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1. Introduction

The discovery of the Temple Scroll has added significantly to our knowledge of the options available for shaping a text in Jewish antiquity. Furthermore, if, as seems likely, the Temple Scroll was composed partly in response to an already existing set of texts now known as biblical, such as parts of the Pentateuch, then it also provides unique evidence for one type of such a literary response. It was known before the publication of the Temple Scroll that ancient texts could tell a biblical or partly biblical story from the point of view of one of its protagonist in the first person, as exemplified by 1 Enoch, 3 Baruch, 4 Ezra and, to some extent, Jubilees. The discovery of Genesis Apocryphon added further, very direct, examples of such a response to texts which, at least later and today, came to be considered as ‘biblical’. Modern scholarship tries to capture part of the essence of these works by genre labels such as ‘pseudepigraphy’ and ‘rewritten Scripture’. But only the Temple Scroll represents a substantial, stand-alone text that transposes what, in the ‘biblical’ books, are divine commandments—reported as speech, but

* I am grateful to my Manchester University colleague, George Brooke, for several conversations over the years on the Temple Scroll and other scrolls, and his comments on an early version of the Temple Scroll Profile and on the present study. I bear sole responsibility for any remaining inaccuracies

1. Such cases are gathered together in A. Samely, R. Bernasconi, P. Alexander and R. Hayward, eds., Database for the Analysis of Anonymous and Pseudepigraphic Jewish Texts of Antiquity (literarydatabase.humanities.manchester.ac.uk), under search categories 7.1.1.1 and 7.1.1.2.


3. I will place quotations marks around this word where it is useful to mark the fact that it is likely to be anachronistic for some Jewish groups in Second Temple times.
from a third-person perspective—into continuous first-person divine speech. Linked to this transformation, there are other literary features of the Temple Scroll which invite synchronic comparison with ‘biblical’ texts. There are also noteworthy similarities and dissimilarities between the Temple Scroll and other ancient Jewish works found outside the rabbinic canon of the Hebrew Bible, such as *Jubilees* and *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. I will attempt to add to the existing substantial body of scholarship on these questions by spelling out what I consider to be the most basic literary features of the Temple Scroll in synchronic comparison with other documents of Jewish antiquity. I also try to address some methodological problems of the description of ancient Jewish literature more generally. The approach here used was first developed in the Manchester–Durham Typology project, 2007–2012. This project analyzed in a fresh perspective many anonymous and pseudepigraphic Jewish texts created between approximately ca. 200 BCE and ca. 700 CE.

In the present study I will argue, first, that the Temple Scroll’s literary surface must be described on its own terms, without presupposing that it merely reproduces ‘biblical’ literary features or is exhaustively characterized by its dependency on earlier texts. Second, I will suggest that the Temple Scroll’s literary surface is in fact significantly different from that of its likely biblical sources, and also from *Jubilees*. My third point draws attention to the Temple Scroll’s numerous individually constituted statements, namely the commands that make up much of its fabric. Fourthly, I will also point out that, in apparently creating a comprehensive large-scale thematic order, the scroll stands in contrast to other normative texts of ancient Judaism. I will finally enumerate typical grammatical and semantic features of the Temple Scroll, and then summarize what I see as its fundamental literary characteristics.

When arguing these positions I will occasionally quote from a literary ‘Profile’ of the Temple Scroll that I created as part of a database of such Profiles, which formed part of the outputs of the Manchester–Durham Typology project. In making this historical point I am expressing agreement with the *communis opinio* of current Qumran scholarship that the Temple Scroll did indeed come later than, and transformed, existing ‘biblical’ texts, rather than the other way round. However, most of the literary observations made in the present study are couched in more neutral terms, for systematic and conceptual reasons. These are explained in A. Samely, P. Alexander, R. Bernasconi and R. Hayward, *Profiling Jewish Literature in Antiquity: An Inventory, from Second Temple Texts to the Talmuds* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 255–59.

5. See the Bibliography that forms part of the Temple Scroll Profile in the Appendix.
Typology project mentioned above. It may be apposite here to say a few words about the methodology of that project. One key goal was the creation of a new framework for the comprehensive and comparative description of a large and important group of texts, including the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, the Pseudepigrapha, the larger Dead Sea Scrolls, and rabbinic literature. We concentrated on works outside the canon of the rabbinic Bible and texts which, in contrast to the books of Philo and Josephus which project a contemporary public author persona referring to itself inside the text, avoid identifying the persona of the speaking voice (are anonymous), or assume the voice of a biblical figure (are ‘pseudepigraphic’). We published this new conceptual framework in 2011 for the first time, and a book explaining it appeared in 2013. I will refer to this conceptual framework as the ‘Inventory of Structurally Important Literary Features’, or ‘Inventory’ for short. It defines some 560 literary features in general terms. The Inventory is the result of collecting significant literary features occurring in any one of the anonymous or pseudepigraphic works between ca. 200 BCE to ca. 700 CE and bringing them, suitably defined in modern descriptive language, into a systematic order. The description of any particular work, such as the Temple Scroll, proceeds by selecting from the Inventory only those literary features that actually apply to the work; and the result of such a selection from the Inventory is called a ‘Profile of work X’. Thus the Profile of the Temple Scroll contains approximately 100 literary features selected from this longer list. We created a large number of such Profiles, all based on the same Inventory and following the same methodology, which are published at http://literarydatabase.humanities.manchester.ac.uk. In the following I will quote occasionally from my Profile of the Temple Scroll, and the whole of that Profile is here presented as an Appendix. I also exploit the evidence of other database

6. The team was constituted by four scholars: the dedicatee of this volume of papers, Professor Hayward, Philip Alexander, Rocco Bernasconi and me. We received a very substantial grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), which funded the project between 2007 and 2012. This support is gratefully acknowledged.


8. The works considered as part of the empirical foundation of the Inventory are listed in Samely et al., Profiling, pp. xiii–xvi, and their selection is explained in the Introduction of that work.
Profiles for making comparisons or generalizing about literary genres in what follows. The fact that the Temple Scroll is only partly extant imposes certain limits on the literary description, in particular since the theory behind the Inventory calls for the interpretation of literary features in the light of the whole text. I will therefore flag up descriptive claims which rely on guesses as to what the whole of the Temple Scroll might have looked like.

2. The Temple Scroll’s Relationship to Scripture in Synchronic Terms and the Task of Literary Description

I will begin by addressing the Temple Scroll’s relationship to Scripture. Many topics and much of the wording of the Temple Scroll are also found in Exodus to Deuteronomy, Ezekiel and other parts of the Hebrew Bible. From the point of view of a description of the literary surface, this means first and foremost that there is a considerable amount of language and themes shared between the Temple Scroll and these ‘biblical’ texts. That much we can say with certainty, because we can compare the texts with each other, and thereby satisfy ourselves that the amount of overlap effectively excludes the possibility of mutually independent production. The Inventory defines such overlap, the literary feature 7.1.4, as follows: ‘The text shares features of language with the Hebrew Bible, or exhibits tacit overlap with specific biblical wording, whether narrative or not’. If one reviews the textual constitution of the Temple Scroll from this angle, the following application of the generic definition (marked in bold) suggests itself as part of the work’s whole Profile:

7.1.4 The text shares features of language with the Hebrew Bible, or exhibits tacit overlap with specific biblical wording, whether narrative or not:

There is pervasive, but far from total, use of biblicizing language (see Profile points 7.1.4.1 and 2.4.4.4 in the Appendix), and at the same time very extensive but entirely tacit adoption of actual biblical wording (see


Profile point 7.1.4.2 in the Appendix). Much of the Temple Scroll could be seen as alluding to specific passages of Scripture, which fact is impossible to separate neatly from the use of biblicizing language. The phenomenon includes the adoption of biblical word choices, phraseology and syntax, as well as phrases for separating smaller text parts (see Profile point 2.4.3 in the Appendix and point 5.8 below) and somewhat ‘technical’ biblical terminology for the cult (see Profile point 2.4.4.4 in the Appendix). Depending on the distance of ordinary language from biblical language at the time of composition of the Temple Scroll, this may amount to treating the biblical language overall as some kind of technical language. If the text depends, in its genesis, on texts now forming the Pentateuch, rather than the other way round, and if it wished to present itself in that dependency, which is far from certain, then informed contemporary readers will have taken its language as creating a more or less constant allusion to the fixed earlier text.

This is an excerpt from my Profile of the Temple Scroll. Within the whole Profile, literary feature 7.1.4 stands alongside tens of other literary features and is contextualized by them. In that dependency, it provides a summary of the nature of the relationship between the Temple Scroll and ‘biblical’ texts in synchronic terms. From this arises a question of wider significance. Since the inter-dependency of biblical and Temple Scroll wording is so pervasive, does from this follow that the task of creating a literary description of the Temple Scroll exhausts itself in a description of its relationship to texts now known as biblical? Will a model of how the Temple Scroll derived its wording from other texts describe the Temple Scroll’s literary constitution? In my view, it will not. One reason for this is that this relationship of derivation is not acknowledged by the Temple Scroll. For, as far as one can see from the extant fragments, its overlap with biblical texts is entirely tacit. Although scholars have often used the term ‘quotation’ when referring to this overlap, there is not a single case of an explicit quotation from another text in the

12. That model is largely one in which interpreting and copying are seen as one acticity. An influential example is M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). It is now often linked to the notion of intertextuality, as referring to a kind of unconscious and culturally mediated exegesis.
13. Such tacit overlap with an earlier text, in particular with texts now known as biblical, is the topic of the categories of section 7.1 of the Inventory. See Samely et al., *Profiling*, pp. 255–85.
work as we have it. There are two instances of God referring to what he
told the projected addressees or their forefathers in the past, namely
55.12–20, which corresponds to Deut. 17.5ff., and 56.17–18 (Deut.
17.16). But the Temple Scroll does not acknowledge the prior existence
of any text as a model for its own verbal substance. This literary feature
separates the scroll from the genre of a sequential commentary, as
exemplified by Pesher Habakkuk, and also from a discourse that uses
biblical quotations as warrants, as embodied in the Damascus Document.
It makes the Temple Scroll much like the biblical text, which presents
itself largely as articulating its own themes autonomously. The Temple
Scroll relates to Bible somewhat like Tosefta relates to Mishnah. Tosefta
Tractates contain large amounts of verbal matter also found in Mishnah
Tractates, but without acknowledging that fact.

By taking the Temple Scroll’s self-presented autonomy of wording at
face value we gain the freedom to ask certain basic questions afresh and
with an open mind. Such questions as: What does the text present itself
as talking about? How does it present the relationships between its parts
or between individual sentences?

Let me start with the size of the document. The Temple Scroll is a text
which, when it was complete, must have contained significantly more
than the approximately 8,600 words which are either extant today or
postulated in the editions of Yadin and Qimron. As for the Temple
Scroll’s basic literary shape, from the extant evidence the text appears to
constitute an address from a first-person speaker to an implied second-
person audience, using largely the language of the imperative, jussive

15. Even if the complete text should have contained isolated instances of explicit
biblical quotations now lost to us, this, while a highly significant part of the literary
description, would not change the fact that in much of the text, as now extant, the
overlap is tacit.

16. Thus excluding use of the categories coming under section 6.1–12 of the
Inventory.

17. One might be inclined to say that the same goes for Jubilees, but that would
not be quite accurate: there are two explicit quotations of biblical wording, namely
Gen. 2.17 in Jub. 4.30 and Deut. 27.20 in Jub. 33.12 (cf. 4QJubilees [4Q221],
iv. 1–2, with morphological differences to the MT).

18. See R. Bernasconi, ‘Cases of Linguistic Incompleteness in the Tosefta’,

tions; Bibliography by F. García Martínez (Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of
the Negev Press; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996). I counted 8,660
words in Qimron’s edition, including all reconstructed words (hollow letters) in
fragmentary lines. Information on text size is noted in point 1.6 of the Inventory and
is found in every work’s Profile in the Database under that number.
or implied command, and complemented by descriptions and clauses that articulate motivations, reasons or purposes. The basic relationship between the objects it talks about is thematic, not narrative. The text’s sentences do not tell a story and produce no plot. Rather, the sentences mostly speak about the same static point in time, namely an envisaged future in which the implied addressee must fulfil a large number of commands and prohibitions. To this envisaged reality in the future corresponds the moment of speaking, a kind of ‘present’, in which that future and those commandments are enunciated, which is the present of the text itself. There are certain hints in the extant wording which show that the point of the text’s present, the moment of speaking, is placed in a (hi)story known to us from a ‘biblical’ text, namely the events depicted in Exodus 34. But the Temple Scroll is not structured by developing narrative links; its potential progression, coherence or incoherence must be sought between its normative topics.

3. Thematic Units in their Mutual Independence and Formal Repetition

What is the thematic fabric of the Temple Scroll? Let me begin by speaking about the smaller components. The fine grain of the text is largely constituted by sentences or clauses whose verbs have imperative or jussive second- or third-person form, and express the meaning of command or prohibition. The normative themes are largely independent of each other. Generally no conjunctions subordinate them to each other, and there are no explicit hierarchies of themes, although the commandments often reflect the spatial inter-connectedness of architectural

20. This triggers use of the categories of Inventory section 5 for the Temple Scroll, as opposed to those of Inventory section 4, which are about narrative.
21. Except for some clauses embedded into the imperatives which make references to past events, such as 29.10 (covenant with Jacob at Bethel).
structures or sequences of actions (see below). This indicates two fundamental features of the Temple Scroll. First, its literary constitution from semi-independent thematic units gives it a basic format of aggregation, not of synthesis. Its fabric is one of ‘flat’ coordination and progression, not ‘deep’ subordination. In this respect the basic structure of the Temple Scroll resembles other texts which consist of recurrent small forms or the juxtaposition of self-contained thematic units. The small forms often used in ancient Jewish texts include: the quotation of a short utterance, as in much of rabbinic literature; the quotation–comment unit, from which Midrashim and Pesharim are built; the proverbial sentence, occurring in most ‘wisdom’ texts and Mishnah Avot; and the self-contained ‘if–then’ structure of the conditional norm, as characterizing most Tractates of Mishnah and Tosefta, as well as parts of the Temple Scroll itself, and much of the legal matter of Exodus to Deuteronomy.

Second, the Temple Scroll’s modular constitution from independent commands is important for understanding the nature of the law that is being promulgated. I estimate that there are some 540 commandments in the text being presented as independent from each other (some using several verbs). The text presents each commandment as issuing from exactly the same point of origin, God, as a new imperative or as a new verb with imperative force. That makes each norm as weighty and authoritative as the next one. Each is equally a parcel of the divine will, or created \textit{ab initio} in the divine will.\footnote{This may imply an equivalence between commandment and creation, which can arguably be traced throughout post-biblical Jewish tradition, and is embodied also in the fact that God is depicted as creating the world by commands in Gen. 1.} From this results an irreducible plurality of commandments. A similar irreducible plurality of norms also holds arguably for Scripture and certainly for Rabbinic Judaism. But the Temple Scroll brings it to the text surface with greater purity than either the biblical texts or the rabbinic ones, by the device of a sustained first-person divine speech containing a stream of individual commands. The Temple Scroll thereby also unifies scattered or repeated biblical commands into an uninterrupted series (as well as deselecting a number of normative topics). The imperative force of the single thematic unit ties each separately and equally to the same point of origin, the will of the speaker. This is the key to their mutual isolation,\footnote{One could imagine a similar separation for a descriptive text in the first person by, for example, each new descriptive theme being separated from the next by the phrase ‘I see now’.} which attenuates the overall continuity of themes which the text also creates by reflecting, for example, the contiguity of architectural space within the Temple precinct and the spatial progression outwards (see below). In a later period,
rabbinic discourse also appears to conceptualize law, *qua* halakhah, as spelling out rabbinitically reconstructed individual divine acts of will. This seems to produce the ‘multiple’ surface of legal rabbinic discourse, including the comparative mutual independence even of related areas of halakhah. This is linked to the comparative scarcity of *reasons* for commandments:27 if there were comprehensive reasons, or if a system of *values* underpinned law, this would remove from at least some of the individual commandments the immediacy of the divine will. That immediacy would be claimed by the reason rather than the commandment it is the reason for; also, the reason might well be reason for several commandments at the same time.28 In any case, the Temple Scroll brings to the text surface an underlying format of Jewish law shared with later Jewish tradition, namely law conceived as individual speech acts of divine commanding and therefore of divine will.

This text surface is first and foremost due to the repeated use of imperative or jussive verb forms, which give many main clauses a conceptual independence from their neighbours *qua* separate acts of request by a speaker. There is furthermore a limited repertoire of small forms and formulae which recur within the Temple Scroll, as well as outside it. Inventory feature 5.8 is meant to describe text structures that are created from the use of a limited repertoire of small forms, effectively creating semi-independent thematic units. Its definition reads: ‘The bulk of the text consists of small forms and patterns drawn from a limited set of formats for thematic articulation or for discussion’.29 In my Profile of the Temple Scroll I apply this generic point as follows:

5.8 The bulk of the text consists of small forms and patterns drawn from a limited set of formats for thematic articulation or for discussion (see further section 8):

This is not equally true of all parts of the Temple Scroll, but substantial parts of it fall under this category. This is because there are many shorter units of text which, while fitting into the overall schema described under Inventory point 5.2/5.5,30 provide self-bounded short treatments of particular normative areas. These are often compatible with being the

27. Searching for ‘reasons’ of commandments was considered problematical in ancient and medieval Jewish discourse; see, e.g., I. Heinemann, *The Reasons for the Commandments in Jewish Thought: From the Bible to the Renaissance* (trans. L. Levin; Brighton, Mass.: Academic Studies Press, 2008; Hebrew original 1953).

28. Although it is not inconceivable that reasons would be as diverse, specific and multiple as commandments.


30. See sections 4 and 5 below, as well as the Appendix for point 5.5.
result of bringing together, but avoiding repetitive use of, relevant verses from across the Pentateuch (and beyond), if a priority of the latter is assumed. Their themes can be marked off against each other by closure markers or closing formulae of one sort or another, built along the same lines as biblical markers or actually found in the biblical partner text for the same theme. These implicit boundary markers between topics include: reason clauses, as in 48.10 (see Profile point 8.1.8 in the Appendix) and standing phrases (couched in biblical language) such as, ‘Eternal precepts for their generations, year after year’ (22.14; similar 25.8, 27.4), ‘It is an X offering…a pleasing odour for the LORD’ (e.g. 16.10, 18; 34.14), ‘And you shall do what is upright and good before me, I am the LORD your God’ (53.7–8), or ‘and not shall cease [the covenant of salt] [forever]’ (once, 20.13–4). In ms. 11Q19 some of these phrases are followed by vacats, clearly used to mark the separation of sub-topics in the textual continuum (see Profile point 9.13). There is also the use of ahar in the meaning of ‘afterwards’ when procedures are described (e.g. 22.14, 25.7, 27.3, 34.7), indicating that one sub-topic is closed and another begins. For many passages there are thus clear and well-managed thematic boundary markers, but they are formal, that is, they do not explain or motivate the thematic transitions as such: the themes remain de facto articulated in self-contained small forms and patterns.

Almost all legal discourse in post-biblical Judaism, insofar as it is extant, shares the feature of being to a considerable extent expressed in parcels of thematically independent statements making up the—sometimes halting—flow of a text. This captures certain aspects of the literary expression of ‘casuistic’ law, at least as it is realized in large parts of the Jewish legal discourse from the Bible to the Talmuds. It is important for describing the literary fabric of 4QMMT and of Mishnah as law texts, although these two are dominated, in contrast to the Temple Scroll, by the format of the conditional sentence (see below). The compositional act of parcelling up of information into thematically independent, and often internally complex, statements also characterizes sentential wisdom texts such as biblical Qohelet or the Proverbs section of Aramaic Aḥiqar, which latter represents more general Near Eastern models of text making.

4. Non-Narrative Constitution and the Absence of a Mix of Thematic Exposition and Narrative

It is useful to contrast the thematic constitution of the Temple Scroll with the manner in which biblical texts are constituted. A considerable amount of the verbal substance of the Temple Scroll is shared with biblical books

31. For this format, see Samely et al., Profiling, pp. 290–91, 312, and the literature cited there.
such as Exodus to Deuteronomy, Ezekiel and others. These biblical texts have overall narrative constitution. Norms appear within an ongoing narrative, but are not spoken in the narrator’s voice. Rather, they are quoted from characters in the narrative, in particular Moses and God, speaking law. The norms are therefore always one step removed from the voice of the overall text. Even extended continuous speeches, like the so-called Book of the Covenant,32 or Moses’ speeches in Deuteronomy, arise within specific narrative situations, and produce new narrative situations: they constitute components of a plot. The norms in the Pentateuch therefore do not set the overall agenda of the text in which they occur; that agenda is a narrative one. By contrast, the agenda of the Temple Scroll is a thematic one, constituted by a voice that speaks norms continuously and directly; by the thematic homogeneity of these norms; and by their potential for thematic inter-relationships, including the potential of a developing logic of themes. Any meaning connections between the Temple Scroll’s sentences must emerge from the identity and sequence of ‘plot-less’ thematic units that constitute the text.

It is possible, perhaps even likely, that the Temple Scroll originally had a passage of narrative scene-setting, now not extant, for example in col. 1.33 But such a narrative framework, if it were to be postulated (and see for this points 2.2.1 and 5.1 in the Profile in the Appendix), would

32. That is, Exod. 20.22–23.33; see, e.g., O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. R. Ackroyd; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), pp. 212–19. From a literary point of view, this stretch of text is bounded by two speech reports by the narrator (with God being the speaker of both), in Exod. 20.22 (‘And the Lord said to Moses: Thus you shall say to the children of Israel…)’ and Exod. 24.1; and it consists of ca. 100 individual normative statements that produce a thematic discourse, regardless of how coherent the selection and order of topics is perceived to be in the first instance. The Temple Scroll, 4QMMT and Tractates of Mishnah and Tosefta also are *prima facie* thematic discourses built up from a number of individual normative statements (ca. 540 in the case of the Temple Scroll; see above).

33. There is nothing left of the text before what is now col. 2, but the existence of a preceding column is accepted by most scholars; see e.g. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 10. Yadin does not, however, exclude the possibility that more than one column preceded what is now conventionally numbered col. 2. There were ten sheets in the scroll, and of the preserved ones each contains three or four columns, with the final sheet taking only col. 67 (Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 1, p. 11). Col. 2 already has clear signs of second-person forms, and thus of an explicit or implied first-person speaking perspective. Any third-person narrative frame (Inventory points 2.2.1 and/or 5.1) would have had to occupy the preceding column(s) or the upper part of col. 2 now not extant. But see Wise, *A Critical Study*, p. 156, who postulates that col. 2 is in fact the first, and that the text began directly in the first person along the lines of Deut. 12.1.
constitute nothing more than an outer shell for the thematic-normative exposition that constitutes the text’s bulk. It would not turn that thematic exposition into a plot component, because there is no narrative development indicated within the work as extant, except the flow of divine speech itself, which is not narrated, but embodied. The text simply does not work as a narrative. The bulk of Jubilees (2.1b–50.13a), also constituted by a long, uninterrupted speech, and exhibiting a narrative frame in ch. 1 precisely of the type that the Temple Scroll may also have had, is itself narrative in content and format. Jubilees is narrative speech within a narrative framework; by contrast the Temple Scroll, if it had a narrative introduction in the columns before col. 2, would have presented itself as thematic speech within a narrative framework. In this context it is worth noting that the Temple Scroll is thematic discourse in the form of a kind of virtual dialogue between a first-person voice and an addressee, as manifest in the imperatives and other second-person forms; it is not a thematic discourse in the format of impersonal exposition as are, for example, most Mishnah Tractates.

Before examining the logic of the themes in the Temple Scroll, a second difference between the work and its ‘biblical’ models needs to be pointed out. Exodus to Deuteronomy constitutes a mixture of thematic and narrative texture. The law is embedded in the narrative as direct speech, and at various points the legal speech is so long that the question arises what its own internal thematic order might be, just as that question arises for the whole of the Temple Scroll. This mix of narrative and thematic discourse is found in all books of the Pentateuch, except for Genesis; and it is typical also for some prophetic books, Ezekiel included. But the Temple Scroll is pure thematic development, without any admixture of plot development. A search of the online database points to (Pseudo-Philo’s) Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (L.A.B.) as also dissolving the Pentateuch mixture of narrative and thematic exposition. L.A.B has the same narrative attitude as the Pentateuch, but not its extended normative speeches. One might say L.A.B. has the substance and form of the Pentateuchal narrative, purged of its extended normative speeches, while the Temple Scroll has the substance and form of the Pentateuch’s normative speeches, purged of their narrative function. As literary types, the Temple Scroll and L.A.B. stand at opposite ends of a spectrum, in the middle of which is Exodus to Deuteronomy, as well as Jubilees. Jubilees imbues with normative-thematic significance the events of Genesis, the one Pentateuchal book that is pure narrative. Jubilees achieves this by the device of the angel both telling what happened, and explaining how timeless or pre-existing norms are linked to what
happened. The mixture is thus achieved very differently from the method in Exodus to Deuteronomy, which mostly uses the device of a character speaking for a long time.\footnote{See A. Samely with P. Alexander, ‘Profile Jubilees’, in Database (accessed 22 July 2013); an edited version in Samely et al., Profiling, pp. 357–72.} But in contrast to Jubilees and Exodus–Deuteronomy, the Temple Scroll and L.A.B. do not have the mixture at all.

5. Thematic Arrangement: The Spatial Movement Outwards and the Temporal Stages of Commands

So, to describe the literary features of the Temple Scroll is to take a step away from its historical dependency on texts known to us as biblical, and to determine them in terms of evidence of the Temple Scroll itself. This shows that it is not narrative, but thematic; and the question now arises: What is the larger arrangement of its themes? The extant fragments of 11Q19 provide very substantial physical continuity for the text’s columns, and thus long stretches of convincing material evidence for the textual arrangement.\footnote{See the plates in Yadin’s edition, The Temple Scroll, vol. 3; see also now: http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/temple (accessed 12 June 2013).} There is overall thematic progress of norms along geographical lines, moving from a centre, which is the Temple, outwards: starting from norms regarding the Temple building proper, its appurtenances and surrounding smaller structures including the main altar (cols. 3–12), followed by sacrifices to be brought on the altar (cols. 13–29), then onwards to further buildings within the inner court and the shape and dimensions of that court (cols. 30–38), the second court (cols. 38–40), the third court (cols. 40–45/6) and the unnamed city of the Temple (cols. 45/6–47); thereafter a transition to the other cities of the land (by way of the topic of animal flesh and skins, col. 47) and finally, in cols. 48–66, a space for norms that apply to non-cultic contexts of Israelite life in general, including life in any cities it might contain. These norms are perhaps suggested as applying in the land of Israel only (see 48.10–11, ‘do not defile the land’, and 62.13–16), or else in any land. The absence of some norms presented very prominently in the Pentateuch, for example regarding murder and other topics of the Ten Commandments, is intriguing. Since the lower half of the last column of

\footnote{Similar accounts can be found in the secondary literature from Yadin’s edition onwards, including in particular Maier, The Temple Scroll, pp. 5–6; see also Wise, A Critical Study, pp. 178–79.}
the manuscript is preserved but blank, the text, at least as interpreted by
the scribe of 11Q19, seems to have reached its end at that point. In the
absence of col. 1 or any preceding columns, it is impossible to say
whether there was an opening in which the text’s overall scope—and
thus its ‘end’—was indicated or not (see above).  

In the first large-scale thematic part, constituted by cols. 3–45, the way
in which the commands relate to each other is quite coherent because of
the physical contiguity of the space and the buildings of the Temple
Mount whose constitution or cultic actions they concern. Within this part
there is a thematic sub-section that speaks of Temple sacrifices in the
order of the first seven months of an annual calendar. Once the text
begins to speak of topics relating to the second and third types of space,
namely the city at large and its environs (cols. 45–7), and, presumably,
the rest of the land (cols. 47–66), the norms are largely relevant to those
geographical regions. Occasionally there are brief mentions of topics that
might be argued to belong to another geographical region. Thus 52.13–
15 specifies animals fit for slaughter, mentioning the sacrificial slaughter
of the Temple as a contrasting case, and 52.19 depicts cultic slaughter in
some detail also in its difference to ordinary slaughter. Such cases
appear to have a perfectly clear thematic role in their textual location and
thus seem not to undermine the overall separation of topics along geo-
ographical lines. In any case, a large-scale separation and sequencing of
normative topics by geographical regions emerges quite clearly from the
surviving parts of the Temple Scroll.

The Inventory has a category for texts that are organized along the
lines of one dominant principle of thematic division, defining them as
suggesting ‘an objective order constituted by dividing a larger topic by a
constant principle of subordination or coordination’. In my Profile of the

37. See plate 82 in Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol. 3; Yadin surmises that the
missing upper part of the column contained five lines, see vol. 2, pp. 300–301.
38. Such an announcement is not necessarily a reliable indicator of what the text
will contain, but might have provided us with an articulation of the text’s topic that
could explain the absence of certain themes. Announcements of this kind are treated
as Inventory point 1.1 in a Database Profile. See as examples the cases of Miqtsat
Ma’aseh ha-Torah and Jubilees in the Database; and see n. 34.
39. Stressing there also the issues of holiness: ‘you [sg.] are a holy people to
the Lord your God’, 48.7, again in line 10; ‘And do not [pl.] render unclean your
land’, with mention of burial sites in the next sentence, 48.10f.
40. Another example is 21.9, which mentions in passing places outside the
Temple area in the context of a rule that applies inside the area. See below the
sampling of the semantics of col. 21, point B.3.
Temple Scroll, I argue that the work does indeed have this feature, and a subordinate one, 5.2.1. Here are my entries for these two points, with the Inventory definitions in bold:

5.2 The sequence of themes in the discursive or descriptive text suggests an objective order constituted by dividing a larger topic by a constant principle (or set of principles) of subordination/coordination:

In the absence of evidence for the complete text, there can be no confidence that this point applies, but I will here try to gather the arguments suggesting that it might apply. From the overall arrangement of themes there emerges arguably a unifying principle, whose subdivisions determine the thematic sequence and thus text parts. This unifying principle is not articulated in the extant text, although it (or some different one) may have been named in the now lost parts, in particular at the beginning of the text. I am trying to take into account a number of factors in suggesting such an implied (or possibly explicit but not extant) unifying thematic concern. If the geography matters (see Profile point 5.5 in the Appendix), if the sequence in which the text speaks of its normative themes is one of ‘the most important topic first’, and if that most important topic is the Temple itself, then what might be suggested by the overall ordering of norms is a principle of holiness, and the textual sequence as one of decreasing holiness: holiness in the cultic sense but holiness also understood as constituted when the land of Israel is kept free from defilement by obeying the non-cultic divine commands. Holiness would then be achieved by both priests and non-priests implementing God’s laws. Yet it would still be tied to the holiness of spaces, including the whole of the land of Israel. This would constitute a principle that selects all such (biblical, or elaborated biblical) commandments as the text’s topic which are connected to the holiness of persons, spaces or times. There is obviously considerable flexibility for the author of the document (and for the modern interpreter) in determining what counts as the norms of such ‘holiness’, beyond cultic and purity laws. Thus the norms on judges and bribes in 51.11ff. might be seen as falling outside the unifying idea of holiness. But, as Maier points out, this can be interpreted as preventing pollution of the land by injustice. Scripture itself expresses the idea that the land can be polluted through acts of idolatry, injustice, sexual misdemeanour or violence. It is thus possible that the Temple Scroll author(s) followed a line of thought which includes effectively all divine commandments to Israel under the idea of holiness, and saw them as continuous with the priestly duties in the sanctuary. If so, there would arise the problem of certain unexplained thematic gaps in the text, e.g. the absence of norms dealing with murder (which is mentioned in passing in

42. Maier, The Temple Scroll, p. 120.
66.6–7). The space available at the lost top part of the final column (67) would scarcely have been enough to supply this and other thematic lacks, if our fullest manuscript is anything to go by.\(^{43}\) Perhaps the author(s) limited the idea of holiness in certain ways, tacitly or, less likely in my view, in a now lost introductory section, but that is by no means necessary for ascertaining whether the text in fact embodies a thematic order and unity. Alternatively, the text’s verbal substance following such a unifying programme was perhaps never quite completed by the author(s). Be that as it may, if some notion of holiness is the overall idea of the composition, then the major thematic divisions are intended as sub-topics of the overall theme. Since the situation of speaking implied by the perspective of the governing voice (see Profile points 2.2 and 7.1 in the Appendix) falls in the period before the Temple, the norms of holiness may be seen as conditional on the norms of creating the Temple as a physical structure in the first place. This would then account for the fact that norms for building precede in the text (see 5.2.1 below). But these architectural norms are not treated as a separate topic from the envisaged future use of the buildings. In many passages the building commandments are found alongside or integrated with norms that concern the acts supposed to take place in the architectural structures. Such a combination of description of physical structures and envisaged function is also found occasionally in the final chapters of Ezekiel. The Temple is thematized as a functional space, or a process space, not merely as a static topic of measurements, materials and spatial orientation. For instance: ‘And the gates through which they come in and through which they go out: The width of the gate is fourteen cubits…’, 36.7f.; and ‘And the huts shall be made…for the elders of the congregation…who shall go up and sit there until the burnt-offering is offered…’, 42.12ff. In other words, even in the architectural sections of the text, human acts are mentioned which go beyond those involved in creating the physical structure, and this links the earlier parts of the Temple Scroll organically to the later ones.

5.2.1 This suggestion includes all substantive parts of the text (other than any frames), or deviations are made explicit:

If the explanation given in 5.2 is correct, the sequential parts of the text can be seen as sub-topics of the overall theme of the divine norms whose implementation creates holiness in the realm of Israel. They are then ordered along a conceptual path from the most immediate and spatially central expressions of holiness, concerned with God’s seat on earth and the cult attached to it, to more mediated expressions of holiness in the land of Israel, such as the behaviour of lay Israelites in their own localities. The text would thus map degrees of holiness onto spatial realities, as is the case in some parts of rabbinic literature, see *m. Kel.* 1.6–9 and the opening of the Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (in regard to revelation). The

\(^{43}\) See the description in Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 2, pp. 300–1.
direction would be outwards, from a central holy location (e.g. the holy of holies) to a periphery (the land of Israel outside Jerusalem). Textually speaking, the movement in stages ‘from the inside out’ appears to account for the sequence of topics in the extant verbal matter as follows:

1. Some kind of introduction, perhaps meant to echo specifically not just the contents but also the narrative speech situation of Exodus 34 or Exodus 24 (col. 2, perhaps also in a first column not preserved);
2. Norms concerning the construction of the central parts of the Temple complex, including the Temple building proper and the altar in front of it (cols. 3–13; see 5.5 in the Appendix);
3. Norms concerning what is to be done with these particular structures, effectively providing a calendar of events and sacrifices for part of the year, the festival season from Nisan to Tishri, but starting with daily and weekly occasions (cols. 13–29); an enumeration is already found in col. 11, perhaps as anticipatory summary, or as relating to the altar; 44
4. Norms concerning the construction of the remaining parts of the Temple complex, such as utility buildings and other structures in the central part, walls, gates, porticos, and then outer courts (with an extended, but apparently still integrated, description of cultic acts in col. 34), (cols. 30–45);
5. Norms concerning the holy city (the ‘city of the sanctuary’, 45.11–12; cols. 45–47); this city is put into explicit opposition (col. 47) to ‘their/your cities’, which are then treated in their own right in the subsequent section;
6. Norms which affect holiness in the land beyond the holy city, starting with rules on eating insects and ending with forbidden marriage ties (cols. 48–66). Often a section ‘law of the king’ (cols. 57–59) is discerned by modern scholarship to form a separate component, although usually only explained from a diachronic point of view, namely as a ‘source’. 45

This order appears to make it possible to understand the otherwise puzzling separation of two sections of Temple construction laws (cols. 3–13 and 30–45) by a section on the festivals and sacrifices (cols. 13–29). 46

Even so, the same principle of thematic order often cannot apply to norms

46. For a detailed attempt to identify disparate ‘sources’ used by the makers of the Temple Scroll, see Wise, A Critical Study; for an overview of main parts different from the one suggested here, see Crawford, The Temple Scroll, p. 27.
within any one of the main sections created by it, in particular if they are very extensive, as in section 6. This is not surprising in itself. One would expect this to be the case for any abstract conceptual scheme applied to a diverse variety of pre-existing concrete norms. These would require subsidiary principles of order, as found in section 2 in the list of Temple Scroll sections above (see Profile point 5.5.2 in the Appendix) but apparently not in section 6. The material in section 6 can be interpreted as offering self-contained, and usually well-demarcated, thematic units (see also Profile point 5.8 quoted above) which, while determined in their overall positioning by the larger, spatial-axiological, principle of order here postulated, are not determined by the same principle in their mutual sequence. (Even modern systematic scholarly texts will have sections in which the sequence of topics is not determined by a larger principle.) This may also explain the fact that, within section 6 as defined above, the text’s dependency on passages of the Pentateuch (or a Deuteronomy-like source, according to Wise47) sometimes extends to the detailed biblical sequencing of themes, not just their identity (see 7.1 in the Appendix). Overall, the Temple Scroll appears to be a very strong candidate for a text of the 5.2 kind, but this rests on the assumption that nothing occurred in the lacunae which would subvert this order.

Overall, the commands of the Temple Scroll appear to imply several temporal stages. The scroll opens with what looks like a version of the divine promise of awe-inspiring deeds, also expressed in Exod. 34.10: ‘[for it is a terrible thing that] I shall do [with you]’, followed by lines which mention the Canaanite nations and enjoin their rejection and the destruction of their graven images (2.1–8). This, together with other topics of the scroll, suggests that the acquisition of the land, apparently ascribed to God rather than Israel in col. 2, and the divine choice of the city of the sanctuary—mentioned several times as lying in the future, with the name ‘Jerusalem’ being avoided—are factual conditions of most of what is mentioned in the text. Into this future situation created by God enter the commandments to Israel. The first stage of the commands appears to be set out in col. 2 as the destruction of the Canaanite cults (2.1–8; see also 62.13–16). This seems to be the precondition not just for the creation of the Temple cult (cols. 3–46/7) but also for the non-cultic norms mentioned in cols. 47–66. The second stage of commands is embodied in the imperatives for constructing the physical reality of the Temple. These in turn are the precondition of the commands of cultic practice, some of which are immediately appended to a building command as the future purpose of constructing an object, while other cultic commands are grouped together in cols. 13–29. Thus the destruction of

the Canaanite idols and the construction of the Temple are necessary acts of obedience prior to the sacrificial imperatives, while for non-cultic commands (most of the cols. 47–66) only the destruction of the Canaanite idols may be read as a pre-condition, although this command appears not to be repeated at the beginning of the new thematic-geographical section starting in col. 47.\textsuperscript{48} The initial sets of commands—destruction of the Canaanite idols and building the Temple complex—are suggested as one-offs: once they are done, they have a lasting effect (notwithstanding that 29.9–10 also envisages a further Temple). The set of commands they make possible, on the other hand—service in the Temple and obedience to God’s laws in the land—are depicted as recurrent or habitual, a fact occasionally made explicit when mentioning ‘generations’ (see, e.g., 22.14; 25.8; 27.4 and cp. item B.6 in List B below on 21.9).

Commandments to destroy Canaanite cult objects also precede instructions of how to build the tabernacle in Exodus 34. Any suggestion,\textsuperscript{49} however, that the Temple Scroll contains the linkage between these two topics because it mirrors the textual arrangement of Exodus 34–35 would be misleading. Exodus 34 speaks, immediately after the commandments concerning Canaanite idolatrous practices in Exod. 34.11–16/7, not of the tabernacle, but of the following topics: the feast of unleavened bread, the first-born, the day of rest, Shavu’ot, three pilgrim festivals, the rule about leaven and (Passover) sacrifice, first fruits, the milk of the kid’s mother (Exod. 34.18–27), Moses’ mountain sojourn (v. 28), the radiance of the skin of his face (vv. 29–35) and Sabbath norms (35.1–3). Only thereafter, in Exod. 35.5, does the biblical text turn to the topic of how the tabernacle is to be built. Temple Scroll 3.2 contains the conspicuous combination of words ‘blue and purple’ which also occurs

\textsuperscript{48} In cols. 47–48, where the transition to norms outside the chosen city takes place, there is no extant reference to such imperatives, although the burial practices of the ‘goyim’ are mentioned, as not to be followed, in 48.11–12, which taken together with the immediately preceding norm may imply that these render the land ‘unclean’. The imperatives regarding the purging of idolatry do therefore not precede immediately the subsequent normative themes of the scroll in the way in which Temple building instructions frame the sacrificial commands. There are, however, some later commandments which make explicit reference to a point after which the addressees have come into the land (‘When you come to the land which I give you, and you possess it and dwell in it…’, 56.12).

\textsuperscript{49} As apparently made by Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol. 2, p. 1, when he says: ‘There too,—i.e. Ex. xxiii.20 f.; xxxiv.10–16—the tenets of the covenant introduce detailed commands for making the Tabernacle and its vessels: Exod. xxv f.—the plan; Exod xxxv f.—its execution. The contents of Col. III provide further evidence of this order.’
in Exod. 35.6. In other words, the author/authors of the Temple Scroll, even if reflecting this biblical passage, clearly selected and arranged their topics independently of the textual sequence of topics in Exod. 34 and 35. Indeed, the object of the lines in Exod. 34.11–16, as apparently reflected in the text of the Temple Scroll in col. 2, is not the sanctuary, nor the tabernacle; it is the whole of the land of which the Israelites are to take possession. The imperatives and warnings here (תתוצון in 2.4, תכרותון in 2.6, תחרדה in 2.7, etc. [ed. Yadin]) concern the location of the nation, not only of the Temple or of the priests. The purging of the land of idolatrous practices can therefore function as an explicit framework for both the cultic (mainly cols. 3–46/7) and the non-cultic (cols. 47–66) norms.

The prescribed acts of cultic practice are mentioned in two different kinds of textual environment. First, some of the commandments to build a particular architectural structure are immediately followed by an account of that structure’s future use by priests or others. This implies at least sometimes further mandated action, and there are occasionally similar passages also in Ezekiel 40–48 (e.g. 42.13–14; 44.2–3; 46.19–24). Second, there is the extended section on daily and festival sacrifices in 13.17 to col. 29, which contains a progression through the first seven months of a festival year, as follows: the first day of the first month (14.9); ordination (15.3–17.5); Passover/unleavened bread (17.6–16); first fruits (cols. 18–22, also col. 43); wood offering (cols. 23–25); Day of Atonement (25.10–27 bottom); Sukkot and Aṣeret (cols. 27–29; also col. 42). These rules come between two extended sections mandating the construction of architectural and cultic physical objects: the Temple and its objects in cols. 3–13, and the Temple courts and their objects in cols. 30–46. The section on sacrificial commands appears to start precisely at the point where the altar’s construction has been


51. This is not always the case; there are also ‘purpose’ clauses which simply describe behaviour, as when it is said about the steps leading up to the Temple that they are for the Israelites to enter the Temple by (46.7; cp. l. 10)—there is no sense here that a specific commandment to enter the Temple is thereby indicated.

52. But not the extended section on distribution of the land, which in Ezekiel has its own principle of thematic order. It may be mentioned in passing that in Ezekiel 40–48, too, there is an effective movement from a central space, the Temple, to the whole of the land, although not, as in the Temple Scroll, with a clear succession of spatial steps; but see Ezek. 45.1ff.

53. See the explanation in Yadin, The Temple Scroll, vol. 1, pp. 91–96, and subsequently on the other festivals.
prescribed, and thus where the existential condition for the most important sacrifices has been realized, and it begins with the daily sacrifices (col. 13).

Based on an analysis of the extant fragments and assuming thematic homogeneity in the lacunae, it seems likely that the Temple Scroll suggests the idea of an overarching order for its normative themes and thereby produces an overall principle of order for them, so that literary feature 5.2 applies. If so, the work differs sharply from a number of other thematic texts dealing with norms, in particular 4QMMT, most Mishnah Tractates, and the thematic stretches of the Pentateuch itself. The other main example of a Hebrew text from Jewish antiquity which imposes an overall thematic order on its normative topics is arguably Mishnah Tractate Sanhedrin; while some other Mishnah Tractates—including some devoted to cultic practices, i.e. Yoma, Tamid and Middot—offer partial sequencing of normative themes by a temporal or spatial order. The only other Hebrew text whose thematic units are organized by literary feature 5.2 is not normative, namely Sefer Yetsirah. A search of the Database (note 1) for literary features 5.5 and 5.2 will bring up all project corpus cases that have ordering principles which are in any way similar to that found in the Temple Scroll.

6. Formats and Themes: Summary of the Textual Fabric of the Temple Scroll

Before gathering into a synthesis the various observations on the nature of the Temple Scroll made above, I will examine briefly the text’s prevalent grammar and semantics. I will collect salient linguistic and thematic features by sampling the contents of columns coming from different thematic sections of the scroll. The following general grammatical and syntactic phenomena illustrate the tendencies I have been pointing out above:

List A (col. 2 and others):

1. Imperative second-person singular or plural forms; prohibitions or jussive second-person (e.g. 2.6, 7) and third-person (e.g. 3.8) imperfect forms. There is a preponderance of semantic fields among the verbs as follows:

55. See n. 24.
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a. Col. 2: to destroy, burn, etc. (2.6–7).
b. Cols. 3–46: to make/build, sacrifice, rejoice, count, and similar verbs.
c. Cols. 47–66: more diverse verbal meanings, including to bring, defile (47.9/10, negated), eat (48.3), wash (49.13), give yourself (judges, 51.11), set up a pillar (52.2, negated), do (56.5–6), choose (57.8), establish (a criminal charge, 61.7), do to a person as he plotted to do (62.10), hear and fear (62.11), let go (65.3).

2. Clauses which provide some ‘reason’ for the imperative, in particular in the following three ways:

a. Indicative clauses which motivate obedience to God by describing God’s character, e.g. 2.1 (reconstructed).
b. Modal clauses which give the aim of a prohibition (with תהיה), e.g. three times in col. 2 (ll. 4, 5 and 12).
c. Indicative clauses which spell out the motivation for a commandment (e.g. 46.12, ‘for I dwell among them’; 29.7–10; 60.10, ‘for I have chosen them out of all your tribes’), or its further purpose, including the future purpose of an architectural structure, either for God (3.4, לא שמים and elsewhere) or for future generations of priests and Israel (use of buildings).

3. Sentences that describe a visual structure in the future tense, with the implied or explicit message that they are to be built like that (e.g. 33.10).56

4. Conditional clauses presenting a hypothetical situation with a legal sanction, mostly cols. 49–66;57 for example, 49.5 (ואדם א_vlog; 50.5 (אשר יגע איש; 50.7 (לואואם; 51.14 (בד; 55.15 (בד; 56.12 (בד, starting the whole topic of the king, ‘and say, I will set a king over me’); 62.8 (בד; 65.2 (בד; reconstructed ב in Yadin); 66.4 (בד.

5. Extended indicative prediction of the future punishment and degradation of a collective, as well as its redemption and reward (in the context of a king’s behaviour; one occurrence, in col. 59, depending also on the ‘if’ of 56.12).

56. This is not an uninteresting parallel to the later Mishnaic use of the impersonal indicative, in particular the present participle, for indicating norms (‘they do X’).
57. But see 45.7, concerning the nocturnal emission.
58. ידור כי ידו.
Point 1 in List A identifies the dominant component of the Temple Scroll’s textual fabric up to cols. 46/7, and subordinate points 1.b–c correspond to two of the main spatial and thematic divisions which the text contains. The contents identified in points 3 and 4 supplement this. It appears that the speech act of explicit or implicit command characterizes the whole of the Temple Scroll from first to last. The descriptive or motivating clauses identified in A.2.a–c are found integrated into this basic textual fabric.\(^59\) If implicit commands and conditional norms (points A.3–4) are taken into consideration, then the alternation of pervasive units of command with occasional units of description governs the whole of the Temple Scroll. The exception is the passage identified by A.5, which is about one column in length. It does not constitute an alternation of command and reason (‘description’), but is pure description, namely of a future situation of punishment followed by forgiveness. It is thematically integrated into the commands regarding the king, royal war (the topic of col. 58) and the general obedience of the king to commandments (59.13ff.), but it stands out because of its sustained descriptive-predictive focus. The passage on the king itself is long and thematically more extended than any other part of the cols. 47–66. But it is no more thematically continuous than are cols. 3–13, 13–29 or 30–46, which hang together at least as strongly, albeit by other principles, namely spatial contiguity in the two outer sections, and temporal contiguity in cols. 13–29, as identified by Inventory point 5.5 (see Appendix).\(^60\) But in contrast to the passage A.5 in col. 59, the passage on the king as a whole (56.12 to col. 59) has exactly the same basic components as the rest of the Temple Scroll: normative content, here in the conditional format typical for cols. 47–66, and progression by largely self-contained norm formulations, as everywhere else.

\(^{59}\) Although Wise postulates a diachronically ‘redactional’ origin of phrases which would partly come under the heading I am using here; see A Critical Study, p. 180.

\(^{60}\) Fraade, among others, has argued that the laws of the king are integral to the purpose of the Temple Scroll. See S. D. Fraade, ‘The Torah of the King (Deut. 17.14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law’, in The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001 (ed. J. R. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 25–60 (31–39), where Fraade accords to the compositional goals of the authors of the Temple Scroll the ability to avoid mechanistic self-alignment with biblical passages.
Turning to a different kind of sampling, which emphasizes semantic range, I use col. 21 as a starting point. Here are its themes, including the evidence of fragment 11QT\textsuperscript{b} 8 1, as integrated by Qimron:\textsuperscript{61}

**List B (col. 21):**

1. Expressions relating to sacrifices.
   a. Types of sacrifices.
   b. Names of animals.
   c. Terms for agricultural produce as sacrifice.
   d. Number terms (of animals, or of their age).
2. Israel/tribes of (ll. [3], 15).
3. Location terms (outer Temple court l. 3, ‘all their’ dwelling places, l. 9 i.e. outside the Temple area).
4. Imperatives of eating and drinking (ll. 4ff.), of rejoicing (l. 8), of counting/calculating (l. 12).
5. Three groups of persons within Israel (ll. 3–4); elsewhere also age groups.
6. Temporal sequences for different imperatives and groups within Israel (at first-afterwards; also the duration of the validity of norms, i.e. וולדה לדורות, l. 9).
7. Terms for norms (\textit{huqqot}, reconstructed, l. 9).
8. Divine name (tetragrammaton) in the third person.
9. Discourse deixis (‘from this [aforementioned] day’, l. 12, after \textit{vacat}; l. 8, in a descriptive clause with \textit{כי}; see category 2.c in the preceding list; l. 9).
10. Calendar items (‘this day’, week, Sabbath), festival (generic).
11. Number terms, including the result of a kind of calculation (earlier number terms combined, multiplication, as for the dimensions of the Temple in other columns, e.g. 40.5ff.).\textsuperscript{62}
12. Future generations, future (temporal validity of norm, see point 6).
13. Cultic functional place/structure (altar, l. 10).

Let me supplement these details emerging from col. 21 by themes that are found regularly elsewhere, mainly outside the section on ‘festivals’. The following are common in cols. 2 to 13 and 30 to 46:

\textsuperscript{61} Qimron, \textit{The Temple Scroll}, p. 33

\textsuperscript{62} On this calculation, see Maier, \textit{The Temple Scroll}, p. 197.
15. Architectural structures, buildings (‘house’ in 3.4 and later, בְּעָרוֹב in 4.4, and many more).
16. Cultic functional objects (‘pillar’ in 2.6, ‘altar’ in 3.14, and later; see point 13 above).
17. Colours, materials (‘blue’ in 3.3 and passim; ‘silver’ in 3.5 and passim, etc.).
18. Spatial relations (עליה in 3.4, פנימה in 3.13), dimensions (בָּאְרָךְ in 40.8), measurements (בָּאְרָך; ‘measure’ as such: מֵדָּה in 40.8), compass directions (לֵילוֹן; מֵדָּה in 40.8), numerals.
19. Persons, proper names, groups (named gates in 39.12; 40.14; ‘Israelites’ in 40.3), family and household members (40.6, etc.).
20. Clothing (40.1, etc.).

These last six semantic components, together with the syntactic-semantic trends recorded in list A, account for a very substantial proportion of the verbal matter of cols. 2–13 and 30–46. The thematic move to norms that apply anywhere in the land of Israel (or perhaps beyond), in cols. 46–47, brings into play other semantic fields, as well as a preference for the conditional sentence in comparison with the imperative/unconditional jussive. Here is what the final column with preserved text, col. 66, contains, as an example for the final section of the Temple Scroll, i.e. cols. 47–66:

**List C (col. 66):**

1. **Forms of Command**
   a. Direct second-person imperative forms (66.2)
   b. ‘Resultative’ second-person imperative (‘and you [sg.] shall⁶³ purge the evil from your midst’, 66.3)
   c. Jussive third-person imperative (‘A man…shall not uncover the skirt of…’, 66.11, 12); expressing conditional (66.11) or unconditional (66.11–12) norms.
2. Conditional description of a scenario in which the commandment applies, i.e. a protasis (וכי in 66.4; [וּכַי in 66.8]; past tense 66.4, future tense 66.8 followed by past tense)⁶⁴
3. Reason clause (for doing something commanded, כי), 66.6, 7, 15–17).

---

⁶³. Meaning presumably: ‘shall thereby’.
4. Legal analogy between cases (rape and murder, הבור והזון, 66.7).
5. Adjective making clear a case condition (‘betrothed’ in 66.7).
6. Relationship terms, family status terms, age/sexual maturity terms.
7. Terms for generic locations of actions (city, field).
8. Verbs of sexual activity, metaphorical verbs.
9. Terms of disgust, uncleanness (e.g. נדה in 66.13; connected to reason clauses, in each of the lines 66.13–17).

7. Summary

Lists A–C collect together some of the key semantic and grammatical features of the Temple Scroll. The text exhibits a very high degree of homogeneity of form and content. This allows the production of a kind of synthetic picture of its textual fabric, as made up of a few literary structures recurring very often. Most sentences of the document have one primary, mandatory component, and one secondary, free-choice component. The structure that carries the thematic progression everywhere, and is therefore apparently ‘mandatory’ for the literary constitution, is the commandment, that is, the demand made of the ultimate projected addressee, the action that requires performing or avoiding. Much of the time this action is expressed in the imperative or the jussive of second or third persons. At other times, in particular from col. 49 onwards, the action is distributed over the protasis and apodosis of the conditional norm: If a person has done X, that person or someone else is required to do Y. These two formats, imperative/jussive and conditional norm, carry the continuity and change of themes in the Temple Scroll: do X, do not do Y, in circumstance A do Z. The verbs have a constant subject, namely the ultimate addressee who is asked to perform the commanded action—groups within Israel and, usually by default, the whole of Israel; and a constant voice does the asking—God. Furthermore, over large stretches of the document, namely cols. 3–46/7, the verbs have primarily one of only two kinds of object: building structures and physical appurtenances relevant to them, or sacrificial objects. Clauses which articulate obligations, permissions or prohibitions create the Temple Scroll’s thematic contour from sentence to sentence, passage to passage, and section to section. The required actions furthermore often have a thematic link to each other in textual adjacency, in that they concern the construction of spatially adjacent physical items on the Temple Mount (in cols. 3–13, 30–46/7) or the next cultic act in a festival calendar (cols. 13–29); or, less often, in that they are situational variations of each other (e.g. 58.3–6,
58.6–9 and 58.9–11, as three variants of how a war might go) or depend on one shared initial ‘if’, as for the laws of the king, 56.12 to col. 59 bottom or 60 top. The constantly repeated format of the commanded action provides the basic textual progression, and in fact much of the verbal quantity, of the text. It creates most of the local continuities and discontinuities of topics from first to last. Into this basic rhythm are inserted, less predictably and ‘optional’ for the literary fabric in the sense explained above, many individual statements on the nature of God or the world, or references to events of the past. These motivate or fill with purpose the commandments and thus depend on the thematic fabric of commandments for their presence in the text, and on the sequence of those commandments for their textual position. This ultimately also goes for the A.5 contents of col. 59, which appears to arise thematically fairly organically from the royal wars in col. 58, and which treats in an extended manner a ‘motivational’ theme. This passage addresses the value of keeping the laws (e.g. 58.8, 9; ‘this torah’, l. 10) both for the whole of Israel and specifically concerning the king (in 58.13ff.), even though it does not articulate specific commandments, as happens in practically every other column of the Temple Scroll.

Appendix:
A Profile of the Temple Scroll According to the Inventory of Structurally Important Literary Features

NB: The generic definitions of a literary feature are given in bold. Abbreviated references to scholarly works within this Profile refer to the first section, ‘Bibliography’. Points placed in square brackets are doubtful, for the reason explained within the point.

Bibliography

Text

65. Other examples include: 64.13–14 and 14–15, two related but differentiated situations—the brother’s lost ox, etc.—requiring different actions (apodoses); and 66.1–4 and 4–8, the contrast between two locations of intercourse producing the difference between consensual and non-consensual acts.

66. For an explanation of this Appendix, see above, text belonging to footnote cue 4. This is a somewhat shortened version of the Profile as available on the Database, and largely identical with the text in Samely et al., Profiling, pp. 373–87.


**Translations**

See Yadin, García Martínez/Tigchelaar, and Charlesworth above


**Selected Studies**


1.1 [The text refers to itself as verbal entity (with implied or explicit boundaries): it is impossible to say what sort of a self-presentation, if any, the text might have had, as the beginning and the end of the extant physical evidence is missing. I will here interpret the surviving evidence of the Qumran manuscripts as an indirect clue to the possible self-presentation of the text. In 11Q19 (11QTa) and the other manuscripts the first column is missing entirely. In 11Q19 the text of the last line of col. 66 requires a continuation on the subsequent column, but that final column of the scroll contained, according to Yadin’s estimate, only about five lines of text. The lower part of that column is preserved but blank (cp. plate 82 of Yadin, Temple Scroll, vol. 3; see also Qimron, The Temple Scroll, p. 91, note). The final full column (66) seems to have an atypical bunching-together of lines, reducing the generous space usually separating lines from each other throughout the rest of the scroll. One might therefore argue that that column had very little (if any) space for containing a framing meta-text or self-presentation, and may in fact have ended quite abruptly even as far as its subject matter is concerned. Nevertheless, the fact that we do not know what the ending or the beginning of the text looked like severely limits the usefulness of the concept of ‘self-presentation’ and thus point 1.1 for the Temple Scroll, with the exception to be discussed in 1.1.1. There is, however, evidence from the main body of the text (also incomplete) for assessing perspective (Profile section 2) and the treatment of its subject matter (Profile section 5).

1.1.1 The text refers to itself using a genre term, speech act term, verb or other term implying verbal constitution: certain parts of the text are clearly characterized as torah, and this may well be meant also as a generic characterization of the kind of subject matter it contains throughout. The more specific question, arising in particular as a question of the scope of the deictic term ‘this’ when the text refers to its own verbal matter, is whether something more bounded than a generic
characterization of subject matter is intended. There are two passages in which the text as a whole may label itself as torah. (a) At 59:10 the biblical and stereotypical ‘according to all the words of this torah’ (hatorah ha-zot) occurs in a context which could be reasonably taken to refer to the whole text and its perspective, not just to a particular sub-topic or paragraph within it. (Similar phrases do occur with the more restricted reference elsewhere, e.g. 15.3 mishpat ha-zeh, 50.7 ke-mishpat ha-torah ha-zot, 57.1 we-zot ha-torah.) If so, this expression has a self-referential deixis (‘this’), together with a ‘genre’ term for the kind of verbal entity the text understands itself to be, torah, without the term thereby necessarily becoming the name of a unique document called by what is effectively a proper name, ‘Torah’. The ‘all’ in this sentence, alongside ‘this’, may refer to the totality of the text, but does not describe the text itself as a totality of torah. Related to this usage of torah, there is also another passage in which there is reference to a book/text (sefer) called ‘Torah’, which thereby appears to be acknowledged as being a different text from the one whose voice mentions it: ‘and according to the word which they will say to you [vacat] from the sefer ha-torah and (which) they shall tell you in truth from the place upon which I shall choose to settle my name’ (56.4). The biblical passage whose wording overlaps with this sentence, Deut. 17.8ff., does contain the word torah (v. 11) but not the crucial word sefer which refers to a specific text by referring to the physical object carrying the text. (b) At 56.20–21, ‘And when he sits on his royal throne they shall write for him this torah (et ha-torah ha-zot) according to/into (al) a book/scroll (sefer) which is before the priests’, the wording could imply that this very text, concerned with torah = instruction, is identical with the book of which the priests have an authoritative copy. The formulation, if taken together with passage (a), may reflect a certain ambiguity in the self-perception of the text: in some sense the Temple Scroll may present itself as identical with the/an existing text (say, the Pentateuch at some stage of its development or in the form it has today), carrying a prestige which is either ‘biblical’ or something like it, yet it does not pretend to be that biblical text. Schiffman, The Courtyards, pp. 493–94, assumes that only the subsequent lines of Temple Scroll text are to be written for the king; Najman, Seconding Sinai, pp. 50–52 (see also pp. 30–31), claims that the Temple Scroll identifies itself in this passage as a complete totality or text of Torah.
1.1.2 [The text speaks of itself as dealing with an overall theme (subject matter) or purpose, or as consisting of coordinated parts making a whole: there is no conclusive evidence of the absence or presence of a declaration of a bounded theme/subject matter, purpose, parts and wholes, as the text is incomplete, and in particular its opening is missing.]

1.1.3 [The text uses expressions for characterizing itself as a bounded entity: there is no conclusive evidence of the absence or presence of other terms characterizing the text as a bounded entity, as the text is incomplete.]

1.1.4 [The text introduces the governing voice, thereby indirectly marking its own boundedness: there is no conclusive evidence on this point in the fragment (see 2).]

1.2 The text presents its internal sequence of sentences (or larger parts) as mirroring the objective relationships of components in the projected world (an objective order), or projects its subject matter as self-limiting (5.3). See further under 4, 5.2–5 or 6: on this point also, no firm conclusion can be drawn given the fragmentary state of the text. However, the overall selection and sequence of themes is capable of being interpreted as embodying a unifying principle of order (see 5.2 and 5.5); there is also a clear attempt being made at treating together in the same part of the text themes that are dispersed in Scripture (see 7.1). Finally, transitions from one sub-topic to another can be clearly marked (see 5.8). It is thus possible that the text, when it was complete, did present its discursive-normative themes in a self-limiting treatment.

1.6 The approximate word count or other indication of comparative size is: ca. 8,660 words in 66 columns, according a manual count of the words in Qimron’s 1996 edition, including all reconstructed words (‘hollow’ letters) in fragmentary lines (also integrating mss. other than 11Q19). The count excludes any lines at the top of columns for which there is no surviving information at all (but which are reconstructed, e.g. in Yadin and García Martínez/Tigchelaar, on the basis of Pentateuch passages). In other words, the original text is certain to have exceeded this total significantly (the fullest columns have ca. 200 words).
1.7 The text’s Inventory profile should be seen in the light of the following further information on completeness, thematic progression, aesthetic effects, etc.: the methodology of the Inventory presupposes that the role of any literary feature within the text as a whole can be assessed. Therefore the attempt to apply the Inventory categories to a fragmentary text constitutes an experiment. The fact that the extant evidence for the Temple Scroll is incomplete severely limits the usefulness of a Profile like this, and renders some points speculative that would otherwise not be so. See also 1.1. The thematic parts of the text are described under 5.2/5.2.1.

2.1 The information conveyed in the text defines the perspective of the governing voice in the following way:

2.1.1 The text does not thematize how the governing voice comes to know the text’s contents (or its right to command obedience from the addressee), but suggests that its knowledge (or authority) is unlimited: while there is no evidence to say that the governing voice does not thematize the source of its authority (as the text is extant only in part), there is no passage surviving in which the governing voice indicates a dependency on other information sources, and it ranges over many, mostly normative, topics. If the missing text parts did not contain verbal matter that would contradict this, the text suggests unlimited authority, by the governing voice assuming the role of the immediate source of the law, and so determining the law absolutely. It is also possible that unlimited authority was explicitly claimed in a text part now lost, which would make the text come under 2.1.6 rather than 2.1.1.

2.1.1.4 The text’s governing voice speaks from the perspective of unlimited authority in commanding the addressee’s obedience: see 2.1.1.

2.2 A first-person voice imposes its perspective on all (or almost all) knowledge or norms conveyed in the text: this is true of the extant fragments; whether this was the case continuously throughout the document is impossible to ascertain.

2.2.1 [The first-person governing voice is identified by an anonymous voice through a proper name or unique description. Points 2.2.1.1–3 are devoted to the anonymous voice; all other points presuppose the knowledge horizon of the first-person voice, unless otherwise indicated: there is no evidence for saying if such an identification of the
first-person voice existed in the text parts (in particular the beginning) now lost. Thus it is uncertain if the first person is the highest level of the voice, or whether there was another voice introducing that first person. However, there appears to be no trace of the kind of repeated introduction of God speaking (along the lines of ‘And God spoke to Moses, saying: “…’”) which is so typical of the Pentateuch passages to which the Temple Scroll stands in parallel.]

2.2.2 The first-person voice identifies itself by name or uniquely identifying expression (once or repeatedly): it is impossible to ascertain with certainty if the governing voice is continuous throughout the document, given its fragmentary nature. However, what appears to be the governing voice names itself explicitly in 45.14, in the phrase ‘because I, YHWH, dwell in the midst of the children of Israel’, and in 51.7–8. (It may be noted that in the extant manuscript the tetragrammaton is written in square script, not in Palaeo-Hebrew, as Yadin emphasizes in Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law, pp. 67ff.) The wording of 29.10 offers a culturally unambiguous self-identification of the text’s voice by way of a narrative-‘biblical’ reference (‘establishing it for myself for all days, according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel…’), and another fixed point of biblical history identifies the governing voice in 54.16f., mentioning ‘your God, who brought you out from the land of Egypt’ (the third person is clearly a self-reference of the speaker, who a few lines earlier said, ‘I am putting you to the test’, 54.12). (See also 2.3.)

2.2.4 The number and gender of the first-person governing voice are as follows:

2.2.4.1 The first person singular is used.

2.2.4.4 The first-person forms are marked for gender: as masculine (e.g. 45.14 ani...shokhen, twice). The ‘historical’/narrative identification of the voice as the publicly known God of Israelite history also identifies the persona projected by the governing voice as masculine.

2.2.5 The first-person governing voice refers to herself/himself also in third person grammatical constructions: the apparent speaker, God, seems to use his own name in the third person (as happens, e.g., in some passages of Exod. 19 and 20, and also in Exod. 34.10ff., presumed to have been used in col. 2); 54.12 has an example of the transition from the grammar of the first person to that of the third person (using the divine
name), which indicates clearly that the first person perspective is not meant to be suspended by such a usage of the third person. In cols. 13 to 28 the divine name occurs, and no first person; these passages are in theory compatible with someone other than God speaking (with or without an assumption that a changed speech report originally occurred in the textual lacunae). However, they can also present God as speaking and referring to himself in the third person by proper name, as in the biblical usage. Some of the themes in these columns, including sacrifices, might have invited the imitation of formulaic biblical phrases which have such a third-person grammar, e.g. ‘a pleasing odour before the Lord’ (15.13 and elsewhere), and generally the usage ‘before the Lord’ in collocations with verbs of cultic import. In other words, these usages are compatible with God being presented as the speaker throughout the extant document (see also 2.3).

2.3 [There is an unexplained switch of the grammatical person of the governing voice within the main body of the text, from third to first person or from first to third person: this appears unlikely (see 2.2.5), but one cannot be sure because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence for the text. In col. 2, ‘God’ (el) is used in the third person (2.12); and there is no unequivocal evidence in that first extant column for the use of a first person. Yadin, Qimron (1996), Maier, and García Martínez/Tigchelaar all have restored the text as offering traces of the grammatical first person. This is partly based on that column’s assumed use of Exod. 34.10–16 (see 7.1), where God is speaking in the first person. Also, in 3.4 the expression ‘my name’ is clearly visible (also elsewhere, e.g. 56.5; 60.13; 63.3). In cols. 13–28 there is mention of the divine name in the third person (see 2.2.5). From col. 29 onwards, the use of the first person is common (see 2.2.2).]

2.4 The governing voice defines a horizon of knowledge as shared with the projected addressee by taking for granted the following linguistic usages or references (in selection): NB: In all sub-points of 2.4 the identification of proper names as either presupposed or introduced is affected by the fragmentary nature of the evidence for the Temple Scroll. Proper names are sensitive to the positioning of their first mention, as they can be taken for granted after initially having been introduced explicitly. So, it is theoretically possible that some of these proper names may not have been taken for granted, but were explained at their first occurrence, now lost.
2.4.1 Persons or unique objects referred to by proper name or by technical expression:

2.4.1.1 for persons mentioned or presented in narrative usage; as characters; or topics, for example: Israel (in: ‘tribes of’, in 18.16, or ‘children of’, e.g. 22.11); the names of the twelve tribes are introduced as ‘names of the children of Israel’ in 39.12 and thereafter (gates of the court); see also cols. 13 and 40–41; in the accepted reconstruction of col. 2 acc. to Exodus 34, the names of the seven Canaanite nations (including the Girgashites who do not occur in Exod. 34.11 but in Deut. 7), and again in 62.14f.; the priests are called ‘sons of Levi’ (e.g. 63.3); ‘sons of Aaron’ are mentioned in 44.5 with the apposition ‘your brother’ (Maier translates, ‘brothers’), which could imply a reference to Moses as the addressee also (Yadin, Temple Scroll: The Hidden Law, p. 66); mention of Jacob as partner of God’s covenant at Bethel (29.10; cf. Lev. 26.42).

2.4.1.3 for Gods/mythical figures/supernatural beings, etc., for example: the tetragrammaton is used regularly in certain sections of the text (in square script, not Palaeo-Hebrew); Azazel is mentioned in 26.13; the ‘children of Belial’ occur in 55.3—whether Belial is here used as a demon’s proper name (as elsewhere in Qumranic texts), or as ‘worthless’ (as probably in the parallel verse Deut. 13.14) is not clear from the co-text.

2.4.1.4 for locations, for example: the biblical place name Bethel is mentioned in 29.10; 51.7 mentions norms of uncleanness ‘which I declare to you [singular] on this mountain’, which presumably is meant to be taken as a reference to the mountain also mentioned in biblical texts as the place of revelation (e.g. Mount Sinai). On Jerusalem, see also 2.5.1.

2.4.1.5 for times or calendar dates (specific to a language or culture), for example: there are regular references to calendar months by ordinal number, e.g. ‘first month’ (17.6, for Nisan), see 2.5.1; festival references, by uniquely identifying description rather than by proper name, e.g. ‘day of the waving of the omer’ (11.10), ḥag ha-sukkot (11.13); and generic festival terms, e.g. migra’ qo[desh] (17.10); see further 2.5.1.
2.4.1.6 for documents, texts, books, etc. (identified through being referred to or quoted): a sefer ha-torah is mentioned without explanation in 56.4 (see 1.1.1); also 56.20, introduced as ‘And I said to you’ (echoing closely the Deut. 17.16 speech report).

2.4.3 The text as a whole routinely employs the following language(s), knowledge of which is taken for granted: Hebrew. The text often employs the long suffix forms typical of ‘Qumranic’ (and not biblical) Hebrew, and uses both the Biblical Hebrew waw consecutive verbal tense and the unchanged tense.

2.4.4 Special linguistic usages occur pervasively or prominently: a Persian loan word for ‘beams’ is found in col. 41.16 according to Yadin (Temple Scroll, vol. 1, 38). Maier, p. 2, stresses the absence of Greek loanwords.

2.4.4.4 Biblicizing language, such that the text may be assumed to project itself as having a link to texts today known as biblical (see 7.1.4.1): this is potentially a very prominent feature of the text. There is pervasive (but far from total) use of biblicizing language, going hand in hand with an extensive but entirely tacit overlap with actual biblical wording (7.1.4.2). The phenomenon includes the word choices and syntax, phraseology, as well as phrases for separating smaller text parts (2.4.3 and 5.8) known from biblical texts. It extends to somewhat ‘technical’ terminology for the cult occurring in biblical texts also, e.g. Urim and Thummim (58.20–21), animal parts, measures, etc. If the text largely depends on earlier texts now forming the Pentateuch, and if it wished to present itself in that dependency (which cannot be judged without knowing the context or the full text), then its language points very clearly to a fixed earlier text, i.e., the text now called Pentateuch. See also 7.1.4.

2.5 The text contains deictic or other expressions referring to the governing voice’s time or place, or placing it after/before some key event:

2.5.1 as part of the words of the governing voice: there is one extant deictic reference to the place of the ‘speaking’ of the text, in 51.7, where God speaks of the types of uncleanness ‘which I declare to you [singular] on this mountain’, which presumably is meant to refer to Mount Sinai (cf. Brin on a possible link to the text of Jubilees); see 2.6.1. There is
also a temporal deixis ‘today’ in 54.5–6, which stands in parallel to Deut. 13.1 (in the text form also used by the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch, while the Masoretic Text does not have ‘today’): ‘All the things which I command you today, take care that you do them…’ More generally, the self-identification of the speaking ‘I’ locates the text in a situation co-extensive with part of the biblical historical narrative, perhaps tacitly adopting the biblical speech situation of Exodus 34 (see 7.1). Furthermore, if ‘Aaron your brother’ in 44.5 identifies Moses as addressee (2.4.1.1), then the text’s self-presented situation of speaking is narrowed down to the time, and presumably known locations, of this human figure Moses. Israel’s conquest of Canaan is treated as lying in the future (56.12), and so is the building of the Temple. The latter’s being built is subject to commandments addressed to the ‘you’ of the text or third parties, and apparently contrasted with a renewal of the building in the still more distant future (29.9–10; cf. Yadin, Temple Scroll, vol. 1, pp. 182ff., and vol. 2, p. 129). Its location is left open, by use of expressions such as ‘place which I shall choose’ (e.g. 52.9/16; 56.5, 60.13) or ‘city of the sanctuary’ (45.11–12). The proper name ‘Jerusalem’ is not mentioned in the text (see Yadin’s concordance, vol. 2 of Temple Scroll). The avoidance of post-exilic names of months (2.4.1.5) as well as of the place name Jerusalem could be meant as emphasizing the pre-exilic temporal horizon of the persona (God at Sinai) of the governing voice.

2.6 The text presents itself as speaking to certain persons, groups or entities, explicitly projecting a certain image of its addressee.

2.6.1 The governing voice uses apostrophe, second-person grammatical forms or first-person exclusive or inclusive ‘we’: the text uses second-person pronouns or suffixes in the singular (see Wise, p. 63) or plural, and verb forms conveying norms directly addressed to the projected audience. In 48.10 the second-person singular is used collectively, in parallel to Deut. 14.2 (‘you [singular] are a holy people’), and continuing it with the use of plural suffixes (cf. Yadin, Temple Scroll, vol. 2, p. 209) and verbs. In the case of the second person singular, there is an indirect identification of Moses as addressee in 44.5 speaking of Aaron as ‘your brother’ (see 2.4.1.1). As for the ultimate recipients of the commandments, these appear also to be mentioned in the third person, as ‘children of Israel’, priests (also as ‘sons of Aaron’) and levites (also as ‘sons of Levi’), respectively. At least once the immediate addressee is identified as being an intermediary speaker: ‘And you shall warn the
children of Israel of all the impurities’ (51.5–6), a passage which is tied to a subsequent reference of the governing voice to its own speaking, ‘And they shall not defile themselves with those things which I declare to you [singular, but 11Q20 has plural] on this mountain’ (see 2.5.1). This, like the third-person recipients of commandments, suggests that a Moses-like intermediary is taken for granted throughout, but that the governing voice is not that of the intermediary (see also Schiffman, ‘The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha’).

2.6.3 The governing voice uses verbs of epistemic or moral exhortation or employs a ‘focus marker’: there is pervasive use of verbal forms of command (imperative or jussive) directed at the addressee or via the addressee at other groups, implying that these are told by the addressee what to do. These include verbs such as ‘to build’ or ‘to make’, but also verbs concerning many other normative themes (cp. Wise, pp. 62ff.).

5.1 [The bulk of the text is constituted by thematic discourse/description, albeit presented as speech/wording quoted from a narrative setting: insofar as there is no trace in the extant evidence of an explicit introduction of a narrative setting for the speech of God that constitutes the Temple Scroll, this point only applies with certainty in an indirect fashion, namely by the allusions, within the governing voice’s speech, to a biblically known narrative setting of the giving of commandments, see 7.1.1.1.1.]

5.1.1 [The discursive or descriptive treatment of themes is presented as one character’s continuous speech or wording in a unique narrative situation: applicable only in the sense explained in 5.1.]

5.2 The sequence of themes in the discursive or descriptive text suggests an objective order constituted by dividing a larger topic by a constant principle (or set of principles) of subordination/coordination: see main body of the article above, in section 4.

5.2.1 This suggestion includes all substantive parts of the text (other than any frames), or deviations are made explicit: see main body of the article above, in section 4.
5.5 The text’s sequence of sub-topics (discursive or narrative) mirrors a temporal or spatial order, but without narrative emplotment between the sub-topics. Or it mirrors the sequence of units of meaning in another text (from single words to whole books), while not reproducing the relationships between those parts, not using quotations from it as lemmatic progression (i.e. not 6.1), and not creating narrative emplotment.

5.5.1 This order includes all parts of the text (excepting any frames), as follows:

5.5.1.3 A spatial or geographical order provides the sequence for the text’s themes (including any normative themes): it is possible that all larger text parts follow a spatial progression, which reflects the putative conceptual progression identified in 5.2, namely, from the Temple, marking the holiest place, outwards towards the boundaries of the land of Israel (not thematized as such). Terms of spatial orientation abound in the first part of the text, including direction terms and, in one passage, the direction downward, towards the middle (tokh) of the earth (col. 32). There is also one expansion which, while arresting the spatial point (altar and Temple building), inserts a separate temporal progression (5.5.2).

5.5.1.3.1 Additionally, the themes so ordered are distinguished from one another by spatial or geographic expressions: see 5.5.1.3.

5.5.2 This order defines only a continuous substantial part of the text, as follows:

5.5.2.1 A temporal order provides the sequence for a continuous text part thematizing norms or normative information: in addition to and within the overall conceptual-spatial scheme (5.2 and 5.5.1.3), there is a secondary principle of order, starting at the point at which the altar has been described (col. 13). The sub-group of topics appearing at this point and ending in col. 29 is ordered in relation to time and calendar, and consists of norms that presuppose the existence of the altar for the bringing of sacrifices and related issues. The themes are ordered as a succession of cultic occasions, from the daily offerings to festival rites in their annual sequence, but only treating the first month (Nisan) to the seventh.
5.8 The bulk of the text consists of small forms and patterns drawn from a limited set of formats for thematic articulation or for discussion (see further section 8): see main body of the article above, in section 2.

5.9 The text’s governing voice projects the accuracy or validity of its statements as:

5.9.1 Being taken for granted or being self-evident: the governing voice takes for granted its right to command obedience for the norms it prescribes.

7.1 Narrative or thematic correspondences, or overlap of specific wording, occur between a non-biblical text and one or more biblical texts in a manner that is prominent or pervasive.

7.1.1 [Characters correspond between the non-biblical narrative and the narrative of a biblical text or texts: this point and the subordinate points only apply insofar as the normative-thematic discourse of the governing voice, non-narrative as it is, also has an implied narrative background setting.]

7.1.1.1 [Some or all main characters of the text correspond to main characters in a biblical partner text: the persona of the governing voice of the Temple Scroll corresponds to the God character in the Pentateuch; see also comment in 7.1.1.]

7.1.1.1.1 [A main character shared with a biblical partner text is also the first-person narrator of the text: the following observations need to be read in light of the qualification in 7.1.1. The governing voice of the Temple Scroll is identical with a character in the Pentateuch, God, in that God is (with the provisos made in 2.2, 2.2.4) projected as being the speaker of the whole text of the Temple Scroll. God is thus the speaker of the normative contents both in the Pentateuch (reported directly by the narrator or indirectly, via Moses), and in particular including Deuteronomy (Fraade, ‘Moses and the Commandments’, p. 400), as well as in the Temple Scroll. However, in the latter he is the governing voice of the whole text or its bulk (if there should have been an introduction of the governing voice at the text’s beginning), while in the former he is a character in a narrative, reported as having made certain utterances by an}
anonymous narrator (see 2.2.1). The precise point in the chronology of communications between God and Israel/Moses (e.g. 51.5–7, see 2.6.1) is not clarified by the extant Temple Scroll text, but there is an overlap with the speech situation of Exodus 34, privileged by its (near) opening position in col. 2. This perhaps points to the situation of Exodus 34 as an implied setting for the whole of the Temple Scroll as an event of communication, without the Temple Scroll thereby becoming a narrative text (for its parts are not related to each other by progression of action, cause, or chance—plot). The co-extension with narrative Exodus only concerns the situation of speaking; the speech itself (that is, the Temple Scroll) is normative-thematic in its contents and structure. Something like a covenant scenario provides the communicative ‘model’ for the text’s own attitude of speaking (that is, its narrative self-location); if the text presented itself as a response to an already existing text (the Pentateuch or a similar text), then it constitutes a repetition or resumption of the Sinai covenant of the kind that the Hebrew Bible itself contains several times.]

7.1.2 [Chronology, physical setting or emplotment correspond between the non-biblical narrative and the narrative of a biblical text or texts: this only applies indirectly, as the Temple Scroll is not a narrative text; see 7.1.1.]

7.1.2.1 [The narrative’s chronological and spatial framework, as well as certain events, are co-extensive with that of a biblical partner text, or with some extended part of it: this point applies only insofar as the thematic contents of the Temple Scroll, as divine direct speech, also presupposes narrative information. Within this framework the Temple Scroll constitutes itself as the contents of one unified speech act, while the narrator of the Pentateuch allocates the same normative themes to separate speech occasions and speech acts by God, Moses, or Moses in the name of the God; see 7.1.2.2.]

7.1.2.2 [While the narrative covers the same chronological-spatial ground or plot as a biblical text, it lacks extended speeches found in that biblical text: this point does not apply to the Temple Scroll, but it may be useful for comparative purposes to note here that its opposite applies to it. The text consists of what in Exodus–Deuteronomy constitutes the contents of narrated ‘direct speech’ uttering commandments. In the Temple Scroll, that normative content has no narrative ‘interruptions’ (although it may have had an initial all-encompassing narrative ‘frame’).
The roles of extended speech and narrative setting, if there should have been one, would be reversed in the Temple Scroll in comparison to the Pentateuch. Additionally, normative information that is distributed over several separate speech acts identified throughout the Pentateuch between Exodus and Deuteronomy, is treated as one continuous speech act of promulgation in the Temple Scroll, thus providing implicitly a single point in the narrative of divine law-giving which uniﬁes all norms that are mentioned.]

7.1.4 The text shares features of language with the Hebrew Bible, or exhibits tacit overlap with speciﬁc biblical wording, whether narrative or not: see the main body of the article above, in section 1.

7.1.4.1 There are pervasive biblical linguistic features (vocabulary, morphology or syntax) or a pervasive use of unspeciﬁc biblical language, such as generic biblical phrases or single words: see the details in 7.1.4.

7.1.4.2 The text contains prominently, but not necessarily frequently, the wording of speciﬁc biblical passages such as whole sentences or unique biblical phrases, used in a tacit manner. See also 8.1.4.1: further to the observations in 7.1.4, one may note that there is pervasive overlap between the Temple Scroll and extensive parts of the Pentateuch and other biblical texts. This overlap has a number of different aspects: (1) Basic to it is the interweaving of independent sentences with sentences or sentence-parts also found in the Hebrew Bible, which is entirely unacknowledged in the extant text. The biblical text is thus not quoted, if by that word one means (as scholars often do) that the governing voice acknowledges a verbal entity as existing independently of and prior to the current text. Such acknowledgment is simply not there and that is a vital characteristic of the text. Yet, while biblical wording does not become explicitly thematic, it appears to be constantly represented and hermeneutically engaged with, if one assumes the precedence of the known biblical texts over the Temple Scroll (a combination of features also typical of the Targums, see Samely, ‘Is Targumic Aramaic Rabbinic Hebrew?’). Otherwise, this engagement goes the other way, or in both directions at different historical stages of the growth of the texts. The verbal overlap is too substantial to be accidental. An attempt to identify six patterns of ‘composition’ (also hermeneutic use of Scripture) in relation to what above was called interweaving, is found in Kaufman (in particular p. 42) and Swanson, pp. 9ff.; see also the line-by-line analysis in the appendix of Wise (pp. 205–42). (2)
Observations on the Temple Scroll

7.1.4.2.1 The tacit overlap of specific wording extends regularly to whole sentences or to extensive sentence groupings, found alongside sentences or sentence parts not found in that biblical partner text.

7.1.5 The projected persona of the governing voice of the text, whether a narrative or not, is also known from a biblical text, or the governing voice assumes an epistemic stance similar to that of a biblical text.

7.1.5.1 The projected first-person persona of the governing voice is also a character in a biblical text.

7.1.5.1.1 The persona appears to be linked to a character as it specifically appears in the biblical text, not merely as it might be known from diffuse cultural knowledge.

7.1.6 The range of themes in the non-narrative text is wholly or nearly contained within the specific range of themes found also in a biblical text: there is a co-extensive thematic agenda between the non-narrative Temple Scroll and the narrative Pentateuch. The Temple Scroll’s range of themes can be interpreted as overlapping entirely, or almost entirely, with that of the Pentateuch and certain other parts of the texts today referred to as Hebrew Bible, in particular for the general themes of Ezekiel 40ff. The Temple Scroll does not, however, imitate the latter’s perspective or the narrative embeddedness of the information in the format of quoted speeches. The topics shared between the Temple Scroll and the Hebrew Bible are not necessarily presented in the same sequence (although some are, see 7.1.7), and the normative positions regarding these topics are not necessarily the ones found in the Pentateuch/Scripture.
7.1.7 The sequence of themes in (at least) substantial parts of the non-narrative text is tacitly isomorphic with the sequence of themes in a biblical text: although there is no overall thematic isomorphism between the Temple Scroll and the Pentateuch, there are some striking examples of such isomorphism for limited passages, in particular in the latter part of the scroll (called ‘section 6’ in 5.2.1). These include the sequence of diverse normative themes in Deut. 21–23 being echoed by the thematic concerns of cols. 63–66; also cols. 53–55 in relation to Deut. 12.20–13.19.

7.1.8 The non-narrative text pervasively or prominently presupposes the narrative fabric of biblical events/reported speech, beyond the contents of any specific biblical quotations that may occur: see 7.1.1.

7.1.8.1 The text presupposing biblical narrative fabric has a thematic structure of discourse or description.

7.2 Narrative or thematic correspondences, or overlap of specific wording, occur between the non-biblical text under discussion and other non-biblical texts in a manner that is prominent or pervasive: there are relationships in particular between the Temple Scroll and Jubilees (see, e.g. Brin), 4QMMT, and the Damascus Document (on all of these, see Crawford, pp. 77–87).

8.1 Standard forms or contents formulated in set phrases, set sentence formats, or clauses in a standard syntactic connection.

8.1.1 Conditional norm or hypothetical legal case: occasional, e.g. 45.7 and 11; 50.7 (im) and 10; 65.7.

8.1.2 Unconditional norm: pervasive in the form of apodictic norms, in the grammatical form of ‘you shall’, ‘there shall be’, etc.

8.1.3. Sentence with theme anticipated to the beginning and repeated in a pronoun or by ellipsis: occasional, e.g. 36.7f.

8.1.4.1 The expressive use of unmarked biblical wording whose function in the text’s discourse is enhanced or achieved by it being recognized as coming from a Scripture: possibly pervasive, see 7.1.4, 7.1.4.2 and 2.4.4.4.
8.1.8 **Reason clause**: occasional to frequent, using e.g. *ki*, and often formulaic: 32.15; 43.12 and 17; 45.14/51.7–8 with self-identification, 46.4/12 with *asher*; 47.18; 48.10; 52.18; 60.19; these clauses can also have thematic closure function (cf. 5.8).

8.1.10 **List sentence enumerating items by words or phrases**: occasional.

8.1.18 **Sentence making a prediction of a future event**: once, as self-prediction of the speaking voice, 29.9.

9.13 **Physical evidence from antiquity potentially shows non-verbal signals indicating (an interpretation of) the text’s thematic division**: in ms. 11Q19 there is regular use of *vactats* coinciding with thematic boundaries (see 5.8), but there are also other kinds of blank spaces (e.g. 56.4).

11.1 **The non-narrative text projects its thematic concern as being mainly one or more of the following**:

11.1.3 **Law, commandments or norms of behaviour**: this applies. In addition to this feature, some events of the past/future, similar to what would be indicated for a narrative by point 11.2.1, are implied in commandments which take effect once the Israelites will have taken possession of the land (cp. points 11.1.3 and 11.1.7 in the database Profile of the War Scroll).

11.2.1 **[The reported events are those of a biblical past, or of a biblically foretold future]**: some events of the past/future are implied in commandments which take effect once the Israelites will have taken possession of the land, but the text is not dominated by the reporting of emplotted events and is not in a narrative format.

12.1 **Sampling of genre labels applied to the text in secondary literature**: halakhic pseudepigraphon; new Torah, second Torah, re-redacted Torah, divine halakhic pseudepigraphon (in contrast to a Moses-pseudepigraphon, see Schiffman); ‘Ur-Deuteronomy’ (Maier, p. 6), ‘rewritten Bible of a legal nature’ (Bernstein, pp. 224f.), pseudepigraph, *sefer torah*, rewritten Bible (Crawford, p. 17); rewritten Torah (Swanson), additional Torah.