

REVUE DE QUMRAN

NUMÉRO 37
SEPTEMBRE 1979

TOME 10
FASCICULE I

PUBLIÉ AVEC LE CONCOURS DU CENTRE NATIONAL
DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE

ARTICLES

J. CARMIGNAC : Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalypique? Son emploi à Qumrân.....	3
E. PURCH : Remarques sur l'écriture de 1 QS VII-VIII.....	36
L.-H. SCHIFFMAN : Communal Meals At Qumran.....	45
James C. VANDERKAM : The Poetry of 1 Q Ap Gen XX, 2-2a.....	57
H. BURGMANN : Die Interkolation in den Jahrwochen des Sonnenkalenders..	67

NOTES

Daniel R. SCHWARTZ : The Three Temples of 6 Q Florilegium.....	83
Robert I. VASHOIZ : Two Notes on 11 Q 1g Job and Biblical Aramaic.....	93
Robert I. VASHOIZ : A further Note on the Problem of Nasalization in Biblical Aramaic, 11 Q 1g Job and 1 Q Genesis Apocryphen.....	96
M. BREKMAN : Another Reference to « A Teacher of Righteousness » in Midrashic Literature.....	97
H. JACOBSON : The Position of the Fingers during the Priestly Blessing...	101

RECENSIONS

E. PURCH : (J. Pouilly, La règle de la communauté de Qumrân).....	103
P. GRELOT (Louis F. Hartmann et Alexander Di Lella, The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and commentary).....	111
P. GRELOT (Daniel, Ester and Jeremiah: The additions. A translation with Introduction and commentary, by Carey A. Moore).....	118
P.-M. BOGABRY (François du Toit Loubecher, Aharit haJamin in die Qumrân Geskrifte).....	119
E. COHENET (Marcello Del Verme, Comunità e condizionalità del bant. Chiesa primitiva e giudaismo esseno-qumranico a confronto).....	119
J. CARMIGNAC (Charles Perrot, La lecture de la Bible: les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes).....	120

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

J. CARMIGNAC : Ouvrages. Périodiques.....	129
---	-----

GABALDA

90, rue Bonaparte, 75006 Paris

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 *miqdaš 'ādām* (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 *miqdaš 'ādām* as further confirmation for it: the sect, so they hold, is a "human temple". (2) This text, in fact, is a very

(1) *The Temple Scroll*, Jerusalem, 1977, vol. I, pp. 143-144 (Hebrew). YADIN's text of XXIX, 8-10, which I have translated on p. 85 below, is found in vol. II, p. 238; photographs of the fragments appear as plates 44 and 14' in vol. III. The *Florilegium* was originally published by J. M. ALLBRO, *Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrāšim*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 77, 1958, pp. 350-354; his definitive publication is in *Qumran Cave 4, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, V, Oxford, 1968, p. 53 and plate xix. Corrections and improved readings have been suggested by YADIN, *A Midrash on 8 Sam. vii and Ps. 1-11 (4 Q Florilegium)*, in *Israel Exploration Journal*, 9, 1959, pp. 95-98, and by J. STROUPELL, *Notes en marge du volume V des « Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan »*, in *Revue de Qumrān*, n° 26, vol. 7, fasc. 2, April 1970, pp. 220-221.

(2) So, among others, B. GÄRTNER, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Society for New Testament Studies, 1968), p. 110.

"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 *miqdat* in both material and metaphorical senses within the same line 6. (8) Similarly, it further allows us to take *maqflrm*, 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

(6) So YADIN, *Midrash...*, p. 96 and now again in his *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 144, n. 13; D. FLUSSEN, *Two Notes on the Midrash on 8 Sam. vii*, in *Israel Exploration Journal*, 9, 1959, p. 102; E. LONSER, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, Munich, 1964, p. 257; J. MAIEN, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, Munich-Basel, 1960, vol. 1, p. 185; KLINZING, *Umdeutung...*, p. 83.

(7) *Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 144, n. 13.

(8) Cf. F. 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 KLINZING, *Umdeutung...*, p. 48, who properly criticize those who, in a similar matter, give a spiritualizing interpretation to the "sacrifices" which JOSEPHUS (*Antiquities* XVIII, 1, 6, § 19) says the Essenes "perform" by themselves, while giving a literal translation to the same words when, a breath before, JOSEPHUS uses them in stating that the Essenes do not sacrifice at the Temple.

(9) So too FLUSSEN, *Two Notes...*, p. 102. STRUGNELL (*Notes en marge...*, p. 221) has even suggested reading, in line 7, מ'ש'י תרנח instead of מ'ש'י תרנח; cf. KLINZING, *Umdeutung...*, p. 84, who leans in favor of this suggestion. BAUMGARTEN (*Studies...*, p. 83) emphasizes, however, that the use of ש'ח with תרנח as a designation of the sectarians and their activities is characteristic of the scrolls. But even if the reading תרנח is therefore retained, it need not follow that, as BAUMGARTEN argues, the מ'ש'י תרנח 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'י תרנח.

(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 (*bē'ahārlī hayyāmīm*, 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 (id est, material), the only difference being that the second would not share the fate of the first.

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

In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, edited by W. ELTESTEN, 2nd. edition, Berlin, 1964, p. 9; G. VERMES, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 2nd. edition, Penguin Books, 1975, pp. 245-246; L. GASTON, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*, (Novum Testamentum Supplement 23), Leiden, 1970, p. 164 (• unmistakably •); T. H. GASTEN, *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, 3rd. edition, Anchor Books, Garden City, New York, 1976, pp. 446, 474, n. 2; J. M. BAUMGARTEN, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 24), Leiden, 1977, pp. 82-83.

(3) Apart from the citation of *Ezekiel 44, 15* in *Dem. Doc. IV, 1*; cf. J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR's comments in *Revue Biblique*, 79, 1972, pp. 438-439 (in his review of KLINZING's book cited in the next note). The other main proof-texts of the temple-community thesis are 1 Q Serek V, 6, VIII, 5-6, VIII, 9, and IX, 6, with secondary references sometimes made to 1 Q p Hab XII, 3-4 (• Lebanon •) and 4 Q p Isa^d. In this article we will confine ourselves to the question of the relevance of 4 Q Florilegium.

(4) Including A. JAUBERT, *La notion d'alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère Chrétienne* (Patristica Sorbonensia, 6), Paris, 1963, pp. 160-161; R. J. MCKELVEY, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs, 3), London, 1969, pp. 50-51; G. KLINZING, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 7), Göttingen, 1971, pp. 82-83. GASTON, on the other hand, calls 4 Q Florilegium "one of the most important texts in which the community of Qumran is seen as the temple" (*No Stone...*, p. 163).

(5) Which has a decidedly future reference; see J. LIVERA, *The "Sons of Zadok the Priests" in the Dead Sea Sect*, in *Revue de Qumrān*, n° 21, vol. 6, fasc. 1, February 1967, p. 10, n. 15, and KLINZING, *Umdeutung...*, p. 141. Cf. especially 4 Q Florilegium 1, 12, where the messianic descendent of David is described as being in Zion n'ḥryt ḥymym; 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 ḥryt ḥymym refers to anything more definite than "the future"; see J. CARMIGNAC, *La notion d'eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumran*, in *Revue de Qumrān*, n° 25, vol. 7, fasc. 1, December 1969, pp. 20-27.)

to me, however, that it at the same time argues against YADIN's interpretation of *miqdaš '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 *miqdaš '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 *miqdaš '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 *miqdaš 'ādām* may only be understood as a contrast to *miqdaš 'dōnāy* in line 3, we have led to a more basic objection to all of the interpretations outlined above: while they assume that the *miqdaš '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 *miqdaš yisrā'el* 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. MAIR (in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 90, 1978, p. 153) and D. FLUSSER (*Ha-Aretz*, 3 February 1978, p. 18).

(12) ALLEGRO (see n. 1, above); JAUBERT, *Notion d'alliance...*, p. 160; A. DUPONT-SOMMER, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*, 3rd. edition, Paris, 1968, p. 325 (but *ibidem*, n. 7, he recognizes «bâti en hommes» as an alternative); MCKELVEY, *New Temple...*, p. 61.

(13) *Temple and Community...*, p. 160.
 (16) *New Commentary Structure...*
 (17) On this and similar introductions...

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 *bayit* 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 *miqdaš* (*bayit* appears only in line 2), while lines 7-13, beginning with *wa'dšer 'amar l'dāwid* (again ignoring the phrase *wayyōmer ... lōra* in lines 6-7, for the moment), refer only to the *bayit* of David's posterity. By carefully choosing its words, this midrash has clarified the two parts of the discussion. GÄRTNER is thus wrong in stating that "the theme of the text, as far as the expression *miqdaš 'ādām*, is that the eschatological temple is to be made up of the community;" (15) the text actually clearly put 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. LANE, 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. LANE explained only one of the exceptions, apparently correctly: the introduction *midraš mē...* 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'dšer 'amar l'dāwid* 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 anyway be inferred from the allusion to "your seed after you", and 2) the redundant information that that seed "shall proceed from your bowels". KUCZ and BURZ (*Von Gott gezeugt...*, p. 10) also list verse 14b as an omission, but this is hardly proper, for the commentator simply ceased his citations with verse 14a. As for the lost beginning of the *Florilegium*, it apparently included at least verse 10, for it is "I will appoint a place for my people Israel..." which the commentator explains as referring to the future temple (line 2), just as Israel's prior troubles, alluded to in the end of verse 10, are taken as references to the pollution of Israel's prior temple (lines 5-6).

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

(16) *New Commentary Structure...*, p. 345.

(17) On this and similar introductory formulae see GÄRTNER, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

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'dler katub*, 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: *lhaqlr lepānyw*.

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. MICHEL and BETZ, *Von Gott erzeugt...*, 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 MICHEL and BETZ, *loc. citato*, p. 10, who explain that "Gott selbst erbaut ja Sein Heiligtum"; 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 2-5, seems to be deliberately distinguished from that alluded to in lines 6-7.

(20) The second half of verse 13, *wknnty 't ks' mmlktw 'd 'wlm*, 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 12 (*wknnty 't mmlktw*); 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' yibneh bayil lism'el* to *wayyōmer libnōt lō miqdaš 'ādām*: the speaker is God, who "said," indirect speech changing *lism'el* to the third person and *lō* being used instead of *lismō*, (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); *miqdaš* is substituted for *bayil*, 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 anticlimatic, 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 *moi* and *lō onomati mou*.

(22) So, for example, G. WESTPHAL, *Jahres Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer* (Beihfte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 15), Giessen, 19'8, p. 162; M. SIMON, *La prophétie de Nathan et le Temple (Remarques sur II Sam. 7)*, in *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, 32, 1952, pp. 41-58, especially 50-51. Both refer to WELLSHAUSEN, who, however, is more tentative than they: "Übrigens leugne ich nicht, dass ich unsern Vers streichen würde, wäre nicht 1 Reg. 5, 19" (*Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, Göttingen, 1871, p. 172).

(23) M. ORA has recently suggested an interpretation of Nathan's speech which assigns verse 13a absolutely crucial role: *A Note on 2 Sam 7*, in *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (Gettysburg Theological Studies, 4), edited by H. N. BREAN, R. D. HEIM, and C. A. MOORE, Philadelphia, 1974, especially p. 408.

(24) M. SIMON (*Saint Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church, 1936*, Haskell Lectures, London, 1958, 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 parts of the Bible, including those favorable to sacrifice and temple, were "false pericopes". See BAUMGARTEN, *Studies...*, pp. 39-51, 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; (26) for the sect, in particular, the view that the current temple is "desolate" is amply paralleled. (27) As the

(25) *Two Notes...*, p. 99; cf. his article, *Jerusalem in the Literature of the Second Temple Period*, in *Ve'im Bigvuroth: Fourscore Years, A Tribute to Hubin and Hannah Mass on their Eightieth Birthdays*, edited by A. EBER-SHUSHAN, A. SH. ELHANANI, A. BIRN, A. M. HABERMANN, and S. SHALOM, Jerusalem, 1974, pp. 264-281 (Hebrew).

(26) These include *Jubilees* 1, 17 (cf. 1, 26-29), 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, *Haggai* 2, 3.9, *Ben-Sira* 36, 12-14, and *II (Syriac) Apocalypse of Baruch* 32, 2-4, 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), *šm* need not imply destruction, for it may mean pollution and desecration as well; KLINZING's doubts (*Umdeutung...*, p. 82, n. 15) are not convincing. Cf. *Yerushalmi, Hagigah* 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 BAUMGARTEN 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 KLINZING, *Umdeutung...*, pp. 12-20. It may even be that the unique expression *mqdš yān'l* itself carried a pejorative connotation, for 1) its closest biblical counterpart is *Amos* 7, 9, where *mqdš yān'l* are the condemned sanctuaries of the northern kingdom, and 2) similarly, the sect at times characterized itself as "Judah", its enemies as "Menasseh" and "Ephraim", which latter together comprised the wicked northern kingdom of Israel; see FLUSSER, *Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes in Pesher Nahum*, in *In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon: Essays in Jewish History and Philology*, edited by M. DORMAN, S. SAFRAI, and M. STERN, [Tel-Aviv], HaKibbutz HaMeuchad, 1970, pp. 139-141 (Hebrew); LONSKY, *Die Texte...*, p. 294, n. 7. Cf. *II 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 (A^a) cited in the apparatus of R. H. CHARLES' edition (*The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford, 1908, pp. 57-59), refers to what was polluted as "your sanctuary" (15, 1), "our altars" (16, 1), "your temple" (16, 4), "your

analysis of the *Florilegium* here proposed shows, and the *Temple Scroll* confirms, there is thus no reason for viewing 4Q 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*, pages xiv-xvi. It may be, however, that 4Q *Florilegium* uses the term מִקְדָּשׁ יְהוָה simply as a reflex of II Samuel 7, 10a's reference to "a place for my people Israel"; see above, n. 14.

(28) 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) II (*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, 5, 12-13, like 4Q *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, 26, 10, 44-59, and 13, 36, which indeed say a heavenly Jerusalem will "appear" on earth, mean only that in the future others will share the seer's current vision of the heavenly Jerusalem; see the ancient versions cited by H. GUNKEL in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, edited by E. KAUTZSCH, Tübingen, 1900, vol. II, p. 370, note d. The conception is virtually missing from rabbinic literature as well, as has been pointed out by H. BIRKENHARD, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2), Tübingen, 1951, pp. 194-196 (cf. *ibidem*, p. 125, notes 3-4) and by S. SAFRAI, *The Heavenly Jerusalem*, in *Ariel*, 23, Winter 1969, p. 16. Only in *Revelation* 3, 12; 21, 2.10, and in I (*Ethiopian*) *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. 286) thus seems a more accurate characterization of the idea's popularity.