



BRILL

DEAD SEA DISCOVERIES 29 (2022) 123–154

Dead Sea
Discoveries

brill.com/dsd

Reading for Resonance

Divine Presence and Biblical Hermeneutics in the Temple Scroll

Annie Calderbank | ORCID: 0000-0002-4172-4975

University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

anne.calderbank@oriel.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

This article offers a hermeneutic approach attentive to the tangled idiomatic and literary interconnections among biblical texts and other Second Temple literature. It focuses on the expressions of divine presence in the Temple Scroll and their prepositions; the divine presence is ‘upon’ the temple and ‘in the midst’ of the people. This prepositional rhetoric engages recurrences and interconnections within and beyond the Hebrew Bible. It thus evokes multiple interlocking resonances and offers a window onto concepts of temple presence across biblical texts and traditions.

Keywords

divine presence – temple – Temple Scroll – hermeneutics – divine name – divine glory

1 Introduction

This article examines the expressions of divine presence in the Temple Scroll as a window onto hermeneutics. It builds upon scholarship’s attention to the scroll’s deep engagement with the biblical text.¹ Firstly, the language of the scroll not only reflects ‘biblical style,’ but also resembles specific biblical passages.² Secondly, the Temple Scroll interweaves different biblical traditions

1 Already Yadin’s magisterial commentary identified biblical sources and parallels for almost every line of the scroll.

2 The “biblical style” of the Temple Scroll is particularly noted by Zahn, “New Voices,” 441–42. She observes that “even the most innovative sections of the scroll draw upon biblical phrase-

in its laws and architecture, and even in the precise wording of commands.³ Thirdly, the scroll engages biblical texts as part of and in dialogue with a larger corpus of Second Temple texts and traditions.⁴

Identification of sources, allusion, and rewriting is prevalent across these discussions of the Temple Scroll and of much Second Temple literature more broadly.⁵ These terms reflect a notion of engagement with “specific identifiable units of specific texts.”⁶ Sometimes this is complicated by the suggestion that a source or base text is read in light of other texts, traditions, and ongoing discourses.⁷ But reference to a source or base text still retains the element of specificity. Scholars define such specificity by contrast with the recurrence

ology or biblical models”; *ibid.*, 452; similarly, Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:82. Identification of verbal correspondences between the Temple Scroll and specific biblical passages is a dominant feature of the work of Wise, *A Critical Study*, and Swanson, *Temple Scroll and the Bible*.

- 3 In his discussion of the scroll’s compositional techniques, Yadin speaks of “merging commands on the same subject” and “unifying duplicate commands (harmonisation)”; *The Temple Scroll*, 1:73–74. Three of Kaufman’s six compositional patterns identified in the Temple Scroll are “paraphrastic conflation,” “fine conflation,” and “gross conflation”; “Higher Criticism,” 37–40. Brin described the scroll as a “mosaic” of “various texts, taken from the Bible and from other sources, and even included his own work”; “Uses of the Bible,” 528.
- 4 For example, VanderKam compares the Temple Scroll and Jubilees and concludes that they reflect “the same exegetical, cultic tradition”; “The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees,” 231. I will consider further resonances between the Temple Scroll and Jubilees in my discussion below. Crawford provides a helpful summary of the resemblances between the Temple Scroll and Jubilees, 4QMMT, the Damascus Document, the New Jerusalem, and several other texts, concluding that they stem from a shared ‘milieu’; *Temple Scroll*, 77–83, see also the literature cited there. Schiffman’s collection of studies on the Temple Scroll, *Courtyards of the House of the Lord*, includes a section of six essays entitled “The Temple Scroll and Other Jewish Writings,” which discusses many of these same texts as well as others.
- 5 Whilst the Temple Scroll was not included in Vermès’s initial definition of Rewritten Bible due to its legal rather than narrative content, it has been considered a paradigmatic example of rewriting by many scholars since; see Vermès, *Scripture and Tradition*, 95 and Bernstein, “Rewritten Bible.” The Temple Scroll receives in-depth discussion in two recent monographs on rewriting: Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 84–104 and Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting*, 110–19.
- 6 This phrasing is taken from Zahn’s definition of rewriting; *Genres of Rewriting*, 192. Concern for specificity is also made explicit in Hughes’s criteria for identifying an allusion where she repeats the phrase “one identifiable scriptural passage” (or exceptionally “a group of passages” “viewed as an entity”); Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 53.
- 7 Kugel in particular has drawn attention to “exegetical motifs,” individual pieces of interpretation that circulated widely but were anchored to specific biblical verses; *Traditions of the Bible*, for a summary of the idea, see 24–29. More recently, Zahn has problematised viewing rewriting as an “uncomplicated, dyadic relationship.” She draws attention to the multiple text forms of both biblical sources and their rewritings, suggesting that it is not a direct or one-step process. She also recognises the role of “an ongoing unwritten discourse” within the “environment of writing-supported orality”; *Genres of Rewriting*, 48–50, see also 29–34. The notion of ongoing discourses will be important in my interpretation of the Temple Scroll below.

of certain language and themes across biblical and Second Temple literature, often identified instead as idioms, motifs, or tropes.⁸

The case study in this article involves a simultaneous appreciation of the multiple and the specific. I suggest that the expressions of divine presence in the Temple Scroll reflect the scroll's participation in ongoing idiomatic and literary discourses that are partially represented in extant texts from both within and beyond the Hebrew Bible. The dynamic and vital nature of these discourses is displayed in the interaction between and transformation of idioms within the composition of the Temple Scroll itself.⁹

Yet when read in the context of the scroll, these expressions do evoke particular instantiations of such idioms. As the expressions of divine presence interact with other aspects of the law, architecture, language, and themes of the Temple Scroll, constellations of associations emerge that strongly resemble certain texts. In fact, and this is key, in light of the idioms' recurrence across biblical and Second Temple texts and their complex context within the scroll, they evoke multiple such instantiations simultaneously.

I have found it helpful to speak of this in terms of *resonance*.¹⁰ To be 'resonant with' something is to echo or evoke it, but language of resonance has

8 For example, Hughes distinguishes allusion and idiom. She suggests that "multiple use of a phrase is more easily explained by use of an idiom"; *Scriptural Allusions*, 46. Similarly, Sommer differentiates citation and allusion from "common phrases or tropes"; *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 8. The same ideas are reflected in Tooman's principle of "uniqueness" for identifying allusion. And the same tendencies, although qualified, are also present in his principle of "distinctiveness": "the locution, image or trope in question is associated with a particular antecedent text, though it may appear in other texts as well"; *Gog of Magog*, 27–28. This issue is often understood in terms of distinguishing intention from coincidence; see especially Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 32–35. Hughes, however, whilst employing the same distinction between specificity and recurrence, "bracket(s) the notion of intention and regard(s) as an allusion any reference which works as such for a reader"; *Scriptural Allusions*, 49. Hinds has identified similar distinctions within Classics, between allusion and "accidental confluence of language" on the one hand, and between allusion and topos on the other. My approach is inspired by Hinds's problematisation of these dichotomies in his attention to cultural "reverberations" and in his critique of the reification of topoi as inert collectivities; *Allusion and Intertext*, chapter 2, "Interpretability," 17–51. Hinds's critiques are animated by the insights of intertextual scholars, specifically Conte. I discuss my avoidance of the term 'intertextuality' in footnote 11 below.

9 My use of the adjective 'vital' reflects my indebtedness to Najman's concept of "The Vitality of Scripture." My thinking here is also in dialogue with the concept of "traditionary processes" as expressed in Najman and Tigchelaar, "Unity After Fragmentation," 497–98, and Najman, "Traditionary Processes and Textual Unity."

10 I am by no means the first to use the term 'resonance' in relation to biblical hermeneutics, but I give it distinctive emphasis. Brooke, for instance, speaks of "a field of language use resonant with traditions of numerous kinds" in a way that bears some resemblance to

a particularly integrative orientation. Within physics, resonance describes the amplificative effect when the frequency of a stimulus is the same or nearly the same as the natural frequency of the system. This offers a productive metaphor, which I see as operating in two mutually reinforcing ways. First, an expression resonates with other expressions, details, and themes within its context in the scroll. One part of this is a sharing of associations with the same biblical and Second Temple texts and traditions. This points to the second mode of resonance, resonance with texts and traditions outside of the scroll itself, the embedding of the scroll within a wider temple discourse.¹¹ Therefore, this article, as a case study of resonance with a focus on divine presence, offers not only an account of the richness of expression of divine presence within the Temple Scroll itself, but also a picture of broader reflection on divine presence in Second Temple Judaism.

Hinds's phrase "a rich freight of cultural resonance"; Brooke, "Controlling Intertexts," 86; Hinds, *Intertext and Allusion*, 32. By contrast, Hays speaks of resonance in terms of the 'implications' or 'overtones' of an allusion to or echo of a specific source; *Echoes of Scripture*, 21–23.

- 11 My interest in recurrent idioms and ongoing discourses bears resemblance to some understandings of 'intertextuality.' In this article, however, I avoid the term for two primary reasons. First, intertextuality is employed and understood in a variety of ways in biblical scholarship. Some of these hew closely to traditional notions of allusion to and reuse of sources, as noted by Tooman, *Gog of Magog*, 11–12, and Brooke, "Controlling Intertexts," 85. By contrast, an alternative definition sees intertextuality as a synchronic approach which potentially emphasises multiple readerly receptions; Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*, 6–9; Hinds, *Intertext and Allusion*, 47–48. The term itself, therefore, does little to clarify the approach taken, and the relation posited between texts. Furthermore, neither of these 'strong' definitions matches my approach in this article. Second, intertextuality has an externalising and fragmenting orientation. It is the breaking down of a text into the other 'texts' from which it is made. I opt for the term resonance to express the integration and dynamic interaction of elements within the Temple Scroll itself, including the way that this relates to the scroll's integration within wider temple discourses. My perspective on intertextuality is inspired by Najman's critique; see "Textual Unities and Poetic Processes in Ancient Judaism," especially Part III Hermeneutics and Intertextuality. For example, "My point is that intertextuality in biblical studies is obsessed with where the texts 'came from' instead of how the conversation across corpora interact in new song, new creation, in poetic expression," or, footnoted to this sentence, the observation of Glenn Most that "it tends to fragment a text into constitutive elements and distract attention from how these elements have been put together into a coherent whole."

2 Propositional Distinctions in the Temple Scroll

This article will consider all the expressions of divine presence in the Temple Scroll, focusing in particular on their use of the prepositions על “above” and בתוך “among.” I will show that such prepositional orientation acts as a mode of idiomatic and literary inheritance across biblical and Second Temple texts and traditions. These texts and traditions are connected not simply by the idea of the sanctuary as a place where God dwells, but by the prepositional rhetoric of ‘above’ and ‘among.’¹²

When speaking of the Temple Scroll, I refer specifically to 11Q19. The other witnesses are fragmentary and do not include the formulas of divine presence under investigation.¹³ I discuss 11Q19 in its extant form rather than in terms of possible source documents.¹⁴ The prepositional distinctions are consistent across the entirety of the scroll. They therefore play a role within 11Q19 as a compositional whole.

The Temple Scroll’s prepositional distinctions are sharpest in its name formulas. The name formulas echo Deuteronomic idiom, which speaks of the place the Lord will choose לשון/לשכן שמו שם “to put / settle his name there.”¹⁵ The Temple Scroll applies similar expressions not only to המקום “the place,” but also to more specific structures, הבית “the house” and העיר “the city.”¹⁶ The scroll

12 This offers an intriguing counterpoint to the dominance of language of ‘indwelling’ in biblical scholarship on divine presence, including scholarship on the Temple Scroll itself; e.g. Davies, “The Presence of God,” 33–34; Schiffman, *Courtyards*, xxvi–xxx, 26, 29–30; Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 35.

13 11Q20, 4Q524, and possibly 11Q21. For summaries of similarities and differences see Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting*, 111–15; Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 12–14; and García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 434–35. The lack of extant divine presence formulas makes it impossible to discern if the depiction was consistent across the versions. The only points of overlap are שוכן בתוכה in 11Q19 45:13–14 with 11Q20 12:6, and אני שוכן in 11Q19 46:4 with 11Q20 12:17.

14 Wilson and Wills, “Literary Sources,” influentially proposed that the Temple Scroll was a redactional combination of five independent sources. Zahn, “4QReworked Pentateuch C,” advocates an alternative model based on 4Q365 as an example of what could have been the scroll’s primary source, an already expanded Pentateuch. She further problematizes one of Wilson and Wills’s major arguments in a recent article on the periphrastic participial construction; “Linguistics and *Literarkritik*.”

15 Deut 12:11; 14:23; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2 with שכן. Deut 12:5, 21 with שים. This is adopted and adapted in the Temple Scroll in both forms. It is often applied as a relative clause rather than an infinitive and without the intervening אשר אבחר. אשר אבחר only occurs three times: 11Q19 52:9, 16; 60:13.

16 In Deuteronomy, it is applied to המקום alone. But in the monarchic history the place is identified specifically as הבית (1 Kings 8:16–20, 29; 9:3; 2 Kings 23:27; 2 Chr 6:5, 20; 7:16), or

does not, however, describe God's name simply as שם "there"; instead, it offers more precise prepositional specification.¹⁷

In the case of הבית "the house" or המקום "the place," God's name is עליו "above, over, or upon it." For example, 11Q19 53:9–10 עליו אשר אשכין שמי "the place over which I will settle my name." In the case of העיר "the city," the name is בה or בתוכה "in it" or "in its midst." For example, 11Q19 52:19–20 עירי אשר אנוכי מקדש לשום שמי בתוכה "my city which I sanctify by putting my name in its midst."

הבית + עליו	3:4, ¹⁸ 29:3–4; 30:4–5 ¹⁹
המקום + עליו	52:16; 53:9–10; 56:5 (cf. 60:13–14) ²⁰
העיר + בתוכה	45:11–12; ²¹ 47:10–11 (cf. 47:3–4); ²² 52:19–20

This article seeks to interpret the significance of this prepositional distinction between על and בתוך by identifying its resonance within and beyond the Temple Scroll.

העיר/ירושלים (1 Kings 11:36; 14:21; 2 Kings 21:4; 2 Chr 6:6; 33:4), or both together (2 Kings 21:7; 2 Chr 33:7).

17 Almost all formulations in the Hebrew Bible include שם. The only exceptions are 2 Kings 21:4, 7//2 Chr 33:4, 7 which instead employ the preposition ב.

18 Only the *tav* of ב[י]ת is extant, so while this is a plausible reconstruction in light of 29:3–4 and 30:4–5, it is not certain.

19 עליו / עלים שמי following Schiffman and Gross, *The Temple Scroll*, 88, and Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:169, in light of letters visible on the *verso*. This differs from Yadin's original suggestions for reconstruction here; *The Temple Scroll*, 2:130–31.

20 This formulation lacks a resumptive pronoun altogether. I think it best to assume that this was an accidental omission.

21 בה rather than בתוכה.

22 In 47:3–4, ה[עיר] / אשר אקדיש שמי ומקד[ש] בתוכה, the preposition בתוך is plausibly reconstructed in light of the similar phrasing of lines 10–11 which also pairs God's name and sanctuary; so Schiffman and Gross, *The Temple Scroll*, 128; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:186; Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:202; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 1264. In addition, in 47:3, Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:186, reconstructs ויהי[ו] עריהמה טהורות וש[ן] כנתי שמי בתוכמה לעולם. This is somewhat surprising insofar as column 47 distinguishes the cleanness of the temple city, in which the name dwells, from the cleanness of the other cities. Indeed, the next line describes how the temple city will be sanctified by making the divine name dwell within it. At the same time, by virtue of this, the divine name would also be in the midst of the cities as a collective, and so within the concentric structure of the scroll's prepositional rhetoric Qimron's reconstruction is not implausible. Yadin does not provide a full reconstruction but refers to 29:7–8 which uses את and 51:7–8 which uses בתוך. Both describe God dwelling with Israel, so presumably Yadin has God rather than the divine name in view here too; *The Temple Scroll*, 2:204. In this vein, Wise, *Critical Study*, 180 n. 2 proposes the addition of אני between the verb and preposition (cf. its use after אברא in 29:9). On either reconstruction, this would be

3 Above the Temple

The name formulas of the Temple Scroll have a complex idiomatic and literary background. The Temple Scroll engages Deuteronomic idiom, but such idiom has a life beyond the pages of the biblical text. Deuteronomy itself participates in independent patterns of thought and language related to both naming and divine presence. At the same time, it sparks its own tradition of expression beginning with the Deuteronomistic History and continuing into the Hellenistic period.

Whilst *על* is never found within the *לשים/לשכן שם* formula of Deuteronomy or the monarchic history, it is part of naming idiom more broadly.²³ ‘Name’ language can refer to fame,²⁴ or to possession.²⁵ To place one’s name, therefore, can be to establish reputation or hegemony.²⁶ In this case, whether the name is put *על* “upon,” *ב* “within,” or *שם* “there” makes little difference for the meaning of the metaphor.

Jubilees exemplifies the metaphorical use of *לשים שמי עליו* in this way, around the time of the writing of the Temple Scroll.²⁷ Naming language is applied to Abraham’s household. His descendants are a vehicle for his reputation. Just before he dies, he tells Jacob:

the only instance where the divine presence, God’s name or God’s-self, is said to be in the midst of the cities (plural).

- 23 Within the Hebrew Bible I have identified the following instances, some of which I will address in more depth below: *על- שם שם* Num 6:27; *על- נקרא שם* Deut 28:10; 2 Sam 6:2; 12:28; 1 Kings 8:43//2 Chr 6:33; 2 Chr 7:14; Isa 4:1; 63:19; Jer 7:10, 11, 14, 30; 14:9; 15:16; 25:29; 32:34; 34:15; Amos 9:12; Dan 9:8–19; cf. Ps 49:12; *על- הקים שם* Ruth 4:5, 10; and possibly *על- הוציא שם* Deut 22:14, 19.
- 24 This is frequent; BDB, s.v. “שם,” 2b. Note especially 2 Sam 7:23//1 Chr 17:21 where it occurs with *שם*.
- 25 Especially in the idiom *על נקרא שם*, see the discussion of Jeremiah below.
- 26 De Vaux, “Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi,” cites the Amarna Letters 287.60–63 and 288.5–7 as examples. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History*, points to a similar idiom in relation to Mesopotamian monumental inscriptions and the installation of victory stelae.
- 27 11Q19 is paleographically dated to the end of the 1st c. BCE or beginning of the 1st c. CE (a second scribe copied columns 1–5 slightly later); Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:18–20. 4Q524 attests to an earlier date, 150–125 BCE; Puech, DJD 25:88. But it may have contained the text or its source at a reduced stage of composition or in a different recension, as it differs from 11Q19 and contains no extant overlaps with columns 2–34, 36–48. Dating the text apart from its manuscript attestation is more speculative. See Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 24–26 and García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 444 for further discussion. The earliest copy of Jubilees, 4Q216, is paleographically dated to the end of the 2nd c. BCE; VanderKam and Milik, DJD 13:2. VanderKam proposes a date of composition between the 170s and c. 125 BCE; *Jubilees*, 25–37.

This house I have built for myself to **put my name on it** upon the earth. It has been given to you and to your descendants forever. It will be called Abraham's house. It has been given to you and your descendants forever because you will build my house and will establish my name before God until eternity.²⁸

Jub. 22:24

A much earlier attestation of such language is at the conclusion of the Priestly blessing in Num 6:23–27:

וּשְׁמוֹ אֶת שְׁמִי עַל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֲנִי אֲבָרְכֶם

So they shall put my name upon the Israelites, and I will bless them.

There is uncertainty over the precise significance in this verse of the placing of God's name upon Israel. It may be a further case of possession, the blessing constituting the people of Israel as God's people.²⁹ But it also interacts with the repetition of the divine name in each line of the blessing itself.³⁰ The words of the blessing, for example, 'the Lord make his face to shine upon you,' are metaphors for showing favour,³¹ but also imply and invoke divine presence.

Within Jubilees, this idiomatic use of על also appears within the name formula applied, in Deuteronomistic fashion, to the temple.

... my temple which I sanctified for myself in the middle of the land so that I could set my name on it and that it could live (there).

Jub. 1:10

The Hebrew of this verse is extant at Qumran and evidences its likeness to the formula in the Temple Scroll.³²

28 Translations of Jubilees are from VanderKam, *Jubilees*, based on the Ethiopic text.

29 So Milgrom, *Numbers*, 51. Imes understands this in terms of a metaphor of branding; Imes, *Bearing Yhwh's Name*, 71–76.

30 Cf. Exod 20:24; Levine, *Numbers 1–20*, 228.

31 Cf. Prov 16:15.

32 Transcriptions of Dead Sea Scrolls are based on Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, except where otherwise indicated, with consultation of the relevant DJD edition, or for 11Q19, Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, and Schiffman and Gross, *The Temple Scroll*.

... מקדש] י אשר הקדשתי לי בתוך] הארץ לשים א] ת שמי] עליי []
 4Q216 2:9–10

This prepositional rhetoric also occurs in Jub. 32:10 to describe the chosen place, as attested in the Ethiopic, although the Hebrew is not preserved.

For this reason it is ordained as a law on the heavenly tablets to tithe a second time, to eat it before the Lord—year by year—in the place which has been chosen (as the site) **over**³³ **which his name will reside**.

The Ethiopic of Jub. 49:21, however, does not maintain prepositional consistency, instead referring to “the house *in* which his name has resided.” This contrasts with the Latin which does reflect the rhetoric of presence ‘above’ that I am examining:

... in conspectum tabernaculi domini et in conspectu domus ubi habitavit nomen eius **super** ipsam.³⁴

... before the Lord’s tabernacle or before the house **over** which his name has resided.

Jubilees thus attests to the wider idiomatic currency, beyond the Temple Scroll, of the preposition על within name formulas applied to the temple. But such prepositional rhetoric cannot be understood in terms of this external context alone. It must also be considered in terms of its resonance within the Temple Scroll itself. The preposition על sits alongside and in dialogue with the preposition בתוך, used in relation to the temple city. Moreover, both prepositions resonate with expressions referring to other modes of divine presence. In column 29, for instance, God not only places his name upon the temple, but also settles his glory upon it.

... בבית אשר אשכין 4 שמי עליי [ויקריבו בו] עולת [יום] ביומו כתורת המשפט הזה

...

והיו לי לעם ואנוכי אהיה להם לעולם ושכנתי 8 אתמה לעולם ועד ואקדשה [את מ]קדשי בכבודי אשר אשכין 9 עליי את כבודי עד יום הבריה אשר אברא אני את מקדשי 10 להכינו לי כול הימים כברית אשר כרתי עם יעקוב בבית אל

33 Emended from “where” in VanderKam’s translation to reflect more clearly the preposition *la’lehu* “over it” here, see VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 177.

34 Transcription from VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 300.

... **in the house upon which I shall settle 4 my name** [and they will offer in it] burnt-offerings, [day] by day, according to the ruling of this regulation

...

They shall be my people and I will be theirs for ever; and I shall dwell 8 with them for ever and always. I shall sanctify my [te]mple with my glory, **for I shall settle my glory 9 over it** until the day of creation,³⁵ when I shall create my temple, 10 to establish it for myself for all days, according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel.³⁶

11Q19 29:3-4, 7-10

The combination of כבוד, שכן, and על echoes Priestly texts of the Pentateuch. In particular, it evokes Exod 24:16 where the glory of the Lord settles upon Mount Sinai (וישכן כבוד יהוה על הר סיני). At the same time, to identify this verse alone as 'the source' of the Temple Scroll's language in column 29 would be too hasty. The Priestly texts present the Sinai revelation as a partially repeatable experience. Just as the glory settles upon Sinai, the cloud settles upon the tabernacle.

For example, Num 9:18 (see also Exod 40:35; Num 9:17, 22; 10:12):

כל ימי אשר ישכן הענן על המשכן יחנו

All the days the cloud settled over the tabernacle, they remained camped.

The combination of שכן and על is one of a series of linguistic recollections of the Sinai event in the accounts of the guiding function of the cloud.³⁷ These evoke the glory's presence, even as it is not described.³⁸

The language of 'settling upon' thus becomes idiomatic for divine presence within the Priestly corpus. Nor is this constellation of terms restricted to the Pentateuch. It will be shown below that various combinations of שכן, על, and

35 Or transcribe as ברכה "blessing"; Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:129; Schiffman and Gross, *The Temple Scroll*, 86.

36 Translations of Dead Sea Scrolls are my own, with consultation of the relevant DJD volume (or Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* for 11Q19) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*.

37 Others include the verb כסה "to cover" and the collocation מראה אש "the appearance of fire."

38 The כבוד is not mentioned in the accounts of the guiding function of the cloud (Exod 40:36-38; Num 9:15-22; 10:11-12). In Exod 40:34-35 at the completion of the tabernacle, the glory is said to fill the tent when the cloud settles upon it. But this is a temporary event (cf. 1 Kings 8:11).

כבוד are found across Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.³⁹ The Temple Scroll is engaging a recurrent phenomenon, which is more than any one of its instantiations.

I have shown, therefore, that the preposition על sits naturally within both name and glory formulas. Within the context of the Temple Scroll the expressions and their prepositions garner additional resonances. As they are brought together in the scroll, they resonate with one another, particularly in their congruence in locating the divine presence ‘upon’ the temple.

Similar resonance may occur between two lines in 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A.

[כי ש]ם יהוה נקרא עליה
[וכבודו] נראה על ירושלם

[For the na]me of the Lord is invoked over her
[and his glory] is seen over Jerusalem.

4Q380 1 i 5–6

This is an instance of parallelism. The shared preposition על reinforces the coordination of the lines. It establishes resonance between an invocation and an appearance *over* Jerusalem, both expressed in the *Niphal*.

The combination of the *Niphal* of קרא and the preposition על in line 5 brings to mind the formula שם נקרא על which appears in the biblical text as an idiom for possession (see 2Sam 12:28). It occurs frequently in Jeremiah to describe the temple and appears to be an alternative to the Deuteronomic name formula (e.g. Jer 7:10: בבית הזה אשר נקרא שמי עליו).⁴⁰ Especially relevant for 4Q380 are Jer 25:29 and Dan 9:18–19 where it is applied to the city.⁴¹ This supports the restoration of שם “name” here, as well as providing further evidence for use of

39 It is also worth noting 2 Chr 7:3: יהוה על הבית והאש וכבוד יהוה על הבית. This occurs at the inauguration of the Solomonic temple. The previous two verses speak of the glory filling the temple, evoking the same occurrence at the inauguration of the tabernacle. The glory upon the temple therefore resonates with Priestly traditions of Sinai and tabernacle and forms part of the same ideas of repeatable experience that I have drawn attention to in relation to the tabernacle itself. The glory here is specifically said to be seen and I will consider the importance of visibility as a theme towards the end of this article.

40 Jer 7:10, 11, 14, 30; 32:34; 34:15. It is also applied to the people (Jer 14:9) and to the prophet (Jer 15:16).

41 Schuller, DJD 11:80.

לע alongside שם into the Hellenistic period.⁴² It is notable in this respect that the Septuagint translates the name formula in Deuteronomy with ἐπιναληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ, analogous to the Jeremianic idiom.⁴³

In terms of line 6, the restoration of כבודי reflects a sense of resonance with Isa 60:2 where the glory appears over Zion.⁴⁴ Below I discuss further possible instances in the Dead Sea Scrolls that describe manifestation of the divine glory, often including the preposition על. I also consider their relationship with Priestly texts that speak of the glory appearing above the sanctuary.

Whether or not these particular reconstructions are accepted, it is clear that the preposition על coordinates an auditory invocation in line 5 with a visible manifestation in line 6. It displays the poetic power of prepositional resonance. If the restorations in terms of divine presence are correct, this provides a particularly close analogy to the resonance of the preposition על across the name and glory formulas of the Temple Scroll.

In column 29 of the Temple Scroll, אשר אשכין עליו את כבודי “for I shall settle my glory over it” in lines 8–9 mirrors the name formula which occurs just before in lines 3–4: בבית אשר אשכין שמי עליו “in the house upon which I shall settle my name.” In Priestly Pentateuchal texts, the divine presence, whether glory or cloud, is always the subject of שכן. The form here, with כבוד as the object of the first person *Hiphil* of שכן, mirrors the name formula, particularly as found in the Temple Scroll.⁴⁵ Even the conjunction אשר resembles the relative אשר in the name formula. Therefore, just as parallelistic word order coordinates expressions in 4Q380, so too the phraseology of the Temple Scroll adapts Priestly idiom to bring it closer together with its counterpart. Such language and expression is thus as much a product of forces and associations internal to the Temple Scroll as external ones. The preposition על, as natural to both idioms, facilitates and reinforces this inner resonance.⁴⁶

42 Yadin proposed the Jeremianic idiom as a point of comparison for 11Q19 52:16; *The Temple Scroll*, 2:235.

43 In Deut 12:5, which contains both לשכן and לשום, the variation between the verbs is represented in the LXX by ἐπονομάσαι alongside the usual ἐπιναληθῆναι. There may be influence from ἐπι in ἐπιναλέω on the choice of ἐπονομάζω rather than ὀνομάζω. But ἐπονομάζω is also common in Greek for giving a name or naming after.

44 Schuller, DJD 11:80.

45 In the name formula of the biblical text, שכן always occurs in the *Piel*. In the Temple Scroll, some instances are clearly *Hiphil* because they have a *plene yod* (45:12; 47:4; 53:9; 56:5). Other instances are ambiguous due to the unvocalised text (47:11; 60:13), or because the verb is partially restored (30:4; 47:3).

46 The Temple Scroll does not equate the name and glory. Instead, spatial resonance enables coordination without collapse. Each retains its distinct idiomatic nuances, such that the

4 In the Midst of the People

In describing God's presence with Israel, the Temple Scroll favours the preposition בתוך.⁴⁷ Certain purity regulations are justified in the Temple Scroll with the words: אשר אנוכי שוכן בתוכמה "for I dwell in their midst" (11Q19 46:12), or כי בני ישראל אני יהוה שוכן בתוך בני ישראל "for I the Lord dwell in the midst of the people of Israel" (11Q19 45:14; 51:7–8).⁴⁸

שוכן + בתוך 45:13–14; 46:4, 12; 47:18; 51:7–8

This specific formulation involving a pronoun and participle is found in Numbers:

ולא יטמאו את מחניהם אשר אני שכן בתוכם

They shall not defile their camp⁴⁹ for I dwell in their midst.

Num 5:3

ולא תטמא את הארץ אשר אתם ישיבים בה אשר אני שכן בתוכה כי אני יהוה שכן בתוך בני ישראל

You shall not defile the land in which you live, in the midst of which I dwell; for I the Lord dwell in the midst of the people of Israel.

Num 35:34

name evokes notions of reputation and possession, whilst, as I will show below, the glory points to a visible manifestation.

47 An exception to this may be 11Q19 29:7–8: ועד ושכנתי אתמה לעולם ועד "and I will dwell with them forever and always." The only precedent within the biblical text for the combination of שכן and the preposition את in relation to divine presence is Lev 16:16 where the tent of meeting is said to dwell with them (Israel) in the midst of their uncleanness: לאהל מועד לאהל טמאתם השכן אתם בתוך טמאתם. Alternatively, it is possible that אתמה is not a preposition but the third person masculine plural direct object. This could be supported with reference to Jer 7:3 and especially verse 7: ושכנתי אתכם במקום הזה "and I will let you dwell (*Piel*) in this place." But the Temple Scroll lacks the specification of place, perhaps making this latter option less likely (though cf. Ps 37:27), and some scholars would seek to emend Jeremiah itself to *Qal* + preposition in line with Aquila and the Vulgate; see BHS; HALOT, s.v. שכן.

48 While the name formula occurs in a variety of contexts across the scroll in relation to architectural construction, purity law, and sacrifice, the formula of God dwelling in Israel's midst is more restricted to concern for purity and holiness. But the highly fragmentary state of the earlier columns of the scroll means that it is difficult to make strong claims about its absence there. In column 52 and following, the preference for the name formula may reflect a distinctive characteristic of the Deuteronomic paraphrase.

49 *מחנה* is a noun whose singular with suffixes can have the form of the plural; GKc § 93ss.

The combination of the root שכן and preposition בתוך to describe God's presence among the Israelites occurs several further times in Priestly texts of the Pentateuch (cf. also Lev 15:31; 26:11 with משכן).⁵⁰

ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם

They shall make me a sanctuary so that I may dwell in their midst.

Exod 25:8

ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים
וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם

**I will dwell in the midst of the people of Israel and I will be their God
And they shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them
out from the land of Egypt that I might dwell in their midst.**

Exod 29:45–46

This expression is taken up in Ezekiel 43. When the glory returns to the temple, God promises to dwell in the midst of the Israelites forever.⁵¹

את מקום כסאי ואת מקום כפות רגלי אשר אשכן שם בתוך בני ישראל לעולם
... ושכנתי בתוכם לעולם

The place of my throne and the place of the soles of my feet **where I will
dwell in the midst of the people of Israel forever**
... and I will dwell in their midst forever.

Ezek 43:7, 9

The Temple Scroll thus engages a recurrent and idiomatic expression of divine presence found across Priestly Pentateuchal texts and Ezekiel.⁵²

50 This formula is attributed to H by Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1399 and Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 180–87. I refer to “Priestly” literature in an expansive way, including H materials and so-called “post-Priestly” additions.

51 Ganzel perceives 11Q19 45:12–14 in particular as resembling this passage from Ezekiel; “Reworking of Ezekiel,” 236.

52 The use of בתוך in relation to divine presence is a feature of P, Ezekiel, and Zechariah (as well as Josh 22:31 and 1 Kings 6:13). Other texts use בקרב in similar expressions; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 95.

On two occasions in the Temple Scroll God is said to dwell in the midst of the temple city specifically (45:13: הָעִיר אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שׁוֹכֵן בְּתוֹכָהּ; 47:18: אֲשֶׁר ... וְעִירִי וְעִירִי). As noted above, the name formula applied to the temple city similarly describes God settling his name in its midst (בְּתוֹכָהּ). The preposition בְּתוֹךְ, however, does not have idiomatic association with naming language. Its occurrence within the name formula of the Temple Scroll, therefore, gains resonance primarily from coordination with other expressions of divine presence in the scroll.

From the perspective of much scholarship on Deuteronomy, this combination of expressions would seem surprising. For such scholarship, name language expresses that God does not dwell in the midst of Israel; God is in heaven and only God's name is on earth.⁵³ Shemesh attempts to reconcile these assumptions about Deuteronomistic language with the Temple Scroll's usage in claiming that the Temple Scroll reflects what he sees as Deuteronomistic tendencies to abstraction: "the dissociation of the divine presence from any confined hallowed physical area: God resides in the midst of the community."⁵⁴ For Shemesh, reference to God's name in relation to the temple and God's-self in relation to Israel indicates that God is present in Israel's midst, rather than and apart from being present in the sanctuary.⁵⁵

I argue, however, that closer attention to the various formulas and their interaction with one another reveals that they localise God's presence over the temple, which is in the midst of the city and the people. The coordination of God's name and God's-self is especially clear in 11Q19 45:11–14:

11 וְאִישׁ כִּי יִשְׁכַּב עִם אִשְׁתּוֹ שִׁכַּבְתָּ זָרַע לֹא יִבּוֹא אֶל כּוֹל עִיר 12 הַמִּקְדָּשׁ אֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁכֵּן
 שְׁמִי בָּהּ שְׁלוֹשֶׁת יָמִים כּוֹל אִישׁ עוֹר 13 לֹא יִבּוֹא לָהּ כּוֹל יְמִיהָמָה וְלֹא יִטְמָאוּ אֶת הָעִיר
 אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שׁוֹכֵן 14 בְּתוֹכָהּ כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה שׁוֹכֵן בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד

11 *vacat* And a man if he lies with his wife and has an ejaculation, for three days he shall not enter the whole city of 12 the temple in which I settle

53 These ideas go back as far as Stade (1888), but were popularized by von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 127, and have been followed by most scholars, including Clements, *God and Temple*, 90; Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth*, 46; Sommer, *The Bodies of God*, 62–67; and Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 193–95. Richter, *The Deuteronomistic History*, 24–30 provides a useful summary of the influence of this perspective. There has been some resistance; especially, Wilson, *Out of the Midst of the Fire*, and McConville, "God's 'Name' and God's 'Glory'."

54 Shemesh, "Holiness according to the *Temple Scroll*," 380.

55 The division is not as clear cut as Shemesh claims. The temple city participates in both formulas.

my name. *vacat* No blind person 13 shall enter it all their days, and they shall not defile **the city in whose midst I dwell** 14 because **I, the Lord, dwell in the midst of the Israelites** for ever and always.

The settling of the name in the city in line 12 parallels the dwelling of God within the city in line 13. The name formula is not opposed to, but rather an expression of, God's presence within the temple city. The final causal כִּי clause in line 14 implies that both statements are reflections of, or specifications of, the dwelling of God in the midst of Israel.

Similarly, the interaction between divine presence and sanctification across the Temple Scroll expresses the coordination of name, glory, and God's-self. In 46:11–12 the Israelites are said to sanctify the temple and to fear the temple **אשר אנוכי שוכן בתוכמה** “for I dwell in their midst.” God's dwelling in Israel's midst is connected to the temple and requires its sanctification.

Other texts relate the sanctification of the temple city to the placing of God's name within it:

העיר אשר אקדיש לשכין שמי ומקד[שי בתוכ]ה

the city which I shall sanctify by settling⁵⁶ my name and [my] temp[le within] it

47:3–4

עירי אשר אנוכי מקדש לשום שמי בתוכה

my city which I sanctify by placing my name within it

52:19–20

Similarly, 29:8–9, quoted above, speaks of the temple as sanctified by God's glory. 47:3–4 suggests that the sanctity of the city and the temple are not independent of one another but intimately related. It incorporates the **מקדש** into

56 The translation of the preposition *lamed* in **לשכין** and **לשום** is ambiguous. It could signify purpose: in order to settle my name. Or it could be gerundial: by settling my name; GK, § 1440; *IBHS* § 36.2.3e. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, and Schiffman and Gross, *The Temple Scroll*, translate 47:3–4 as purpose but 52:19–20 as gerundial. By contrast, Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, translates 47:3–4 as gerundial and 52:19–20 as purpose. This ambiguity is already present in 1 Kings 9:3. A purpose reading is supported by 1 Kings 9:7//2 Chr 7:20 which have **לשמי** without a verb. A gerundial reading is supported by the parallel in 11Q19 29:8–9 which uses an instrumental *beth* in **בכבודי**, echoing Exod 29:43.

the name formula applied to the city (see also 47:10–11). This reflects the concentric structure established by the scroll's prepositional distinctions.⁵⁷ The name is upon the temple, which is itself within (בתוך) the city, and so the name is said to be within (בתוך) the city. Similarly, the temple city is itself in the midst of the land as a whole, so God can be said to dwell in the midst of the Israelites.

The Temple Scroll's prepositional rhetoric contributes to debate over the meaning of עיר המקדש. Yadin, followed by Milgrom, argues that the temple city is the residential city.⁵⁸ By contrast, Levine, followed by Schiffman, suggests that it designates the temple compound.⁵⁹ I side with Yadin and Milgrom in suggesting the need to distinguish the temple (*temenos*) from the temple city, the מקדש from the עיר המקדש.⁶⁰ The prepositional rhetoric of the Temple Scroll supports this. על, המקדש, הבית, and המקום all relate to the divine presence using the preposition על. By contrast, the עיר המקדש and the people as a whole relate to the divine presence using the preposition בתוך. But I therefore disagree with Milgrom's claim that the Temple Scroll sees the divine presence as *on* the whole city of Jerusalem.⁶¹

Thus far I have shown that the Temple Scroll's expressions of divine presence, including the prepositions על and בתוך, resonate with idioms and formulas that recur across multiple texts both within and beyond the Hebrew Bible. I have interpreted these expressions not only in terms of their idiomatic background, but also in terms of their interaction with one another in the scroll itself. The prepositions coordinate God's-self, name, and glory, and this has an integrative force within the scroll.⁶² In the following sections, I will build upon

57 This prepositional concentricity accords well with Schiffman's suggestion that the Temple Scroll's plan "envisioned concentric spheres of holiness"; *Courtyards*, xxviii, see also chapter 17, "Sacred Space," 281–94; similarly, Maier, *Temple Scroll*, 5.

58 Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:288–89; Milgrom, "The City of the Temple," 125–28.

59 Levine, "The Temple Scroll," 14–17; Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 53–65.

60 A major argument for distinguishing the temple city from the temple is the statement in column 46 about a חיל separating the temple from the city. Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 57–59 is required not only to see מקדש as having a multivalent meaning, the temple-building in some places (e.g. 47) and the *temenos* (i.e. temple city) in others (e.g. 46), but he also reads this passage as about separating the temple city from "the city," in his view the residential city. This is rendered unlikely by the context where the group excluded from "the temple city" in column 45 is the same group for whom places are to be built outside "the city" in column 46. Levine's claim that the חיל around which the מקדש is built is the inner-temple area is similarly problematic in requiring מקדש to have a different meaning from the previous part of the column (46:8); "The Temple Scroll," 16–17.

61 Milgrom, "City of the Temple," 127.

62 By 'integrative' I mean the coherence of different parts of the scroll itself. But one can also speak of the integration of wider traditions. I noted in the introduction that a feature of

and nuance these observations. I will consider these formulas of divine presence within the wider context of the temple plan and laws of the Temple Scroll.

5 Wider Schemes of Resonance

From the beginnings of research on the Temple Scroll, its temple plan was understood to reflect traditions of a heavenly תבנית “pattern.”⁶³ The Temple Scroll presents itself as divinely given, the words of God to Moses on Sinai.⁶⁴ Within the biblical text, Moses, David, and Ezekiel are all given divine temple plans (Exod 25:9; 1 Chr 28:19; Ezek 43:10–12). These same sanctuaries are evoked by the details of the Temple Scroll’s temple plan.⁶⁵ The idea of a heavenly or divine pattern therefore has resonance and an integrative force within the scroll.

The giving of these plans for sanctuaries is associated in the biblical text with God’s promise to dwell in the midst of (בתוך) Israel. Exod 25:8 orders the making of the tabernacle “so that I may dwell in their midst” (ושכנתי בתוכם) and follows this with instructions for its construction. Partway through the account of the temple in Ezekiel 40–48, Ezekiel declares that God will dwell in the midst of (בתוך) the sons of Israel forever (43:7, 9), and this is followed in verses 10–12 by the command to Ezekiel to describe the temple plan to the house of Israel and write it down in their sight.

The בתוך formulas in the Temple Scroll, therefore, resonate with these verses not only at an idiomatic level, but also in terms of their respective literary contexts. Or to rephrase this inversely, the בתוך formulas, in their evocation

scholarship on the Temple Scroll has been attention to the scroll’s interweaving of traditions. Within this, scholars have particularly observed the scroll’s bringing together of ideas and expressions associated with Priestly and Deuteronomic Pentateuchal texts. The expressions of divine presence which I am examining certainly form part of this wider tendency. But I avoid the term ‘harmonisation’ often used to describe this. It can be taken to imply a conflict between the traditions being ‘harmonised,’ and it is not clear to me that the writers or readers of the Temple Scroll would have perceived this to be the case with the formulas of God’s name, glory, and self. They occur side by side in other Second Temple texts, including 4Q380 1 i 5–6 (as restored above), 2 Chr 7:1, 16, 20, and possibly Jub. 1:10, 17. I also differentiate harmonisation and resonance from one another insofar as the former tends to express an exegetical intention, whereas the latter describes a connotative effect.

63 Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:82–83.

64 See 11Q19 44:5 “the sons of Aaron, your brother,” and 51:6–7 “which I tell you on this mountain.”

65 See especially Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1: 177–276.

of Exod 25:8 and Ezek 43:7, 9, resonate with the wider context of the Temple Scroll as a divinely given plan. They also resonate with the architectural details of the scroll insofar as they resemble the tabernacle plan of Exodus and the temple vision of Ezekiel. Resonances with other texts and resonances within the Temple Scroll itself reinforce one another.

Literary context is often used by scholars as a tool for choosing between possible sources of an expression. In this case, however, it highlights the Temple Scroll's engagement with an interconnection between two biblical texts. The *בתוך* formula in the scroll is framed by echoes of both Exodus and Ezekiel. In this way, recognition of the formulaic quality of the Temple Scroll's language is in dialogue with the identification of specific literary resonances.

In using language of resonance, I have avoided making a claim about intention. It is possible that the Temple Scroll is exploiting the point of connection between these sanctuaries in order to reinforce bringing them together in its temple plan. But it is equally possible that patterns of thought and language in the biblical text and amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls mean that such resonances unfold, even unconsciously, in an attempt to speak of temple presence and temple plans.

Alongside architecture, the laws of the Temple Scroll also resonate with its account of divine presence. In addition to its occurrence in the tabernacle plan of Exodus, God's dwelling in the midst of Israel is referred to in Numbers as justification for purity regulations.⁶⁶ These further instances of the *בתוך* formula are also evoked by the Temple Scroll; for not only is the tabernacle plan echoed by the temple plan of the Temple Scroll, but also the restrictions of the tabernacle camp are applied to the temple city and the cities around it.⁶⁷ Based on their exclusion from the camp in Num 5:2–3, those with leprosy, corpse impurity, and discharges are excluded from the temple city in 11Q19 45:15–18 and 46:16–18, and those with leprosy and discharges from other cities in 48:14–17.⁶⁸ Moreover, the

66 Num 5:3; 35:34 (quoted above); cf. also Lev 15:31.

67 The gates and courts of the temple itself also recall the tabernacle camp, in terms of the four Levitical groups on each side of the tabernacle and the twelve tribes of Israel arranged around them in Numbers 2–3. Schiffman argues that the temple of the scroll represents the desert encampment with the tabernacle and divine presence at its centre; Schiffman, *Courtyards*, 218, 227–28. Cf. Ezek 48:30–34.

68 The complex application of these laws to both the temple city and other cities reflects the fact that the camp in the Hebrew Bible has a double function; it is both the area surrounding the tabernacle and the residence of the Israelites. For further discussion of these issues see Feder, "The Wilderness Camp Paradigm," with whom however I differ in that he understands these laws to reflect God's presence in all cities as somehow distinct from God's relationship with the sanctuary.

laws about corpse impurity in the wilderness camp in Num 19:10–15 are applied to the Israelite cities in 11Q19 49:5–51:6.⁶⁹

This echoing of the tabernacle in temple plan and law similarly resonates with the combination of שכן and על, the settling of the divine presence upon the temple. As I suggested above, this calls to mind the linguistic mechanism by which the cloud over the tabernacle evokes the glory on Sinai.

Sinai associations are also involved in the regulations set out in the scroll in a way that is distinct from the tabernacle. In 11Q19 45:7–12 (partially quoted above), the man who has a nocturnal emission may not enter the temple for three days, and the man who lies with his wife may not enter the city of the temple for three days. The ‘three days’ echoes Exod 19:15, “be ready for the third day; do not go near a woman”; by contrast, the laws in Lev 15:16–18 and Deut 23:11–12 only require a wait until evening.⁷⁰ Just as at Sinai the people consecrate themselves because “on the third day the Lord will come down on Mount Sinai” (Exod 19:11), the settling of the glory upon the temple in the Temple Scroll is framed by the same response.

The expressions of divine presence in the Temple Scroll therefore resonate with its laws in their evocation of both Sinai and tabernacle camps. The recollection of Sinai and its three-day preparation is particularly interesting because it does not involve a physical sanctuary, and yet participates in the resonances of the scroll as a place of divine presence. This is facilitated by the recollection of Sinai already in P’s tabernacle, which brings it into the discourse of temple presence.

Divine presence ‘above’ and ‘among’ in the Temple Scroll engages connections embedded within the Hebrew Bible. There is an interwovenness to biblical attestations of God’s presence at various sacred places involving literary relationships as well as patterns of thought and language. The prepositions על and בתוך play a central role within this and resonate with various sanctuaries evoked by the Temple Scroll’s temple plan. This has an integrative force within the scroll.

Anonymity of location in the Temple Scroll contributes to this integration. It speaks of ‘the place the Lord will choose.’ This expression maintains anonymity within the context of Deuteronomy, but within the context of the Deuteronomistic History it refers to Jerusalem. Brooke uses this to argue that the Qumran corpus is “facing Jerusalem while only looking over the shoulder to Sinai.”⁷¹ But we should take seriously the absence of a place name in the Temple

69 See especially Swanson, *Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 184–211.

70 Fraade, “Looking for Narrative Midrash,” 58; Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:287–89.

71 Brooke, “Moving Mountains,” 75.

Scroll, tied to its setting at Sinai before Jerusalem was conquered and any temple built.⁷² From the perspective of the reader, this anonymity means that the recognition of המקום “the place” as Jerusalem is as much a matter of association and resonance as the recognition that שכך, כבוד, and על echoes Sinai. Indeed, the Temple Scroll recalls not only Sinai and Jerusalem but also more ambiguous locations, such as the tabernacle in the desert and the high mountain of Ezekiel 40–48.

6 Idealisation and Eschatology

Having examined wider schemes of resonance across the Temple Scroll, this final section focuses on a specific passage, column 29 lines 7–10. This deepens the hermeneutic picture offered so far by considering this column’s simultaneous resonance both with a specific biblical passage and with a tradition of eschatological expectation. Together they contribute to the idealisation of the temple in the Temple Scroll.

11Q19 29:7–10, quoted above, strongly resembles Ezekiel 37:26–28’s description of a promised and idealised future.⁷³

וכרתי להם ברית שלום ברית עולם יהיה אותם ונתתים והרביתי אותם ונתתי את
מקדשי בתוכם לעולם
והיה משכני עליהם והייתי להם לאלהים והמה יהיו לי לעם
וידעו הגוים כי אני יהוה מקדש את ישראל בהיות מקדשי בתוכם לעולם

I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting
covenant with them;⁷⁴ and I will place them⁷⁵ and multiply them,
and I will set my sanctuary in their midst forever.

My dwelling shall be over them; and I will be their God, and they shall
be my people.

72 For the “unbuilt ideal” in Second Temple thought see Mroczek, “How Not to Build a Temple.”

73 This has also been noted by Ganzel, “Reworking of Ezekiel,” 234–35.

74 LXX Vaticanus and Alexandrinus have μετ’ αὐτῶν and Papyrus 967 has αὐτοῖς. Block suggests that MT’s אותם may be a dialectal variation (cf. Ezek 16:60); *The Book of Ezekiel*, 408.

75 Hermann suggested that אותם ונתתים was a corruption of a marginal note creating a doublet of ונתתי ונתתי; *Ezechiel*, 234. NRSV follows the Targum in reading “and I will bless them.” Block proposes reading the final mem as a datival suffix forming an abbreviation for a land grant formula (cf. Ezek 11:17) or נתתים as an aural error for נטעתים ‘I will plant them’; *The Book of Ezekiel*, 408.

Then the nations shall know that I the Lord sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary is in their midst forever.

They share an interest in covenant (ברית) and use of the covenant formula. Yadin, comparing 11Q19 29:7 (והיו לי לעם ואנוכי אהיה להם לעולם) with Ezek 37:23, 27, observes that the Temple Scroll substitutes לעולם for לאלהים.⁷⁶ The language of עולם “forever” is repeated in both texts: 11Q19 29:7, 8; Ezek 37:25, 26, 28. Covenant and eternity are combined with an interest in God’s מקדש “sanctuary”: 11Q19 29:8–9; Ezek 37:26, 28.

Ezekiel 37 displays intimacy with the formula of God dwelling (שכן) in the midst of (בתוך) Israel known from the Priestly texts as well as Ezekiel 43. But it separates the root שכן and the preposition בתוך. It offers an alternative formulation. The מקדש “sanctuary” is בתוכם “in their midst” (Ezek 37:26, 28). This forms an *inclusio* around another related expression: והיה משכני עליהם “my dwelling will be over them” (Ezek 37:27).

The distinction between מקדש and משכן is surprising in light of their synonymous usage in Priestly Pentateuchal texts.⁷⁷ The statement in verse 26 is very similar to Lev 26:11: ונתתי משכני בתוכם, which is also closely followed by the covenant formula.⁷⁸ But Ezekiel’s version employs מקדשי rather than משכני and instead associates משכן with the preposition על.

It is difficult to discern what it means to say that God’s משכן is עליהם. Many English translations understand על as ‘with.’⁷⁹ But if על carries a sense of accompaniment, it is difficult to interpret what the distinction from בתוך signifies. The Greek translations offer little help. Papyrus 967 obscures any distinction; it uses ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν for all three verses. Vaticanus and Alexandrinus maintain some prepositional distinction; the κατασκήνωσις is ἐν αὐτοῖς, whereas τὰ ἄγια are ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.⁸⁰ But this would not be a possible reading of the Hebrew.

Allen and Cooke argue that the משכן is equivalent to the מקדש and refer to the high mountain of Ezek 40:2, claiming that God’s dwelling place overlooks

76 Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:128.

77 Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, 2299–3000 considers Lev 26:11 to be an exception, translating משכני as “my presence” (contrast Lev 15:31). He claims that Ezekiel understood it this way. But Ezekiel’s interpretation of Lev 26:11 is not straightforward. Indeed, Ezekiel replaces Leviticus’s משכני with מקדשי.

78 Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy*, 70 takes this as evidence of Ezekiel’s dependence on H. The combination of promised dwelling among/with the people and the covenant formula is found in both Jub. 1:17 and 2 Cor 6:16; Kister, “Jewish Dimensions.”

79 NRSV, ESV, NIV, KJV; cf. Jub. 1:17.

80 For further analysis of the Greek here see Crane, *Israel’s Restoration*, 134.

the people.⁸¹ Alternatively, a heavenly dwelling place could be in mind. But it is hard to flesh out these suggestions when the combination of שכן and על occurs nowhere else in Ezekiel.

It is notable, however, that 11Q19 29:7–10, amidst its various resemblances with Ezek 37:26–28, includes a combination of שכן and על. Indeed, the juxtaposition of formulas in Ezek 37:26–28 offers a precursor for the dynamic between presence above (על) and among (בתוך) that I have been examining across the Temple Scroll.

At the same time, the Temple Scroll's relationship with these formulas in Ezekiel 37 is by no means one of direct imitation. In 11Q19 29 God promises that he will settle his glory upon his temple. The כבוד and its place above the temple rather than the people attests, as shown above, to engagement with broader Priestly idiom, beyond Ezek 37:27. Moreover, whilst בתוך appears in expressions of divine presence across the scroll,⁸² it is not found in column 29 specifically, which employs the preposition את.

The scroll's engagement with Ezekiel 37 is thus always part of a broader set of resonances. In this way, the scroll attests as much to possible literary forces behind Ezekiel 37 itself as to any dependence of its own upon that text. It suggests a further interpretation of the latter's unusual combination of משכן and על in terms of Priestly tradition, the divine presence settling above the sanctuary, and so above the people.⁸³

At the same time, the strong resonance between Ezekiel 37 and 11Q19 29, in terms of not only divine presence and prepositions, but also eternity and covenant, suggests that the associations of Ezekiel 37 with idealisation and divine promise also pertain to the Temple Scroll. This is the case whether they are products of a similar network of traditions or are reading each other directly.

One of the ways in which column 29 of the Temple Scroll differs from the phraseology of Ezekiel 37 and displays engagement with a wider tradition is the language of כבוד. I have considered this in terms of the Sinai pericope, as well as the more subtle evocation of the divine glory in the cloud settling upon the tabernacle. But the resonance of the combination of כבוד and על also goes

81 Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48*, 191; Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 403.

82 It is mostly associated with שכן as in wider Priestly idiom, rather than מקדש as in Ezekiel 37. But 11Q19 47:3–4, 10–11 do describe the מקדש as in the midst of (בתוך) the city.

83 Cf. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 757–58, who refers also to Isa 4:5–6; Block, *The Book of Ezekiel*, 421. A couple of Pentateuchal texts do describe the cloud of the Lord as over the people rather than the sanctuary specifically; Num 10:34; 14:14. But the relation of these verses to one another and to the Priestly cloud texts is difficult to determine.

beyond the Pentateuch. In discussing 4Q380 above, I drew attention to the final phrase of Isa 60:1–2: **וּכְבוֹדוֹ עָלֶיךָ יִרְאֶה** “and his glory will appear over you.”⁸⁴

Unlike Isaiah, the Temple Scroll never speaks of the glory as ‘appearing.’ Indeed, within the scroll as a whole, there is little that resonates with the book of Isaiah specifically.⁸⁵ However reference to God’s glory appearing ‘above’ exists beyond the text and context of Isaiah alone. Several Dead Sea Scrolls attest variations on this idea, often in an eschatological setting. I therefore suggest that the Temple Scroll resonates not with Isa 60:2 in particular, but rather with a set of expectations that, perhaps inspired by this text, involves the combination of **כְּבוֹד** and **עַל**.

וּכְבוֹדוֹ עָלֶיהֶמָּה יִרְאֶה [...]

And his glory will be see[n] over them⁸⁶ [...]

4Q457b (4QEschatological Hymn) 11 6⁸⁷

It is hard to make firm comments about such a fragmentary text. It moves from a description of God battling alongside David in the past to a statement about the future in relation to God and his holy ones. The appearance of God’s glory is probably looked forward to as an eschatological event.

יְגַלֶּה [כְּבוֹדוֹ לְ] עוֹלָם תָּמִיד עָלָיו יִרְאֶה

[His glory shall] be revealed for[ev]er; it shall be seen over it continually

4Q174 (4QFlorilegium or 4QEschatological Commentary A) 1–2 i,⁸⁸ 21 5

The phrase **עָלָיו יִרְאֶה** “it/he will be seen over it” resembles the language of Isaiah. Along with most commentators, I interpret **יִרְאֶה** as *Niphal*.⁸⁹ This appearance is eschatological. The surrounding lines 2–7 of this thematic pesher describe an eschatological sanctuary with line 2 referring to “the house which [he will establish] for [him] in the last days.”

84 “You,” second person feminine singular, refers to Zion.

85 For instance, there are no references to Isaiah in Wise’s appendix of biblical sources for the Temple Scroll; *Critical Study*, 235–42.

86 “Presumably upon the holy ones mentioned in line 5”; Chazon, DJD 29:417.

87 Transcription from Chazon, DJD 29:416.

88 This is column 3 in the reconstruction of the scroll by Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:289, but column 1 in Allegro, DJD 5:53.

89 Carmignac takes it as Qal: “constamment Il regardera sur elle” as an idiom for protection; *Les textes de Qumran*, 2:281. But I find no evidence for this idiom in Hebrew.

Discerning what it is that will be seen is more difficult. The earlier part of the line is poorly preserved, leading scholars to propose different reconstructions. Much depends on whether the second letter is read as *gimel*⁹⁰ or *heh*.⁹¹ The rightward slant of the line inclines me to see it as *gimel*. If it is *gimel*, it is plausible that the subject is כבוד “glory”; the verbs גלה and ראה occur together in Isa 40:5: כבוד יהוה וראו כל בשר יחדו: “the glory of the Lord will be revealed and all flesh will see it together.”⁹²

The Damascus Document also looks forward to the revelation of God’s glory, although without specifying that such glory is על “above” in any way.⁹³ In CD 20:25–26 the judgement of the wicked and salvation of the righteous are expected to occur בהופע כבוד אל לישראל “when the glory of God shines forth to Israel.”

In the Temple Scroll, the temple over which the glory settles is not an eschatological temple, but the temple that God through Moses is commanding Israel to build in the present.⁹⁴ This is set apart from the sanctuary that God will build on the day of creation/blessing (11Q19 29:9–10). But the idealisation of the temple in the Temple Scroll resonates with promised and prophesied, even eschatological, events. As demonstrated above, column 29 evokes the promises of Ezekiel 37. The reference to the divine glory embedded within this likewise resonates with the use of glory language in eschatological settings. Eschatology and idealisation are not unrelated; they are connected by ideas of perfection and completion.

The settling of the glory upon the temple carries associations of visibility. At Sinai, the appearance of the glory is like devouring fire “in the sight of the people of Israel” (Exod 24:17). The glory in Isaiah and 4Q457b is associated with the verb ראה. 4Q174 and 4Q380, even apart from the restoration of כבודו, attest to a visible manifestation over the sanctuary. In a Second Temple context, such visibility may have contemporary political and religious significance. There is no visible sign of God’s presence over the current temple in Jerusalem. From the perspective of those texts with an eschatological focus, this could signify that the current Jerusalem temple is temporary. From the perspective of the

90 With Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:289; Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 103; Dimant, “4QFlorilegium,” 270.

91 With Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 25; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Study Edition*, 352: יהוה [ה] [מליך ל] עולם.

92 Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 104.

93 Whilst the Temple Scroll was originally identified as ‘sectarian’ by Yadin, scholarship has increasingly moved away from this categorisation; see summary in Crawford, *Temple Scroll*, 26.

94 Contra Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 21–28.

Temple Scroll, however, which describes a temple to be built by Israel in the present, it could suggest the current temple's inadequacy and failure to meet this standard.⁹⁵

Such visibility is an example of the inseparability of this Isaianic tradition from Priestly resonances. Alongside Isa 60:2, the divine glory appears (ראה *Niphal*) at the sanctuary in the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch. In the Hebrew Bible the precise location of the glory in these appearances is left ambiguous.⁹⁶ But the Septuagint of Num 14:10 describes the glory as appearing *over* the tent.⁹⁷

וכבוד יהוה נראה באהל מועד אל כל בני ישראל

καὶ ἡ δόξα κυρίου ὤφθη ἐν νεφέλῃ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐν⁹⁸ πάσι τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ.

And the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud **upon the tent** of witness among all the Israelites.

It therefore provides further evidence for the influence of the image of the divine glory appearing above the sanctuary in the Hellenistic period. Indeed, like the temple of the Temple Scroll, the tabernacle has an idealised or paradigmatic quality. At the same time, LXX Num 14:10 problematises associating the scrolls examined above with Isaiah alone, indicating that they also resonate with early interpretations of Priestly Pentateuchal texts.

In this final section I have shown that the settling of the divine glory upon the temple in 11Q19 29:8–9 can resonate with a specific biblical verse, Ezek 37:27, evoked by its narrow literary context in column 29, and with a wider tradition of eschatological expectation. Moreover, both Ezekiel 37 and the Isaianic tradition are deeply entangled with the Priestly idioms that dominated the earlier discussions of this article. This demonstrates the complexity of levels of resonance that operate simultaneously, engaging and indeed reinforcing one another.

95 Goodman, "Constructing Ancient Judaism," 86–88 has argued persuasively that implied critique of the Second Temple, as found in the Temple Scroll and in other Qumran texts such as the Damascus Document, does not necessarily mean that their authors had entirely separated from the Jerusalem temple cult.

96 Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 16:19, 17:7, 20:6.

97 This may be implicit already in Exod 16:10 and Num 17:7 which suggest that it appears within the cloud.

98 The change from לֹא to ἐν creates a similar dynamic of over and among to the Temple Scroll.

7 Conclusion

This article has explored the richness of the Temple Scroll in terms of the interlocking resonances of its expressions of divine presence, and in particular their use of prepositions. The preposition על in the name formula of the scroll reflects a dynamic interaction between naming idiom and Deuteronomic language that has a history going back to Deuteronomy and is still operative in Jubilees. But it also forges internal resonances within the composition of the Temple Scroll itself. The coordination of על and בְּתוֹךְ in the name formulas is resonant with their use in expressions referring to God's-self and glory, forming a concentric structure with divine presence at its centre. As this prepositional rhetoric interacts with other aspects of its complex context in the scroll, in terms of divine plan and law, it evokes at once several central moments within a history of temple presence: Sinai, tabernacle, and Ezekiel's temple vision. The details of a specific column, 11Q19 29:7–10, garner additional resonances in terms of divine promises and eschatological expectations that are alive in a Second Temple context, attested in Ezekiel and Isaiah as well as across the Dead Sea Scrolls. But these expectations cannot be separated from Sinaitic echoes or Priestly tabernacle traditions that themselves continued to grow and change, as attested by LXX Num 14:10. The multiple levels of resonance thus reinforce one another, acting as a mode of integration among the scroll's details and themes, while embedding it within a wider temple discourse. This account of resonance is not unique to the Temple Scroll or to ideas of divine presence. It is applicable to other Second Temple texts, including the composition of the Hebrew Bible itself. It is reflective of what it means to participate within a tradition that has a long and tangled history, but which is at once dynamic and alive.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor Hindy Najman for her support and guidance during my research for this article, and Eibert Tigchelaar and Arjen Bakker for their comments on earlier drafts. I also want to acknowledge the helpful feedback of the editor Molly Zahn and the two anonymous reviewers. This paper is based on a chapter of my MPhil dissertation at the University of Oxford, which was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. I am grateful to many friends and teachers for their helpful suggestions and incisive questions over the course of my MPhil, and to those who engaged with my papers at various conferences, including the Qumran Session of the SBL Annual Meeting, Nov 2020; Hermeneutic Interventions, Oxford, Dec 2019; British Asso-

ciation for Jewish Studies, Oxford, July 2019; 70 Years of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Oxford, June 2019; Groningen-Leuven-Oxford Dead Sea Scrolls Network, Leuven, June 2019.

Bibliography

- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20–48*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1990.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. “Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96.
- Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25–48*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Brin, Gershon. “Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll.” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 519–28.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Brooke, George J. “Moving Mountains: From Sinai to Jerusalem.” Pages 73–89 in *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. TBN 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Brooke, George J. “Controlling Intertexts and Hierarchies of Echo in Two Thematic Eschatological Commentaries from Qumran.” Pages 85–98 in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*. EJL 39. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Carmignac, Jean. “Florilege.” Pages 279–82 in *Les textes de Qumran*. Vol. 2. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- Chazon, Esther G. “457a, b. 4QCreation?, 4QEschatological Hymn.” Pages 409–20 in *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon et al. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Clements, Ronald E. *God and Temple*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965.
- Cooke, George A. *Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.
- Crane, Ashley. *Israel's Restoration: A Textual-Comparative Exploration of Ezekiel 36–39*. VTSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSS. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

- Davies, Graham I. "The Presence of God in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Doctrine." Pages 32–36 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple*. Edited by William Horbury. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Dimant, Devorah. "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple." Pages 269–88 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Feder, Yitzhaq. "The Wilderness Camp Paradigm in the Holiness Source and the *Temple Scroll*: From Purity Laws to Cult Politics." *JAJ* 5 (2014): 290–310.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Looking for Narrative Midrash at Qumran." Pages 43–65 in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 7–9 Jan 2003*. Edited by Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh, and Ruth Clements. STDJ 62. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Ganzel, Tova. "The Reworking of Ezekiel's Temple Vision in the Temple Scroll." Pages 230–52 in *Law, Literature, and Society in Legal Texts from Qumran: Papers from the Ninth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Leuven 2016*. Edited by Jutta Jokiranta and Molly Zahn. STDJ 128. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "The *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem*." Pages 431–60 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1997/8.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arthur E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Goodman, Martin. "Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls." Pages 81–91 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 21–37*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hermann, Johannes. *Ezechiel*. KAT. Leipzig: Deichert, 1924.
- Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Imes, Carmen Joy. *Bearing Yhwh's Name At Sinai: A Reexamination of the Name Command of the Decalogue*. BBRSup 19. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2018.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism." *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29–43.
- Kister, Menahem. "Qumran, Jubilees, and the Jewish Dimensions of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1." Pages 103–39 in *The Religious Worldviews Reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study*

- of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 28–30 May, 2013*. Edited by Ruth A. Clements, Menahem Kister, and Michael Segal. STDJ 127. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and The Holiness School*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1995.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E.J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.
- Kugel, James. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Levine, Baruch A. "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character." *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5–23.
- Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 1–20*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Lyons, Michael A. *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*. LHBOTS 507. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. JSOTSup 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- McConville, J. Gordon. "God's 'Name' and God's 'Glory'." *TynBul* 30 (1979): 149–63.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. *The Dethronement of Sabaoth: Studies in the Shem and Kabod Theologies*. ConBOT 18. Lund: Gleerup, 1982.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The City of the Temple: A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman." *JQR* 85 (1994): 125–28.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17–22*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 23–27*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Mroczek, Eva. "How Not to Build a Temple: Jacob, David, and the Unbuilt Ideal in Ancient Judaism." *JSJ* 46 (2015): 512–46.
- Najman, Hindy. "The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the 'Canon'." *JSJ* 43 (2012): 497–518.
- Najman, Hindy. "Traditionary Processes and Textual Unity in 4 Ezra." Pages 99–117 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Matthias Henze. JSJSup 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Najman, Hindy. "Textual Unities and Poetic Processes in Ancient Judaism." Paper presented at the 23rd Congress of IOSOT. Aberdeen, 2019.
- Najman, Hindy, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "Unity After Fragmentation." *RevQ* 26 (2014): 495–500.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD 25. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2010. (Hebrew.)

- Rad, Gerhard von. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. SBT 9. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Richter, Sandra L. *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology*. BZAW 318. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., and Andrew D. Gross. *The Temple Scroll (11Q19, 11Q20, 11Q21, 4Q524, 5Q21 with 4Q365a)*. Dead Sea Scrolls Editions 1. Leiden: Brill, 2021.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "The Holiness According to the *Temple Scroll*." *RevQ* 19 (2000): 369–81.
- Sommer, Benjamin. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Sommer, Benjamin. *The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Stuedel, Annette. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidr-Eschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Tooman, William A. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*. FAT II 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees." Pages 211–37 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by George Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. CSCO 510. Aeth. 87. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- VanderKam, James C. and Józef T. Milik. "Jubilees." Pages 1–187 in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- VanderKam, James C. *Jubilees*. Hermeneia. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018.
- Vaux, Roland de. "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom." Pages 219–88 in *Das Ferne und nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres am 30. November 1966 gewidmet*. Edited by F. Maass. BZAW 105. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967.
- Vermès, Géza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. HUCM 8. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.

- Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Wilson, Andrew M., and Lawrence Wills. "Literary Sources of the *Temple Scroll*." *HTR* 75 (1982): 275–88.
- Wilson, Ian. *Out of the Midst of the Fire: Divine Presence in Deuteronomy*. SBLDS 151. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 49. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.
- Zahn, Molly M. "New Voices, Ancient Words: The *Temple Scroll's* Reuse of the Bible." Pages 435–58 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by John Day. LHBOTS 422. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Identifying Reuse of Scripture in the *Temple Scroll*: Some Methodological Reflections." Pages 341–58 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric F. Mason. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Zahn, Molly M. "4QReworked Pentateuch C and the Literary Sources of the *Temple Scroll*: A New (Old) Proposal." *DSD* 19 (2012): 133–58.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Zahn, Molly M. "When Linguistics and *Literarkritik* Meet: Revisiting the Periphrastic Participial Construction in the *Temple Scroll*." *DSD* 27 (2020): 426–38.