THE CONCEPT OF ריע AND ריע שדקמה IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL
A SPATIAL EXAMINATION OF COLUMNS 45-47

Kay, Nicholas

Awarding institution:
King's College London

THE CONCEPT OF עיר AND עיר המקדש

IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL:

A SPATIAL EXAMINATION OF COLUMNS 45-47

SUBMITTED BY

NICHOLAS JOSEPH KAY

FOR

THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

KING'S COLLEGE

LONDON

ABSTRACT

Abstract

The Temple Scroll of Cave 11 (11Q19) bears intriguing features which have not yet received any scholarly attention. The most striking is the repeated iteration of the Hebrew word עיר, our nearest translation to which is 'city'. Indeed, the use of this repetition, mainly in columns 45-47, would indicate a level of concern by the scroll's author about עיר and its concepts. This concern is reinforced by the punning near-homograph עור, translated as both 'blind' and 'animal hide'. Its presence is of significance because both are cited as impurities, forbidden in עיר המקדש, 'temple city'. Up to now, scholarly opinion on the understanding of עיר has restricted itself to the relationship of עיר to המקדש and מקדשי. This has generated differing and inconclusive opinions on the understanding of עיר in the Temple Scroll. The heart of this study takes a more holistic approach to resolve this problem by the application of Critical Spatial Theory, proposed by Henri Lefebvre and subsequently developed by Edward Soja. When applied to עיר and its related spaces, it sheds fresh light on this relationship. A challenge is raised against the prevailing scholarly assumption that עיר relates directly to Jerusalem. The absence of the word 'Jerusalem' in the extant scroll raises the possibility that the divine presence, envisaged in the text, need not necessarily require Jerusalem as its centre. These inconclusive issues open up a research investigation as to the alternative ideas of עיר in the scroll; that is to say, the idea of עיר as a spatial concept, with or without boundaries and its associations with purity practices. This study offers a resolution to the hitherto inconclusive understanding of עיר המקדש in that it is a complete Thirdspace entity rather than separate Firstspace entities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BAR   *Biblical Archaeological Review*

BASOR   *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

BDB   Brown, Driver, Briggs: *Hebrew and English Lexicon,* F. Brown, S. Driver and C. Briggs (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008)

BR   *Biblical Review*

CD   Cairo Damascus (Damascus Document)

CDSSE   Vermes, Geza, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Revised edn. (London: Penguin, 2004).

DCH   *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, ed. by David J. A. Clines, 8 vols (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007)

DJD   *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 40 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955-2008)

DSD   *Dead Sea Discoveries*

DSSSE   García Martínez, F., and Tigchelaar, E.J.C., *The Dead Sea Study Edition*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1998), II.

DSSNT   Martin Abegg and Edward Cook, eds, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins, 1996).

HB   Hebrew Bible

HAR   *Hebrew Annual Review*

HTR   *Harvard Theological Review*

IES   *Israel Exploration Society*

JBL   *Journal of Biblical Literature*

JBR   *Journal of Bible and Religion*

JJS   *Journal of Jewish Studies*

JNES   *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*

JSJ   *Journal of the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*

JSS   *Journal of Semitic Studies*

JQR   *Jewish Quarterly Review*

JSOT   *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

LXX   Septuagint

LCL   Loeb Classical Library

MT   Masoretic Text

OT   Old Testament

OUP   Oxford University Press

PEQ   *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*

PTSDSSP Charlesworth, James H., Henry W. Morisada Rietz and Loren L. Johns, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: The Temple Scroll and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Andrew D. Gross, Michael C. Rand, J. Milgrom, M. T. Davies and A. de la Ronde Van Kirk, 10 vols, VII (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

RevQ   *Revue de Qumrân*

SBL   *Society of Biblical Literature*

SPLSP   *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*

SPCK   Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge

TS   Schiffman, Lawrence H. and Andrew D. Gross, *The Temple Scroll* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021).

REFERENCE STYLE

Footnotes are based on Modern Humanities Research Association guidelines in MHRA Style Guide, 3rd edn. (London: MHRA, 2013).

Biblical book abbreviations are based on *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bs6ct>.

REFERENCE SOURCES

Unless otherwise stated, the Scripture quotations in English contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Anglicized Edition, © 1985, 1995 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission. All rights reserved.

Hebrew Bible quotations are from Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 5th edition (1997).

Translations of the Temple Scroll transcriptions are my own, unless indicated otherwise.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CHAPTER 1

Aim of the Present Dissertation: Introduction

What was the 'temple' (המקדש) of the Temple Scroll and where was it supposed to have been constructed? Ever since this important scroll (11Q19) and its fragmentary duplicates came to light, scholars have been mystified by both its meaning and its contextual significance. Most importantly, the temple exists in association with a 'city' (עיר), but this city is not closely defined. Indeed, the use of the repetition of this word, mainly in columns 45-47, would indicate a level of concern by the scroll's author about עיר and its concepts. What is this city? Moreover, the text's overall purpose is unclear. It certainly proposes an alternative and a more stringently observant temple that is nearer to the divine will. However, the divine commands in the scroll's text have never been executed. This raises the implication that God had never been fully present amongst the Israelites since they re-entered the land.[1] This is of particular note because, at the likely time of composition of the scroll, the Jerusalem temple was standing. The text therefore raises questions about its relationship with the governance of the temple. Perhaps, as has been suggested, the scroll served as an auxillary text (§2.8). In the absence of a consensus of the purpose of the scroll, this is plausible in that it could be considered not only as a document of rebuke to the temple authorities under John Hyrcanus or another Hasmonean ruler but also a statement of what should currently be normative.[2] As noted, the scroll's author presents his text as a corrected precise meaning of the divine revelation at Sinai.[3]

---

[1] Molly M. Zahn, presentation of a paper provisionally entitled 'The Utopian Vision of the Temple Scroll' given at the University of Aberdeen Biblical Studies Seminar, 23 February 2022.

[2] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of Chicago, 1990), p. 1.

[3] *TS* p. 5. The canonical Torah was not precise enough for the scroll's author.

The temple that is proposed in the Temple Scroll is clearly built up as a detailed plan. Molly Zahn suggests that the enormous building project would not necessarily be implemented but would serve as a catalyst for change in the hearts and minds, as it were, of the prevailing temple authorities.[4] However, a description of a utopian vision rather than physical reality on earth is strongly suggested in the narrative by the vastness of its physical dimensions, exceeding by far those of the tabernacle in Exodus, Solomon's temple and Ezekiel.[5] The width of the חיל, 'rampart' (46:9), is fanciful in its size, without any physical doors or passageways through it, for coming and going. It was not even to be a permanent place in which the divine would dwell but rather one designed only until the day of הבריה, 'creation' or 'blessing' (29:9-10).[6] At that time, it would be replaced by a structure which should have been standing in Jerusalem in the first place, rather than appearing at the end time.

How 'real' was the temple of the Temple Scroll, and why, if it was not real, was it envisioned in such detail? It is only by looking closely at the supposedly physical features described in this work that we can begin to understand why these features are of so much concern.

1.1 The Problem with the phrases עיר and עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll

Our fundamental research question is how to understand the scope of the term עיר המקדש. In order to define precisely what such structures that are envisaged and what such structures entail in the imagination of the author(s) of the scroll, we need to look closely at how such structures relate,

---

[4] Molly M. Zahn, presentation of a paper provisionally entitled 'The Utopian Vision of the Temple Scroll' given at the University of Aberdeen Biblical Studies Seminar, 23 February 2022.

[5] Exod. 35, 36 and 37; 2 Chr. 3: 3-8; Ezek. 40-42. See Frauke Uhlenbruch, 'Reconstructing Realities from Biblical Utopias', *Biblical Interpretation*, 3 (2015), 191-206 (p. 191). See also n.4.

[6] The Temple Scroll continues that the divine will then create his sanctuary for all the days according to the covenant between God and Jacob at Bethel (29:10). *TS* p. 87, n.9. They read יום הברכה, 'day of blessing' rather than יום הבריה, 'day of creation' on the basis that 'blessing' is associated with building the sanctuary, as in Jub. 1:16.

and to seek out clues as to how they exist as part of the 'city' as conceptualised. Up to now, despite its importance, there has been no detail in the literature on how the עיר is to be conceptualised. The interesting repetition of this word in columns 45-47, especially in 47, would suggest that the עיר idea was of particular concern to the author/redactor of this scroll. The concept created by the phrase עיר המקדש lies at the heart of this study.

The phrase is identified in the scroll four times and conjectured as a vacat once.[7] Yadin translated it as 'Temple city', in keeping with his announcement in 1967 of the unrolling.[8] Wise, Abegg and Cook and Levine translate similarly.[9] 'City of the Sanctuary' is the translation of Schiffman and Gross, Vermes, Maier and Milgrom.[10] For reasons that are not clear, Schiffman and Gross translate המקדש as 'the Temple', rather than 'the sanctuary', when not linked to עיר.[11] Charlesworth, Maier and Vermes are consistent with 'sanctuary' whilst Wise and others are consistent with 'the Temple'.

Is this difference of translation part of the problem? The word מקדש appears early in scripture in the context of the desert: ועשו לי מקדש, 'let them make me a sanctuary' (Exod. 25:8).[12] The word also appears in the Song of Moses as a dwelling place for God, מקדש אדני כוננו ידחיך, 'the sanctuary[13], Lord, which your hands have established' (Exod. 15:17b). We sense a portable

---

[7] 16:11 (vacat); 45:11, 16-17; 46:10; עיר מקדשי in 47:9, 13. Qimron fills the vacat with למחנה הקדש. See Elisha Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Beer Sheva/ Jerusalem: Ben Gurion University of the Negev/IES, 1996), p. 26.

[8] Yigael Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 30 (1967), 135-139 (p. 136). 'I have called it the Temple Scroll'. See also Baruch A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character', *BASOR* 232 (1978), 5-23 (pp. 14-5).

[9] *DSSNT* pp. 477, 478.

[10] *TS* pp. 123, 129. However, 49:13 is translated as 'city of my Temple'; Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation and Commentary,* trans. by Richard T. White (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), pp. 40, 41, 42. However, 47:13 is translated as 'city of my holiness'. See also *CDSSE* pp. 206, 207, Jacob Milgrom, 'Studies in the Temple Scroll', *JBL* 97 (1978), 501-23, Sidnie White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll', *DSD* 8 (2001), 242-54.

[11] 3:11; 4:9 (vacat); 6:11; 29:8, 9; 43:12; 45:8, 10; 46:2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11; 47:4, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18; 52:15, 17, 18, 20.

[12] BDB, p. 874. 'sacred place', 'sanctuary'.

[13] *NRSV* translation.

desert structure which is, in effect, a marker of the divine presence. Perhaps the idea of a temple reflects a built structure with foundations which may or may not be permanent (11Q19 29:9-10). Sidnie White Crawford is less nuanced in that המקדש means 'the sanctuary, that is the actual tabernacle or temple plus its surrounding installations'.[14] Perhaps this hybrid can be reconciled by understanding the word as a built structure in the context of the desert setting.

So far, any claimed understanding of the relationship between the two component words of the phrase עיר המקדש has been presented in geophysical terms. This has led to an impasse that leads to binary arguementation: the 'city' in question is either Jerusalem or not.

1.2 Current Unsatisfactory Attempts at a Solution: Need for a New Approach

Scholars have written on the meaning of עיר המקדש, 'the city of the temple', by using Jerusalem as the point of reference, despite the fact that the name of the city is absent in the entire extant text.[15] Alas, so far, there is no consensus. Lawrence Schiffman understands עיר המקדש as comprising only the temple precincts, as does Baruch Levine.[16] This contrasts with the view of Yigael Yadin, who sees it as the city of Jerusalem as a whole.[17] Jacob Milgrom, aligning with Yadin, states 'Jerusalem and other cities can be distinguished in the scroll in matters of holiness and purity by extending to Jerusalem a good measure of the holiness of the temple'.[18] As a way of reconciling these views, Sidnie White Crawford proposes that the Temple City was an unspecified city, not necessarily Jerusalem, with the special status of pilgrimage, that 'exists only

---

[14] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', p. 243.

[15] Ibid., pp. 242, 243. Crawford is unique in stating this obvious fact, albeit without any elaboration.

[16] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), p. 290; *TS* pp. 121, 125; See also Baruch A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character', *BASOR* 232 (1978), 5-23 (p. 14). Levine commends 'Temple City', for example, as in 'Vatican City' and 'Cité de l'université'.

[17] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (1983), I, p. 279.

[18] Jacob Milgrom, 'Sabbath and Temple City in the Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character', *BASOR* 233 (1978), 25-27 (p. 27).

to support the Temple and its rites'.[19] Also, as we shall see later (§6.1), the scroll itself speaks of עיר and the עיר המקדש as being separated by a structure, חיל (46:9), yet it is being unified as in כול עיר המקדש (45:11-12). However, did the divine speaker of the Temple Scroll require Jerusalem as its centre?

It could be argued that 'Jerusalem', assumed by scholarship to be the locus of עיר, may have been mentioned in the missing first column(s). However, as it remains absent in the subsequent 65 extant columns, this likelihood is remote. Fascinating questions arise: Do we know whether 'Jerusalem' is meant when the word עיר is used? Is it used as an antithesis to Jerusalem, the locus of the temple which is perceived as being mismanaged? Do the references to עריהמה, their cities, and עריכמה, your cities, contribute to our understanding of עיר? [20]

This study, then, proposes some solutions as to how this impasse can be avoided and asks by what means this issue can be resolved. Up to now, the question of place and space of the geophysical features of עיר המקדש remains unresolved. In looking beyond simple geophysical thinking, we may be able to solve the puzzle of the meaning of עיר המקדש. The question here, therefore, is whether another approach, using Critical Spatiality Theory, might shed light on the meaning of עיר, 'city', and עיר המקדש, 'city of the sanctuary/temple', in the Temple Scroll. Critical Spatiality theory looks at space that is occupied by humans as a lived experience, beyond the realms of history and geography but does not pose necessarily as an alternative to those realms. It extends beyond geographical dualistic worlds, e.g. real versus imaginary, objectivity versus subjective. This occupied space, according to Soja, is a socially produced space, distinguishable

---

[19] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', p. 242.

[20] 47:8 and 47:16 respectively.

from physical space of coordinates and dimensions, 'a place of critical exchange where the geographical imagination can be expanded to encompass a multiplicity of perspectives'.[21]

For our purposes here, we shall consider one particular section. The focus is on the temple, the document shows an interesting literary feature in column 47 and to a lesser extent in 45 and 46: repetition of the word עיר and its iterations.[22] So far, there has not been any commentary on this feature.[23] Indeed, the use of repetition would indicate a level of concern by its author about עיר and its concepts. It is therefore vital that this section be analysed closely.

A further research question for the present study relates to the absence of the word 'Jerusalem' in the extant scroll. Up to now, there has been much scholarly assumption that the עיר of the envisaged temple was Jerusalem. Our study will challenge this assumption by arguing that the divine speaker of the Temple Scroll did not necessarily require Jerusalem as its centre. This, in turn, will have an impact of the understanding of the scoll's עיר. Toward some understanding of this void, a critical review and spatial analysis will be deployed. Recent growing interest in the application of spatiality theory to biblical studies has provided interesting spatial commentaries that have opened up new thinking about these ancient texts.

Our approach to these two problems will provide an important opportunity to advance the understanding of this repeated Hebrew word עיר and its relationship to מקדש. Up to now, scholarly attempts to understand עיר by invoking the closely associated words המקדש and מקדשי have resulted in an impasse. To take this forward, I intend to argue that Soja's concept of Thirdspace is a way of breaking this up, such that עיר could be clarified in the context of

---

[21] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness of Space and Spatiality', in *Communicating in the Thirdspace*, ed. by Karin Ikas and Gerhard Wagner (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 49-61.

[22] *TS* p. 438. Concordance shows 4 times (col. 45), 6 times (col. 46) and 11 times (col. 47). Lesser concentration occurs elsewhere.

[23] Yigael Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1, p. 279. Yadin briefly ascribes the repetition merely to emphasise that the entire temple city is to be holy and pure.

Thirdspace without being shackled to המקדש and מקדשי. For this argument to be secure, we shall be expounding on the work of Lefebvre and Soja in detail (§1.4.2). We shall not be making presumptions about the text but letting the text speak for itself spatially.

Another interesting feature will be explored through other literary aspects of the text; that is, the use of two punning homographs of עיר and their connection with spatiality. These words, in consonant form, are both עור, meaning blind (45:12) and עור, meaning animal hide (47: 7, 13, 15, 17 and 18). Both these entities are identified as impure and forbidden in the עיר in which God dwells in its midst (45:13-14). Given this likely wordplay between עור and עיר in the contexts of sanctity and purity, it will be necessary to explore the dynamics of purity space in the framework of the text. My study will thus be looking primarily at columns 45-47 because they display the unusual features of repetition of עיר and its near-homography relating to impurity. These characteristics may suggest that these three columns are themselves a distinct element within the whole structure.

Might spatiality theory then stimulate a fresh approach to the unresolved problems of interpretation of עיר המקדש? Through the prism of spatiality, I shall be asking whether the Temple Scroll extends its meaning beyond the limited concept of עיר. Its repetition may suggest concern by the author about how עיר was to be understood, especially because it is closely associated with the temple.[24]

---

[24] Paul M. Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), p. 24. Repetition in Ezekiel is cited, for example, in 16:6. The point is raised as to whether this is scribal error or deliberate gloss. See also A. López Eire, 'Rhetoric and Language', in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* ed. by Ian Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), pp. 336-49 (p. 348). Repetition of the same word was a rhetorical strategy in ancient Greek literature, a psychological strategy of magnifying a statement.

1.3. Scholarly Literature on the City in the Hebrew Bible

Previously, the studies of the עיר of the Temple Scroll have relied on what this is referred to in ancient Israel. The subject of the city has been explored widely in studies of the Hebrew Bible. Before so doing, we pay heed to the potential pitfalls in any approach to biblical scholarship, especially with regard to city studies, as highlighted by Lester Grabbe.[25] He asks as to how a 'city' in antiquity can be defined whilst acknowledging the complicated nature of urbanism and urbanisation.[26] The modern idea of city and the relationship of city to hinterland is different today to what was experienced in ancient times.[27] Indeed this is so but the point of a spatial study is to extend beyond the limitations of relative geophysical characteristics to which Grabbe is not contributory.

The Old Testament city in ancient Israel has been extensively reviewed by Frank Frick. His analysis, now somewhat dated, encompasses Old Testament urban terminology and the functional nature of the city through its physical, social, economic and political structures in the Monarchies. Most of his references in that particular context are sociological, archaeological and

---

[25] Lester L. Grabbe, 'Sup-urbs or Only Hyp-urbs? Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio-historical Method', in *Every City Shall Be Forsaken*, ed. by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) pp. 95-123 (pp. 95-97). He robustly counsels caution in the use of sociological data in the pursuit of biblical scholarship: 'But why is it that so many biblical scholars become totally bereft of common sense when they start to mess around in sociology or anthropology (p. 95). The concept of 'urbanism' is a 'perfectly respectable subject in anthropology and sociology and a great deal has been written on it' (p. 96). He offers quasi-apologetic explanation that 'biblical scholars are too influenced by modern urbanization and attempt to apply this model to a society organized in a quite different way' (p. 96).

[26] Lester Grabbe, ''Sup-urbs or only Hyp-urbs?' Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio- Historical Method', pp. 95-123 (p. 108).

[27] Ibid., p. 103. This 'most recent study' refers to a footnote citing solely *The Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776 by Adam Smith. See also Richard Rohrbaugh, 'The pre-industrial city in Luke-Acts: Urban social relations', in *The Social World of Luke-Acts. Models for Interpretation,* ed. by J. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), pp. 125-149 (p. 126): In antiquity, the city was nearly always linked to a group of surrounding villages. Josephus mentions that Caesar bestowed on Agrippa the city of Perea with its fourteen surrounding villages (Josephus, *Antiquities*, 20:159). The idea of a Wilderness Tradition was expanded by John W. Flight; John W. Flight, 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament', *JBL* 42 (1923), 158-226 (p. 210). Flight attributes the phrase 'nomadic ideal' to K. Budde, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', *New World*, 4 (1895), 726-745.

anthropological.[28] Whilst a long way from formal spatiality theory and its categories, Frick helps comprehend the city of ancient Israel in a new way, for example, by extending the idea of עיר as a functioning entity into near-synonyms representing different types of features relevant to the biblical city. Two of these near-synonyms relate to components of the city structure: שער and מגדל. Two other words קריה and הר allude to relative size and position. מקום is more of a generality that may include עיר. He takes the view that עיר bears synonyms which designate some form of community of a secondary settlement or less permanent type of city.[29]

---

[28] Although invaluable from a functional perspective, Frick's now dated work does not invoke interpretational nuance with regard to the city and its essence. However, it could be argued that, albeit unwittingly, his suggested synonyms hint at the idea of a category of space, rather than a closely defined structure; Frank S. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel* (Montana: SBL, 1977), pp. 25-61. Sjoberg proposes certain pre-conditions of city life: 1) a favourable ecological base, 2) advanced agricultural and non-agricultural, 3) complex social organisation and 4) a well-developed power structure; Gideon Sjoberg, *The Pre-Industrial City, Past and Present* (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 5. Westermann is careful to distinguish between the founding of the first city and the city with a tower in the Babel narrative; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, trans. by J. Scullion (London: SPCK, 1984), pp. 327-8, 554. Diane Edwards discusses the conceptual progression from Garden to City. She poses questions as to why we do not have a heavenly garden rather than a heavenly city. An interesting concept of the city as a pre-Edenic phenomenon emerges from this paper; Diane T. Edwards, 'From Garden to City: Closure in the Bible', *Bucknell Review,* 33, 2 (1990), 102-117. M. Daniel Carroll raises the possibility that we are dealing with 'city' as an anonymous entity. In his opinion, there is in the bible only one city although it has a multitude of representations and manifestations; M. Daniel Carroll, 'City of Chaos', in *Every City shall be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, ed. by Lester Grabbe and Robert Haak (Sheffield: JSOT, 2001), pp. 45-61 (p. 49). Mary Mills investigates the concept of urban morality by using readings of the book of Jonah. Her inquiry probes into whether the city is a space whose moral value can be clearly perceived; Mary Mills, 'Urban Morality and the Great City in the Book of Jonah', in *Political Theology*, 11 (2010), 453-465. Yoram Hazony bases his thoughts on the city in terms of biblical ethics rather than theology. The conventional understanding is to consider town and country as opposites. He argues against this by reference to the Cain and Abel narrative; Yoram Hazony, *The Philosophy of Hebrew Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 109 -110.

[29] Frank S. Frick, *City in Ancient Israel*, pp. 25-61. מגדל: As part of the citadel, a tower could be reasonably considered as an important structure around which the city would develop. It is absent in the Temple Scroll. The word arises from the root גדל, 'great', the addition of מ, 'from', 'arising from', lends itself to the concept of 'stronghold'. It is probably not strictly synonymous with עיר but conceptually close. See also Joan E. Taylor, 'Missing Magdala', *PEQ* 146 (2014), 205-33 (pp. 206, 209). The geographical context is examined through the prism of Mary Magdalene's name which, traditionally, indicates the place whence she came. The name is not mentioned, however, in any contemporaneous writings, including the early New Testament. However, there is the ancient ruin of Magdala, just north of Tiberias. Such place-names were used as identifications of people who had left their home towns. Known villages which have part of their name comprising 'Migdal' are scattered between the Mediterranean coast and the river Jordan; in other words, they are 'towers of somewhere'. שער: The concept of the gate as a controlling function of the city is apparent in: Gen. 22:17; 23:10; 24:60; Ruth 4:1; Neh. 1:3; 2:3, 13, 17. הר: 'mountain' is a term which does not mean 'city' specifically but could sometimes be considered as such. Practically the city would be situated on high ground for fortification and protection of its inhabitants.

James Aitken is critical of Frick in that its dated approach restricts it to biblical narrative, rather than exploring the historical context of the city or developing the imagery.[30] Alison Gray sees עיר as a container metaphor, within which is space for another container, for example, a temple.[31] Such a view embraces the ideas of function and human activity. She invokes cultural geography studies to remind us about potential for cultic activity such as the temple. Hugh Pyper reminds us there are no cities in the Hebrew Bible. Rather, there are words about cities. To further his understanding of the biblical city, he argues the etymology of 'metropolis' as having been derived from μέτρον, 'measurement', rather than μέτρου, 'mother' and πόλις 'city'. Hence his understanding of metropolis' is 'a city of measurement' or 'of metre' by which other cities are measured. 'All other cities, great and small, for all their attempts to impose their own rhythms will find themselves marching to the rhythms of Zion'.[32] This interesting idea will be reflected in our analysis of 'other cities' (§6.2). This idea is not lost in our thinking about the absence of Jerusalem in the Temple Scroll. Bradford Anderson reminds us that places are more than just backgrounds; in them we see complexities of a lived experience.[33] Without invoking spatiality, Mary Mills draws a connection between civilisation and nature, in that crop cultivation is a necessary part of urban life, in the context of prophetic writing. We shall be noting that crop

---

[30] James K Aitken and Hilary Marlow, eds, *The City in the Hebrew Bible* (London: T&T Clark, 2018), p. 7.

[31] Alison Gray, 'Reflections of the Meaning(s) of עיר in the Hebrew Bible', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible,* ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 18-34 (p. 22).

[32] Isorhythmy is where inner and outer rhythms, private and public, cosmic and communal, come into step with each other. In his discussion of isorhythmy, Pyper argues that the Jerusalem that is lamented and longed for in exile is a city of a different rhythm to the Jerusalem of lived experience, where the rhythms are set by the rituals of its temple; Hugh Pyper, 'The Biblical Metropolis', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible'*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 35-52 (pp. 37, 43). A community living forcibly outside the city can recreate in its imagination the idealised existence in the city through social praxis of the city, reflected by the temple rhythms described in scripture; Lefebvre, 'Rhythmanalysis of Mediterranean Cities', in *Writings on Cities*, ed. by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 228-40.

[33] Bradford Anderson, 'Mapping Narrative Complexity: Textual Geography, Literary Studies and the City in the Hebrew Bible', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible: Critical Literary and Exegetical Approaches*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow, (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 55-72 (p. 70).

products are not mentioned in our discussion of column 47 of the scroll. In her examination of the shape of a restored Jerusalem in Ezekiel, Deborah Rooke raises an interesting point, especially relevant to our considerations of Jerusalem's absence in the scroll, by reference to the Garden City project of the late 19th century.[34] The earlier part of Ezekiel's vision places the temple on Mount Zion, as before the exile (Ezek. 40:2). Later on, the location of 25,000 cubits square is surrounded by open land (48:15-18), separated from any tribal vested interests, as well as being separated from the temple. This raises the question as to the purpose of the city if it has no temple. The city is still available to the populus, whereas the temple or sanctuary is not. Indeed, the sanctuary is the central spiritual point of Israel's holiness, whereas the city is the centre of social interaction and a lived social experience.[35]

The notion of space is used with regard to biblical texts in the work of Kalinda Rose Stevenson. In her study of Ezekiel 40-48, she invokes space, although without reference to any spatiality theory or its proponents. She reminds us that the precise measurements of Ezekiel's envisioned temple refer to the measurement of spaces rather than the physical structures, such as gates and walls. This may explain the lack of vertical measurements.[36] This may reflect the concept of architectural height as unacceptable to the divine, illustrated in the Babel narrative (Gen. 11:7-9). The 'city', the location of which is unspecified, is configured in Ezekiel 48. It has open space, 250 cubits in each direction (Ezek. 48:17), to be cultivated by the workers of the city. Stevenson understands such measured spaces as territorial codes for apportionment, possession and access: the City is a Possession within the Portion.[37] The city does not divide the tribal portions of

---

[34] Deborah Rooke, 'Urban Planning According to Ezekiel: The Shape of the Restored Jerusalem', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible* (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 123-43 (p. 124). She draws some parallels with the writings of Ebenezer Howard, the originator of the Garden City project of the late nineteenth century of Victorian England. These new cities were for the common good, rather than for vested interests.

[35] Ibid., p. 139-40. Again, she invokes Howard, in that Ezekiel saw a new location, cleared of its previous faults.

[36] Kalinda Rose Stevenson, *The Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), pp. 19, 34.

[37] Ibid., p. 35, fig. 4. This summarises her discussion on 'The Portion' (pp. 30-36).

territory but is available for access by means of gates which are themselves demarcations of space. Interestingly, Ezekiel's vision speaks only of one city, pollution within which makes it impossible for God's residence.[38] Perhaps we may think more broadly of the city as a gate to the divine. Soo Kim follows Stevenson in her analysis of the purpose of Ezekiel 40-48 as referring to a new social order that delineates spatial access.[39] Her reading of horizontal language for the temple construction in Ezekiel is noted by Claudia Camp in her spatial reading of Ben Sira to whom we shall refer in the next section.[40] Paul Joyce raises the question as to whether heavenly and earthly temples are distinguishable. By association, this particular question should also apply to עיר המקדש. He asserts that Ezekiel 43:1-9 is to be understood as the deity being returned to the earthly temple rather than to the heavenly temple which he had never left.[41]

Despite the work done on understanding the עיר in biblical texts, it would appear that this survey of scholarship on the city does not really assist in the understanding of the עיר of the Temple Scroll.

These findings would therefore underscore the necessity for an alternative approach; that is to say, Critical Spatiality Theory. As this will be key to a new perception of עיר, it will now be introduced.

1.4 Exposition of the New Approach and Methodology: Critical Spatial Theory

Whilst most older publications focus on the historical and geographical, some have been identified as showing some useful pointers from which spatiality thinking can be developed. In

---

[38] Julie Galambush, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), p. 127.

[39] Soo J. Kim, 'The City as a Gateway to the Presence of YHWH', *JSOT* 39 (2014), 187-207 (p. 189).

[40] Claudia Camp's contribution is discussed in §1.3.

[41] Paul M. Joyce, 'On Earth as It Is in Heaven: Heavenly and Earthly Temple in Ezekiel 40-48', in *Contextualizing Jewish Temples*, ed. by Tova Ganzel and Shalom Holtz (Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2021), pp. 123-140 (p. 134). He cites contrasting views: Heaven and earth are within the same world. Entering the temple on earth is as if one was entering heaven itself. Another view is that as the temple, the place of divine residence, is on earth, it is one and the same as heaven. The temple, as presented, is the gate of heaven.

this section, we shall not only expound this modern urban-based theory as a framework but also argue in favour of its use in ancient literary discourse.

The formal spatial categorisations of Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991) and Edward Soja (1940-2015) predominate in spatiality discourse. Their ideas of categorised spatiality add new thinking and specific terminology to the human social narrative. Not only do we think in physical space of a given spatial entity but also in terms of our mental and cognitive recognition of that space. Spatial theory gives such thinking a structural paradigm although it is not without its critics (§1.3.5).

However, we shall first highlight significant work by earlier pre-spatiality scholars who wrote about biblical space. Although without categorisation, they alert us to an earlier presence of spatial thinking. Unfortunately, they have not been recognised in modern discourse but are nevertheless foundational and worthy of acknowledgment.

1.4.1 Before spatiality theory

Thinking about space in relation to biblical and extra-biblical texts is not new. Gerardus van der Leeuw wrote in 1933 'What is true of time is equally true of space'. It is the first sentence of the chapter entitled 'Sacred Space' in his book *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*.[42] Although this writing predates spatiality thinking and terminology of Lefebvre and Soja, it is nevertheless the dawn of spatial thought relating to biblical literature. Spatiality was to be developed over the subsequent decades by radical prominent postmodernists and contribute subsequently to biblical thinking. As he wrote:

> Parts of space, therefore, like instances of time, have their specific and independent value.
> They are 'positions'; but they become 'positions' by being 'selected' from the vast eternity of

---

[42] Gerardus van der Leeuw, 'Sacred Space', trans. by J. E. Turner, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 393-402.

the world. A part of space, then is not a 'part' at all, but a place, and the place becomes a 'position' when man occupies and stands on it. He has thus recognized the power of locality, he seeks it or avoids it, attempts to strengthen or enfeeble it; but in any case he selects the place as a 'position'.[43]

The 'position' of van de Leeuw appears to be humanly selected. It is nothing until it is actually 'selected'. If we were to substitute 'position' for 'space', it would underscore a notion that social space is a social product. As we shall see, this particular idea was to be spawned decades later by Henri Lefebvre in his *The Production of Space* as part of a more structured and categorised approach to space, advancing towards the concept of spatiality. [44]

Gerardus van der Leeuw extends his thinking to sacred space:

Sacred space may also be defined as that locality that becomes a position by the effects of power repeating themselves there, or being repeated by man.

A consideration of sacred space does not slot into the later spatiality paradigms but it does prompt fresh thinking beyond the mere material physicality of a given space. There is a human interaction with the divine, as well as a human realisation that the space has some bearing on behaviour within the space.

Sacred space is a long-established category of the sacred phenomenology of religion. Mircea Eliade, without any reference to van der Leeuw, writes specifically about sacred space, not only in general terms but also from the perspectives of diverse belief systems. Again, this is spatial rather than spatiality thinking. Eliade's overriding theme, in terms of space, is the dualism of sacred versus profane.

---

[43] Ibid., p. 393.

[44] Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. by D. Nicholson-Smith (Cambridge, MA, Oxford: Blackwell, 1996). This is the translation of the original work, *La Production de l'espace* (Paris: Anthropos, 1974). I shall be referring to the shorter 'spatiality theory', rather than Critical Spatiality Theory. As the study progresses, I shall also refer to 'spatial analysis'.

For religious man, space is not homogeneous; he experiences interruptions, breaks in it; some parts of space are qualitatively different from others.[45]

To drive the point home, he immediately quotes Moses' encounter with God in the burning bush episode (Exod. 3:5) where Moses is instructed by God to stay put and remove his shoes because where he is standing is holy ground. This is a space which has strength and significance, distinctive from surrounding amorphous space. Thus, there is a break in the homogeneity of space, revealing a fixed point of spatial orientation:

So it is clear to what a degree the discovery -- that is, the revelation -- of a sacred space possesses existential value for religious man; for nothing can begin, nothing can be done, without a previous orientation – and any orientation requires a fixed point. It is for this reason that religious man has always sought to fix his abode at the 'center of the world'.

If the world is to be lived in, it must be *founded* [his italics] - and no world can come to birth in the chaos of the homogeneity and relativity of profane space.[46]

In his discussion of heavenly Jerusalem, Eliade draws attention to the Wisdom of Solomon and 2 Baruch.[47] In quoting the Wisdom (9:8), he states that Solomon has been commanded to build a temple on God's holy mount and an altar in the city where God dwells. It will be a resemblance

---

[45] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane,* trans. by Willard R. Trask (Orlando: Harcourt, 1959), p. 20.

[46] Ibid., p. 22.

[47] 'Baruch asks God if the end of all things will follow on the delivering up of Jerusalem; will Israel's name be lost and students of the law fail? Will chaos return and men die?' According to Charles, the answer lies in 4:1 'And the Lord said to me: This city shall be delivered up for a time, And the people shall be chastened during a time, And the world will not be given over to oblivion'. Charles states that God's answer is that 'Jerusalem will be restored, the chastening of its people restored and chaos will not return'. It appears that Charles has not considered the interpretation of 'for a time'. See R H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: OUP, 1913), p. 482, n. 4.

to the holy tabernacle which God had prepared from the beginning.[48] The word 'beginning'

implies that Jerusalem was modelled by God at the same time as the transcendent paradise of

Eden. Eliade views Jerusalem as 'only an approximate reproduction of the transcendent model.

It could be polluted by man, but the model was incorruptible, for it was not involved in time'.[49]

To reinforce this conceptual point, Eliade then quotes 2 Baruch (4:3-7):

> This building now built in your midst is not that which is revealed with Me, that which was
>
> prepared beforehand here from the time when I took counsel to make Paradise and showed it
>
> to Adam before he sinned.

From these references, the concept of Jerusalem's formation is paradisiacal, only to be tarnished

by man. For Eliade, it would be an Edenic divine space that transcended time and that 'beginning'

was merely textual; it did not reflect divine transcendence.

1.4.2 Critical Spatiality Theory

Early spatial thinking that has been previously discussed (§1.4.1) is not Critical Spatiality Theory

as now defined. The formal categorisation of space is found in the theories of Henri Lefebvre.

This evolved from his interest in French architectural research of the 1960s, in particular how

the spaces of the 'pavilion' were used by 'pavillonaires'. There was no practice specific to the

'pavilion' but rather a concept of dwelling.[50] From these ideas, he became a major intellectual

force in spatial thinking which was directed towards the knowledge of space production, rather

than the science of space. At this point, it should be noted that Lefebvre's *The Production of*

---

[48] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane,* p. 60. I quote this in paraphrase as Eliade has not quoted the source of the translation. As the Wisdom of Solomon is pseudepigraphal, Solomon cannot have been personally responsible for this utterance.

[49] Ibid., p. 60.

[50] Łukasz Stanek, *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research and the Production of Theory* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), p. 85. 'Pavillon' referred to an individual urban or suburban house with a garden, as opposed to the collective estate and the rural house (p. 82).

Space pivots primarily, from his Marxist perspective, around how twentieth century capitalism produces space.[51] Space is a product from which his expansive spatial thinking flowed.[52] As Kim Knott declares, 'we do not need to claim any personal or intellectual engagement with Marxism to be inspired by his spatial ideas'.[53] Even though Lefebvre's setting is a far cry from ancient texts and experiences, they should be welcomed as a useful approach in reading religious texts through the lens of how they conveyed perception, conception and the lived experience of those spaces the texts portrayed. Lefebvre views every society as producing its own space. Physical space has no reality without the deployment of human energy within that space.[54] Such social space evolves by the production of special places, religious and political. In other words, man makes space, not the reverse. Christian Schmid reinforces this basic tenet by breaking with the understanding of space as an independent reality.[55] For Lefebvre, space is bound up with social reality; it is not an absolute. Physical and mental spaces, mathematical and philosophical respectively, do not encompass the lived experience.[56] It is not sufficient for him to limit the understanding of human activities solely in terms of the historical and geographical dimensions of life; spatiality must play its part. However, spatiality does not supplant the others. The three elements of his conceptual triad, his trialectics of spatiality, are specific but interplaying concepts:

---

[51] Henri Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, p. 55. Space is produced entirely by classes and their representatives. 'The class struggle is inscribed in space'. That struggle prevents abstract space from prevailing universally and masking the differences. Presumably, by 'differences', Lefebvre means spatial categorisations.

[52] Ibid., pp. 36-7. Lefebvre asks how spatial production differs from material production.

[53] Kim Knott, *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis* (London: Equinox, 2005), p. 11.

[54] Ibid., p. 14.

[55] Christian Schmid, 'Henri Lefebvre's Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectic', in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre,* ed. by Kanishka Goonewardena and others (New York/London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 27-45 (p. 28).

[56] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 27. See also Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 52. It is this social space that Soja designates as Thirdspace. His introduction of social space spawned Soja's concept of the Trialectics of Being, comprising the entities of Historicality, Sociality and Spatiality.

1) Perceived space carries spatial practice, with such components as measurements and mapping.[57] In Lefebvre's words, 'the spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its space'.[58]

2) Conceived space, or representations of space, involves activities of all those, such as planners and scientists who identify 'what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived'. This space is formed in the minds of such people and, as such, is designated as mental space. Lefebvre casts this as 'the dominant space in any society (or mode of production)'.[59]

3) The lived space, or representational space, is that which is 'directly lived through its associated images and symbols, and hence the space of 'inhabitants' and 'users''. For example, a house is a physical space and structure, its perceived space. It conforms to a certain mental plan typical for that societal group or subgroup, its conceptual space. However, it is a home to those occupying it, its symbolic space.[60] Lefebvre regards this as the space which is 'dominated - and hence passively experienced - space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate. It overlays physical space, making symbolic use of its objects'.[61] It expands beyond without excluding the physical-mental dualism. This space appears to foster the potential for what Soja was later to call 'a critical exchange where the geographical boundaries can be expanded'.[62]

---

[57] Henri Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, pp. 33, 38: 'Spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its space'; Christian Schmid, 'Lefebre's Theory', pp. 27-45 (pp. 36-37): Spatial practice relates to a system which evolves from everyday connections of activities such as work and trade. Schmid distinguishes this language of spatiality from the phenomenology of spatiality, the reference points of this phenomenology are 'perceived', 'conceived' and the 'lived'.

[58] Henri Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, p. 38.

[59] Ibid., pp. 38-9.

[60] Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2009), p. 28.

[61] Ibid., p. 39.

[62] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 50.

To help us understand his three 'moments' of social space, Lefebvre invokes the human body as the entity from which the whole of social space proceeds.[63] 'Social practice presupposes the use of the body: the use of the hands, members and sensory organs, and the gestures of work as of activity unrelated to work'.[64] This falls within the realm of perceived space. 'Bodily lived experience' is complex because of the intervention of culture. He cites the example of the 'heart' which, as a living organ, differs from the heart as perceived.[65] As a result, the three moments, his trialectics, 'loses all force if it is treated as an abstract model'.[66] These moments 'should be interconnected, so that the 'subject', the individual member of a given group, may move from one to another without confusion…'. Lefebvre links his thinking briefly with religious ideology:

> What would remain of a religious ideology – the Judaeo-Christian one, say – if it were not based on places and their names: church, confessional, altar, sanctuary, tabernacle? What we call ideology only achieves consistency by intervening in social space and its production, and by thus taking the body therein: Ideology, *per se*, might well be said to consist primarily in a discourse upon social space.[67]

Despite its philosophical sophistication, in many ways the importance of Lefebvre was the use made of his theory by Edward Soja (1940-2015), an urban geographer who was not concerned with ancient texts. He views the first and second categories of material space of nature and

---

[63] Henri Lefebvre, *Production,* pp. 27, 28, 40. Social space differs from mental and physical space. If it is a social product, this fact has somehow been hidden. It is inert but somehow assumed to be roughly coincidental with mental space. Lefebvre emphasises that the written and spoken word cannot be taken as social space. Such communication brings 'brings the non-communicated into the realms of the communicated'. See also Schmid, 'Henri Lefebvre's Theory' (p. 39), calling these 'The Dialectical Trinity of Man'.

[64] Ibid., p. 40.

[65] Ibid., p. 40.

[66] Ibid., p. 40.

[67] Ibid., p. 44.

cognition as being incorporated into the social production of spatiality.[68] For our study, it will be necessary to pin down Soja's theory into usable form. As we shall see, this has been tackled by those biblical scholars who have incorporated Soja into their analyses of biblical texts (§2.4). Broadly, Soja introduces his categories of space based on those of Lefebvre.[69] He views the first and second categories of material space of nature and cognition, as being incorporated into the social production of spatiality. Such space is 'significantly transformed in the process'.[70] Soja approximates Lefebvre's category of 'spatial practices' with Firstspace. He terms Lefebvre's 'representations of space' as Secondspace.[71] However, Thirdspace is Soja's concept which was inspired by Lefebvre's third category.[72] Soja thinks of Thirdspace as a 'multitude of approaches and perspectives' which extend beyond critical geography but not as an alternative. He labels the strategy as 'thirding-as-othering' on the basis of 'interjecting an-Other set of choices'.[73] It is a space of 'extraordinary openness, a place of critical exchange where the geographical imagination can be expanded'.[74] Thirdspace breaks out from the restrictive Firstspace and Secondspace dualism. Soja does not pose it as an alternative to other perspectives but rather an approach of inclusivity.[75] He invokes Lefebvre in the development of Thirdspace:

---

[68] Edward W. Soja, 'The Socio-Spatial Dialectic', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70 (1980), 207-225 (p. 208). Soja recognised that 'In his conceptualisation of this urban revolution, Lefebvre appeared to be substituting spatial/territorial conflict for class conflict as the motivating force behind radical social transformation',

[69] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Spaces* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), pp. 65-68. See also Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', pp. 49-61 (pp. 53-6).

[70] Edward W. Soja, *Post-Modern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989) p. 120.

[71] Capital lettering for space is standard orthography in Soja's spatial discourse.

[72] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 188. He illustrates his 'third space' with theatre metaphor. Theatrical interplay between 'actors, audience, characters of the play, text and author all come together but never become one'. The third space extends beyond the scenic and public. 'At once fictitious and real, this third space is classical theatre space'.

[73] Ibid., p. 5.

[74] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 50.

[75] Ibid., p. 50.

Unlike Firstspace, Secondspace refers to the spatial representations, cognitive processes as well as modes of construction, which give rise to the birth of geographical imaginations. Whereas Firstspace epistemologies are used to describe spatial dimensions, which can be perceived, Secondspace epistemologies rather deal with symbolic worlds, which are conceived. Lefebvre's project, which remains almost invisible until the 1990s, was to inject a third dimension to the dually privileged dynamics of historicality and sociality: an encompassing and problematic spatiality that demanded at least equivalent attention in critical theory and praxis.[76]

This tight relationship is reinforced by the converse argument that spatiality cannot be completely separated from physical and psychological spaces regardless of how much they are socially mediated; social life is never free of physical impingements. Thus, the space of nature is filled with politics and ideology which, in turn, play a powerful role in shaping the spatiality of social life.[77] Social structures manifest themselves in spatial structures; spatiality is a social product. Soja does not define a 'social product' but it could be ventured that it could apply to a societal ideal or an eschatological utopia. According to Soja, Lefebvre's critical spatial ideas have been underplayed by a 'deep tradition of historicism'. He is not advocating an 'anti-history' agenda which gives way to 'spatialism' but he is attempting to 'rebalance the fundamental trialectic of historicality-sociality-spatiality', his 'trialectics of spatiality', in a more collaborative way in equal measure.[78] Thirdspace incorporates the meaning we give to space by the activities we do and the experiences within it.

---

[76] Ibid., p. 51.

[77] Ibid., pp. 120-121.

[78] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, pp. 71-74. This trialectic is Soja's paradigm for stating what the world should be in order for us to have true knowledge of it. See also 'Thirdspace', in *Human Geography Today*, ed. by Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1999), pp. 260-278 (pp. 263-4). See also Soja's diagram of the Trialectics of Being, in *Thirdspace*, p. 71.

1.4.3 Spatiality Scholarship as Applied to Biblical Texts

As proponents, Lefebvre and Soja, amongst others, have opened up a discourse about the meaning by which spatiality should be understood. Their work has been deployed diversely by different scholars, not only in the extension of geophysical status but also in discussions of power dynamics.[79] Although they were not interested in biblical contexts, they are the prisms through which more recent biblical spatiality scholarship expands our interpretation of this ancient environment. It goes to the heart of concept of biblical space and by my extension, uniquely to the concept of עיר in the Temple Scroll and will make the most significant impact. One of the most interesting things in the field of spatiality studies, with its division between physical conception and utilised reality, is its focus on the modern city. How can spatiality theory be applied to the ancient biblical city? What has been published in the context of the Hebrew Bible and ancient Jewish literature? Are there any interesting insights? Patrick Schreiner acknowledges that the world of biblical studies has so far been sluggish in adopting and applying the spatial categories.[80]

We now consider those scholars who have actually brought spatial analysis into the complexities of the biblical arena, with its real and apocalyptic spaces and structures.[81] More generally, James Flanagan was one of the first biblical scholars to explore socio-world [his term] studies within biblical studies.[82] His view was that social space has become a major concern in social theory and that biblical studies had been witnessing a change from 'scientific accuracy' models towards

---

[79] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, pp. 35, 67.

[80] Patrick Schreiner, 'Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in the Light of Developing Trends', *Currents in Biblical Research*, 14 (2016), 351.

[81] Matthew Sleeman, 'Critical Spatial Theory 2.0', in *Constructions of Space V*: *Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. by Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl Maier (New York/London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 49-59. Sleeman marks the inclusion of Critical Spatial Theory into the realm of biblical spatial studies as CST 2.0, as disct form the foundational CST ideas and paradigms.

[82] James A. Flanagan, 'Ancient Perceptions of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space', *Semeia*, 87 (1999), 15-43.

postmodern 'social-theory' models of scholarship. His insights signalled a dawn of spatial thinking towards biblical studies: 'Omitting, ignoring or suppressing spatiality leads to imbalanced, distorted and continually flawed understanding and practices of the real world'.[83] 'Social space is not to be regarded as a real thing, but a set of relations that are produced through praxis.'[84] This set of relations is referring to Soja's trialectic of First, Second and Thirdspaces, the settings of praxis. As we shall see, Thirdspace attracts interesting debate in the arena of biblical studies. Homi Bhabha encapsulates the difficulties succinctly:

> The third space is a challenge to the limits of the self in the act of reaching out to what is liminal in the historic experience, and in the cultural representation, of other peoples, times, languages, texts.[85]

The spatiality work of Claudia Camp brings us closer to the Jerusalem temple through her reading of Ben Sira, using the categories of Firstspace, Secondspace and Thirdspace.[86] She does so by interpreting the Temple space through the text's catalogue of attributes of prominent biblical figures. Her position on the blurring of application of inter-spatial boundaries of Soja's trialectic has, by her own admission, caused challenges in applying it to Sirach.[87] Her agenda is to read Thirdspace, using Soja, as not only just 'lived' space but the space for living as a way of power production.[88] In her preliminary thoughts, she alerts us to the problems of applying spatial theory as potentially reductionist. She takes Secondspace as an example. Secondspace is closely

---

[83] Ibid., p. 26.

[84] Ibid., p. 29.

[85] Homi K. Bhabha, 'In the Cave of Making: Thoughts on Third Space', in *Communicating in the Third Space*, ed. by Karen Ikas and Gerhard Wagner (New York/Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2009), pp. ix-xiv, (p. xiv).

[86] Claudia V. Camp, 'Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple', *in 'Imagining' Biblical Words: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*, ed. by David M. Gunn and Paula McNutt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 65-80 (p. 66). She clarifies that Ben Sira refers to the author of the book of Sirach. The Jerusalem temple is glorified to bolster Jewish faith.

[87] Ibid., p. 69.

[88] Ibid., p. 68.

related to language, as it is created in cognitive terms. It is the spoken or written language which makes it conceived. Mapping and planning of a space are performed by those in dominance.[89] It follows that written texts are Secondspace because the texts themselves convey conception; they are read as a space. She reminds us that, in reality, spatialities are entities of complex interrelationships. The problem is keeping a sense of balance between these complexities and the spatial entities. The business of living in conceived spaces can alter the dynamics of living, such that conceptions are changed. We get a sense from Camp that these spatial entities are too narrow for her analysis of power dynamics.[90] She challenges Soja's Thirdspace as 'lived' space on the basis that Secondspace is a space of such attributes as surveillance, control and domination which Thirdspace challenges.

Camp's reminder that spatial status is conveyed by the written or spoken word; it is an objective, rather than a subjective paradigm. In other words, the subjective experiences of the spatiality paradigm can only be conveyed by language. My understanding of her argument is that Thirdspace, in terms of power dynamics, cannot therefore be fully lived. I would argue otherwise, in that the challenge in Thirdspace to the *status quo* in Secondspace must surely rely on knowledge and experience of those adverse attributes of Secondspace. Those who dominate Secondspace also have 'lived' space; domination, too, arises from the complex business of living.[91] However, my understanding then diverges, in that Thirdspace introduces an extension

---

[89] Ibid., pp. 66, 69.

[90] Ibid., p. 69.

[91] Ibid., p. 68. See also Christl Maier, *Daughter Zion, MotherZion* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2008), p. 16. Maier understands 'mental mapping' from geographers and sociologists as to how a given environment is perceived and evaluated. She weaves this into Lefebvre's three spaces 'as a cognitive construct combining material space and experience of space'. This would imply that, without Lefebvre's spaces, mapping would not be possible. Maier continues with the caveat that not all mental mapping will be conscious but will be influenced by personal priorities, shared values and biases 'within a group'. This implies that mental mapping cannot be created by a singular person.

of the lived space where insights develop into reactions and non-acceptances of the *status quo* of Secondspace.

She reads the text as Thirdspace, not in the expected way of liberation and emancipation but beyond into her Thirdspace of power.[92] Ben Sira's verbal adornment of the temple is read by Camp in terms of the verticality of the temple experience. Camp reads spatiality into Ben Sira's lines about David's arrival in Jerusalem:

> He added beauty to the feasts
> and solemnized the seasons of the year
> With string music before the altar
> Providing sweet melody for the psalms
> So that when the Holy Name was praised
> before daybreak the sanctuary would respond
> The Lord forgave him his sins
> and exalted his strength forever;
> He conferred on him the rights of royalty
> and established his throne in Israel [Jerusalem] (47:10-11).[93]

David takes command of time, 'the seasons of the year' and space, 'before the altar' and 'Israel' or 'Jerusalem'. Camp's spatial reading is that the Thirdspace of ritual worship happens in the Firstspace of power. This is 'mapped onto the Secondspace of royal ideology, complete with the sounding (and sinless) horn'.[94] David's people who are now worshipping, along with the fruitfulness of their king, places this combination in Thirdspace, a space 'united in authorized power'. Aaron is not granted space in the form of land and inheritance but receives the Lord

---

[92] Ibid., p. 69.

[93] *The Wisdom of Ben Sira,* trans. by Patrick Skehan (New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 522-3. Skehan uses Ισραήλ with reference to Syriac Peshitta and Codex Vaticanus of the LXX (Skehan, p. 524). 'Jerusalem' is apparent in <https://www.bensira.org> (MS B XVII recto).

[94] Claudia V. Camp, 'Storied Space', p. 73.

himself as the inheritance (45:22).[95] Thus, 'Aaron's space is the space of holiness itself.'[96] Firstspace activity is reflected by the physical strengthening of Jerusalem by the priest Simeon, the 'Greatest amongst his kindred, the glory of his people' (50:1). If Simeon is to be regarded as a paragon of holiness, his own space is holy. As his base is the temple, the temple itself is holy and takes on his space which is holiness itself. The Ben Sira story is static in one place, not moving around different spaces whilst the reader all along encounters names and their attributes, as a technique of structuring Ben Sira's temple. For Camp, spatiality is not necessarily space itself but the tool for a power relationship analysis. She alerts us to the problems of applying spatial theory as potentially reductionist, taking Secondspace as an example. Secondspace is closely related to language, as it is created in cognitive terms. It is spoken or written language which makes it conceived. Mapping and planning of a space are performed by those in dominance. Simplistically, written texts are Secondspace.

We see Soja's work being used for a different agenda by Christl Maier. She tests his concept of Thirdspace to illuminate the use of feminine images, by examining Zion's spatial and gendered portraits.[97] The raised topographical Firstspace of Zion as a divine dwelling place is extended by the human communion with the divine as a lived Thirdspace, enacted by ritual and worship (Isa. 8:18). The gendered metaphor of Jerusalem as a female to be taken by royal power conveys Secondspace as if it were a mother, similar in ancient thinking, to the role of a city. Maier argues that, since this image is as a result of experience and ideology, there is very little difference between its Second and Thirdspace. She challenges Soja's narrow perception of Thirdspace in her nuanced reading of Isaiah 2:1-5. Either Jerusalem is envisaged as a place of divine inspiration

---

[95] Wisdom, p. 508.

[96] Claudia V. Camp, 'Storied Space', p. 73.

[97] Christl Maier, 'Daughter of Zion as a Gendered Space in the Book of Isaiah', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 102-118 (p. 105).

by those in post-exilic Jerusalem or by those who are marginalised, say, in Persia, envisaging a future where it will be the centre of a peaceable world. She argues that the relationship between the lived experience and the expression of ideology is not necessarily univocal. Both readings incorporate the dominant ideology of Secondspace, as opposed to challenging that space. Maier's Thirdspace is broader than that of Soja. Her basis for this is that 'people with vastly different lived experiences can find meaning that suits their situation in the same ideological vision'.[98] This ambivalence of Third or lived space challenges Soja's distinction between centre and periphery. The combination of the gendered picture (Isa. 66:13) and the spatial expression of the holy mountain Jerusalem (Isa. 66:20) convey various experiences of space as part of Thirdspace.[99] Against these references to Soja, it is interesting to note that, in a separate study, Lefebvre's terminology predominates in her study with scant reference to Soja.[100] Her detailed spatial readings 'offer some new tesserae to the overall mosaic of Jerusalem regarding its history as well as political and theological significance'.[101] She appears to be using spatiality as an interesting commentary rather than as a tool to clarify a hitherto untangled problem.

More specific to the Biblical city is the work of Karolien Vermeulen. She tackles city spatiality textually by binding it with building metaphor in the context of the Hebrew Bible.[102] She

---

[98] Ibid., p. 110.

[99] Ibid., p. 117.

[100] Christl Maier, 'Body Space as Public Space: Jerusalem's Wounded Body in Lamentations', in *Constructions II*, pp. 119-138.

[101] Ibid., p. 211.

[102] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities: A Stylistic Study* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), p. 18. Vermeulen argues that a biblical text develops a city space, which differs from its 'real-life counterpart'. She evokes Ezekiel 26:9-12 to illustrate that the cityscape is inherently human, albeit with strength and vulnerable to attacks, making it Thirdspace. In that Ezekiel passage, the city is expressed by God as 'you', inferring that the city-building is metaphorised as city-woman. Such a human body could not survive the onslaught described in that passage. Thus, the combination of those metaphors evokes a cityscape that reflects humanity and mortality (pp. 150-1). See also Robert Ezra Park, 'The City: Suggestions for the Investigations of Human Behaviour in the Urban Environment', in *American Journal of Sociology*, 20 (1915), 577- 612, (pp. 578, 584). Park states that the roots of the city lie in the customs of its residents with the consequence that the city has a moral as well as a physical structure. '… a psychophysical mechanism, in and through which, private and political interests find

acknowledges that עיר does not have a direct translation and asserts that the biblical 'city' is, to some extent, 'an invention of translators and scholars and may not have existed at all'.[103] The verticality of Zion, what she calls 'up' space, is associated with power and happiness to which humans aspire.[104] She cites Psalm 48, where man-made high structures, towers, ramparts and palaces, connects the reader with God, who is defined as an elevated space (Ps. 48: 3-5). She looks at spatiality through language and text base, rather than critical-spatiality; it is a textual linguistic experience for the reader. Firstspace represents actual words to describe space. Such an example is the use of repetition as a possible space builder. Secondspace consists of conceptual metaphors for the city. Thirdspace is textual cityscaping, where the reader experience is created by words and ideas that are used within specific passages. Vermeulen asserts 'Thirdspace is far more textual than critical-spatial Thirdspace'.[105] In dealing with ancient texts, our only connections with ancient realities would be archaeological findings. These reveal

---

corporate expression'. Each separate part of the city is inevitably stained with the peculiar sentiments of its population. The effect of this is to convert what was at first a mere geographical expression into a neighbourhood, that is to say, a locality with sentiments, traditions, and a history of its own' (p. 579).

[103] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, p. 215.

[104] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1980). Those authors illustrate orientational metaphors with examples: 'more is up; less is down'. 'good is up; bad is down'. 'happy is up' (pp. 15-17). See also Frick, *City in Ancient Israel*, p. 44. The gate was a pivotal part of the city's social and commercial function. Frick draws attention to the fact that שער is translated in the LXX as 'gate' except for three passages (Deut. 12:12; 23:17; Exod. 20:10) where it is translated as πολις. An inference of city is also conveyed in the Hebrew word, מקום, literally translated as 'place'; BDB devotes one and a half columns to biblical references bearing the word (pp. 879-80). Although its meaning has a wide range, it conveys a sense of place of human abode. Frick draws our attention to הר, literally translated as 'mountain', as a term which does not mean 'city' specifically but could sometimes be considered as such, given that mountains were mythologically the dwelling places of gods (Frank S. Frick, *City in Ancient Israel*, p. 45). A utilitarian approach is that the city would be situated on high ground for fortification and protection of its inhabitants; the high locations of Jerusalem and Samaria, capitals of Judah and Israel respectively, reinforce this point. The Hebrew word מגדל is interpreted as 'tower' although, when appended to a proper noun, 'stronghold'. As part of the citadel, a tower could be reasonably considered as an important structure around which the city would develop. Conversely, as will be seen later, it could also be interpreted as a stigma. The word arises from the root גדל ('great'), the addition of מ ('from', 'arising from'), lending itself to the concept of 'stronghold' or something high. The word מגדל is usually associated with a place-name, for example, מגדל -עדר (Gen. 35:21). Elevated space has more recently been viewed as Secondspace. See Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 40-52 (p. 43).

[105] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, pp. 229-30.

physically defined spaces although not necessarily any direct evidence of how they were actually lived.

However, perhaps the most important work using biblical spatiality to date has been done by Jon Berquist. His work is of particular relevance in that, as in our study, he is not talking about power dynamics but how people actually use spaces. Our study is therefore different from other spatiality studies. Berquist is key to the kind of categories we are using because of his more practical approach of dealing with the more nebulous concepts of spatiality. His new way of thinking has brought positive results. He tackles the application of the spatial theories of Edward Soja to ancient Jerusalem, as city and space. Through such theories, he shows Jerusalem not as an urban population centre but as a site of pilgrimage. His comments are specific to Jerusalem rather than the generic 'city' but are nevertheless useful and innovative in considering the concept of city. I quote Berquist's understanding of Soja's categories thus:

> Firstspace or physical space which is conceived in terms of physical co-ordinates such as longitude and latitiude; Secondspace, a perceived or conceptual space which involves symbols, plans, intentions and feelings about space and Thirdspace, a lived or experienced space, the different ways the space is used such as social practices and behaviours.[106]

Berquist first challenges previous unspecified scholarly explanation for the choice of Jerusalem's central location between north and south as strategic. Military and administrative logistics would invoke the physicalities of Firstspace. However, he doubts whether Jerusalem as a physical strategic space in Firstspace terms would explain fully the choice of its location because of its difficult transport access. He follows this with an analysis of 'Jerusalem in the Third Dimension' by virtue of its position as one of the highest points in the region. This physical feature would

---

[106] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', pp. 41-42. The unusual orthography of the 'Spaces' is not a misprint.

qualify as Firstspace. Nevertheless, Berquist understands Jerusalem's functions in more than Firstspace terms. In Secondspace, conceptual space, Berquist notes how elevation is a powerful symbol of authority. It is this symbol of Zion which works as a Secondspace explanation for the importance of Jerusalem.[107] David's capture and re-usage of the city would qualify this as a Thirdspace performance; he envisioned a change in the ownership of Jerusalem to become City of David from its previous Jebusite ownership. This vision resulted in conquest which Berquist interprets as 'social action', changing Jebus into Jerusalem. Thirdspace seems to transcend ownership into the realms of how the space is used in the broadest sense.

He proceeds to argue in favour of a pilgrimage function of Jerusalem rather than habitation.[108] As we have already seen, Crawford argued a similar conclusion non-spatially (§1.2). The Firstspace realities, Secondspace meanings and Thirdspace performances of modern urban centres are not the only types of urban experience. He thinks 'much Hebrew Bible scholarship has assumed these characteristics for ancient Jerusalem'.[109] He draws a similarity of the functions of Jerusalem to the capital cities of ancient Persia which were also used primarily for ceremonial purposes. In other words, because they were remote, they were spaces used for celebration, rather than for habitation.[110] Difficult access to Jerusalem would limit travel to that which would be obligatory. Other reasons for travel would require the motivation ascribed to pilgrimage which Berquist defines as a voluntary movement to a destination for reasons beyond necessity or coercion. It is encouraged by religious motivation rather than enforcement. This relies on Soja's Secondspace perceptions of the journey as positive, thereby encouraging the Thirdspace action of travel. If Jerusalem's purpose is pilgrimage, then according to Berquist, the city is a space

---

[107] Ibid., p. 43. See also 2 Sam. 5:7 where Jerusalem is called 'the stronghold of Zion which is now the city of David'.

[108] Ibid., p. 47. There is a similar function in Persian capitals such as Persepolis, Pasargadae, Ecbatana and Susa. See also White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', 242-254 (pp. 249-51). Crawford argues that it could not have been a residential city.

[109] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', p. 47. See also Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace', in *Human Geography Today*, pp. 261-278.

[110] 2 Sam. 5-6; 6:19 '…then all the people went back to their homes.'

constructed by its Thirdspace. This would require a Secondspace full of religious meaning and symbolism. He continues that 'successful pilgrimage is not only about destination but about the paths one takes to reach it and the sights one sees along the journey'.[111] From Berquist's use of Soja's spatial paradigm, it would seem that the ancient human perception and experience of a holy city would depend on the religious motivation to think about such a city and ultimately to travel to it physically.

Berquist touches on the application of spatiality as a way of rethinking maps, not least those pertaining to ancient Israel.[112] His argument is that earlier ideas of the social world of ancient Israel concentrated on tribes and segmented societies; he regards this as a manifestation of the insertion of the disciplines of sociology and anthropology. He suggests that we could look away from the monarchic and mythological spatialities that had informed traditional boundary maps and think in terms of models that were 'unmappable' by those standards because they relied on social interaction at different scales.[113] According to Berquist, maps participate in a Firstspace project of perceiving and measuring space. However, in his words, 'maps are always Secondspace products that structure the constructions of space and reinforce certain ideals and hierarchies that undergird those ideas'[114]. In other words, two-dimensional maps reflect Firstspace physical measurements but nevertheless result in Secondspace interpretations of ancient Israelite existence. He then invokes the concept of fractals in re-interpreting the idea that something comes, say, 'from Israel'. He suggests this idea is impossible because Israel comprises an infinite number of spaces where scale itself becomes meaningless.[115] To identify a named

---

[111] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', p. 48.

[112] John L. Berquist, 'Critical Spatiality', in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds*, ed. by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 15-29 (pp. 21-22).

[113] Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[114] Ibid., p. 22

[115] Ibid., p. 16. Fractals, a geometrical and mathematical concept, are similarly never-ending patterns of progressively smaller scales. Within each measurement, there are other measurements.

space is to use, perhaps he means misuse, space to 'obscure and displace the people who are actors (subjects of the practice and creators of the objects)'.[116] He does not offer an alternative physical representation except 'social labelling theory', a concept which he does not explain or elaborate.

Berquist then invokes spatiality theory to consider the origins and geography of Jerusalem. Although its centrality serves as a unifying symbol and the focus of scholarship, his view is that Jerusalem's temporal origins have attracted more attention but it has rarely been treated as geography and space.[117] Its early Amorite association (Josh. 10:5) and David's reign (2 Sam. 5:5) does not convey how Jerusalem functioned. Berquist is of the view that a 'spatial analysis could contribute much to the understanding of this city as well as its role in the narrative and developing society, culture and religion of Israel, Judah and Yehud'.[118] He invokes Soja's spatial categories to explore Jerusalem's functions beyond Firstspace terms. Jebus was thence converted into Jerusalem, its Thirding-as-Other.[119] What happens in Thirdspace is the shaping of 'memories and identity through the performances of metaphors and symbols that provide Secondspace meaning'.[120]

This has brought us to the point that it would seem that Berquist's thinking could be deployed usefully to our study. He has distilled Soja's categories specifically to Jerusalem. If we can use a similar approach to the עיר and עיר המקדש of the scroll, this will open up an opportunity for progress in the understanding of how these entities are related without being shackled to an assumed location. Will it actually answer the question of the absent Jerusalem? Because a direct

---

[116] Ibid., p 22.

[117] Jon L. Berquist, *Constructions II,* p. 40.

[118] Ibid., p. 41.

[119] Ibid., pp. 44-5. See Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace', p. 55. Soja creates his expression as 'a critical other-than choice that speaks and critiques through its otherness'. It is not merely an add-on to the other Spaces, rather a deconstruction and disordering of their presumed totalities.

[120] Jon L. Berquist, *Constructions II*, p. 50.

spatial analysis of a textually absent entity would not be credible, the nearest entities for such an analysis would be עיר and עיר המקדש. Still, this would not necessarily cast an assumed Jerusalem as an obvious candidate for עיר.

Up to now, we have been dealing with real spaces in the Hebrew Bible. What about spaces as yet to be realised? With regard to the Temple Scroll, if not Jerusalem, then the idea of עיר המקדש will have to be widened beyond an assumed geographical locus. This invites the possibility of a spiritually bigger עיר, not necessarily in the form of 'city' as we would loosely translate it; in other words, an eschatological entity.

To pursue this, we now ask whether we can reconcile eschatological and apocalyptic thinking with the categories of spatiality. Kathryn Lopez looks specifically at critical spatiality in apocalyptic writings. She asks in what way are such writings more than just wishful thinking. What lived space did those writers actually articulate? [121] For them, their transcendent reality is real space, knowledge of which comes by revelation not widely available.[122] To the seer, this now becomes lived Thirdspace space which can be a useful tool against competing groups.[123] She regards apocalyptic writings as 'Thirdspace strategies attempting to make those 'longed-for expectations' into a lived space.[124] She makes an interesting point about the purification rituals at Qumran for those who wished to join its community: 'While apocalyptic writings do not directly mention any rites or rituals, they contain a strong insider/outsider rhetoric that creates a real space different from all other spaces'.[125] It was this difference that resonates with the sequestration of some of the Essenes to the isolated desert terrain of Qumran. Although

---

[121] Kathryn M. Lopez, 'Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgement', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 139-55 (pp. 139, 141).

[122] 'Transcendent', from its Latin etymology, conveys an upward spiritual dynamic, from trans. scandere (*Shorter OED*).

[123] Kathryn Lopez, 'Standing', p. 142.

[124] Ibid., p. 144.

[125] Ibid., pp. 145-6.

Jerusalem is central prophetically, it was not central to the apocalyptic writers who felt that Jerusalem was unable to reflect the divine in their perceived reality. For example, the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85-90) avoids mention of the temple; it had no space in the new envisaged Jerusalem. [126] Hilary Marlow alerts us to the question as to whether Deuteronomy, although not apocalyptic, narrates a vision of an ideal that might be or 'is it merely making sense of what has been lost − a story that has gone badly wrong?'[127]

Kim Knott regards Lefebvre as potentially contributory to religious studies, stating 'the scholar of religions is thus offered a potentially useful analytical approach to material, ideological, and social forms of religion and their embeddedness in a broader network of social and cultural relations'.[128] She applies the ideas of spatiality to the study of present day religion, specifically 'the location of religion in the places of the body, artefacts, events, communities, localities and institutions'.[129] She acknowledges that 'Within the study of religions, examinations of the role of space and of the relations between space and religion have been a minority interest…'. [130] The visual impact of contemporary places of worship provides her with examples of the manifestations of spatial dynamics. Such places represent more than architectural structure, in that places of worship comprise clusters of smaller places in the form of religious icons and adornments. Places can be designated as sacred, sacralised, within homes with the assistance of religious artefacts.[131] Knott creates five 'terms' for the analysis of a place, object, body or group, as well the location of religion within those entities: the body as the source of space, the

---

[126] Ibid., pp. 144, 151. Indeed, this resonates with the tenth sphere of Dante's *Paradiso.* 'non è in loco e non s'impolo', '…is in no space, it has no pole' (XX11, 67). See Dante Alighieri, *Paradiso,* trans. by Mark Musa (New York: Penguin, 1986), p. 260.

[127] Hilary F. Marlow, 'A Land with Fine Large Cities', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible: Critical, Literary and Exegetical Approaches,* ed. by James Aitken and Hilary Marlow (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 73-88 (p. 76).

[128] Kim Knott, *Location of Religion,* p. 12.

[129] Ibid., p. 29.

[130] Ibid., p. 94.

[131] Ibid., p. 60.

dimensions of space, properties of space, aspects of space and the dynamics of space.[132] She extends Lefebvre's importance of the body, in his third category, by looking for signs of a body, when considering the location of religion in a place. The body is therefore part of religious discipline in that space.[133]

Pieter Venter discusses the Thirdspace of Enoch's journeys. The narrative conveys that 'something' is happening to 'someone', 'somewhere' and 'sometime'. The 'somewhere' is focal space although this will alter if travel is involved. Venter attempts to analyse Enoch's three journeys in terms of Thirdspace.[134] He invokes Soja's Thirdspace, a lived space of resistance, in the scenario of the fallen angels transgressing borders by mingling with women (En. 19:1). His journey, accompanied by the angels of light, starts from the sinful west to the righteous east, the purpose of the quest being to destroy the cause of sin. The story refers to realistic phenomena such as mountains and fire. Venter views the spaces depicted as being symbolic, its only meaning within the narrative.[135] Presumably, Venter means the meaning is textual. He interprets the depiction of space as Enoch's actual helper. Unfortunately though, Venter's engagement with spatiality theory is somewhat vague and this paper therefore difficult to be read as a convincing spatiality study.

As already mentioned, in relation to spatiality and the Dead Sea Scrolls, two scholars published their presented work at the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls in 2003. Ingebord Lied deploys Soja's paradigm in tackling the concept of Damascus in CD.[136] Jorunn Økland has

---

[132] Kim Knott, 'Spatial Theory and the Study of Religion', *Religion Compass*, (2008), 1102-16 (p. 5).

[133] Ibid., p. 9. She confines her comments about location to 'an ostensibly secular, urban street'.

[134] Pieter Venter, 'Allotted Place and Cursed Space in Enoch 12-36', *Old Testament Essays*, 27 (2), (2014), 666-683.

[135] Ibid., p. 674. See *The Book of Enoch*, trans. by R. H. Charles (Mineola: Dover, 2007): 'holy mountain' (26:2), 'centre of earth' (26:1), 'garden of righteousness' (32:3). Most of these sites are not named.

[136] Liv Ingeborg Lied, 'Another Look at the Land of Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward G. Soja's Thirdspace Approach', in *New Directions in Qumran Studies; Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls 8-10 September 2003*, ed. by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pieterson (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 101-125.

contributed to spatiality scholarship on the Temple Scroll (11QT[a]) and Ezekiel, predominantly on discourse of sanctuary space and movement through the temple gates.[137] Matthew Sleeman, a doctoral geographer, raises the question as to 'whether geographers have engaged in corrective readings of scripture'.[138] It seems to him that biblical scholars, rather than geographers, are taking the lead in new scriptural insights.[139] He supports Soja's paradigm as helpful in clarifying 'its processes and wider analytic and interpretative applicability'.[140] For example, with regard to reading of the Ascension, he argues that the application of the Sojan paradigm is more productive than otherwise. In contrast to Parson's 'empty space' reading of Christ's ascension, Soja's Thirdspace incorporates the production of space on earth. In so doing, there is greater scope in spatial analysis of the Ascension, thereby advancing scholarly debate.[141] It appears that, rather than being judgmental about the absolute veracity of Thirdspace, Sleeman is offering Thirdspace as a spatial methodology toward a wider analysis of the ascension text, as indeed we are in our present Temple Scroll study. More recently, Natalie Lantz has been working on the experience of temple space through Ezekiel, the Temple Scroll and Mishna Middot.[142] Her message is that ancient Jewish temple descriptions take shape in the minds of the immediate audience who engage with these narratives (her word) within the 'fabric of Jewish tradition', a simulation of what she calls 'temple space'; that is to say, spatial aspects relating to the temple produced by social ideas and practice of the Lefebvre/Soja spatiality dimensions. Her work is guided not only by Critical Spatiality Theory but also 'Narrative as Virtual reality'. This borrows the idea of

---

[137] Jorunn Økland, 'The Language of Gates and Entering', in *New Directions of Qumran Studies*, ed. by Lester L. Grabbe and James H. Charlesworth (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 149-165.

[138] Matthew Sleeman, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 37.

[139] Ibid., p. 38.

[140] Ibid., p. 46.

[141] Ibid., p. 48.

[142] Natalie Lantz, 'The Hypertemple in Mind: Experiencing Temple Space in Ezekiel, the Temple Scroll and Mishnah Middot' (PhD dissertation, Uppsala Universitet). I am grateful to Natalie Lantz for her generosity in forwarding me a pdf of her thesis, even some weeks before her examination.

computer-generated space, such that it can be broadened into something that is almost real and potentially realisable.[143] She uses the term 'Hypertemple' as a phenomenon that occurs in the dimension of virtual reality rather than in the perception of space. Her 'temple space', a term she uses frequently, is the mental representation that 'the audience is perceiving when immersing in and interacting with the narrative. The Hypertemple is the process by which a temple space is enacted by the user's associative engagement with hyperlinks embedded in the narrative'.[144] However, her reading of the Scroll is more a commentary of her 'temple space' than a hard-edged spatial analysis of the spaces and subspaces of עיר המקדש.

1.4.4 Criticisms of the Spatiality Paradigm

Although the spatiality paradigm has been deployed frequently in biblical spatial scholarship, its challengers should nevertheless receive some attention, if only to make the point that it appears to me that they have merely reacted to the paradigm, rather than created an alternative workable framework. As an example, Christopher Meredith is one such vocal critic, evident in the opening of his study of the Song of Songs. He reads Lefebvre's space as a produced commodity, 'a tool more attuned to history rather than phenomenology'.[145] Reading has its own phenomenology for which Lefebvre's work was not constructed. Lefebvre uses the ideas of product and production not in the social context but in the Marxist context of production, space as a process.[146] In fact, Meredith asserts that 'space is not even Lefebvre's subject', more a way of socialist

---

[143] The Temple Scroll, however, is thematic, rather than narrative. It does not tell a story or plot, rather a set of instructions. See Samely, 'Observations', pp. 239, 243.

[144] Natalie Lantz, 'The Hypertemple in Mind', p. 39.

[145] Christopher Meredith, 'Journeys in the Songscape: Reading Space in the Song of Songs' (University of Sheffield PhD thesis, 2012), p. 12.

[146] Ibid., p. 17.

empowerment against capitalism.[147] We should be thinking of texts themselves as space, in that texts are also systems with spaces of their own. Language makes texts possible so we should think of our reading of a text as systemic in the way we immerse in it. Meredith refers to space within biblical texts not as a further text to be read but that the text itself presumes spatiality. It seems Meredith is drawing a distinction between the spaces of the real world and the spaces evoked by texts as actual experiential worlds; in other words, the reading itself is a spatial experience. Soja is also very much in Meredith's crosshairs. Rather than developing Lefebvre, Soja is merely, in Meredith's musical metaphor, transposing it into a more manageable key. He has reduced Lefebvre's trialectics into a pragmatically usable three-point plan, suitable for the task of the town-planner.[148]

Meredith also challenges others who have incorporated the paradigm into their biblical fields, for example, Lopez who critically challenges the proponents of Thirdspace.[149] He criticises her use of the idea of 'alternative' which assumes other kinds of lived experience other than apocalyptic writings. In any case, as Meredith footnotes, apocalyptic writings are more ideological than lived space.[150] Nevertheless, this 'alternative' creates two types of Thirdspace. The whole idea of Thirdspace is that it moves beyond the binary and becomes final. Meredith directs his criticism, not so much to Lopez but more to the limitation of Soja's paradigm.[151] In his critique of Camp's essay on Ben Sira, Meredith raises important questions in a challenge to Soja's paradigm as to how the lived experience of reading can be separated from the lived experience of ideology and as to how the ideological experience of reading can be separated

---

[147] Christopher Meredith, *Journeys in the Songscape: Space and the Song of Songs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), p. 7.

[148] Christopher Meredith, 'Journeys in the Songscape', pp. 24-25.

[149] Christopher Meredith, 'Taking Issue with Thirdspace: Reading Soja, Lefebvre and the Bible', in *Constructions* of *Space III: Biblical Spatiality and the Sacred*, ed. by Jorunn Økland, J. Cornelis de Vos and Karen Wenell (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 75-103.

[150] Ibid., p. 78, n. 5. See also Christopher Meredith, *Journeys*, pp. 11-12.

[151] Christopher Meredith, 'Taking Issue', p. 78.

from the spatial fact of reading. He questions how the societal context of Soja's Thirdspace relates to how biblical scholars look at individual biblical characters and their related spaces.[152] Meredith counsels caution to 'Lefebvre's biblical disciples', in that they are 'half correct in their assumption that Lefebvre aimed to overcome a physical/mental dichotomy in philosophical discourse'. He continues:

> One cannot help but wonder if treatments of *The Production of Space* in biblical studies are symptomatic of the very problem Lefebvre was combating; Lefebvre's 'space' has become a fetishized intellectual commodity in our discourse, a 'thing in itself', a conceptual designation which Lefebvre's own style and politics tries to explode.[153]

How has the paradigm permeated biblical scholarship? Soja's Thirdspace has attracted biblical scholars 'as a readymade location for social emancipation, offering biblical scholars, a kind of spatialised politics of liberation'.[154] Meredith cites the 'Constructions of Space Seminar', running between 2000 and 2005, as the origin of this Sojan influence.[155] In my view, the paradigm should not be abandoned or invalidated in biblical scholarship because it does provide a structure for reading the texts themselves. Rather than the texts making a further exploration necessary, they can be understood by the reader as a spatial experience in its own right. Lefebvre would argue that space is produced before it is read but he refers, of course, to concrete space, not textual space.

---

[152] Ibid., p. 82. He argues that these differences explain the varying ways Thirdspace functions in the biblical context.

[153] Meredith cites Maier's lived space as a collective experience which aligns closely with Lefebvre. He then criticises her later heading 'Lefebvre Interpreted by Edward W. Soja' as excluding Lefebvre as if Maier's interpretative work had already been done. If Maier is seeing Lefebvre through Soja, it is reasonable for Maier to concentrate on Soja, rather than harking back comprehensively to Lefebvre.

[154] Christopher Meredith, 'Journeys in the Songscape', p. 24.

[155] Ibid., p. 22. This Seminar was sponsored by the American Academy of Religion and the Society of Biblical Literature. A majority of the papers over this period use Soja as a methodology.

Mark George is less critical. He merely requires Lefebvre's work to be modified because his twentieth century models are far removed from the ancient structures and early productions of space. By way of making a paradigm more applicable to the ancient tabernacle, George reclassifies the three spaces as 'spatial practice', 'conceptual space' and 'symbolic space'.[156] Clive Barnett critiques Soja's *Thirdspace* in an unflattering light, sometimes *ad hominem*, without articulating his objections to Soja's paradigms.[157]

Vermeulen has mounted a riposte to Meredith and is supportive of the paradigm, stating 'Previous work, including my own, argued that all three spaces of critical-spatial theory are present in the biblical text' and 'Firstspace and Thirdspace in the text gave biblical scholarship a new lens to look at textual space'.[158] She bats off Meredith's assertion that critical spatiality is ill-fitted for a study of biblical text by insisting that the theory 'can be a valid framework for the study of cities, and space in general, in the Hebrew Bible'.[159]

So it is apparent that the use of what Meredith calls the 'Soja-Lefebvre animal' has not yet derailed critical spatial methodology in the arena of biblical studies.[160] There has been no influential replacement although Meredith cites Walter Benjamin in not providing a 'ready-made or rigid methodological schema'.[161] He sidesteps an alternative paradigm by quoting Benjamin's ideas as 'not a universal theory of space so much as a mode of approach to the text as a spatial structure...'.[162]

---

[156] Mark K. George, p. 31.

[157] Clive Barnett, 'Review of *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imagined Spaces* by Edward W. Soja', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 22 (1997), 529-30.

[158] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, p. 4.

[159] Ibid., p. 24. See also Meredith, *Journeys*, p. 185.

[160] Christopher Meredith, *Journeys*, p. 7.

[161] Ibid., p. 25.

[162] Ibid., p. 25.

Do any components of the above survey help us to reconcile spatiality theory with spaces that have not been realised? For a start at least, Berquist and others support the use of spatial analysis in our understanding of Hebrew Bible texts. In apocalyptic literature, the spaces are not real to the recipients in the sense that it is a vision inspired by engagement with the divine presence. It is not yet real to those who receive the text in anticipation of reality. This brings us back now to the envisaged structures of the Temple Scroll, where עיר and מקדש predominate in the columns of our focus, 45-47.

1.4.5 Spatiality Studies on עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll: Framework

Spatiality theory as a methodology has already made its presence felt in the realm of Dead Sea Scroll studies, as we have seen. Liv Ingeborg Lied has invoked Soja's paradigm to the problem of location of Damascus in CD. Nevertheless, she proposes caution in applying post-modern social theory to religious texts. The narratives of ancient geography do not necessarily convey the real geophysical entities that we could expect from reading a modern geographical narrative.[163]   Jorunn Økland refers to the Temple Scroll in his broader study of a 'discourse of sanctuary space' around the time of the first century BCE and CE in the Eastern Mediterranean.[164] He acknowledges that modern spatial theorists provide language to express relations and practices. Such an approach could be applied to the Temple Scroll, raising questions about the scroll's expression of the 'sanctuary space'.[165] His discussion of 'Movement and Perspective' in relation to this space will be useful in our later analysis of column 46 of the scroll.

---

[163] Liv Ingeborg Lied, 'Another Look at the Land of Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward G. Soja's Thirdspace Approach', in *New Directions in Qumran Studies; Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scroll, 8-10 September 2003*, ed. by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pieterson (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 101-125 (p. 108).

[164] Jorunn Økland, 'The Language of Gates and Entering: On Sacred Space in the Temple Scroll', in *New Directions in Qumran Studies; Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls 8-10 September 2003*, ed. by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pieterson (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 149-65 (p. 152).

[165] Ibid., p. 153.

He notes the interesting paradox that God's accessibility, through the use of the first person, contrasts with his withdrawal behind strictly imposed walls and precincts. However, spatial movement disappears when we realise that there is unrestricted divine access to his people, but restricted access of his people to the place of the divine dwelling. [166]

Before sharpening the focus onto the heart of this study, we must consider the framework by which spatiality is going to play into our analysis of עיר and עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll. Such a text describing the idealised temple is an attempt by the scroll's author to make happen this envisioned architectural plan as if it were a real planned space to be located somewhere on earth, even though the knowledge of this vision may not accessible to everybody. To those for whom it is accessible, their knowledge of this envisioned plan confers on them a sense of reality of what is to be realised on earth.

This argument is reinforced by Kathryn Lopez who proposes that divine revelation which, in our case is the Temple Scroll, is deployed as protection against other Jewish groups competing for power.[167] For example, the scroll expresses ritual cleansing following which, those participants will then be accepted as pure; part of the club, so to speak. Of what space do they become part? The space has now been separated from the current unsatisfactory Jerusalem temple reality, rather than being a sub-culture. In the case of the temple city envisaged in the scroll, Lopez would probably place it outside the current culture by virtue of divine revelation. That separated space will be realised somewhere on earth according to the scroll's plan as if it were real space already. It must surely qualify as a utopian space.[168] This argument is supported by Foucault's definition that this is a site with no real place, a society in its perfected form.[169] Because the envisioned

---

[166] Ibid., p. 158.

[167] Kathryn Lopez, p. 142.

[168] Literally, 'no place', ὀυ τόπος.

[169] Michel Foucault, 'Of Other Spaces', trans. by Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics*, 16 (1986), 22-9 (p. 24). It is distinct from heterotopia which Foucault explains as 'effectively enacted utopia' where the counter-culture is found within the prevailing culture.

עיר המקדש lies in an unspecified place, qualifying as utopian, I argue that it is now re-mapped in this different unspecified place to be realised on earth. Its 'objectivity and materiality' as Firstspace is now to be established.[170] Our analysis will be using Soja's categories to examine the scroll's space as if they were real, not imagined. The envisioned עיר המקדש can therefore be discussed spatially through its constituent spatial Sojan categories.

As we have already discussed (§1.2), the phrase עיר המקדש presents an unresolved problem of the inter-relationship between its constituent words. The analyses thus far have not invoked spatiality either by inference or by formal categorisation. So far, publications specific to this problem assume the עיר to be Jerusalem. It is this fixation which has hindered a resolution to the impasse in dealing with the relationship of עיר and המקדש. We have seen the differing non-spatial opinions of Lawrence Schiffman, Baruch Levine, Jacob Milgrom and Yigael Yadin with regard to the question of Jerusalem. As a brief recapitulation, Yadin and Milgrom viewed עיר as the 'city', inside of which was המקדש, 'the sanctuary'. Levine and Schiffman viewed עיר המקדש as being only the sanctuary, not the entire city [of Jerusalem]. Sidnie White Crawford proposed a solution to reconcile this impasse by suggesting Jerusalem was a city of pilgrimage, not a residential city.[171] As these opinions are unresolved, a fresh approach to עיר המקדש is now required through a spatiality perspective, where the concept of city, assumed by others to be Jerusalem, is viewed through the idea of lived experience.

---

[170] Edward W. Soja, *Trialectics*, p. 75. He views Firstspace text as empirical. As such, it can be read for both its surface characteristics and for other formative spatial biophysical and social explanations.

[171] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', 242-54 (p. 244). She uniquely acknowledges that Jerusalem is never named. See also Tamar Kamionkowski, 'The Savage Made Civilized: An Examination of Ezekiel 16.8', in *Every City*, ed. by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, pp. 124-36 (pp. 21-22). Kamionkowski suggests Ezekiel's ambivalence to urban life as in Ezekiel 16; this appears to be based on the assumption that Jerusalem generically represents the city. Jerusalem is allegorised as a maturing young women who was castigated by God: '…in all your abominations and your whorings you did not remember the days of your youth' (16:22).

Because of Jerusalem's absence, the nearest target of our spatial analysis is עיר. It would therefore seem appropriate to refer to Berquist's spatial study which is modelled on a city, in this case Jerusalem and the concept of Zion. Jerusalem's functions are seen in more than Firstspace terms, in that height itself is more than Firstspace.[172] Berquist asserts that the 'meaning of Zion depends upon this symbolic function'. Zion theology hinges on height, the category of Secondspace (Isa. 2:3).[173] The idea of elevation as impregnable military advantage worked for David's conquest but did not protect the city from the subsequent fall to Babylonian siege (2 Kgs. 18:9-19.36). Therefore, height confers a symbolic but not necessarily military advantage. Berquist invokes Soja in the understanding of Jerusalem as David's target as Secondspace. The idea of emptiness of a space is argued by Berquist as Secondspace in that emptiness is still about space that is not being used.[174] David's capturing and changing the usage of the city would be the performance of Thirdspace. It was no longer Jebus, a non-Israelite city but Jerusalem, the city of David (2 Sam. 5: 6-7).

Does the spatial literature bring us any other approximations to the scroll? In her discussion of apocalyptic spatiality, Lopez brings us nearer to considering texts that omit the naming of a divine locus, such texts representing a grouping that held an alternative worldview.[175] Their revelatory transmission was an attempt to establish this view as mainstream, so that it would become normal, rather than alternative. As a performative vision, it could be considered a performative utopia; in Foucault's words, a heterotopia.[176] This new normality would thus have

---

[172] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', in *Constructions II*, ed. by Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist, pp. 40-52 (p. 43).

[173] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[174] Ibid., p. 44.

[175] Kathryn Lopez, 'Standing', p. 142.

[176] Michel Foucault, p. 24. This paper was based on a lecture delivered in 1967. Although pre-spatiality, he talks about places of utopia, 'sites with no real place' and heterotopias, 'a kind of effectively enacted utopia'. He subdivides heterotopias into 'crisis heterotopias', special places of personal crises, e.g. menstruation, and 'heterotopias of deviation', special places for those with deviant behaviour outside the required norms of that society, e.g. prisons. Foucault reminds us that the space in which we live inside is a set of relations that delineates different sites, for example, sites of transportation, homes and sites within the home;

a real lived spatial function. Because עיר has been shackled to an assumed Jerusalem, its omission in the Temple Scroll should therefore alert us to fresh thinking specifically about the repeated word עיר.

1.4.6 Justification of the Spatiality Paradigm as a Methodology

Fro the foregoing review, the Critical Spatiality paradigm is based on relatively modern urban space and structure, its application to biblical studies has been gaining scholarly traction over the past few decades. It is clear that pictorialising space in the form of mapping was not a source of geographical knowledge in ancient times; there was a dependence on written reports, land and sea itineraries.[177] Likewise, scholarship of the concept of the temple has been based on description. It is the language of that description on which any concept relies. Language itself is a powerful instrument with which to construe what results from it as city spaces. As such, they are textual city spaces, created by language. Vermuelen reminds us that whilst reading a text never happens in a vacuum, every text carries traces of its historical and background information. She advises that this should not keep us from following the text's imagination, a lived experience in itself. If language is inherently textual, so it must be with its product, the text itself. [178] To reinforce the point, Meredith comments that analysis of literary space 'is not simply a matter of affirming that space is textual and then *reading*, but of realizing that text is spatial and then *exploring*.'[179] It is thus fair to say that, in agreement with Vermuelen, Critical Spatiality Theory as a methodology has advanced biblical space scholarship from historical/geographical

---

these are not superimposable on each. Rather, Foucault is interested in certain spaces that invert the set of properties that they reflect.

[177] Christian Jacob, 'Mapping in the Mind: The Earth from Ancient Alexandria', in *Mappings*, ed. by Denis Cosgrove (London: Reaktion, 2011), pp. 20-34 (p.26).

[178] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, pp. 2, 4.

[179] Christopher Meredith, *Journeys in the Songscape*, p. 16 [his italics].

approaches. The current Sojan spatiality paradigm still provides a useful framework for reading space into ancient text such as the Temple Scroll.

1.5 The Contents of this Study

We have therefore seen that, although much of the copious scholarship on the ancient city does not provide any significant spatial insights, we found that the work of Frick, now somewhat dated and pre-spatial, expands the idea of עיר as a functioning entity into near-synonyms representing different features relevant to the biblical city. The interpretation of עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll has so far depended totally on literary and linguistic methodology. Faced with the thorny problems we have identified in the Temple Scroll, the spatial methodology of our study will deploy these fresh concepts social usage and living within the Sojan framework. Within these columns we shall be conducting a spatial analysis of the various divine instructions in relation to עיר and מקדש. Although Vermeulen views the biblical city spatially and metaphorically, we shall be building on the works of Berquist and Lied who, as we noted, have invoked spatial theory to deal with an identified problem of interpretation, Jerusalem and Damascus respectively. It is this sharpened methodology to an identified problem of עיר המקדש which we shall be applying to our study.

The principal problem to be addressed is the concept of the repeated word עיר and the reading of עיר המקדש. Up to now, the understanding of this phrase has been limited to geophysical constraints; this has yielded inconclusive results. In attempt to break this impasse, the focus of our methodology will apply the spatiality Sojan paradigm to columns 45-47 where עיר is repeated significantly. Such spatial reading will be applied to three aspects within these columns: first, its linkage with and second, the nature of the חיל. This methodology will be extended to challenge the hitherto scholarly assumption that Jerusalem is the intended locus of the envisaged temple, based on the improbable dimensions of עיר המקדש in relation to the available space of the assumed

Jerusalem. Released from the geophysical shackles of the previously assumed 'Jerusalem', the idea of עיר המקדש can now be explored fruitfully. Our study is unique in that spatiality theory will stimulate a fresh approach to the unresolved problems of interpretation of עיר המקדש. Through the prism of spatiality, I shall be asking whether the Temple Scroll extends its meaning beyond the limited concept of עיר. Its repetition may suggest concern by the author about how עיר was to be understood, especially because it is closely associated with the temple.[180]

This study comprises seven chapters. Chapter 1 starts by raising questions about what the Temple Scroll is trying to convey. There follows a clear articulation of the problems of the scroll's text in relation to the entities עיר and עיר המקדש. The absence of any consensus on the relationship between these two entities leads our methodology toward Critical Spatiality Theory, as a way forward out of this impasse. Each successive subsection of the chapter gradually focuses toward spatiality scholarship as applied to biblical texts. This serves as preparation for the later chapters where the study's methodology applies the Critical Spatiality Theory to the Temple Scroll. Our attention is directed to columns 45-47 in which עיר appears more frequently than in other columns. Chapter 2 will contextualise the scroll as the key text, not only with regard to its emergence into the public realm, but also to the various approaches to dating the composition of this ancient text. There will be a discussion about the relationship between fragmentary documents with different sigla bearing similar material to 11Q19. The scroll's material characteristics, as well as its textual structure will be laid out. The matter of authorship will be explored along with genre and purpose. Chapter 3 will take Critical Spatiality Theory directly to the concept of the repeated word עיר and how it is developed in the earlier columns. Spatial

---

[180] Paul M. Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), p. 24. Repetition in Ezekiel is cited, for example, in 16:6. The point is raised as to whether this is scribal error or deliberate gloss. See also A. López Eire, 'Rhetoric and Language', in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* ed. by Ian Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), pp. 336-49 (p. 348). Repetition of the same word was a rhetorical strategy in ancient Greek literature, a psychological strategy of magnifying a statement.

entities relating to עיר and מקדש will be explored. Chapters 4-6 will focus on columns 45-47

respectively. Their texts will be transcribed and translated, followed by a spatial analysis of each

column. Chapter 6 will also raise the observation and its significance of a near-homograph עור

which appears in columns 45 and 47. Chapter 7 will search through the whole of 11Q19 to

explore other iterations outside our core columns 45-47, which, for ease of reference, have been

grouped as peripheral iterations.

CHAPTER 2

The Key Text: The Temple Scroll

Introduction

The caves in the Judaean desert on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea have revealed themselves to be a rich source of ancient manuscripts. In 1947, whilst tending his livestock in the vicinity of the ruins of Khirbet Qumran on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea, a Bedouin shepherd, Mohammed edh-Dhib, stumbled across a cave in which he found seven clay jars containing scrolls. This initial discovery stimulated archaeological searches for further documents in other caves. In order to assist in categorising these documents, the caves themselves were each allocated a number, eleven in all. Although sensational to the lay public at the time of these initial discoveries, for the scholar they presented documentary evidence that took us back to the time of the Second Temple and the origins of Christianity. Amongst the most important manuscripts is the well-preserved Temple Scroll (11Q19). The Temple Scroll is one of the 21 texts discovered in Cave 11Q in 1956, just over a mile north of Khirbet Qumran. Measuring 8.6 metres in length, 11Q19 is the longest scroll retrieved from all the caves.[181] This assumes that length reflects importance although the Scroll is not referenced elsewhere in the Qumran literary corpus. However, its length would indicate its importance and purpose at least to those who compiled its text.

The scroll has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention over the decades. Its length has actually added to the mystery. Such a long and expansive text testifies to its importance, yet it has proven

---

[181] It can now be readily viewed online, courtesy of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem at <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

difficult to ascertain what that importance is, especially as the Scroll is not referenced elsewhere in the Qumran literary corpus.

In this chapter, we will consider the finding and first publication of the Temple Scroll along with the various attempts to define and understand it. This will be followed by a focus on the questions that have led to the current study. Here we will set out the different aspects of evidence regarding its material and compositional dating, drawing on physics, material science, historicity and palaeography, as well as the text's emergence into scholarly hands and the problems of its dating and purpose.

2.1 Temple Manuscripts and Texts

11QT was the original siglum which was applied to the scroll by Yigael Yadin to 11Q19.[182] However, as there are fragmentary pieces bearing similar material, each with its own siglum, 11Q19 serves as the index text.[183] There were also fragmentary pieces of the same work found in two different texts in the cave and two further fragments were identified in Cave 4Q. 11Q19 thus forms the major part of the Temple corpus which includes 11Q20, 11Q21, 4Q365a, 4Q524 and 5Q21.[184] Because of the existence of these other Temple materials, it would be therefore more accurate to consider the misleading siglum 11QT^a as representing nothing other than 11Q19. However, in our study it will be referred to as the Temple Scroll which is ultimately a modern scholarly title of the work represented multiple times, with the ancient title unknown. It should itself be considered as a copy of an unknown original, bearing no particular authority over

---

[182] Yigael Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 30 (1967), 135-139 (p. 136). Yadin states 'Temporarily, since nearly half its length deals with the Temple, I have called it the Temple Scroll'.

[183] Other Temple text materials: 11Q20, 11Q21, 4Q365a, 4Q524 and 5Q21.

[184] Otherwise referred to as 11QT^b, 11QT^c?, 4QT^a?, 4QT^b and 5QT^a.

the more fragmented Temple manuscripts. Any references to other Dead Sea Temple Scroll materials will be signified by their appropriate sigla.

These other examples are found in both Caves 11Q and 4Q. 11Q20, also found in 1956, comprises 60 pieces which have been joined into 42 fragments. They show a slightly younger type of hand than the youngest scribal hand in 11Q19.[185] Scholarly consensus views 11Q20 as a copy of 11Q19 rather than a separate composition. Schiffman and Gross also now consider them copies of the same composition.[186] 11Q21, in late Herodian script, comprises four tiny pieces that have been joined into three fragments. The subject matter relates to the Sanctuary and עירי, 'my city', assumed to be Jerusalem. Qimron, in his 2010 edition, identified two additional fragments which were part of a clutch of manuscripts that had emerged onto the antiquities market after 2002. Their provenance and authenticity were deemed doubtful.[187]

The relationship of 4Q365 with 4Q365a has been a matter of debate with regard to their relevance to the Temple Scroll. 4Q365, as 38 fragments, was edited and designated as 4QRP by Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White Crawford in 1994; it spanned Genesis to Deuteronomy.[188] Five additional fragments were separated off as 4Q365a. Michael Segal argues that these two documents should be 'reunited' into one scroll. To avoid confusion, he refers to the united scroll as 4Q365+.[189]

---

[185] *TS* p. 8. Palaeographic dating places it 25-50 CE. With improved readings, they now consider 11Q21 and the Temple Scroll as copies of the same composition. See also PTSDSSP pp. 247-253 (p. 247).

[186] *TS* p. 8.

[187] Schiffman and Gross have re-examined these fragments and do not consider them authentic (*TS* p. 8). See also Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, 'A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century, Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments', *DSD* (2017), 24, pp. 173-188 (p. 175). Tigchelaar proposed two aspects of provenance: evidence of find-place and chain of post-discovery ownership.

[188] Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White Crawford, '4Q Reworked Pentateuch: 4Q364-367', *DJD* 13, pp. 187-252 (p. 188).

[189] Michael Segal, 'Reconsidering the Relationship(s) between 4Q365, 4Q365a and the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 30 (2018), 213-233 (p. 230). The festival ritual laws are clearly presented in the Temple Scroll. He considers there are 'difficulties inherent in the presentation in 4Q365 23'. On this basis, he argues that lines 9-11 of the fragment were copied form the Temple Scroll.

Sidnie White Crawford, however, does not subscribe to such a combination.[190] The five additional fragments parallel some of the Temple Scroll. The largest fragment of 4Q365a, frag. 2, closely parallels the Temple Scroll (11Q19 38-41). Furthermore, fragment 23 of 4Q365 includes material from Leviticus 23, the festival laws, also closely resembling Temple Scroll material (11Q19 23).[191] Thus 4Q365+ may have been a source for the Temple Scroll or even part of what is missing before the start of 11Q19. Against this, on the basis of a literary analysis, Segal argues that 4Q365+ has evolved from the the Temple Scroll, rather than the reverse.[192] My observation is that these six fragments and show two characteristics that do not tally with those of the Temple Scroll: the appearance of Moses by name (4Q365a, frag. 1: line 4; 4Q365, frag. 23: line 3) and the use of the divine referent in the third person (4Q365a, frag. 1: line 4; 4Q365, frag. 23: lines 3 and 4). I would agree with Crawford that it is still unclear whether these fragments were the source for the composer of the Temple Scroll or whether they shared a common prior text.[193]

Scholarship has more recently shed light on the poorly preserved thirty-nine small fragments of 4Q524, the oldest extant manuscript of the Temple Scroll. 4Q524 has similarities to 11Q19, except that it carries on the theme of marital law beyond the end of 11Q19. Its palaeographic

---

[190] Sidnie White Crawford, '4QTemple? (4Q365a) Revisited', in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday*, ed. by Jeremy Penner, Ken Penner and Cecilia Wassen (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 87-95 (p. 94). Fragment 5 of 4Q365, relating to building specifications, does not fit into the columns structure of 4Q365 23. She concludes that 4Q365a belongs more likely within 4Q365 rsther than with the Temple Scroll (p. 95).

[191] Michael Segal, 'Reconsidering', 219.

[192] Ibid., 220-23, 230. Segal identifies similarities between 4Q365a with 11Q19 38: 4-15; 41: 4-17; 42 (temple precincts), 4Q365 frg. 23 with 11Q19 (wood festival). See also *TS* pp. 8-9 and Ben Zion Wacholder, *Dawn*, pp. 205-6, n. 169. Wacholder quotes a letter written to him by Professor Strugnell who viewed the work to which the 4Q fragments belong is not a copy of the Temple Scroll, but a Pentateuch with frequent non-biblical additions.

[193] White Crawford, 'Revisited', p. 94.

dating is circa 150-125 BCE, earlier than 11Q19.[194] They were published by Émile Puech in 1998.[195]

5Q21 parallels 11Q19 66:2-8. Schiffman and Gross note that it does not fill in any missing text but 'it provides some interesting alternative forms to those in 11Q19'.[196] The linearity of the texts differ slightly. They both reflect Deut. 22: 24-28, although 5Q21 stops short at 27.

2.2 The Finding of 11Q19 and Scholarly Editions

The initial publication of the Temple Scroll (11Q19) was delayed owing to the circumstances of its finding. It was not an archaeological team but a shepherd from the Bedouin community who made a discovery in Cave 11 of several scrolls. It was not initially known whether they had all been offered to the Antiquities Department of Jordan or if some found their way to a private dealer to be kept for a later clandestine sale. Khalil Iskander Shahin, otherwise known as 'Kando', had been told by someone at the PAM that scrolls and fragments were best stored in cardboard shoe boxes which could be obtained for free. This is how the Temple Scroll, as well as the Psalms Scrolls, from cave 11 were stored.[197]

Manuscripts from Cave 11 were offered to the Palestine Archaeological Museum (PAM).[198] Although the PAM wanted to acquire these texts immediately, there were problems because of its limited financial resources. The required funds could have been raised by foreign institutions. However, the Jordanian government then decided to forbid any exportation from Jordan of manuscripts discovered now or in the future. As a result, the PAM was obliged to retain some of

---

[194] *TS* p. 9. Its ending runs beyond the ending of 11Q19. Palaeographic dating is c.150-125 BCE. See also PTSDSSP p. 252.

[195] Émile Puech, *DJD* 25, pp. 85-114.

[196] *TS* p. 9. This statement does not endorse copies between 11Q19 and 5Q21 without doubt.

[197] Weston Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2 vols, 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 532, endnote 5.

[198] Ibid., p. 327.

the Cave 11 manuscripts, borrow money to pay for them and to repay the debt of £48,000 incurred by their acquisition.[199] In order to liquidate this debt, the PAM had to sell some of its securities held in London, thus reducing its capital holding. This catalogue of financial woes was included in an extensive letter written in December 1958 by Father Roland de Vaux, as President of the Board of Trustees of the PAM, to the President of the Gulbenkian Foundation in Portugal, asking for financial assistance.[200] The £48,000 was just to balance the budget; a further £12,000 was required to fund the study of the Cave 11Q material.[201] This request was rejected.[202] The matter was eventually settled in July 1960. However, in his description of events, Weston Fields is not specific about the Temple Scroll with regard to its whereabouts and negotiations between 1958 and 1960. The scroll did not see the light of day until the West Bank and the PAM came under Israeli control in 1967, before which time it had actually been stored in a Bata shoebox by Kando in Bethlehem. With the help of Israeli military intelligence, he was located and forced to surrender the scroll and fragments into the hands of Yigael Yadin.

Yigael Yadin's acquisition of the Temple Scroll in June 1967 was announced 'as an important scoop' in the journal *Biblical Archaeologist* in December that year.[203] A definitive translation, including supporting photographs and commentary was published in 1977 as the three-volume *Editio Princeps* in Hebrew. An English edition, followed in 1983, later than expected.[204] The

---

[199] Ibid., pp. 300 and 550, endnote 51. Kando's son, William, remains adamant that the Temple Scroll did not come form Cave 11 but Cave 1 and that his family already had it in the 1950s.

[200] Ibid., p. 557, endnote 51. De Vaux appealed to the President that recent fragments could not be seen without the means of purchase. De Vaux thought there were two, three or even more texts which had to be saved from damage at all costs. He did not indicate specific texts but thought that Greek 12 Prophet Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever and possibly the Temple Scroll, on the basis of reports from Kando, without having seen them.

[201] Ibid., pp. 427-428. The endnote 51 to chapter 11 shows that, further to the mention of the Psalms of the Bible, a large part of the scroll of Leviticus and a Targum of Job, along with further components of the Cave 11 materials, were not specified. Fields queries in this endnote that De Vaux may possibly have known that the Temple Scroll was included.

[202] Ibid., p. 557, endnote 57.

[203] Yigael Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 135-139. He described a brief history of its discovery, physical state, characteristics and contents.

[204] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

quality of his commentary and photographic reproductions is particularly laudable, given the compromised state of the scroll with which he was faced. Between those editions, the appearance of the scroll was echoed in various European languages by authors who were not necessarily specialists in scroll studies.[205] In response to the English edition, Lawrence Schiffman wrote a lengthy 'Book Review' which was a study in itself, largely in support of Yadin.[206] However, the point of divergence was Schiffman's hesitation in accepting Yadin's view of the authorship as being one of the 'sectarian' scrolls.[207] Michael Wise, in his critical study of the Scroll, agrees that it is not a 'sectarian' writing although sectarian connections are possible.[208] We shall be returning to the matter of authorship (§2.5). The term 'sectarian' in this context is misleading

---

[205] See Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of Chicago, 1990), p. 3, nn. 12-17. See also G. Wilhelm, 'Qumran (Tempelrolle)', *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 22 (1968-9), 165-6. W. Baumgartner, *Eine Neue Qumranrolle'*, Universitas 23 (1968), pp. 981-4; E. M. Laperrousaz, 'Presentation, à Jérusalem, du plus long rouleaux-actuellément connus-provenant du Qumrân', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 174 (1968), pp. 113-5; H. de Saint-Blanquat, 'Le nouveau manuscrit de la Mer Morte', *Sciences et Avenir*, 257; André Caquot, 'Information préliminaire sur le 'Rouleau du Temple' de Qumrân', *Bulletin de la Société Ernest-Renan*, 22 (1973), 1, 3-4; Paolo Sacchi, 'Scoperta di un nuovo rotolo in Palestina', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, 3 (1967), pp. 579-80; Pasquale Colella, 'Nuovi manoscritti del Mar Morto', *Rivista Biblical Italiano*, 16 (1968), pp. 214-5; J. M. Keshishian, 'Il puo lungo manoscritto del Mar Morto', *Sapere*, 59 (1968) 60-3; Luigi Moraldi, *I manoscritti di Qumran* (Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971), 733-6; Felipe Sen, 'El Nuevo Manuscrito del Templo', *Cultura Bíblica*, 25 (1968), 60-3; K.R. Veenhof, ''Een niew handschrift van de Dode Zee: De 'Tempelrol'', *Phoenix*, 14 (1968), pp. 186-8; A. Andreassen, Tempel-rullen', *Kirke og Kultur* (1968), pp. 262-7; Jerzy Chmiel, 'Nowe rekopisy z Qumran', Ruch Biblijnyi i Liturgiczny (1969), pp. 302-3; T. Scher, 'A kumráni Templomkercs', Világosság, 9 (1968), pp. 636-7..

[206] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Biblical Archaeologist*, 48 (1985), pp. 122-6.

[207] Ibid. The scroll presents itself as conveying the original revelation to Moses, whereas the sectarians' law, in documents that were available before the scroll's discovery, arose from biblical exegesis as the model for the group's way of living (p.124). Schiffman added a sad note at the end of his review to convey that Professor Yadin had passed away before this review had been completed. He credited Yadin's work as a 'crowning achievement' (p. 125). See also Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), pp. 17, 21. Schiffman warns that the theory of the Essenes being authors of the Qumran texts does not serve as a basis for building interpretations of the Qumran texts; each text must be subjected to its own critical review. Sectarian individuals considered themselves a servants of the divine which is expressed, for example, in 1QS and CD.

[208] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, pp. 201-3. Throughout his work, English translations are provided only in part. Doubts about a 'sectarian' origin are raised by: Baruch A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character', *BASOR* 232 (1978), 5-23 (p. 7); Hartmut Stegemann, 'Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status in Qumran', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, p. 128; Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'The Temple Scroll in Literary and Philological Perspective', in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, ed. by William Scott Green (Missoula, MT: Scholar, 1980), pp. 143-155 (p. 154). The linguistic and literary character does not correspond to what is expected from a Yaḥad text.

with regard to the site of origin of the Temple Scroll, as it does not bear any reference to community structure. In his rejection of 'the Qumran Community' as a single homogeneous wilderness settlement, John Collins proposes multiple settlements, collectively known as the יחד. Not all of the Qumran library was copied or composed on site, some having been composed in parallel at different sites by members of the יחד.[209] What actually constituted the core centre of governance of these multiple settlements, whether it be Temple or Government, is not clear.[210] In other words, what is the point of reference to which the scroll's polemic is directed, from wherever it was written? Thus far, it is arguable that the scroll could have been authored in one or more of those multiple settlements of the Essene community, with a view to express a more stringent divine relationship which was at variance with that of its core centre of govenance.

English translations of the whole scroll were subsequently published by Johann Maier (1985), first published in German (1978), Geza Vermes (1962, 1987, 1995, 2004), Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook (1996) and Charlesworth as editor of a volume dedicated to the Temple Scroll corpus, compiled by Lawrence Schiffman, Andrew Gross, Michael C. Rand, J. Milgrom, M.T. Davis and A. de la Ronde van Kirk (2011), as part of the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.[211] Elisha Qimron then produced a revised transcription of

---

[209] John J. Collins, 'Sectarian Communities in the Dead Scrolls', in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Clarendon, 2010), pp. 151-172 (pp. 159-60, 163). He refers to Max Weber's definition of a sect as 'a religious community founded on voluntary membership achieved through qualification'. See David Chalcraft, 'The Development of Weber's Sociology of Sects: Encouraging a New Fascination', in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism*, ed. by David Chalcraft (London: Equinox, 2007), pp. 26-51 (p. 27). See also Josephus, *Jewish War*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, 3 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965), 2:124 which coveys that 'they [Essenes] do not occupy one city but settle in large numbers in every town', Μία δ᾽ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν πόλις, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἑκάστῃ μετοικοῦσιν πολλοί.

[210] Jutta Jokiranta, 'Sectarianism', in *Eerdman's Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. by John J. Collins and David C. Harlow (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), p. 1210. 'The notion of any single normative Judaism in the Second Temple period has been widely rejected. Without a centralised power in Judaism, the idea of a sect as high tension is not meaningful'.

[211] Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*; CDSSE; *DSSNT*; *PTSDSSP*.

the text but without a translation.[212] It is based on the various photographic expressions of the scroll.[213] Most of the text's variants are taken from Yadin's English edition.

The most recent comprehensive work, published 2021, has been compiled by Lawrence Schiffman and his former pupil, Andrew Gross. This is the first published volume of a new series of Dead Sea Scroll editions. The completed project will cover hitherto unpublished or incompletely published Dead Sea Scrolls texts and fragments, updated critical editions of those Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts that have reflected the results of improved photography and new reconstructions of manuscripts. The text is supported by textual commentaries and footnotes, as well as an extensive concordance section and exhaustive bibliography. This work will therefore be serving as the default text, the transcriptions from which will be taken for our study.[214]

2.3 Materiality

Yigael Yadin wrote about the materiality of the Temple Scroll in his seminal work.[215] He noted that the storage conditions had resulted in some physical deterioration. Yadin realised, on opening the Bata shoe box in which it had been stored, that the scroll was very soggy and parts even dissolved. One side was more damaged than the other, not due to the cave but to the dealer's unsuitable conditions albeit over a relatively short period. As a result, when the top of the scroll

---

[212] Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Beer Sheva/ Jerusalem: Ben Gurion University of the Negev/IES, 1996).

[213] Ibid., p. 3. The various photographs are those in Yadin's edition, early coloured transparencies, early black and white prints, coloured photographs and the Zuckerman photographs. See Bruce Zuckerman, 'Bringing the Dead Sea Scrolls Back to Life: A New Evaluation of Photographic and Electronic Imaging of the Dead Sea Scolls', *DSS* 3 (1996), 178-207. Scholars have relied on 'Photographic plates' but technical improvements concentrating on the negatives such as back-lighting, infra-red and improved resolution have helped to clarify the primary data.

[214] See also Martin Abegg, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (Leiden: Brill, 2003). This was useful prior to the publication of Schiffman and Gross.

[215] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (1983), I, pp. 9-55.

was eventually unrolled, it was found to be uneven. He entrusted the task of unrolling to Joseph 'Dodo' Shenhav since his previous collaborator Bieberkraut was, by now, infirm. With Dodo's painstaking technical work, the scroll was gradually unrolled over several months to reveal better conditions towards its interior. [216] Yadin recognised the isolated fragments already at the Rockefeller as part of the Temple Scroll; these fragments were part of a copy or copies. As these fragments were small and text meagre, he felt it would have been impossible for a scholar studying them as isolated texts to have grasped their meaning. Perhaps this was an explanation as to why they had not been published hitherto.

These early examinations established that the scroll was made up of 19 leather pieces sewn together with thread, the leather having been derived from either sheep or goat skins. Research has attempted to differentiate these species by the study of the arrangement of hair follicles in the parchment; the ratio of secondary to primary follicles suggested sheep rather than goat.[217]

---

[216] Yigael Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, p. 136. Yadin describes, first hand and somewhat movingly, the painstaking unrolling and physical treatment of the scroll when it first appeared to him. His fascinating initial observations must surely merit quotation: 'The scroll was tightly rolled, although numerous pieces were peeled off and detached and were in various stages of decomposition. The upper part was a completely mutilated brown-black stump; part of it looked like melted chocolate, a typical condition of scrolls exposed to too much humidity. The lower part, however, looked intact, with many rolled layers. The diameter of the rolled scroll looked about two inches. I was fortunate in having the services of Mr. J. Henshav (known as 'Dodo' in Israeli archaeological circles), who was the chief technical restorer at the excavations of Havor and Masada. With skill and devotion, he worked for several months until he unrolled the entire scroll. The different phases of his work were photographed in black-and-white and color, so as to ensure full documentation in case something should go wrong in the process. The scroll was opened in the usual manner, by exposing for some time to 75% relative humidity under constant vigilance, thus softening the hard parchment. In many cases, layers of the scroll stuck firmly to one another…The problem was to relax the membranes to a point where they could be manipulated without at the same time making the black material so sticky as to prevent this. It was necessary, therefore, to have some method of arresting the softening action of water at the crucial point. The process eventually adopted was to expose the scroll fragments to 100% R.H. for a few minutes, and then transfer them to a refrigerator for a like period… It was fascinating to watch Dodo, like an expert plastic surgeon, discern and dissect the layers…the more we advanced to the inner parts of the scroll (its end), the better was the condition of the parchment, but even there we had to face some disappointments. The parchment of the various sheets (which is amongst the thinnest known to me in the Dead Sea Scrolls, less than one tenth of a millimetre) was differently treated in antiquity. Some sheets even deep inside were more damaged that (*sic*) others near the outside'.

[217] M. L. Ryder, 'Follicle Arrangement in Skin from Wild Sheep, primitive Domestic Sheep and in Parchment', *Nature*, 182 (1958), 781-783 (p.782). Ryder suggests that the secondary to primary follicular ratio of 4:1 to be of sheep origin. He had access

Even when in use in antiquity, the scroll needed repair in a number of places.[218] This observation, along with the scribal observations discussed later (§2.6b), would suggest that the scroll had actually been used, rather than just stored. Where the scroll had been used cannot be verified. The length of the sheet and the number of columns per sheet vary. Seven sheets have three columns; ten have four. The first sheet has five columns; the last sheet is virtually blank. It was assumed that the preceding material comprised just one column. Because the outermost turn of the scroll was degraded, Yadin therefore began his numbering with 'two'. There are thus 66 extant columns. The additional space of the damaged outer turn would bring the length of the entire scroll to 8.75 metres. This exceeds the length of the Isaiah Scroll whose length is 7.35 metres. The height of the Temple Scroll is between 24 and 26 cms. The animal skin is extremely thin, never exceeding a tenth of a millimetre. The text had been written on the flesh side of this thin parchment. The guidelines were etched by the scribe with a sharp instrument rather than in ink; such was the scribe's light touch that nowhere is there a perforation.[219] Roman Schuetz and others published their findings on the salt composition of the surface of the scroll parchment.[220] This inorganic layer served as writing base on the parchment. This research article refers to 'sample' and 'entire fragment' but the introduction gives the impression that the findings relate to the whole scroll. The results of this particular study suggest that the inorganic layer of the scroll is 'part of a unique production technology that was applied in antiquity'. The reports on this paper by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Guardian newspaper quote from one of the authors, Professor Masic, that the composition of the elemental coating does not match

---

to 18 specimens from the Dead Sea Scrolls, although nothing more specific was stated in the paper. One of those samples was from calf. Ryder wrote from the Wool Industries Research Association, then based in Leeds, UK.

[218] Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 1.

[219] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (1983), I, p. 9.

[220] Roman Schuetz and others, 'The Temple Scroll: Reconstructing an Ancient Manufacturing Practice', *Science Advances*, 5 (2019), doi: 10.1126/sciadv. aaw 7494.

that of Dead Sea water.[221] This interesting point, however, is not mentioned in the research article. The existence of fragmentary multiple copies and the likelihood of more than one scribe of the Temple Scroll would suggest that the scroll was being used for a considerable period of time and was therefore a composition that was valued. We shall return to scribal contributions later in this chapter.

2.4 Contents and Structure

The scroll is clearly a composite text which evolved over time.[222] It is immediately striking that we have something that reads like Exodus and Deuteronomy, albeit in a different way.[223] The extant copy of the Temple Scroll available to us does not exclude the possibility that it was used and copied over time. Broadly speaking, it is about the structure and practices within a temple which is beinge envisioned.

There are some features which suggest a composite origin. Andrew Wilson and Lawrence Wills have identified evidence for different literary sources. Their proposal is based on variations of person, number and grammatical forms.[224] Identification of structure is an attempt to reveal some insight into the train of thought of the compositors and the particular group of people receiving it. Because of interruptions in thematic flow, the contents have been divided into different thematic blocks by scholars with slightly differing results. The blocks represent the Temple

---

[221] <http://news.mit.edy/2019/temple-scroll-ancient-preservation-0906>; <https://theguardian.com/science/2019/sep/06/dead-sea-scrolls-study-questions-origins>.

[222] *TS* p. 2; Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll', *HTR* 75 (1982), 275-288 (p. 275). Interestingly, in his initial report, Yadin wrote in terms of a single author and scribe of the scroll. See Yigael Yadin, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 135-139 (pp. 135-9).

[223] The covenant (Exod. 34) is reflected in the first column, the building and adornments of the Temple (Exod. 35) in the next nine columns. The statutes and ordinances of Moses' Second Discourse (Deut. 12-17) are reflected in columns 51-56, the Law of the Kings (Deut. 17:14-20) in columns 56-59. Religious leadership and rules of warfare (Deut. 18-22) are reflected in the last six columns.

[224] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', pp. 275-88.

Scroll's author's intention to display his version of canonical Torah, taking into account a wide variety of material in order to produce what is available to us. The relationship of the scroll's textual substance with that of biblical texts has been discussed at length by Alex Samely. He distinguishes narrative from thematic 'texture'. Whereas the texts of Exodus to Deuteronomy present both thematic and narrative textures, the Temple Scroll is purely thematic without any plot development.[225] It would appear that the identification of a particular theme or textual substance would, not unreasonably, lead to a proposal of structure. For example, Schiffman and Gross propose four such divisions.[226]

1) Description of the envisaged temple precincts (cols. 3-13, 30-45). The courtyards and their respective gates recreated the wilderness camp experience of the Israelites. The first part deals with the temple and its immediately adjacent structures of the inner sanctum. The second part deals with structures outside the temple and its concentric square yards, the temple being at the centre of this concentricity. This reflects the desert camp experience. The discontinuity between columns 13 and 30 is filled by the Festival Calendar.

2) The Festival Calendar (cols. 13-29), based on the 364-day solar calendar, has been embedded into the previously described section. This includes daily sacrifices as well as introducing two additional first fruit festivals of oil and wine. The scroll introduces four new festivals: New Year on the first of Nisan followed by an eight-day ordination of the priests, festivals for oil and wine at fifty day intervals and the wood offering.

3) Purity regulations (cols. 45-51), include quarantine, pertaining to temple, its city and the cities of wider Israel. These rules are more stringent than those in scripture. This section contains the columns in which this study concentrates. The laws of purity immersion reflect the Sadducean,

---

[225] Alex Samely, 'Observations on the Structure and Literary Fabric of the Temple Scroll', in *The Temple in Text and Tradition: A Festschrift in Honour of Robert Hayward*, ed. by R. Timothy McLay (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 233-277 (p. 244).
[226] *TS* pp. 2-3.

rather than the less stringent Pharisaic view, in that impurity lasts until sunset without compromise.[227]

4) The Deuteronomic Paraphrase (51-66) which restates the legal portions of Deuteronomy, largely but not exclusively verbatim, hence the term Paraphrase.

Schiffman raised the hypothesis that the canonical Deuteronomy could have been adapted from a version of Deuteronomy that resembled the Paraphrase that we now see. By his admission, this argument failed.[228] Gershon Brill makes the basic point that Deuteronomy was predominantly chosen over other sources because the subject of the Scroll's theme, the City of the Temple, reflected a similar theme in the book of Deuteronomy.[229] The Paraphrase comprises three sections:

i) Columns 51-66 draw on the legal portions of Deuteronomy. Columns 51:11-56:11 reflect Deuteronomy 12-17, with contributions from Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.

ii) Columns 56:12-59:21 are known as the Law of the King, expanding on Deuteronomy 17:14-20. This section regulates how the King must acquit himself.

iii) Columns 60-66 reflect Deuteronomy 18-22 closely, dealing with such matters as warfare, marriage and witnesses.

---

[227] Joseph Baumgarten, 'The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts', *JJS* 31 (1980), 157-70 (pp. 151, 157, 158, 163). Following the burning of the red heifer, the priestly officiant had to bathe. That was sufficient for the Pharisees but the Sadducees required him to wait until sundown, unitl which time he was impure (*m. Parah* 3:7). Another purity dispute revolved around the status of a continuous stream of liquid. The Sadducess would have regarded such an unbroken stream as conveying a retrograde impurity of the receiving vessel to the delivering vessel. The Pharisaic view would be that not all unbroken stream would convey defilement as, for example, a flow of water from a burial ground (*m. Yadayim* 4:6).

[228] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), xxxiv-xxxv, p. 451.

[229] Gershon Brill, 'Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 12 (1987), 519-528 (p. 523).

This analysis by Schiffman and Gross agrees broadly with García Martínez.[230] Wilson and Wills differ slightly in that they propose five source-critical sections on the basis of content: [231]

1) The largest number of columns relate to laws of temple construction as well as outlying buildings and courts (2-13:8). Michael Wise disagrees that column two forms part of the temple source, as the temple is not even mentioned.[232] Wilson and Wills incorporate into this block the rules controlling access to the holy areas (45:7-46:4; 47:1-18).

2) The festival calendar, embedded within the first section.

3) Purity laws (48:1-51:10) with a firm conclusion (51:5b-10).

4) Legal material (51:11-56:21; 60:1-66:7). This is interrupted by

5) Torah of the King (57-59) which the authors regard as form-critical because of its introductory formula וזואת התורה. Schiffman and Gross incorporate this separate section into the Paraphrase.

Maier simply divides the text into detailed subsections without any fresh insights, as follows: [233]

Part I   Introduction (2)

Part II   The Sanctuary in the Holy City and its Cult (3-48? - Maier's question mark[234])

  A.   The Temple Building and the Altar

  B.   Cycle of Feasts and their Sacrifices (13:8-30)

  C.   Temple Court Constructions (30-45:7)

---

[230] Florentino García Martínez, 'The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment,* ed. by Peter Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999), pp. 431-460 (p. 436).

[231] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', pp. 275-288.

[232] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, pp. 38-39. He argues this column arises from the Deuteronomic source as it 'Deuteronimizes' Exod. 34 by adding material from Deut. 7:18. Schiffman and Gross base it on Exod. 34: 10-16, without any reference to Deut. 7:18. They refer to the command to destroy idols, where the scroll's author has 'harmonised' Deut. 7:25-6 into similar material from Exod. 34: 13-14 (*TS* p. 21).

[233] Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, pp. 8-19.

[234] Ibid., 8. Maier does not explain the significance of his question marks.

D.   Ritual protection of the Sanctuary and the Holy City (45:7-46?)

Part III   Laws of General Application (48.?-)

However, it is the structure of Schiffman and Gross that seems most insightful in terms of the organisation of the text. Importantly, they bracket columns 45-51 as Purity Regulations because they are regulations specific to the temple, 'Temple City' and other cities of the Land, with particular stringencies applied to the temple. Any temporary impurity requires quarantine in a designated space, such that other people cannot be contaminated. A third courtyard is even added, compared with the two of the Solomonic temple, to provide an extra layer of purity protection.[235] In the present study, therefore, it is their structure that will form a template for our analysis, as it is the most forensic and recent work on the temple materials to date.

2.5 Authorship

In the context of discussions of the enigmatic Temple Scroll, the term 'author' encompasses the terms 'authors', 'redactor' and 'redactors'.[236] The identity of whoever produced the final version of the text remains unknown. Schiffman and Gross do not say anything specific to the question. Florentino García Martínez floats the idea of the strong personality of the Teacher of Righteousness although, by his own admission, there is nothing confirmatory.[237]Schiffman and others suggests it was those of Sadducean/Zadokite heritage who founded the Qumran sect.[238] Wise is firmly of the opinion that the redactor was a member of the CD community rather than

---

[235] *TS* p. 3.

[236] With regard to composite authorship, throughout this study, in the interests of elegance, I shall be referring to the singular 'author', rather than the inelegant 'author(s)' or 'author/redactor'.

[237] García Martínez, 'The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem', pp. 431-6 (pp. 437-8). His basis is 'The scroll's authoritative character, the redactor's profound knowledge of the biblical text and his audacity in rewriting the biblical text, might suggest for an author the strong personality of the priest known in Qumran texts as the 'Teacher of Righteousness', but none of the preserved data confirms this supposition'.

[238] PTSDSSP p. 4.

the יחד, in that the redactor believed the era of wickedness was going to end.[239] Wise argues against the idea of the scroll as a product of a sect, in as much as there were numerous sects in the Second Temple period. Any text of that period would have arisen from a 'sect'.[240]

In my view, this is a semantic argument. The challenge is that the landscape of hard evidence is bleak so we are seeking the least implausible answer. However, there is a consensus that the text is pre-sectarian.[241] As already noted, Wilson and Wills have advanced the idea that it is composite. Their analysis of column 2 as part of the temple and courts source is at variance with that of Wise. He argues that, in the absence of any mention of 'temple', the column belongs to the Deuteronomic source (Deut. 7:18). From this, it could be deduced that the different authors or redactors compiled the scroll in collaborative agreement as to what should be included by the scribe or scribes. Alternatively, the compilers of the sources may have had no direct contact with the scribe. We may therefore look to characteristics that point to the midset of those who wrote the Temple Scroll.

The text as a whole is not binary in terms of good and evil, darkness and light, nor does it discuss punishment for those to whom it is addressed.[242] The only retribution relates to the king should he fail to rule by divine law (59: 13b-15).[243] The text addresses temple purity, rather than the purity of everyday practice which is omitted. Who could have composed a text which manages

---

[239] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study,* pp. 179, 184. He draws parallels with the ideology of CD in that the Israelites had not complied with divine commandments (CD 1:2-4) except for a small remnant who would inherit the land (CD 1:8). A proper relationship with the divine is common to both the scroll and CD (3:14-15). See also *DSSNT,* p. 458. They attribute it also to the Teacher of Righteousness or one of his disciples after his death.

[240] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, p. 202.

[241] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards,* p. 8. In contrast to other documents, regarded as sectarian, deposited in Qumran, the scroll's author does not denounce his adversaries. See also Eyal Reger, *Sectarianism in Qumran* (Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 36-37. The Temple Scroll also contrasts with its absence of separationism and righteousness, such as is found in 1QS 1: 6-8; 2: 5-7; 8: 13 and dualism between light and dark, for example in 1QM 1: 5-10.

[242] Except in part of the Paraphrase, 64: 6-13.

[243] *TS* p. 173. 'As for the king whose heart and eye (s) turn aside from My comm(an)dments, no one will be found of his to sit on the throne of his fathers (for) all time, for I will cut off his progeny forever from ruling over Israel'.

to combine stringency with diplomacy? It would appear that the target audience may not have been ordinary Judaeans in their daily routines but a body of authority, namely those managing the temple. Without being driven into the buffers of dubious speculation, our argument is nudging us towards a priestly identity.[244]

2.6 Dating

Authorship is inevitably tied up with dating. Although we are looking for clues in the text, it must be borne in mind that, whatever palaeography shows, the text was written somewhere before it was copied as the Temple Scroll. As the relative ages between the temple manuscripts have been broached (§3.1), we shall now proceed to a discussion about dating of the Temple Scroll, approached from different perspectives.

2.6 a) *Radiocarbon (AMS) Dating* [245]

Radiocarbon dating is restricted to the date of the materials, not of composition. As distinct from palaeographic dating, it is invasive to the materials. In a study by Bonani and others, initial sampling took place in July 1990 from material at the Rockefeller and Israel Museums in Jerusalem.[246] Of the 14 scrolls sampled, the Temple Scroll was the ninth from which five subsamples were studied. The ^{14}C results revealed an age of 2030 +/- 40 years. Parchment

---

[244] 1QS 5:1-3 refers to men in the community who are called upon to turn aside from evil and be answerable to the Sons of Zadok. A composition as extensive as the Temple Scroll would be in keeping with their erudition and leadership. 1QSb 3:22-25 refers to the blessing at the End of Days for the Zadokite High Priest as the Teacher, holding fast to the Covenant. See also Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priest in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), pp. 43-79. Zadok formed part of King David's court (2 Sam. 8:17). The later priests of the Temple would claim descendency from Zadok whom they regarded as the origins of their tradition (p. 72). Those descendants were Levitical (Ezek. 44:15) and could therefore not be classed as 'sectarian'. They were actually closely associated with Jerusalem and the established monarchy, under whose authority they worked.

[245] Accelerator Mass Spectrometry. Ions from the sample are accelerated and analysed according to atomic mass. It has the advantage of less damage than radiocarbon dating to the ancient artefact.

[246] Georges Bonani and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls', *Radiocarbon*, 34 (1992), pp. 843-849.

samples were affected by the twofold complications of gelatinisation and the attachment of rice paper with glue. This included the Temple Scroll. Bonani and others suggested that rice paper and glue was used to improve the visibility of the writing. These particular components added error, in that rice paper and glue, a petroleum product, would increase the apparent age of the scroll. That study showed that a sample of rice paper and glue removed from the Temple Scroll indicated an age of that accessory material of 6215 +/- 75 years. The problems of such contamination were addressed in the laboratory by chemical cleaning methods. During the initial sampling, an attempt was made to obtain ungelatinised portions in addition to samples from the gelatinised edges. Further samples from the Temple Scroll showed that the ^{14}C age of the gelatinised sample was 2024 +/- 49 years; the ungelatinised sample showed 2066 +/- 78 years. The paper did not explain the disparity between these figures and the presumably undifferentiated (gelatinised and ungelatinised) result of 2030 +/- 40 quoted earlier in the paper. However, from statistical evaluation it did conclude that gelatinisation does not affect the ^{14}C dating of the parchment. Thus if we are to take the undifferentiated result, the dating of the parchment would range between 75 BCE to 5 CE. Jull and others report new ^{14}C measurements in 1995 from the Accelerator Mass Spectrometry Unit at the University of Arizona although this study did not include Temple Scroll samples.[247] However, there is a short paragraph comparing this study's results on a particular sample (1QIsa^a labelled sample DSS-50) with the results on the same sample previously studied at Zürich (Bonani and others) with which there was 'excellent agreement'. Flint tabulates the various texts with their palaeographic and AMS dates, the latter of which are subdivided into 1-sigma (or one standard deviation) and 2-sigma. 1-sigma represents a 68% confidence that the correct date falls within proposed palaeographic limits; 2-sigma represents a 95% confidence level. For 11Q19, the palaeographic date range is 30 BCE to

---

[247] A. J. Timothy Jull and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert', *Radiocarbon*, 37 (1995), 11-19.

30 CE, AMS 1-s is 53 BCE to 21 CE, AMS 2-s is 166 BCE to 67 CE.[248] These results pertaining to 11Q19, amongst other scrolls but not to 11Q20, are included in a tabulation by Greg Doudna.[249]

Radiocarbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls were published in the 1990s by two groups: i) Bonani and others (1991) and ii) Jull and others (1995). Both studies are critically reviewed by Joseph Atwill and others in 2004.[250] That paper is critical of the accuracy of the Stuiver Pearson dating curves (proposed in 1986 and corrections made in 1998) which formulate a calendar band width that could be expected for a ^{14}C date. The Bonani and Jull studies are based on that data.[251] Atwill and others view as misleading the assertions by these authors, in that the ^{14}C results confirmed the reliability of palaeography and even criticised their definition of reliability. Further on, the paper makes the point that, of the scrolls that had been dated by radiocarbon, only nine could be seen in any way relevant to the question regarding whether the sect was active during the first century CE or not; of these nine, '11QT' was quoted without a more specific siglum. The 1998 calibration shows the result 53 BCE to 21 CE; that of 1986 shows 97 BCE to 1 CE (within 1 standard deviation, representing a 68% probability that the actual date lies within that range). The criticism continues in that no indication is given in those reports of how many samples were taken from a given scroll and from which parts. If only one sample was taken, the resulting sigma (standard deviation) would be less accurate than a sigma from multiple samples. I struggle with this criticism because the Bonani paper does specify subsamples even though Jull and others

---

[248] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[249] Greg Doudna, 'Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years,* ed. by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols, I (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), pp. 430-471 (p. 469).

[250] Joseph Atwill, Steve Braunheim and Robert Eisenman, 'Redating the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 11 (2004), 143-157.

[251] Minz Stuiver and Gordon Pearson, 'High-precision Calibration of the Radiocarbon Time Scale', *Radiocarbon*, 28 (1986), 805-38 (p. 805). This paper deals with the smoothing out of error, based on the results from wood samples, and states that the construction of a calibration curve from ^{14}C age with statistically limited precision was not a simple matter.

tabulated their sampling. This paper by Atwill is roundly criticised by van der Plicht.[252] Atwill considers that the interpretation of the ^{14}C dates is inaccurate from a purely statistically point of view. Van der Plicht views this as 'wrong and unjustified' and was based on an incorrect understanding of statistical processes underlying the principles of ^{14}C dating and calibration. He later makes the point that the ^{14}C timescale is a defined timescale, not a calendar timescale. Nevertheless, it is a 'good and reliable' dating method because the varying ^{14}C clock rate is known.[253]

AMS dating has also been done for the linen wrapper of the Temple Scroll with results published by Taylor and van der Plicht. The wrapper is held in Norway, in the Schøyen Collection. The textiles of the wrapper had never been treated or cleaned. There were therefore no modern contaminants although they had been bleached in antiquity. The dates would only reveal the cutting of the linen flax, not the date of deposit. Their analysis was performed in Groningen to reveal a later than usual date, between 50 and 180 CE. The authors conclude that the younger wrapper had been applied to the older scroll, quite possibly at the time of the First Revolt, though possibly later.[254] Ira Rabin found that the most abundant foreign material was sodium chloride, which was not distributed throughout all wrapper samples. This may have been due to transfer of salt from the parchment.[255] Naama Sukenik cites 'Kando' who actually bought the scroll from

---

[252] Johannes van der Plicht, 'Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment on Redating', *DSD* 14 (2006), 77-89.

[253] The rate of radiocarbon production through the ages is now known not to be constant. See Claudio Vita-Finzi, *Solar History: An Introduction* (Dordrecht/Heidelberg/New York/London: Springer, 2013), p. 38.

[254] Joan E. Taylor and Johannes van der Plicht, 'Radiocarbon Dating of the Temple Scroll Wrapper and Cave 11Q', in *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, ed. by Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 350-355. The fragments were treated serially with HCl, NaOH and HCl to remove soil carbonates and products of soil decomposition.

[255] Ira Rabin, 'The Temple Scroll: The Wrapper in Fragment MS 5095/2, MS 5094/4', in *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, ed. by Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 327-38 (p. 336).

the Bedouin, as witness that this textile was originally used as the wrapper for the Scroll.[256] When the Scroll was rolled, the estimated diameter was 5-7 cm. The length of the binding cord was 85 cms so the cord was wound several times, thus providing the double protection of the wrapper and the jar. As a result, it was likely that there was minimal contact with the floor of the cave.[257] The linen itself was derived from *Linum Usitatissimus* which had been used since neolithic times.[258] Sukenik concluded that it was not woven by Qumran residents because its high quality would not be typical of such a settlement.[259]

In summarising conclusions from the foregoing palaeography versus ^{14}C, we can see that, despite the arguments of methodology, error and interpretation, ^{14}C dating remains an invaluable dating tool. With regards to '11QT', degenerative gelatinisation did not affect ^{14}C age of the parchment. Could ^{14}C dating and palaeographic dating be reconciled? Bonani and others suggest from their data that ^{14}C ages are 35 years older on average although statistical significance of this difference had yet to be proven.[260] Jull and others report that their data, which do not include the Temple Scroll in their sampling, agree well with palaeographic dates.[261] Atwill and others do not view as satisfactory the application of ^{14}C results to confirm palaeographic attempts to determine the earliest possible dating. Those authors cite two samples with similar palaeographic ages, other than '11QT', where one standard deviation would create a spread of 169 years. Two standard deviations would create a potential range of nearly 400 years difference for two documents that

---

[256] Naama Sukenik, 'The Temple Scroll Wrapper from Cave 11: MS 5095/2, MS/ 5095/4, MS 5095/1', in *Gleanings*, pp. 339-49.

[257] Ibid., p. 344.

[258] Ibid., p. 345.

[259] Ibid., p. 347.

[260] Georges Bonani and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls', p. 849.

[261] A. J. Timothy Jull and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert', p. 13.

were palaeographically similar.[262] Further work specifically addressing this relationship is awaited.

Until then, I offer the difficult task of some assessment of physical dating, based on the material of the scroll. The potential flaw of that basis is that the materials might have been procured and stored as blanks for decades before actual use. For that to be supported, evidence would be required of genuinely blank scroll material and its dating. In the absence of that, we could reasonably work on the basis that the material was made ready for use without delay. There is also a potential flaw in assuming that the material dates reflect the actual date of composition; it could possibly be the date of copying from an earlier text. In the absence of supporting evidence of that, I lean toward ^{14}C 2-s of 166 BCE-67 CE as the earliest possible dating for this copy of the Temple Scroll.

2.6 b) Scribal characteristics

Palaeography is helpful as far as relative, rather than absolute, dating is concerned. Palaeographic analysis is more precise than radiocarbon dating, in that the range of dates can be narrowed down to a half-century.[263] Dating is only relevant to when the scroll materials were copied out, not necessarily the time of their conception. Frank Moore Cross argues that the writing of the Dead Sea scrolls can be divided into three palaeographic periods.[264] The first and oldest is known as Archaic or proto-Jewish (ca 250-150 BCE); the relatively few examples include 4QExod[b] (275

---

[262] Atwill and others, 'Redating the Radiocarbon Dating', 149.

[263] Frank Moore Cross, 'Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. by Peter W. Flint and James A. VanderKam, 2 vols, I (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), pp. 379-402 + plates ix-xiv.

[264] Ibid., p. 393. 'Semi-Ligatures', bending the final stroke to meet the start of the next letter, is a feature of fourth-and third-century scripts. Semi-cursive scripts found at Qumran are mainly in documents from the Hasmonean age (167-37 BCE). For a summary, see Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013), pp. 30-35. This provides a suitable framework.

to 225 BCE) and 4QSam[b] (ca 250 BCE). The second is the Hasmonean (150-30 BCE) which Cross calls the 'heyday of sectarian composition', examples of which are 4QDeut[a] (175-150 BCE) and 1QS (100-75 BCE). The third period is the Herodian (30 BCE-68/70 CE) when the largest of the scrolls were copied, including the Pesharim and Nahal Hever Psalms scroll. The fourth is the Post-Herodian (70-135 CE), an example of which is a Hebrew contract from Murabba'at (XHev/Se49, dated 133 CE).

Yadin noticed that the writing on the wad differed slightly from that of the main body of the text. Whilst the writing of both scribes was Herodian, the writing of columns 1-5 (he calls the scribe 'A') looked more developed than the main body of the scroll which looked from a slightly earlier period (scribe B). Once the whole scroll had been unrolled, he noted that the first sheet had been damaged by prolonged usage; the later scribe A rewrote and replaced it. The first sheet, later added, was rolled around the body of the scroll. The palaeographic suggestion places the writing into the Herodian period (37 BCE-70 CE).[265] Barbara Thiering suggested columns 1 to 5 are late and the remaining columns middle Herodian. She cited the group of fragments called Rockefeller 43.366, 'said to belong to the Temple Scroll', which have been used to suggest a *terminus ad quem* of circa 90 BCE. She challenged this by citing Cross's 50-year allowance on the basis that the end of the middle Hasmonean period was 75 BCE, not 90 BCE, so the resulting date of 25 BCE was not impossible. She noted that the Rockefeller fragments amongst other Qumran scripts contained letter forms that Palmyrene scribes used in the time of Herod.[266] This placed the date of composition not later than the final decades of the second century BCE. E.-M. Laperrousaz

---

[265] Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, I, p. 18.

[266] Barbara Thiering, 'The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 99-101. Thiering stated: 'On the palaeographic evidence, there is in fact no objection to the dating of the Temple Scroll in the reign of Herod the Great'. See also *TS* p. 270: The PAM photograhic plate 43.366 contains fragment 23 of 4Q365. See also Émil Puech, 'Textes Hebreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)', *DJD* 25 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), p. 85. Puech asserts that the 4Q fragments, improperly labelled 43.366 are much earlier (ca 75 BCE). 'The work to which these fragments belong is not a copy of the Temple Scroll but a Pentateuch with frequent non-biblical additions'.

took the view that the composition occurred after the Hyrcanus measure was taken. The time interval between the initiation of the measure and composition 'does not oblige us to date the composition of the Temple Scroll during the lifetime of John Hyrcanus or of any other person to whom it would be suitable to attribute this measure.'[267] Lawrence Schiffman takes the view that it was composed no earlier than the second half of the reign of Hyrcanus or in the early reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE).[268] Stegemann pulls the text back to the 4th to 6th century BCE.[269] Ben Zion Wacholder states a likely date of about 200 BCE, at which time it was written by a pupil of Antigonus of Socho.[270] George Brooke dates the scroll as 'almost certainly' belonging to the latter half of the first century BCE or even a little later on account of its 'Herodian hand'.[271]   All this indicates that scribal dating is relative and unlikely to provide a conclusive date range. Palaeography has led us to an approximate date of the 11Q19 text in terms of a copy. The date of composition will fall more likely in the context of historical events.

2.6 c) Historical Events

Other than from scribal characteristics and scientific dating, scholarly opinion on the issue of dating covers a wide range of compositional timing. The *terminus ad quem* of compositional date could be established by reference to the oldest Temple manuscript 4Q524. The *terminus a quo*

---

[267] E.-M. Laperrousaz, 'Does the Temple Scroll date from the First or Second Century BCE?', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), pp. 91-97 (p. 94).

[268] Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'The Systems of Jewish Law', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke, pp. 239-255 (p. 243). See also Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), p. 263; *TS* p. 9.

[269] Hartmut Stegemann, 'The Origins of the Temple Scroll', in *Congress Volume 1986: Jerusalem,* ed. by J. A. Emerton (Leiden: Brill, 1988), pp. 235-56 (pp. 246, 247, 254).

[270] Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), pp. 203, 211. Wacholder argues that Zadok 'discovered' the hitherto hidden Qumranic Torah in 196/197 BCE 'which assures us that 11QTorah was composed in that year or earlier. The likely date, then for the composition of the scroll, taking into account internal and external evidence, is circa 200 BCE.' I find this sequence quite baffling.

[271] George J. Brooke, 'The Ten Temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*: *Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. by John Day (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 416-31 (p. 424).

could be established by reference to known historical events that may have prompted the contents of the text. References in 11Q19 or 4Q524 (4QT^b) to contemporary historical events may merely represent the date of a particular source used by the Temple Scroll, rather than the date of the scroll itself.[272] The scroll's author may have been taking advantage of the stable Hyrcanus regime, the second half of which would have been considered by the author as the optimum time to publish his revisionist manifesto.

Common to both manuscripts is the Law of the King (4Q524 frgs 5 and 6-13; 11Q19 57:12 to 59) which represents a polemic against Hasmonean rule (152-63 BCE). More specifically, fragment 5 line 1 shows ו[מ]חצית corresponding to 11Q19 58:11 ומחצית which in tells that if the war intensifies against the king, he will be sent half of the people of the army. Line 2 of fragment 5 shows ונ[שא א]ת corresponding to 11Q19 58:12 ונשא את שללמה which means capture of the enemy's pillage.[273] If the sources from which the Law of the King was taken cannot pre-date the time of Hasmonean rule, then the likely compositional date would be in the second half of the second century. 11Q19 57:11-15 describes the ruling structure whereby the king's function was separated from priests, priests and Levites who were nevertheless the king's protectors, a reference to the security vulnerabilities of an unprotected king.[274] Schiffman and Gross argue in favour of a date of compilation no earlier than the second half of the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE) under whom there was noted political stability and expansion.[275] We note that the Law of the King was incorporated into the fully redacted scroll and that particular part of the text was seeking radical reform of governmental structure. With this, the Scroll's author was

---

[272] PTSDSSP p. 4.

[273] Ibid., pp. 150, 257.

[274] VanderKam quotes a date of 152 BCE. See James C. VanderKam, *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), p. 64. Such situations of vulnerability are found, for example, in 1 Sam. 24: 1-7; 26: 6-12. The fate of Jonathan the Hasmonean in 143 BCE is also a contemporary example.

[275] *TS* p. 9. See also PTSDSSP p. 5.

making the argument for a comprehensive revision of the existing Hasmonean order to be replaced with the revised temple as envisaged in the text.[276]

Hartmut Stegemann, however, viewed that the catalyst for writing the work was Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem bearing the Pentateuch. He proposed aspects of the scroll which supported its origins; for example, the *terminus a quo* was suggested by the final section of the Statute of the Kings (59:1-3) which reflected the exile of the sixth century BCE. He is categorical that the Temple Scroll was not composed in Qumran but in the preceding centuries close to the time of the writing of the book of Chronicles.[277]

Vermes thought the scroll pre-dated the Damascus Document, the War Scroll and the Nahum Commentary which he thought 'may safely be dated to the second century BCE'.[278] Vermes stated that, although a view had been proposed that the scroll was not 'a Qumran composition', a contrary view had a solid foundation.[279] He viewed that there was a striking resemblance between the Temple Scroll and CD in the matter of royal polygamy, of marriage between uncle and niece and of marital relations within the city of the Sanctuary. He noted that the death penalty of hanging, reserved for traitors, appears both in 11Q19 64: 6-13 and the Nahum Commentary (4Q169: 1, 7). He made the assumption that CD and 4Q169 were more likely to depend on the Temple Scroll than vice versa, so the latter 'may safely be dated to the second century BCE'.[280] Vermes then added that 'it may also have had an antecedent history reaching back to the pre-

---

[276] Ibid., p. 9. See also Lawrence H. Schiffman, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, pp. 242-3.

[277] Hartmut Stegemann, 'The Origins of the Temple Scroll', in *Congress Volume*, pp. 235-256 (pp. 246-247, 255). He suggests that the dating of 11Q19 to the first part of the Second Temple period would have 'consequences in other fields of Qumran research' and that the debate could reasonably be re-opened on some texts other than the Temple Scroll. He identifies Persian loan words, such as *parwār*, 'stoa/colonnade', featuring as פרור in the construction details (37: 3,5,6). See also A. Cohen, ed., *Chronicles* (London: Soncino, 1994). The introduction to this edition proposed that the date of authorship could not have been earlier than 350 BCE on the basis of the six generations after Zerubbabel (mid 6th century) enumerated in 1 Chron. 3: 19-24.

[278] *CDSSE* p. 192.

[279] Ibid., p. 192. Presumably Vermes meant that it was not actually written in Qumran.

[280] Its composition reached back to the 'pre-Qumranic age'.

Qumranic age'.[281] Interestingly, there has been scant reference by others to Vermes' opinion on the matter of dating. PTSDSSP and Wise appear to avoid such reference.[282] However, Barbara Thiering cited Vermes in conjunction with the work of Emil Schürer, to whom Vermes contributed the editorship.[283] Thiering viewed the Herod scenario as a 'perfect setting' for the writing of the Temple Scroll. Herod promised to rebuild the temple to its true form as prescribed by God.[284] His temple did not follow the plan of the scroll. This historiographic detail clashes with the likelihood that the Temple Scroll predates CD (before 100 BCE). Thiering then made the palaeographical point that the dating of CD was problematic, in that the earliest fragment was in a semi-cursive script. This was open to uncertainty because of an added mixture of formal and cursive scripts within the semicursive.[285] This uncertainty seems to have stalled the CD comparison albeit incompletely.[286]

Elgvin proposes that the scroll predates CD and 1QS, contemporary with Jubilees.[287] Yadin's view was that the work came about in the Hyrcanus era (134-104 BCE). He also suggested that

---

[281] Ibid., p. 192. See also pp. 47-8. Vermes' now outdated view associated the Qumran sect with the Essenes. By 'pre-Qumranic', he would therefore not be meaning 'pre-sectarian'. Current thinking does not uphold this.

[282] PTSDSSP pp. 4-5; Wise, *Critical Study*, pp. 189-94.

[283] Barbara Thiering, 'The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll', in *Temple Scroll Studies* ed. by G. Brooke
pp. 99-120. See also Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus
Christ* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Martin Goodman, pp. 412-413. Many of the sanctuary rules overlap with CD. See PTSDSSP pp. 4-5; Wise, *Critical Study*, pp. 189-94.

[284] *Ant*. 15:380.

[285] Barbara Thiering, 'The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll', pp. 106-108.

[286] Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p.186. The traditional datings of the scrolls have been challenged in favour of later datings 'that better fit their views on Christian origins'. However, such theories have not been supported by Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship.

[287] Torleif Elgvin, 'The Qumran Covenant Festival and the Temple Scroll', *JJS* 36 (1985), 103-6. Elgvin argues that 'If, as Yadin holds, the Temple Scroll was the authoritative Torah of the sectaries, it should have dealt with such an important element in the Qumran cult (*sic*)'. The 'important element' to which Elgvin refers is the Feast of Weeks which does not appear in the Temple Scroll. He offers two possible solutions: The first is to regard the Temple Scroll a document which originated in the fringes of the sect, in agreement with Levine and Schiffman; in other words, the sect knew the scroll but did not consider it authoritative. If 11Q19 is a document of the sect itself, there would have been a time gap between 11Q19 and CD and 1QS; the covenant feast of Shavuot would have been inserted into the Qumranite calendar. The other possibility is that, if the scroll preceded the Essene exodus from Jerusalem, such an exodus would then give the background for the new Covenant in the Land of Damascus (likely

it should date to when Tannaitic Hebrew had begun to appear. Yadin supported this dating by reference to the matter of the use of restraining rings used in the slaughterhouse (34:6). Yadin was of the opinion that the scroll was already known at the time of John Hyrcanus (134-104 BCE).[288] Talmudic tradition holds that these rings, considered ritually essential to the Sadducees and the Essenes, were first used by Hyrcanus.[289] The work then could have been composed after Hyrcanus had introduced the rings, having sided with the Sadducees. Yadin took the view that the rings had not yet been used. If so, it is possible that this passage was demanding that the rings be used, thus dating the composition before Hyrcanus' decision to instate them.[290] André Caquot suggested a pre-Hasmonean dating, based on his view that Hyrcanus had been influenced by the Scroll to introduce the use of rings.[291] My view is that, although some association of the restraining rings with Hyrcanus is tempting, that particular association does not necessarily focus

---

to be Qumran). Elgvin suggested that Damascus represented their exile at Qumran. The notion of an Essene mass exodus from Jerusalem is now somewhat dated. See Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Re-writing in Second Temple Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), p. 101. Zahn's view is that Jubilees may have used earlier materials that re-used pentateuchal texts. From other Qumran texts, Jubilees may have been revised over time and used in other Second Temple compositions. See also Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 99-100. Perhaps the Temple Scroll text stemmed from a group whom its author viewed as spiritual ancestors, rather than a contemporaneous group.

[288] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985), pp. 221-2. Yadin's argument revolves round the rings used to restrain animals prior to slaughter. Such rings were in use in the Herodian temple. He approached the problem by asking whether the rings were already in existence or whether the scroll's author was preaching for a change. The scroll usually covered commands and subjects that went counter to practices of the day. The increasing detail of descriptions and injunctions, the more polemic the style in that the text's author was calling for something new. The rings were attributed to John Hyrcanus 1, the high priest who adopted them, quite possibly, from the scroll. He had turned away from the Pharisees to the Sadducees who were close to the Essenes in temple cult. Fixed religious practices were nullified and new ones introduced. See Josephus, *Antiquities*, trans. by Ralph Marcus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 13: 296: ἐπιπαρώξυνεν Ἰωνάθης καὶ διέθηκεν οὕτως, ὥστε τῇ Σαδδουκαίων ἐποίησε προσθέσθαι μοίρᾳ, τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀποστάντα καὶ τά τε ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν κατασταθέντα νόμιμα τῷ δήμῳ καταλῦσαι καὶ τοὺς φυλάττοντας αὐτὰ κολάσαι, 'And Jonathan in particular inflamed his anger and so worked upon him that he brought him to join the Sadducaean party and desert the Pharisees, and to abrogate the regulations which they had established'.

[289] *Mishna Middot*, 3:5. *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino, 1989).

[290] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, I, pp. 138-140, p. 222. See also Jacob Milgrom, 'The Concept of Impurity in Jubilees and the Temple Scroll', *Revue de Qumrân*, 16 (1993), 277-284 (p. 284). The mechanism of the rings (34:6-9) 'is attributed by credible rabbinic sources to John Hyrcanus'. Milgrom's view was that Jubilees would have been written during the composition of the Temple Scroll (p. 284).

[291] André Caquot, 'Le Rouleau du Temple de Qoumrân', *Études Théologiques et Religieuses*, 53 (1978), 443-500 (p. 446).

the compositional date as sometime during his rule.[292] A later time, perhaps during the rule of

Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE) would also be reasonable, by which time Hyrcanus had

already instituted the rings.[293] García Martínez suggests that the moderate tone of the Temple

Scroll polemic would tally more appropriately with the early phase of Maccabean national

independence than a later period when Hasmonean power fell to Roman rule.[294] Francis Schmidt

states it was not possible to date the composition of the Temple Scroll because its development

was not straightforward.[295] Stegemann proposed that the scroll describes a utopian land

surrounded by nameless enemies, with a central temple in an unnamed place.[296] Callaway

examines the implications of the scroll for the canonisation of the Torah and concludes that,

because of its revelatory stance, it was written at a time when no canon yet existed.[297] Schiffman

and Gross take the view that, since the text reflects the historical experience of the Hasmoneans,

the Law of the Kings (56:12-59:21) was composed in the second half of the second century BCE.

---

[292] Vered Noam, *Shifting Images of the Hasmoneans: Second Temple legends and their Reception in Josephus and Rabbinic Literature*, trans. by Dana Ordan (Oxford: OUP, 2018). There is a re-working of the Hasmonean stories to produce a disparity between Jsephus and Rabbinic Literature. For example, Judas Maccabeus is glorified by Josephus, but the Rabbis omit specific mention of those involved in the Hasmonean victory. This assumes that length reflects importance, although the Scroll is not referenced elsewhere in the Qumran literary corpus.

[293] García Martínez disagrees. See 'The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem', pp. 431-460 (p. 441). The reign of Alexander Jannaeus was not necessarily the correct time of origin. Reformulating biblical material relating to royalty would have been important once the Maccabees established independence. All the Hasmoneans were involved with wars, both offensive and defensive.

[294] Ibid., p. 441.

[295] Francis Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, trans. by J. Edward Crowley (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), p. 179.

[296] Hartmut Stegemann, ''Das Land' in der Tempelrolle und in anderen Texten aus den Qumranfunden', in *Das Land in Biblischer Zeit*, ed. by G. Strecker, (Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 154-171 (p. 165-6). 'Man kann in Jerusalem sitzen und sagen, man sei in der 'Wüste'; man kann irgendwo auf der Welt sein und sich dabei als Jerusalemer Tempel sehen. Die zentralen geographischen Kategorien der Tradition sind zu Symbolen and Chiffren geworden. Ja, die 'eigentliche' Welt liegt inzwischen im Himmel, wie z.b. die Henoch-Literatur zeigt' ('One can sit in the Jerusalem temple and say one is in the wilderness; one can be anywhere in the world and see oneself as being in the Jerusalem Temple. The essential categories of the tradition were symbols and codes. Of course, the true world is set meanwhile in heaven, as the Enochic literature, for example, demonstrates.').

[297] Phillip Callaway, 'The Temple Scroll and the Canonization of Jewish Law', *RevQ* 13 (1988), 239-250 (p. 243).

On the basis of palaeographic dating of 4Q524 (c.150-125 BCE), the material of the Temple Scroll would have been copied shortly after.[298]

Nevertheless, proposals of historiographical evidence are conjectural. As an example, Stegemann referred to dispersal in the last part of the Law of the Kings (59:1-3). This does not necessarily date the composition to the preceding centuries. In other words, it has to be considered whether the work's author may have composed historically rather than contemporaneously. The era of John Hyrcanus may provide historiographical reference points although they are not necessarily conclusive. On the matter of the restraining rings, if Hyrcanus had first used them (34:6), the work could have been written any time after the rings had been instituted. It is also possible that Hyrcanus instituted the rings as a result of the work. We cannot be sure that he had been influenced by a direct reading of the Temple Scroll or by someone associated with its authorship. As a convert to the Sadduceans, his sympathies against the current Pharisaic temple management may have disposed him favourably to demands by the scroll's author on the use of these rings.[299] As the object of rebuke by the author of the Scroll, the continuing expansionist era of Hyrcanus and his resulting increasing personal wealth suggest a historiographical linkage.[300]

---

[298] *TS* pp. 9-10. They make a cautionary point about dating in trying to match the temple architecture and laws to a particular era. These were erroneously based on the premise that the text described something physically real.

[299] *Ant.* 13. 296, trans. by Ralph Marcus: 'Hyrcanus had been persuaded by Jonathan, a close friend, that he had been slandered by Eleazar, a Pharisee. Hyrcanus was appalled at what he considered to be too lenient a punishment by the Pharisees. Jonathan inflamed his anger such that he deserted the Pharisees to align himself with the Sadducees.

[300] *Ant.* 13. 249.: 'Hyrcanus also opened the tomb of David, whom Hyrcanus assists Antiochus Sidetes in his Parthian campaign; the death of Antiochus and return of Demetrius II. surpassed all other kings in wealth, and took out three thousand talents of silver, and drawing on this sum, became the first Jewish king to support foreign troops'. See also Kenneth Atkinson, *A History of the Hasmonean State: Josephus and Beyond* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2016), p. 46. Atkinson makes the point that Hyrcanus broke free from Syrian occupation and pursued unprecedented military campaigns to annex portions of Seleucid territory.

The Torah forbade the king to wage war to accrue personal wealth (Deut. 17: 16).[301] The passage 11Q19 57:5-11 describes the appointment by the King of his army and royal guards, 1000 from each of the twelve tribes who had to be of impeccable character.[302] There is a veiled threat to any king who did not operate to the laws of Torah: 'But if he walks by my statutes and keeps my ordnances and does what is upright and good before me, none of his sons will be cut off from sitting upon the throne of the kingdom of Israel forever' (Deut. 59:16-18).

In an attempt to distil these views, I would cautiously suggest the date of composition in the early Hyrcanus era (134-104 BCE). If, as Schiffman and Stegemann have suggested, historical references, as in the Law of the Kings, are key to a Hasmonean dating, there is an added complication of the scroll's composite nature.[303] On that premise, the dating of composition can therefore only apply to that segment. If we take the view of García Martínez in looking at the broader tone of polemic, presumably he means the whole of the extant text, that would suggest a compositional date in the early part of Maccabean independence (110-63 BCE). Stegemann views a much earlier compositional date.

---

[301] 'Even so, he [the king] must not acquire many horses for himself, or return the people to Egypt in order to acquire more horses, since the LORD has said to you 'You must never return that way again'' (Deut. 17:16).

[302] Josephus, *Wars* 1.61, trans. by H. St.J. Thackeray: Ἀντίοχος δὲ κατ᾽ ὀργὴν ὧν ὑπὸ Σίμωνος ἔπαθεν στρατεύσας εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐπολιόρκει τὸν Ὑρκανὸν προσκαθεζόμενος τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις. ὁ δὲ τὸν Δαυίδου τάφον ἀνοίξας, ὃς δὴ πλουσιώτατος βασιλέων ἐγένετο, καὶ ὑφελόμενος ὑπὲρ τρισχίλια τάλαντα χρημάτων τόν τε Ἀντίοχον ἀνίστησι τῆς πολιορκίας πείσας τριακοσίοις ταλάντοις, καὶ δὴ καὶ ξενοτροφεῖν πρῶτος Ἰουδαίων ἐκ τῆς περιουσίας ἤρξατο. 'Antiochus, smarting under the blows which His war with Antiochus Sidetes.Simon had dealt him, led an army into Judaea and, sitting down before Jerusalem, besieged Hyrcanus; who, opening the tomb of David, wealthiest of kings, extracted therefrom upwards of three thousand talents, with three hundred of which he bribed Antiochus to raise the blockade. The surplus he used to pay a mercenary force, being the first Jew to start this practice'.

[303] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, *Literary Sources*, pp. 287-8. Two possibilities: a) the Law of the King was an independent document incorporated by the scroll's compiler or b) it has been earlier incorporated into Deuteronomy and was later taken up with other Deuteronomy texts.

2.7 Message and Receptivity

Scholarship on the message and receptivity of the Temple Scroll has thrown up widely differing viewpoints.[304] Yadin proposes three purposes: i) to harmonise duplicate and contradictory laws, ii) the scroll set out to provide laws not included in what we now recognise as the Hebrew Bible such as a Davidic Temple plan[305] and iii) as an expression of opposition to contemporary Temple polemic, concurred by Schiffman and Gross.[306] Wacholder takes the view that Yadin had underestimated the scroll's purpose and proposed that it was written to supersede the Torah as a new version.[307] Stegemann suggests that the scroll comprised old traditional expansions of the Pentateuch which Ezra excised when he proclaimed the canonical Pentateuch. He expresses his view that, if there was any indirect polemic in the scroll, it was aimed not against conditions in the second century BCE but against conditions two centuries earlier when the imperfections of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel led to the exile. The message of the scroll was, therefore, to preserve Israel from a second exile by the rebuilding of the temple to reinforce God's covenant on Mount Sinai. According to Stegemann, there was nothing specifically aimed at the people of the Qumran settlement.[308] After Ezra's arrival at Jerusalem in about 458 BCE, these former expansions and additions were collected and edited to form what is now known as the Temple

---

[304] *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford: OUP, 1978). 'Ability or readiness to receive or take in', as distinct from 'Reception', defined as 'the action or fact of receiving or getting'.

[305] Sidnie White Crawford, *The Text of the Pentateuch*: *Textual Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2022), pp. 102-4. In the context of the late Second Temple period, the 'Bible' had not yet attained canonical status. The Torah formed a set of authoritative scripture, as yet unfixed. The Jewish canon, still a collection of scrolls, was to evolve later toward the end of the first century CE. Eventually the physicality of a codex, bound together between two covers, would emerge in the Christian setting and tradition.

[306] *TS* p. 9. The polemic extends beyond the temple to the war practices of John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus.

[307] Ben Zion Wacholder, *Dawn*, p. 23. 'If there is anything that is reiterated repeatedly in 11QT it is that the prescriptions of the temple and its rites are to be eternal.' Wacholder argues that the envisaged temple cannot be both 'forever' and 'until' the day of blessing: 'Thus Yadin's explanation that 29:8-9 refers to two epochs-the period of the existence of the temple at the time of the author and the age when God will create a new sanctuary- is textually inconsistent with the remainder of 11QT Torah, as well as logically faulty'. Wacholder suggests that עד should be translated as 'during' or 'while'.

[308] Hartmut Stegemann, in *Temple Scroll Studies*, pp. 144-5.

Scroll. Maier suggests the scroll should be called the 'Holiness Scroll'.[309] This idea was based on the Temple plan of concentric areas of holiness radiating from the central Holy of Holies. In his Critical Study, Wise proposes four major sources: Deuteronomy, Temple, Midrash to Deuteronomy and Festival Calendar.[310] Wacholder views the scroll as conveying a single theme amidst the detailed descriptions of different subject matter. This theme was the reproduction of the sacred camp in Israel as it stood before God in Mount Sinai, the highest level of sanctity.[311] In my view, his word 'camp', in relation to the camp's re-formation, understates the importance of the emergence of a spiritually pivotal nucleation in the form of what the Temple Scroll articulates as עיר.

Who was reading or listening to the contents of the Temple Scroll? Working from his position that the final form of the scroll had been written two centuries before Qumran came into existence, Stegemann considered that the scroll did not achieve much of an audience within the small subset of Essenes living in Qumran. It was not cited as an authoritative text although Yadin's scroll showed evidence of repair which suggested the effects of intensive use. However, this does not necessarily indicate as to how the text was valued. Stegemann, in a somewhat outlying view, went on to suggest a more casual reception in that a temple was not intended to be built and it was merely viewed from a historical perspective; that is to say, a polemic against the pre-exile conditions.[312]

There are parallels to other Qumran texts to the Temple Scroll. For example, sexual intercourse was forbidden in עיר המקדש (CD 1-2), the prohibition of marriage between niece and uncle (CD

---

[309] Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 6.

[310] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study,* pp. 34, 101, n.1; pp. 195-203. Wise adopts the term 'midrash' as a secondary source of commentary to Deuteronomy.

[311] Ben Zion Wacholder, *Dawn*, p. 16.

[312] Hartmut Stegemann, 'The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, pp.123-148. He makes the point that if ther was an indirect polemic in the scroll, it was not so much against the temple of its day but to conditions two centuries earlier, which led to the exile. (p. 144).

5: 9-10), matters of temple purity (4Q394-399), the New Jerusalem Texts which plan for an earthly location for a heavenly Jeruselam. Whether these represent evidential sources or cross-references is unclear. Thus the absence of any clear evidential link of the Scroll to other Qumran texts raises questions as to how it was viewed by those who established themselves by the Dead Sea; that is to say, members of the Yaḥad there. If the lack of citation reflected it to be of diminished value, why was it amongst its library? Alison Schofield has rejected Qumran-centricism in favour a more complex paradigm. The Yaḥad created its own authoritative centre at Qumran and generated new divergent traditions which did not develop in isolation. Their geographical limitation to Qumran was not supported by those texts. In fact, this is supported by a brief clause 'wherever they dwell' (1QS 6:2). Those communities behind the scrolls diverged from the powers of the temple and became aware of other literary traditions of their contemporaries. To develop a new paradigm for a 'sectarian' community formation, the penal code would serve as an important pivot in its interactions with those in central power.[313] However, unlike 1QS, CD and 4Q265 fr.4, we note that the Temple Scroll does not address punishment to whom it is addressed; it is only concerned with violations of temple purity.

2.8 The Problem of Genre and Purpose

Genre relates closely to the purpose of the text and will therefore be considered together. We have seen in the previous section that the Scroll's purpose is also bound up with its message. In the absence of a consensus of the purpose of the scroll, it is plausible that it could be considered not only as a document of rebuke to the temple authorities but also a statement of what should

---

[313] Alison Schofield, 'Between Centre and Periphery', *DSD* 16 (2009), 330-350. Schofied draws on the work of the sociologist. Robert Redfield, who modelled community formation on the basis of 'great' and 'little' traditions. The primary assumption was that no 'little' (non-urban) community develops in isolation from the 'great' cultural and religious centre from which it develops. The periphery is therefore more bound up in the centre, so we cannot speak definitively of one Jewish centre.

currently be normative.[314] Nothing is known about the purity observances of the ruling Hasmoneans of the day. All we can say is that the scroll represents the voice of those objecting groups who, as part of their objections, would be incorporating enhanced purity practices into their text of rebuke. Biblical scripture would serve as a framework or template for this enhancement. It does not distinguish between the individual and whole. It is directed to the temple authorities as a body of people rather than to a singular person.[315]

In terms of genre, the Temple Scroll was written pseudepigraphically as a direct command from God, using the first person. It is God's voice which speaks. Nowhere in the scroll, unlike the Pentateuchal texts, is Moses featured by name in the transmission of the divine law.[316] Moses is actually silent as an emanuensis and eliminated as a teacher of the divine owrd so that the divine utterances in the scroll are conveyed directly onto the Scroll.[317] However, there are two indicators of Moses' presence. First, there is a brief reference to Aaron, brother of the addressee, regarding the allocation of the dwelling chambers: ושמאולו לבני אהרון אחיכה (44:5). Second, there is a reference to 'mountain': אני מגיד לכה בהר הזה (51:7). The scroll's author is, in effect, claiming Sinaitic authority, as being the Voice on Sinai rather than that of Moses.[318] The Temple Scroll presents a plan of the temple that should have been, but not yet physically realised.

---

[314] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study,* p. 1. Schiffman describes the scroll as an 'enigma'; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, p. 258.

[315] For example, the second person plural imperfect verbal ending on תתוצון ומציבות (2:6), the paragogic final *nun*, used for emphasis, indicates that the early column of the text is addressed to more than one recipient. The same applies to תכרותון in the next line. The thrust of the text is to invoke a higher level of observance, to be practised ultimately by a population, rather than an individual.

[316] Phillip Callaway, 'The Temple Scroll and the Canonisation of Jewish Law', *RevQ* 13 (1988), 239-250 (p. 243).

[317] Baruch A. Levine, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects', *BASOR* (1978), 5-23 (p. 6).

[318] Sidnie White Crawford, 'Where is Moses? The Temple Scoll's Claim to Authority', *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*, 133/9 (2022), 49-59. The switch to the first person is most apparent in the Deuteronomic Paraphrase, reflecting Deut. 12-16 where Moses is conveying the divine law. The scroll's author abandons this scenario and chooses to convey the divine voice directly.

The question therefore arises as to the genre of this work. The text appears to be acting as an oracle, if we use a classical reference.[319] If we are to consider the text as an oracle on the basis that it is the Voice on Sinai, it would increase its authoritative weight. However, it is difficult to reconcile its oracular status with the absence of citation in other documents (§1.6d). Is the concept of genre actually going to be helpful in reading the text? If it was copied from an earlier elusive text, the original author, possibly with input from the copyist scribe, had taken the process a stage further in reworking the text to more stringent observance as it were delivered through the word of God. The text itself then conveys not so much in the way of interpretation but authoritative direct divine instruction. It would appear that reception is coloured by what we now understand as 'genre'. Cutting to the chase, George Brooke asks for whom do genre labels assist.[320] Thomas Beebee proposes that the differences in genres were grounded in the 'use-value' of a discourse, rather than its content, formal features or its rules of production.[321] In other words, it is the reader response that governs how the text is received.[322] Although genres were not categorised as such by the ancient writers, the question arises as to whether the 'user-value' of the Temple Scroll would now bear the genre of

---

[319] *Oxford Companion to Classical Literature*, ed. by M.C. Howatson (Oxford/New York: OUP, 1989), p. 395. Oracle is defined here as 'an answer given by a god to a question asked him by a worshipper; it usually took the form of a command or a prediction or a statement of fact'. See Trevor Curnow, *The Oracles of the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 2004), pp. 1-2. Curnow distinguishes oracles from prophets. He takes Old Testament prophets as typical for his comparison. They claimed to receive messages of a divine origin which was not dissimilar to oracles. Prophets moved from place to place whereas oracles, by contrast, were actual institutions. Some, for example, Delphi, made use of people as mouthpieces for their god. Another difference related to sacrifice, which was central to ancient religion. In the biblical context, following sacrifice, subsequent events were awaited. A prompt response was expected following sacrificial interaction with an oracle, who would offer a special contact with the divine. See also Richard Stoneman, *The Ancient Oracle: Making the Gods Speak* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2011), p. 15. A distinction is made between oracle and omen. Omens can take over your life because everything becomes a hidden message.

[320] George J.. Brooke, *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method* (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2013), p. 125.

[321] Thomas O. Beebee, *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1994), p. 7.

[322] Ibid., p. 3. Beebee proposes four stages: genre as rules, genre as species, genre as textual features and genre as reader conventions.

'rewritten Bible', a term initiated by Vermes.[323] Dwight Swanson has investigated the methodology of the Scroll's biblical connections, the scholarship of which had previously been predicated on Yadin's methodology. Swanson takes previous compositional studies further by arguing how biblical sources are used.[324] For example, the Scroll may gather two base biblical texts, one of which will be the base text to which the secondary text will be embedded or added.[325] Swanson designates secondary texts as those 'which are parallel either in the whole of their context or in some part' to be 'woven together with the base text'.[326] Moshe Bernstein considered that the Temple Scroll presented a unique dilemma. It does not conform to Vermes' criterion of biblical narrative, in that the Scroll does not contain narrative. Nevertheless, it shows rewritten legal, rather than narrative, portions of the Pentateuch. Bernstein overcomes this dilemma by proposing that 'rewritten Bible' criteria should be broadened out beyond the confines of narrative, including the Temple Scroll.[327] I would suggest that, from an emic or internal perspective, perhaps we should be thinking in terms of receptivity, rather than genre.

---

[323] Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), p. 95. Vermes proposed the defining characteristic as 'insertion of haggadic development into biblical narrative-an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation'.

[324] Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill,1995), p. 2. Although the Scroll was not canonical for Judaism, it was composed when there were possibilities that it could be construed as divine true law (p. 7).

[325] Ibid., p. 228. Swanson cites an example: A restored Column 2 reflects Exod. 34:11-16 and Deut. 7:25-26. The former (col. 2:1a-7b) functions as the base text, into which Deuteronomy is embedded (col. 2: 7c-11b). The column finishes with the base text as Exod. 34:16 (col. 2: 13-15).

[326] Ibid., p. 228. Num. 28 is reflected as parallel in the whole context by cols.18-22. A partial parallelism occurs in col.49 which takes the matter of earthen vessels rendered impure in the context of the house of the dead. Lev. 11 expounds on the dietary laws, but makes mention of earthen vessels being rendered unclean if they come into contact with 'swarming things'. This would therefore qualify as Swanson's secondary text.

[327] Moshe Bernstein, ''Re-written Bible': A Genetic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness', *Textus,* 22 (2005), 169-196 (pp. 193-5).

Arguing away from genre, Francis Borchardt proposes interesting parallels with Graeco-Roman auxiliary texts.[328] He adopts from Markus Dubischar the concept of auxillary texts which:

> render service and help, as it were, to a primary text (or corpus) that needs or deserves this
> kind of service or help…They provide help and render an important service to the text in
> trouble. Auxillary texts allow, facilitate, or even assure that a primary text or primary corpus
> is read as, in the opinion of the auxillary author, it deserves to be read.[329]

Borchardt argues a focus on function rather than genre, thus avoiding difficulties with the concept of 'rewritten Bible'. Perhaps, as Zahn suggests, this concept should be re-labelled as 'rewritten scripture' as the complete canonical bible had not been conceived at the time of the Second Temple.[330] Texts are 'in trouble' when they enter a new social or political situation. Indeed, whoever created the scroll's text was, indeed, facing an unacceptable new reality regarding the management of the Jerusalem temple. Perhaps it was the author's perception that the primary biblical texts were insufficient and ineffective in influencing the situation for the better. This, in turn, would drive the creation of an auxillary text.[331] It is the auxillary author who determines whether a given text poses a problem. In addition, 'the service rendered to a text is also a service to the readers'.[332] Borchardt concludes:

---

[328] Francis Borchardt, 'The Temple Scroll in the Context of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Scholarly Texts', in *JQR* 108 (2018), 139-158.

[329] Markus Dubischar, 'Survival of the Most Condensed? Auxillary Texts, Communications Theory and Condensation of Knowledge', in *Condensing Texts, Condensed Texts*, ed. by M. Horster and C. Reitz (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010), pp. 39-67 (p. 43).

[330] Molly Zahn, 'Rewritten Scripture', in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 323-36 (p.323). She considers Vermes' concept of 'rewritten bible' as foundational: 'his terminology has been slightly amended'.

[331] Markus Dubischar, 'Survival', p. 42.

[332] Ibid., p. 43.

One ought not to ask whether it was meant as a replacement, but rather for whom and under what circumstances it could serve as a replacement, an interpretative aid, or a supplement.[333]

Conclusions

In this chapter, the scroll has been contextualised not only with regard to its emergence into the public realm but also to the various approaches to dating the composition of this ancient text, the authorship of which is probably composite. These present a wide spectrum of possibilities which are difficult to prioritise. The scientific dating of the materials does not necessarily refine the date of composition. The scribal and historiographic approaches are more likely to narrow the range of possibilities. Both approaches narrow the dates of the copy towards Hyrcanus and Jannaeus, perhaps spilling over into the new century on the basis of the Herodian script. Such a setting helps in the purpose of the text in its polemic against the temple management and the Hasmonean war practices. If our dating is realistic, the text is all the more poignant in that the author of the text was striking against the heart of contemporary Judaism. In so doing, the text may have served as an auxillary function to the base texts, rather than a rewriting, in order to persuade change in temple governance and kingly behaviour.

There has been confusion among previous scholars about the interrelationships between the different structures conveyed in the Temple Scroll. As a result, the relationship between מקדש and עיר in the phrase עיר המקדש has not been resolved, resulting in an impasse. These entities have been discussed only on the basis of their physical attributes, rather than as spaces endowed with properties beyond those limiting attributes. The idea of space opens up analyses and discussions of the human factor regarding how these spaces are envisaged and used. This impasse will allow me to take the argument beyond physical limitations into the paradigms of Spatiality.

---

[333] Francis Borchardt, 'The Temple Scroll in the Context of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Scholarly Texts', p. 158.

Columns 45-47 provide a fruitful resource of verbal substance to enable this impasse to be resolved by casting new light on how to interpret the highly improbable geophysical portrayal of the envisaged structures of עיר המקדש.

CHAPTER 3

Application of Spatiality to עיר in the Temple Scroll

Introduction

Up to now, there has been no consensus in the scholarly literature of the understanding of עיר and its relationship to מקדש, nor any acknowledgment and study of the repetition of עיר in the Temple Scroll. The reason for this impasse is that עיר and מקדש have been treated merely as entities of physical structure and containers of ritual. In order to resolve the inconclusive results of previous scholarly work, I shall be taking an innovative approach by using Critical Spatiality Theory (§1.3.2). This chapter will serve as a preparation for our spatiality analysis in subsequent chapters.

The methodology will be an analysis of those spatial entities related to עיר, as spaces speaking their own spatiality, rather than an imposition of spatiality onto the text. This analysis will extend beyond the mere geographical and positional relationships between one space and another. It will bring into play how those spaces are experienced and used. The 'your' and 'their' city spaces, עריכמה and עריהמה respectively, are repeated in column 47. They will also be subjected for the first time to a spatial analysis.

3.1 Issues

There are a number of issues to be studied. We consider therefore how spaces are conceived, practised, valued. In order to examine the spaces of the Temple Scroll, we shall take each spatial entity in the text as it relates to עיר. Ultimately, this will lead to an understanding in terms of a conceptualised lived experience of these spaces. This approach will extend beyond their mere

physicality and their physical interrelationships. As part of this approach, there will also be some engagement with literary analysis.

We shall therefore be applying these particular ways of thinking to our approach to the עיר of the Temple Scroll. As it is part of an envisaged scenario, we have to ask what is the essence of this עיר? How should we see it? Does it have boundaries, conceptual or physical? Does spatiality theory help us understand it if it is created by human activity or does it create such activity? Does עיר confer a spatial understanding other than the conventional understanding of the word? How does it materialise, relative to other spaces mentioned in the scroll? The Temple Scroll describes the envisaged temple city both in terms of construction and how that projected structure was going to be imbued with holiness and managed. The process of evolving into עיר המקדש, as described in the scroll, appears to have been fulfilled even at the planning stage. In other words, the עיר המקדש had already become conceptually urbanised even before it had been physically realised. This planning process, in today's world, may be considered normal in the design of urban spaces but in the scroll, there is a significant difference in that there is an added proscription about purity and godly engagement as part of the planning. The scroll refers to spatial entities: עיר כול עיר המקדש, עיר המקדש, המקדש, כול המקדש which are textually linked to (11Q19 45-47). What do these particular entities represent? How do they relate spatially to the repeated word עיר? So far, translations and commentaries on the Temple Scroll have not explored these issues.

Since the עיר of the Temple Scroll must surely have been presented in a way that made sense to the ancient readership or audience, the question arises as to how it is to be understood. It is therefore necessary to understand the concept of the city in contemporaneous literature. Because scholarship has done much to advance the understanding of the city in ancient Israel and elsewhere, such scholarship can therefore provide tools for examination of the city idea in the Temple Scroll.

At the heart of this, we face the important question as to whether עיר המקדש is meant necessarily to convey a physical Firstspace or particular use with regard to Secondspace. As these are spaces and subspaces with כול עיר המקדש, envisioned by God as future constructions, they are not yet represented physically.[334] There is therefore no requirement for the argument to be bound by mere physicality, as to whether they are different Firstspaces or as envisioned spaces. They are not actual built structures but envisioned as being such. As envisioned built structures, we can still define them in Soja's terms. They are divine visions which are not yet bound to physical reality. They are visions which convey an intended human experience to be realised within those spaces. Exodus 25-27 serves as inspiration and a template for physical construction. As that envisioned experience is predicated on the fulfilment of divine commands, the discussion could actually be released from the constraints of physicality. The Temple Scroll is concerned with potential physicality which is implied. It follows that expressions of spatial entities in the Temple Scroll are not necessarily restricted to the Firstspace idea of different or separate spaces. They are not mystical spaces for angels, envisioned spaces for bodies somewhere other than Jerusalem. Nevertheless, these imaginary spaces of the Temple Scroll are given measurements and boundaries. The imaginary nature of a space does not necessarily invalidate the concept of measurement and vice versa. For example, the divine visions of Ezekiel are narrated with copious measurements (Ezek. 40-48). The prophet was brought 'in visions of God to the land of Israel and set me down on a very high mountain' (40:2) where he encountered a man 'with a linen cord and a measuring reed in his hand' (40:3). This man was to act as a guide around what is about to be shown to Ezekiel who proceeds to describe actual physical entities.[335] The nature of

---

[334] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. xxviii. The scroll views this new building as utopian. See also Magen Broshi, 'The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll', *BAR* 13 (1987), 36-37 (p. 36). Broshi reminds us that this temple did not exist when the scroll was written. See also PTSDSSP p. 5. The temple vision was unrealistic.

[335] Paul M. Joyce, 'On Earth', in *Contextualizing Jewish Temples*, ed. by Tova Ganzel and Shalom E. Holtz, pp. 123-140 (p. 136). There is also a command to plan and build the temple (Ezek. 43:10-11).

envisioning any space is fundamental to a perception of that space whether it is to become either a reality or remain as part of a symbolic narrative tool. The point is that Soja's spatial terms can be applied to space that is not actual since an envisioned structure is still perceived as an actual structure.

However, there are two problems to be overcome: First, the two prominent exponents of spatiality theory, Lefebvre and Soja, were interested in contemporary spatial models such as the modern city rather than biblical contexts. Second, the Temple Scroll spaces were as yet unrealised as physical entities. How can these particularly vital issues be addressed? First, let us recall previous thinking. The first problem is countered by James Flanagan, (§2.4). Even though spatiality theory has been applied most often to the modern city, it is relevant to all spaces where human activity takes place. Flanagan states that 'omitting, ignoring or suppressing spatiality leads to imbalanced, distorted and continually flawed understanding and practices in the real world'.[336] He reminded us that 'social space is not to be regarded as a real thing but a set of relations that are produced through praxis'.[337] He was not imposing a formal spatial analytical structure. It is the praxis itself which should be framing our spatial thinking. This impacts on the second problem: the conceptual spaces of the Temple Scroll. We may take it that when we are talking about space, we are also talking about assumed human praxis within that space.

Likewise, for the second problem, Claudia Camp goes some way in grappling with this.[338] Conceived space, that is, Secondspace, is conceived because spoken or written language makes it so. Allocation of a written scenario to a particular spatial category depends on the type of literature being studied. Narrative literature conveys 'both a *model* for thinking Thirdspatially

---

[336] James H. Flanagan, 'Ancient Perceptions', *Semeia*, 15-43 (p. 26).

[337] Ibid., p. 29.

[338] Claudia V. Clamp, 'Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple', *in 'Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James H. Flanagan*, ed. by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 64-80.

and a *site* of Thirdspace, from which First- and Secondspace possibilities can be abstracted and analysed'.[339] If narrative literature is, as a whole, ripe for spatial analysis, then this is applicable to the Temple Scroll as a narrative of divine instruction. We shall therefore be referring back to the formal spatial categories of spatiality theory, elaborated earlier in this study (§1.3.2).

The prominence of the word עיר, including its genitive and plural forms, mainly but not exclusively in columns 45-47, indicates that whoever constructed these columns intended to stress the significance of a certain concept. We have already seen that scholars have been fixated with the relationship of עיר with המקדש, in the phrase עיר המקדש.[340] However, solutions have been various. For a more coherent understanding of the עיר idea, the issue has therefore to be tackled from another perspective. The linkage between עיר and המקדש, a coupling which occurs four times in the Temple Scroll, is not, in itself, really helpful in understanding their individual or even combined spatial categories; nor does this linkage probe the explanation for the repetition of עיר. Crawford identifies that the phrase is not biblical, hence the biblical texts will not assist in the understanding of the phrase.[341] Any solution lies elsewhere.

A brief reiteration of some previously noted points will remind us of the unresolved issues regarding עיר (§1.2). Despite the absence of the mention of Jerusalem, Yadin, along with subsequent scholars, assumed that עיר is, in fact, reconfigured Jerusalem. He thought that עיר and מקדש could be differentiated because the laws of purity, as applied to other cities, are more stringent in the Temple City which can only be Jerusalem. Jacob Milgrom has followed Yadin, in suggesting that the Temple City is different from other cities (47:14-15), but cannot simply be

---

[339] Ibid., p. 68.

[340] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, I, p. 280. See Levine, 'Aspects', 5-23 (p. 14); Jacob Milgrom, 'Sabbath and Temple City', 25-27. Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the Temple Scroll', *HAR* 9 (1985), 301-320. This paper also appears in Lawence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 381-401. See also *TS* p. 125; White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', 242-54; Jacob Milgrom, 'The City of the Temple: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman', *JQR* 85 (1994), 125-8.

[341] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', 242-54 (p. 242).

the temple compound. The city is holy because the temple is in the midst of the city.[342] Milgrom argues that, in relation to עיר and המקדש, עיר המקדש can only mean the עיר that contains המקדש. He reaches this view by arguing that, if עיר were limited to the sacred compound, then המקדש would have to be the temple building. Milgrom fails to offer a discussion about the seeming relationship of city with sanctuary. One passage indicates inclusion:

(45:11-12) לוא יבוא אל כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי

he will not enter any part of the temple city in which I cause my name to dwell

whereas, one column later, the text indicates exclusion:

(46: 9-10) ועשיתה חיל סביב למקדש רחב מאה באמה אשר יהיה מבדיל בין מקדש הקודש לעיר

you will make a rampart around the sacred place, a hundred cubits width, which will separate the holy temple from the city

In his attempt to untangle this problem, Milgrom acknowledges the difficulties by stating that some problems are left unanswered whilst others emerge.[343]

However, Baruch Levine views עיר המקדש as referring to the temple complex, not to the entire city of Jerusalem.[344] Lawrence Schiffman also understands the phrase as comprising the temple compound.[345] He disagrees with the notion that the entire city of Jerusalem was to be devoid of women and only occupied by male celibates.[346] The absence of any quarantine regulations for female impurities leads Milgrom to believe that women were banned from the Temple City.[347] Cecilia Wassen agrees with those who identify (CD12: 1-2) עיר המקדש with 'the city of

---

[342] Jacob Milgrom, 'City of the Temple', 125-127.

[343] Jacob Milgrom, 'Studies', p. 517.

[344] Baruch A. Levine, 'Aspects', p. 14, 16. Yet another example of Jerusalem as the assumed locus.

[345] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 57, 58; *TS* p. 125, n. 10.

[346] Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'Exclusion from the Sanctuary', p. 313.

[347] Jacob Milgrom, 'Studies', pp. 513, 517.

Jerusalem'.[348] As we have already noted, Crawford reconciles these differences by proposing the Temple city was an unspecified city with the special status of pilgrimage, not necessarily Jerusalem.[349] The duration of pilgrimages would be short, rather than a place of extended residence.[350] In her studies of women in the Damascus Document, Cecilia Wassen acknowledges the problem of understanding עיר המקדש (CD 12:1-2) in that scholars understand it as either the temple complex or 'as the entire city of Jerusalem'.[351] These two lines state the prohibition of sexual intercourse in עיר המקדש. If this phrase meant that intercourse was banned in the Temple precincts, it would seem redundant because of the holy status of the Temple. If it meant that such activity was banned in the whole city, this would be difficult to impose. Louis Ginzberg is emphatic that there was no reason to understand by 'the city of the sanctuary' as any city other than Jerusalem. The מקדש was the Temple; the עיר was the whole city. The rigorous sexual laws would have made life in Jerusalem too difficult.[352] Both these interpretations are therefore problematic. In the Temple Scroll, it is only used in the context of purity; its specific connotation is elusive.[353] The inconclusiveness of previous scholarship requires fresh thinking as to how human activity was practised in the 'city', 'the sanctuary' and 'the city of the sanctuary', in line with spatiality theory that incorporates praxis in the analysis of space. Because we are dealing with the Temple Scroll as a text of divine commandment, the question arises as to the underlying concept of praxis. The next section will discuss the divine and human components of this praxis.

---

[348] Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), p. 100. Again, Jerusalem is the assumed focus.

[349] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', 242-54 (p. 244). Crawford actually acknowledges that Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Scroll. She considers such a place impossible for full-time residential family life, because of the three-day ban from the city of the sanctuary, following sexual intercourse.

[350] Ibid., 249, 251.

[351] Wassen, p. 98.

[352] Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Jewish Theological Seminary of America: New York City, 1976), pp. 73-4. This is a revised version of *Eine Unbekannte Jüdische Sekt* (1922). Ginzberg views עיר דוד as corresponding to עיר המקדש (2 Chron. 8:11): 'Solomon brought Pharaoh's daughter from the city of David to the house that he had built for her, for he said, 'My wife shall not live in the house of King David, for the places to which the ark of the LORD has come are holy''.

[353] Cecilia Wassen, p. 99. She assumes the city to be Jerusalem.

3.2 Praxis: Divine or Human?

The praxis of the Temple Scroll is tied into divine commandment. This is pre-ordained as the divine plan, implying divine praxis. This divine praxis is the foundation on which human praxis is built; the divine operates in a space on earth.[354]

The Temple Scroll makes this point explicitly. God acts by causing his glory to dwell in a particular space (29: 8b-9):

<div dir="rtl">

ואקדשה [את מ] קדשי בכבודי אשר אשכין

עליו את כבודי עד יום הבריה אשר אברא אני את מקדשי

</div>

> … and I shall make holy my sanctuary with my glory, upon which I shall cause my glory
>
> to dwell until the day of blessing, when I shall create my sanctuary [355]

In other words, it is already perceived by the divine as humanly lived space before it is gifted for human possession and experience. The author of these columns is using the first person as the divine voice. God is therefore addressing the audience through the text. The verbal action of making the sanctuary by the divine is incomplete; it has yet to happen. This raises important

---

[354] Timothy J. Gorringe, *A Theology of the Built Environment: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 58-9: 'When the LORD your God has brought you into the land that he swore to your ancestors, to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob, to give you – a land with fine large cities which you did not build, houses filled with all sorts of goods that you did not fill, hewn cisterns you did not hew, vineyards and olive groves that you did not plant…' (Deut. 6:10-12). Eliade raises an important point about the significance of consecration and the avoidance of chaos. Is inclusion of the cosmos essential for worldly order? He argues that if every inhabited territory is a cosmos, this is because it was consecrated because it is in communication with the gods. The status of the Jerusalem temple at the time of the Temple Scroll can be explored in this context on the basis that the wayward management of the temple, could be regarded as deconsecration, a returned to chaos outside the cosmos (see Eliade, pp. 29-30).

[355] *TS* p. 87. This follows the reading, יום הברכה, 'day of blessing' rather than יום הבריה, 'day of creation'. 'Blessing' is associated with building the sanctuary (Jub.1:16). See also Ben Zion Wacholder, *Dawn,* p. 23. Here it is argued that God could not have both promised an eternal structure, לעולם, 'for ever' and עד, 'until' the day of blessing. Hence Wacholder's suggestion that עד should be translated as 'during' or 'while'.

questions. Does human anticipation of this space mean that the space is already humanly experienced and lived or is it still a divine description, yet to materialise?

Given that God is speaking directly to an audience, that audience is in direct communication with the divine. The divine is thus sharing spatial information with the audience. The nature of that information is a glorification of the divine sanctuary. That glorification is to be fulfilled by the ritual requirements, as expressed in the columns leading up to 29. As the divine has expressed directly to the audience the details of what is expected as a human spatial experience, given divine praxis, that experience is shared as an anticipated experience. This will be the basis on which עיר will be analysed spatially.

3.3 Utopia and the Temple Scroll

Such divine sharing of spatial information, as yet unrealised physically, invites us to consider the concept of utopia in the Temple Scroll.[356] Up to now, there has been no link with utopia and spatiality. More broadly in relation to the Bible, Frauke Uhlenbruch advises against a strict definition, rather a flexible ideal type. She sees utopia as a specific authorial response to a perceived reality, depending on the reader's viewpoint.[357] Suvin's definition is a little more verbose: 'Utopia is the verbal construction of a particular quasi-human community where socio-political institutions, norms and individual relationships are organized according to a more perfect principle than in the author's community'.[358] Can we reconstruct historical reality from utopia? As alternative visions, not necessarily realistic, utopias tend to be generated at times of social upheaval by non-dominant social groups.[359] To reach historical reality, Uhlenbruch

---

[356] Εὐτοπος, 'good place' or οὐτοπος, 'no place'.

[357] Frauke Uhlenbruch, 'Reconstructing Realities', p. 193.

[358] Darko Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre* (Oxford: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2016), p. 63.

[359] Frauke Uhlenbruch, 'Reconstructing Realities', p. 195.

suggests a retrograde analysis of utopian texts. The difficulty here is that biblical utopias may be constructed from traditions from different eras. Another difficulty is whether a text is to be regarded as *actual* utopia or whether the text should be *read* as utopia.[360] Furthermore, a utopian text may convey considerable risk in attempting a new improved reality. For example, the spy narrative (Num. 13: 31-33) juxtaposes a utopian vision of a prosperous land to a dystopian vision of the same land inhabited by stronger tribes.[361] Regardless of these problems, every utopian text has the potential to become reality.

Utopia specifically in relation to the Temple Scroll is currently being explored by Molly Zahn.[362] Her approach is that it is the vision itself rather than any relationship to previous texts or halakhic principles that will further an understanding. She frames the vision as 'counterfactual', instructions that should have been implemented but were never carried out; an alternative past. Between the scroll's envisioned ideal and the historical experience of its author lies one of two gaps. The first is the time over which the divine commands have gone unfulfilled. Temple practices have never fulfilled God's commands in accordance with those at Sinai, thus making it unsuitable for divine residence. Perhaps God has never been totally present amongst the people. The extant opening column reflects the Sinai setting as the base, since which time there has been a long period on what Zahn calls 'out of compliance'. The second gap is that of the disparity between the envisioned space and that which is physically available.[363] The physical improbability of this vision leads Zahn to propose that the scroll's author was not concerned about implementability but the vision itself. As part of a polemic against Hasmonean temple

---

[360] Ibid., p. 201. See also Ruth Levitas, *Utopia as Method*: *The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 125. The way the texts are read affects their potential social function. The absence of any degree of plausibility renders them compensatory fantasy.

[361] Frauke Uhlenbruch, 'Reconstructing Realities', p. 203.

[362] Mollly M. Zahn, 'The Utopian Vision of the Temple Scroll' (presented to the University of Aberdeen Biblical Studies Seminar 23.2.22).

[363] Magen Broshi, 'The Gigantic Dimensions', p. 37.

management, the vision may serve to influence the *status quo* even though it is not implementable. Those responsible for the scroll's text were in the paradoxical position of not being in control of the *status quo* but nevertheless claiming to know God's will. They would have the upper hand, so to speak, when God acted to restore Israel as envisaged.

3.4 The development of עיר in the text:

As עיר is to emerge into prominence, we now give special consideration as to how we see this as happening in the text.

The first suggestion of עיר relates to a *lacuna* in 16:11:

<div align="center">ואת עורו עם פרשו ישרופו מחו]ץ</div>

> and its hide along with its dung they shall burn from outside

It states the instruction to remove and burn 'the hide and its waste outside [*lacuna*]'. This line is physically degraded toward the end. The last decipherable letter is the lower half of the *waw* in the incomplete word מחו.

The lacuna at the end of the line is restored by Yadin and Schiffman as: מחו]ץ לעיר המקדש. Qimron restores it as מחו]ץ למחנה הקודש.[364] In agreement with Qimron, Schiffman and others suggest restoring the end of the line as 'probable': [ואת עורו עם פרשו ישרופו מחו]ץ לעיר המקדש.[365] Vermes fills the *vacat* in English with [sanctuary city on a wood fire].[366] Wise refers the passage to Exod. 29:14.[367] The lacuna is reconstituted from the base text (Lev. 8:17), מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the

---

[364] Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll,* p. 26. See also *TS* p. 50.

[365] *TS* p. 50.

[366] PTSDSSP p. 48; *CDSSE* p. 195.

[367] Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, p. 215. Exod. 29:14 and Lev. 8:17 state that the burning of dung was to be performed מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp'.

camp'. Even at this early stage in the scroll, there is a hint that impurity is unacceptable within עיר.

It is striking that עיר does not make a substantive appearance until 45:11b-12b, explicitly on the theme of marital physical relations: לוא יבוא אל כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי בה שלושת ימים: 'they shall not enter the whole city of the sanctuary, in which my name dwells, for three days'. Before that appearance, the Temple Scroll starts with a forceful reminder to shun and destroy evidence of idolatry; this is followed by detailed instruction of ritual. It is only in 29:10 that מקדשי, 'my sanctuary' is to be created although at that point, there is still no mention of עיר associated with מקדשי.

The tribal gates have to be navigated before we arrive at any sense of space, as expressed by עיר, in כל עיר המקדש, 'all the city of my sanctuary' (45:11-12).[368] The phrase עיר המקדש, 'city of the sanctuary', reappears four lines later (45:16-17), in relation to purification after male discharge. There is implied distinction between the physiological and pathological, although both require mandatory purification in עיר המקדש.

We must ask why is עיר not stated sooner to establish a setting for ritual, purity and the house bestowed by the divine name לעלות עולה [ומנחה זבח ונסכים כמשפט [בבית אשר אשכין שמי עליו, 'to offer up burnt offerings [meal offerings, sacrifices, and libations according to the regulation] in the house where I cause my Name [to dwell]. (29:3-4a).

It could be argued that if בית, rather than עיר המקדש, is the first inkling of sacred space, then both expressions somehow have their own and possibly linked significance. In support of this argument, בית is also written in other lines: כל בית המסבה, 'in the whole house of the circle' (31:8), ועשיתה בית לכיור 'you shall make a house for a basin' (31:10), שער בית הכיור 'the house of the basin' (33:10-11), וכול הבית הזה 'and this whole house' (33:11). It is interesting to note that, before

---

[368] The gates are apportioned in 40:10-41:17; 44:5-16.

the constructional details, a different word מזרק is used for 'bowl' or 'basin' to collect sacrificial blood (23:12). However, in the context of temple construction, we note an alternative word for 'bowl', כיור, which is paired with בית. The word כיור denotes more than a simple basin, perhaps a fire-basin.[369] In the Hebrew Bible, it is quoted as part of the paraphernalia of cleansing before entry into the tent of the meeting (Exod. 30:18, 28). It becomes an integral part of the sanctuary (Exod. 31:9; 35:16) and of the sacrificial apparatus (Exod. 38:8). Therefore, the choice of the word כיור indicates not just an ordinary basin but one which is elevated in status; it is integral to the trappings of sanctity. Its pairing with בית in would suggest that בית has also been elevated to the status of sacred space.

Now that בית has been elevated, the question arises as to relative status of בית and עיר; is one a subset of the other? According to Jacob Milgrom, the city is holy because the temple is in the midst of the city.[370] As עיר המקדש occurs twice (45:11-12; 16-17) and עיר מקדשי twice (47: 9,13) without any reference to the temple building, only to the sacred compound, Milgrom asks as to how the scroll refers to the temple building.[371] It never refers to the temple building but always to the sacred compound. The word בית is used in association with structures of the inner court, such as the staircase (31:8), vessels (33:8,11) and laver (33:10-11). To Milgrom, it is logical to conclude that that the temple would be called בית המקדש. He deduces that 'the confinement of המקדש to the sacred compound leaves עיר to assume its normal meaning'. My view is that, in the context of the Temple Scroll, עיר does not have a 'normal meaning', whatever that may mean. After all, we shall be noting Loren Fisher's view that the word does not have a straightforward translation (§4.1). What, then, is the relationship between temple and city? One passage indicates

---

[369] David J. A. Clines, ed., *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, 9 vols (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007),* IV, p. 392. See also BDB p. 468.

[370] Jacob Milgrom, 'City of the Temple', 125-127.

[371] Ibid., p. 126. As part of his argument, Milgrom inexplicably states that the construct עיר המקדש occurs 36 times, without specific references.

inclusion, לוא יבוא אל כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי, 'he will not enter into any part of the temple city in which I cause my name to dwell' (45:11-12). As we shall see later (§5.1), the scroll states:

ועשיתה חיל סביב למקדש רחב מאה באמה אשר יהיה מבדיל בין מקדש הקודש לעיר,

'you will make a rampart around the sacred place, a hundred cubits width, which will separate the holy temple from the city' (46: 9-10).

The first passage indicates 'temple city' whilst the second separates 'holy temple' from 'city' by means of a 'rampart'. This would support Milgrom's view that the entity of 'temple city' is a city inside of which is a temple. Levine's view of 'temple city' as the temple complex, not the whole city, is also supportable in that the 'rampart' separates 'holy temple' from 'city'. The crux of my argument is that it cannot be both and that another approach, in the form of spatial analysis, is required.

3.5 The Significance of בית in the Development of עיר

Despite this tension between עיר and מקדש, there is arguably a conceptual linkage between בית and מקדש. The discussion will examine the purpose of עיר because of potential conflict with the status of בית 'house' which is also a locus of sanctity. We start by exploring any similarity or difference between בית and עיר in 11Q19. The initial mention of בית (29:3) relates to the place where God, the speaker, will dwell. It then appears as an impurity structure as a way to purity, a house of the basin בי [ת] הכיור. The basin serves to collect drainage from the altar of the burnt offering (32:12,13), the drainage itself being impure with sacrificial blood such that it cannot be touched (32:14,15). The association of בית with הכיור 'basin' is restated in the next column (33:10,11).

In 29:3-4a, בית is nominated by God as his dwelling-place, so its holiness is definite. It is the place of the burnt offering, עולת (29:4). Scripture links בית with the royal palace (Jer. 22:1, 5 and

6).[372] The temple is the locus of cultural meaning, situated adjacent to the royal residence, forming a dual seat of urban government (2 Sam. 7:1).[373] By association with בית, עיר המקדש could be reasonably linked with עיר. Put in another way, I propose that the use of בית establishes a firm relationship with God by virtue of the burnt offering so that when עיר is introduced, the sanctity of עיר is definite. Such sanctity is guarded by the threat of lethal punishment in the event of any violation of the inner court and the holy of holies, קודש קודשים (11Q19 35:9).[374] In addition, taking into account the analysis of כיור, my view differs from that of Milgrom, in that בית and עיר do not necessarily have a comparative structural relationship.[375] I deduce that their relationship is more subtle, in that עיר is a continuum of בית on the purity spectrum.

Further on, the domestic purity ritual over seven days, following a death at home, is centred around בית (49:5-7, 11, 14, 17-19). We note that, whereas the scroll states ואדם כי ימות בעריכמה, 'and if a man dies in your cities' (49:5), the source (Num. 19:14) states אדם כי־ימות באהל. It appears that the scroll has made the leap from אהל 'tent' to עיר, having bypassed בית. It is a tentative suggestion, therefore, that we are seeing an evolution in the purity status of עיר; that is to say, עיר as understood by the scroll's author.

To reinforce this impression, the use of עיר, in a more limited sense, can be applied to and translated as a space within a city, rather than the city expanse itself.[376] For example, NRSV renders the final sentence of 1 Kgs. 20:30 as '…Ben-Hadad also fled and entered the city to hide'. The Hebrew reads literally as 'to the city room by room', ויבא אל־העיר חדר בחדר. The same sequence חדר בחדר occurs in 22:25 but is rendered in NRSV as 'inner chamber'. חדר בחדר also

---

[372] Mary Mills, *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy* (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2012), p. 58.

[373] Alison Gray, 'Reflections', p. 23.

[374] *TS* p. 98. Previous rendition ם] הקודשי ש [קוד by Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 382.

[375] Jacob Milgrom, 'City of the Temple', 125-127 (p. 126). Milgrom argues that the temple building would be called בית המקדש on the basis that בית is attached to other structures, 'staircase' (31:8), 'vessels' (33:8,11) and 'laver' (33:10-11).

[376] Frank S. Frick, *City in Ancient Israel*, pp. 32-33.

occurs in 2 Kgs. 9:2 where it is stated that Jehu is taken 'into an inner chamber' to be anointed. Nevertheless, an interesting question arises as to the leap from 'city' to 'room', in that the all-important intermediate structure, 'house', is omitted. Why not 'house by house', בית בבית? The clue may lie in the context of Ben-Hadad, an adversary of Israel who takes flight to hide in the city of Aphek (1 Kgs. 20:30). The sanctified status of בית might preclude its nominal association with an unholy adversary and, indeed, with the city of Aphek because of its pagan association.[377]

However, in the context of the scroll, why does a heavenly בית (29:3), a divine place שמי, 'of my name', necessarily escalate in status to עיר המקדש? The heavenly offering from בית contrasts impressively with the base earthiness of man's secretions in relation to עיר (45:15-18). Thus עיר marks the place of man's bodily relationship with God. Perhaps the hierarchy of holiness is such that the place of burnt offering, בית, is closer to God than עיר, establishing itself as the locus of purity in preparation for communing with the divine, once purification is complete. It is interesting to note that between בית and עיר (45:11-12), there is repeated mention of שער from 31:2 to 44:16. שער seems not so much an editorial delaying tactic before עיר but rather to indicate an idea of transition between the increasing sanctities of בית to עיר. Such a transition is taken up between 29:3 and 40:5 by a complete architectural description. The structures of the middle (38:12) and outer courts (40:5) are introduced and designated specifically. However, the intended structure of the inner court (30:3 *et seq*) is not designated as such. The scroll's author assumes the reader or audience will understand the inner court as the start of the project, to become the court containing the space of ultimate purity. Only on completion of the whole architectural plan is עיר introduced (45:11-12). This raises the question of whether עיר, following the radiating pattern of contstruction in the context of holiness, is an entity beyond the outer court. This is not necessarily so, in that the word עיר is not connected textually with construction details of the

---

[377] Marvin Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1955), p. 75. Aphek was the dwelling place of a god of subterranean water.

temple. It would appear, therefore, that עיר covers a spectrum of purity, not just the holy of holies. The idea of transition between one level of purity and the next may help address and reinforce the point of עיר.

3.6 Purity and holiness towards the understanding of עיר

How does עיר relate to the idea and practice of purity as the ultimate qualification in the quest for divine approval? In preparation, it would be helpful to divert onto a discussion of the general concept of holiness. In his study of Leviticus, Milgrom offers his definition: 'that which is approachable except through divinely imposed restrictions' or 'that which is withdrawn from common usage'. The source of holiness is ascribed to God alone. In the creation narrative of Genesis, the only holiness is the creation of the Sabbath. This particular holiness rests in time, not space. However, whenever there is reference to space as 'holy', for example the Sanctuary and its environs, this holiness stems from divine revelation rather than something inherent to creation. It is an extension of God's will and of a positive nature: 'Speak to all the congregation of the people of Israel and say to them: You shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy' (Lev. 19:2).[378] Holiness was the doctrine by which an exasperated Moses ushers his rebellious people into a life of discipline. Man can strive to attain holiness; it is the duty of priests to sustain it.[379] Milgrom takes the view that holiness is evident in the concept of space. For example, the wilderness camp does not tolerate severe physical impurities (Num. 5:1-4). Holiness is enforced by exclusion into quarantine (Deut. 23: 10-15). These ordinances are to apply to the place of future residence of Israel, the promised land: 'Speak to the people of Israel and say to them: When you enter the land I am giving you, the land shall observe a sabbath for the LORD' (Lev.

---

[378] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), p. 107.

[379] Ibid., 178.

25:2).[380] Compliance will ensure divine residence: 'I will place my dwelling in your midst' (Lev. 26:11a). The human attempt towards attaining holiness requires the practices of purity.

Joan Taylor brings us to an important point that ritual purity is nothing to do with hygiene or dirt although the purity language is similar; ritual impurity is an actual state. There is nothing morally sinful about being impure. To return to a state of purity, one has to get rid of impurity, only by being made aware that the two states differ: 'You are to distinguish between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean' (Lev. 10:10).[381] The conditions of return of the redeemed to Zion is laid out: 'A highway shall be there, and it shall be called the Holy Way; the unclean shall not travel on it, but it shall be for God's People…' (Isa. 35:8).[382] Prior spiritual cleanliness is a prerequisite for the journey towards holiness. The use of such cleansing language is prevalent in the writings of the prophets.[383]

Jonathan Klawans distinguishes between ritual and moral impurity.[384] The ritually impure are excluded from certain ritual acts and debarred from the sacred precincts. Impurity may continue after the ritual until the evening (Lev. 15:5). Time also plays a part in its limiting the defilement. For example, contact with bedding contaminated with one's own discharge and contact with a

---

[380] Ibid., 251-252.

[381] Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist* (Cambridge: Eerdmans,1997), p. 58.

[382] Ibid., p. 85.

[383] Isa. 1:16-17 expressed the futility of blood of sacrifices on the hands of those offering sacrifices; Isa. 1:16-17 exhorts those to wash and learn to do good, rather than make sacrifices. Ps. 26:6 refers to hand washing in the vicinity of the altar; Ps. 51:1-5 refers to the washing away of original sin 'Indeed, I was born guilty…'; Ps. 73:13 'All in vain I have kept my heart clean and washed my hands in innocence'; Prov. 30:12 identifies 'those who are pure in their own hearts yet are not cleansed of their filthiness.' Similar sentiment is expressed 'Though you wash yourself with lye and use much soap, the stain of your guilt is still before me' (Jer. 2:22); 'O Jerusalem, wash your heart clean of wickedness so that you may be saved' (Jer. 4:14); '…once the Lord has washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion and cleansed the bloodstains of Jerusalem from its midst by a spirit of judgement and by a spirit of burning' (Isa. 4:4); The gathering together of the exiled is compared with the Israelites bringing 'a grain offering in a clean vessel to the house of the LORD.' (Isa. 66:20).

[384] Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), pp. 22-31.

menstruant confers the status of defilement until that evening (Lev. 15: 5, 21).[385] The sources of ritual impurity are unavoidable and 'part of life' unless the purity is generated by the priest performing the ritual.[386] Even though ritual impurity is not sinful, ritual defilement may be understood as punishment for moral shortcomings. For example, Miriam contracted leprosy as divine punishment for speaking against the wife of her brother Moses, a Cushite woman (Num. 12:1,10).[387] Refusal to purify after contamination by a corpse leads to expulsion from Israel unless the ritual is performed on the third and seventh day. (Num. 19:13, 19, 20). Klawans sees moral impurity as defiling the sinner morally but not ritually, as in sexual sins (Lev. 18: 24-30) and idolatry (Num. 35: 33-34). He draws up five differences between moral and ritual defilement: i) ritual is not sinful whereas moral is a grave sin, ii) moral impurity does not arise from contract with a contagion; for example, there is no need to bathe after contact with a murderer, iii) ritual defilement is temporary whereas moral is long-lasting or even permament, iv) moral impurity cannot be expunged by purification rites, whereas ritual impurity can, and v) abomination (תועבה) is associated with moral but not ritual impurity.[388] Klawans makes the interesting point that, since moral impurity does not cause ritual defilement, such sinners are not excluded from the sanctuary.[389] As examples, an adultress is brought to the sanctuary for the priest to assess her status (Num.5: 13, 15-20); an ancient Israelite murderer would seek refuge in a place of God's choosing to await judgement of guilt or otherwise (Exod. 21:13). The sanctuary can also be defiled by moral impurity; for example, those giving their children to the Canaanite god of child sacrifice, Molech, 'defiling my sanctuary' (Lev. 20:3). Foreign lands, not just Israel, are also subject to moral defilement: 'you yourself shall die in an unclean land and Israel shall surely go

---

[385] Ibid., p. 23.

[386] Ibid., pp. 23-26.

[387] Ibid., p. 25

[388] Ibid., pp. 26-27. These are summarised in a tabulation (p. 27).

[389] Ibid., p. 30.

into exile away from its land' (Amos 7:17).[390]It is interesting to note that the scholarship of Taylor and Klawans understand purity through the prism of impurity whereas Milgrom approaches purity as an absolute.

Hannah Harrington, in her work on impurity systems, invokes the discipline of cultural anthropology. 'We can understand a particular society better by examining their rules concerning the body because the latter is, in effect, a symbol of society itself'.[391] Disease, death and bodily discharges may lend themselves to different interpretations but nevertheless, they represent something that a sentient human feels the need to avoid. Perhaps it is one of the hallmarks of what it is to be fully human. Harrington makes the leap into duality, in that impurity stands for death and holiness stands for life.[392] She attempts to correlate holiness and purity; 'holy can never become impure and impure may never become holy'.[393] This statement implies inflexibility between the two attributes. Later on in this section, I shall argue that, relevant to עיר, this may not be the case. Milgrom draws a distinction between the heathen environment of Semitic polytheism and holiness; the former ideology holds that the realm of the gods is never wholly separate from the world of humans. Natural objects are thus invested with supernatural force. Holiness is unapproachable except through divinely imposed restrictions of that which is withdrawn from common usage; it is the extension of God's will. Milgrom makes the interesting point that there is no holiness in creation except the Sabbath. It rests in time not space. However, when the Bible designates space as holy, this holiness stems from divine revelation rather than being an inherent part of creation.[394] On this basis, it follows that עיר, as a space, is a product of

---

[390] Ibid., p. 30.

[391] Hannah Harrington, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (The Society of Biblical Literature, 1993), p. 22. Harrington includes the Temple Scroll amongst the sectarian writings without defining 'sectarian'. The current view is that it is pre-sectarian. Therefore, an overall 'sectarian' approach to purity can be valid (pp. 51-55). This would not apply necessarily to the Temple Scroll.

[392] Ibid., p. 29.

[393] Ibid., p. 29.

[394] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, p. 107.

divine revelation. However, we have developed the idea that עיר need not be considered as a physically defined space and could therefore be considered inherent to creation. The people of Israel are told they will be holy as God is holy (Lev 19:2); holiness is therefore something for which to strive. The evolution of biblical purity is expounded in a nineteenth-century study by Marcus Moritz Kalisch.[395] His views were that the 'Hebrews' could not accept morbid conditions merely as a matter of physical dislike. They were eager to spiritualise every external process, such that they began to associate purity with ideas of life and death. Thus they regarded everything connected with disease and decay as contamination. 'The temple then became the abode of life in its purest form'.[396] Purity is the means of striving in that effort. As we shall see later in column 47 (§6.3), 'their cities' are part of that spiritual evolutional process.

3.7 Development of עיר as a Place of Supreme Holiness

In order to understand this development of עיר to this ultimate status, we start by analysing the categories of emissions, dermatoses and death. A nocturnal emission calls for an exclusion also for three days from כל המקדש; the word עיר is omitted. Sexual intercourse requires exclusion from כל עיר המקדש. The former is allowed to enter the Temple City but not the temple. The latter is debarred from כל עיר המקדש. There is a hierarchy of impurity here, in that an involuntary lapse in the form of a nocturnal omission is less impure than wilful sexual intercourse. Milgrom points out that this is the only impurity which distinguishes 'Temple City' from 'city'.[397] An impure discharge, בנדת טמאתמה, (45:10) calls for exclusion without a stated time limit. Is the omission of עיר merely be a casual scribal slip? Does the qualification of עיר, as in עיר המקדש, (11-12) stress the importance of holiness in relation to marital relations? In my view, an important point has

---

[395] Marcus Moritz Kalisch, *Leviticus* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer; 1872), pp. 191-192.

[396] Ibid., p. 192.

[397] Jacob Milgrom, 'Studies', p. 517.

been overlooked: the difference between a voluntary and an involuntary lapse. Amidst the stringencies, the scroll's author appears to display a degree of compassion in acknowledging that an involuntary lapse differs from one that is wilful. Remedial action is nevertheless required in that anyone, defiled by his nocturnal emission, must retreat temporarily to one of three places east of the city (46:17). עיר may thus be interpreted as a place of fair constitution without a compromise on purity, as required at עיר המקדש.[398] This exclusion intensifies in the city of God's dwelling with regard to all blind men, imposing lifelong exclusion:

כול איש לוא יבואו לה כול ימיהמה ולוא יטמאו את העיר אשר אני שוכן

> Any man who is blind shall not go there all their days and they shall not make
>
> Impure the city in which I shall establish my name (45:12b-13) [399]

In relation to עיר, what is the court of ultimate purity or the holy of holies? The question arises as to the relationship between מקדש הקודש 'the holy sanctuary' (46:10) and [ם] קוד[ש הקודשי 'the holy of holies' (35:1).[400] Does the חיל (46:9), 'rampart', protect the [ם] קוד[ש הקודשי as well as מקדש הקודש? The entry of anyone into the holy of holies other than a priest is punishable by death, הוא אין הוא כוהן יומת (35:4-5). Schiffman equates this area of exclusion to the Inner Court.[401] I propose that they are not synonymous for two reasons: i) the dire penalty reflects the deaths of Aaron's sons (Lev. 10: 1-3) for their violation, suggesting that the 'holy of holies' is an area within the inner court and ii) it is separated from the inner court by chains hanging from pillars (34:15), reflecting the divine instruction that Aaron must not 'come just at any time into the

---

[398] This understanding of leniency for unwitting violations derives from the notion that, although guilty, the violator's punishment is to offer an unblemished ram to the priest who will atone him (Lev. 5:17-19).

[399] It is noteworthy that the word עור is a near-homograph for עיר. See §6.4 for a fuller discussion.

[400] PTSDSSP p. 88. Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 50; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 382.

[401] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 382.

sanctuary inside the curtain…' (Lev. 16:2). The use of chains in the scroll's temple is a more robust delineation, in keeping with its enhanced stringencies of purity.

If עיר is a place of elevated holiness, the question arises as to how it relates to the temple quarter. Spatiality Theory will cast fresh light in contrast to somewhat tangled pre-spatiality thinking exemplified by Loren Fisher who deduces, from other Ancient Near East texts, that city terminology was widespread in that region. Postpositives, for example 'great' and 'little', were not unusually used as determinants of city names. [402] He extends this device to Hebrew readings, for example עיר בית הבעל (2 Kgs 10:25) where he takes issue with RSV's rendering 'citadel of the temple of Baal', arguing that the use of the word 'citadel' (דביר) is unnecessary and should not be substituted for a translation of עיר. Presumably, Fisher considers בית הבעל as a qualifying postpositive to עיר. He argues that עיר surely means 'temple quarter'. In an extrapolation from other Ancient Near East dialects, the word takes on the meaning of 'hill' or 'city/building on a hill'. From his study of Nuzu texts referring to cities, he feels it is possible to apply their postpositive usages of 'great' and 'little' as a concept to the city or temple quarter. He notes it might be possible for the city of God to be within the temple. Taking the temple as a microcosm, Fisher then jumps to the idea, somewhat unclearly in my view, that 'it is entirely possible that עיר means 'city' and 'temple quarter' means outside of the temple. 'Within would be (*sic*) the עיר meaning 'hill', 'altar' or inner room – the little city'.[403] The 'inner room' signifies the temple of which there are more than one, as stated in Jeremiah 2:28 מספר עריך היו אלהיך, 'for you have as many gods as you have towns'. An example of this is in 2 Kgs. 10:25 which states בית־הבעל 'the temple of Baal'. Indeed, the use of 'house' for 'temple' is not uncommon in the Hebrew Bible. Fisher assumes that the temple quarter contains the inner chamber, rendering חדר חדר as עיר. Presumably חדר אל־העיר בהדר would merely be represented as a figure of speech in the form of

---

[402] Loren R. Fisher, 'The Temple Quarter', *JSS* 8 (1963), 34-41 (pp. 37-38).

[403] Ibid., p. 37.

syndecdoche. The thrust of Fisher's message appears to be that a postpositive of עיר confers on it a sense of 'little city' or 'the city of God to be within the temple'.[404] His idea of a 'little city' as 'altar' can only be workable, therefore, with one god, rather than multiple. Fisher's concept throws a challenging perspective on the terms עיר המקדש (45:11-12) and עיר המקדשי (47:13). From his standpoint, the words following עיר could be considered postpositive, thereby conveying עיר המקדש as the idea of a holy city of God within עיר. A form of barrier, חיל (46:9), must be made to separate מקדש הקודש (46:10) from עיר. Our spatial analysis of חיל will take the discussion forward (§5.3).

3.8 Spatial Entities Relating to עיר and המקדש

In our examination of spatial entities, we must be aware that Secondspace is complex and interacts with Firstspace and Thirdspace. These categories are not isolated to the exclusion of the others.[405] We must therefore be prepared for less rigid distinction between the categories of Second and the lived Thirdspace.

I shall be looking at עיר and other terms which overlap with עיר. A spatial analysis of each term will be important because those terms will be shown to share a spatial relationship. This will extend the range of thinking beyond the present scholarly constrictions of location and positional relationships. In order to test out Critical Spatial Theory, it will also be necessary to engage in a literary and linguistic study as we move through the relevant text, not necessarily in scribal order. This combined approach will lead to a fresh understanding of עיר and its overlapping terms, as an anticipated human lived experience.

---

[404] Ibid., p. 37.

[405] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 50.

To begin with, in the next section we will look at the earlier parts of the Temple Scroll, where עיר appears to be inferred, rather than directly expressed as עיר. The terms used to convey these inferences are: מחנה, מקדש and בית.

3.8.1 Early inference of עיר

In terms of Firstspace definition of the physical, we do not have any clear markers at the point the עיר idea is introduced. However, it does not appear from nowhere. Before dealing with columns 45-47, which bear frequent repetition of עיר, we will examine some interesting ideas that appear earlier in the Temple Scroll which hint at עיר before it is actually stated as a defined entity.

3.8.1 a) מחנה, 'camp'

There is probably already a spatial understanding of מחנה as עיר, although this is somewhat hypothetical and requires its reading in the light of a base text. The word does not actually appear in the Temple Scroll. Schiffman disagrees with those who made use of the word מחנה in 4QMMT to support their notion that עיר המקדש was the entire city of Jerusalem:

כי ירושלים היאה מחנה הקדש והיא המקם שבחר בו מכל שבטי ישראל כי ירושלים היא ראש מחנות ישראל

> For Jerusalem is the holy camp and is the place which he chose from all the tribes of Israel;
> for Jerusalem is the head camp of Israel (4QMMT B59-62)

He follows this with another 4QMMT quotation that shows similarities between the boundaries of sanctity of the desert era with those in Israel at the time of the scroll's author:

ואנחנו חושבים שהמקדש [משכן אוהל מועד היה וי[רושלי[ם] מחנה היא וחוצה למחנה [הוא חוצה לירושלים ו] הוא

מחנה ער[י]הם ... [כי ירשלים] היה המקום אשר [בחר בו] מכול שב[טי ישראל

But we are of the opinion that the sanctuary [is (equivalent to)' the Tabernacle, the Tent of Meeting', and Jerusale[m] is (equivalent to) 'the camp'. And 'outside of the camp' [is (equivalent to) outside of Jerusalem, and] that is the camp of their cities… [for Jerusalem] is the place [which He (God) chose] from all the (territory of the) tri[bes of Israel] (4QMMT B29-33).[406]

The sacred boundaries of the desert camp have their equivalents in what Schiffman assumes to be the Jerusalem of the scroll's author. The desert tent of meeting is the sanctuary, the desert camp is Jerusalem; outside the camp is outside Jerusalem, the camp of their cities.[407]

Superficially, these two words מחנה and עיר seem unrelated but previous scholarly reference to the base Levitical text will show otherwise.[408]

Well before the appearance of עיר itself (45:11-12), עיר is inferred for the first time in 16:11.[409] This inference is based on the scholarly handling of the *lacuna* in 16:11-12a:

<div dir="rtl">

[410] ואת עורו עם פרשו ישרופו מחו[ן]ץ לעיר המקדש *vacat?*

במקום מובדל להטאות
</div>

and its hide with its waste they shall burn it from outsi[de…] the Temple City

in a place separate from the sin-offerings

---

[406] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 60-61.

[407] Ibid., pp. 60-61. Jerusalem is readily assumed, despite its absence in the Temple Scroll.

[408] Mark K. George, 'Israel's Tabernacle', pp. 113-114. מחנה is a space in which the tribes are arranged in a specific order, but without boundaries. In contrast, the tabernacle spaces are demarcated by screening structures (Exod. 26). George ascribes this difference to the idea that priestly writers considered demarcations within ritual space more important than in non-ritual spaces. In the early part of the Temple Scroll, the outer turns have been physically degraded, so the details of the envisaged tabernacle are scanty.

[409] There is an isolated reference to עיר in 44:2; to what it relates is unclear from the scanty text.

[410] The end of this line is badly degraded, in that only מח is discernible <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>. García Martínez and Tigchelaar reconstruct as מחוץ עיר ל[המקדש (*DSSSE* p. 1236-7).

It states the instruction to remove and burn 'its hide and its waste from outside [*lacuna*]'. This line is physically degraded toward the end.[411] The last decipherable letter is the lower half of the *waw* in the incomplete word עורו עם פרשו ישרופו ואת מחו]ץ :מחו. One would expect the burning to take place outside the מחנה (Exod. 29:14; Lev. 8:17). Qimron restores it as מחו]ץ למחנה הקודש.[412] The lacuna is restored by Yadin as: מחוץ ל]עיר המקדש, as do García Martínez and Tigchelaar.[413] Schiffman and others suggest restoring it as:

[ואת עורו עם פרשו ישרופו מחו]ץ לעיר המקדש][414]

Vermes fills the lacuna in English with [sanctuary city on a wood fire].[415] However, מחוץ carries spatial significance; the preposition מ in מחוץ, 'from outside', conveys the sense that the waste is to be burnt from a position outside a spatial entity. This 'outside' is separate from the space of sin-offerings (הטאות). The space of מחוץ, 'outside', should be seen as part of that Thirdspace practice, in that the waste must not be burnt in the space where sacrifices are made.

In this particular line (16:11), it is interesting to note the use of עור, 'animal hide'. עור is a near-homograph of עיר. This has not previously been noted. Is this near-homography coincidental or a consciously conceived wordplay? The author could have used the synonym גלד, although this word is not actually used in the Hebrew Bible.[416] I propose wordplay as a credible reason for suggesting a reconstruction of the lacuna with עיר for the following reason. Later on, we will learn that one of the forbidden items in מקדשי is עור (hide). In fact, עור is mentioned seven times

---

[411] <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

[412] Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 26.

[413] *DSSSE* p. 1236.

[414] PTSDSSP p. 48; *TS* p. 50.

[415] *CDSSE* p. 195.

[416] BDB p. 162.

in column 47 (lines 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 18), in relation to 'your cities' and 'their cities'; that is to say, those cities without מקדשי.

Returning to the reconstitution of 16:11-12a, we have noted that, apart from Qimron and Wise, the consensus is that this lacuna, מחו[ץ, should be reconstituted with 'outside', מחו[ץ לעיר. However, the base texts have מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp'.[417] The desert camp refers to a spatial entity where waste is burned, but here it is burned outside the עיר. It is therefore a space in which impurity is unacceptable: במקום מובדל להטאות (16:12), 'in the place set aside for sin-offerings'. Rather than planting מחנה, 'camp', from the biblical into the scroll text, Yadin and Qimron must have recognised עיר as the spatial entity appropriate to the ritual actions specified in the Temple Scroll. There is therefore an implied equivalence between מחנה and עיר.

The question now arises as to what happens when עיר is used in a way that requires the memory of מחנה. To tackle this point, we must refer to a verse in the Jericho narrative where both words uniquely come together (Josh. 6:11). This is the first עיר that the Israelites encounter after their crossing of the River Jordan:

<div dir="rtl">ויסב ארון־יהוה את־העיר הקף פעם אחת ויבאו המחנה וילינו במחנה</div>

> And the ark of God was taken around the city, going round once. And they came to the camp
> and spent the night in the camp

Although there is mention of Israelite capture of Canaanite and Amorite cities (Num. 21:3 and 25 respectively), מחנה does not actually feature in these verses. Perhaps the crossing of the Jordan to the Promised Land is of particular significance in the transition from מחנה to עיר. The מחנה idea is a mobile, yet inhabited wilderness space of divine commandment and fulfilment. In the context of Josh 6:11, עיר is to be part of promised space, as yet unused by the Israelites. Nevertheless, its

---

[417] PTSDSSP p. 48.

walls of fortification indicate that Jericho had been spatially conceived and used by the Canaanites although the Joshua narrative does not elaborate, except to say that it was endowed with a king and soldiers (Josh. 6:2). It would appear, therefore, that although the עיר of Jericho had been spatially conceived as a planned and envisaged space, there is no mention as to how it was actually lived as a space. We are told it was shut up without any human movement (Josh. 6:1). The narrative at this stage thus conveys a sense of Secondspace. The spatial scene then changes, in that Jericho is revealed as a divine gift to the Israelites (Josh. 6:2). Redolent of the Mosaic narrative (Exod. 3:5), Joshua is instructed by God to take off his footwear as he approaches Jericho; at that point he is now standing on holy ground (Josh. 5:15). The rest of the Jericho encounter is therefore by divine command, in keeping with the desert מחנה of the Israelites, as a space in which all behaviours were decreed by divine command. Anything that was performed but not so decreed was punishable. Adherence to divine command extends the spatial experience beyond the geographical and historical; it becomes a space of human lived experience. Lefebvre analogises such an entity with 'theatrical space'; he would call this 'classical theatre space'. We can now see that, in Lefebvre's and Soja's terms, this is a space that expands beyond geography and cognitive processes.[418] Lefebvre would understand this as 'representational' space, because it is lived through complex symbolism of its objects, as well as a shared history amongst the populace and its relationship with the symbolic objects of the space. The space is also passively experienced, in that its lived experience is decreed by divine command. Furthermore, the lived social experience of מחנה would include acts of resistance and struggle, for example, the mutiny of Korach (Num. 16-18).[419] From this, it would appear that the מחנה entity is endowed with the characteristics of the Thirdspace of Lefebvre and Soja. Without the grafting of the Thirdspace idea of מחנה, the עיר of the Temple Scroll would have not extended

---

[418] Henri Lefebvre, p. 188; Soja, *Thirdspace*, p. 51.

[419] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, p. 56.

beyond Secondspace.[420] However, the memory of מחנה in the base text would have been instrumental in extending an understanding of עיר as an entity of human praxis.

3.8.1 b) מקדש, 'Temple'

Given the importance of understanding the 'city of the temple', עיר המקדש, we now turn to a spatial analysis of מקדש as its own entity. The Temple Scroll has lost its first column but in column 2, there is a forceful reminder to shun and destroy evidence of idolatry; this is followed by detailed instruction of ritual. It is only much further on that מקדשי, 'my temple' is to be made holy (29:8) and created (29:9) although at that point, there is still no mention of עיר that is to be associated with מקדשי. The next line stamps onto מקדשי the covenantal seal made with Jacob at Bethel: אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית על, 'which I cut with Jacob in Bethel'. It is at Bethel that the divine will settle and build an altar (Gen. 35: 6-7) in accordance with the divine instruction in Jacob's vision to return to the land of his birth (Gen. 31:13).[421] The scroll's author is invoking Jacob's ladder, an image symbolising the connection, just like the temple, between heaven and earth.[422] As Kalinda Rose Stevenson notes, 'the function of the Temple as a mediator between the social and the cosmic, earthy and heavenly, actual and symbolic, makes the house of God the focal

---

[420] Ibid., p. 50. It is an extension of Secondspace, not an alternative.

[421] However, angelic intervention (Jub. 32:22) tells Jacob, on his return to Bethel, that this is not the place for an eternal sanctuary. Eva Mroczek works on this theme to demonstrate that Jacob, as well as David, having been denied the building of an earthly temple, displayed an imaginative return to unbuilt time before any temple had been built. This is foundational in providing the opportunity to describe the ideal temple. See Eva Mroczek, 'How Not to Build a Temple: Jacob, David and the Unbuilt Ideal in Ancient Judaism', *JSJ* 46 (2015), 512-546 (pp. 515, 521). See also Judith L. Wentling, 'Unraveling the Relationship between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple and the Qumran Community', *RevQ* 14 (1989), 61-73 (p. 72). Wentling seems to be making the assumption that 11QT was Qumranic sectarian, in that 'they perceive themselves to be a temporary dwelling place for his spirit, and they would remain so until God would come to build the future temple.'. Even so, as a pre-sectarian document, this could still apply to its composer(s) wherever it was written.

[422] Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'The Theology of the Temple Scroll', *JQR* 85 (1994), 109-23 (p. 118). An edited version paper appears in Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 27.

point of the new society'.[423] If we accept that the divine covenant was a mark of holiness, a non-physical entity, it appears (29:8 and 9) that this holiness is now imbued with a spatial quality; holiness is now a space. Because this space has been divinely created, is it to be regarded as perceived, conceived or lived space or, indeed, a combination? Has the divine already experienced this space?[424] The text conveys a sense of divine purpose, בכבודי, 'with my glory', עד יום הבריה, 'to the day of creation/blessing'. After, it will be established כל הימים, 'all the days' (29:9).[425] If we hark back to Soja's basic dictum that space is socially produced beyond physical materiality and mental cognition, the question arises as to who or what has produced this divine מקדשי (29:9).[426] After all, the Temple Scroll author has only written out the divine instruction in the role of an amanuensis. Is God part of, or separate from, that social production of space?

The clue may be in the command to sacrifice a burnt-offering: בבית אשר א[שכין] שמי עליו, 'in the house where I cause my name to reside' (29:3-4). According to these lines, the social practice of ritual behaviour and its weaving into the lived experience is to be experienced in a space of divine presence. That space can either be sacred as a result of ritual or be suitable for ritual because it has been stamped with the divine presence. Kim Knott views this in terms of spatial practice transformed by religious meaning, performed in a space designated as sacred. Rather than sacred space being the stimulus for ritual, ritual produces space designated as sacred.[427] However, the text (29:3-4) suggests otherwise. The *hiphil* אשכין, reconstructed from the lacuna, conveys the

[423] Kalinda Rose Stevenson, 'Vision of Transformation', p. 153.

[424] Bradford A. Anderson, 'Mapping Narrative Complexity', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible,* ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow, pp. 55-72 (p. 69). As Bradford Anderson reminds us, 'Bethel is a reminder of the experience of God'.

[425] הבריה (PTSDSSP p.78, supported by Qimron) would read as 'creation'; הברכה would read as 'blessing'(Yadin). This ambiguity arises from the possible readings of what could be the roof of the *kaph* rather than a *yod* (*TS* p. 86). If so, we could propose 'blessed creation' to be Bethel. See also Schiffman, 'Theology of the Temple Scroll', 109-23 (p. 117). Edited version in Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 27. Schiffman is emphatic that the phrase refers to the end of days. The sacrificial rites are for the present era. At the end of days, the divine will create a replacement temple (4Q174: 1-2).

[426] Edward W. Soja, *Post-Modern Geographies*, p. 120.

[427] Kim Knott, *Location of Religion,* p. 43.

idea that the divine presence will be established. Therefore, the בית is a fitting place for ritual, rather than holiness being conditioned on ritual practice.

Julia Rhyder raises an interesting discussion about rituals in relation to space. [428] Although the rituals and their spatiality were reproduced to some extent by ancient audiences, the wilderness setting would be an obstacle to a complete reproduction of those rituals if they were to be reconfigured beyond a wilderness context.[429] For example, the festival of Succot demonstrates different spatial configurations in the use of the gathered branches.[430] On one hand, they would be used in the construction of booths (Neh. 8:13-18); on the other, they would be an instrument of rejoicing (Lev. 23:39-43). She moves on to discuss the idea of visiting imagined spaces. She suggests that ancient audiences were invited to enter the imagined spaces of Leviticus through the detailed accounts of ritual activities that were to take place round the wilderness sanctuary. More specifically, Leviticus 16 condemns entry to the holiest section by anyone other than the High Priest. The non-priestly audience is thereby transported in spirit by means of a detailed description of that forbidden space, a space which is now dynamic and operational, rather than static.[431]

3.8.1 c) בית, 'house'

We now consider how בית relates to מקדש in column 3 of 11Q19. בית is nominated by God as his dwelling-place (29:3-4a), so its holiness is definite. It is the place of the burnt offering. בית is the first entity in the extant text to imply a dwelling (3:4): בי]ת לשום שמי עליו, 'house to put my name on it'. We need then to examine the entity of בית, as a space of social and ritual

---

[428] Julia Rhyder, 'Space and Memory in the Book of Leviticus', in *Scripture as Social Discourse: Socio-Scientific Perspectives in Early Jewish and Christian Writings*, ed. by Jessica M. Keady, Todd Klutz and Casey A. Strine (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 83-96 (p. 84).

[429] Ibid., p .89.

[430] Ibid., p. 90.

[431] Ibid., pp. 90-91.

performance, a space that is connected with מקדש, thence the association of עיר with המקדש. We shall see how בית establishes a firm relationship with God. This will progress the argument that עיר is a continuum of בית on the purity spectrum.

The phrase עיר המקדש occurs four times in the Temple Scroll without any reference to any structure we may define as a 'house', בית. However, Milgrom notes that the word בית is used in association with structures of the inner temple court, such as the staircase (31:8), vessels (33:8, 11) and laver (33:10-11). To Milgrom, it is logical to conclude that the temple would then be called בית המקדש. Thus עיר would assume its 'normal meaning'.[432] What 'normal meaning' is unclear; we have already noted that עיר is not always easy to translate.[433] By 'normal', it would not be unreasonable to assume that Milgrom envisions בית and עיר as geophysical entities. Spatial thinking will bring us to a different conclusion. Nevertheless, Milgrom's line of thought prompts the question as to whether בית is a subset of עיר.

To test the spatial relationship of these two entities, we shall develop a spatial analysis of עיר by starting with בית. Such an analysis will investigate how these words in the text express themselves in terms of how those spaces are experienced socially, symbolically and dynamically with other spaces. In other words, the appreciation of these spaces will not be confined merely to measurements and physical attributes (Firstspace).

It could be argued that, from a literary analysis perspective, if בית, rather than עיר המקדש, is the first inkling of sacred space, then both expressions somehow have their own and possibly linked significance. בית is occasionally quoted unqualified (3:4 and 29:3) where it is juxtaposed with ideas in other lines: כל בית המסבה, 'in the whole house of the stairway' (31:8), לכיור ועשיתה בית, 'you shall make a house for a basin' (31:10), שער בית הכיור, 'the gate of the house of the basin'

---

[432] Jacob Milgrom, 'City of the Temple', 125-127 (p. 126).

[433] Loren R. Fisher, 'The Temple Quarter', p. 34.

(33:10-11), וכול הבית הזה, 'and this whole house' (33:11). As we saw at its first mention, בית

appears as a space endorsed by the divine stamp (3:4):

בי]ת לשום שמי עליו

house to put my name upon it….

The context is unclear here because of adjacent vacats but it seems to reflect a physical

construction. This initial appearance of בית (3:4), is in a divine utterance in the first person,

superficially suggesting the physicality of a space onto which the divine name is placed. Up to

this stage, the scanty extant text refers to the divine instruction to tear down idolatrous symbols.

It does not actually refer to the space in which these symbols are situated. However, the initial

mention of בית is the place of divine instruction in the setting up of material appurtenances made

of precious metals. It is therefore not just a physical entity but a space which is being planned

and envisaged, as yet unlived, in keeping with the criteria of Soja's Secondspace. However, a

closer look suggests the divine stamp expresses more than physicality and day to day physical

existence. It will be a space dominated by God such that those who find themselves within that

space will subjugate themselves to divine authority. Even at this early stage in the text, it

nevertheless represents a symbolic space, within which humans will conduct their relationship

with the divine. It is God who, in Lefebvre's terminology, has conceptualised the space, Soja's

Secondspace.[434] From the divine perspective, the text does not reflect human spatial planning;

there is no particular instruction as to how בית is yet to be used by people. It is about rich materials

fitting for a divine dwelling. Yet there is an implication that humans are involved in the making

of this structure. They will be involved in activities related to the ritual objects it contains: an

altar, sprinkling bowls, incense burners (3:9-17). We even encounter the first divine instruction

relating to בית, forbidding the removal of ritual items from this space (3:11):

---

[434] Neither was interested in religious space specifically.

לוא ימוש מן המקדש קער [ותיו]

you must not remove from the temple [its] platters. [435]

The mention of המקדש here would suggest that בית and המקדש are the same. To understand the relationship between human performance and the space, it is insufficient to restrict the understanding of בית and המקדש merely as a single place. In so doing, their spatial attributes are ignored and the opportunity of a fuller understanding lost. The line of argument is therefore not just a matter of spatial similarity between these entities. In the passage, בית (3:4) starts out as having been marked by the divine. Without divine instruction, there would be no sacrifice in בי]ת לשום שמי. The salient point here is that the symbolic activity of sacrifice and its relationship to God conveys בית as a space of specific social performance expressed in the phrase בבית אשר אשכין שמי עליו, 'in the house upon which my name is to dwell' (29:3b-4a). The divine stamp thus marks בית as a space of complex human activity in a space that has already been planned and its function conceived. Some hint of more complex societal cooperation in the performance of ritual appears as in the third person plural possessive ונסכמה (29:1).[436] The text is telling us that those making the offering are doing so in the house marked by the divine name: בבית אשר אשכין שמי עליו (29:3b-4a). Those that do so will be accepted and qualify as a people (לעם), with whom God will live for ever (29:7). There are no conditionals, only what will happen; this is made clear: ועשה ככול אשר אנוכי מדבר אליכה, 'do everything I say to you' (31:9).

By column 31, בית has thus become a socially produced space in which life, from the human perspective, is lived with a sense of mutual cooperation within the defined space. This requires knowledge of signs and codes known from scripture, for example, the repudiation of idolatry (Exod. 20:3-5; Num. 33:52; Deut. 7:16, 12:31, 16:22, 31:16, 33:16), the construction of the

---

[435] PTSDSSP p. 17, n. 24. המקדש is considered as the entire temple complex but not the entire city.

[436] 'drink offering' (root נסך); 'grain offering' (*CDSSE* p. 201); 'liquid offering' (PTSDSSP p. 77).

tabernacle (Exod. 25-27), sacrifice (Lev. 1-3). Lefebvre would call this 'representations of space' or 'conceived space', the second category of his triad of spatiality.[437] Soja would categorise this as Secondspace.[438] It is the active fulfilment of these traditions that would eventually expand בית towards Thirdspace.[439]

To study how the text expresses itself spatially, it is necessary to engage with literary analysis. In the case of בית, there is a suggestion that בית has been elevated to the status of sacred space, argued as follows. It is paired with a sacrificial utensil כיור, 'bowl': בית הכיור (32:11). Before the constructional details, a different word מזרק is used for 'bowl' or 'basin', where its function is to collect sacrificial blood (23:12). However, in the context of temple construction, we note an alternative word for 'bowl', כיור, which is paired with בית. The word כיור denotes more than a simple basin, perhaps a fire-basin.[440] In the Hebrew Bible, it is quoted as part of the paraphernalia of cleansing before entry into the tent of the meeting (Exod. 30:18, 28). It becomes an integral part of the temple (Exod. 31:9; 35:16) and of the sacrificial apparatus (Exod. 38:8). Therefore, the choice of the word כיור indicates not just an ordinary basin but one which is elevated in status. This is because it is integral to the trappings of sanctity, in keeping with בית.

We now return to the association of בית with מקדשי in column 3. בית is later nominated by God as his dwelling-place (29:3-4a). It is the place of the burnt offering, עולת. The place of the burnt offering is significant in that the 'pleasing odour' of Noah's post-diluvial offering, smelled by God, resets God's relationship with mankind (Gen. 8:21). By association with בית, עיר המקדש could be argued as linked with עיר. Put in another way, the use of בית establishes a firm

---

[437] Henri Lefebvre, p. 33.

[438] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, p. 67.

[439] At this point, it must be borne in mind that these pioneers of spatiality theory refer to spaces, such as cities, that are already in existence. Conversely, an ancient text that deals with spaces that are more envisioned than physically real, requires us to see how the text expresses spatiality, rather than to supplant spatiality on the text.

[440] David Clines, *DCH* IV, p. 392. See also BDB p. 468.

relationship with God by virtue of the burnt offering, so that when עיר is introduced, its sanctity is definite. Lethal punishment would apply if the sanctity of the inner court, the holy of holies, was violated, קוד[ש הקודשי]מ (35:1-8).[441] In addition, taking into account my analysis of כיור, Milgrom's structural view may be challenged, because בית and עיר do not actually have a structural relationship. That is to say, the two words are neither juxtaposed nor linked in the text. However, they are linked by association of בית with מקדשי.

In column 29, [מ]קדשי, 'my temple', is a space of divine glory (29:8). Two lines later, it is this [מ]קדשי which is to be established according to Jacob's covenant at the place Jacob calls Bethel (Gen. 28:19). Thus we have a named place which is designated as a city in that biblical text. As such, it very likely functions as a populated city, not an empty space. This may indicate nothing more than Firstspace, which would convey the beginnings of spatial development of the עיר idea. Various aspects of construction now take place, culminating in the statement of its by completion: וכול הבית הזה, 'and this entire house' (33:11). In spatial terms, again we recognise Firstspace. It is within this defined space that divine instruction, which imparts knowledge of purity rituals, has been received by the human audience. Of course, these events are not yet reality but the force of divine instruction makes them mandatory and, in the fullness of time, inevitable. The text conveys a sense of intention and planning as to what must happen there. The space of בית (33:11) is now more than mere structure, with implications of human activity; it has a sense of space in which human praxis exists. The potential performance of ritual thereby establishes a relationship between people and the materials of ritual. The space now has a sense of what Lefebvre would categorise as space of representation: Soja's Secondspace.

Does this analysis help us deal with our earlier question as to the relative status of בית and עיר? is one a subset of the other? Kim Knott reminds us that a given place of worship comprises

---

[441] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 382.

'clusters of smaller places, inanimate and animate'.[442] With this in mind, I propose that spatiality theory supports my sense that בית is the first indication of עיר. It follows that, if בית is the first indication of עיר, then בית will project its spatial attributes onto עיר. בית seems to be the centre, from which further construction will project its attributes, for example, a pair of winding staircases, pillar, gates, all to be adorned with זהב, 'gold' (31:8).

Conclusion

Following the previous foundational chapter on Spatiality Theory, this chapter has engaged with literary analysis of those entities associated with עיר, serving as a preparation for later spatial analysis of those columns where the word is repeated. As עיר seems to have been of concern to the scroll's author, it is important to have investigated how its concept developed in the text before עיר is expressed as such. In this development, we have identified מחנה, מקדש and בית as significant. However בית appears early as the first inkling of sacred space of human praxis in forging a relationship with the divine.

Rather than be mired in the unresolved controversy of its relationship to המקדש, we have extended the concept of עיר and its associated spaces into the realms of spatiality beyond the conventional geophysical understanding. This is not without its difficulties in dealing with the divinely envisioned עיר המקדש because it has yet to be physically materialised. Indeed, there is no absolute requirement for it to be bound by physicality for a spatial analysis. To take this forward, we have introduced the ideas of utopia, quite recent in Temple Scroll studies. This will assist in framing an envisioned עיר המקדש with a sense of how it is to be conceptualised, earthly or heavenly.

---

[442] Kim Knott, *Location of Religion,* p. 60.

Utopia as a concept will underpin the foundations of spatiality study of the scroll as it validates the idea of lived experience, regardless of its earthly or heavenly setting.

CHAPTER 4

Spatial Analysis of Column 45

Introduction

So far, what we have discussed is an analysis of spatial entities relating to עיר and המקדש in the wider context of the Temple Scroll. These words will be seen to convey the idea that purity, and indeed the lack of impurity, is a paradigm for everything that is lived. It is a state of being.[443] The following three chapters will present a detailed analysis of the specific texts of columns 45-47 because it is these columns which bear repetition of the word עיר and its inflections. As we have already noted, previous scholarly studies have not addressed this intriguing feature. After all, repetition implies that the concept of this word was of some interest to the scroll's author and is therefore important to explore. In order to resolve difficulties in the understanding of עיר, as highlighted in the previous chapter, these chapters will focus on עיר and its textually associated spaces in these columns through the prism of spatial analysis which can also bring out aspects of purity.

4.1 The Issue of Translating עיר

The English translation of עיר is 'city' which itself conveys different things to different readers.[444] Frick's narrative supports the difficulty in defining עיר rigidly. Loren Fisher acknowledges that

---

[443] Hannah Harrington, *The Purity Texts* (London/New York: T& T Clark, 2004), p. 9. Purity, a state of being, differs from holiness, which is an active divine force, or divine energy. The phrase קודש קודשים is not only translated as the 'holy of holies' (11Q19 35:9) as the entire temple but is also synonymous with God himself (eg. 1QS 10:4).

[444] BDB p. 746. עיר is translated variously as city, town, inhabitants of a city (Isa. 22:2), a fortified place of any size (2 Kgs. 17:9); *DCH* VI, p. 369. Although there are other words of city language, for example מקום, the most commonly used word for city' is עיר.

it is a flexible term which does not lend itself to a straightforward translation.[445] Michael O'Connor agrees in that the Biblical Hebrew word is not translatable into modern European languages; our English word 'city' does not fit into a biblical category.[446] However, with this caveat, the word 'city' is retained, since there is no other English word that is conventionally used. In this regard, Frick helpfully analyses the meaning of עיר in the Hebrew Bible with reference, not only to the single word but also to related terms.[447] This is supported by Fisher who, having acknowledged translational flexibility, predicates his discussion on Jerusalem as his reference point. C.H.J de Geus uses the term 'town', reserving 'city' for sizeable nucleations such as Samaria and Jerusalem as the capitals of Israel and Jerusalem respectively.[448] Alison Gray opts for a more general term 'settlement' or 'town/city', unless there is reference to a large fortified city of conceptual significance.[449] Karolien Vermeulen agrees that עיר as conveyed biblically does not reflect what is understood today from the English word 'city'. She extrapolates that the biblical city is 'an invention of translators and scholars and may not have existed at all'.[450]

The word עיר, 'city, can also mean 'temple quarter' or 'the hill of God/altar'.[451] Ezekiel visualises 'a structure like a city to the south' (Ezek. 40:2). This becomes 'a wall all around the outside of the temple area' (Ezek. 40:5). That is to say, the temple area was separate from the city. It seems Fisher's view is swayed by:

---

[445] Loren R. Fisher, 'The Temple Quarter', p. 34.

[446] Michael Patrick O'Connor, 'The Biblical Notion of a City', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Claudia V. Camp and Jon Berquist (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 18-39 (p. 25).

[447] Frank S. Frick, pp. 30-42 (p. 37).

[448] C.H.J. de Geus, *Towns in Ancient Israel and in the Southern Levant* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), p. 1.

[449] Alison Gray, 'Reflections', pp. 18-34 (p. 19).

[450] Karolien Vermeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, p. 16.

[451] Loren R. Fisher, 'The Temple Quarter', p. 37.

Alongside the portion set apart as the holy district you shall assign as a holding for the city an area five thousand cubits width and twenty five thousand cubits long; it shall belong to the whole house of Israel (Ezek. 45:6)

From this verse, he views the temple quarter as being the entire city of Jerusalem, the 'holy and chosen city; it is chosen for God's house' [452] Such analysis can be applied to the scroll although there are questions about what kind of comparanda would be appropriate, given its dating which one may place sometime in the period 166 BCE to 67 CE, taking into account the evidence from internal dating and the radiocarbon results (§2.6a).[453]

The key question arises as to whether the scroll's author understood עיר through either a contemporary or biblical prism. To answer this, it partly depends on what *a priori* assumptions we make about the purpose of the Temple Scroll. If we read the text as if its author was making clear points of criticism to the temple authorities of his own time by means of a reworked Torah in such a long scroll, it would not be unreasonable to deduce that its author may well have understood עיר in a revised context of his time as he understood it, rather than in a biblical context.[454] On that basis, the word could be understood with reference to the language of the later part of the Hebrew Bible; that is to say, Daniel, the final third of the Psalms, Wisdom Literature and subsequent early Mishnaic Hebrew. However, the scroll's author may be resourcing earlier

---

[452] Loren R. Fisher, 'The Temple Quarter', p. 39; Pss: 46: 4-5; 101:8 state the divine presence in the unspecified city. Fisher is assuming Jerusalem.

[453] Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 29-34. The internal dating evidence arises from scribal references to persons or events from the Second Temple period. See also Joan E. Taylor and others, 'Qumran Textiles in the Palestine Exploration Fund, London: Radiocarbon Dating Results', *PEQ* 137 (2005), 159-167. The results of this dating pertain only to the linen wrappings, not the date of placement into cave 11. See also Hartmut Stegemann, 'Origins of the Temple Scroll', *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1988*, pp. 246-7, 253. Stegemann pulls back the *terminus a quo* to the beginnings of the Second Temple period. His proposal arises from an interpretation of 59:1-3 which he views as a reflection of the Exile.

[454] The accepted notion of a re-working is acknowledged in modern scholarship: See PTSDSSP p. 6; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, p. 253. See also Michael O. Wise, *Critical Study*, p. 33. Wise considers that the purpose of the scroll has not been answered. As the scroll may well be composite, there may well have been more than one author and/or redactor. For consistency and elegance, I shall refer to the singular 'author'. See Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', p. 288.

biblical texts for usage and meaning, carrying over notions of when the Israelites started to interact with the Canaanites in the late Bronze Age.[455]

4.2 Translation of Column 45

Lines 1-7 set the scene for the introduction of עיר and המקדש, which follow in line 8 onwards. The text embarks on purity relating to male sexual activity and its associated purity spaces: כול עיר המקדש, עיר המקדש, המקדש, כול המקדש. Within these lines, 7-18, the word עיר occurs three times (lines 12, 13 and 16), in addition to which, the near-homograph עור, 'blind', occurs once (12). This particular point will be discussed later as a separate issue (§6.4). It will not be restricted just to the physical entity of Firstspace or a location of activities, as in Secondspace. This will be seen when we undertake spatial analysis but throughout, we shall be also requiring some engagement with a literary analysis. Column 45 stresses conditions of entry to המקדש in relation to matters of cleansing after sexual episodes, entirely from a male perspective. We shall be analysing these episodes in the context of whether they are willed and unwilled.

Towards the end of the column, there is less detailed reference to those with dermatoses, as well as those who have been in contact with the dead. In these purity contexts, our discussion will analyse the spatial entities to which עיר is textually linked in this column; that is to say, המקדש. In the way this column expresses itself, these entities will be shown to be more than mere physical structures.

---

[455] This is chronicled in Judges 1:16-36. See also Max Weber, *The City*, trans. by Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwirth (London: Heinemann, 1958), p. 76. 'Historically, neither the palisaded village nor the emergency fortification are the primary forerunners of the city fortress'.

To assist with the analysis, the most recent transcript of the text by Schiffman and Gross is presented, on which my translation will be based.[456] As עיר and המקדש are the focus of much of the analysis, they are emboldened for ease of reference:

¹ יה [יו באים   [שמ] [457]

² שבעים [ומאתים נשכה   [א וכליהמה ל]   [[458]

³ וכאשר י[הי]ה בא המש[מר הרישון ה] [459] שני יה[י]ה בא לשמאול [ובבואו]

⁴ יצא הרישון מעי [ר]י[460] ולוא [יהי]ו מתערבים אלה באלה ו^ל כליה [מה וב]א

⁵ משמר אל מקומו וחנו זה [ב]א וזה יוצא ליום השמיני ומטהרים את

⁶ הנשכות זואת אחרי זואת [מ]עת תצא הראישונה ולוא תהיה שמה

⁷ תערובת *vacat* וא[יש] כי יהיה לו מקרה לילה לוא יבוא אל

⁸ כול **המקדש** עד אשר [יש] לים שלושת ימים וכבס בגדיו ורחץ

⁹ ביום הראישון וביום הש[ל]ישי יכבס בגדיו ^{ורחץ} [461] ובאה השמש אחר

¹⁰ יבוא אל **המקדש** ולוא יבואו בנדת טמאתמה אל **מקדשי** וטמאו

¹¹ *vacat*   ואיש כיא ישכב עם אשתו שכבת זרע לוא יבוא אל כול **עיר**

¹² **המקדש** אשר אשקין שמי בה *vacat* שלושת ימים כול איש עור

¹³ לוא יבואו לה כול ימיהמה ולוא יטמאו את **העיר** אשר אני שוכן

¹⁴ בתוכה כי אני יהוה שוכן בתוך[462] בני ישראל לעולם ועד *vacat*

---

[456] *TS* p. 120. At this point, it should be noted that there is variability between scholars regarding the capitalisation of the word 'Temple'.

[457] שמי] [ום [שער] (PTSDSSP p. 109). Here, Schiffman concurs with Qimron and García Martínez and Tigchelaar. See *TS* p. 120; *DSSSE* p. 1262; Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 63. The photograph shows a badly degraded line, which seems to start with a *yod* and ends with what could be עת (http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple). Yadin restores: [כול הנשכות אשרלשבט הלוי ומש] ער אשר עד פנת המזרח לבני אשר עהיו. (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 190). To account for subtle variations, it is just possible that the ink may have been gradually decoloured following exposure to light, such that later scholarly readings were compromised.

[458] Concurs with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p. 63); שבעים [ ] א[וכליהמה ל] (PTSDSSP p. 109). A different reconstruction: שבעים [ל נשכה [א וכליהמה ל] (*DSSSE* p. 1262).

[459] הרישון is omitted (PTSDSSP p.109) although most of the word appears intact, except the last two letters; […] ה בה י[י]ה [שני יה]ה (*DSSSE* p. 1262).

[460] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 120) reconstruct as י[ר] מעי, 'from my city', in agreement with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p. 63). A different reconstruction, מימן [י] ן, appears as 'from the rig[h]t' (PTSDSSP p. 108) and 'from the [right]t' (*DSSSE* p. 1262). Schiffman and Gross ascribe the differences to the stance of the differing reconstruction of the final letter which could be a *nun* or a *yod*.

[461] ורחץ is inserted above ובאה <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>. Qimron concurs (*Temple Scroll*, p. 63).

[462] Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, pp. 133, 179-80. בתוכם שוכן אני is one of many examples of what Wise identifies as redactional phrases, particularly evident in cols. 45-51, as a bridge between major sources. These are rooted from earlier passages

¹⁵ וכול איש אשר יטהר מזובו וספר לו שבעת ימים לטהרתו ויכבס ביום

¹⁶ השביעי בגדיו ורחץ את כול בשרו במים היים אחר יבוא אל **עיר**

¹⁷ **המקדש** וכול טמא לנ^פש⁴⁶³ לוא יבואו לה עד אשר יטהרו *vacat* וכול צרוע

¹⁸ ומנוגע לוא יבואו לה עד אשר יתהרו וכאשר יתהר והקריב את

¹ th[ey] will come [464]

² seventy [and two hundred chamber (s)] and all of them

³ and when the [first] guard[ian] sh[all] enter, so sh[a]ll the second [enter] to the left.

⁴ The first shall leave from my ci[ty][465] so as not to mix with one another, nor their equipment[466].
When

⁵ the guardian arr[ives] at his place, they will encamp [467]. On the eighth day,[468] this one will enter
as the other goes out,[469] the chambers having been made pure,[470]

---

in the scroll. This particular phrase, rooted in 29:8, is repeated, albeit slightly modified, in the same line, and reappears in 46:4,12 and 47:3,18. With regard to columns 45-47, other variants are cited: לעולם ועד (45:14; 46:3-4, rooted in 29:8); אשר אשכין שמי (45:12; 47:10-11, rooted in 29:8); אקדיש לשכין *vacat* שמי (47:4, rooted in 29:8).

[463] לנש (PTSDSSP p. 110); לנ^פש (*DSSSE* p. 1264); פ is clearly superscripted <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

[464] Differing reconstructions of this badly degraded line do not lend the line any meaningful translation. Yadin restores 'And from the gate', (Yadin, II, p. 190). 'They shall be entering'. Schiffman favours 'th[ey will be coming…]'. Wise, Abegg and Cook start their translation at line 3 (*DSSNT* p. 476).

[465] PTSDSSP p. 109. Johann Maier (p. 40), *DSSSE* translates 'from the right', on the basis of the reconstruction מימין. (p. 1263). Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121) offer מעירי 'from my city'; 'while the old one exits to the rig[h]t. They are not to intermingle, neither they nor their vessels' (*DSSNT* p. 476). The phrase 'my city' is probably shorthand for 'my Temple City'.

[466] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121) finish this badly degraded line with 'and when'. (http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple).

[467] They slept there whilst on duty, probably in chambers within the Temple.

[468] E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), p. 131. Each duty roster lasted one week. During this week, they worked in an environment of heightened purity, performing the tasks of 'liturgical worship and expert butchery' (p. 133).

[469] The order of the phrases in the text implies that the departing guardian leaves on the eighth day, as conveyed by Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121; Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40. Vermes (*CDSSE* p. 206), Wise, Abegg and Cook (*DSSNT* p. 476) and García Martínez/ Tigchelaar (*DSSSE* p. 1263) convey that both entry and exit occur simultaneously on the eighth day. I agree and translate accordingly.

[470] ומטהרים is *hophal*, so it should convey a causative passive sense as a participle because of the *mem*. The passive sense is conveyed by Milgrom: 'The chambers shall be cleansed one by one when the first one leaves' ['Further Studies in the Temple Scroll', *JQR* 71 (1980), 95]. My translation differs from 'they (shall) purify' in Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121). See also PTSDSSP (pp. 119, 111) and *DSSSE* (p. 1263). 'they clean' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40). 'the incoming divisions shall purify the chambers' (*DSSNT* p. 476).

⁶ one after the other,⁴⁷¹ [from the] time the first one goes out, so as to avoid any

⁷ mixing *vacat*. And if a ma[n] were to have⁴⁷² an emission at night, he shall not enter the

⁸ any part ⁴⁷³of the Temple⁴⁷⁴ for three days⁴⁷⁵ and he will clean⁴⁷⁶ his garments and wash himself

⁹ on the first day.⁴⁷⁷ On the third day he shall wash his clothing and after sunset

¹⁰ he may⁴⁷⁸ enter the Temple. They will not go with an impure discharge from my Temple and

make it impure.

¹¹ A man who lies with his wife with an ejaculation of semen ⁴⁷⁹ will not enter any part of the

Temple ⁴⁸⁰

---

⁴⁷¹ Lit. 'this one after that'. My translation concurs with Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121), Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40 and PTSDSSP p. 111. 'one after the other' (Yigael Yadin (II, p.191). *DSSNT* p. 476; *DSSSE* p. 1263.

⁴⁷² Lit. 'if it will be for him'. כ introduces a protasis, whose conditions will be fulfillable; that is to say, he will not be entering כול המקדש. The translations of Yadin (II, p. 191), Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121), *DSSSE* (p. 1263) and *CDSSE* (p. 206) convey the business of having an emission. 'No m[an] who has a nocturnal emission is to enter' (*DSSNT* p.476). I have offered 'were to' to convey the idea of unintentional randomness of the emission.

⁴⁷³ Lit. 'the whole of'. This would be wooden.

⁴⁷⁴ 'Temple' (Yadin, II, p. 192) and *TS* p. 123; *DSSSE* p. 1263, *DSSNT*, p. 476; 'Sanctuary' (PTSDSSP p. 111; Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40; *CDSSE* p. 206); 'sacred place' (BDB p. 874). 'Sanctuary' avoids the problem of עיר המקדש. Schiffman and Gross regard this entity as only the temple, not the entire city (*TS* p. 121)

⁴⁷⁵ 'until he [com]pletes three days' (*TS* p. 123). 'until he has [comp]leted three days' (Johann Maier, Temple Scroll (p. 40). 'until three days have elapsed (Vermes, p. 206). 'until three days are [comp]leted' (PTSDSSP p. 111). 'until three [com]pleted days have passed' (*DSSNT* p. 476). 'until three days have [pa]ssed' (*DSSSE* p. 1263). [יש לים] is the imperfect of השלם. The sense of completion is conveyedin a less wooden style.

⁴⁷⁶ 'launder' (*TS* p. 123; *DSSNT* p. 477). This emphasises the difference between the washing of clothes and cleansing of the body. BDB translates כבס as wahing by treading, which, again, woud remove any ambiguity between clothes and body (p. 40). Only in the poetic context does it convey washing of the body, eg. 'if you wash yourself with natron' (Jer. 2:22). Maier uses 'washes', which keeps the style simple.

⁴⁷⁷ As in other places in the text, so as not to impede the flow of English, I have not always translated the copulative *vav*. This does not detract from the sense of the Hebrew.

⁴⁷⁸ 'may' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 192); *TS* p. 123; Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40; *DSSNT* p. 477; 'shall' (*DSSSE* p. 1263 and *CDSSE* p. 206). Although יבוא is in the imperfect, 'may' conveys a sense of permission after purification.

⁴⁷⁹ Lit. 'if a man will lie with his wife and copulates scattering (seed)'. Translated variously as 'when a man has sexual relations with his wife, having a seminal emission (*TS* p. 123). 'lies with his wife and has an emission of semen (Yadin, II, p. 193). 'lies with his wife and has an ejaculation' (*DSSSE* p. 1263). 'lies with his wife with emission of semen' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40). 'lies with his wife having an ejaculation of semen (PTSDSSP p. 111). 'no man who has had sexual intercourse with his wife' (Vermes, p. 206). 'intercourse with his wife' (*DSSNT* p. 477). The text makes it clear that intercourse must involve ejaculation.

⁴⁸⁰ כול עיר המקדש is translated variously: 'any part of the city of the temple' (Yadin, II, p. 193). 'the whole city of the temple' (*DSSSE* p. 1263). 'anywhere into the city of the sanctuary' (*CDSSE* p. 206). 'the enire city of the sanctuary' (*TS* p.123; PTSDSSPP p. 111). 'any (part) of the city of the sanctuary' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 40). 'any part of the temple city'

12 City, in which I cause my name to dwell,[481] for three days. Any man who is blind

13 shall not go there[482] all their days and they shall not make impure the city[483] in which I

establish my name [484]

14 in its midst. For I, God, dwell in the midst of the sons of Israel for ever.

15 Each man who purifies himself from his seminal flux counts for himself seven days for

his purification.[485] And he shall clean himself on the seventh day

16 along with his garments and clean all his bodily flesh[486] in running water.[487] Afterwards he

shall enter the Temple

17 city. And all those who are defiled shall not come there until they purify themselves.

And anyone with leprosy offers

18 or anyone so marked[488] shall not enter it[489] until they are purified and when he is purified, and

---

[481] (*DSSNT* p. 477). Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 121) consider עיר המקדש to mean the temple, not the entire city. Very likely, they have used 'sanctuary' to avoid the potentially confusing translation of 'city of the temple', which might convey the idea of an entire city. This passage is taken from Lev. 15:18 which deals with purification after a man has had sexual relations with a woman, אשה. This is not as specific as the scroll's אשתו, 'his woman' or more meaningfully, 'his wife' as we translate here. The scroll inserts עיר המקדש which is absent in Lev. 15:18.

[481] אשכין is Hiphil of שכן (*DCH* VIII, p. 359). The root conveys the idea as an extension of living, to the experience of settling. To translate the root simply as 'live' would be inadequate.

[482] 'may enter it' (*DSSNT* p. 477).

[483] עיר is absent in the base text Lev. 15:2, 13.

[484] 'I will settle my name' (Yadin, II, p. 379); 'lest the city, in whose midst I dwell, be defiled' (*DSSNT* p. 477). שכן is an Akkadian calque, šakānu, 'establish'. See Jeremy Black, Andrew George and Nicholas Postgate, eds, *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000), p. 348.

[485] Lev. 15:13. There must be seven consecutive clear days where there is no discharge whatever, before cleansing is started (Torat Kohanim 15:150, Niddah 33b). 'must count seven days for his purification' (Schiffman and Gross, p. 123). 'must count seven days as a cleansing period' (*DSSNT* p. 477).

[486] בשרו is translated as 'flesh' (*TS* p. 123; PTSDSSP p. 111); 'body' (Yadin II, p. 193; Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41; *DSSSE* p. 1263; *CDSSE* p. 206). It serves as a contrast to בגדיו. My suggestion of 'bodily flesh' makes this distinction even clearer.

[487] Literally, 'day the seventh', which is split between the end of line 15 and the beginning of line 16. במים היים means 'living water', water that is not stagnant; 'running water' (Yadin II, p. 193; *CDSSE* p. 206; *DSSNT* p. 477). 'living water' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll* p. 41). 'living waters' (Schiffman, *Courtyards,* p. 394). Schiffman modifies this in his latest translation with Gross to 'running water' (p. 123).

[488] 'stricken' (*TS* p. 123); PTSDSSP p. 111; Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41; 'infected person' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). 'No leper or person afflicted with a skin disease' (*DSSNT* p. 477); 'any man smitten' (*CDSSE* p. 206). The unpointed verbal root נגע is also the unpointed binyanim of niphal, piel and pual, 'to touch'. מנוגע is the pual passive participle, 'and anyone so marked' or 'anyone so smitten. 'Afflicted' seems to veer away from the intensive sense of touch in נגע.

[489] לה refers back to עיר המקדש in the previous line.

4.3 Spatial Analysis

The crux of the analysis is the problematic phrase עיר המקדש, 'Temple city', for which, we have seen, there is no consensus so far on an understanding (§1.1). Our argument will indicate that עיר המקדש, as expressed in this column, is a single spatial entity.[490] This will be approached by examining it spatially as a unit, as well as its constituent elements.

Apart from a fleeting reference (44:2), עיר does not make a substantive appearance until 45:11-12. However, 45:4 presents a problematic difference in reconstruction of what could conceivably be מעי [ר]י. At this point, as we have already noted, בית has now been supplanted by עיר, which has moved up the spectrum of purity from בית (§3.8.1c). This was deduced from the similarity between the following two phrases, which show a common divine intention:

בבית אשר אשכין שמי עליו [491]

in the house on which I cause]my name [to dwell] (29:3b-4a)

This establishes עיר המקדש as a setting for the ritual of the burnt offering:

כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי

any part of the Temple city in which I cause my name to dwell (45:11b-12)

God's name must not be associated with acts of impurity, explicitly on the theme of marital physical relations, following which a man:

לוא יבוא אל כול עיר המקדש...שלושת ימים

will not enter any part of the Temple City…for three days (45:11-12)

---

[490] Divisions are based on *vacats*, rather than columns.

[491] בבית אשר א[שכין] שמי עליב in PTSDSSP p. 78.

The use of כול implies complexity of space within the עיר המקדש. There is scant reference to women which suggests that the scroll's author does not consider them relevant to the performative scene.

Following בית (29:3-4), the tribal gates are described in detail, before the text indicates the sense of עיר as a space, rather than a mere geographical entity (44:2).[492] This indication starts in the phrase כול עיר המקדש, 'any part of the city of the Temple' (45:11-12). The phrase עיר המקדש, 'Temple city', reappears four lines later (45:16-17), in relation to purification after male discharge. Although marital emission and male discharge require mandatory purification outside עיר המקדש, there is a subtle difference in the way the text expresses this post-purification space that is subsequently entered: כול המקדש for nocturnal emissions, עיר המקדש for discharges, and כול עיר המקדש for marital emissions. כול indicates the idea of subspaces within עיר המקדש.[493] It is interesting to note that the first two situations are involuntary, whereas the last is voluntary.[494] Nevertheless, it is important to be aware that these scenarios are related to the matter of purity, not atonement. On this basis, we must consider the context of the men to whom the text refers. References to המקדשי and המקדש indicate that the men were actually the priests because they would be the only ones permitted into those spaces. It is indeed possible that nocturnal emissions may have occurred whilst the priests were sleeping during their weekly spells of duty. Non-priests were not allowed. A married priest, having specifically ejaculated with his wife, is

---

[492] The tribal gates are apportioned in: 33:7, 10; 36: 2, 2, 8, 13, 14; 39: 1-4, 15, 16; 40; 10-15; 41; 42:7, 17; 44:4, 5, 7, 11-16; 45:1.

[493] BDB pp. 481-2. כל is contracted from the Aramaic כול. 'whole of' 'every kind of', 'any'. Various translations capture this meaning, eg: he may not enter any (part) of the city' in Yigael Yadin, *The Temple* Scroll, II (p. 45); 'shall enter anywhere into the city of the sanctuary' (*CDSSE* p. 206); 'he shall not enter the entire city' (PTSDSSP p. 111); 'he may not enter the entire city' (*TS* p. 123); 'he shall not enter the whole city of the temple' (*DSSSE* p. 1263).

[494] James A. Greenburg, *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus; The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019), p. 108. An involuntarily incurred impurity does not invoke divine anger. Nevertheless, that person must still be made to cleanse before YHWH. This is the same as forgiveness. The divine relationship is restored. Otherwise, the impurity would harm God's people and the camp.

debarred from כול עיר המקדש for three days. It is highly unlikely that marital relations would occur within the עיר המקדש (CD 12:1). Nevertheless, for the avoidance of any doubt, the Temple Scroll says so. Curiously, the text does not tell us if wives are debarred from כול עיר המקדש. Regardless of speculation, it would appear that wives and, by extension, women were deemed as irrelevant by the text's author to the purity of that space, rather than being impure themselves. However, men and women could mingle together in the Second Temple. Josephus describes the walled-off Court of the Women in the Herodian temple which was open to worship to native and foreign Jewesses.[495] However, the Temple Scroll makes the point by omission. Thus it appears that כול עיר המקדש is a gendered Thirdspace, a representational space in which imagination and symbolism, sourced in tradition and history, is experienced. Such experience, through the intentions of thought and praxis, arises from the sole commitment to purity.

Although we are not talking about atonement, the voluntary and involuntary nature of an act cannot be entirely excluded from purity. The performance of a voluntary act, which is known to lead to impurity, must surely reflect an impurity of thought at the time of the act. It would be valid, therefore, to include this in the discussion. We see כול used in the phrase כול המקדש, 'any part of the temple', in relation to nocturnal emission (45:7-8). This is involuntary, but despite the use of כול, the עיר is not part of the prohibition. To those who incur impurity involuntarily, their forbidden space is expressed simply as the more spatially limited עיר המקדש. In other words, a conscious or voluntary act of impurity incurs a greater restriction than one that is involuntary. So it would appear that the addition of כול would actually convey עיר המקדש as a single spatial entity, since כול עיר המקדש creates the sense that it is an entity with subspaces.[496]

---

[495] *War* 5:199.

[496] 45:7 implies that a nocturnal emission would have occurred outside any part of the Temple, although not necessarily outside the city. See Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, pp. 100-101. This aligns with the view of Levine and Schiffman and Gross, that the temple and its temenos is not the entire city (*TS* p. 125). In her comments of confinement and impurity in the Temple Scroll, Wassen acknowledges the unpredictability of nocturnal emission which can presumably also occur in the city,

We shall now examine other expressions of spaces allotted after purification in this column: כל המקדש, 'any part of the Temple' (45:8), המקדש, 'the Temple' (45:10), מקדשי, 'my Temple' (45:10), העיר אשר אני שוכן בתוכה, 'the city in which I dwell in its midst' (45:13-14). Again, the text makes it clear that access to these spaces is permitted to certain men only after purification from emissions and discharges. It appears that the common factor in these expressions is post-purification access. [497]

Access to post-purification spaces demand a commitment to purify oneself, stemming from a profound awareness of the complex biblical foundations by those responsible for composing the Temple Scroll. It would have been an awareness that the source of holiness was not innate but ascribed to divine revelation. It was an extension of the divine will, even something positive and inspirational: 'You shall be holy, for I the LORD your God am holy' (Lev. 19:2). It could never be reached but only approximated as *Imitatio Dei*.[498] The doctrine of holiness enabled an exasperated Moses to reform the rebellious Israelites of the wilderness to become a disciplined people. Israel should therefore strive to attain holiness; priests should strive to sustain it: 'Keep my statutes, and observe them; I am the LORD; I sanctify you' (Lev. 20:8). Harrington reminds us that purity, טהרה, is a state of being; it is the absence of impurity. Holiness, קדשה, actively

---

whilst the culpable man is sleeping there; that is, the holy city of Jerusalem rather than in a regular city (48:14-17). Such a case is banned from the temple and should depart to an area set aside outside the city (46:17-18). She tends to agree with the proponents of the עיר המקדש as the city of Jerusalem, rather than the temenos and views the areas of confinement as being outside Jerusalem. Again, this is yet another scholarly assumption that Jerusalem is the locus, despite its absence in the extant text. Regardless of that, if she had taken כול into account, עיר would be spatially part of המקדש. Crawford takes a pragmatic view in that sexual intercourse could only take place outside the city; 'The Meaning of the Phrase'*,* 242-54 (p. 247).

[497] Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 110. Smith views ritual as the difference between the 'now' of everyday life and that of ritual place; they are simultaneous but not co-existent. He cites an examples in blood and water. Blood may be considered an impurity in the worldly sense, but in a ritual sense, it removes impurity. Water may transmit impurity in a worldly sense, but in a ritual sense, it washes away impurity. In these examples, it is the location which has changed. Without ritual, there is no sacred space, in this case מקדש.

[498] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, pp. 107-108.

comes from God.[499] Schiffman argues that holiness in the Temple Scroll is equivalent to purity. This is because God dwells in the Temple, thereby guaranteeing the purity of the people among whom he dwells. Schiffman points this out in a later passage:

אני מגיד לכה בהר הזה ולוא יטמאו vac. כי אני יהוה שוכן
בתוך בני ישראל וקדשתמה והיו קדושים ולוא ישקצו

I relate to you on this mountain, so they not become impure *vacat*. For I, the Lord, dwell among the Children of Israel. Therefore you shall sanctify them. And they shall be holy, so as not to make themselves abominable (51:7-8).[500]

Milgrom cites the equal importance of 'negative holiness' which requires the prohibition of violating divine prohibitions (Lev. 20: 24b-26). By this, he means the requirement to abstain from violating the divine prohibitions. Israel should separate itself from the contaminating practices of other nations.[501] The holiness vision of the Temple Scroll reflects the exclusion of impurity from the wilderness camp to an external location on matters relating to leprosy, contacting a corpse or discharge (Num. 5: 1-4), and nocturnal emission and defaecation (Deut. 23: 1-5).[502]

---

[499] Hannah Harrington, 'Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 8 (2001), 124-135, (p. 129). Only God is inherently holy. Those who strive for perfection can never become inherently holy, even though they may separate themselves from impurity; an *Imitation Dei*.

[500] Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'The Theology of the Temple Scroll', *JQR* 85 (1994), 109-23 (p. 121).

[501] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, p. 178.

[502] Ibid., p. 251. See also Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity*, pp. 24, 26. Klawans distinguishes impurity into ritual and moral. The sources of ritual impurity are unavoidable; they are natural and part of life. They are therefore not sinful, whereas a moral impurity is gravely serious. In the context of the Temple Scroll, we are dealing with ritual impurities. These are temporary defilements, which can be corrected by the rites of purification; moral impurity cannot be absolved this way. Even though ritual impurity is not sinful, ritual defilement can be seen, somewhat paradoxically, as punishment for moral lapses; for example, Miriam is inflicted with leprosy when she spoke against her brother's wife (Num. 12: 10).

It would appear thus that עיר, המקדש and עיר המקדש, as examined in this column, are more than a measured physical entity, even if they are imagined. The spatial problem is that, up to now in the text, we are not told about the daily physical activities and dynamics within those entities. We are merely told that, in compliance with the various and detailed prohibitions, they are spaces of privileged post-purification access. Viewed from this relatively mundane perspective, there is no spatial difference between these three post-purification entities, עיר, המקדש and עיר המקדש. It will be argued that this is not necessarily an oversimplification.[503]

Given there is divine integration and a purpose, there is then an understanding of what these three terms represent, even though their dynamics are not expressed in the text. Perhaps we can now consider them in terms of their common purpose as 'purity zones'. They are beyond the Secondspace of what Soja describes as 'the birth of geographical imaginations'.[504] These spaces are now the environment of purity praxis as the path to the divine will of purity. There is now the more profound dimension of Thirdspace, as to how this 'zone' is being lived. At this point, we must remind ourselves that, in invoking spatiality theory, we are dealing in the Temple Scroll with planned, envisioned spaces rather than established structures. Although they are indeed envisioned, the audience of the text is drawn to the divine will directly, by means of the first person expressing the divine voice. The envisioned constructions are not a fantasy; they are to be built, whether they are implementable or not.[505] The instructional tone of the divine is evident

---

[503] Accordingly, such a post-purification space would fall under what Lefebvre would label as 'representational spaces': 'Redolent with imagery and symbolic elements, they [representational spaces] have their source in history - in the history – in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people.' (Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 24). Soja makes a more general observation on spatiality as a mark of the human condition beyond mere physicality of the space itself: 'To be human is not only to create distances but to attempt to cross them, to transform primal distance through intentionality, emotion, involvement, attachment. Human spatiality is thus more than the product of our capacity to separate ourselves from the world, from a pristine Nature, to contemplate its distant plenitude and our separateness'. (Soja, *Post-Modern Geographies*, p. 133).

[504] Edward W. Soja, 'The Spatial Turn and the Concept of Thirdspace', in *Communicating in the Thirdspace*, p. 51.

[505] Molly M. Zahn, 'The Utopian Vision of the Temple Scroll'.

even at the beginning of the extant text (col. 2). As the physical structures are planned and their intended uses articulated, they are conceived, in the manner of Secondspace. For if holiness is to be any way achieved, there must be an intention to enact these plans of the space in which God dwells. If this is to be enacted by means of purity that is required in those spaces, this profound extension of spatial practice, the purity zone, qualifies as Thirdspace.

The question must now arise as to whether the absence of any expressed dynamics imparts anything other than basic physicality. In common with each other, they seem to carry the requirements, in terms of purity stringency, as a path to the divine.[506] With regard to the terms themselves, the first mention of המקדש is not yet paired with עיר (45:8), with regard to nocturnal emission. However, it is qualified by כול, which as we have noted, adds a spatial reference to המקדש. Without כול, המקדש has no intrinsic subspaces. Hence, the phrase כול המקדש would imply different but perhaps interconnected spaces within it.[507] Any man, who has completed the cleansing process after three days, will then be eligible to enter המקדש and its subspaces. So far, there is no implied relationship to עיר. His nocturnal emission would have occurred anywhere outside כול המקדש.[508]

If כול confers subspaces, then, at the most basic level, we are dealing with the imagined physicality of Firstspace. If these subspaces have been planned towards their sacral uses, this would be in keeping with representational space, the added layer therefore of Secondspace. This

---

[506] It is interesting that this appears to clash with Timothy Gorringe's idea, drawn from Jacques Ellul, in his discussion of the meaning of the city: 'Because the city is the great means of separation between human beings and God, the place human beings made to be alone, 'she is the very centre of the world's disorder, and it is therefore useless to speak to her of disorder'. See Gorringe, p. 144. See also Jacques Ellul, *The Meaning of the City: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption*, trans. by Dennis Pardee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 119.

[507] Philip Alexander tackles 'כל' in his note on the syntax of 4Q448 B. He considers it to be in a hyperbatic position in the phrase קהל ישראל to emphasise the distinction between Jews in the diaspora and those in Israel. Although there is no reference to spatiality, his opinion would support the additional function of כול in כול המקדש in distinguishing space within and outside המקדש. See Philip S. Alexander, 'A Note of the Syntax of 4Q448', *JJS* 44 (1993), 301 (p. 301).

[508] Nocturnal emission could not have occurred in non-residential space, such as כול המקדש.

spatial reading can be taken further. The space designated as כול המקדש (45:8) debars the man who has yet to cleanse (45:9). The cleansing is a divine commandment which must be fulfilled before entering divine territory. There is now a relationship between the cleansing of inanimate clothing and man; sacral ritual has been established, even before entering כול המקדש. Divine decree will extend the human experience beyond the material and mental thinking by integrating the divine name with its commandments of praxis into that space; in short, a Thirdspace experience.

A spatial concept of כול המקדש can be understood further by approaching the text from a different angle, referring to the conditions which debar entry to כול המקדש (45:8), a phrase which we now examine in more detail. The roles of כול, 'entire/whole/all/any part of', רחץ, 'bathe/cleanse' and בשר, 'flesh/body' are pivotal in this analysis.[509] After a nocturnal emission, clothing must be washed, כבס. The man must be cleansed, ורחץ, in that he must wash on the third day (45:8), following which, he may enter the temple itself. The involvement of his body is implied by ורחץ. In the next line, ורחץ is superadded as a scribal addition over the word ובאה in יכבס בגדיו ובאה, 'he will wash his clothing and go…'. This differs from the rule of the Levitical camp in two respects. First, exclusion was imposed until that evening (Lev. 15:16-17), not for three days as in the scroll. Second, the 'flow of seed' is generalised, whereas the scroll specifies מקרה לילה, 'nocturnal emission'.[510] This phrase is more exacting, in that מקרה, 'chance/accident', implies an unintentional event.[511] The absence of the word זרע, 'seed', suggests that a non-conjugal emission was regarded as not relevant to the creation of new life as it had been wasted. Was this three-day

---

509 Kirsten Simonsen, 'Sensations, Space and Time: The Contribution from Henri Lefebvre', *Human Geography*, 87 (2005), 4. 'Each living body *is* space and *has* space; it produces itself in space at the same time as it produces space.'.

510 Dorothea Erbele-Küster, *Body, Gender and Purity in Leviticus 12 and 15* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017), p. 109. שכב is the root 'to lie down' (*BDB*, pp. 1011-2). As part of the construct זרע־שכבת, it could be interpreted as a synecdoche for 'sexual intercourse'.

511 BDB p. 899. See also *DCH* V (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), p. 471.

exclusion arbitrary? Scholarship has not yet addressed this particular point. There appears to be a resonance with the creational narrative. On the third day, the word זרע is introduced:

ותוצא הארץ דשא עשב מזריע זרע למינהו ועץ עשה פרי אשר זרע־בו למינהו וירא אלהים כי־טוב

> The earth brought vegetation: plants yielding seed of every kind, and trees of every kind that bear fruit with the seed in it. And God saw it was good (Gen. 1:12)

After שכבת זרע, three days must elapse before renewed purity. The scroll's passage may have been an intertextual reference to the third day on which seed, albeit botanical, was created.[512] Perhaps three days was the new stricter mandate by which both the nocturnal emitter and the married ejaculator would be re-created to a state of renewed purity, a performative re-creation.[513] In contrast, the Levitical text states a shorter duration of impurity until the evening of that day (Lev. 15:5).[514] What does Leviticus have to say in terms of the spaces involved with semen? The penultimate verse of Lev.15 makes a single reference to 'my tabernacle' as the space of paramount importance:

> Thus you shall keep the people of Israel separate from their uncleanliness, so they do not die in their uncleanliness by defiling my tabernacle[515] that is in their midst (Lev. 15:31)

---

[512] Mary Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), p. 190. In her view, the escape of bodily fluids and disease of skin cover, that is to say, a failure of skin cover, can be regarded as a breach of the body's containing walls. This view chimes with the spatiality view of Christl Maier, who expands on the idea of body space being used to metaphorise public space (*Constructions of Space II,* pp. 119-138).

[513] Hartmut Stegemann, 'Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah-Lost for 2500 years?', in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review,* ed. by Hershel Shanks (New York: Vintage. 1993), pp. 126-36. (p. 128). Stegemann agrees with Yadin's contention that the scroll was an 'additional Torah' to the Pentateuch, rather than a substitute. This is evidenced by Sstegemann's observation that the scroll does not cover topics such as the creation. Be that as it may, I would argue that this does not preclude the use of intertextual references by the scroll's compiler.

[514] ובאה השמש, 'the sun shall set' (45:9) is the only reference in the column to the sun as a marker for the end of a day; Jacob Neusner, 'Contexts of Purification: The Halakhic Theology of Immersion', *Review of Rabbinic Judaism*, 6.1 (2003), 68-86 (pp. 68, 76-8).

[515] את־משכני, 'my tabernacle'.

Even so, this does not explain the stricter three-day prohibition in the scroll. As Milgrom points out, any discharge of semen, however caused, puts one in a state of impurity. He emphasises that such impurity is ritual in nature. As such, until purification, contact with the temple is forbidden.[516] המקדש is now the Thirdspace of performative re-creation.

We now move through the column to encounter בשר. The body, expressed as בשר, 'flesh', is clearly specified: ורחץ את כול בשרו (45:16); this relates to a pathological discharge.[517] It renders the whole of the sufferer's physical being, expressed by בשר, as impure. Erbele-Küster reminds us that biblical Hebrew does not have a general term for 'body'. Leviticus uses the term sixty-one times, more than any other in the Hebrew Bible, referring mainly to sacrificial offerings and the human body. It can be specific to male genitalia and, in one instance, to female genitalia (Lev. 15:19). Her task of identifying male and female usage of this Levitical term contrasts starkly with our equivalent task in dealing with the androcentric material in column 45.[518] However, her reference to בשר as the single representation of female pudenda (Lev. 15:19) and male (Lev. 6:3; 12:3; 16:4) leads her to believe that sexual difference is neutralised within a 'non-gendered body model'; that is to say, gender-neutral. So, does this give us leeway to consider בשר in column 45 as gender-neutral, thus dispensing with its androcentricity? My view is otherwise, in that the text must be interpreted as it speaks, rather than having gender-neutrality grafted onto it. In support of this point, the significant feature of column 45 is that the 'wife',

---

[516] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*, p. 160.

[517] R. R. Willcox, 'Venereal Diseases in the Bible', *British Journal of Venereology*, 25 (1949), 28-33 (p. 29). 'There is no disagreement on the subject of gonorrhoea, which is described as an 'issue''. The priest, as a matter of self-protection, was forbidden to marry any woman, who was not a virgin (Lev. 21:13).

[518] Dorothea Erbele-Küster, pp. 89-90. Where there is an overriding concern in ensuring purity of the temple, Leviticus 15 elaborates on genital discharges. בשר indicates male (1-18) and female (19-30) genitalia. In her discussion about the diversity of usage of this term, Erbele-Küster identifies this chapter as the sole instance where female genitalia are included in the regulations of temple purity. She interprets the text as analogising the female-gendered body to the male gendered-body. Sexual difference is thereby neutralised within a non-gendered body model. Indeed, we can make our own obvious conclusion that the verse (Lev 15:19) is split nearly equally in this regard, and that בשר applies to both sexes.

mentioned only once, is not in possession of anything; she is merely אשתו, 'his wife' (45:11). With what space is she connected? She will have been involved in the conjugal act somewhere outside the עיר המקדש but she is promptly dropped from the text. Only the man is now part of the purity process. Rather than the women being regarded as the agent of impurity or as a participant in the purity process, the text does not consider the 'wife', presumably including any woman, to be relevant to the exclusive male environment of עיר המקדש. The status of wife is the closest to a man, in contrast with a woman in general terms. The word 'wife' in association with a man, rather than the generality of 'woman', may account for its use as the least irrelevant reference to those other than males or priests. Leviticus, by contrast, shows the woman to be in possession of her 'discharge', 'impurity', 'bed', 'behalf', 'unclean discharge', 'period' (Lev.15: 19-33). Anyone who touches her, anywhere she sits and lies down, is impure until the evening after the required washing. The woman herself is impure throughout. Leviticus appears to endow her with her own spatial zone of impurity, as if she was her own lived space. This is not the case in the Temple Scroll in which the absence of possession renders women irrelevant to the male, priestly space of cultic activity.

Given a male perspective predominates and that the scroll omits any female space in its envisioned temple, the crucial question arises as to whether First and Secondspaces in the scroll are conceptually male or female. Even if there was a Court of the Women, it is of no interest in terms of the activities of men using this space whose entrance would be separate into the temple. If this was directed at priests, they would not be going into this Court at all. If Firstspace is envisaged in terms merely of physical structure and relative positions, it would appear superficially that there is no gender specificity. Once there is planning and forethought about how the space will be used, that is, Secondspace, then there is scope for delineated areas for male and female admission. Josephus refers to an area walled off for women on the east side for them

to worship, to be entered only by the north and south gate.[519] However, Josephus does not say that this area was exclusively for women; presumably they could have mingled with men in that area. The Temple Scroll does not envision a specific space that includes women.

In our treatment of בשר, it should be noted that Lefebvre considered the body to be the point of origin of social space. It 'metamorphoses the body that it may forget it altogether - even though it may separate itself so radically from the body as to kill it'.[520] This stands to reason, in that if social space is produced socially, the body must be part of that social production.[521] There are examples in the Hebrew Bible where cleansing is confined to clothes.[522] The word בשר is absent in the passages referring to cleansing after emissions. For example, the washing of garments was a prerequisite for the Israelites to receive the Covenant: וכבסו שמלתם (Exod. 19:10); the body is not mentioned. The priestly consecration of Aaron and his sons required them to be 'washed' with water, ורחצת אתם במים (Exod. 29:4). The word רחץ implies bathing, rather than washing.[523] It is more explicit in the phrase ורחץ במים את כל בשרו: 'If a man has an emission of semen, he shall bathe his whole body in water [rather than just his genitalia], and be unclean until the evening' (Lev. 15:16).[524] An interesting observation is that there is nothing in the scroll's text specifying anything more than washing and cleansing.

With regard to the medium of cleansing, what does במים חיים, 'living water' (11Q19 45:16) tell us? The same formula is expressed in the base text (Lev. 15:13); this verse concludes with וטהר,

---

[519] *War* 5: 198, (LCL pp. 60-61): δύο δ' ἦσαν ἐξ ἀνατολῆς κατ' ἀνάγκην· διατετειχισμένου γὰρ κατὰ τοῦτο τὸ κλίμα ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἰδίου πρὸς θρησκείαν, 'two [gates] set out in the east, compulsorily sloped off as an area for women to worship' (my trans.).

[520] Henri Lefebvre, p. 405.

[521] Edward S. Casey, *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (University of California Press, 1997), p. 205. Casey makes the point that 'things are not orientated in and by themselves; they require our intervention to *become* orientated. Nor are they orientated by a purely mental operation; the a priori of orientation belongs to the body, not to the mind'.

[522] Exod. 19:10-11, 'the LORD said to Moses: 'Go to the people and consecrate them today and tomorrow. Have them wash their clothes and prepare for the third day.''; Exod. 19:14b, 'He consecrated the people, and they washed their clothes.'.

[523] BDB p. 934.

[524] My squared brackets.

'and he shall be clean'. Does חיים confer on מים a sense that a ritual is being performed? The opening of the Mishnaic tractate *Miqvaot* grades water into six degrees in bringing about purity, from the least to the most effective.[525] The sixth level is the most effective because it comprises מים חיים, 'living waters'. With regard to the wilderness, the result of washing in living, free-flowing natural water in the base text is immediate, whereas the Temple Scroll mandates an exclusion from עיר המקש for seven days after washing (45:16-17). If we consider the specific impurity of an abnormal venereal discharge (45:15) which requires such an exclusion, then perhaps this seven-day protraction after bathing in 'living water' will likely reflect the scroll's purity judgement on such a discharge because of its indicator as irregularity and disease. This is more rigorous than the three-day exclusion from כול המקדש without mention of בשר (45:8-9) because of an emission.[526] By this argument, if the seven-day exclusion confers ritual importance on חיים, then במים חיים could be understood as a ritualistic concept in the scroll's context of a discharge, something which is inherently unhealthy and therefore impure. Thus, by the use of a ritual requirement requiring במים חיים, the scroll distils its exclusions down to what is healthy and what is unhealthy.[527]

---

[525] Joan E. Taylor and Federico Adinolfi, 'John the Baptist and Jesus the Baptist: A Narrative Critical Approach', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus,* 10 (2012), 247-284 (p. 255). The Gospel of John (7:38) conveys the idea of living water flowing from the believer's belly: 'ποταμοί ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτου ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος'. See also Neusner, 'Contexts', (pp. 70-71). His Halakhic review makes the point that 'water that has flowed and collected naturally or that flows on its own, removes uncleanliness; drawn water will not… living or flowing spring water serves for removing corpse-uncleanliness and that which is analogous to it'.

[526] R .R Willcox, 'Venereal Diseases', 28-33. The biblical 'issue' is acknowledged as referring to gonorrhoea.

[527] Moshe Blidstein, *Purity, Community and Ritual in Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 232. Blidstein suggests that purity discourses may be better described as 'webs of allusions rather than as systems'. The use of במים חיים raises the question of purification of the soul, which, along with the body, would also have been defiled in contracting a venereal discharge. See also Harrington, *The Purity Texts,* p. 95. Anyone who had contracted such a discharge bore a degree of guilt: משכב יגון ישכב ומושב אנחה 'to lie alone in a bed of sorrow' (4Q274 1:1). Despite this reference to 4Q Tohorot, Harrington does not elaborate on guilt or morality of abnormal male discharge. Of course, 'sorrow' does not necessarily indicate immorality. Additionally, it should be noted that אנה, 'sorrow/grief ', does not appear in the Temple Scroll. On this basis, the morality issue and the notion of stigma, in the context of the Temple Scroll, can be dismissed. See also Jacob Neusner, 'The Idea of Purity in

Does במים חיים imply actual initiation into anything in the context of this column in the Temple Scroll? Definitely not, in that the scroll proscribes entry to עיר המקדש to anyone who would have otherwise been permitted, had it not been for the incurring of ritual impurity. It is not seeking a transformation of the individual with a discharge. It does not qualify as a variant of what was later to become baptism.[528] In contrast, 1QS suggests a link between ritual and moral purity with regard to admission criteria.[529] The use of בשר presents a rather severe base and unhealthy physical picture of a human, akin to an animal, rather than any reference to a spiritual component of what it is to be human. Access to עיר המקדש is forbidden until purification. המקדש is a more rigorously observed subspace of priestly status to which the person, whose attributes are degraded as בשר, is not admitted.

Furthermore, כול, 'whole/all/any part of', is a word which modifies the space to which it refers. It would indicate that, in the absence of בשר, the stringencies for כול המקדש were less than those for המקדש. המקדש is a space of greater stringency within כול המקדש, a space of lesser stringency. כול also has some spatial bearing if we examine the situation of marital emissions, following which, entry to כול עיר המקדש is forbidden (45:11-12) for three days; washing is not required. However, this banishment is not mandated in the Hebrew Bible (Lev. 18). After three days, a man is permitted to enter כול עיר המקדש. With the addition of כול, the purification process endows a greater spatial allowance of כול עיר המקדש, as compared to עיר המקדש for a venereal discharge.

Ancient Judaism', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 43 (1975), 68-86 (p. 24). All rites of purification were aimed at one goal: to permit participation in the cult.

[528] Karen Pusey, 'Jewish Proselyte Baptism', *Expository Times*, 95 (1984), 141-145 (p. 141).

[529] Hannah Harrington, 'Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran', in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), pp. 187-204 (p. 188). The process of initiating outsiders into the sect underscores their ritual impurity, because they were required to undergo water rituals (for example, 1QS 5:4,13-14). As for moral impurity, the Temple Scroll imposes ritual impurity restrictions as a protection from moral impurity. 1QS 3 stipulates that, in order to enter the covenant of God, his sins are expiated by the sprinkling with purifying water; he can now walk perfectly in all the ways of divine command. The rubicon from sin and impurity to life and purity has thereby been passed.

Banishment from כול המקדש applies to those who have had a nocturnal emission. Once purified, they are allowed into the subspaces of המקדש. It can be thus seen that both המקדש and עיר המקדש have been qualified by כול. To reinforce the point of כול, we can see how the base text (Lev. 15:13) does not include כול. There is no כול in ורחץ בשרו במים חיים וטהר, 'and he shall bathe his flesh' after a discharge. However, the Temple Scroll, with its addition of כול, is more specific about washing 'all his flesh', not just a specific part of the body. This approach would support the scroll's use of כול as a space modifier; that is to say, the space has been modified into subspaces.[530]

An increasing gradient of allowance appears towards המקדש, running from כול עיר המקדש for marital emission, to כול המקדש for nocturnal emission, to המקדש following purification from nocturnal emission. This gradient is predicated either on the voluntary nature of these impurities or the absence of women. From this, we can see that purification after involuntary nocturnal emission, without the involvement of women, brings us closest to המקדש. Those who have purified themselves after emission within marriage are merely debarred from the subspaces of כול עיר המקדש for three days, without any re-entry requirements, except to purify during those three days. They can then resume access to those lived subspaces that are confluent with המקדש. Is it possible that המקדש (line 10), after purifying from nocturnal emission, could just have been shorthand for כול המקדש (line 8)? This would be spatially consistent.

However, the absence of כול is significant for those with an impure discharge. For such individuals who were banished from מקדשי, entry to עיר המקדש is allowed. The text intervenes with other sexual impurities until six lines later, where it states they are allowed into עיר המקדש,

---

[530] Dorothea Erbele-Küster discusses כול in the context of washing, although confining herself to Lev. 15:7 (Dorothea Erbele-Küster, 'Body, Gender and Purity', p. 90). The object of washing is not just the male member, to which בשר refers in Lev. 15:3 but rather the entire body.

without כול. The absence of כול infers that, even after rigorous purification, an impure discharge carries a greater spatial stringency. Any man with an impure discharge is banished from המקדשי, 'my Temple' (45:10), and may return after 7 days of purification (45:15). The text states, as does the base text (Lev. 15:13), 'for seven days for his purification'. This counting of seven consecutive days starts from when he becomes clean. Meanwhile, he is in quarantine east of the city (46:17-18). After purification whilst in quarantine, he may enter עיר המקדש (45:16-17). There is an apparent inconsistency in that he has been banned from the divinely lived Thirdspace המקדשי for an unspecified time but allowed back to the Thirdspace of עיר המקדש after seven days. המקדשי stands alone and is not linked at that point in the text with עיר. If the experience of the divine occurs in both these Thirdspaces, it appears that the text implies that those bearing a venereal discharge are being judged as medically unhealthy and impure, by the word מקדשי.

With the addition of עיר, the phrase כול המקדש soon becomes more complex. מקרה לילה, 'nocturnal emission', forbids entry for three days to כול המקדש (45:7-8). עם אשתו שכבת זרע, marital emission, as noted above, calls for an exclusion from כול עיר המקדש for 3 days. Two questions now arise: i) as to why עיר has been introduced for a situation which is not involuntary and ii) the spatial implication of the addition of עיר. The involuntary act of a nocturnal emission, although qualifying as an impurity, is not willed. Schiffman limits his analysis of this particular matter in making no distinction here between seminal emissions and 'sexual relations'; both require a three-day exclusion. This leads him to conclude that 'Temple City' and 'Temple' are 'one and the same thing', not the entire city of Jerusalem.[531] However, nocturnal emission is devoid of

---

[531] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 57-58; *TS* p. 121. Schiffman contests Yadin's view that the Temple city was the entire city of Jerusalem. The banning of entry from any part of the Temple city would be consistent with Yadin's view that the Essene community was celibate. Schiffman supports his argument by observing that 45:11 opens with 'And', which implies that it is closely connected to what precedes it, that is to say, 45:7-10, dealing with seminal emissions. He notes the paragraphing spaces in lines 7 and 12, before and after this unit, making it a distinct block, based on Deut. 23:11. This base text states that anyone, who has had a seminal emission is excluded from the entire Temple for three days. The scroll's text then states that anyone who has had sexual relations is debarred from the Temple City for three days. Schiffman jumps to the conclusion that

physical or emotional connection, purpose or interest. There is no cognition of space as lived but rather the result of a subconscious human thought process; in other words, a lack of culpability. So, it would seem that the addition of עיר is associated with impurities that are willed; they are lived experiences and involve other people.[532] It is the Thirdspace of emotional involvement arising from the conception of the space in which it is fully lived. From a spatial perspective, its addition is a reminder of that very idea of social interaction and responsibility, rather than simply expressing anything structural, that we would usually understand by עיר.

Conclusion

We summarise by considering עיר המקדש as a single spatial unit, rather than two separate entities. The word בשר assists in this contention. An unhealthy venereal discharge debars entry to מקדשי (45:10) because such a discharge is impure. מקדשי is the place of absolute divine authority and power. This stringency is mitigated later on, in that entry to עיר המקדש is permitted, only after the act of purification, ורחץ את כול בשרו, 'and wash all his flesh' (45:16). Thus, by the bathing of flesh, עיר המקדש is now a conceptually pure space *via* the context of ורחץ את כול בשרו. The space of מקדשי is now spatially part of עיר which is portrayed in the text as a space transition between the human experience of impurity and the human awareness of the divine presence. This interpretation is supported by the argument that, if the previous point about כול is applied, then עיר המקדש is a subspace of כול עיר המקדש (45:11-12). The absence of כול in עיר המקדש (45:16-17) indicates that there are no permissible subspaces within עיר המקדש for a man with a venereal

---

there is a direct parallel between these two terms. When viewed in the passage as a totality, the Temple City and the Temple are the same, i.e. the temple area. He reads lines 45:15-17, regarding areas separate from the Temple City for those with a discharge or contact with the dead, as laws referring to the Temple City, not the entire city of Jerusalem. This deduction seems too much of a leap.

[532] It is interesting to note that the impurities of those who have touched a corpse (45:17) and been stricken with disease (45:18) are also debarred, but without mention of time frames. I have no explanation for this at this stage. See also Wassen, p. 101. She acknowledges that a nocturnal emission is 'unpredictable and can occur within the city'; such a man is debarred from the temple.

discharge until he has washed 'all his flesh'.[533] The addition in the text of עיר, as a socially produced lived space, confers a lived experience to המקדש. That is to say, it is the place where a purified man is permitted to be because he is now pure. The change from מקדשי (45:10) to המקדש (45:11) implies that the purified man is now experiencing the space of עיר המקדש within that space of divine intention. So עיר המקדש is a spatial unit, relevant in terms of Thirdspace, rather than a statement merely of the physicality of two separate First and Secondspaces.[534]

---

[533] There is no reference to women, although they could also be infected. The environment of the Temple Scroll is male-dominated.

[534] We are reminded that Firstspace represents physicality, measurements, geographical position and its physical relationship to neighbouring spaces. Secondspace represents the use for which the space is intended. This therefore involves planning and intentions about how it is to be used. Thirdspace is another way of thinking about social production of human spatiality that incorporates First and Secondspaces. It involves the experience of being a fully lived space, involving imagination and collective experience. See Edward W. Soja, *Postmetropolis* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), pp. 10-11.

CHAPTER 5

Spatial Analysis of Column 46

Introduction

Whereas column 45 dwells on entry qualifications, this column rests on how עיר המקדש becomes

pure. It describes the structural and measurement details of the מקדש and the surrounding חיל.

[535] It also raises an opportunity for a spatial analysis of the חיל beyond its mere physicality, along

with its relation to the מקדש and עיר. The cubit dimensions of the חיל and the outer court (40:7-8)

are seemingly excessive in relation to Jerusalem of the day.[536] As previously declared, we shall

now put aside any pre-conceived notion that the structure should be placed in Jerusalem, since it

is absent in the extant text. The forthcoming spatial discussion will be predicated on the structural

impossibility for it to be situated in Jerusalem because of limited available space, according to

the work of Magen Broshi.[537] Michael Wise acknowledges these difficulties of accommodation

and views its massive construction as in keeping with eschatological tradition, with reference to

the New Jerusalem text.[538] The outer court encompassed an area of 160 acres; Herod's temple

was a quarter of that size. This construction would be topographically challenging in terms of

---

[535] Translated variously: 'rampart' (PTSDSSP p. 113), 'trench' (*DSSSE* p. 1265), 'embankment' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41), 'ditch' (*CDSSE* p. 207), 'barrier' (*TS* p. 125), 'dry moat' (*DSSNT* p. 477).

[536] Robert Balgarnie Y. Scott, 'The Hebrew Cubit', *JBL* 77 (1958), 205-215 (p. 214). Scott's survey of the Ancient Near East and biblical evidence concludes that the Israelite common cubit was a slightly shorter version of the Egyptian cubit of six palms and 24 fingers, whose range was 17.4-17 inches (444-450 mm), very close to 17.52 inches (444.5 mm) in length. However, the Temple Scroll postdates the ancient Israelites. The measuring reed for Ezekiel's temple adds one handbreadth to the cubit (Ezek. 40:5; 43:13). 18 inches would be a reasonable approximation.

[537] Magen Broshi, 'The Gigantic Dimensions', p. 37. Broshi's conversion of 1600 cubits to 2500 feet would result in a cubit measuring 18.75 inches.

[538] Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study*, p. 83.

manpower and materials, in that levelling the ground would require filling in the Kidron Valley to raise it 250 feet on the east and quarrying rock from the west. The outer court would thus extend from the present Damascus Gate in the west to the Mount of Olives in the east. The discussion will take a fresh approach to the spatial concept of חיל, מקדש and עיר.

5.1 Translation of column 46

Whereas column 45 dwells on entry criteria, column 46 details how the מקדש עיר is made to be holy through purity. עיר and מקדש are emboldened:

1 [   ] [שר ה]   גבולו[539] אשר לו] א ישכ[ון]

2 [אשר] השערים גגי על [ו הפנימית בחצר אשר [שי מקד על טמא עוף [540]

3 [ם] לעול מקדשי בתוך היות [541]ל[ירד לוא טמא עוף] וכול החיצונה לחצר

4 *vacat*   בתוכם כן[ו]ש אני אשר הימים כול ועד

5 רחב החיצונה מחצר לחוץ סביב רובד ועשיתה   *vacat*

6 ושתים כולמה השערים פתחי פי על באמה עשרה ארבע

7 עליו ישראל בני עולים יהיו אשר לו תעשה מעלה עשרה

8 *vacat*   \   מקדשי אל לבוא

9 יהיה אשר באמה מאה רחב **למקדש** סביב חיל ועשיתה

10 תוך אל בלע באים יהיו ולוא **לעיר** הקודש **מקדש** בין מבדיל

11 **ממקדשי** ויראו **מקדשי** את וקדשו יחללוחו ולוא **מקדשי**

12 *vacat*   בתכמה שוכן אנוכי אשר

13 שמה יוצאים יהיו אשר **העיר** מן חוץ יד מקום להמה ועשיתה

14 בתוכמה וברות ומקורים בתים **לעיר** המערב לצפון לחוץ

15 רחוק לכול נראה [542] תהיה ולוֹא תהיה תוכמה אל יורדת הצואה תהיה אשר

---

[539] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 124) state these letters are visible on the top line of a fragment adhering to the front of column 45.

[540] This badly degraded line offers differing reconstructions. על גגי השערים is agreed by Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p.124). See also *PTSDSSP* (p. 124) and *DSSSE* (p. 1264).

[541] This vacat is left *vacat* blank except for the *lamed* (PTSDSSP p. 112). Qimron concurs (*The Temple Scroll*, p. 66). The photograph shows a large defect on the parchment; the only legible word being היות.

[542] ולוֹא is superscripted above תהיה, imp. fem.sing. of היה, referring to צואה in the previous line.

¹⁶ מן **העיר** שלושות אלפים אמה *vacat* ועשיתה

¹⁷ שלושה מקומות למזרח **העיר** מובדלים זה מזה אשר יהיו

¹⁸ באים המצורעים והזבים והאנשים אשר יהיה להמה מקרה

¹ [fragments of words] shall no[t] dwe[ll]⁵⁴³

² unclean winged bird⁵⁴⁴ upon [my] Temple⁵⁴⁵ upon my roof of the gates [which lead into]

³ to the outer courtyard and every [impure bird may not descend to] be in the midst of my sacred

place forever and

⁴ ever all the days which I dwell in their midst

⁵ *vacat* And you⁵⁴⁶ will make a terrace⁵⁴⁷ around the outside width of the outer court

⁶ fourteen cubits wide like the entrances, including the openings all the gates and twelve

⁷ steps you shall make for it to on which the sons of Israel will go up

⁸ in order to enter my sacred place.

⁹ You will make a rampart⁵⁴⁸ around the sacred place, a hundred cubits width, which will

¹⁰ separate the holy temple from the city⁵⁴⁹. And they will not be engulfed⁵⁵⁰ entering into

their midst

---

⁵⁴³ The translation of this fragmentary line is suggested variously, 'no]t fly(?)' (Yadin, II, p. 196); '[shall n]ot [fly any?]' (Johann Maier); '[…its border so that there does] not si[t any]' (*DSSSE* p. 1265); '…[No] unclean bird shall fly' (Vermes, p. 206); '[…No] unclean bid is to fly over [My] temp[le' (*DSSNT* p. 477).

⁵⁴⁴ Collective for 'flying creatures' (BDB p. 733). 'fowls' (Lev. 6:13).

⁵⁴⁵ '[My] Temple' (*TS* p. 125; *DSSSE* p. 1265); 'sanctuary' (Johann Maier, p. 41; *CDSSE* p. 207; PTSDSSP p. 113). This is not the entire city but specifically מקדשי. The photograph shows degradation beyond legibility. See <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

⁵⁴⁶ The use of the singular would indicate a responsibility of one man, perhaps the High Priest, to supervise and ensure the construction is correctly executed; he could not construct it single-handedly. The same applies to lines 7, 9, 13 and 16.

⁵⁴⁷ Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 125) point out that the word רובד is absent in the Bible but is found in Mishnaic Hebrew.

⁵⁴⁸ 'fosse' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 198); 'embankment' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41); 'trench' (*DSSSE* p. 1265); 'barrier' (*TS* p.125); 'dry moat' (*DSSNT* p. 477); 'ditch' (*CDSSE* p. 207); 'rampart' (PTSDSSP p. 111); 'fortress' (BDB p. 298).

⁵⁴⁹ The חיל enhances the 'sacred place' into מקדשי in the next line.

⁵⁵⁰ בלע, 'swallowed, engulfed', has thrown up varying translations of this line, each skirting the challenge of בלע: 'so they do not enter suddenly' (*TS* p. 125); 'they shall not enter confused' (PTSDSSP p. 113). 'they shall not enter unprepared' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41). 'so that no one can rush' (*CDSSE* p. 107). 'Therewith they will not enter My temple without thought' (*DSSNT* p. 477). 'they will not enter suddenly my temple (*DSSSE* p. 1265). Maier captures the essence of בלע, in not being distracted; 'so they may not come suddenly into my temple' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 198).

11 of my temple and make holy my temple, [so as] not to defile [it].[551] And they will fear my

temple [552]

12 in which I dwell in their midst

13 and you shall make for them a latrine[553] away[554] from the city[555] to where they will go

14 beyond[556] the northwest of the city, outhouses with rafters[557] and pits in their midst[558]

15 into which excrement shall descend into their midst and will not be seen from any distance;[559]

---

[551] Lines 10b-11a are translated variously as: 'so that they may not come suddenly into my temple and desecrate it' (Yadin, II, p. 198); 'so that they do not enter suddenly into my Temple lest they desecrate it' (*TS* p. 125); 'and they will not enter suddenly my temple and will not defile it' (*DSSSE* p. 1265); 'and they shall not enter unprepared into my sanctuary and they shall not profane it' (Johann Maier, p. 41); 'so that they shall not enter confused into the midst of my sanctuary and they shall not profane it (PTSDSSP p. 113). 'Therewith they will not enter my Temple without thought' (*DSSNT* p. 477); 'so that no one can rush into my sanctuary and defile it. They shall sanctify my sanctuary and hold it in awe' (Vermes, p. 107).

[552] The problematic word is בלע 'swallow', 'engulf, 'confused' (BDB p. 118; *DCH* II, p. 179), around which these varying translations have skirted. Surely בלע must convey the idea that anyone entering should not be self-consumed with high spirits of anticipation. Those who are eligible for entry into this Thirdspace cannot be engulfed in their own Thirdspace. 'so that they do not enter suddenly' *(TS* p. 125). 'may not enter confused' (PTSDSSP p. 113). 'may not enter my Temple without thought' (*DSSNT* p. 4770. 'and they will not enter suddenly my temple' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). 'no one can rush into' (*CDSSE* p. 207). These translations attempt to capture the idea that the חיל provides time in which to calm down and cast off any sense of anticipatory excitement prior to entry.

[553] מקום יד 'place of the hand', a euphemism for latrine.

[554] חוץ מן 'outside from'. I have modified this to 'away from' to catch the sense of a distance of exclusion.

[555] The base text Deut. 23:13 deals with latrines מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp', whereas the scroll specifies עיר.

[556] לחוץ 'to outside'. I have modified this to 'beyond'. 'out, to the northwest of the city' (Yadin, II, p. 383). 'out there, on the northwest of the city' (*DSSNT* p. 477). 'outside, to the north-west of the city' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41 and *CDSSE* p. 207).

[557] קרה, 'beam', 'rafter'. בתים ומקורים = קורה = beam): 'roofed houses' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 199; *CDSSE* p.107); 'roofed buildings (*TS* p. 127); 'houses with beams' (*DSSSE* p. 1265); 'small houses, and furnished with beams' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41); 'roofed outhouses' (*DSSNT* p. 477). Yadin and Schiffman and Gross recognise the purity concept of privacy from view with their translations 'roofed houses' (Yadin, II, p. 199) and 'roofed buildings' (*TS* p. 127) although the Hebrew גג, 'roof', is not in the text. I use 'rafter', an integral roofing structure on which can be laid tiles or other roofing material. As they are distant, I have adopted 'outhouses' (*DSSNT* p. 477).

[558] The verb 'to be' is omitted in the text and also in the English translations of Yigael Yadin (II, p. 199) and Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41. ובורות בתוכמה 'pits inside them' (*TS* p. 127); 'pits within them' (Yadin, II, p. 199); 'pits in their midst' (*DSSSE* p. 1265; PTSDSSP p. 113); 'with holes in them' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41; *CDSSE* p. 207).

[559] ולוא תהיה נראה לכול רחוק מן העיר is translated prosaically: '[so that] it will [not] be visible from any distance from the city' (Yigael Yadin, II, pp. 199-200). '[so that] it will [not] be visible to anyone' (*TS* p. 127). 'and shall not be visible to anyone at a distance from the city' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). 'and will [not] remain visible, [and] with a minimum distance from the city' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41). 'it shall be far enough not to be visible from the city' (*CDSSE* p. 207). 'so as not to be visible' (*DSSNT* p. 477). 'and it shall not be seen by anyone, [It shall be] at a distance from the city' (PTSDSSP p. 113). תהיה, as noted previously, is imp.fem.sing. and must refer to צואה, 'excrement', not מקום יד.

16   from the city, three thousand cubits[560] [away] and you shall make

17   three places east of the city separated one from another,[561] to where

18   the lepers will come,[562] and those with an unhealthy discharge[563] and men who have had an

    emission

5.2 Where is עיר to be located?

There is no indication in the scroll's text that the scroll's new ideals were to be applied specifically to the Jerusalem temple. It could well be argued that such ideals were being projected onto an eschatological temple of unspecified locus, especially as Jerusalem is not mentioned in the extant scroll.[564] Even if 'Jerusalem' was regarded as assumed knowledge by those who wrote the scroll, as a place of pivotal religious importance, it would surely have appeared somewhere in the sixty-six extant columns. Perhaps that would explain its omission. Nevertheless, rather than be engulfed in conjecture, we have taken the text at face value and avoided any assumptions about this conspicuous absence.

Before proceeding to a spatial analysis of column 46, the challenging topography of this column diverts us temporarily to the question as to the envisaged locus of עיר, if not Jerusalem which is not named in the scroll. This is an important question which has not yet attracted any scholarly

---

[560] The base text Num. 35:4-5 specifies a less stringent two thousand cubits from the wall of the city.

[561] 'separating this from that' (PTSDSSP p. 113). 'separated from one another' (Yadin, II, p. 200). Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 41. 'separate from each other' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). 'divided from one another' (*CDSSE* p. 207).

[562] 'skin disease' (PTSDSSP p. 115). Schiffman and Gross just transliterate the Hebrew *meṣora'im* (*TS* p. 127). 'the lepers' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 200, *DSSSE* p. 1265, *CDSSE* p. 207 and Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll* (p. 41). צרע, 'struck with leprosy' (BDB p. 862).

[563] 'gonorrhea' (*TS* p. 127); 'gonorrhoeics' (Jacob Milgrom, 'Studies', 513); 'discharge' (Yigael Yadin, II. p. 200); PTSDSSP (p. 115); *DSSSE* (p. 1265); Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll* (p. 41); 'genital flux' (*DSSNT* p. 478); 'flux' (*CDSSE* p. 207). The implication here is penile fluid, other than urine or semen. As purity is predicated on health, not sickness, 'those with an unhealthy discharge' would be appropriate.

[564] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 381-401; Lawrence H. Schiffman 'The Theology of the Temple Scroll', 118-123. See also Jacob Milgrom, 'Sabbath and the Temple City', 25-27; Yigael Yadin, *Jerusalem Revisited* (Jerusalem: Israel Archaeological Society, 1975), pp. 91-93.

discussion. By way of background, the city, as such, was not viewed favourably by the Hebrew Bible prophets, who railed against it as a place of false refuge.[565] According to Robert Scott, the prophetic view was concerned not so much about deviation by the individual from societal norms, but rather that the individual took on the characteristics of the society which permeated the political, cultural and economic ethos.[566] The city was therefore in a position to be judged by God and found to be wanting. It would appear from this argument that the individual's moral control was inevitably subsumed by city society which, in turn, had been tarnished by the absolute quality of 'city', a place which is innately bad. To the scroll's author, the contemporary temple in Jerusalem was substandard to the point of being ungodly. This would not necessarily reflect on cities generally because the scroll's focus was specifically עיר המקדש rather than the generic 'city'. The absence of Jerusalem would therefore suggest an alternative locus for a temple of such enormous dimensions such that its reality may not have been achievable and its activities implementable. Pesher Habakkuk (12:17) would indicate that the contemporary Jerusalem was in the grip of an illegitimate priesthood in the personage of the Wicked Priest.[567] García Martínez argues that, under such circumstances, it was no wonder that the early community decided to separate from what it saw as an ungodly Jerusalem to re-locate elsewhere, which he assumed to be the desert.[568] This re-location away from Jerusalem leads to the possibility of a textual utopia envisioned by its author.[569] It would be a locus where, even without total physical realisation,

---

[565] Isa. 2:12-15; 17:9-10; 22:8-11; 25:12; 26:1; 33:15-16; Jer. 5: 14-15, 17; 21:7-8, 13-14; Hos. 2:14.

[566] Robert BalgarnieY. Scott, *The Relevance of the Prophets* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), pp. 180, 182.

[567] 'he will smite you; because of the murder and injustice in the land and the city and all who live in it'. The 'city' refers to Jerusalem. See *DSSNT* p. 122.

[568] Florentino García Martínez, 'New Jerusalem at Qumran and in the New Testament', in *The Land of Israel in the Bible, History, Theology*, ed. by Edward Noort, Jacques van Ruiten and Jacobus Cornelis de Vos (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 277-89 (p. 285). He cites 1QS 8:5 as indicating the desert for the new locus, although the passage makes no direct reference to the desert: 'a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holiest for Aaron'.

[569] Modern utopian theory is secular and does not deal with the theology of good and evil (Molly M. Zahn, *personal communication*). There is no strict definition of a utopian text. Such descriptors vary from a strict literary genre to the desire for a better way of being or living. See Ruth Levitas, 'Utopia as Method', p. 104. See also Frauke Uhlenbruch, 'Reconstrucing Realities', pp. 191-194.

change at least could be inspired. In this regard, in view of the Sinaitic setting of the first extant

column (column 2), the desert would not be outside the bounds of possibility (Exod. 34: 10-16).

The desert Nomadic Idea, expounded by John Flight, presented a logical antithesis to the city

ideal.[570] Flight's early twentieth century insights have contributed to our understanding of the

role of the prophets in their rejection of the city as a religious ideal. If we take the location of

עיר המקדש away from Jerusalem, the nomadic idea, as argued by Flight, would direct our attention

to the desert as an ideal place because of its strong identity with the Covenant.[571]

The desert was the alternative locus of spiritual re-purification. This is potentially an important

contribution to our future discussion of the possible location of the עיר המקדש of the Temple

Scroll. The religion of Israel, in Flight's view, cannot be fully appreciated without taking into

account its nomadic elements. In this context, we cannot start further back than the time of Moses

because, according to tradition, he was the founder of the desert religion of Yahweh.[572] During

the literary event of the Sinai sojourn, the main distinguishing feature of the Israelite religion

from the common Semitic nomad type was the development of monolatry, the exclusive worship

of Yahweh. This was an advance over its inclusivity with Baal and Asherah amongst others (2

Kgs. 23: 4-5) although monolatry would take time to be fully established as the Babylonian exile

approached (2 Kgs. 24: 10).[573] As a response to the problems of defection from Yahweh, Flight

views the prophets as having realised that the narrative simplicity of the age of Moses, according

its literary event, must return in order to save the Israelites, even if that restoration were to be

---

[570] John W. Flight, 'Nomadic Idea', 210. Yahweh was the nomads' God, a God closely associated with the desert around Sinai (p.198). Flight attributes the phrase 'nomadic ideal' to Budde. See Karl Budde, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', *New World*, 4 (1895), 726-45.

[571] John W. Flight, 'Nomadic Idea', 210.

[572] Ibid., 197. In addition, the simple life of the desert would provide an easier environment for the exclusive and undistracted worship of Yahweh.

[573] Ibid., 197, 199. Isa. 1:29: 'For you shall be ashamed of the oaks in which you delighted; and you shall blush for the gardens that you have chosen'; Jer. 2:27: 'For they have turned their back to me and not their faces. But in the time of their trouble they say, 'Come and save us!''.

achieved through a catastrophe, expressed by prophetic fiery messages. These impending scenarios would work against external Canaanite temptations that had distracted the people away from Yahweh, resulting in a 'remnant' faithful to Yahweh. To drive this point home, Hosea reminded his audience of the exodus from Egypt, 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called my son out of Egypt (Hos. 11:1), 'By a prophet the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt and by a prophet he was guarded (12:13), 'Yet I been the LORD your God ever since the land of Egypt; you know no God but me and besides me there is no saviour' (13:4) and Amos 'Also I brought you up out of the land of Egypt…' (Amos 2:10). The restoration of the city of righteousness is announced by Isaiah, 'And I will restore the judges as at the first and your counsellors as at the beginning. Afterwards you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city' (Isa. 1:26). Flight views 'as at the first' as meaning the early desert days at a time of close attachment to Yahweh. Jeremiah alludes to the days of old '…Thus said the LORD, I remember the devotion of your youth, your love as a bride, how you followed me in the wilderness…Israel was holy to the LORD…' (Jer. 2: 2-3).

Niels-Erik Andreasen contests the concept of a Nomadic Ideal which, he felt, evolved from a fundamental rejection of the city in the Hebrew Bible. Desert motifs undeniably play an important role. However, the opinion that those motifs actually produced a desert idealism cannot be sustained from the evidence.[574] The desert conveyed a negative message in the Hebrew Bible as a symbol of punishment and death. It did not itself present an ideal to the Israelites but rather it presented the deeds of Yahweh in the desert.[575] Without divine guidance, the desert would otherwise serve as a warning rather than provide an ideal for social structure. Andreasen proposes a reassessment of early Israelite city evolution, the basis for which he cites studies of Ancient

---

[574] Niels-Eric Andreasen, 'Town and Country in the Old Testament', *Encounter*, 42 (1981), 259-275 (p. 260). See also R. T. Anderson, 'The Role of the Desert in Israelite Thought', *JBR* 27 (1959), 41-44. Incidentally, Andreasen erroneously quoted '*JBL*'. The nomadic ideal was championed by John W. Flight, 'Nomadic Idea', 158-226.

[575] Niels-Eric Andreasen, 260. See also Frank S. Frick, *City in Ancient Israel*, p. 219.

Near East societies.[576] The early Israelites did not emerge as desert nomads but comprised agriculturalists who lived near urban centres. Whereas the ambient Canaanite urban society functioned as a military autocracy of the city and surrounding populations, Israel strove for a tribal government of personal autonomy and equality.[577] How did these ideals, rather than any desert ideal, generate a Hebrew Bible bias against the city? Andreasen suggests that Israel's 'bad experience with cities' arose from its experience of living among cities and its consequent adverse valuation of city culture; this was not to be interpreted as an inherent opposition to the city. In support, he then cites various biblical passages, starting with the Cain and Abel saga. He disagrees with the notion of a conflict between two cultures of the secure farmer and the rootless shepherd, the former claiming victory over the latter. [578] These dated views reflect the Conquest

---

[576] Niels-Eric Andreasen, 260. See also George E. Mendenhall, 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 25 (1962), 67-85: Mendenhall disagrees with the notion that tribalism originated from nomadism. He presents two traditional scholarly views that 1) the Twelve Tribes conducted a systematic military campaign starting in Transjordan, ending up in northern Palestine and 2) the Tribes infiltrated peacefully into the settled land and that the destruction of cities had nothing to do with Israel. These views are based on the assumptions that 1) the Tribes just entered Palestine prior to or simultaneously with conquest, 2) the Tribes were nomads and 3) the Tribal solidarity was based on the contrast between Israelite and Canaanite. Mendenhall challenges the assumption that the early Israelites were nomads because 'it 'is entirely in the face of both biblical and extra-biblical evidence'. He describes as scholarly 'obsession' that the early Israelites must have been nomads, he challenges this on the basis that the city of Athens was divided into 'tribes' as was Byblos and 'modern north Syria'. He stresses that there is no justification that tribal organisation must have originated from a tribal background. A tribe was a larger tribal societal unit which 'transcended the immediate environment of an individual unit, usually a village, upon which the village could rely for aid against attack too strong for it to cope unaided'. See also Norman K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (London: SCM, 1990): 'Urban statism and rural tribalism are antagonistic morphemes' (p. 467). 'The urban centre would extend its powerful sway into the countryside as far as possible such that the affected villages would become centres of conflict. The city depended on surplus rural produce such that the rural communities would become articulate and organised with the resulting potential to overthrow central power' (p. 468).

[577] Niels-Eric Andreasen, p.261. See also Brendon C. Benz, *The Land before the Kingdom of Israel: A History of the Southern Levant and the People Who Populated It* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016), pp. 368, 382. The distinction between the urban Canaanite and the rural Israelite holds true whether Israel is believed to have consisted as a geographical outsider or to have taken share amongst the indigenous population. The Canaanites revered a variey of gods although the Israelites gradually set themselves apart by their belief in Yahweh. Later theological development is reflected in such texts as Deuteronomy.

[578] Niels-Eric Andreasen, 259. See also A. Leo Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1964), pp. 109-140. Oppenheim attributes this to a lack of Mesopotamian records. He notes the lack of data between city and rural dwellers in the cuneiform sources. He cites the best example of where archaeological reports coincide with literary records to be the πολις, whose data survives because of the inhabitants were articulate enough to keep records to describe the process of urbanisation.

Model which has given way more recently to the idea of a group that emerged from the Canaanites themselves.[579] Shemaryahu Talmon has also argued against the nomadic element of the Desert Motif in that Israel cannot be defined as a truly nomadic society but rather a semi-settled society. Nomadic society itself is a regression from a higher status of society rather than a desirable achievement.[580]

The idea of re-location is discussed by Deborah Rooke. In her analysis, Ezekiel's vision, implies the temple was situated on a mountain, very likely Mount Zion (40:2). On the basis that the temple was located in the city, the temple was placed in city of old before the exile, in the territory of Judah. Later on in the vision, the new location was to belong to the 'whole house of Israel' (45:6). This land is in addition to the twelve tribes, containing the city and its sanctuary.[581]

My argument is that the Temple Scroll's author was seeking a more observant spiritual base than was currently on offer in Jerusalem under the Hasmoneans. Indeed, a contrary view would suggest that this envisaged and spiritually enhanced structure should have been in Jerusalem in the first place. The absence of Jerusalem and any inference would not support this. Although writing well before the scroll was discovered, Flight raises the desert as an important alternative. Its profound spiritual significance harks back to the divine covenant delivered there. This is supported by the text of the scroll's first extant column, designated column 2, which coalesces

---

[579] Lily Agranat-Tamir and others, 'The Genomic History of the Bronze Age Southern Levant', *Cell*, 181 (2020), 1146-1157 (pp. 1153-4).

[580] Shemaryahu Talmon, 'The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature', in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 31-63 (pp. 35-36). Over the development of the biblical corpus, a motif is one which is used and reused. The Temple Scroll, of course, had not been published at the time of Talmon's article. Motifs are concrete examples of a theme. See Alison Schofield, 'The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. by K. Pomykala (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), pp. 37-53 (p. 39, n.3). Schofield's discussion of sectarian material does not apply to the pre-sectarian Temple Scroll.

[581] Deborah W. Rooke, 'Urban Planning According to Ezekiel', in *The City in the Bible: Critical, Literary and Exegetical Approaches*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 123-143 (p. 127).

material from the desert setting of Exodus 34.[582] If we are to consider relocation, the issue of portability arises. The desert tabernacle was in effect a portable temple, its own particular conception of space. However, portability did not undermine its importance as a space of the divine presence. The portable tabernacle narrative served as a means of considering the four dimensions of cultic activity: place, time, act of ceremony performed and the person or personnel performing the ceremony.[583] In the process of being moved from place to place, the dissembled tabernacle would necessarily come into contact with space that, in the new location, would then be considered as לחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp' (Lev. 13:46). During the process of this moving, the tabernacle and its furnishing would no longer function as social space, even though the individual components retained their holiness.[584] Moving of the sanctuary as a whole space would therefore not undermine its innate holiness. Clearly, the desert tabernacle cannot compare physically with the Temple Scroll structure but our considerations of movement would nevertheless support the idea of relocation.

The absence of a location in the text opens up a novel discussion about this overlooked feature. Perhaps the near-universal acceptance that it was to be Jerusalem would account for this scholarly hiatus. The next section of this study leads us into some fresh thinking on the matter

5.3 Spatial Analysis

The first and second מקדשי relate to birds, which are forbidden on the temple roof. Their free flight and presence on the roof lie outside the bounds of human purity ritual. It therefore lies outside the divine realm, expressed as מקדשי. The use of two birds in the purification ritual of the leper (Lev. 14:4-7) resonates with the scapegoat narrative (Lev.16:7-10). The meaning of the

---

[582] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 20) restore 1a-7b in accordance with Exod. 34: 10-13. 7c-11b accords with Deut. 7: 25-26.

[583] Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle*, p. 105.

[584] Ibid., p. 114.

phrase עוף טמא, 'unclean bird', may allude to the bird, the container and vector of sin cast off by the sinner. As מקדשי is the place of the divine presence, it would be the ultimate defilement for its roof to accommodate such a bird.

It is in this column, in which עיר appears five times, that the difficult issue of separateness between city and sanctuary arises. It deals with structures of purity, חיל 'rampart' and מקום יד, 'place of the hand', meaning 'latrine'. The post-purification spaces are: i) מקד[שי, (46: 2, 3 and 8); ii) היל סביב למקדש, 'a rampart around the Temple' (46:9), iii) תוך מקדשי, 'midst of my Temple' (46:10-11), and iv) מקדשי (46:11). עיר is expressed as Firstspace without any divine qualification, only when stating a relative position of the latrine. They are to be constructed at a specific location חוץ מין העיר, 'outside the city' (46:13), המערב לעיר, 'northwest of the city' (46:14) and שלושה מקומות למזרת העיר, 'three places east of the city' (46:17).

The third instance of מקדשי (46:8) is in relation to Firstspace also. It must be approached by twelve steps which gives it a Firstspace and physical Secondspace orientation.[585] The word עליו, 'up to it', (46:7) conveys the sense of an elevated location. The 'sons of Israel'[586] will conceive מקדשי as a space more than just a geographical entity; it is a Secondspace of divine power and authority as expressed by עליו. It has not yet reached the status of Thirdspace, as the 'sons' are not yet living their spiritual lives within and through it. A spatial reading of מקדשי would therefore bestow on it more than just a geographical Firstspace entity. מקדשי reverts to a Firstspace expression of המקדש in the construction of the חיל around the sanctuary (46:9). In the next line, it then becomes מקדש הקודש, 'holy', in its separation from the עיר (46:10) With reference to my

---

[585] This note serves as a reminder that Firstspace is understood in terms of physicality, geographical coordinates and its position in relation to neighbouring Firstspaces. Secondspace involves plans and intentions about how the space will be used. Thirdspace represents thoughts about how the space is used and lived. These categories are included in a given space; they are not mutually exclusive.

[586] Alternatively rendered as 'children of Israel'. בני, 'sons of', when placed with name of a specific location, denotes descendants, inhabitants or membership of that nation or family (BDB p. 120).

argument earlier, חיל represents a spatial entity which warns and prepares, rather than separates (§4.4). The climax of divine power, מקדשי, 'my temple' is expressed twice in the same line: מקדשי ולוא יחללוהו וקדשו את מקדשי ויראו ממקדשי (46:11). As the text implies in the previous line, ולוא יהיו באים בלע, 'they will not be engulfed', preparation to enter מקדשי demands total respect without compromise. My suggestion is that this passage conveys the sense that any fears of inadequate purity, intentional or otherwise, should be rectified prior to approaching עיר, yet alone מקדשי. Its function would therefore appear in the text as a physically described entity, as well as being symbolic as a spatial watershed.

As a boundary structure, חיל (46:9), if built as a rampart or trench, is not only impervious, without any gaps or gates but also unrealistically wide in the context of the limited available space of contemporary Jerusalem.[587] The same would apply to the outer court of the scroll's temple (40:8). These unrealistic dimensions would suggest that the author of the text envisaged placing these structures in a different locus, where they could be accommodated. This raises the possibilities of the wilderness of the biblical camp or a utopian setting. We have already seen that the described physical property of the חיל is a seemingly excessive width of a hundred cubits. We have no indication as to whether this a solid or hollow structure. Schiffman calls this a 'wide, empty space'.[588] In the absence of any verticality in the form of superstructure, there would be no physical hoop stress. The need for such width to support a superstructure, would therefore be technically unnecessary.[589] This would indeed suggest it is an empty flat space, in agreement with Schiffman. The instruction to build it is given in the singular: ועשיתה (46:9). The recipient

---

[587] Josephus, *Jewish War*, 5: 197: μετὰ δὲ τοὺς δεκατέσσαρας βαθμοὺς τὸ μέχρι τοῦ τείχους διάστημα πηχῶν ἦν δέκα, πᾶν ἰσόπεδον, 'beyond the fourteen steps, up to the wall, there was a space of ten cubits, evenly surfaced throughout'. This clearly conveys a limited space, across which one had to walk to reach the δεύτερον ἱερὸν ἅγιον ἐκαλεῖτο (195),'second holy temple so called'.

[588] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. xxvii.

[589] A wide base would be necessary to overcome not only vertical load but also a deforming lateral 'hoop' stress. This was appreciated in Roman times, an example being the Pantheon in Rome. See Ross King, *Brunelleschi's Dome* (London: Pimlico, 2005), pp. 30-31.

must be singular. One possibility is perhaps to the High Priest to supervise and ensure the construction is correctly executed, rather than for him to construct it single-handedly. The other possible recipients of this instruction are Israel as a single entity or, indeed, Moses himself. In the apportionment of the temple gates, the text makes an indirect reference to him as the sons of Aaron 'your brother' (44:5).[590] ועשיתה would derive from the singular 'you shall make' Sinaitic formula, expressed in Exodus 25-30, where it is repeated some thirty-eight times. Nevertheless, it is a meaningful site, occupying a space itself.

Does it have its own separate lived environment? The text does not mention gates or breaks in its structure to allow human movement in either direction. It is not, as Lefebvre would call it, a lived space.[591] In his discussion of religious and political space, he views distinguishable spaces, such as temples and monuments down to simple structures, such as a stone or hollow, as being governed by prohibition. He would regard it as a space without an environment; its mental and social components are indistinguishable. The anthropologist Victor Turner illustrates this transitional process through the lens of liminality. During the liminal period, the characteristics of the ritual subject are ambiguous. That is to say, he is not in possession of attributes from his former state or attributes which he is about to experience.[592]

On the subject of boundary, Martin Heidegger considers that boundary makes room for space.[593] He uses an analogy of a bridge straddling a stream. The stream has many spots where something

---

[590] The name of Moses is absent throughout, even in the biblical portions of the scroll. The indirect reference *via* his brother suggests that Moses was either the recipient of these divine utterances or just an emanuensis of the unmediated speech between God and the redactor of the text. See Wise, *Critical Study*, p. 88.

[591] Henri Lefebvre, p. 39.

[592] Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (London/New York: Routledge, 1969), p. 94. See also H.J.M. Van Deventer, 'Aspects of Liminality in the Book of Daniel', *Old Testament Essays*, 30 (2017), 443-4. This discusses 'ceremonial patterns' accompanying passage from one situation to another. The preliminary rites are the rights of separation; liminal of transition; post-liminal rights of incorporation. Strictly speaking, the transition through the חיל could be construed as 'ceremonial' in that it is a process which is necessary to be accepted by the divine as suitably purified.

[593] Martin Heidegger, 'Building Dwelling Thinking by Martin Heidegger (Translation and Commentary by Adam Bobeck)', trans. by Adam Bobeck (unpublished, Academia.edu), p. 9.

could be built. Once the bridge is laid, one of them emerges as a location because of the bridge. Thus, the bridge, which he calls a 'thing', makes a location, space. Such 'things' initially allow only spaces. He invokes the ancient Greek view that a boundary does not stop something. Instead, a boundary, ὅρισμος, is that from which something begins its nature; space, πέρας, is let into its boundary. That which is made room for, he argues, owes itself to a location and not from space in general. Heidegger then asks about the relation between location and space. The space allowed by his bridge contains many places at different distances from the bridge. These are mere positions between which there is a measurable distance. This distance, στάδιον, always has room made for it. The result is a στάδιον of its own kind. It is a space allowed in, by a 'thing', the bridge. Perhaps we could regard the חיל similarly. It is space for which room has been made by עיר and המקדש.

This raises the interesting question as to the spatial function of חיל in its relation to עיר. As I argued above, in view of its physical improbability in the context of available accommodation, חיל may well serve additionally as a metaphor to convey warning in the form of a spiritual boundary, rather than a physical barrier.[594] There is a sense that the חיל will convey a sense of change to those who enter מקדשי. The word בלע, translated here as 'engulfed', conveys the idea that anyone entering must not be self-consumed with one's own preoccupations. This would distract from the Thirdspace experience that would follow in מקדשי itself. It has been stated that there must be an overriding fear of transgression in God's place. This must be the ultimate in lived space of the divine will which extends beyond the confines of Firstspace and Secondspace.

<https://www.academia.edu/34279818/Building_Dwelling_Thinking_by_Martin_Heidegger_Translation_and_Commentary_by_Adam_Bobeck> [accessed 18.1.23].

[594] Schiffman recognises three ritual boundaries: The three-day boundary from 'My Temple' (52:14) outside which slaughter of a pure ox, sheep or goat is not allowed; the exchange of tithe, if it is too heavy, for money, with which grain can be purchased (43:12-15); the slaughter and consumption of a blemished animal is forbidden within 30 ris (52:17-18). See Lawrence H. Schiffman 'Sacred Spaces: The Land of Israel in the Temple Scroll', in *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the 2nd International Congress on Biblical Archaeology 1990* (Jerusalem: IES, 1993), pp. 398-410 (p. 404).

The ultimate location of holiness מקדשי appears three times in 46:11. מקדש is transformed into מקדשי by the making of the חיל.

The space of the חיל therefore provides a time for calming in preparation for entry. The notion of time, as a consequence of space, resonates with the creation narrative (Gen. 1-2:3). Following six days of geophysical creation, it is only with the creation of the Sabbath on the seventh day that the notion of time is introduced and made holy, ויקדש (Gen. 2:3). This raises the question as to whether the text infers that the חיל is part of the process of becoming holy, in preparation for entry to the מקדש. This profound purpose would place חיל in the realms of Thirdspace as a place for reflection. Even so, on the basis of what we have discussed, if חיל were to be regarded as non-physical, we still know very little about it. As a metaphor, it allows us to think of it in terms of סביב למקדש, 'around the Temple', for the purposes of either protection from without, or a lapse of holiness into the עיר from within the מקדש.[595]

The question still remains: Does the חיל, even as a container metaphor, actually divide the עיר from המקדש? This is an important question, as it challenges previous notions discussed above. Thus far, as we have already noted, scholars have attempted to analyse מקדש and עיר relative to each other, with conflicting and unresolved results. I have argued that חיל is also a spatial entity in its own right. Nevertheless, it is a space which contributes to the integrity of המקדש. Like any barrier, it does so by being a part of both עיר and מקדש. It is not just a Firstspace or a conceptualised Secondspace; 'it is more than the sum of two parts'.[596] It has been allocated a width of 100 cubits (46:9), the implication being that this is a significant space, enough perhaps to qualify it as a space with an environment. On the basis of my argument that it is envisaged to

---

[595] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors*, pp. 29-32. Lakoff and Johnson would categorise this as a 'container' metaphor. They explain the concept of 'container' by reference to our physical bodies; we are each a 'container' with an *in/out* orientation which we project onto other physical objects that are bounded by surfaces. See Alison Gray, 'Reflections', pp. 20-24.

[596] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', pp. 49-61 (p. 52).

be contributing to the process of becoming holy, its environment is shared between עיר and מקדש.

It is a Thirdspace, like עיר and מקדש, which is actually lived and experienced through its symbolic significance by being bound to עיר and מקדש. It follows that these three entities are bound in Thirdspace. Thus, through the lens of spatiality, the function of חיל seems to bind, rather than separate, contrary to Schiffman's reading.[597] In addition, my argument of חיל as an instrument of warning, rather than separation, would support the idea of חיל as a uniting and binding symbol.

What a contrast, then, with the lines that follow on the matter of latrines and their location (46:14-17). The text moves rapidly from the profoundly spiritual (46:12) to the most basic of bodily functions (46:14). Økland reads into this passage an 'outward movement' of God's voice radiating from the outer gates to as far as the latrines. The concept of holiness is reinforced by the invisibility of the latrines relative to the Holy of Holies.[598] The עיר is now merely a Firstspace reference point from which the facilities for this basic function must be constructed. מקדשי does not feature here. The word בתוכמה, 'in their midst', is massively contrasting in that it applies to both the fear of transgression and the pits into which excrement will be passed; these pits are 3000 cubits distance from the עיר (46:16). Clearly, בתוכמה refers to the midst of the intended toilet complex. Is the midst of people observing the divine instruction supposed to have a parallel with the midst of the toilet complex? Is this a clumsy oversight of the scroll's author? This is an observation, for which I cannot provide an explanation. That aside however, it is now apparent that עיר is repeatedly expressed as an extension from Firstspace into a Thirdspace category, a matter of vital importance as a socially experienced space.

---

[597] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 60. In his opinion, the text shows עיר in the sense of the city as an area of residence. The חיל is designed to separate the temenos of the Temple, ie עיר המקדש from the city of Jerusalem.

[598] Jorunn Økland, 'The Language of Gates and Entering', p. 159.

Conclusion

A spatial analysis of חיל is at the heart of a wider spatial understanding of the relationship between עיר and המקדש. The preposition סביב, 'around', indicates חיל as a container metaphor. Nevertheless, it could be regarded as a space that has been accommodated by עיר and המקדש, a space of liminality. The scroll's text does not refer to anything facilitating physical human movement, such as gates and breaks, even though it has a measured width of a hundred cubits. We have argued it as a Thirdspace structure of contemplation and preparation which binds, rather than separates or divides עיר from המקדש. Because of the problematic geophysical Firstspace realities, the location of עיר המקדש makes Jerusalem an unlikely Firstspace contender. The scroll's text makes no indication either because Jerusalem was assumed or that the omission was intentional. The latter gives rise to speculative thinking that the wilderness would give the opportunity for Israel to re-establish its relationship with the divine, rather than in Jerusalem whose temple was being managed unsatisfactorily. Spatial analysis, thus far, is driving the argument in favour of עיר המקדש as a single Thirdspace entity, rather than the thorny issue of separated Firstspace entities.

CHAPTER 6

Spatial Analysis of Column 47

Introduction

This column elaborates on the status of עריהמה, 'their cities' and עריכמה, 'your cities' to which we shall refer as 'other cities'. In this transcription, they are emboldened. For the purpose of this analysis, they could be classed as 'other cities'. These entities have not yet received any specific scholarly attention, except to distinguish them from 'my city'.[599] The aim of this chapter is to show that 'your' and 'their cities' are separate spatial entities, not just a collective comparator for 'my city'. Before we analyse this column, the unfortunate reality is that the scant nature of the surviving text of the first three lines is going to pose a problem of reconstruction and translation. Even when we are resting on the reconstructed text, the various conjectures, footnoted in this study, may not therefore provide a firm basis from which to analyse that part of the text. This is particularly frustrating because we are dealing with an important part of the scroll about purity, which is introduced between the two reconstructions in line 3. Schiffman makes his decisive case by invoking a connection with isolated words in fragments 25 and 21ii of 11Q20 column 13: 9 and 10; these are underscored in his transcription to denote an overlap with 11Q20. He follows Qimron in this overlap which takes the base text as Deut. 28:12-13, albeit with a change to the first person by the scroll's author.[600]

---

[599] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 290. They are distinguishable from 'My city' or 'the Temple City'.

[600] Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 67.

6.1 Translation of Column 47

⁶⁰¹[בעתו הגשם את <u>והורדתי</u>   ] [°ב°ו] […] [**1**

2 [למט]ה⁶⁰² ולוא מעלה [ל רק ויהיו]   *vacat*

3 ⁶⁰³והעיר לעולם [מה בתוח]שמי כנתי [וש טהורות עריהמה ו[ויהי]

4 וטהורה קודש תהיה [שי בתוכ]ומקד שמי לשכין אקדיש אשר

5 יהיה בתוכה אשר כול בה יתמאו אשר טמאה לכול דבר מכול

6 אוכל וכול ושמן יין טהור יהיה לה יבוא אשר וכול טהור

7 יזבחו אשר טהורא בהמה עור כול טהורים יהיו מושקה וכול

8 עושים יהיו **בעריהמה** כי לה יביאו לוא **עריהמה** בתוך

9 יביאו לוא מקדשי **עיר** ואל צורכיהמה לכול מלאכתמה בהמה

10 אשר **העיר** את תטמאו ולוא טהרתמה תהיה כבשרמה כי

11 יזבחו אשר בעורות כי בתוכה **ומקדשי** שמי את משכן אנוכי

12 וכל שמנמה ואת יינמה את מביאים יהיו בהמה **במקדש**

13 זבחי בעורות **מקדשי** את יגאלו ולוא **מקדשי לעיר** אוכלמה

14 עור תטהרו ולוא ארצמה בתוך יזבחו אשר פגוליהמה

15 אם העורות יטהרו כן בשרו כטהרת כי **לעירי עריכמה** מתוך

16 וטהר תזבחוהו **בעריכמה** ואם **למקדשי**   וטהר תזבחוהו **במקדשי**

17 תטמאו ולוא תביאו **המקדש** בעורות **המקדש** טהרת וכול **לעריכמה**

18 בתוכה שוכן אנוכי אשר פגוליכמה בעורות **ועירי מקדשי** את

---

⁶⁰¹ Transcriptions vary on these first two degraded lines:]וב[   ] ⁰[(Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 68; PTSDSSP p. 114); […
והורדתמה] …[…] (*DSSSE* p. 1264). Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 128) cite an overlap with parts of 11Q20 and 11Q19.

⁶⁰² Yadin, II (p. 202) leaves the first lacuna empty, agreeing with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p. 68). See also PTSDSSP (p. 114).
Yadin suggests there is room for 4-5 letters (II, p. 202). [… ה[למט ולוא מעלה] ל …] (*DSSSE* p. 1264).

⁶⁰³ The first lacuna is reconstructed in this way by Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 129) agreeing with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p.
68). See also PTSDSSP (p.114). The photograph on the Israel Museum website shows degradation which extends to the ער of
the next word. In the second lacuna, שמי is added (*TS* p. 128 agreeing with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p. 68). It is omitted in
PTSDSSP p.114. It is reduced by García Martínez to וש[ה...] (*DSSSE p*.1264). Yadin leaves both lacunae empty (II, p. 202). In
Yadin's photograph (III, p. 62), the area around the first lacuna is invisible to me.

[word fragments][604]

₂ upwards and not downwards[605]

³ and that their cities [will be][606] pure and [my name will dwell] amongst them [607] for ever. And the city

⁴ which I make holy, my name and my Temple having been established in its midst, shall [itself] be holiness and purity [608]

⁵ [to be separate][609] from all things [with regard][610] to all uncleanliness, by which they[611] would be

---

[604] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 128) create their own line: '[…]…[… and I will cause the rain to fall in its time]. He admits the problematic nature of these zero lines to three points of overlap in 11Q20 13: frgs. 21ii and 25. Yadin states that the restoration of the beginning of the line is certain: לילה[, a direct continuation of the previous column. However, his intention is unclear as he does not fill the lacunae. He merely places two clear traces of two undecipherable letters]°°[.

[605] [ ]up[ward] and not [d]ownward (Yigael Yadin II, p. 283); 'upwards and not downwa[rds]' (*PTSDSSP* p. 115). '…above and not be[low]…' (Maier, p. 42); 'downwards' (*BDB* p. 641). [and you will lead down…][…up]wards and not downwar[ds] (*DSSSE* p. 1265); Vermes does not attempt a translation (*CDSSE* p. 207). The degraded script of the first line does not convey the context, although this has been conjectured, not particularly helpfully, by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*DSSSE* p. 1265): 'and those who come […] far fr[om…] and all […]matter… The consensus on line 2 appears to be 'upwards and not downwards'. Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 129) expand '[They shall be only at the]top and never at the bott[om…] *vacat.*. Wise, Abegg and Cook (*DSSNT* p. 478) start their translation at line 3.

[606] The first lacuna is potentially problematic in that the translation possibilities are 'will/shall be' and 'must be'. Yadin leaves it empty (II, p. 202) but translates '[And let] their cities[be] clean'. *TS* (pp. 128, 129) and *PTSDSSP* (pp. 114, 115) fill it as [ויהי] and translate it as 'shall be', as does *CDSSE* p. 207. García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*DSSSE* pp. 1264, 1265) provide [והיו] and translate it as 'will be'. Wise, Abegg and Cook (*DSSNT* p. 478) use 'must be'.

[607] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 128) fill the second lacuna with שמי, and translate 'I will cause My name to' (p. 129). The lacuna is untranslated in Maier (*Temple Scroll*, p. 42) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (*DSSSE* p. 1265). *PTSDSSP* leaves it empty (p. 114) but translates the lacuna 'and [I shall allow my name]' (p. 115). It suggests a possible restoration שמי with Qimron (*Temple Scroll*, p. 68). Yadin leaves it blank (II, p. 202). Vermes (*CDSSE* p. 207) skates over this with 'Their cities [shall be] pure…for ever'. From my close examination of the photographic image, after the space following טהורות, there appears a faint *vav*. There is complete degradation until a *he* at the end of the line (http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple).

[608] 'which I will hallow by settling my name and [my] temp[le within (it)], shall be holy and clean' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 202). 'The city that I shall sanctify by establishing My name and temp[le there must be holy and pure…' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'And the city which I will sanctify to cause My name and My sanctu[ary to dwell within it] shall be holy and pure' (*TS* p.129). 'But the city [w]hich I consecrate, so that my name and [my(?)]san[ctuary]… shall be present, is to be holy and clean' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42). 'The city which I will sanctify, causing my name and [my] sanctuary[y] to abide [in it], shall be holy and pure of all impurity which the by can become impure' (*CDSSE* p. 207). 'which I will sanctify to make dwell my name and [my] temp[le within it] shall be holy and shall be clean' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). These translations overlook the parsing of קדש and טהורה, which are both nouns. I have inserted 'itself' to make sense of them as nouns.

[609] מ denotes separation, the inclusion of which, makes the line clearer.

[610] My addition of 'with regard' makes the function of ל clearer.

[611] All those Israelites who are not priests are addressed' as 'they'.

rendered as defiled.[612] It shall be

6 pure. And everything which is entered there shall be pure: wine, oil and food,

7 and anything [mixed] with drink shall be pure.[613] Each hide of a pure animal which they shall slaughter

8 in the midst of their cities, they shall not allow themselves to bring [them] there[614] because, in their cities, they will be making

9 with them their products for all their needs. Into my Temple City [615] they shall not bring [such things],

10 for as their flesh [must be], [so] there will be their purity[616]. And you[617] shall not make impure

---

[612] יטמאו is translated variously: 'with which they may be defiled' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 202); 'which might make it impure' (PTSDSSP p. 114); 'with which they could be defiled (*DSSSE* p. 1265); 'through which they can become unclean' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42); 'by which one (lit. 'they') can become impure' (Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 29-30). 'with which they may be defiled' (*TS* p. 129); 'by which one might be defiled' (*DSSNT* p. 478); 'with which they can become impure' (*CDSSE* p. 207). יטמאו (imp. masc. 3ʳᵈ pl.) refers to the two nouns קודש וטהורה. The unpointed Hebrew could be imperfect *niphal, piel* or *pual*. The root טמא is 'to become unclean'. It is intensified in *niphal* which would be grammatically reflected as 'be rendered as defiled'.

[613] 'any food upon which liquid has been poured' (*TS* p. 129). 'any foodstuff upon which liquid is poured' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'all drink' (PTSDSSP p. 115; Johann Maier (*Temple Scroll*, p. 42); *DSSSE* p. 1265). 'all food and all moistened (food) shall be clean' (*CDSSE* p. 207). משקה, 'irrigation' (BDB p. 1052). 'and anything with liquid shall be pure' conveys both drink and moistened food. I suggest 'and anything [mixed] with drink' is appropriate.

[614] יביאו לה. (Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study*, p. 207-8) raises the issue of influence of MT on the Scroll. In contrast to Yadin (II, pp. 202-3), he takes a 'minimalist position'. With regard to the coupling ל plus בוא, he cites Yadin's reference to Deut. 23:3, Jer. 51.48 and Zech. 9:9 as referring to entities such as Zion, Jerusalem and the congregation. Yadin is criticised for not considering the Late Biblical Hebrew tendency to pair ל with verbs of motion, as opposed to אל in Standard Biblical Hebrew. The scroll's יבואו is the *hiphil* imperfect. It must therefore capture the sense of causation, an onus *not* to bring these products. Many do not convey this: 'they may not bring' (*TS* p. 129); they shall not bring' (Yadin, II, p. 203); PTSDSSP p. 115; *DSSSE* p. 1265). 'may they bring' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42); 'are not to be brought' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'no skin…shall be brought there' is nearer the mark (Vermes, p. 207). There is no passive in יביאו לה.

[615] Schiffman and Gross (*TS* p. 129) translate as 'city of my Sanctuary' but two lines later, he translates the same word as 'my Temple'. Yigael Yadin (II, p. 203) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate both as 'my temple' (*DSSSE* p. 1265). PTSDSSP (p. 115) and Johann Maier (*Temple Scroll*, p. 42) translate 'my Sanctuary' for both. Why does Schiffman differentiate? It probably reflects his view that the 'my temple' was within the city, rather than occupying the entire city.

[616] 'for their (degree of) cleanness is according to (the degree of cleanness of) their flesh (Yadin). 'for their (level of) purity is (equal to) that of their meat (*TS* p. 129). 'for their purity shall be like that of their flesh' (*DSSSE* p. 1265) 'For their purity shall be like their flesh' (PTSDSSP p.115). 'for as their flesh, so shall their purity be' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42). 'The reason: their degree of purity corresponds with that of the animals' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'for the purity of the skin corresponds to that of the flesh' (*CDSSE* p. 207). כי, the conjunction 'because'. The preposition כ conveys a comparison between the purity status of their flesh to the wider class of impurity. I have kept the translation of כ as near to the text as possible, whilst making the sense clear.

[617] People addressed as 'you' are priests functioning in the temple.

the city in which

11   I am established in its midst, [nor] of my name and my Temple[618], because of the animal

hides, [which] they shall be sacrificing[619]

12   in the sanctuary. In them,[620] they shall be bringing their wine, oil and all

13   their foods to my Temple City.[621] They will not defile my Temple with

14   their unclean[622] sacrificial flesh, which they will slaughter in the midst of their land.[623] And

you shall not purify a hide

15   from the midst of your cities for my city, for as with the purity of its flesh, so shall the hides

be pure if

16   in my Temple you sacrifice it. And so it is pure for my Temple; if you slaughter it in

your cities, then it is pure

17   for your cities. And all the purity of the Temple with hides of the Temple you shall bring

and not defile

18   my Temple and my city, where I dwell in its midst, with hides of your unclean sacrificial

flesh[624]

---

[618] 'And you shall not defile the city in which I settle my name and my temple' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 204). 'For you may not render impure the city that I am causing My Name and My Temple to dwell within' (*TS* p. 129). 'and they shall not defile the city within which I make dwell my name and my temple' (*DSSSE* p. 1267). 'and you shall not make impure the city (in) which I shall allow my name and my sanctuary to dwell in its midst' (PTSDSSP p. 115). 'and they shall not pollute the city in the midst of which I cause my name and my sanctuary to be present' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42). These translations take the view that 'my name' and my sanctuary/temple' are the objects of 'make dwell', because of the object marker את. The problematic word is משכן, the participle (*piel* or *pual*). These translations have used it as an infinitive. I have interpreted את שמי ומקדשי as two of the three objects of ולוא תטמאו, the other being את העיר. To make sense of this, I have inserted 'nor'.

[619] 'No, they must use skins of animals sacrificed' (*DSSNT* p. 478). I have added 'nor' for continuity.

[620] בהמה, 'with' or 'in them', is ambiguous. It could relate to those actually importing these materials, or to the animal hides as well as the wine, oil etc. Either way, it is masculine, agreeing with עורות, an irregular plural of the masculine עור. 'in them' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 204). 'bringing with their wine' (*TS* p. 129). 'with these' (*DSSSE* p. 1267). 'with them' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42). It is left untranslated by Vermes (*CDSSE* p. 207) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (*DSSNT* p. 478).

[621] 'city of my Temple' (*TS* p. 129); 'my temple city' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 204). Yadin's translation probably reflects his view that it is the עיר inside of which is the מקדש.

[622] 'abominable' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 204). *TS* p. 129). 'skins of improper offerings' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'profane' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42. פגול denoting the flesh of animals slaughtered outside Jerusalem (Baruch A. Levine, 'Aspects', p. 15).

[623] 'in their land' (Yigael Yadin, II, p. 204; *DSSSE* p. 1267. Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p.42). 'throughout their land' (*TS* p. 129); 'elsewhere in the land' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'in their country' (*CDSSE* p. 207).

[624] 'skins of your abominations' (Yigael Yadin, II, 205). 'improper skins' (*DSSNT* p. 478). 'skins of your profane slaughterings' (Johann Maier, *Temple Scroll*, p. 42). 'profaned skins' (*DSSSE* p. 1267). 'with tainted skins' (*CDSSE* p. 207).

6.2 Other Cities and the Divine Presence

In preparation for a spatial analysis, we review the relationship between 'other cities' and the divine presence. The word, 'their cities' is stated three times (47:3, 8, 8). A few lines later, עריכמה, 'your cities' is also stated three times (47:15, 16, 17). As we have seen, Schiffman merely treats them together as both being distinguishable from 'my city'.[625] His reading limits them to Firstspace; they are described as being positioned relative to each other. Yadin states that it is impossible to cleanse other cities to the same degree as the Temple city; the Lord had simply not settled his name there.[626] My translation of lines 3-5 would suggest that divine settlement *per se* is not the sole determinant of the effectiveness of cleansing. Cleansing will separate the individual from the less holy towards the more holy space. The act itself will be dependent on the will to cleanse. Without the will, there can be no act. Additionally, it will make a step away from the world outside עיר המקדש towards מקדשי, the divine dwelling place, against the outwardly radiating holiness gradient. In a more general context, Philip Peter Jenson makes this point in his discussion of the holy and profane aspects of the Divine Sphere:

> If 'holy' is defined as that which belongs to the sphere of God's being or activity, then this might correspond to a claim of ownership, a statement of close association, or proximity to his cultic presence… But since the normal state of earthly things is purity, it requires a special act of God to make a thing or person holy, God ultimately consecrates or sanctifies (*piel* or *hiphil* of קדש), although he may make use of persons and material means.[627]

---

[625] Lawqrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 290. He acknowledges that even these cities had to observe certain purity regulations, without qualifying whether 'these cities' were 'their' or your' cities.

[626] Yigael Yadin, II, pp. 201-3.

[627] Philip Peter Jensen, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), p. 48. Consecration evokes ritual, as opposed to sanctification, which conveys a more profound ethical involvement.

The lacuna in line 3 suggests that '[my name will dwell] amongst them for ever'. The text continues into the next line with 'And the city which I make holy (אקדיש, *hiphil*) my name and my temple having been established in its midst, shall [itself] be holiness and purity'. Rather than the mere presence of the divine, a causative action is required to make the city holy. The text does not specify which city would qualify. Lines 15-16 provide a link of praxis to 'your cities', whose people are allowed to slaughter in 'my Temple' but not in 'your cities'. The impurity lies in the flesh sacrificed in other cities, not their people.

6.3 Spatial Analysis

Spatial analysis will extend our horizons further. Andrew Merrifield considers that 'place can be taken as practised space'.[628] Jonathan Z. Smith considers that 'human beings are not placed: they bring place into being'.[629] Soja reminds us that spatiality is socially produced and is distinguishable from the materiality of nature and the mental space of cognition.[630] These other cities are not lifeless or a 'mere background or stage for human drama'.[631] It is what is actually being practised and experienced within; that is to say, Thirdspace as lived reality. They are spaces in which ritual is being performed to their own standards.[632] This requires organisation and a sense of purity, acknowledged by the divine: כול עור בהמה תהורה (47:7b). They have not been condemned as irredeemably godless; a divine endorsement will be conferred on them (47:3): [ויהי]ו עריהמה טהורות 'their cities [shall be] pure'.

---

[628] Andrew Merrifield, 'Place and Space: A Lefebvrian Reconciliation', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 18 (1993), 516-531 (p. 522).

[629] Jonathan Z. Smith, *To Take Place*, p. 28.

[630] Edward W. Soja, *Post-Modern Geographies*, p. 120.

[631] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, p. 157, ascribed to Foucault.

[632] If those cities were three days' journey from the temple, non-sacral slaughter was allowed.

The question now arises as to which population does עריהמה refer. The first two lines of this column are poorly preserved. The second line *vacat*, ל[מעלה ולוא למט]ה, may have been derived from the base text (Deut. 28:13): [633]

ונתנך יהוה לראש ולא לזנב והיית רק למעלה ולא תהיה למטה ...

And God will make you the head and not the tail; you shall be only at the top, and not at the bottom…

This was the divine message, delivered metaphorically through Moses, that the people of Israel were to become great, rather than insignificant. It would be reasonable to assume that the author of the Temple Scroll intended עריהמה to refer to Israelites who lived away from עיר המקדש, in a local diaspora relative to עיר המקדש, rather than in exile. The divine is conferring purity by purging them from any lingering impurities; those cities will aspire to greater purity:

[ויהו]ו **עריהמה** טהורות וש [כנתי שמי בתוכ] מה לעולם

and that their cities [will be] pure and [my name will dwell] amongst them for ever (47:3)

The עיר המקדש will share its Thirdspace with the midst of those other cities, even though the divine dwells and is established in עיר המקדש.

The divine referent has acknowledged that 'their cities' have functioned so far in their own way as First and Secondspace entities. That is to say, they are referred to as being distinct from 'my'. Although the text does not provide a geographical distinction, there is a sense of a relative spatial distinction. In the text's acknowledgement of sacrificial activity in other cities, there is an implied Secondspace. If we were to imagine spatial practice in 'their cities' beyond the text, 'their cities' would qualify as a representational space of Lefebvre or Thirdspace of Soja. However, the scroll's text does not refer to complex or symbolic living; we read merely of the basic materials

---

[633] See PTSDSSP p. 115, n. 386. Restoration is attributed to Qimron (Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 68).

and routine, 'wine, oil and all food' (47:6), 'slaughter' (47:7) and 'leather' (47:9). Doubtless, 'their cities' would have had subspaces, to which these activities were delegated; the text goes no further than this.

God has declared those cities [shall be] pure: ויהי]ו עריהמה טהורות] (47:3). [ויהי]ו is no longer visible on the photograph because of degradation.[634] As this line is reconstructed in part, we are not in a strong position to infer that other cities had the potential to reach the level of purity of the עיר המקדש. Schiffman thinks this is not the case. Imported hides which are slaughtered outside עיר המקדש are an infringement.[635] In his latest commentary on this line, he skates over the issue of 'other cities', merely noting that the city of God's presence must be holy and free of all impurity; there is no comparative reference to 'their cities'.

My view hinges on the filling of the first vacat of the line, ו ...].[636] Schiffman provides [ויהי], imperfect, but translated as 'shall be'. Wise, Abegg and Cook translate it as 'must be'. Martínez and Tigchelaar provide [והיו], an imperative, although they translate it as 'will be'. Their space within the brackets is unexplained. This implies that those cities must be pure although they still translate their version as 'will be', rather than Schiffman's 'shall be'.[637] If Schiffman views that there is no room for manoeuvre with regard to purity and impurity of 'their cities', I would have expected an imperative into the vacat. His use of the imperfect is therefore difficult to reconcile.

In grappling with this line, a different approach through the prism of spatiality would be to consider how these spaces, 'their' and 'your' cities, would have actually been used. As already noted, the text does not convey complex living. Without any elaboration, the extant text could well assume non-sacral slaughter. However, beyond the text into the wider biblical sphere, there

---

[634] <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temp>.

[635] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 133.

[636] This *vav* is designated as an uncertain reading (*TS* p.128; PTSDSSP p. 114).

[637] *TS* p. 129.

was a priestly presence in cities other than Jerusalem in the Second Temple period.[638] Those priests would divide their time between Jerusalem and their allotted cities.[639] Even though the purity issue is immutable, the priestly presence and activity in other cities would indicate cultic involvement that went beyond mere planning and intentions of how those spaces were to be used. As Thirdspace, there is commonality with עיר המקדש and an implication that 'their' and 'your' cities have the potential to elevate their purity level, albeit never to that of עיר המקדש. This steers me in favour of Schiffman's ו[יהי], rather than the imperative.

The required degree of purity is not stated or implied. Despite this textual uncertainty, divine intention is likely although not certain.[640] Even so, the presence of the עיר המקדש in the land of the Israelites as a yardstick increases the level of purity required for other cities.[641] It would follow that those other cities, albeit less stringent in purity, would not be in danger of divine punishment. They are not in the same bracket as those idolaters, enumerated in column 2, who are to be driven out.

How does the text link this yardstick with other cities? The sentence: כי כבשרמה תהיה טהרתמה, 'for as their flesh [must be], [so] there will be their purity (47:10), may possibly provide the clue, in that בשרמה refers very likely to their sacrificial flesh. The sense here is that if their animal flesh is pure, so are they, as distinct from their purity being contingent on flesh purity. This sentence also throws up a problem in the understanding of בשר as potentially ambiguous, in that it already refers to bodily flesh (45:16). This ambiguity would intensify the impact of בשר, rather than limit it to animal flesh. It is interesting to note that מקדשי is coupled with עיר in the previous line (47: 9) and uncoupled in the next line (47:11). It is similarly expressed as uncoupled (46:11),

---

[638] Joshua Schwartz, 'On Priests and Jericho in the Second Temple Period', *JQR* 79 (1988), 23-48 (p. 23).

[639] Josh. 21:10-19; 1 Chron. 6:39-44.

[640] Schiffman and Gross base their reconstruction ו[יהי] on the overlap with 11Q20 13: 8-9 (*TS* pp. 128, 218).

[641] Hannah Harrington, *Purity Texts*, p. 85.

following the construction of the חיל. These affirmations of purity would appear to confer מקדשי as the epicentre of divine holiness, from which would radiate holiness through עיר and beyond.

The spatial idea of עריהמה, to which בשר applies, forms a scattered diaspora of nucleated or subsidiary spaces, probably within the land of Israel. There is divine hope that they will develop from Secondspace into the more complex category of Thirdspace. That is to say, symbolic spatial practice and the development of complex associations with the divine presence will supervene over space that is merely designated for different functions. As we have noted, the text does not indicate complex living of other cities.[642] Even if priests were known to have functioned in such places, the text does not convey it. Again, the text is speaking Secondspace.[643] Soja reminds us of Thirdspace as 'a space of radical openness, a space of resistance and struggle… a meeting point, a hybrid place, where one can move beyond the existing borders'.[644] In the context of the Temple Scroll, the only physically described border is the חיל (§5.3). Column 47 conveys the sense of nucleated spaces, whose borders are not physically described but are implied through the divine prism by a difference in purity with עיר המקדש.

This 'struggle' is driven by the divine will. This is expressed in the text, which switches from what the divine tells 'them' to do, to what 'you' will do:

ולוא תטמאו את העיר אשר אנוכי משכן את שמי ומקדשי בתוכה

And you will not make impure the city in which I am established [nor] of my name and my temple in its midst (47:10b-11a)

This passage conveys a warning not to contaminate the עיר המקדש with their products, as stipulated before and after this line. 'You' could imply there will be custodians who are protecting the purity of the city. It could also imply that 'you' will be sufficiently pure that the

---

[642] We recall that Secondspace and Thirdspace are not mutually exclusive.

[643] Soja views Secondspace, as a space of domination and power, from which 'struggle, liberation, emancipation' break free into what he calls Thirding-as-Othering. See Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace,* pp. 66-67.

[644] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 56.

will of God will automatically be followed without formal checks. If we are to follow Schiffman's reconstruction, the divine relationship with other cities is suggested in an earlier line:

ויהי]ו **עריהמה** טהורות וש [כנתי שמי בתוח]מה לעולם

and that their cities [will be] pure and [my name will dwell] among them forever

(47:3) [645]

As we noted earlier, the handling of the first lacuna is problematic, in that we could be dealing with the imperfect or imperative. Yadin does not commit himself to a reconstruction although he offers a jussive in translation, '[And let] their cities [be] clean'.[646] It is quite plausible that an imperfect could be applied to this problematic lacuna. On this basis, those who inhabit עריהמה, 'their cities', will have the divine presence בתוך עריהמה, 'in the midst of their cities' (47:8). Godly presence could be present, even though its epicentre is in עיר המקדש, from which purity radiates outward towards other cities of lesser purity. Theirs will be a space of more complex living in the presence of the divine, once 'their cities' have broken free and expanded into a fully lived space. As we argued earlier, they will no longer be merely designated spaces, Secondspace, for different functions that the scroll's text implies. Such an existence makes use of a mental map as an active part of how other cities are experienced, according to its planned structure. It is not fully lived, in that it is merely perceived and conceived. As such, it has yet to be realigned toward a fully lived and, in Soja's words, 'locus of collective experience'.[647] Hence the divine voice is addressing its warning to 'you', rather than the more distant and impersonal 'their'. Interestingly, 'they' is never used as the subject of 'their cities'.

---

[645] *TS* p. 128.

[646] Yigael Yadin, II, p.

[647] Edward W. Soja, *Postmetropolis*, p. 11. Soja talks of the concept of Synekism of Ancient Greece which refers to the union of several smaller urban developments.

This prepares us for the switch from עריהמה to עריכמה, 'your cities' (47:15). The scroll deals with 'you/yours' and 'they/theirs' in many other columns although their contexts do not necessarily conform to the dualism of kinsman and outsider. If we accept the plausibility of an imperfect in that lacuna, these potentially qualified עריכמה will each have the divine name and his sanctuary: אנוכי משכן את שמי ומקדשי (47:11). The text now addresses these cities, albeit with limitations, on their current purity status. Sacrifices performed in 'my sanctuary' are pure for 'my sanctuary'; those performed in 'your cities' are pure for 'your cities' (47:16). Once elevated, 'your' cities will be no less Thirdspace for that, even though the products of sacrifice from 'your' cities are not yet acceptable in 'my Temple and my city' (47:18). Like 'their' cities, they are organised spaces, suitably organised to perform slaughter to their own current purity standards (47:16). A spatial reading would bring these categories of עיר into one intended Thirdspace category of purity (47:3).[648]

Is Thirdspace apparent in the later columns? The paraphrases of Leviticus and Deuteronomy comprise spatial practice in terms of purity, as instructed directly by the divine. It is notable that 'you', as the object of the divine instruction, features heavily in these later columns. If we consider places as practised spaces, there are indeed references to places of spatial practice.[649]

---

[648] Soja discusses Synekism which refers to the union of several smaller urban settlements under a 'capital' city, implying an urban-based governmentality, equivalent to the city state. Cityspace involves a much larger and complex configuration, which tends to be dynamic and expansive in its territorial domain. It will always contain inhabited and uninhabited areas that do not look urban, but are 'urbanised', part of a regional cityspace. See Edward W. Soja, *Postmetropolis*, pp. 12-16. This 'urbanised' idea parallels with the potential purity of the other cities of column 47. They may not 'look' pure, but have the potential to become part of the purity of the capital cityspace.

[649] 'your land' (48:11; 51:19; 52:3), 'their houses' (48:12), 'four cities' (48:13-14), 'your cities' (48:15; 49:5), 'the house' (49:6, 11, 17; 50:13; 53:17; 57:16,21), 'open field' (50:5), 'grave' (50:6, 11), 'this mountain' (51:7), 'every place' (51:19), 'your gates near to my Sanctuary' (52:14-18), 'my city' (52:19), 'midst of my Sanctuary' (52:20), 'your gates' (53:4), 'that city' (55:7; 63:1; 63:4), 'the city' (55:9; 62:10), 'the place' (56:5), 'the land' (56:12; 59:12), 'Egypt' (56:16; 61:14), 'throne of his kingdom' (56:20), 'their cities'(57:5; 58:9, 11,15; 59:4), 'field' and 'vineyard' (57:21), 'cities of Israel' (58:4-5), 'Israel' (59:15; 60:12), 'kingdom' (59:21); 'a city' (62:6), 'the cities' (62:12,13), 'stream' (63:5); 'your house' (63:13), 'his city' and 'gate of his place' (64:4), 'nations' (64:7,10), 'ground' (64:12), 'a road, in any tree or upon their land' (65:2), 'new house' (65:5), 'gate' (65:10), 'that city' (66:3), 'field' (66:7).

Amongst these references, there is an instruction regarding stillbirth (50:10-16). The mother's resulting impurity is likened to that of קבר, 'a grave'. The whole body of the unfortunate woman, not just her sexual organs, is now equated to an impure space. Her body is therefore a practised gendered space of impurity; her home is a source of contamination. The resulting praxis of impurity renders her as Thirdspace.

Does this reading shed any light on the repetition of עיר, especially in this column? The repetition would seem to convey a sense of concern by the author about the role of עיר in the text.[650] Firstspace represents actual words to describe space. Such an example is the use of repetition as a possible space builder. [651] The word may have stood for an understanding of a Firstspace and Secondspace entity, rather in the way of an urbanised nucleation, such as the Greek πολις. Alternatively, it may have stood for a more elaborate societal concept, extending beyond Firstspace and Secondspace thinking. Earlier in this study (§1.3), there are references relevant to this particular discussion, even though they do not engage with spatiality analysis. Robert Ezra Park viewed the city as what would now be considered Thirdspace, 'a state of mind, a body of customs and traditions and of unorganised attitudes and sentiments that adhere to those customs and are transmitted in this tradition'.[652] Malcolm Schofield shows that the Stoic idea of πολις is nothing but an idea of community founded on common acceptance of social norms. Those who

---

[650] It is interesting to note the contrast with Rooke's observation that the verses of Ezekiel's envisioned new city make scant reference to the city (Ezek. 45:6-7; 48:15-22, 30-35), 'a mere 16 verses out of the 260 that constitute the vision'. See Deborah W. Rooke, 'Urban Planning According to Ezekiel: The Shape of the Restored Jerusalem', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 123-143 (p. 123). See also James Muilenburg, 'Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style', in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, *Congress Volume, Copenhagen*, ed. by G.W. Anderson, Millar Burrows, Henri Cazelles and others (Leiden: Brill, 1953), pp. 97-111 (pp. 99-101). Although Muilenburg's context is within verbs and poetry, his comments are applicable to prose. Repetition functions widely in the Hebrew Bible. It concentrates the mind of the reader as well as giving continuity to the writer's thought.

[651] Karolien Vemeulen, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities*, p. 229. Vermeulen views Firstspace as standing for the actual words used in the text to evoke and describe space, such as spatial vocabulary as well as specific word categories in motion verbs or spatial prepositions. In addition, as a stylistic feature, repetition functions possibly as a space builder.

[652] Robert E. Park, 'The City', 577-612. This article states that the roots of the city lie in the customs of its residents with the consequence that the city has a moral as well as a physical structure.

share 'right reason', an intellectual elite, make up a community that is just the same to the Stoic in believing that such people constitute a city.[653] This implies that a community without an intellectual elite does not constitute a city. These ideas point toward a commonality of the different levels of purity observance and behaviour within a nucleation which the Temple Scroll conveys as עיר, inclusive of עריהמה and עריכמה. This would indicate that spatial commonality takes the understanding of עיר, עריהמה and עריכמה as a unified category of Thirdspace. Repetition conveys the significance of עיר as a matter of both contrast and commonality with these entities. It is only with the introduction of מקדשי coupled with עיר (47:13) that עיר is unique in the context of ultimate purity and holiness. This raises the question as to why the unambiguous, incisive עיר מקדשי is coupled only twice (47:9,13). It is so unambiguous that previous couplings and uncouplings of עיר, as well as מקדש and מקדשי, perhaps could be considered as varieties of shorthand that the scroll's author used for עיר מקדשי.

We now consider the function of מקדש and מקדשי.

[ויהו]ו עריהמה טהורות וש [כנתי שמי בתוכ] מה לעולם

and that their cities [will be] pure and [my name will dwell] among them forever (47:3)

followed by:

והעיר אשר אקדיש לשכין שמי ומקד[שי בתוכ]ה תהיה קודש וטהורה

and the city which I make holy, my name and my Temple having been established in its midst,
shall [itself] be holiness and purity (47:3b-4)

Earlier in this chapter, we discussed the problem of reconstructing the first lacuna in line 3. On the basis of an imperfect, rather than an imperative, the text conveys the hope of including עריהמה into the divine presence. Whether this is guaranteed or contingent on purity compliance is not

---

[653] Malcolm Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 61, 73.

stated. Whichever, this divine presence is represented by ומקד[שי. There is no mention here of the relative Firstspace positions of מקדש to עיר. The text refers to 'city' and 'Temple' separately until:

<div align="center">

ואל עיר מקדשי לוא יביאו

into the city of my Temple they shall not allow themselves to bring (47:9)

</div>

This indicates the purity status of עיר מקדשי exceeds that of anywhere else. It re-appears in line 13, where it is stated that wine, oil and food can only be imported in hides that have been sacrificed במקדש. The divine possession of the מקדש becomes מקדשי, a veritable Thirdspace. It conveys more than symbolism or a space that is merely in the process of being planned. It involves a Thirdspace action of bringing appropriate items as offerings. In a way, to 'bring' is an act of pilgrimage by those from other cities. Such non-residents of עיר המקדש will then experience that process as a lived experience as they strive towards the standards of divine holiness by means of purity praxis, beyond the acknowledgment of the physicality of location and symbolism.

Interestingly, this possessive מקדשי (46:9) first takes its form in the context of the חיל (46:9-11), such that entry is restricted to מקדשי, a word that is stated three times in one line, as previously noted (46:11) although only twice coupled with עיר (47:9,13). מקדשי attracts the word אל תוך, 'into the midst of' (46:10), בתוכמה, their midst (46:12), בתוכ]ה, 'in its midst' (47:4,11). This conveys not so much a static middle point of מקדשי but a suffusion within it. תוך also appears in relation to other locations, בתוך ערצמה, 'in the midst of their land'(47:14), and מתוך עריכמה, 'from the midst of your cities' (47:15). The text's author could have simply used ב rather than תוך. It could not be applied just to any space but to the populus throughout those spaces. Because their citizens can have their animal hides sacrificed במקדש (47:11-12), their products carried within them are allowed into עיר מקדשי. This sacrificial rite in עיר מקדשי is thus the pivotal bridge

between it and those other cities.[654] It follows that those from other cities, who bring their animals for such rites, would be aware of this required purity ritual. Their intention to comply would be apparent before they departed from those cities. Even though the text does not say directly, spatially their people would therefore be living in a space of complex thought and perspectives beyond, although including, the perception of the space as somewhere for day to day living, that is to say, Thirdspace. By divine intent, מקדשי provides the bridgehead in the sacrificial journey for people of those cities to break away from the prevailing grip of contemporary temple management, towards the idealised entity of עיר מקדשי.

The relationship between עיר מקדשי and עיר המקדש calls for spatial thinking. עיר מקדשי appears in column 47 without כול. We argued earlier that כול suggested the presence of a subspace. Without it, עיר מקדשי becomes the final indivisible spatial entity. Previous scholarship, as we noted earlier in this study, has wrestled inconclusively with the meaning of עיר המקדש. This has not been resolved satisfactorily because analyses have been limited to thinking within geographical locational entities, which, in spatial parlance, would be categorised as Firstspace. A spatiality approach introduces a wider fresh understanding of the phrase. This has shown that מקדש and מקדשי need not necessarily be shackled to עיר. The phrases עיר המקדש and עיר מקדשי can be reconsidered as the single entity of Thirdspace. Thereby, they are unshackled from the confines of geographical Firstspace thinking of עיר, in its relation to מקדש.

6.4 Near-homograph עור

We have already noted the presence of עור, which is translated 'blind' (45:12), 'hide' (47:14), and עורות 'hides' (47:11, 13, 17).

---

[654] *TS* p. 125. מקדש pertains to the sanctuary; עיר המקדש to the temenos. My spatial argument in favour of the חיל as a binding, rather than a separating concept, would weigh against this view.

Should these insertions of near-homographs be considered coincidental? Is there a spatial relevance? Was this merely a device by the author to reinforce the significance of the already repeated עיר? According to the likely base text, entry to the wilderness sanctuary was forbidden to those who bore any blemish or deformity, including blindness (Lev. 21:18-20).[655] It would be useful to clarify the scroll's concept of blindness, with reference to the OT. Schiffman comments that we cannot determine a definition of blindness. We cannot be sure whether it indicates partial or total blindness, in one or both eyes. Schiffman's view is eminently reasonable in that blindness, in the biblical context, is more a case of the inability of finding one's way, rather than the inability to read, as we might consider it today.[656]

However, the Temple Scroll does not present a list but mentions only עור, to be banished from כול עיר המקדש (45:12-13). The sentence construction here shows the subject עור in the singular; this is followed by the plural verbs לוא יבואו and ולוא יטמאו. The avoidance of a plural subject would suggest the author's intention to keep the word closely aligned with עיר. Although the two words would differ in pronunciation, they would convey a visual word-play.

The author appears to use עור to link כול עיר המקדש with העיר אשר אני שוכן בתוכה, because the text equates the banishment from כול עיר המקדש for those who have had a marital emission, with banishment for the blind. There are two observations to be extracted from this passage. First, the

---

[655] Alex Samely, 'Observations', p. 238. The issue of Temple Scroll overlap with scripture is questionable in that the scroll does not acknowledge prior existence of a text as a model for its own verbal material or is tacit, at least. Samely cites Pesher Habakkuk and CD, as examples of sequential commentary, in contrast to the thematic structure of the Temple Scroll.

[656] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), p. 44, n. 38. 'You shall not revile the deaf or put a stumbling block before the blind…' (Lev. 19:14). Cursed be anyone who mislead a blind person on the road…' (Deut. 27:18). 'you shall grope about at noon as blind people grope in darkness' (Deut. 28:29). The prophets metaphorise: 'Listen, you that are deaf; and you that are blind, look up and see' (Isa. 42:18). 'we grope like the blind along a wall, groping like those who have no eyes' (Isa. 59:10); 'I was eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame' (Job: 29:15). Blemishes, with and without blindness, are proscribed in making offerings to God: '… or a man with a blemish in his eyes…' (Lev. 21:20). Before David's victory in capturing Jerusalem, the indwelling Jebusites taunted him '…You will not come in here, even the blind and the lame will turn you back…' (2 Sam. 5:6). At some later time, he decreed 'the blind and the lame shall not come into the house' (2 Sam. 5:8). This resonates with the prohibitions in the Temple Scroll.

divine presence seems to pervade the 'city in its midst', in all its subspaces, as implied by כול. Second, the עור seems to have been judged by the scroll's author to have been afflicted involuntarily, insofar as he has been banished spatially as for a marital emission. Of course, the difference is temporal, in that banishment for the עור is lifelong, not for three days. The text's author is reinforcing the point, in that blindness prevents the fullest engagement with visible cultic practice. In spatial terms, the עור cannot possibly engage visually with the symbolic experience of Thirdspace.

Indeed, blindness was one of the many blemishes for which entry to the priesthood was forbidden (Lev. 21:18-21). Similar wide-ranging rules are stated in The Messianic Rule (1QSa 2:4-9).[657] However, the Temple Scroll has singled out blindness, which perhaps stood for multiple other disabilities. However, the word 'blind' is open to interpretation.[658] It could be an impediment to strict observance of ritual.[659] Alternatively עור could be construed as the idea of moral blindness. Either way, the punning use of the near-homonym to עיר reinforces the point, as a way of relating the demand for purity to the standards demanded by God in עיר.

We could speculate that the scroll's author may have been aware of other texts but has chosen to omit other blemishes, either for brevity or of their insufficient importance. Perhaps there was no cross-reference to other texts. Another possibility, which I favour, is that inclusion of a list of other blemishes would have diluted the intended impact of עור with עיר. Schiffman, in his detailed treatment of exclusion from the Temple City, does not make any connection between these

---

[657] 'And no man smitten with any human uncleanliness shall enter the assembly of God; no man smitten with any of them shall be confirmed in his office in the congregation. No man smitten in his flesh, or paralysed in his feet or hands, or lame, or deaf, or dumb, or smitten in his flesh with a visible blemish; no old or tottery man unable to stay still in the midst of the congregation; none of these shall come to hold office among the congregation of the men of renown, for the Angels of Holiness are [with] their [congregation].' (*CDSSE* p. 161).

[658] The degree and nature of the blindness is unspecified (*TS* p. 123).

[659] 4QMMT B: 51 refers to the blind as not being able to see and therefore observe ritual regulations.

words.[660] If, as Schiffman proposes, these restrictions apply to other defects as well, then עור serves as synecdoche. As עור has been prioritised over other defects, it follows that the word has actually been punned as literary device.

The other near-homograph is seen in column 47, where עור also conveys the word 'hide' of an animal. The Levitical requirement for cattle sacrifice is that the offering must be a male without blemish (Lev.1:3).[661] The Hebrew Bible does not use the word עור specifically as a marker of impurity but merely as part and parcel of the sacrificial animal.[662] Again, the author may have earmarked עור to resonate with עיר. The scroll's text tells us that the hide has its uses in the transport of wine, oil and all food (47:6). The act of transport of these hides and associated offerings from one place to another of supreme holiness would be undertaken by those willing to take that path; in short, a pilgrimage.[663] Berquist views pilgrimage as relying on Secondspace perceptions as something positive, thereby encouraging a Thirdspace action of travel.[664] Therefore, we could understand pilgrimage as 'pilgrim space'. However, the scroll does not really convey a sense of journey other than the bringing of offerings. The transport of such offerings is no less significant for that. It lies within the category of Secondspace, by virtue of religious significance and meaning. As the ultimate destination of the transport of offerings, מקדשי becomes Thirdspace as the actual living of the symbolic Secondspace of the journey to it. The pilgrims themselves would be experiencing their journey to and arrival at עיר מקדשי not just as another place, but a realigned spatial experience, which extends beyond physicality and historical awareness. The mental process of realignment brings the pilgrim into Thirdspace,

---

[660] *TS* p. 123. See also Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, pp. 391-393.

[661] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus*. There is no commentary on this particular point.

[662] Exod. 29:14; Lev. 4:11.

[663] Bruria Bitton-Ashkelony, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate of Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 2006), pp. 11-12. Pilgrimages cannot take place in the same place, so there must be a break with regular life and outside the social framework.

[664] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', in *Constructions II*, p. 48.

mediated in the text only by a sacrificially pure עור. It is just possible that such wordplay supports the contention that column 47 is somehow distinctive, as proposed by Andrew Wilson and Lawrence Wills. Their study has identified a different set of features in the form of pseudepigraphic composition and verbal forms. They noted that the second person singular address predominated except in column 47. Because lines 14-18 of column 47 express divine commands in the second person plural in preparation for the purity laws similarly expressed in the next column, they viewed this column as a 'transitional section'.[665]

Conclusion

After the numerous expressions of עיר in columns 45-47, why has the text culminated this repetition with the phrase עיר מקדשי, 'city of my sanctuary' (47:9,13)? The two words are uncoupled in the column (10,11,15,16). Somewhat out of keeping with the coupled עיר מקדשי, a new phrase מקדשי ועירי, 'my Temple and my city' appears in the last line, as if 'my Temple' and 'my city' were to be considered as separate entities (47:18), as is also the case with the חיל (46:10). Scholarship has not yet identified and discussed this apparent inconsistency.

Afresh through the prism of spatiality, this chapter has re-examined עיר and עירי beyond the confines of a geographical עיר. It is noteworthy that עירי does not appear elsewhere in the scroll. Because the text does not indicate a location, the עיר seems a space which, in some of the text, is part of the מקדש. However, in the last line, it is separate. As it cannot be both, we should consider the עיר differently as a functioning space which is conceived, that is to say, Secondspace, rather than a Firstspace entity which is just perceived and measured. The only function of עיר in the text is its association with מקדש. Although it is symbolic of Secondspace, there is no sense that עיר, on its own, is a lived space, even on the two occasions it is mentioned (46:14,17). The text could

---

[665] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', pp. 275-277. This challenges the notion of single authorship.

have been written without עיר, relying on the strength of מקדש as a marker of holiness. Once other cities were introduced in column 47, then עיר had to feature. It is the relative impurity of other cities that leads to עיר מקדשי as the Thirdspace of lived purity to the standard of holiness.

Does this infer that, prior to the introduction of other cities, the inconsistency of עיר makes it non-contributory to the understanding of the problematic phrase עיר המקדש? Let us revisit the earlier two columns where the divine dwells in the city's midst (45:13-14) and the temple's midst (46:3; 46:10-11). It must be remembered that the city is as yet undetermined, quite feasibly, in an idealised location (§5.2). Because the location is idealised, the city will be the setting for the temple; without the city, there can be no temple. In spatial terms, physical space becomes real because of human energy within that space which Lefebvre indicates is socially produced.[666] Therefore, the city space in that eventual location will be realised by human spatial practice, not only in Firstspace terms but also conceived by means of symbolic references to religious belief, Lefebvre's space of representation.[667] Of course, it would be possible for the city to be produced through spatial practice but without any predictability of a temple. Differing spatial practice by people within that city would eventually conceive the space in their different ways. The problematic question is whether the intended divine space, as described in the text, is merely conceived as Secondspace or is it actually lived as Thirdspace? God can act as a change of those differing conceptions. The divine location is a place of God's presence and activity. In that location, everyone is required to act by the divine presence. Hence, we see an overlapping of holy space with personal space, although nothing on earth could match the divine whose presence makes it the new lived reality of that space. Through historic religious associations and symbolism, people of that disposition would produce the temple space in accordance with divine will. It will be a Thirdspace that is lived accordingly. Without that spatial foundation of עיר,

---

[666] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 27.

[667] Ibid., p. 33.

עיר המקדש would not be possible. The divine would therefore claim עירי, 'my city' (47:18) as the setting for מקדשי, 'my temple' (47:16). In other words, in the context of the Temple Scroll, עיר is not a geographic entity but rather a spatial setting for המקדש.

CHAPTER 7

Other Iterations of עיר in the Temple Scroll

Introduction

The word עיר appears in columns 45-47 some 20 times. In the other 63 extant columns, it is expressed far less densely, some 30 times. This chapter will characterise the use of עיר in these 63 columns to which, for ease of reference, I shall refer as 'peripheral'. A distinction will be drawn between those particular iterations and those in the 'central' columns 45-47. Interesting questions arise. First, was the scroll's author appropriating the word directly from the Hebrew biblical sources? This likelihood should not be surprising as the bulk of those peripheral columns comprise the Deuteronomic Paraphrase (cols. 51-66). Second, was he using it in his own context? Third, was the author actually making any substitutions from the biblical sources? Any commonality of these issues along with any spatial readings will be explored by an examination of each entry.

7.1 Peripheral Iterations

This section will look at the lines bearing iterations of עיר and compare them with closely resembling biblical passages, thus allowing us to note whether the scroll's עיר has been directly imported, inserted or substituted with another word. A comparison can then be made with the more densely populated columns 45-47.

We have seen that עיר המקדש is not a biblical phrase, so that direct appropriation from the biblical sources can be discounted.[668] By means of a reconstruction of the decayed script, it has been taken to appear, early on in the scroll (16:11), in relation to the burning of hide and dung outside the City of the Temple.[669] The first two letters and the lower part of the *vav* of מחוץ are discernible from the photograph; the rest of the line has decayed.[670] The biblical passages of similarity (Lev.4:12; 16:27) does not mention עיר but מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp'. If we are to rely on this reconstruction, it would seem that the scroll's author would have substituted מחנה for עיר.

עיר appears in the tribal apportioning of territories: אשר בתוך העיר, 'which is in the midst of the city' (44:2). The based text is located in Ezekiel where the various tribes are allocated spaces measured in cubits in the context of the עיר (Ezek. 48:22, 23-29). עיר has thus been appropriated.

Burial of the dead and those with leprosy was to be handled in an organised manner so as not to defile the land, in contrast to other nations which bury randomly (48:11-12). The management of both these impurity situations required designated places:

בן ארבע ערים תתנו מקום לקבור בהמה ובכל עיר ועיר תעשו מקומות למנוגעים בצרעת

> Between four cities you shall apportion a place to bury in them. And in every city you
> shall set aside places for those afflicted with leprosy (48:13b-15a)

---

[668] White Crawford, 'The Meaning of the Phrase', p. 242. Although not a biblical phrase, it does appear in CD 12:1-2 which states the prohibition of sexual relations in עיר המקדש. Schiffman refers to this parallel reference to stress that such relations there would render the 'holy place impure' (Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, p. 155). Davies views the CD reference as a reminder to residents and pilgrims of the sanctity of the temple, without any elaboration on the phrase itself. See Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) supp. 25, p. 136. Crawford argues that the reason for the similarity of the rulings is that seminal emission conveys ritual impurity. See White Crawford, 'Meaning of the Phrase', 243. The issue of similarity of the phrase in the two documents has not really addressed. As a phrase that is not biblical, any commonality cannot be attributed to scripture. Dependency of one on the other is a possibility, but given only a single appearance in CD, I would view that possibility as remote. The Temple Scroll is a document primarily of purity to which CD, in its handling of marital impurity, may have referred.

[669] *TS* p. 50. The reconstruction of מחוץ לעיר המקדש is attributed to Yadin.

[670] <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

It was made clear that the land was not to be defiled: ולוא תטמאו את ערצכמה (48:10-11). This reflects the biblical reference (Num. 35: 34) where there is no reference to עיר. The scroll's author has grafted it into his text as something of significance.

Column 49 deals with death occurring in a house within 'your cities' (49:5). It is interesting to note the base text (Num.19:14) is similar but for one substitution. The place of death, באהל, 'in the tent', has been substituted in the scroll by בעריכה, 'in your cities'. This reflects the progress of the new reality expressed in the scroll. Such progress is merely physical in that 'tent' of the wilderness has progressed to the more sophisticated nucleation of 'your cities'. This substitution is deeply more spiritual in that עיר would provide the scroll's more stringent setting of holiness.

Column 52 falls within the territory of the Deuteronomic Paraphrase (cols. 51-66). It stipulates rules relating to sacrificial animals and their welfare in the context of agriculture. The column refers to the ruling that unblemished animals could only be slaughtered in 'my temple'. Blemished animals could only be consumed away from 'my temple'. Towards the end of the column in line 19, it is stressed that such meat could not be consumed within עירי, 'my city'. The non-Deuteronomic base text (Lev.17:3-4) refers to such restriction being applied to מחוץ למחנה, 'outside the camp'. Again, מחנה has been substituted by an iteration of עיר.

Column 55 closely reflects passages from Deuteronomy 13 from which עיר is lifted out directly into the scroll, if this reconstruction is to be accepted in line 2. Here the divine voice alerts the people to be vigilant against any talk of idolatry:

(55:2) אם תשמע באח[ת עריכה אשר א]נוכי נותן לכה [671]

---

[671] *TS* p. 158. This portion of the line is degraded as in the photograph <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

If you hear about one of your cities which I give to you…

(Deut.13:13) כי־תשמע באחת עריך אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך

The divine voice warns against the Israelites being led astray by worthless people amongst them:

(55:3-4a) יצאו אנש [י]ם בני [בלי] על מקרבכה וידיחו את כול [י] וישבי עירמה

Some worthless amongst you have gone out and led astray all those who live in their city…

(Deut. 13:14)   יצאו אנשים בני־בליעל במקרבך וידיחו את וישבי עירם

The inhabitants of any city found to be guilty of practising idolatry are to be annihilated:

(55:6b-7a) הכה תכה את כול יושבי העיר ההיא לפי[672] חרב

'You shall surely destroy all who live in that city by means of the sword…'

(Deut:13:16)   הכה תכה את־יישבי העיר ההוא לפי חרב

The spoils are then to gathered and the city with its spoil burnt down:

(55:9) ושרפתה באש את העיר ואת כול שללה

'… and then burn with fire the city and all its spoil…'

(Deut.13:17) ושרפתה באש ואת־העיר ואת־כל־שללה

The Law of the King is embedded within the Deuteronomic Paraphrase (Column 56:12-60:21). עיר is iterated in 57:5 where the God-chosen king appoints his army, but does not appear in the base text of Moses' first discourse where he reviews the experiences of the Israelites up to that point of the wandering (Deut.1:15):

(57:5) ושרי ע' שרות[673] בכול עריהמה

…and commanders of tens in all their cities…

(Deut.1:15) ושרי עשרת ושפטרים לשבטיכם

…commanders of tens and officials throughout your tribes

The scroll's author has upgraded 'your tribes', commanded by Moses to nucleations of 'their cities', on his assumption of an idealised setting where everyone now lives in cities, including soldiers of the king's army.[674]

The king's conduct of warfare, both defensive and offensive, is stipulated in column 58. For the most part, the scroll's author has appropriated עיר from the biblical texts. The Deuteronomic reference (Deut. 20) demands peace talks, with war being the last resort (Deut.20:10-12). It warns against cowardice by boosting morale with the optimistic hope of a safe return of the soldier to his home. עיר is iterated with regard to smiting every male but sparing women, children and cattle (Deut. 20: 13-14), as well as doing battle with cities of nations such as the Hittites (Deut. 20: 15-18). By contrast, the scroll's column 58 is more precise and prescriptive in terms of numbers of soldiers and how the vanquished are to be dealt with. Soldiers, stationed in the cities, are to be on standby (58: 4, 15), not reflected in the biblical text. There is to be a home guard to protect each Israelite city from hostile incursion whilst front line troops were battling (58:9). If fighting were to intensify, there would still have to be a reserve in 'their cities' (58: 11). This is reflected without mention of עיר in 1 Sam.30: 24-25.

Towards the end of the Law of the King, the scroll deals with the fate of idolatrous enemies:

(59:4) יהיו עריהמה לשומה

their cities will become a waste [675]

This phrase is reflected in these biblical sources:

---

[674] *TS* p. 167, n. 5.

[675] שמה, 'waste'. The biblical sources use הרבה.

(Lev. 26:31a) ונתתי את־עריכם חרבה

And I shall make your cities a waste

(Ezek. 12:20) והערים ונושבות תחרבנו

And the inhabited cities will be laid waste

(Ezek. 35:4) עריך חרבה אשים

I shall lay waste your cities

The laws of warfare continue in column 62, drawing close parallels with Deuteronomy 20 from which עיר is lifted directly:

(62:5-6) כי הקרב אל עיר להלחם עליה

If you approach a city to wage war against it

(Deut. 20:10) כי־תקרב אל־עיר להלחם עליה

(62:10) הנשים והטף והבהמה וכול אשר יהיה בעיר

…the women, the children and animals and all that is in the city…

(Deut. 20:14) רק הנשים והטף והבהמה וכל אשר יהיה בעיר

(62:11b-12) כן תעשה לערים הרחוקות ממכה מאודה אשר לוא מערי הגואים האלה הנה

…so you shall do to the cities that are far away from you which are

not from the cities of these nations

(Deut. 20:15) כן תעשה לכל־הערים הרחקת ממך מאד אשר לא־מערי הגוים־האלה הנה

(62:13) המה רק מערי העמים אשר אנוכי נותן לכה נחלֹה לוא תחיה כול נשמה

But in the cities of the people I give you as an inheritance you

shall not save any living thing

(Deut. 20:16) רק מערי העמים האלה אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך נחלה

Column 63 initially deals with the finding of a murdered body. The elders of the nearest city to the corpse must take a heifer that has never been worked and break its neck. The first line is badly degraded. Schiffman and Gross have reconstructed it from:

(Deut. 21:3b) זקני העיר ההוא עגלת אשר לא־עבד בה אשר לא־משכה בעל

…the elders of that city shall take shall take a heifer of the herd that has not

been worked and not pulled the yoke

(63: 4b-5a) וכול זקני העיר ההיה הקרובה אל החלל ירחצו את ידיהמה אל ראוש העגלה [676]

all the elders of the city nearest the corpse will wash their hands over

the head of the heifer…

(Deut. 21:6) וכל זקני העיר ההיא הקרובה אל־החלל ירחצו את־ידיהם על העגלה

Column 64 parallels the deuteronomic text where radical measures of fatal stoning are proposed to deal with a rebellious and defiant son. His parents must present him to:

(64: 4-5a) זקני עירו ואל שער { } [677] מקומו ואמרו אל זקני עירו בננו זה סורר ומורר ואננו שומע

…the elders of his city to the gate of his place. They shall say to the elders of his city 'this son is rebellious and defiant. He does not take heed…

(Deut. 21: 19b-20a) זקני עירו ואל־שער מקומו ואמרו אל־זקני עירו בננו זה סורר ומורר ואננו שומע

Similar deuteronomic replication is seen in the last extant column, dealing radically with adultery and rape. Line 1 on the photograph is unreadable because of degrading and fissuring of the parchment. Schiffman and Gross have reconstructed:

(66: 1) [והוציאו את שניהמה אל זקני] העיר ההיא ואל ש [ער מקומה]

---

[676] *TS* p. 182

[677] Erasure (*TS* p. 186; Elisha Qimron, *Temple Scroll*, p. 89). This segment of the parchment looks blank in <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>.

[they shall take the two of them to the elders of] that city and to the gate of her place…

(Deut. 22: 24a) והוצאתם את־שניהם אל־שער שער העיר ההוא

The adulterers are to be stoned to death, the man because he has violated the wife of someone else. The betrothed woman, if she is a virgin, qualifies for this punishment because she did not cry out in the city. Had this liaison occurred in open countryside far from the city, the married girl would not be guilty. Schiffman and Gross have reconstructed from Deut. 22:25 directly:

(66: 2c-3a) הנערה על דבר אשר לוא זעק [ה] בעיר

… the girl because she did not cry out in the city

(66: 4b-5a) ואם בשדה מצאה האיש את האשה במקום רחוק וסתר מהעיר והחזיק [678]

and if in the field the man found the woman in a place far away and hidden

from the city…

(Deut. 22: 25) ואם בשדה ימצא האיש את־הנער המארשה והחזיק־בה האיש

and if in the field the man were to find the betrothed woman and held her there…

Interestingly the scroll's author has inserted עיר as an important geophysical reference point.

Conclusion

From this survey, the scroll's text shows two interesting and important observations. First, the iterations of עיר are more densely represented in columns 45-47 than peripherally. Second, these particular iterations are part of original composition, in contrast with the peripheral columns which have been imported mainly from biblical sources. In contrast, 45-47 show scant biblical references but the text does not actually replicate the biblical texts.

---

[678] This is clearly superscripted in <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>. See *TS* p, 190.

This point is supported by my observation that Swanson's study of biblical methodology actually omits reference to columns 45-47. In places outside the Deuteronomic paraphrase, we have seen textual similarities to Numbers and Leviticus. Similarities there may be, but Samely reminds us that the scroll does not acknowledge prior existence of any text as a model for its own verbal substance.[679]

These observations should prompt us to ask why the texts of 45-47 specifically were composed without the crutch of biblical texts, that is to say, independent of the process of biblical transcription. The impetus behind this difference seems to be that the concept of עיר was of significant concern. This concern is reinforced by the observation of a substitution and addition twice in the peripheral columns, such as we saw where בעריכמה (49:5) substitutes אהל (Num. 19:14) and where עיר is added (66:5a) where it is absent (Deut. 22:24).

This textual extra-biblical approach was to strike at the heart of Judaism; the temple itself. To incorporate עיר was part of this plan of challenging the unsatisfactory situation of the day. Because readers of the twentieth and twenty-first century have grappled inconclusively with the concept of עיר המקדש, the development of Spatiality Theory has provided an opportunity to re-read the problematic columns 45-47 beyond geophysical constraints. In contrast, the peripheral columns that have been reviewed in this chapter do not present the specific problem of עיר המקדש and do not attract a re-reading regarding this particular issue.

Our survey of other parts of the scroll strongly suggests columns 45-47 as a definable block, with its own characteristic of textual independence. The question arises as to whether this supports, in any way, the notion of authorial heterogeneity, a concept argued by Wilson and Wills.[680] They single out column 47 as transitional using the second person plural address in

---

[679] Alex Samely, 'Observations', p. 238.

[680] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', 275-288 (p. 276). They propose more than one literary source of the scroll on the basis of grammatical forms and vocabulary.

preparation for the following purity texts.[681] Interestingly and probably coincidentally in relation to Wilson and Wills, this column shows the highest density of iterations of עיר. Our proposed block of 45-47 although not in any way falling into their criteria, is demonstrably definable on the basis of biblical textual independence and the עיר repetition, along with its homographs (§6.4).

As for the possibility of separate authorship of this block within the long scroll, any such project might possibly have been collaborative and brought to fruition without disagreement. On the other hand, the compiler(s) of the Temple Scroll may have had no temporal connection with those from a previous generation responsible for the source material. On the basis that the Temple Scroll was composed as an absolute expression of singular divine revelation without any intermediate moderation, this particular block may have reinforced the notion that traditional biblical reference had not prevented the Israelites from going astray. This block of text would then re-invigorate the divine purity of עיר המקדש as an entire purity entity which should have been as such in Jerusalem all along. Who might have been responsible for this interposition? If we accept that the scroll was composed and written as a pre-sectarian text, then it cannot necessarily be tied with sectarian authorship such as the Teacher of Righteousness. This can only be conjecture but perhaps the block was composed by someone of Sadducean persuasion who viewed his text as authoritative, without any recourse to traditional references.

[681] Ibid., 277.

FINAL CONCLUSIONS

This study arose from my observation of three intriguing and inescapable issues about the nature of the concept of עיר featuring within the text of the Temple Scroll. As none of them had yet received scholarly attention, I considered them worthy of serious research. As a prelude to more comprehensive conclusions, these three features are reiterated briefly as follows.

First, there is repetition of the Hebrew word עיר in columns 45-47, especially 47. This conveys the sense that the scroll's author may have been particularly concerned about the concept of עיר. It is this concept that this study set out to explore spatially. The straight English translation of this word is 'city' although this is a flexible term. As it is linked in the scroll's text to the מקדש, 'sanctuary' or 'temple', it was understood to have an impact on the understanding of עיר המקדש. It became apparent that there had not yet been any scholarly consensus on the understanding of the phrase עיר המקדש which is an important and challenging issue. The phrase itself has been translated as Temple City and City of the Sanctuary; I have subscribed to the former. By deploying a fresh approach to the appreciation of עיר, potential was seen in taking this problem forward. Thus far, one school of thought regarded עיר המקדש as a city, inside of which, is the Temple. Another regarded עיר המקדש as only the Temple, not the entire city. An attempt to resolve this impasse came from an alternative view that the assumed locus of Jerusalem was not residential but a site of pilgrimage.

The thrust of this study lies in chapters 3-6 where we read columns 45-47 through the prism of Spatiality Theory. This gave us the tools to tackle the impasse of the relationship of המקדש to עיר, beyond the bounds of mere physicality. As we have seen, this impasse has arisen over the years because of differing scholarly interpretations of this phrase, based on geophysical arguments,

which would limit the categorisation to what we now understand as Firstspace. This present study has therefore extended our thinking beyond this confinement, such that a close reading of these columns can be understood afresh.

It is within these three columns, 45-47, that the scroll's author chose to insert a text conveying a heightening of purity with regard to the newly envisaged עיר המקדש, with hardly any lifting of biblical text itself, in contrast to the other extant columns with just two exceptions (§7). This textual extra-biblical approach was to strike at the heart of Judaism, the temple itself. It appears that עיר was part of this plan of challenging the contemporary temple situation. Although Schiffman reminds us that some groups of Second Temple Jews objected to the religious, political and military conduct of the Hasmoneans, we do not actually know about the purity temple practices of the Hasmoneans.[682] All we can say is that the scroll represents the voice of those objecting groups who, as part of their objections, would be incorporating enhanced purity practices into their text. Biblical scripture would serve as a framework or template for this enhancement.

The readers of the twentieth and twenty-first century have been grappling inconclusively with the concept of עיר המקדש. The development of Spatiality Theory has presented the opportunity to read these particular columns beyond the confines of the geophysical. In the absence of consensus, I sought to tackle this problem afresh through the prism of Critical Spatiality Theory, a paradigm which categorises space in terms of perception, conception and the actual lived experience of space. Because of restricted thinking of sites and locations, attempts to understand עיר המקדש had become mired in thinking of nothing more than sites and locations. A spatiality study presented as means to open up new horizons which went beyond present geophysical thinking. This would enable us to view the spaces and subspaces of עיר המקדש not only as physical

---

[682] *TS* p. 4.

entities and backgrounds to human events, but more conclusively as spaces where human planning and living are taken into account.

Second, there is in the Temple Scroll a curious absence of the word 'Jerusalem'. There is widespread scholarly assumption that Jerusalem is the intended locus of the idealised temple or sanctuary as described in the scroll. Yet location is never mentioned in any of the 66 extant columns. The absence of text before the first extant column could be argued as a problem, in that it is just possible that a specific city locus could have been stated therein. More likely, the remaining 66 columns would have given ample opportunity for an appearance. This absence conveys the notion that the scroll's author had other ideas. As the scroll contains ideas that were at variance with those of the current temple authorities in Jerusalem, it is quite possible that the author was harking back to the desert ideal, where the Sinai covenant originated. After all, the desert was barren and devoid of any chance of acculturation and influence from other groups. The covenant could thus be delivered without any influences which would have operated if it had been delivered, say, in Egypt. In this study, this train of thought has opened up a rethinking of the temple locus in that we argued against the prevailing scholarly assumption of Jerusalem. The ideal temple, with its massive dimensions, could have been built in a place with sufficient space to accommodate it, rather than on Mount Moriah.[683]

Third, there is the use of עור in the three columns 45-47. It is the repetition and punning of עיר that attracts our attention to 45-47, a portion of the scroll which seems to convey a sense of concern by the scroll's author about how עיר should be understood. Here, עור is also found. It

---

[683] The question arises as to a possible spatial treatment of the seven fragmentary Aramaic copies comprising the New Jerusalem texts (1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q554-54a; 4Q555; 5Q15; 11Q18). Again, the word Jerusalem is absent, which raises doubt about the assumption of Jerusalem as the locus. The angelic guide reveals not only architectural structure but also performance of priestly ritual; a catalogue of observations by an unidentified person. It is a planned heavenly restorative messianic model to be realised on earth when the final battle against Israel's foes is played out. This is distinct from the Temple Scroll which concerns itself with divine commands to comply with temple purity, rather than conflict. The absence of divine commands on the Israelites reduces the performative nature of the New Jerusalem texts such that its predominant literary spatial feature would be Firstspace.

was apparent that this is a near-homograph of עיר, meaning 'blind' and 'animal hide', both forbidden in the temple. Although a subsidiary issue, I considered how this functions very likely as a lexical punning device which the author(s) added to re-inforce their concern about the concept of עיר. This led us to a discussion about the associations of impurity between עיר and עור. Because blind people and impure hides were forbidden in the sanctuary, the use of these near-homographs of עיר reinforces its significance as an entity of Thirdspace performance.

The Temple Scroll treats עיר as a significant concept rather than simply as a word to be translated lexically. The word appears relatively late in the scroll, having been transitioned into the purity role by the intermediate בית. Although the opening extant column hints at a desert setting by its reflection of Exodus 13, the absence of a clearly defined physical locus does raise a further question as to the nature of עיר. The idea by Flight of a nomadic ideal in the desert and the development of spatial theory by Soja drive our thinking towards עיר as a space without a place, as yet to be realised on earth.[684] This would resonate with an earlier view by Park that the 'city' is a 'state of mind', if taken in the context of Secondspace planning, applicable to the Temple Scroll.[685]

Through purity and portability, עיר serves as a link to the holiness of divine acceptance, as a way to a fulfilled human experience. The purity laws were intended to have validity not just in temple times but in all ages.[686] Thus, עיר, as applied to the scroll, would appear to take on the attributes of a utopian nucleation. The apparent demarcation from the temple and the city by a rampart חיל need not be taken as a physical separation as a barrier, but rather as a space for reflection to those about to enter עיר המקדש. Through the lens of spatiality, it was deduced that חיל is binding, rather than separating, the spaces of עיר and מקדש.

---

[684] John W. Flight, 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament', p. 210.

[685] Robert E. Park, 'The City', 577-612.

[686] Marcus Moritz Kalisch, *Leviticus,* p. 193.

Before embarking on a close reading of these columns, it was necessary to review the published scholarship on the ancient 'city'. The key concepts of what actually makes a city in material and behavioural terms derives from ideas in the fields of sociology and anthropology.[687] With regard to biblical thinking, these disciplines have to be approached with caution, as the human relationship to the city phenomenon was dependent on interpretation of the biblical sources. More abstract sociological thinking in the early twentieth century presaged formal spatial categories that were to evolve decades later in the late 1970s onwards, crystallising as Critical Spatiality Theory. Prior to this, literature specific to biblical cities concentrated on the urban aspects of the social world of ancient Israel. The twenty-first century has spawned literature on biblical cities which has started to introduce spatiality as an analytical tool.

Since the עיר of the Temple Scroll must surely have been presented in a way that makes sense to the ancient readership or audience, the question was raised as to how it was to be understood. We explored what is necessary to understand the concept of the city in contemporaneous literature. Because scholarship has done much to advance the understanding of the city in ancient Israel and elsewhere, such scholarship could therefore provide tools for examination of the city idea in the Temple Scroll. To tackle the unresolved problem of the relationship between המקדש and עיר, it was necessary to extend our thinking beyond the geophysical towards how space was perceived, conceived and actually lived, according to Critical Spatiality Theory.

This provided the foundation for further analysis in spatial terms. Earlier on in the twentieth century, there were unstructured spatial inferences but it was only from the 1970s that Henri Lefebvre presented formally categorised spatial thinking.[688] For my study to proceed, it was necessary to explore spatiality thinking. It was noted that Lefebvre's ideas of perceived, conceived and lived spaces were extended by Edward Soja into a framework of Firstspace,

---

[687] Frank S. Frick, *The City in Ancient Israel*, pp. 25-61; Gideon Sjoberg, *The Pre-Industrial City, Past and Present*, p. 5.

[688] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, pp. 38-39.

Secondspace and Thirdspace which is now recognised as Critical Spatiality Theory.[689] It was important to stress that these categories are not mutually exclusive. A given space on the ground can be categorised as having the attributes of Firstspace which Lefebvre understood as 'perceived' space. That is to say, the given space is understood in a limited way in terms of its geophysicality; for example, its mapping coordinates, its relationship to topographical features and other spaces. Secondspace extends our thinking as to how the space is conceptualised, which has ramifications in terms of planning for its eventual use. Lefebvre understood this as 'conceived' space. These two spaces have been the constraining basis of historical and geographical narratives. Spatial thinking has nevertheless extended this limited understanding into the realms of how space is actually lived and used. This extension was understood by Lefebvre as 'representational', spaces that are actually lived and categorised by Soja as Thirdspace. Thus, it is through Soja that we see Lefebvre. Neither was interested in the biblical arena but Soja, rather than Lefebvre, has been used in the biblical arena as a paradigm.

Around the turn of the present century, spatial analysis was brought not only into the realm of biblical analysis but also the Temple Scroll [690] and the Damascus Document.[691] Our study took spatial analysis a step further into the realm of imagined spaces depicted in the Temple Scroll from which Jerusalem is omitted. Because we were dealing with imagined space, it is Berquist's methodology of dealing with biblical Jerusalem that brought us closer to our analysis of the scroll. Imagined spaces conform to certain parameters as if they were real spaces; the natural

---

[689] Edward W. Soja, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles*, pp. 53-82.

[690] Jorunn Økland, 'The Language of Gates and Entering', pp. 149-165. See also Lantz, 'The Hypertemple in Mind'. This takes a broad approach, incorporating the Temple Scroll as a subsection. There is repeated mention of *temple space* but without any detailed spatial analysis of those spatial entities within the text.

[691] Liv Ingeborg Lied, 'Another Look at the Land of Damascus', pp. 101-25.

order still applies.[692] Thus, as an alternative approach to geophysicality, we tackled space as a textual spatial experience that is envisaged in the Temple Scroll.

However, the paradigm did not go unchallenged, notably by Meredith, in its application to more general biblical studies.[693] Nevertheless, we considered that, however imperfect, structured spatial thinking was more contributory than none. In addition, as no alternative was proffered, the paradigm should not be invalidated.

After this foundational review, the study pursued an enquiry into the reasons behind the striking feature of repetition of the Hebrew word עיר, including its prefixed, genitive and plural forms, in column 47, comprising 14% of words. It occurs less so in columns 45 and 46. Up to now, it was noted that there had been no detail in the literature on how עיר had been conceptualised in this scroll although there were inconclusive scholarly attempts to understand עיר המקדש. This absence of study is surprising, since the use of repetition very likely indicates a level of concern by its author about the עיר idea. Through a literary analysis, we investigated concepts and meaning, as well as issues of provenance of the columns that feature the repetition of עיר. The questions arose as to what, if anything, distinguishes 45-47 from the rest of the scroll. Might there be different authors or redactors, so that עיר is of concern to those who crafted columns 45-47, but not of any particular concern to those involved with other columns? If we assume that its author was making clear points of criticism to the temple authorities of his own time by means of a reworked Torah in a long scroll, it would not be unreasonable to deduce that its author may well have understood עיר in a revised context of his time as he understood it, rather than in a biblical context.

In support, it is interesting to note that the number of appearances of עיר and its different iterations in columns 45-47 is 17 in total. Of further interest is that, in these three columns where עיר is

---

[692] Jon L. Berquist, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', in *Constructions II*, pp. 40-52.

[693] Christopher Meredith, 'Taking Issue with Thirdspace', in *Constructions* of *Space III*, pp. 75-103.

presented, the biblical base texts do not mention עיר. Furthermore, 46:13, dealing with latrines, has the words חוץ מן עיר supplanting its base text מחוץ למחנה (Deut. 23:13), showing a substitution of מחנה, 'camp' by עיר. This is a matter of significance in that the עיר idea must have been of considerable importance. By contrast, in the 63 extant columns other than 45-47, עיר appears only 28 times. Most of these cases take עיר from their base texts. It would therefore seem that the more concentrated and self-standing appearance of עיר in 45-47 involves particular significance regarding the עיר idea.

In terms of specific analysis, this study has worked through the relevant columns closely. Although numerous translations have been presented previously over the years, it was contributory to offer my translation of columns 45-47 to explore how עיר develops in the text. I argued that the sanctity of עיר developed through the concepts of כיור, 'basin/bowl' and בית, 'house'. We noted that, before the constructional details, a different word מזרק is used for 'bowl' or 'basin' to collect sacrificial blood (23:12). However, during the envisioned temple's construction, we noted the alternative word for 'bowl', כיור, which is paired with בית. The word כיור denotes more than a simple basin, perhaps a fire-basin. It is quoted in the Hebrew Bible as part of the paraphernalia of cleansing before entry into the tent of the meeting (Exod. 30:18, 28). It becomes an integral part of the sanctuary (Exod. 31:9; 35:16) and of the sacrificial apparatus (Exod. 38:8). Therefore, the choice of the word כיור indicates not just an ordinary basin but one which is elevated in status because it is integral to the trappings of sanctity. Its pairing with בית in would suggest that בית has also been elevated to the status of sacred space.

My view was that the use of בית establishes a firm relationship with God by virtue of the burnt offering, so that when עיר is introduced, the sanctity of עיר is definite. In addition, taking into account my analysis of כיור, my view differs from that of Milgrom, in that בית and עיר do not actually have a comparative structural relationship. I deduced that their relationship is more subtle, in that עיר is a continuum of בית on the purity spectrum. It is now becoming evident that

עיר cannot be satisfactorily understood in purely geophysical terms of Firstspace. In other words, our thinking must extend holistically and afresh into Second and Thirdspace.

The unresolved relationship between עיר and המקדש was then placed in the spotlight by mention of the חיל, translated variously as 'rampart', 'trench', 'fosse' (46: 9-11). Its physical reality was not considered to be plausible. In the context of available space in contemporary Jerusalem, we considered its width of a 100 cubits unrealistic. In addition, the חיל seems impervious, in that the text does not describe any breaks or gates to allow human movement either direction. Because of this physical improbability, the problem was considered spatially which led to my opinion that this was a liminal space for reflection, as part of the process of becoming holy, before entry to המקדש. In spatial terms, this is a space of complex living beyond the mere geophysical and planning. It is a Thirdspace, like עיר and מקדש, which is actually lived and experienced through its symbolic significance, by being bound to עיר and מקדש. I argued that these three entities are therefore bound in Thirdspace. Spatiality thinking brought us to the conclusion that the function of the חיל is to bind, rather than separate, contrary to the separationist readings of Schiffman, and Levine.

We looked at terms with which עיר share a spatial relationship: מחנה, מקדש and בית. The Thirdspace memories of the desert מחנה, invoked in the base text, are grafted onto עיר. The inclusion of מחנה was predicated on the scholarly handling of the lacuna of 16:11-12a. The idea of מקדש, expressed earlier in the scroll as מקדשי (29:8), takes holiness into its own space, because it is to be made holy, even though עיר is not yet mentioned. בית is linked by association with מקדשי, thus establishing a firm relationship with the divine. This is the first inkling of sacred space here because of active fulfilment of traditions known to the scroll's author from Hebrew Biblical scripture. We read the scroll as a projection of a divine vision conveying an intended human praxis within those spaces as if it were real space yet to be realised somewhere on earth. Because this vision is predicated on the fulfilment of divine commands, it was therefore moved

beyond the physicality of Firstspace. Those spaces that require a commitment to self-purification towards holiness are based on profound awareness of complex biblical foundations. Those post-purification spaces, עיר, המקדש and עיר המקדש, are mentioned in the text as nothing more than spaces of privileged access; daily physical activities and dynamics are absent. If we take Soja's idea that spatiality is part of the human condition, then those spaces are more than just geophysical entities, even if they have yet to be realised.

To this we added the spatial significance of כול, conferring a sense of subspaces as in כול המקדש, in relation to nocturnal emission (45:7-8). If such spaces were planned for sacral use, they would expand into the realm of Secondspace. Furthermore, in cleansing after nocturnal emission, there is now a relationship between the washing of inanimate clothing and man. Sacral ritual is now being performed, even before entering כול המקדש. By way of extending the human experience beyond the mental and thinking, the Divine decree integrates the divine name with its commandments of praxis within that space; that is to say, the complexities of Thirdspace.

The spatial concept of the phrase כול המקדש was tackled further by approaching the text from a different angle, referring to the conditions which actually debar entry to כול המקדש. In addition to כול, the roles of רחץ and בשר were pivotal in this analysis. כול conveys a sense of subspaces within המקדש. The word בשר opened up a discussion on gender reference in the text. Only a man is now part of the purity process. Rather than the women being regarded as the agent of impurity or as a participant in the purity process, the text does not consider the 'wife' to be relevant to the exclusive male environment of עיר המקדש. Unpersuaded by biblical gender scholarship that would look for inclusivity, I concluded that the text should be read at face value. Fundamentally, the text's author simply does not regard women relevant to the proposed environment.

In exploring what was unhealthy and impure, we looked at the concept of בשר, 'flesh' (45:16). Lefebvre considered the body to be the point of origin of social space.[694] This stands to reason, in that if social space is produced socially, the body must be part of that social production. The use of בשר in the scroll presents, somewhat pointedly, a base physical picture of humankind, rather than any reference to a spiritual component of what it is to be human. Access to עיר המקדש is forbidden until purification. המקדש is a more rigorously observed subspace of priestly status, to which the person, whose attributes are degraded as בשר, is not admitted. If we consider the specific impurity of a venereal discharge, an unhealthy condition, which requires an exclusion for seven days, then perhaps this week-long protraction after bathing in 'living water' will likely reflect the scroll's purity judgement on such a discharge. This judgement is not morally based but rather on its indicator as irregularity and disease. This is more rigorous than the three-day exclusion from כול המקדש, without mention of בשר, because of an emission. By this argument, if the seven-day exclusion confers ritual importance on חיים, 'living', then במים חיים, 'in living water', could be understood as a ritualistic concept in the scroll's context of a discharge, something which is inherently unhealthy and impure. Thus, by the use of a ritual requirement requiring במים חיים, the scroll distils its exclusions down to what is pure and what is impure, rather than moral and immoral.

The spatial idea of עריהמה, 'their cities', to which בשר applies, forms a scattered diaspora of subsidiary spaces, probably within the land of Israel. There is divine hope that they will develop from Secondspace into the more complex category of Thirdspace. That is to say, symbolic spatial practice and the development of complex associations with the divine presence will supervene over space that is merely designated for different functions. This train of thought is predicated on our interpretation of the first lacuna in 47:3 which is of particular interest and an interpretative problem. For the sake of context, it would be appropriate in this conclusion to reiterate some

---

[694] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 40.

details. In the commentaries of Schiffman and Gross and Charlesworth, the *vav* here is superscripted as an uncertain.[695] Physical degradation has rendered this reconstruction of these scholars ו[...] invisible to me on the photographs of the Israel Museum and Yadin. Yadin does not fill the lacuna but suggests there is room for 4-5 letters.[696] However, it is these scholars' attempts at reconstruction of this lacuna which stimulated my thinking about the spatiality of these other cities. God has declared those cities pure: ו[...] עריהמה טהורות in this line. The argument distils down to whether we are dealing with a grammatical imperfect or an imperative. In his most recent transcription, Schiffman and Gross provide ו[ויהי], imperfect but translates it more as an imperative 'shall be', akin to 'must be'.[697] Wise, Abegg and Cook translate it as 'must be'.[698] Martínez and Tigchelaar provide an imperative [והיו], although they translate it as 'will be'.[699] Their space within the brackets is unexplained. The imperative implies that those cities must be pure although they still translate their version as 'will be', rather than Schiffman's rather stronger 'shall be'. If there is no room for manoeuvre with regard to purity and impurity of 'their cities', I would have expected an imperative into the lacuna. My view has steered towards Schiffman's imperfect in the Hebrew although his English imperative 'shall be' would convey the strength of an imperative. In support of this, the way these other city spaces were used provided the basis of further spatiality analysis.

Although the text does not convey complex living in the 'their cities' or 'your cities', the presence of priests in cities other than Jerusalem would indicate cultic activity going beyond the geophysical and planning categories of First and Secondspace. On the basis of priestly activity as the social practice of Thirdspace, there is a spatial commonality with עיר המקדש and an

---

[695] *TS* p. 128; PTSDSSP p. 114.

[696] Yigael Yadin, II, p. 202.

[697] *TS* p. 129.

[698] *DSSNT* p. 478.

[699] *DSSSE* p. 1265.

implication that these other cities have the potential to elevate their purity level, albeit perhaps never to that of the space of עיר המקדש. Thus, the Hebrew imperfect in the lacuna in the third line would be more appropriate than the imperative.

An analysis of cities outside עיר המקדש was useful in extending a spatial understanding of the text's 'your cities' and 'their cities'. The divine referent has acknowledged that 'their cities' have functioned so far in their own way as First and Secondspace entities. They are bracketed and expressed as being distinct from 'my city'. Although the column's text of column 47 does not provide a geographical distinction, there is, nevertheless, a sense of a relative spatial distinction. In the text's acknowledgement of sacrificial activity in other cities, there is an implied Secondspace. If we were to imagine spatial practice in 'their cities', 'their cities' would qualify as Thirdspace. However, the text does not refer to complex or symbolic living. We read merely of the basic materials and routine, 'wine, oil and all food' (47:6), 'slaughter' (47:7) and 'leather' (47:9). Doubtless, 'their cities' would have had subspaces, to which these activities were delegated, but the text is silent on this point.

We then noted a switch from 'their' cities to 'your' cities (47:15). On the basis of an imperfect (47:3), those who inhabit עריהמה, 'their cities', will have the potential for the divine presence בתוך עריהמה, 'in the midst of their cities' (47:8). Godly presence could be present, even though its epicentre is in עיר המקדש, from which purity radiates outward towards other cities of lesser purity. Theirs will be a space of more complex living in the presence of the divine, once 'their cities' have broken free and expanded into a fully lived space. Thus, when the imperfect is invoked, 'their cities' have potential to qualify to take the divine name (47:11). In spatiality terms, they will no longer be merely designated Secondspace entities for different utilitarian functions that the scroll's text implies. Once 'their' and 'your' cities are elevated from their current purity status, they will engage in living the required purity praxis of Thirdspace. A spatial reading, as well as taking the first lacuna as an imperfect (47:3), would bring עיר המקדש and other

cities into a unified category of Thirdspace. עיר המקדש is intensified by the expression עיר מקדשי, 'city of my sanctuary'(47:9). God's possession confers the category of Thirdspace, in that items of offerings are brought from other cities. This implies that non-residents of עיר המקדש experience that process as a lived experience through purity praxis, beyond mere physicality and symbolism. Such non-residents would be living in a space of complex spatial practice, because their preparation for the act of bringing suitable offerings is, to them, an act of pilgrimage. By divine intent, מקדשי thus provides the bridgehead for people from other cities in their sacrificial pilgrimage.

As we have noted, the text does not indicate complex living of other cities. Even if priests were known to have functioned in such places, the text does not convey it. Again, the text is speaking Secondspace. Soja reminds us of Thirdspace as 'a space of radical openness, a space of resistance and struggle… a meeting point, a hybrid place, where one can move beyond the existing borders'.[700] In the context of the Temple Scroll, the only physically described border is the חיל (§5). Column 47 conveys the sense of nucleated spaces, whose borders are not physically described, but are implied through the divine prism by a difference in purity with עיר המקדש.

After the numerous expressions of עיר in columns 45-47, why has the text culminated this repetition with the phrase עיר מקדשי, 'city of my temple' (47: 9,13)? The two words are uncoupled in the column (10, 11, 15, 16). Somewhat out of keeping with the coupled עיר מקדשי, a new phrase מקדשי ועירי, 'my temple and my city' appears in the last line, as if 'my temple' and 'my city' were to be considered as separate entities (47:18). We argued that, through our spatial reading of חיל (46: 9-10), this could not be the case.

Afresh through the prism of spatiality, this study has re-examined עיר and עירי beyond the confines of a geographical עיר. It is noteworthy that עירי does not appear elsewhere in the scroll.

---

[700] Edward W. Soja, 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness', p. 56.

Because the text does not indicate a location, the עיר seems a space which, in some of the text, is part of the מקדש. However, in the last line of column 47, it is separate. As it cannot be both, we should consider the עיר differently as a functioning space, which is conceived; that is to say, Secondspace, rather than a Firstspace entity which is just perceived and measured. The only function of עיר in the text is its association with מקדש. Although it is symbolic of Secondspace, there is no sense that עיר, on its own, is a lived space, even on the two occasions it is mentioned (46:14,17). The text could have been written without עיר, relying on the strength of מקדש as a marker of holiness. Once other cities were introduced in column 47, then עיר had to feature. It is the relative impurity of other cities that leads to עיר מקדשי as the Thirdspace of lived purity to the standard of divine holiness.

In spatial terms, physical space becomes real because of human energy within that space which Lefebvre proposes is socially produced.[701] Therefore, the city space in that eventual location will be realised by human spatial practice, not only in Firstspace terms but also conceived by means of symbolic references to religious belief. Of course, it would be possible for the city to be produced through spatial practice but without any predictability of a temple. Differing spatial practice by people within that city would eventually conceive the space in their different ways. The problematic question is whether the intended divine space, as described in the text, is merely conceived as Firstspace and Secondspace or is it actually lived as Thirdspace? God can act as a change of those differing conceptions. Our basic observation remains that, to the author of the scroll, the text is as if it were real space that is to be realised somewhere on earth. The divine location is a place of God's presence and activity. In that location, everyone is required to act by the divine presence. Hence, we see an overlapping of holy space with personal space although nothing on earth could match the divine, whose presence makes it the new lived reality of that space. Through historic religious associations and symbolism, people of that disposition would

---

[701] Henri Lefebvre, *Production*, p. 27. See also Kim Knott, *Location*, p. 11.

produce the temple space, once it is established, in accordance with divine will. It will then be Thirdspace that is lived accordingly.

Without that spatial foundation of עיר, עיר המקדש would not be possible. The divine would therefore claim עירי, 'my city' (47:18) as the setting for מקדשי, 'my temple' (47:16). In other words, in the context of the Temple Scroll, עיר is not a geographic entity, but rather a spatial setting for המקדש. A spatial analysis thus brings us to the conclusion that the phrase עיר המקדש need not necessarily be considered as some form of problematic geographical confection, but rather a spatial concept that puts the repeated עיר at the heart of the strive to holiness.

The text is clear that the actual locus of the temple city is unstated but linked to עיר. Does this absence have spatial relevance? Perhaps it was meant to be a mystery by its absence in 66 extant columns, leaving it as an unexpressed idealised location. My study explored this particular problem and concluded that the dimensions of the proposed temple could not possibly have been accommodated in contemporary Jerusalem. Despite this absence, most scholarly writings to date have assumed the locus to be Jerusalem, most likely because Jerusalem is pivotal in the Hebrew Bible. My view was that its absence in the scroll must surely have to be taken at face value and explored afresh. This particular issue drew the discussion towards the ancient Nomadic Ideal, as proposed in the 1920s by John Flight. He viewed the adoption of Yahweh by the tribes that left Egypt into the desert as their god of defence and offence, as pronounced, for example, in the Song of Moses. One of the two holiest appurtenances in the desert was the tent as a place of meeting with the Lord. The other was the ark which would act as a promise of God's presence, accompanying the people throughout their wanderings. The ark was eventually brought to Jerusalem by David, albeit with strong disapproval by Michal, Saul's daughter who baulked at David's vulgarity during the ritual (2 Sam. 6: 20-22). It is just possible that the scroll's author is reflecting on this scenario involving the ark, the temple's predecessor, to reinforce the notion

that Jerusalem would actually be an unsuitable locus for עיר המקדש. That is to say, in the context of Thirdspace, Jerusalem may have been considered as a space of lived fulfilment but was rejected as such, hence its omission, albeit without any pointers. The Israelite reception of the divine covenant was itself Thirdspace performance. If this absence was intended as an invitation to the audience by the scroll's author to think beyond Jerusalem, perhaps the desert was the alternative rightful place for עיר המקדש.

My observation of the near-homograph עור, 'blind' and 'animal hide', somewhat surprisingly, had not yet received any scholarly attention. Superficially, this may appear a subsidiary issue but there is a degree of spatial resonance with regard to 'animal hide'. I questioned whether this near-homography was coincidental or a lexical device to stress the significance of עיר. In the desert camp of the Israelites, entry to the wilderness sanctuary was forbidden to those with any deformity, including blindness (Lev. 21:18-20). The Temple Scroll just mentions blindness without the fuller biblical listing. A further question arose as to what constituted blindness. As Schiffman has suggested, rather than today's interpretation as the inability to read, the biblical context was probably the more basic inability of being able to find one's way. Intriguingly, we noted that, although the verbs associated with עור were in the plural, עור itself is in the singular. Perhaps this was the author's way of keeping עור closely aligned with עיר, at least as visual word-play, if not in pronunciation. With regard to its meaning as 'animal hide', also forbidden, we noted that hides were used to transport wine and food offerings (47:6). This was an act of pilgrimage, a pilgrim space, to those willing to take themselves to עיר המקדש. Although pilgrimage could be regarded as relying on Secondspace performance, it encourages Thirdspace action of travel, even though the scroll does not convey any sense of journey, just bringing. Nevertheless, those people in the pilgrim space would experience this journey of profound spiritual importance as a re-aligned Thirdspace experience with עיר מקדשי. מקדשי is the ultimate

destination for those pilgrims striving to accord with God's will. Again, the עיר provides the spatial setting for this to happen.

The divine location is a place of God's presence and activity. In that location, everyone is required to act by the divine presence. Hence, we see an overlapping of holy space with personal space, although nothing on earth could match the divine whose presence makes it the new lived reality of that space. Through historic religious associations and symbolism, people of that disposition would produce the temple space in accordance with divine will. It will be a Thirdspace that is lived accordingly. Without that spatial foundation of עיר, עיר המקדש would not be possible. The divine would therefore claim עירי, 'my city' (47:18) as the setting for מקדשי, 'my temple' (47:16). In other words, in the context of the Temple Scroll, עיר is not a geographic entity but rather a spatial setting for המקדש.

Does this study open up further opportunities to read the Temple Scroll through the lens of spatiality? Given Soja's idea that Thirdspace harbours social or political marginality, we can understand this as a space of protest and counterculture. Those in Secondspace are causing the marginality and protest; as such, they also have a lived space. It would follow that the business of living the space therefore spans over Second- and Thirdspace. As Camp ruefully acknowledges, 'Most of the time, life just goes on'.[702] The heterotopia that makes life liveable for those oppressed does not really make for societal transformations. Perhaps then it is the reader, rather than the characters or even the author, 'living' the text who will make the change. Was this not also a Thirdspace of a power struggle between those who created the scroll against the *status quo* of the Hasmonean Temple? Such a potential study of power relations could examine the scroll's envisioned עיר המקדש similarly.

---

[702] Claudia V. Camp, 'Storied Space', in *Constructions II*, p. 68.

Therein lies a problematic crossover about Thirdspace. Those managing the Temple would be not only in Firstspace and Secondspace but 'living' their own Thirdspace. I propose that those occupying that space are not, themselves, creating the spatial category. It is the reader of the text, even bypassing the author, who will categorise. Specific to the long and enigmatic Temple Scroll, this study has extended the argument beyond the constraining geophysical shackles of previous work, providing the scope for further thinking.

An interesting consequence of our spatial analysis has seeded the concept that columns 45-47 comprise a distinct definable block of text independent of biblical reference, in contrast to other parts of the scroll we surveyed, bearing less frequent iterations of עיר from biblical reference. This would support the notion of heterogeneous authorship although not necessarily fitting in with the analysis of Wilson and Wills.[703] On the basis that the Temple Scroll was composed as an absolute expression of singular divine revelation without any intermediate moderation, this particular block may have reinforced the notion that adherence to traditional biblical reference had not prevented the Israelites from going astray, in the eyes of the scroll's author or authors. This block of text would then re-invigorate the divine purity of עיר המקדש as an entire purity entity which should have been as such in Jerusalem all along.

---

[703] Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources', 275-88.

Bibliography

Abegg, Martin G., Bowley, James E., Cook, Edward M. and Tov, Emanuel, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

Agranat-Tamir, Lily and others, 'The Genomic History of the Bronze Age Southern Levant', *Cell*, 181 (2020), 1146-1157.

Aitken, James K. and Hilary Marlow, eds, *The City in the Hebrew Bible* (London: T&T Clark, 2018).

Alighieri, Dante, *Paradiso,* trans. by Mark Musa (New York: Penguin, 1986).

Alexander, Philip S., 'A Note of the Syntax of 4Q448', *JJS* 44 (1993), 301.

Anderson, Bradford A., 'Mapping Narrative Complexity: Textual Geography, Literary Studies and the City in the Hebrew Bible', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible: Critical Literary and Exegetical Approaches*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 55-72.

Anderson, Robert T., 'The Role of the Desert in Israelite Thought', *JBR* 27 (1959), 41-44.

Andreasen, Niels-Erik, 'Town and Country in the Old Testament', *Encounter*, 42 (1981), 259-275.

Andreassen, A., Tempel-rullen', *Kirke og Kultur* (1968), pp. 262-7.

Atkinson, Kenneth, *A History of the Hasmonean State: Josephus and Beyond* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2016).

Atwill, Joseph, Braunheim, Steve and Eisenman, Robert, 'Redating the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 11 (2004), 143-157.

Barnett, Clive, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Baumgartner, Walter, *Eine Neue Qumranrolle'*, Universitas 23 (1968), pp. 981-4.

——, 'Review of *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real and Imagined Spaces* by Edward W. Soja', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 22 (1997), 529-30.

Beebee, Thomas O., *The Ideology of Genre: A Comparative Study of Generic Instability* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1994).

Bernstein, Moshe, ''Re-written Bible': A Genetic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness', *Textus,* 22 (2005), 169-96.

Berquist, Jon L., 'Critical Spatiality', in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds*, ed. by D. Gunn and P. McNutt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 14-29.

——, 'Spaces of Jerusalem', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York and London: T & T Clark, 2008), pp. 40-52.

Benz, Brendon C., *The Land before the Kingdom of Israel: A History of the Southern Levant and the People Who Populated It* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016).

Bhabha, Homi, ''In the Cave of Making': Thoughts on Third Space', in *Communicating in the Third Space*, ed. by Karen Ikas and Gerhard Wagner (New York/Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2009), pp. ix-xiv.

Bitton-Ashkelony, Bruria, *Encountering the Sacred: The Debate of Christian Pilgrimage in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 2006).

Black, Jeremy, Andrew George and Nicholas Postgate, eds, *A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2000).

Blidstein, Moshe, *Purity, Community and Ritual in Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Bonani, Georges, and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls', *Radiocarbon*, 34 (1992), 843-849.

Borchardt, Francis, 'The Temple Scroll in the Context of Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman Scholarly Texts', in *JQR* 108 (2018), 139-158.

Brill, Gershon, 'Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 12 (1987), 519-528.

Brooke, George J., ed., *Temple Scroll Studies* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

_____, 'The Ten Temples', in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. by John Day (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 416-31.

_____, *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013).

Broshi, Magen, 'The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll', *BAR* 13 (1987), 36-37.

_____, and Finkelstein, Israel, 'The Population of Palestine in Iron Age II', *BASOR* 287 (1992), 47-60.

Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver and Charles Augustus Briggs, [*Brown, Driver, Briggs (BDB)] Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008).

Budde, Karl, 'The Nomadic Ideal in the Old Testament', *New World*, 4 (1895), 726-745.

Burgmann, Hans, '11QT: The Sadducean Torah', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George Brooke (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 259-60.

Callaway, Philip, 'The Temple Scroll and the Canonization of Jewish Law', *RevQ* 13 (1988), 239-250.

Camp, Claudia V., 'Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple', in *Imagining Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James H. Flanagan*, ed. by David M. Gunn and Paula M. McNutt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 64-80

_____, and Jon L. Berquist, eds, *Constructions of Space II: the Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces* (London and New York: T& T Clark, 2008).

Caquot, André, 'Information préliminaire sur le 'Rouleau du Temple' de Qumrân', *Bulletin de la Société Ernest-Renan*, 22 (1973), pp 1, 3-4.

_____, 'Le Rouleau du Temple de Qumrân', *Études Théologiques et Religieuses*, 53 (1978), 443-500.

Carroll, M. Daniel, 'City of Chaos', in *Every City shall be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, ed. by Lester Grabbe and Robert Haak (Sheffield: JSOT, 2001), pp. 45-61.

Casey, Edward S., *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History* (University of California Press, 1997).

Charles, R.H., ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* (Oxford: OUP, 1913).

_____, trans., *The Book of Enoch* (Mineola: Dover, 2007).

Charlesworth, James H., Henry W. Morisada Rietz and Loren L. Johns, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: The Temple Scroll and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Andrew D. Gross, Michael C. Rand, J. Milgrom, M. T. Davies and A. de la

Ronde Van Kirk, 10 vols, VII (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

_____, and A. de la Ronde van Kirk, 'Temple Scroll Source or Earlier Edition', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, 10 vols. VII: *Temple Scroll and Related Documents*. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 247-53.

Chmiel, Jerzy, 'Nowe rekopisy z Qumran', *Ruch Biblijnyi i Liturgiczny* (1969), pp. 302-3.

Chyutin, Michael, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

Clines, David J.A., ed., *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 9 vols (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007).

Cohen, A., ed., *Chronicles* (London: Soncino, 1994).

Colella, Pasquale, 'Nuovi manoscritti del Mar Morto', *Rivista Biblica Italiano*, 16 (1968), pp. 214-5.

Collins, John J., 'Sectarian Communities in the Dead Scrolls', in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Clarendon, 2010), pp. 151-172.

_____, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000)

_____, 'The Meaning of the Phrase עיר המקדש in the Temple Scroll', *DSD* 8 (2001), 242-54.

_____, '4QTemple? (4Q365a) Revisited', in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday*, ed. by Jeremy Penner, Ken Penner and Cecilia Wassen (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

_____, *The Text of the Pentateuch*: *Textual Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2022).

_____, 'Where is Moses? The Temple Scoll's Claim to Authority', *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*, 133/9 (2022), 49-59.

Cross, Frank Moore, 'Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, ed. by Peter W. Flint and James A. VanderKam, 2 vols, I, (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998), pp. 379-402.

Curnow, Trevor, *The Oracles of the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth, 2004).

Davis, Nicola, 'Dead Sea scrolls study raises new questions over texts' origins', *The Guardian* (2019).

Davies, Philip R., *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983) supp. 25.

Deventer, H.J.M. van, 'Aspects of Liminality in the Book of Daniel', *Old Testament Essays*, 30 (2017), 443-4.

Doudna, Greg, 'Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, ed. by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols. I (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 430-471..

Douglas, Mary, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Dubischar, Markus, 'Survival of the Most Condensed? Auxillary Texts, Communications Theory and Condensation of Knowledge', in *Condensing Texts, Condensed Texts*, ed. by M. Horster and C. Reitz (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2010), pp. 39-67.

Edwards, Diane T., 'From Garden to City: Closure in the Bible', *Bucknell Review*, 33 (1990), 102-117.

Eire, A. López, 'Rhetoric and Language', in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* ed. by Ian Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), pp. 346-49.

Elgvin, Torleif, 'The Qumran Covenant Festival and the Temple Scroll', *JJS* 36 (March 1985), 103-106.

Eliade, Mircea, *The Sacred and the Profane,* trans. by Willard R. Trask (Orlando: Harcourt, 1959).

Ellul, Jacques, *The Meaning of the City: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption*, trans. by Dennis Pardee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970).

Erbele-Küster, Dorothea, *Body, Gender and Purity in Leviticus 12 and 15* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017).

Fields, Weston, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*: *A Full History*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Fisher, Loren R., 'The Temple Quarter', *JSS* 8 (1963), 34-41.

Flanagan, James, 'Ancient Perceptions of Space/Perceptions of Ancient Space', *Semeia*, 87 (1999), 15-43.

Flight, John, 'The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament', *JBL* 42 (1923), 158-226.

Flint, Peter, and James C. VanderKam, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment,* 2 vols, II (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1998).

_____, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2013).

Foucault, Michel, 'Of Other Spaces', trans. by Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics*, 16 (1986), 22-9.

Frick, Frank S., *The City in Ancient Israel* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).

_____, *The Formation of the State in Ancient Israel* (Sheffield: Almond, 1985).

Galambush, Julie, *Jerusalem in the Book of Ezekiel: The City as Yahweh's Wife* (Atlanta, GA:

Scholars Press, 1991).

García Martínez, F., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, trans. by Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

_____, 'The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem', in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment,* ed. by Peter Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 1999), pp. 431-60.

_____, 'New Jerusalem at Qumran and in the New Testament', in *The Land of Israel in the Bible, History, Theology*, ed. by Edward Noort, Jacques van Ruiten and Jacobus Cornelis de Vos (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 277-89.

García Martínez, F., and Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C., *The Dead Sea Study Edition*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1998), II.

George, Mark K., *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (Atlanta: SBL, 2009).

de Geus, C.H.J., *Towns in Ancient Israel and in the Southern Levant* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

Ginzberg, Louis, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Jewish Theological Seminary of America: New York City, 1976).

Golb, Norman, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New York: Scribner, 1995).

Gorringe, Timothy J., *A Theology of the Built Environment: Justice, Empowerment, Redemption* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Gottwald, Norman, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (London: SCM, 1990).

Grabbe, Lester L., 'Introduction and Overview', in *Every City shall be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, ed. by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, JSOTSup 330 (Sheffield: JSOT, 2001), pp. 15-34.

_____, ''Sup-urbs or only Hyp-urbs?' Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio-Historical Method', in *Every City Shall Be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, ed. by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak, JSOTSup 330 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 95-123.

Gray, Alison R., 'Reflections of the Meaning(s) of עיר in the Hebrew Bible', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible,* ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 18-34.

Greenburg, James A., *A New Look at Atonement in Leviticus; The Meaning and Purpose of Kipper Revisited* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019).

Harrington, Hannah, *The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, SBL Dissertation Series, 1993).

_____, 'Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 8 (2001), 124-135.

_____, *The Purity Texts* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004).

_____, 'Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran', in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008), pp. 187-204.

Hazony, Yoram, *The Philosophy of Hebrew Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Heidegger, Martin, 'Building Dwelling Thinking by Martin Heidegger (Translation and Commentary by Adam Bobeck)', trans. by Adam Bobeck (unpublished, Academia.edu), <https://www.academia.edu/34279818/Building_Dwelling_Thinking_by_Martin_Heidegger_Translation_and_Commentary_by_Adam_Bobeck>.

Jacob, Christian, 'Mapping in the Mind: The Earth from Ancient Alexandria', in *Mappings*, ed. by Denis Cosgrove (London: Reaktion, 2011), pp. 20-34.

Jenson, Philip Peter, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992).

Jokiranta, Jutta, 'Sectarianism', in *Eerdman's Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. by John J. Collins and David C. Harlow (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), p. 1270.

Josephus, *Jewish War*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, 3 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965).

_____, *Antiquities*, trans. by Louis H. Feldman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

Joyce, Paul M., *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989).

_____, 'On Earth as It Is in Heaven: Heavenly and Earthly Temple in Ezekiel 40-48', in *Contextualizing Jewish Temples*, ed. by Tova Ganzel and Shalom Holtz (Leiden/Boston, MA: Brill, 2021), pp. 123-140.

Jull, A.J. Timothy, and others, 'Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert', *Radiocarbon*, 37 (1995), 11-19.

Kalisch, Marcus Moritz, *Leviticus* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1872).

Kamionkowski, S. Tamar, 'The Savage Made Civilized: An Examination of Ezekiel 16.8', in *Every City shall be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*, ed. by Lester L. Graabe and Robert D. Haak, JSOTSup 330 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 2001) pp. 124-36.

Keshishian, J. M., 'Il puo lungo manoscritto del Mar Morto', *Sapere*, 59 (1968) 60-3.

Kim, Soo J., 'The City as a Gateway to the Presence of YHWH', *JSOT*, 39 (2014), 187-207.

King, Ross, *Brunelleschi's Dome* (London: Pimlico, 2005).

Klawans, Jonathan, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Knott, Kim, *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis* (London: Equinox, 2005).

_____, 'Spatial Theory and the Study of Religion', *Religion Compass*, (2008), 1-19.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: Chicago University
Press, 1980).

Lantz, Natalie, 'The Hypertemple in Mind: Experiencing Temple Space in Ezekiel, the Temple
Scroll and Mishnah Middot' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Uppsala Universitet, to be
examined in late 2022).

Laperrousaz, E-M., 'Presentation, à Jérusalem, du plus long rouleaux-actuellément connus-
provenant du Qumrân', *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 174 (1968), pp. 113-5.

_____, 'Does the Temple Scroll date from the First or Second Century BCE?', in *Temple
Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), pp. 91-97.

Leeuw, Gerard van der, 'Sacred Space', trans. by J. E. Turner, in *Religion in Essence and
Manifestation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 393-402.

Lefebvre, Henri, *The Production of Space*, trans. by D. Nicholson-Smith (Cambridge, MA,
Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

Levine, Baruch, 'The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary
Character', *BASOR* 232 (1978), 5-23.

Levitas, Ruth, *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society* (New York:

Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Lied, Liv Ingeborg, 'Another Look at the Land opf Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward G. Soja's Thirdspace Approach', in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003*, ed. by Jonathan G. Campbell, William John Lyons and Lloyd K. Pieterson (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005), pp. 101-25.

Lim, Timothy H., 'Authoritative Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: OUP, 2010), pp. 303-322.

Lopez, Kathryn M., 'Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgement', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 139-55.

Maier, Christl, 'Body Space as Public Space', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Jon L. Berquist and Claudia V. Camp (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 119-138.

_____, 'Daughter Zion as a Gendered Space in the Book of Isaiah' in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Claudia V. Camp and Jon L. Berquist (New York and London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 102-118.

_____, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008).

Maier, Johann, *Die Tempelrolle vom Totem Meer* (Munich: Ernst Reinhard, 1978).

_____, *The Temple Scroll,* trans. by R. White (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).

Marlow, Hilary F., 'A Land with Fine Large Cities', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible: Critical, Literary and Exegetical Approaches,* ed. by James Aitken and Hilary Marlow (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 73-88.

Massey, Doreen, J., Allen, John, and Sarre, Philip, eds, *Human Geography Today* (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1999).

Mendenhall, George E., 'The Hebrew Conquest of Palestine', *Biblical Archaeologist*, XXV (1962), 67-85.

Meredith, Christopher, 'Journeys in the Songscape: Reading Space in the Song of Songs' (University of Sheffield PhD thesis, 2012).

_____, *Journeys in the Songscape: Reading Space in the Song of Songs* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2013).

_____, 'Taking Issue with Thirdspace: Reading Soja, Lefebvre and the Bible', in *Constructions Of Space III: Biblical Spatiality and the Sacred*, ed.by Jorunn Økland, J. Cornelis de Vos and Karen Wenell (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 75-103.

Merrifield, Andrew, 'Place and Space: A Lefebvrian Reconciliation', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 18 (1993), 516-531.

Milgrom, Jacob, 'Sabbath and Temple City in the Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character', *BASOR* 233 (1978), 5-23.

_____, 'Studies in the Temple Scroll', *JBL* 97 (1978), 501-523.

_____, 'Further Studies in the Temple Scroll', *JQR* 71 (1980), p. 95.

_____, 'Jubilees and the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 16 (1993), 277-284.

_____, 'The City of the Temple: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman', *JQR* 85 (1994), 125-128.

_____, *Leviticus: A Book of Ritual and Ethics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).

Mills, Mary E., 'Urban Morality and the Great City in the Book of Jonah', *Political Theology*,

11(3), (2010), 453-65.

_____, *Urban Imagination in Biblical Prophecy* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2012).

Mishna Middot, *Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino, 1989).

Moraldi, Luigi, *I manoscritti di Qumran* (Turin: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971).

Mroczek, Eva, 'How Not to Build a Temple: Jacob, David and the Unbuilt Ideal in Ancient Judaism', *JSJ* 46 (2015), 512-546.

Muilenburg, James, 'Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style', in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Congress Volume, Copenhagen*, ed. by G.W. Anderson, Millar Burrows, Henri Cazelles and others (Leiden: Brill, 1953), pp. 97-111.

Neusner, Jacob, 'Contexts of Purification: The Halakhic Theology of Immersion', *Review of Rabbinic Judaism*, 6.1 (2003), 68-86.

——, 'The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism', *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 43 (1975), 15-26.

Noam, Vered, *Shifting Images of the Hasmoneans: Second Temple legends and their Reception in Josephus and Rabbinic Literature*, trans. by Dana Ordan (Oxford: OUP, 2018).

O'Connor, Michael Patrick, 'The Biblical Notion of a City', in *Constructions of Space II: The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*, ed. by Claudia V. Camp and Jon Berquist (New York/London: T&T Clark, 2008), pp. 18-39.

Økland, Jorunn, 'The Language of Gates and Entering: On Sacred Space in the Temple Scroll', in N*ew Directions in Qumran Studies*, pp. 149-65.

Oppenheim, A. Leo, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

Park, Robert E., 'The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behaviour in the City Environment', *American Journal of Sociology*, 20 (1915), 577- 612.

van der Plicht, J., 'Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment on Redating', *DSD* 14 (2006), 77-89.

Pope, Marvin H., *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1955).

Puech, Émil, 'Textes Hebreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)', *DJD* 25 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

Pusey, Karen, 'Jewish Proselyte Baptism', *Expository Times*, 95 (1984), 141-145.

Pyper, Hugh, 'The Biblical Metropolis', in *The City in the Hebrew Bible'*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 35-52.

Qimron, Elisha, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstruction* (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press and Israel Exploration Society, 1996).

Rabin, Ira, 'The Temple Scroll: The Wrapper in Fragment MS 5095/2, MS 5094/4', in *Gleanings from the Caves: DSS and Artefacts from the üøyen Collection*, ed. by Torleit Elgvin, Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 327-38.

Reger, Eyal, *Sectarianism in Qumran* (Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

Rhyder, Julia, 'Space and Memory in the Book of Leviticus', in *Scripture as Social Discourse: Socio-Scientific Perspectives in Early Jewish and Christian Writings*, ed. by Jessica M. Keady, Todd Klutz and C. A. Strine (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 83-96.

Rohrbough, R., 'The pre-industrial city in Luke-Acts: Urban social relations', in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. by J. Neyrey (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), pp. 125-149.

Rooke, Deborah W., 'Urban Planning According to Ezekiel: The Shape of the Restored Jerusalem', in *The City in the Hebrew*, ed. by James K. Aitken and Hilary F. Marlow (London: T&T Clark, 2018), pp. 123-143.

_____, *Zadokite Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Ryder, M.L., 'Follicle Arrangement in Skin from Wild Sheep, Primitive Domestic Sheep and in Parchment', *Nature*, 182 (1958), 781-783.

Sacchi, Paolo, 'Scoperta di un nuovo rotolo in Palestina', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, 3 (1967), pp. 579-80.

de Saint-Blanquat, H., 'Le nouveau manuscrit de la Mer Morte', *Sciences et Avenir*, 257 (1968), 582-89.

Samely, Alex, 'Observations on the Structure and Literary Fabric of the Temple Scroll, in *Text and Tradition: A Festschrift in Honour of Robert Hayward*, ed. by R. Timothy McLay (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), pp. 233-277.

Sanders, E.P., *Judaism: Practice and Belief* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016).

Scher, T., 'A kumráni Templomkercs', Világosság, 9 (1968), pp. 636-7.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., 'The Temple Scroll in Literary and Philological Perspective', in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism*, ed. by William Scott Green (Missoula, MT: Scholar, 1980), pp. 143-155.

Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

_____, 'The Systems of Jewish Law', in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke

(Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), pp. 239-255.

_____, 'Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the Temple Scroll',
HAR 9 (1985), 301-320.

_____, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

_____, 'Sacred Spaces: The Land of Israel in the Temple Scroll', in *Biblical Archaeology
Today: Proceedings of the 2nd International Congress on Biblical Archaeology*, (Jerusalem:
IES, 1993), pp. 398-410.

_____, 'The Theology of the Temple Scroll', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 85 (1994), 109-23.

_____, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

_____, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2009).

_____, James H. Charlesworth and Andrew D. Gross, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew,
Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations*, VII, ed. by James H. Charlesworth
(Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen, 2011), pp. 1-11.

_____, and Gross, Andrew D., *The Temple Scroll* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021).

Schmid, Christian, 'Henri Lefebvre's Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-
Dimensional Dialectic', in *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, ed. by
Kanishka Goonewardena and others (New York/London: Routledge, 2008), pp. 27-45.

Schmidt, Francis, *How the Temple Thinks*, trans. by J. Edward Crowley (Sheffield: Sheffield
Academic Press, 2001).

Schofield, Alison, 'Between Centre and Periphery', *DSD* 16 (2009), 330-50.

_____, 'The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Israel in the Wilderness:
Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. by

Kenneth E. Pomykala (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), pp. 37-53.

Schofield, Malcolm, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Schreiner, Patrick, 'Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in the Light of Developing Trends', *Currents in Biblical Research*, 14 (2016), 340-71.

Schuetz, Roman, and others, 'The Temple Scroll: Reconstructing an ancient manufacturing practice', *Science Advances*, 5 (2019), doi: 10.1126/sciadv. aaw 7494.

Schürer, Emil, and others, eds, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1986).

Schwartz, Joshua, 'On Priests and Jericho in the Second Temple Period', *JQR* 79 (1988), 23-48.

Scott, Robert Balgarnie Y., 'The Hebrew Cubit', *JBL* 77 (1958), 205-15.

_____, *The Relevance of the Prophets* (New York: Macmillan, 1944).

Sen, Felipe, 'El Nuevo Manuscrito del Templo', Cultura Bíblica, 25 (1968), 60-3.

Segal, Michael, 'Reconsidering the Relationship between 4Q365, 4Q365a and the Temple Scroll', *RevQ* 30 (2016), 213-233.

Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: OUP: 1978).

Simonsen, Kirsten. "Bodies, sensations, space and time: The contribution from Henri Lefebvre." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 87, no. 1 (2005): 1-14 (p. 4).

Sjoberg, Gideon, *Pre-industrial City Past and Present* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960).

Skehan, Patrick, trans., *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, (New Haven/London: Yale University Press,

1987).

Sleeman, Matthew, *Geography and the Ascension Narrative in Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

_____, 'Critical Spatial Theory 2.0', in *Constructions of Space V*: *Place, Space and Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. by Gert T. M. Prinsloo and Christl Maier (New York/London: Bloomsbury, 2013), pp. 49-59.

Smith, Jonathan Z., *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1987).

_____, *Map is not Territory* (Chicago: University of Chicago University Press, 1993).

Soja, Edward W., 'The Socio-Spatial Dialectic', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70 (1980), 207-225.

_____, *Post-Modern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Spatial Theory* (London: Verso, 1989).

____, *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and Imagined Places* (Malden, MA/Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).

_____, 'Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination', in *Human Geography Today*, ed. by Doreen Massey, John Allen and Philip Sarre (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 1999), pp. 261-278.

____, *Postmetropolis* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

—— 'Thirdspace: Toward a New Consciousness of Space and Spatiality', in *Communicating in the Thirdspace*, ed. by Karin Ikas and Gerhard Wagner (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 49-61.

Stanek, Łukasz, *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research and the Production of Theory* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

Stegemann, Hartmut, ''Das Land' in der Tempelrolle und in anderen Texten aus den Qumranfunden', in *Das Land in Biblischer Zeit*, ed. by G. Strecker (Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 154-171.

____, The Origins of the Temple Scroll', in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, ed. by J. A. Emerton (Leiden: Brill, 1988), pp. 235-56.

____, 'Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah Lost for 2500 years?', in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. by Hershel Shanks (New York: First Vintage Books, 1993), pp. 126-36.

Stevenson, Kalinda Rose, *The Vision of Transformation: The Territorial Rhetoric of Ezekiel 40-48* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

Stoneman, Richard, *The Ancient Oracle: Making the Gods Speak* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2011).

Stuiver, Minze and Pearson, Gordon W., 'High-precision Calibration of the Radiocarbon Time Scale', *Radiocarbon*, 28 (1986), 805-838.

Sukenik, Naama, 'The Temple Scroll Wrapper from Cave 11: MS 5095/2, MS/ 5095/4, MS 5095/1', in *Gleanings from the Caves: DSS and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, ed. by Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2016), pp. 339-49.

Suvin, Darko, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre* (Oxford: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2016).

Swanson, Dwight D., *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodoogy of 11QT* (Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1995).

Talmon, Shemaryahu, 'The 'Desert Motif'in the Bible and in Qumran Literature', in *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. by Alexander Altmann (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 31-63.

Taylor, Joan E., *The Immerser: John the Baptist* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997).

____, 'Missing Magdala and the Name of Mary 'Magdalene'', *PEQ* 146 (2014), 205-33.

Taylor, Joan E., and Adinolfi, Frederico, 'John the Baptist and Jesus the Baptist: A Narrative Critical Approach', *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus,* 10 (2012), 247-84.

Taylor, Joan E., and Johannes van der Plicht, 'Radiocarbon Dating of the Temple Scroll Wrapper and Cave 11Q', in *Gleaning from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, ed. by Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis and Michael Langlois (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 77-89.

____, and others, 'Qumran Textiles in the Palestine Exploration Fund, London: Radiocarbon Dating Results', *PEQ* 137 (2005), 159-167.

Thiering, Barbara, 'The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll' in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. by George J. Brooke (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984), pp. 99-120.

____, 'The Temple Scroll Courts Governed by Precise Times', *DSD* 11 (2004), 336-58.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C., 'A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century, Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments', *DSD* 24.173-188.

Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White Crawford, '4Q Reworked Pentateuch: 4Q364-367', *DJD* 13, pp. 187-252 (p. 188).

Turner, Victor, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (London/New York: Routledge, 1969).

Uhlenbruch, Frauke, 'Reconstructing Realities from Biblical Utopias', *Biblical Interpretation*, 23 (2015), 191-206.

VanderKam, James C., *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

Venter, Pieter, 'Allotted Place and Cursed Space in Enoch 12-36', *Old Testament Essays*, 27(2), (2014), 666-683.

Veenhof, K. R., ''Een niew handschrift van de Dode Zee: De 'Tempelrol'', *Phoenix*, 14 (1968), pp. 186-8.

Vermes, Geza, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1961).

_____, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Revised edn. (London: Penguin, 2004).

Vermeulen, Karolien, *Conceptualizing Biblical Cities: A Stylistic Study* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2020).

Wacholder, Ben Zion, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983).

Wassen, Cecilia, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005).

Weber, Max, *The City*, trans. by Don Martindale and Gertrud Neuwith (London: Heinemann, 1958).

Wentling, Judith L., 'Unraveling the Relationship between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple and the Qumran Community', *RevQ* 14 (1989), 61-73.

Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11*, trans. by J. Scullion (London: SPCK, 1984).

Wilhelm, G., 'Qumran (Tempelrolle)', *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 22 (1968-9), 165-6.

Willcox, R.R., 'Venereal Diseases in the Bible', *British Journal of Venereology*, 25 (1949), 28-33.

Wilson, Andrew M., and Lawrence Wills, 'Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll', *HTR* 75 (1982), 275-288.

Wise, Michael Owen, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of Chicago, 1990).

____, Martin Abegg and Edward Cook, eds, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins, 1996).

Yadin, Yigael, 'The Temple Scroll', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 30 (1967), 135-139.

____, *Jerusalem Revisited* (Jerusalem: Israeli Archaeology Society, 1975).

____, *The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

____, *The Temple Scroll* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1985).

Zahn, Molly, *Genres of Re-writing in Second Temple Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020)

_____, Presentation of a paper provisionally entitled 'The Utopian Vision of the Temple Scroll' given at the University of Aberdeen Biblical Studies Seminar, 23 February 2022.

____, 'Rewritten Scripture', in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 323-36.

Zuckerman, Bruce, 'Bringing the Dead Sea Scrolls Back to Life: A New Evaluation of Photographic and Electronic Imaging of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSS* 3 (1996), 178-207.

Electronic Sources

<http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple>

<https://archive.org.details>biblia-hebraica-stuttgartensia

WORD COUNT 87472