats to (Rock. 42. 178)

Yadin (I, 102-03) postulates that two he-goats were brought by each tribe during the six day Wood Festival as purgation offerings, one to atone for the priests and the other for the tribe. He cites for comparison the two purgation bulls for the priests and people during the Priestly Consecration, and the two rams, likewise for the priests and the people, on the Day of Atonement.

First, the analogies are questionable. The rams prescribed for the Day of Atonement are whole offerings and not purgation offerings, and the requirement of two purgation bulls for the Priestly Consecration (a unique feature of the Scroll) makes sense on its own terms: before the priests atone for the people they must atone for themselves (just as they do on the Day of Atonement, Lev. 16:11-19).

10 J. C. Greenfield, RB, 80 (1973), 51.
Other objections can be mustered. Yadin is certainly correct in suggesting that the Wood Festival offerings were modelled on the sacrificial order for the dedication of the altar. But if so, only one he-goat per tribe was prescribed (Num. 7:16, 22, 28, 34, etc.)!

Moreover, why would each tribe have to bring an additional he-goat? It certainly had to provide its own atonement, but why would each tribe have to atone for the priests? Indeed, the line

שוהט לָפָד אֵלֶּה הַעֲשִׂר הַעֲשָׂרִים לְאָרָסָף

“first the he-goat shall be slaughtered before him” (23:11) implies that there is only one he-goat in the sacrificial order!

The solution suggests itself after one perceives the structure of the entire text of the Wood Festival. It divides itself into two logical and necessary parts 23:2-10, the prescriptive administrative order, in which the whole offering is mentioned first (cf. Num. chaps. 7, 28-29) and the point is stressed that the whole offering of Levi will precede that of Judah (lines 9-10); and 23:11 ff., the descriptive procedural order, stressing that the purgation offering is sacrificed first (line 11). Without predicking this division, the text would ostensibly prescribe the sacrifice of the whole offering ahead of the purgation offering, a procedure which would be contrary to the proper sacrificial order of the Torah, 21 which the Scroll zealously upholds. 22 Thus the requirement of two he-goats (23:4) falls into the prescriptive administrative order, and therein lies the solution:

In the prescriptive order, it is emphasized that Judah’s whole offering follows directly upon Levi’s whole offering (lines 9-10). Thus it must be assumed that in the preceding lines, which unfortunately are too fragmentary for plausible restoration, there must have been a listing of the whole offerings for both these tribes, e.g.,

אַלְפוֹן שֶׁכָּנָה אֶלְיוֹן שֶׁכָּנָה כָּבָּשָּׁן. שֶׁכָּנָה. אַלְפוֹן שֶׁכָּנָה אֶלְיוֹן שֶׁכָּנָה כָּבָּשָּׁן. שֶׁכָּנָה.

In other words, the listing of the sacrificial animals

21 J. Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, nn. 251, 252, 295.
22 As recognized by Yadin, I, 116-19.
was not according to the tribe but according to the day. Thus the two he-goats were not for each single tribe but for the two tribes which were sacrificing them on the same day. In fact, the letter ה in Rock. 42.178 leads me to believe that the text may have read שכר תנו שכים ליהוה, “two he-goats each day”, for which there is ample attestation (e.g., Exod. 29:38; Num. 28:3;22 cf. Exod. 29:36; Num. 28:4; Jer. 37:21; Ezek. 43:25, 45:23). Thus in consonance with all other known he-goat offerings, here too only one is required for the purgation offering.

(17) II, 76 יקריב ... יקריב shall offer ... shall sacrifice (23:9,10)

These verbs describing the sacrifice of the whole offering precede the description of the purgation offering (23:11 ff.). As explained in no. 16, above, this ostensible discrepancy in the rule that the purgation offering must precede all other offerings in the sacrificial series is resolved when one realizes that the first half of the column, down to line 10, gives the prescriptive administrative order in which the whole offering is always listed first, whereas lines 11 ff. give the descriptive procedural order in which, indeed, the purgation offering is sacrificed first (23:11-17), followed by the whole offering (24:1-25:1).

The Day of Atonement ritual according to the Scroll also follows this structure. First the prescriptive order הקריב them ... ב שצל ולל' פר אזריאל (25:12-13) in which the whole offering is cited first. It should be noted that this prescriptive order uses the verb הקריב, the same as in the Wood Festival offerings, above. However, no sooner does the Scroll shift to the descriptive order than the purgation offerings are described first (26:1-27:2), and only then do we read י(dx) ... מעשא ואמר את אindre הוא הלפיאל (27:3), where the technical verb for performing the entire sacrificial ritual, נשע, is used.

(18) II, 77
the caudate lobe in addition to the kidneys (23:15)

Yadin suggests that עָנִיִּים is a scribal error for עָנִיִּים. However, this would imply that the liver is burned on the altar with its appendage (the caudate lobe). But this is not the case. Rather עָנִיִּים is equivalent to עָנִיִּים "in addition to the kidneys" (Lev. 3:15).

(19) II, 71
it should be wholly burned (22:04)

This expression is found in the same context as כָּרָלְכִּים עָלִיֶּה מַעֲשָׂיָה (כָּרָלְכִּים מַעֲשָׂיָה (02) and כָּרָלְכִּים מַעֲשָׂיָה (03), which can only refer to the function and sacrificial accompaniment of a purgation offering bull. Thus cannot be rendered "it is a whole offering". Yadin plausibly suggests that it refers only to the burning of the suet of the purgation bull and its accompanying meal offering and wine libation, and hence should be rendered "it should be wholly burned". He can find firm support for his suggestion in the fact that the same expression occurs in 16:10, in a passage which expressly states that the suet of the purgation bull and the accompanying meal offering and wine libation are burned on the altar. Corroboration can also be sought in 15:12, where the suet and right thigh of the consecration ram together with the accompanying bread offering are called כָּרָלְכִּים because they too are burned on the altar.

But the question remains: how could the term כָּרָלְכִּים be applied to a purgation offering? First, it must be noted that there is a Biblical precedent; כָּרָלְכִּים מַעֲשָׂיָה כָּרָלְכִּים מַעֲשָׂיָה (02), "those who returned from captivity, the exiles, offered whole offerings... he-goats for purgation offerings... all as a whole offering to the Lord" (Ezra 8:35). This verse is clear in its inclusion of the purgation offering among the sacrifices that were com-
pletely burned on the altar. Thus the Bible itself speaks of a purgation offering as an הָלַחֶן.

The answer, I submit, lies in the distinction between two kinds of purgation offerings, the ordinary one whose blood is daubed on the altar horns and whose meat is eaten by the priests (Lev. 6:22), and the rarer one whose blood is aspersed inside the Sanctuary and whose meat may not be eaten and is burned outside.\(^{24}\) The purgation offerings in Ezra 8:35 are of the latter category: their suet is burnt on the altar and their meat outside.\(^{35}\) The complete incineration of the purgation offering makes it, so to speak, "a whole offering to the Lord".

In any event, this Biblical precedent provided the Scroll with ample ground for designating the parts of any sacrifice that were burned on the altar by the term הָלַחֶן.

(20) The aforecited passage (22:04) serves to indicate that there are still many unanswered questions concerning the sacrificial order on the first-fruit festivals. Two of the main ones are:

1. Why is a purgation bull prescribed for the New Oil Festival and not for the others? The argument that the texts are incomplete will not hold for the New Wine Festival where the sacrificial order is restorable.

2. The well-being offering of 14 rams and 14 lambs is prescribed for the New Wine and New Oil \(^{26}\) Festivals (20:1-21:3; 22:2-14). Why is it missing in the sacrificial requirements for the New Barley and New Wheat Festivals? True, the texts of the latter are fragmentary, but the lacunae occur at the beginning of the accounts and not at the end, where the well-being offering would have appeared. One may argue that the New Barley and New Wheat Festivals are Biblical and their sacrifices are fixed, but this argument did not stop the author.

\(^{24}\) J. Milgrom, “Two Kinds of ḥallāq’, VT, 26 (1976), 333-37

\(^{25}\) In agreement with Sitra, Ḥobah, 3:5.

of the Scroll from prescribing an additional whole offering of 12 rams for all the festivals, including the New Wheat (19:3, restored). Besides, what was the Biblical basis for prescribing these 12 whole offering rams as well as the well-being offering of 14 rams and 14 lambs?

*(to be continued)*
No. 5
(f. 206 v)
Ep[is]t[ol]a isaac hebrei ad m[a]g[ist]r[u]m
Caspare[m] am[m]a[n]

[Hebrew text]

1 “Hans”, the German nickname for Johannes.
2 I was unable to ascertain where this was.
3 Above, pp. 79 f. Note the pertinent comment of S. Münster in his Grammatica Chaldaica (Basel, 1527), p. 203: “Id autem didici ex literis, quas doctus quidam Judeus Vuormaciensis ad me Heydelbergae agentem scripsit”. See also Perles, op. cit., pp. 32 f.
FURTHER STUDIES IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL

By Jacob Milgrom, University of California, Berkeley

(continued)

(21) II, 78, אוביה (24:8)

Yadin accepts my emendation אבריה, the metathesis attributable to scribal error. It should be added that this term is attested in Mishnaic Hebrew and in a similar context: אבריה חאתה השארית בכרים, "sections of the purga-
tion offering that became mingled with sections of the whole offering" (Zeb. 8:4). With this emendation the entire passage now makes sense: וה槎ה ישב להר אבריה ולמא אתיי...]...] וה槎ה ישב להר אבריה ולמא אתיי, "so shall they do to each bull, ram, and lamb: its sections shall remain apart" (24:7-8), i.e., the animal sections on the altar shall be kept apart from each other, just as the Scroll explicitly prescribes in 34:12 פך ומר התוח אצלי, "each bull, its sections alongside it".27

(22) II, 84, תשרים אתל מכר

shall be burnt next to his bull (26:9)

The context refers to the burning of the flesh of the bull and he-goat purgation offerings on the Day of Atonement. What need is there to specify that they are to be burned together? The ashes of the purgation offerings were kept apart from the ashes of the other sacrifices—במקם מבדיל להשאתו שמתה שרפה, "in a place set apart for purgation offerings, there it shall be burned" (16:12)—because of the ancient tradition that ritual purgatives retained their magi-cal powers.28 The Biblical basis for the Scroll's prescri-

28 Cf. Yadin's discussion, I, 118.
tion is not clear. Perhaps כַּעֲשֵׂר נַחֲלָתָה (Lev. 4:21) was understood as if כַּעֲשֵׂר = כַּעֲשַׂר, i.e., the second purgation bull should be burned wherever the first one was burnt.

(23) II, 96,98  הָעַלָּל בְּתֵי הָמַסְחָה הַהָאת צְפִי הָתֹב כְּרַדִּי וּשְׁעֵרֵי
מַעַה מִבָּתָן עַדּוּדֵי מַעַלְדוֹת
plate this entire House of the Winding Staircase with gold, its walls, gates, roof—inside and outside—its pillar and stairs (31:8-9)

Why is the House of the Winding Staircase plated with gold? It is because of the rule “Whatever contacts them becomes sacred” (Exod. 30:6) which includes the Tent of Meeting in “them” (v. 20). Thus the sanctity of the Scroll’s Temple communicates itself to any attachment, such as the House of the Winding Staircase, which is connected to the Temple by an elevated viaduct (30:6-7). As gold was used to plate the interior of Solomom’s Temple (1 Kings 6:20) and to fashion its vessels (2 Chr. 4:19), so was gold prescribed for the Scroll’s Temple (4:14) and vessels (3:8,9,12).

Gold was used also in the House of the Laver—מצומחת—which holds אַשָּׁר יִזֶּהַ מִכְסֵם (32:10-11), i.e., to plate the cubicles in which the priestly garments were stored. These garments are holy (Exod. 29:21; Lev. 8:30) and the Scroll adopts the teaching of Ezekiel (42:14, 44:19) that their holiness is contagious to whatever or whomever they contact (33:7). Thus their receptacles in the House of the Laver must also be lined with gold.

Finally, gold was also used in the gates of all three courts of the Temple (36:11; 39:3; 41:16-17). Here the principle followed is that of the Tabernacle construction: the entrances are holier than the surrounding enclosure. Thus the Veil covering the adyton contains more wool and less linen.

30 Yadin, I, 164, correctly associates the term 'hehal with the entire building.
than the inner curtains (Exod. 26:1,31); the entrance screen of the Tent made of embroidered wool and linen is more important than the Tent's outer curtains made of goats' hair and ram and dolphin skins (Exod. 26:7,14,36); and the entrance screen of the Tabernacle enclosure is identical in composition to the entrance screen of the Tent, in contrast to the inferior linen curtains of the enclosure (Exod. 27:9, 16). In this respect it should be noted that the gold of the inner gates (36:11) is of a higher quality (מַכָּב, based on 2 Chr. 3:5-8) than the gold (שֵׁבֶר) of the outer gates (41:16-17), again corresponding to the material gradations of the Tabernacle entrances.

(24) II, 98 אַשְׁפַּמְתּ לַכְּפַר עַל הָעָם
their reparation offering to expiate for the people (32:6)

The new reading suggests the possibility that the reference is to the אַשְׁפַּמְת, the reparation offering. If so, this would be the only instance in the Scroll where it is explicitly assigned an expiatory role (cf. Lev. 5:16, 18, 26:7:7).

(25) II, 112 מַקְמֵם עֵסֶר לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים לְכָלִים
places made for the priests, (the prebends from) their well-being offerings, first fruits, tithes, and the well-being offerings they (themselves) sacrifice (37:10-11)

This passage refers to the places in the inner court where the priests can eat their sacred food. A number of questions spring to mind: (1). Why the double mention of הבן? (2). Why are some of the priestly prebends missing: the first-born

---

32 Unfortunately the adjective describing the type of gold used in the middle gates (39:3) is missing.
33 Qimron, p. 143.
animals, the chest, right thigh, foreleg, check, and stomach—all explicitly assigned to the priests by the Scroll (e.g., 20:15-16, 60:2)? (3). Why must they be eaten in the inner court when the Torah allows priestly prebends from the בוק to be eaten anywhere in a state of purity (Lev. 7:10, 10:14), and even Ezekiel specifies that the prebends from the most sacred offerings, the שמן, תנה, and קנות, may not leave the inner court, and thereby implies that the בוק is excluded from this prohibition (Ezek. 46:20)?

The first two questions are answered by the generalization that seems to operate in the enumeration: יבוקים stand for the priestly prebends from the well-being offerings whose meat belongs entirely to them, i.e., the first-born (cf. Lev. 27:21; Num. 18:17-18) and the offerings they themselves offer.35

As for the third question, I would suggest that the Scroll does permit the priests, if they so wish, to remove their sacred food from the inner court. Indeed, they are commanded to eat their prescribed well-being offerings of the New Wine and New Oil Festival in the outer court (22:13-14; cf. no. 13, above). Here, however, the Scroll presumes that the priests are serving in their course and are forbidden to leave the inner court while wearing their priestly garments (33:7; cf. Ezek. 44:14, 44:19). For such circumstances installations are provided for the priests in the inner court: stoves, tables, and chairs (37:8), so that they can eat while performing their duties.

34 The animal tithe, also a priestly prebend, is probably subsumed under the term תיהלמה; cf. Milgrom, "Temple Scroll", pp. 519-20.
35 I have changed my mind concerning the meaning of יבוקים (37:5) which I felt referred to the priestly prebends from the well-being offerings ("Temple Scroll", pp. 521-22). Now it is clear that this term refers to the offerer’s sacrifices whose suet and blood are offered on the altar in the inner court by the priests and whose meat is eaten by the offerer in the outer court. Support for this interpretation is indicated by the following word דונן... which implies that the previous words did not refer to the priestly prebends.
(26) II, 115 
there they will eat [ ] of the bird, turtle doves, and pigeons (38:10)

This new reading of 38:10\textsuperscript{36} does not leave room for the insertion of את התיבות \textsuperscript{37} “the yields”, from Rock. 43.366, line 6. Besides it would make no sense. Can then the latter, especially its first column (pl. 38:5\textsuperscript{5}), be the text of col. 38?

(27) II, 129

all (the sacred food) that remains from your festivals retains its holiness. It shall be destroyed by fire; it shall not be eaten—it is holy (43:10-13)

Yadin suggests that the consecration ram and bread (Exod. 29:24) provide the precedent for declaring that the tithe also must be destroyed by fire if it is not eaten in its prescribed time. A more likely Biblical warrant, I submit, is the well-being offering, which according to the Scroll is eaten by the people in the outer court under the same conditions of purity concerning which the Torah states: \textsuperscript{38} “what is left by the third day must be consumed in fire... and he who eats of it... has profaned what is sacred to the Lord” (Lev. 19:6,8).

(28) II, 129

they shall not eat of it during their distressful working days (43:15-16)

The word \textsuperscript{39} would seem to derive from \textsuperscript{40} “evil, misfortune”, attested frequently in Scripture; even the form אובד is found (e.g., Ps. 94:23). Another possiblility is that

\textsuperscript{36} Qimron, p. 144.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.
is frequently coupled with הָעָלָם (e.g., Num. 23:21; Ps. 90:10; Job 5:6-7), which can mean “labor” (e.g., Deut. 26:7; Eccl. 2:24, 8:18), and it was this association that the author of the Scroll had in mind when he coupled אָרָא with יֵשׁ יָמִים הַמַּעֲשָׂה “work days”.

However, it is more likely that the Scroll chose אָרָא because of its resemblance to אָרָא, “mourning, sorrow”, which is the very term used by Scripture in the same context of the tithe: לא אכלי באז ממע (Deut. 26:14), which the LXX renders ἐν ῥήμαν, “in my distress”.

So is it understood also by the Karaites: the author of the Sefer ham-Mibhar explains this word as אָרָא נַעֲרָא, “(I did not eat of it) when I was dejected and sad”, to which his commentator Tirat Kesef adds “the worrier is in perpetual mourning”.

Thus the Scroll concludes from this Deuteronomic verse that one must not eat the tithe not only in mourning but also during any distressful period. Therefore, since the only times certain of being free from distress are Sabbaths and festivals, only then may the tithe be eaten (43:2-4).

Herein lies a clear polemic with Rabbinic teaching. The Rabbis actually limit the prohibition of eating the tithe to the initial mourning period, either the first day following death or the time between death and burial (Pes. 8:8; Zeb. 99b-100b). The Scroll extends the prohibition beyond the entire mourning period to include every profane, i.e., working, day.

(29) I, 108 (on 40:13-41:11)

The diagram of the location of the tribes in the wilderness camp is in need of correction. The leading tribe of each deqel should occupy the middle position, since other two tribes in the deqel are חֵזֶק עֹלָם, “camping next to it”. Thus Judah, Reuben, Ephraim, and Dan should be placed at the middle gates. The Scroll, however, conceives of a different arrangement, the basis for which I cannot fathom.

---

38 Only once does it translate בַּאל (Esth. 9:2).
The chambers in the outer court have to be cleansed. They are occupied by the people throughout the year who leave behind all sorts of impurity and *piggul* of their sacrifices. The old priestly course would have become contaminated, and hence must be kept apart from the new uncontaminated course.

But who does the cleansing? If the new course, it too would become contaminated. This point helps illuminate a Biblical crux “They were unable to celebrate it (the *pesah*) at the proper time, since the priests had not purified themselves in sufficient number” (2 Chr. 30:3). The reason is now clear: the purification of the Temple undertaken by the priests lasted from the first to the sixteenth of Nisan (2 Chr. 29:16-17); the date for the *pesah* (the close of the fourteenth of Nisan) intervened, and many of the priests were still involved in the cleansing and were therefore impure.

Even so, the question cannot be resolved. Perhaps the old course is responsible for the cleansing—this would be the simpler solution. If it is the new course, then, like its counterpart who had purified the Temple in Hezekiah’s time, its priests would have to purify themselves before they could enter upon their duties.
you shall make a moat around the Temple... that will separate the most sacred area from the city (46:9-10)

The term מﻛדוש (borrowed from Lev. 16:33) was chosen because of Ezekiel's definition of the Temple precinct's boundaries: ואה לוה אביה על ראם רמה כל יובל סקרן, "such are the instructions for the Temple on top of the mountain: the entire area shall be most sacred" (Ezek. 43:12). Thus Ezekiel designates the Temple precincts as קרשו, "most sacred", a status which the Scroll also accepts by its use of the synonymous term מﻛדוש (though in Leviticus it refers to the adytum). This designation is significant for the system of holiness gradations adopted by the Scroll: the distinction between the Temple and the Temple-city is that between the most sacred and sacred. There is practically no difference between them in regard to impurity prohibitions: both Temple and Temple-city are off limits to the impure. But there is a world of difference in regard to the positive qualifications for entering either sphere: all who are pure may enter the Temple-city, but not necessarily the Temple.

(32) II, 140-141 (on 46:13-16)

One of the startling teachings of the Scroll is that human excrement is defiling. What is its Biblical warrant? It is to be found, I submit, in the following passage (key words are italicized): "Eat it as barley cake; you shall bake it on human excrement before their eyes. So, said the Lord, shall the people of Israel eat their bread, unclean, among the nations to which I will banish them. Then I said, Ah, Lord God, my person was never defiled, nor have I eaten anything that died of itself or was torn by beasts from my youth until now, nor has foul flesh entered my mouth. He answered me, See, I allow you cow's dung instead of human excrement; prepare your bread on that" (Ezek. 4:12-15).
Thus Ezekiel unambiguously declares that human excrement does defile. The implications for the Essenes and for the Qumran sectaries are clear: (1). There can be no lavatories in the Temple-city (46:13-16; cf. Josephus, Wars, 2:147-49). (2). Urination, by implication, does not defile, a deduction that can also be drawn from “there shall be an area for you outside the camp . . . you shall cover up your excrement” (Deut. 23:13-14); otherwise, how could the Essenes of Jerusalem, forbidden to use their lavatories on the Sabbath, have managed? 3. The Qumran sectaries probably bathed after defecation (so did the Essenes, Josephus, Wars, 2:147-49). See Yadin’s excellent discussion, I, 228-35.

(33) II, 140 ל ComVisible בחית

to the northwest of the city, houses (46:14)

Why was the northwest designated as the site for the lavatories, particularly since the prevailing winds are westerlies, and hence even tanneries were forbidden west of the city (BB. 2:9)?

Josephus informs us that the Essenes chose to build their lavatories in “desolate places” (Wars, 2:147-49). East of the city was, according to the Scroll, reserved for impurity bearers (46:16-18). The south and west were probably disqualified because they were separated from the city by deep ravines. At the end of the second Temple period the major population expansion was in the north. Thus, by elimination, only the northwest fulfilled the two desiderata of being desolate and of easy access.

But what of the wind problem? It is the reason for the Scroll’s requirement to build הבתים, “houses” (and the likelihood of Yadin’s identification of βηθοψω with בית ואקום, “the [Essene] excrement houses”). Even though the lavatories were at least 3,000 cubits from the city and hence out of sight, they had to be enclosed, so that their odor would not be wafted back into the city.
they shall not defile my Temple with the skins of their putrid (unsacrificed) animals which they slaughter in the land... you shall not pollute my Temple and city with the skins of your putrid animals (47: 13-18).

The Scroll's emphatic prohibition against bringing skins of unsacrificed animals into Jerusalem is not just a theoretical product of its hermeneutics. It corresponds to the historically verifiable status of Jerusalem at the end of the third century. A proclamation of Antiochus III actually confirms this special sanctity of Jerusalem (Josephus, Antiquities, 12:146). Yadin graciously acknowledges my reference to this proclamation (although in fact it only prohibits the entry of skins of impure animals, whereas the Scroll excludes also the skins of pure but unsacrificed animals), but he does not go far enough, I believe, in drawing its full implications. The fact is that this prohibition is unattested in Rabbinic literature. That the Scroll knows it and makes it a cardinal rule for a purified Jerusalem points to the possibility that the sect may be pre-Maccabean in origin. In any case, it underscores the real reason for the bitterness that the Qumran sectaries felt toward the Temple establishment. Jerusalem did have more stringent rules of purity, which moreover were confirmed by the Syrian monarch, but which were not restored by the Maccabean ruler-priests. Thus from the point of view of Qumran, Jerusalem had been defiled by its own leaders.
and everyone who enters the house will bathe and launder his clothes on the first day. On the third day lustral waters will be aspersed on them, and they will bathe and launder their clothes together with the vessels in the house. On the seventh day they will be aspersed for a second time, and they will bathe and launder their clothes and vessels (49:17-19).

The text would seem to imply that only persons are aspersed with the lustral waters on the third and seventh days, whereas clothes and the vessels in the house are only washed. If so, it would be in direct contradiction to “aspere (the lustral waters) on the tent and on all the vessels and people who were there” (Num. 19:18; cf. 31:32). In fact, the Karaites actually distinguish between the purification of persons and that of objects, deducing from this verse that objects “are purified with one aspersion” (Keter Torah), i.e., they need not undergo two aspersions as do persons.

However, before we draw the unlikely conclusion that the Scroll defies a commandment of the Torah which clearly requires the aspersion of corpse-contaminated objects, we had better inspect another provision of the Scroll. Anyone who enters the house of a woman pregnant with a dead fetus must undergo aspersions, bathing, and laundering on the third and seventh days, to which the Scroll adds “and all the vessels, clothes, skins, and everything made of goats’ hair shall undergo the procedure of this instruction” (50:16-17). Thus objects are subjected to the same purification process as persons.

(36) II, 165 (52:9)

Read בָּשָׂם, as MT (Deut. 15:20), since the ה and כ are at
times indistinguishable (compare the ב of the next word בכם in pl. 67).

(37) II, 166 נחֵר (52:20)

The subject of this verb is not the priests, for the Scroll is in agreement with MT in that the slaughter of sacrificial animals may be performed by a layman. If the Levites perform the sacrificial slaughter in the regular cult (22:4), it may well be that the laity were permitted to perform the slaughter of their own private offerings.39

(38) II, 174 כָּאָשֶׁר דְּבָרָתָּם לְאָבִיתֵךְ
as I promised your fathers (55:12)

This quotation from Deut. 13:18 involves a change from MT which reads כָּאָשֶׁר נָשָׁה לְאָבִיתֵךְ, “as I swore to your fathers”. However, there is no change in meaning, since in Deuteronomy the clauses are synonymous, for כָּאָשֶׁר דְּבָר does not mean “as He spoke/commanded” but “as He promised”, and God’s promise is equivalent to His oath (compare Deut. 12:20 with 19:8, and Deut. 26:19 with 28:12).40

(39) II, 179 בִּיוָא אָשֶׁר מִלְכוֹ אֶלְוָהָ as soon as he is crowned (57:2)

It is hard to believe that the king would order a national military census on his coronation day. But בִּיוָא does not always mean “on the day”. Frequently it should be rendered “thereafter” or “when” (e.g., Num. 3:1, 7:1,10,84 [cf. 88]).

(40) II, 181-82 (on 57:15-19)

The question is: if no woman may live in the Temple-

39 Cf. above, n. 11.
40 For other examples, cf. J. Milgrom, “Profane Slaughter and a Formulaic Key to the Composition of Deuteronomy”, HUCA, 47 (1976), 1-17.
City, how can the king have a queen? Only one answer is possible: the royal precincts were outside of the city of Jerusalem.

The Scroll would have taken its cue from Ezekiel, who in his futuristic vision separates the domain of the nāsiʾ, i.e., the king, from those of the Temple and the city (Ezek. 45:1-8, 48:20-21). In view of this Biblical prescription, the Qumran sectaries were probably horrified to see that the Hasmoneans had built their palace on the eastern slope of the western hill overlooking the Temple mount (Josephus, Wars, 2:344; Antiquities, 20:190). It was within the upper city and subject to the holiness rules of the Scroll, thereby providing another reason for declaring Jerusalem polluted. Ironically, the later Herodian palace might have met the Scroll's standards, since it was built at the city's edge and separated from it by its own wall (Josephus, Wars, 5:177).

The same question applies to the priests: were they of necessity celibate? The answer becomes clear when we realize that the Temple priesthood was divided into courses, each course serving no more than two weeks per year. Thus it was possible for the priests to reside with their families outside the Temple-City, since they were faced with the Scroll's rigid rules of holiness only when their course performed its semi-annual week-long duties in the Temple. During that short time they would probably reside in the Temple and, as observed (no. 13, above), take their sacred meals in the inner court, completely segregated from the worshipers.

(41) II, 187 המנהיגים ועניבים will be astounded at them, while they, in their enemies’ lands, will groan and cry out (59:5-6)

Instead of rendering “their enemies will bring destruction upon them”, it would be best to take שמשה in the attested sense of “astounded, appalled”, i.e., while your enemies ensconced in your cities will express astonishment at their condition, you, in their lands, will give voice to your suffering.

(42) II, 188 שמשה אול אמשה
until they are thoroughly punished (59:5)

This clause expresses the climax of Israel’s suffering in exile before they repent and are restored. As Yadin has noted, the clause is modelled on Hos. 5:15, שמשה אול שמשה, which, as recognized by Ibn Ezra, is capable of two renderings: “until they acknowledge their guilt” (Targum and Rashi) or “until they are punished” (LXX). Both interpretations are possible. But since the notion of repentance implied in the first rendering is expressed in the following clause יושב אל עזר, “then they will turn to Me”, the second rendering seems preferable.

(43) רחובות לאמים מובירם
their male first-born (60:2)

The first-born are thus listed among the priestly perquisites. However, the Scroll has already cited Deut. 15:19-23, which assigns the first-born to the owner, to be sacrificed and eaten at the Temple (52:7-12). Did the Qumran sectaries side with the Rabbis in that the first-born, despite Deuteronomy, belong to the priests (cf. Sifre Num. 118), or did they oppose this Rabbinic teaching, as they often did, and side with Deuteronomy (which is used by the Scroll as the basis of its law) in that the first-born belong to their owners? There is no attempt at harmonization in the Scroll. Perhaps it felt no conflict to begin with. Here it unequivocally item-

42 Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, pp. 3-12.
43 The reading according to Qimron, p. 145.
izes the first-born among the priestly perquisites, and this probably indicates its decision. As for its citation of Deut. 15:18-23, it may have rendered אָכָל (Deut. 15:20) not as “you (the layman) shall eat it” but “you (who are eligible, i.e., the priest) shall eat it” (cf. Ibn Ezra and Sêfer ham-Mibhar on Deut. 15:20).

(44) II, 191

and a levy from their donations... of their hunt, and whatever they ban, and a levy from the spoil and loot (60:4-5)

As noted by Yadin (I, 128), the insertion of the ban between the hunt and spoil levies is confusing. Yet is bears a logic of its own. Spoil and ban (הֶרֶם) are frequently coupled. Before a difficult battle, the spoil is foregone by the warriors and is dedicated in its entirety to God (e.g., Jericho, Josh. 6:17-19; Arad, Num. 21:3; the Canaanites, Deut. 20:16-17. Hence כל מעלה means not everything, i.e., every banned object (the meaning it usually has, cf. Lev. 27:28; Num. 18:14; Ezek. 44:29), but only all of the banned object. Thus while the priests’ levy amounts only to 0.1% (58:13), they receive 100% of every ban.

(45) II, 192

cכֹל אַחֶר הָהֲלִיָּמִים יִשְׁרָאֵל יְהֹואָד הַסּוֹפֵר לְשָׁמָה לְמִשְׁמָעֳה

as all his fellow Levites, he shall assist those in attendance there before Me (60:14)

Deut. 18:7 states: וֶהָיָה בְּמֶשֶׁח בְּאֶלְּכָי ככֹּל אַחֶר הָהֲלִיָּמִים יִשְׁרָאֵל שָׁמָה יִשְׁרָאֵל מִן "he may serve in the name of the Lord his God like all his fellow Levites who are there in attendance before the Lord". But what does “serve” mean? Does it connote that the Levites may officiate? The ambiguity is clarified by the Scroll’s rewriting of this verse. Now the

44 Milgrom, “Profane Slaughter”, pp. 6-9.
object of "serve" is "those in attendance". Thou
she can only mean "assist" and not "officiate". Though
the Scroll has greatly enhanced the powers of the Levites
even to the extent of assuming the priestly function
of blessing the people, they in no way usurp the priestly role
of officiating at the altar.

(46) II, 201

לֹאָ मַעְטַ לְךָ בְּשָׂרוֹ הָרָע כִּי בֵּצֵנֶךָ שָׁנָה שְׁלֵשָׁי לְאֹ אַנְשָׁל שְׁאֵל וּיְבָוָאָ רֵאָ שֵׁנִים

she shall not touch your pure food for seven
years, and she may not eat of the well-being
offering until seven (full) years have elapsed
(63:14-15)

Yadin is surely correct in thinking that this addition to
Deut. 20:13 indicates that the seven years during which
the captive woman may not eat of the well-being offering
imply a longer period than the seven years during which she
may not handle her husband’s pure food. Yadin feels that
an additional seven years is meant (I, 281), i.e., she must
abstain from sacrificial food for 14 years. I submit another
solution, one that is consistent with the priestly system of
purities: she may not eat pure food until the seventh year
and sacrificial food until the eighth year. This would cor-
respond to the 7/8 day purification scheme for severe impu-
rities. For example, the leper and the gonorrheic become
pure after they bathe during the seventh day of their purifi-
cation (Lev. 14:9, 15:13) and are presumably able to enjoy
free contact with all pure persons and food, but not until
the eighth day, after they have brought their prescribed
sacrifices (Lev. 14:10, 15:14), are they allowed to handle
sancta, for until then they are subject to the prohibition
"she shall not touch any sacred object nor enter the Sanctu-
ary" (Lev. 12:4). Thus purification is achieved not at the

45 Milgrom, "Temple Scroll", p. 503.
46 Ibid., n. 11 should now be crossed off.
end of the seventh or eighth day, but during these days, once the requisite ceremonies are carried out.

Perhaps, as Yadin claims (I, 256), the Scroll does not recognize the Rabbinic concept of מָזוֹן כַּפֵּרִים, i.e., that bathing per se effects a degree of purification,\textsuperscript{47} but it surely holds to the concept of מָזוֹן כַּפֵּרִים, literally “taking expiation” (Kel. 1:5,8), meaning that complete purification is not effected until the purgation sacrifice on the eighth day, a requirement well grounded in Scripture (cf. Ker. 2:1 for references). Hence it is logical to expect that the Scroll (and the Qumran sectaries) would have made a distinction between pure food and sacred food, thus requiring a longer period of purification for access to the latter. Seemingly, the Scroll admits of this distinction when it states that corpse-contaminated persons may at the close of the seventh day “contact all their pure food” (49:21), a possible indication that it distinguished between pure food of the seventh day and sacred food of the eighth.

The fragmentary nature of the text does not allow any firm hypothesis about how this distinction operated in the case of the captive woman. On the analogy of the 7/8 day purification scheme it may be conjectured that she was permitted to partake of pure food when the seventh calendar year had ended, i.e., when the first of Nisan occurred for the seventh time. This would correspond to sunset, the astronomical end of the seventh day. But she would be permitted sacred food only during the eighth year after seven full years had elapsed.

\textsuperscript{47} I am not certain that the Qumran sectaries did away completely with the מָזוֹן כַּפֵּרִים concept. True, they always require sunset as well as bathing on the seventh day, but all the registered cases deal with corpse contamination (49:20; 50:4,9,15; 51:35), which, however, is the most severe of all the impurities. Perhaps in their view the sunset was not one of the required thresholds for the leper and the gonorrhoeic (the prescriptions for these impurity bearers are unfortunately missing). The objection may be raised that the sunset requirement is imposed upon the minor impurities, nocturnal emission and sexual intercourse (45:9-10), but these impurities are discussed only in connection with the Temple-City.
(47). I would like to close by praising once more Yadin’s magisterial edition of the Temple Scroll. If I have succeeded in offering some insights and improvements, it is only because of his painstaking decipherment and restoration of the text and his comprehensive research into its polemical and historical background.

48 Cf. J. Milgrom, "The Temple Scroll", BA, 41 (1978), 105-20, especially p. 120.
Plan of the middle court, with its twelve gates named after the sons of Jacob. The arrangement is identical with that of the outer court (see detailed caption to the illustration on page 154).