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NOTES

THE THREE TEMPLES OF 4 Q FLORILEGIUM

In his long-awaited publication of the Temple Scroll, Y. Yadin has called attention to the similarity of a passage at the end of its twenty-ninth column to one in the first column of the 4 Q Florilegium. (1) The latter, particularly due to its singular expression miqdad ʿādām (line 6), has been used in support of quite divergent interpretations of Qumran beliefs and hopes regarding the Temple. Therefore, in the reasonable hope that in the light of the Temple Scroll, renewed examination of the Florilegium will bring surer conclusions regarding this subject, we will review the two major interpretations it has received. After noting the problems which they encounter, we will suggest another, perhaps more successful.

A. Building upon the widely accepted theory that the Qumran community considered itself a temple, many scholars have seized upon the term miqdad ʿādām as further confirmation for it: the sect, so they hold, is a "human temple". (2) This text, in fact, is a very


"a sanctuary amongst men". (6) This unique phrase was created by the commentator, YADIN explains, (7) in order to clarify the contrast between this temple and another one which God has built, but not amongst men: the heavenly temple. Thus, he argues, this text expresses the hope for a new temple, essentially like the former one, but differing in that it will be built by God's hands.

Along with maintaining the essential similarity of the former temple and the expected one, this interpretation also releases us from the necessity of taking midrash in both material and metaphorical senses within the same line 6. (8) Similarly, it further allows us to take manahlem, in line 6, as a literal reference to sacrifice, the purpose of the future temple, (9) without requiring metaphorical interpretations of that word as well. Finally, YADIN now argues, the new passage from the Temple Scroll confirms his interpretation. For in promising "I will sanctify My temple with My glory which I will cause to dwell upon it, until the day of blessing when I will create My temple to establish it for Me forever," God nowhere hints that the eschatological temple or its cult will differ in essence from the interim ones. (10)

While this new passage does confirm that the Florilegium's future temple will be essentially the same as the former one, it seems


(8) Cfr. P. M. CROSS, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (1956-57 Haskell Lectures), 2nd. edition, Garden City, New York, 1961, p. 102, n. 120, and KLINGEN, Umdeutung..., p. 48, who properly criticize those who, in a similar matter, give a spiritualizing interpretation to the "sacrifices" which JOSIPPUS (Antiquities XVIII, 1, b, § 10) says the Essenes "perform" by themselves, while giving a literal translation to the same words when, a breath before, JOSIPPUS uses them in stating that the Essenes do not sacrifice at the Temple.

(9) See too FLISER, Two Notes..., p. 102. STRUCK, (Notes on margin..., p. 221) has even suggested reading, in line 7, מ"ש תַּשֶּׁנֶת instead of מ"ש תַּשֶּׁנֶת; cf. KLINGEN, Umdeutung..., p. 84, who leans in favor of this suggestion. BAUMGARTEN (Studies..., p. 83) emphasizes, however, that the use of 'in with תַּשֶּׁנֶת as a designation of the sectarians and their activities is characteristic of the scrolls. But even if the reading תַּשֶּׁנֶת is therefore retained, it need not follow that, as BAUMGARTEN argues, the מ"ש תַּשֶּׁנֶת which the sectarians hope to perform in the future will exclude sacrifices. Rather, the term simply refers to observance according to the law, and when the ability to sacrifice in a purified temple would become available to the sectarians, there is no reason why their offerings could not be likewise characterized as מ"ש תַּשֶּׁנֶת.

(10) Temple Scroll, vol. 1, p. 144; my translation of XXIX, 8-10 (see n. 1, above).
welcome supplement to the other evidence for the temple-community thesis, for it is the only one which explicitly mentions a temple (miqdās). (3)

However, this interpretation of 4 Q Flor. has been rejected by many, even those who otherwise subscribe to the temple-community thesis, (4) and this largely for two good reasons: 1) the text seems to state this temple will exist in the end of days (be'ahdrell hayydmim, line 2) (5), while, if it refers to a temple-community, which now exists, this would be unnecessary; and 2) the contrast of this temple with Israel's prior temple, which was defiled (lines 5-6), implies that the two temples are essentially similar (i.e., est, material), the only difference being that the second would not share the fate of the first.

B. Another interpretation, that of Yadim, Flusser, and others, avoids both difficulties by translating the problematic phrase as


(3) Apart from the citation of Ezekiel 44, 16 in Dan. Doc. IV, 1; cf. J. Murphy-O’Connor’s comments in Revue Biblique, 79, 1972, pp. 438-439 (in his review of Klemke’s book cited in the next note). The other main proof-texts of the temple-community thesis are 1 Q Sekh V, 8, VIII, 5-6, VIII, 9, and IX, 6, with secondary references sometimes made to 1 Q p Hev XI, 3-4 (Lebanon) and 4 Q p Isaa. In this article we will confine ourselves to the question of the relevance of 4 Q Florilegium.


(5) Which has a decidedly future reference; see J. Livern, The “Sons of Zacah the Priests” in the Dead Sea Sect, in Revue de Qumran, n° 21, vol. 6, fasc. 1, February 1967, p. 10, n. 15, and Klemke, Umdeutung..., p. 141. Cf. especially 4 Q Florilegium 1, 12, where the messianic descendant of David is described as being in Zion n’qawt nymv; no one would hold that this refers to a figure the commentator believed present in his own time. (In retaining the conventional translation “the end of days”, I do not mean to imply that n’qawt nymv refers to anything more definite than “the future”; see J. Carmignac, La notion d’archéologie dans la Bible et à Qumran, in Revue de Qumran, n° 25, vol. 7, fasc. 1, December 1969, pp. 50-57.)
to me, however, that it at the same time argues against Yadin's interpretation of miqdal 'ādām. For, as the Florilegium, so too the Temple Scroll makes no reference to the heavenly temple, but, again as the Florilegium, it does refer to the future temple which God will make. It is therefore unnecessary to look outside of these two passages for the contrast which led the commentator to create the term miqdal 'ādām; the contrast is sufficiently clear between the God-made temple of the future and the man-made temple of the present. The latter, so elaborately described in the Temple Scroll, (11) is what the Florilegium calls a miqdal 'ādām, and thus, indeed, it was already interpreted by its first editor, followed by others as well. (12)

Once we have recognized, however, that the strange term miqdal 'ādām may only be understood as a contrast to miqdal 'ādānay in line 3, we have led to a more basic objection to all of the interpretations outlined above: while they assume that the miqdal 'ādām of lines 6-7, however it is to be translated, is the eschatological temple alluded to in lines 2-5, it now appears that the two are deliberately contrasted. Moreover, if this is true, as I believe, then we are actually dealing with three temples, for the use of miqdal girāṭel in line 6, equally unique, implies that this temple too is being distinguished from the others. A new analysis of the Florilegium is needed, therefore, in order to understand these references.

C. First, we must repeat the oft-made comment that the term "Florilegium" is a misnomer. (13) Lines 1-13 are more aptly termed a pesher of a single passage, 2 Sam 7, 10-14. This observation has more than semantic importance: it means that the order of texts and ideas discussed is governed by that of the biblical text (while the compiler of a florilegium is free to pick texts as he likes). That this is so is confirmed by a glance at the text: lines 1-2 quote verses 10b-11a, explaining them in lines 3ff. (leaving aside, for the moment, the question of where this explanation ends); line 7 quotes

(11) It seems clear that the Temple Scroll describes the Temple as it was to have been built, in the opinion of its author(s); so Yadin, Temple Scroll, vol. 1, p. 141, followed in reviews by J. Mann (in Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 90, 1978, p. 153) and D. Flusser (Ha-Arets, 3 February 1978, p. 18).
(16) New Commentary Structure.
(17) On this and similar introd...
7, 11b, which is explained in lines 7-9; and lines 10-11 quote verses 11c-14a, which are explained in lines 11-13. With the exception of verse 13, to which we shall return, only duplications are omitted from the text of verses 10-14, (14) and all texts are cited in order.

Next, we must note that while 3o‘ayil is used with two senses in 2 Sam 7, both of David’s posterity and of the Temple, our text splits its discussion into two distinct sections and avoids the ambiguity: lines 1-6 speak of temples, using the term miqdat (3o‘ayil appears only in line 2), while lines 7-13, beginning with wa’di‘er ‘amar l’davdo (again ignoring the phrase wayyqomer ... ‘ora in lines 6-7, for the moment), refer only to the 3o‘ayil of David’s posterity. By carefully choosing its words, this midrash has clarified the two parts of the discussion. Gärnter is thus wrong in stating that “the theme of the text, as far as the expression miqdat ‘eqdám, is that the eschatological temple is to be made up of the community”; (15) the text actually clearly puts its discussion of the community— if that is how one may understand its references to David’s posterity—only after this expression.

Finally, one must note the importance of introductory formulae. Lamm, in his discussion of the nature of the Florilegium, emphasized that, with two exceptions, introductory formulae are not used to introduce the biblical texts to be explained, but they are used to introduce the text used a commentary. Lamm explained only one of the exceptions, apparently correctly: the introduction midrash me... in line 14 was used to call attention to the fact that the commentator is now turning to passages from a new section of the Bible. (16) The other exception is in line 7, where wa’di‘er ‘amar l’davdo introduces verse 11b, which is thereafter explained. (17) As verse 11a was the last-explained verse, according to the scheme we outlined above, we cannot explain this formula as an indication, as in line 14, that the following verse is from a new section of the

(14) Both are in verse 12: 1) the reference to David’s death—which could not be inferred from the allusion to “your seed after you”, and 2) the redundant information that that seed “shall proceed from your bowels”.

(15) Temple and Community..., p. 35.


(17) On this and similar introductory formulae, see above...
Bible. However, on the analogy of line 14, we must infer, as is natural, that the formula somehow indicates a change from the preceding discussion. But what change? Since the formula is not merely a standardized ka'der kâtâb, as in lines 2, 12, 15, and 16, but rather points out that verse 11b was said to (or of) David, it seems reasonable to suggest that the use of this formula indicates that the foregoing was said to or of someone else. (18)

Having made these three observations, the following suggestion may be offered: "And He said to build Him a man-made temple" is meant as a paraphrase of verse 13a, which refers to Solomon's future construction of the Temple. It is followed by an explanation of the purpose of this temple, in terms obviously reminiscent of those used for the same purpose by Solomon himself, according to 2 Chr 2, 5: ìhâqîlîr lepâdîyîw.

This interpretation takes account of all the difficulties we have noticed:

a. We must no longer assume the absence of this important passage. (19)

b. We can understand why the next citation from Samuel has to be introduced with a reference to David: to distinguish it from the preceding words, which referred to Solomon.

c. We can also understand why this half-verse, in contrast to all the others commented upon, is cited out of order (the rest of verses 11-14 are cited and explained only later), for its topic, along with that of verses 10-11a, in the sectarian interpretation, is the temple, not the "house" of David's posterity. (20)

Two objections might be raised:

a. Line 6 does not give a literal quotation of verse 13a. However, the other quotations are not literal either, and we have even

(18) Which excludes the possibility that the foregoing phrase reports David's request to build a temple for God; cf. Michæl and Bätz, Von Gott getrug..., p. 9, n. 35, who also reject that possibility, from their own point of view.

(19) Its absence has been noted by some scholars, including Michæl and Bätz, loco citato, p. 10, who explain that "Gott setzet erbaut ja Sein Heiligum"; Gaston (No Stone..., p. 128, n. 2) implies a similar explanation. As has been explained, however, the temple which God will build, referred to in lines 25, seems to be deliberately distinguished from that alluded to in lines 6-7.

(20) The second half of verse 13, wâlnîl y'kkîn wîlîl y'îlîl, on the other hand, dealing as it does with David's posterity, was not transferred to the first half of the Florilegium but rather left in its place and assimilated, in lines 10-11, with the last words of verse 15 (wâlnîl y'kkîn ywîl), with verse 13a removed, literal reproduction of the latter followed by 13b would have been ridiculously redundant.
noticed two omissions (n. 14). Furthermore, it is quite easy to understand how and why the commentator changed *hu‘ yibneḥ bagil lisml* to *wayyōmer libnōl lō migdal ‘addām*: the speaker is God, who "said," indirect speech changing *lisml* to the third person and *lō* being used instead of *līsmō*, (21) as already in 1 Chr 17, 12.25 and 2 Chr 2, 5 (to which we have already referred as the source of the definition of the Temple’s purpose); *migdal* is substituted for *bagil*, as explained above, in line with the commentator's attempt to avoid the ambiguous meaning of the latter in Nathan's speech.

b. It might also be argued that reference to Solomon’s Temple is irrelevant, or at least anticlimactic, in an eschatological midrash, as this is so often termed. However, we must reassert the importance of the recognition that the commentator did not freely choose his material, but rather commented on whole texts from beginning to end, without significant omission. The lack of coherence or relevance of this part of the *Florilegium* is thus only a reflection of the jarring presence of verse 13a in the context of Nathan’s speech; many critics, as is well known, have deemed it an interpolation into a speech which otherwise seems to reject temples altogether. (22) However that may be, (23) we have no reason to suspect that such doubts were entertained by the Qumran sectarians, (24) and our commentator, in fact, seems to have explained this half-verse just as he explained the rest of the passage.

In summary, then, the *Florilegium* refers to three temples: the Third Temple, to be built by God in the eschatological future;

(21) Note that the Septuagint here reflects both readings, having both *mei* and *lō onomāl lō*.

(22) So, for example, G. Westphal, *Johannes Weihnachtslied nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer* (Beiträge zur Zeitgeschichte für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 15), Gießen, 1926, p. 162; M. Simon, *La prophétie de Nathan et le Temple* (Remarques sur 11 Sam. 1), in Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses, 32, 1952, pp. 41-58, especially 50-51. Both refer to Wellhausen, who, however, is more tentative than they: "Übrigens kenne ich nicht, dass ich unser Vers streichen würde, wäre nicht 1 Reg. 6, 10" (Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, Göttingen, 1881, p. 172).


(24) M. Simon (*Saint Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church, 1816*, Haskell Lectures, London, 1956, p. 81), in a similar case, asserts that Stephen was aware that verse 13a was interpolated. Even that is doubtful, to say the least; for the Qumran community, in any case, we have no reason to suppose that they held any part of the Bible, including those favorable to sacrifice and temple, were "false pricopes". See Baumgarten, *Studies...,* pp. 39-54, for a review of the evidence for Qumran’s essentially favorable view of sacrificial worship.
the Second Temple, which the sect held to be desecrated; and the First Temple, built by Solomon. These, it tells us, are alluded to in verses 10 and 13 of 2 Sam 7: verse 10 alludes to the Third and Second Temples, while verse 13 alludes to the First. The new passage from the Temple Scroll, col. XXIX, now confirms these views regarding the First and Third Temples, while the Second Temple is not mentioned. As Flusser (25) has emphasized, furthermore, these are views evidenced in other Second Temple period texts as well; (28) for the sect, in particular, the view that the current temple is "desolate" is amply paralleled. (27)


(26) These include Jubilees 1, 17 (cf. 1, 28-29), which, like the Temple Scroll, purports to be God's words to Moses and, again like the Temple Scroll, refers only to the first man-made temple and the future God-made one; cf. Testaments of the Patriarchs, Benjamin, IX, 2. Other texts, such as Tobit 14, 5, Zaggai 2, 39, Ben-Sira 36, 15-14, and 11 (Syria) Apocalypse of Baruch 32, 9-4, while not condemning the Second Temple, still express the hope that the future one will be more glorious.

(27) As Flusser explains (Two Notes..., p. 102, n. 9), "Éém" need not imply destruction, for it may mean pollution and desecration as well; Kleinzingo's double (Umdelung..., p. 92, n. 15) are not convincing. Cf. Yerushalmi, Zaggai 11, 3, 78a, where the word is used simply to note pejoratively that there were no people in the Temple court. Furthermore, as the Second Temple is contrasted with the Third, which will not be polluted by the entrance of impure people ("Ammonite, Moabite...", line 4), it seems natural to interpret lines 5-6 as referring to the pollution of the former. (I thank Professor Joseph Baumgartner for this, as for several other ideas which are reflected in this paper, although we do not always agree.) Cf. Nehemiah 13, 1-9 and Lamentations 1, 10 for other cases in which those not allowed "to enter the congregation" are regarded as polluting in the Temple. For detailed evidence of the sect's view that the Second Temple was defiled, see Kleinzingo, Umdelung..., pp. 12-20. It may even be that the unique expression ṣâšêr yânâti, itself carried a pejorative connotation, for 1) its closest biblical counterpart is Amos 7, 9, where ṣâšêr yânâti are the condemned sanctuaries of the northern kingdom, and 2) similarly, the sect at times characterized itself as "Judaí", its enemies as "Menasseh" and "Ephraim", which latter together comprised the wicked northern kingdom of Israel; see Flusser, Pharisaism, Sadducees, and Essenes in Peshar Nahum, in In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon: Essays in Jewish History and Philology, edited by H. Dorman, S. Safrai, and M. Stern, (Tel-Aviv), HaKibbutz HaMeuchad, 1970, pp. 138-141 (Hebrew); Löser, Die Texte..., p. 294, n. 7. Cf. 11 Chronicles 36, 17: the Temple had been God's house in verses 14-15, but now, when the people persisted in its sinfulness, it is only "their temple". Similarly, the Testament of Levi, chapters 15-16, according to an Armenian version (A²) cited in the apparatus of R. H. Charles' edition (The Greek Versions of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford, 1904, pp. 57-58), refers to what was polluted as "your sanctuary" (15, 1), "our altars" (16, 1), "your temple" (16, 4), "your
THE THREE TEMPLES OF Q FLOREIGIUM

analysis of the Florilegium here proposed shows, and the Temple Scroll confirms, there is thus no reason for viewing Q Flor as evidence for the temple-community thesis; it is rather just another text which states that although man-made temples were indeed ordained by God, the present one was defiled, while the future held hope for a new and eternally pure one to be built by God Himself (28).

Daniel R. Schwartz.

when speaking of the Levites' ideal charge, this version refers to "the Sanctuary of the Lord". On the value of this version, see Charles, ibidem, points xiv-xvi. It may be, however, that Q Florilegium uses the term modis vim...simply as a reflex of 11 Samuel 7, 10a's reference to "a place for my people Israel"; see above, n. 14.

(20) It should be emphasized that the expected future construction of the temple by God was not usually envisioned as the descent of the or a heavenly Temple. While Charles (The Apocalypse of Baruch, London, 1896, p. 7) writes that "the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven...was indeed a very current conception in the latter half of the first century a.D."; almost all of the sources which he cites in this connection are irrelevant: 1) 11 (Syriac) Apocalypse of Baruch 32, 2-4 makes no mention of a descent, but only of a rebuilding; 2) ibidem, chapter 4 does indeed refer to a heavenly Jerusalem, but does not say it will descend; 3) Testaments of the Patriarchs, Dan, 8, 19-13, like Q Florilegium compares the new Jerusalem to the formerly desolated one, making no mention of a descent; cf. the Apocalypse of Abraham, chapter 29; 4) IV Ezra 8, 52-53 speaks only of a city being built; 5) ibidem, 7, 28, 10, 44-50, and 13, 36, which indeed say a heavenly Jerusalem will "appear" on earth, mean only that in the future others will share the see's current vision of the heavenly Jerusalem; see the ancient versions cited by H. Günkel, in Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testamentes, edited by E. Kautzsch, Tübingen, 1900, vol. 11, p. 390, note d. The conception is virtually missing from rabbinic literature as well, as has been pointed out by H. Buxbaum, Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 3), Tübingen, 1961, pp. 194-196 (cf. ibidem, p. 125, notes 3-4) and by S. Sarna, The Heavenly Jerusalem, in Aris, 23, Winter 1969, p. 18. Only in Revelation 3, 12; 21, 2.10, and in I (Ethiopic) Enoch 90, 28-29 do we find the idea of the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem or Temple. As opposed to Charles' "current conception", Flusser's "marginal" (Jerusalem...p. 206) thus seems a more accurate characterization of the idea's popularity.