

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious
Studies Department

Classics and Religious Studies

September 2001

THE MEANING OF THE PHRASE ציר המקרש IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL*

Sidnie White Crawford

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, scrawford1@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub>



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Crawford, Sidnie White, "THE MEANING OF THE PHRASE ציר המקרש IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL*" (2001).
Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department. 6.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/classicsfacpub/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics and Religious Studies at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

THE MEANING OF THE PHRASE עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL*

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

A minor point of contention in the interpretation of the Temple Scroll has been the meaning of the phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ found in the laws concerning the purity of the ideal sanctuary envisioned by the Temple Scroll. This phrase is not a biblical phrase; therefore we cannot fall back on a biblical meaning to help us determine its meaning. The problem is compounded by the fact that the Temple Scroll uses a variety of terms to refer to the Temple building itself, the various buildings and courts which surround it, and the wider area around it; these terms overlap and a clear distinction in terminology is not discernible. These terms include הַיְחָל, הָעִיר, הָעִירִי, בֵּית, הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, מִקְדָּשׁ, הַקֹּדֶשׁ, and the phrase presently under consideration, עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ (see Appendix 1).

The phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ occurs four times in the Temple Scroll, each time in the context of maintaining the purity of the Temple complex envisioned by the Scroll. All of the occurrences come from the collection of purity laws, which the redactor of the Temple Scroll has woven into the end of the Temple Source. Col. 45:15-17, which outlines the procedure for purification of a man suffering from a flux, reads עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ אֵל אַחֲרַי יָבוֹא אֵל ("afterwards he may enter into the city of the sanctuary"). Col. 47:9-13, a section interdicting the use of vessels not made from the skins of animals slaughtered in the Temple, has two occurrences of the phrase: אֵל עִיר מִקְדָּשִׁי לֹא יָבֹאוּ (line 9; "to the city of my sanctuary there shall not enter . . .") and וְכֹל אוֹכְלָמָהּ לְעִיר מִקְדָּשׁ (lines 12-13; "and all their food to the city of my sanctuary . . .").

* It gives me great pleasure to present this essay in honor of Emanuel Tov, my teacher, collaborator and friend. I would like to thank John Strugnell, Shalom Paul, and Eyal Regev for their helpful comments and suggestions.

Finally, the phrase appears in a context which has stirred the most controversy: col. 45:11-12, which reads: ואיש כיה ישכב עם אשתו שכבה כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי בה שלשת ימים זרע לוא יבוא אל כול עיר המקדש אשר אשכין שמי בה שלשת ימים (“and a man who lies with his wife for sexual intercourse shall not enter any of the city of the sanctuary where I have set my name for three days . . .”). This ruling is paralleled by a similar statute in the Damascus Document (CD 12:1-2; 4QD^f 5 i 17-18): אל ישכב איש עם אשה בעיר המקדש למבוא את עיר המקדש (“no man shall lie with a woman in the city of the sanctuary to pollute the city of the sanctuary”). It is evident that the subject of the two rulings is similar. In the Temple Scroll, any man who has intercourse is prohibited from entering עיר המקדש for three days, while the Damascus Document prohibits sexual intercourse בעיר המקדש. The reason for the two rulings is the same: seminal emission conveys ritual impurity (Lev. 15:16-18).¹

The question before us is the exact meaning of the phrase עיר המקדש. In the material surrounding the occurrences of this phrase in cols 45-47, we find the following terms: המקדש (col. 46:10; 47:12, 17; 11QT^b 7:11-12); הקודש (col. 45:8, 10); מקדשי (col. 45:10; 46:2, 3, 8, 9, 11; 47:3-4, 11, 13, 16, 18); העיר (col. 45:13, 17-18; 46:10, 13, 14, 16, 17; 47:3, 10) and עירי (col. 46:15, 18; 11QT^c 3 2). Where the terms המקדש and עיר occur separately, they seem to carry their usual biblical meanings: המקדש means the sanctuary, that is the actual tabernacle or Temple plus its surrounding installations (e.g., Exod. 25:8; Lev. 16:33; 1 Chron. 22:19; Isa. 63:18), while עיר is a city, i.e., a large, often fortified multi-family abode for humans. Several rulings in this section of the Temple Scroll make a clear distinction between the מקדש and the עיר: col. 46:9-10 declares, “And you will make a fosse around the מקדש a distance of one hundred cubits, which will separate the holy מקדש from the עיר.” Col. 47:3-4 proclaims “and the עיר which I will consecrate to set my name and my מקדש within it shall be holy and pure. . . .” Col. 47:10-11 reads, “and you will not defile the עיר in which I am setting my name and my מקדש.” And in col. 47:17-18 we find “and you will not defile my מקדש and my עיר. . . .”

¹ The ruling in the Damascus Document does not help in determining the meaning of the phrase עיר המקדש, since it is not contextualized. Hempel suggests that “CD 12, 1b-2a constitutes an interpolation in the Laws of D which seems to have originated from the same milieu as 11QT^a 45-47” (C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* [STDJ 29; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998] 156).

If this distinction is carried through to the construct phrase עיר המקדש, the plain meaning would seem to be the עיר in which is the מקדש.² However, this understanding of the phrase has created certain problems for some scholars. It is not difficult to accept that a man suffering from flux would be excluded from the city (which may be presumed to be Jerusalem, although Jerusalem is never named, in keeping with the pseudepigraphic fiction of the Temple Scroll); it may be inconvenient, but it would be possible. Likewise, while the prohibition on bringing the skins of animals not slaughtered in the Temple into the city of the sanctuary would cause a certain amount of inconvenience and economic loss, it would not be impossible. If, however, the rulings of the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document concerning sexual intercourse are read as complements to each other,³ then sexual intercourse is prohibited in the city of the sanctuary, and anyone impure as a result of sexual intercourse is banned from the city of the sanctuary for three days.⁴ This ruling would seem to make it impossible to have normal, full-time residential family life in Jerusalem, and so commentators have taken various positions on the controversy, as we see when we turn to the history of scholarship.

History of Scholarship

Scholarship on this question actually begins before the publication of the Temple Scroll, in commentaries on the similar passage in the Damascus Document. L. Ginzberg, in 1922, noted that המקדש must refer to the Temple in Jerusalem, and therefore עיר המקדש can mean “no other place than Jerusalem.” He goes on to say that “conceivably the rigorousness of our author is dictated by a policy of making a sojourn of some time in Jerusalem very difficult for adherents of the

² J. Milgrom, “The City of the Temple. A Response to Lawrence H. Schiffman,” *JQR* 85 (1994) 126.

³ It must first be accepted that the two documents stem at least from the same circles of halakhic interpretation, for which there is evidence on several counts. See S.W. Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls Series 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 80-82.

⁴ This three-day period of impurity, rather than the one-day period prescribed by Lev. 15:18, comes from an exegesis of Exod. 19:10-15, in which Moses commands the people to prepare themselves for the theophany of God on Mt Sinai. They are to purify themselves for *three* days; this purification includes abstention from sexual intercourse. The Temple Scroll understands the city of the sanctuary to be the equivalent of Mt Sinai, since God’s presence resides in both.

sect. . . .” However, he seems to reject the understanding of the phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ as coextensive with Jerusalem in favor of understanding the phrase to correspond to the biblical עִיר דָּוִד (“the city of David,” e.g., 2 Sam 5:7, 9). Thus Ginzberg concludes that עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ refers to a specific area within Jerusalem, that is, the Temple Mount.⁵

C. Rabin, on the other hand, seems to understand the prohibition to refer to the entire city of Jerusalem. He notes that according to Josephus (War 5:227), a man with a flux is excluded “from the whole city” (ἡ πόλις ὅλη), and concludes concerning the Damascus Document passage, “probably a ‘fence’ regulation to prevent defilement of the Temple, meant, like the similar Islamic law, to apply only to pilgrims. . . .”⁶ We will return to Rabin’s intriguing comment below.

Y. Yadin, the editor of 11QTemple^a, commented extensively on the use of this phrase. He noted the clear differentiation that existed between the terms עִיר and מִקְדָּשׁ and concluded that this meant that the Scroll understood the phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ to mean “a city, inside of which is a sanctuary.”⁷ He notes that several categories of impure persons or things are banned from entering the sanctuary or the city; those banned from the sanctuary are men who have had a nocturnal emission (col. 45:7-10), while those banned from the city are the blind (col. 45:12-14), the man suffering from flux (col. 45:15-17), a person with corpse impurity (col. 45:17), lepers and other diseased persons (col. 45:17-18), and the skins of animals not properly slaughtered in the Temple (col. 47:7-14). Since, according to Yadin, the Temple Scroll is extending the laws of purity to apply not only to the contemporary equivalent of the camp, but to other cities as well, the purity regulations become even more stringent when applied to the sanctuary and its city. Therefore Yadin concludes “the absolute application of all the laws of purity to the Temple city led the members of the sect to forbid sexual intercourse therein, and from that to the banning of women from taking up permanent residence there was a small step. It seems that it was this edict that eventually developed into the ‘abstention’ of the Essenes and their celibacy.”⁸ And again, “Hence, according to the laws of the sect, all males residing in

⁵ L. Ginzberg, *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte* (rev. and updated translation *An Unknown Jewish Sect*; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976) 73-74.

⁶ C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958) 59.

⁷ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983) 1.280.

⁸ Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.281. Yadin identifies the author/redactor of the Temple Scroll with the Essenes.

the Temple city must abstain from having sexual relations therein. Therefore, this ban is tantamount to ordaining complete celibacy for them.”⁹ In further support for his argument, Yadin notes that the Temple Scroll sets aside quarantine areas for menstruating and postpartum women in other cities in the land (col. 49:16-17), but not for the city of the sanctuary. The Scroll does, however, mandate quarantine areas outside the holy city for those impure by reason of skin disease, flux, or nocturnal emission (col. 46:17-18). Thus, he concludes “the doctrine of the sect deemed it necessary to ban women from permanent residence in the Temple city.”¹⁰

Yadin’s conclusions have been criticized on several points. B. Levine took issue both with Yadin’s understanding of the phrase עיר המקדש and his conclusion concerning the presence of women in the city of the sanctuary. Levine suggested that עיר המקדש referred only to the Temple complex, and not to the entire city of Jerusalem, arguing that the term עיר can mean a precinct or a quarter of the city, as in the phrases עיר דויד (2 Chron. 8:11) and עיר בית הבעל (2 Kgs 10:25).¹¹ Further, Levine pointed out that there is no law prohibiting the presence of women in עיר המקדש (*contra* Yadin); the only prohibition is sexual intercourse.¹² Therefore Levine understood the ruling in col. 45:11-12 to prohibit sexual intercourse in the Temple compound itself, but not in other parts of the city.

L. Schiffman has followed Levine’s line of argument, arguing that the phrase עיר המקדש must refer only to the (vastly expanded) Temple compound, since “it is difficult to imagine that the entire city of Jerusalem was to be free of women and celibate.”¹³ He also makes the obvious point that ritually pure women were permitted into the outer court of the Temple, and so were not permanently banned.¹⁴

Finally, S. Japhet, arguing from a different perspective, points out that Yadin’s conclusions regarding the presence or absence of women in the Temple City are conjectural and methodologically flawed. First,

⁹ Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.288.

¹⁰ Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.289.

¹¹ B. Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978) 14, 16.

¹² Levine, “The Temple Scroll,” 14.

¹³ L.H. Schiffman, “Exclusion from the Sanctuary and the City of the Sanctuary in the Temple Scroll,” *HAR* 9 (1985) 313.

¹⁴ L.H. Schiffman, “Laws Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (eds D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 211.

the prohibition of sexual intercourse in the “city of the sanctuary” would only affect married women, leaving whole classes of women (young girls, widows, divorced women) unaffected. Second, she notes that Yadin does not argue that married men were permanently banned from the Temple City because of the ban on sexual intercourse!¹⁵ Japhet does take note of the lack of quarantine areas for menstruating and postpartum women in col. 46; however, she argues that the Scroll means to subsume Jerusalem under the rubric “any city” in col. 48, where quarantine areas for those categories of women are prescribed.¹⁶ Thus, according to Japhet, all categories of women could live in the Temple City; they were simply barred from the Temple compound itself during times of impurity.

J. Milgrom, on the contrary, has followed Yadin’s line of reasoning on the question of the meaning of עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ. He argues that the Scroll explicitly states that Jerusalem is different from any other city (“and you shall not purify a city among your cities like my city,” col. 47:14-15). Since the Scroll’s aim is to strengthen the purity regulations so as to protect the holiness of the Temple city, all residents who incur any impurity are banished to special areas outside the city. Since female impurities are not included in these quarantine areas, Milgrom concludes that women were prohibited from residing in the Temple City.¹⁷

On the question of why a man who has had a nocturnal emission is barred only from הַמִּקְדָּשׁ for three days, while anyone having sexual intercourse is barred from עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ for three days, Milgrom suggests that the reason for the difference can be explained geographically. Since nocturnal emission is involuntary, it can take place accidentally even within the Temple compound, and the man affected must then go out from there. Sexual intercourse is a voluntary act; therefore the Scroll can regulate that it must take place outside the city, and the persons affected cannot come in there for three days. They are impurities of the same degree, however, and the purification period is the same.¹⁸

Finally, Milgrom argues on the basis of grammar that the construct phrase עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ must mean the city that contains the sanctuary. He

¹⁵ S. Japhet “The Prohibition of the Habitation of Women: The Temple Scroll’s Attitude toward Sexual Impurity and its Biblical Precedents,” *JANES* 22 (1993) 71-72.

¹⁶ Japhet, “Prohibition,” 77 n. 29.

¹⁷ J. Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 97 (1978) 513, 517.

¹⁸ J. Milgrom, “‘Sabbath’ and ‘Temple City’ in the Temple Scroll,” *BASOR* 232 (1978) 27.

notes that nowhere in biblical or rabbinic literature is the sacred compound called עיר; therefore he opts for the plain meaning of the text.¹⁹

The publication of 4QMMT has brought new evidence into the debate. Although the phrase עיר הבקדש does not occur in 4QMMT, it does give a very clear definition of its understanding of the meaning of the words הבקדש and מונה (“camp”) in a discussion concerning the proper place for slaughter (4QMMT B 29-33; see Leviticus 17). It reads

And we are of the opinion that the sanctuary [is the tent of meeting and Je]rusale[m] is the camp, and outside the camp [is outside Jerusalem . . .].²⁰

The definition concerns contemporary equivalents to the tabernacle and the camp in the wilderness. 4QMMT equates the מבקדש with the Temple and the מונה with Jerusalem. Further, later in the passage Jerusalem is identified as “the camp of holiness,” “the chief of the camps,” and “the place which he has chosen from all the tribes of Israel” (4QMMT B 59-62). Thus, according to 4QMMT, all of Jerusalem, not just part of it, is equivalent to the camp in the wilderness, and the regulations for the camp apply to all of Jerusalem.²¹ Since there are important connections between the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT on other points,²² it can be argued that the Temple Scroll understands the meaning of עיר in the same way that 4QMMT understands the meaning of מונה, and that their use of הבקדש is the same. However, since the language is different, and 4QMMT specifically mentions Jerusalem while the Temple Scroll does not, the evidence of 4QMMT is merely suggestive and not conclusive.

It seems to me that neither side has yet won the debate. The plain meaning of the phrase עיר הבקדש and the grammatical arguments support Yadin and Milgrom, while Levine and Schiffman have biblical and historical precedent on their side when they argue that the Scroll could not possibly imagine a residential city without the presence of women. Further, Yadin’s conclusions are logically flawed; the Scroll

¹⁹ Milgrom, “The City,” 126.

²⁰ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 144.

²¹ Isa. 52:1 is relevant in this discussion as well. In Deutero-Isaiah’s vision of the reconstituted Jerusalem, called the עיר הבקדש, the “uncircumcised and unclean” (ערל ושבא) are barred from the city. This verse states in microcosm the macrocosmic vision of the Temple Scroll.

²² L.H. Schiffman, “Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll,” *RevQ* 14 (1989-90) 435-57.

does not ban women from the Temple City—on the contrary, it allows ritually pure women into the outer court of the Temple. Is there a solution to this dilemma?

Proposed Solution

I would like to propose a solution that was first obliquely suggested by Rabin in his commentary on the Damascus Document. I believe that the Temple Scroll envisions the city that contains the Temple compound not as an ordinary residential city, but as a pilgrimage or sacred city that exists only to support the Temple and its rites. The Scroll articulates the special status of the Temple City in col. 47:14-15: “and you shall not purify a city from among your cities like my city. . . .” If the Temple City has a special status over against other cities, and a particular role as a pilgrimage city, then special regulations can be ordained for it, including the ban on sexual intercourse within the city. Those couples on pilgrimage to the holy city would be expected to refrain from sexual intercourse while there and for three days beforehand, while priests would likewise refrain during their period of service. A comparison with pilgrimage rites in other cultures shows that such a ban is not unusual. But first let us look at the internal evidence of the Scroll for our contention that the Temple City is envisioned as a pilgrimage city.

The Temple Scroll does not contain architectural instructions for a residential area around the Temple compound. After the fosse, the next thing that is called for is the construction of latrines 3000 cubits outside of the city. Next, the Scroll calls for the establishment of quarantine areas to the east of the city. There are no mandates concerning houses, streets, or any structures between the fosse surrounding the Temple compound and the latrines 3000 cubits outside. Further, there is no provision made for the king’s residence, although the Scroll clearly envisions the existence of a king in its ideal vision (cols 57-59).²³ These are strange omissions if the Temple City were envisioned as a residential city, as it is in the ideal Temple plans of

²³ F.E. Peters notes that royal and priestly powers do not easily coexist in the same city, citing as examples Jerusalem, which was dominated by the king during the period of the kingdom of Judah and then by priests (including the Hasmonaean priest-kings) in the post-exilic period, and Mecca, which was never a royal residence. *Jerusalem and Mecca: The Typology of the Holy City in the Near East* (New York and London: New York University Press, 1986) 23.

Ezekiel and the New Jerusalem Scroll, and as Jerusalem was in the historical reality of the First and Second Temples. It does not appear as if the Scroll expects permanent residences (i.e., buildings) around the Temple compound. Also, the Scroll does not legislate the establishment of a cemetery for the Temple City, although it is very clear about this requirement for the cities of the land (col. 48:13-14). If the Temple City were expected to be an ordinary residential city, in which people lived and died, surely a place for a cemetery would be a necessity.

Further, the quarantine areas set aside outside the Temple City for those who contract ritual impurity are only for those who have had a nocturnal emission, those afflicted with skin disease, and those experiencing a discharge. Glaringly absent are quarantine areas for menstruating and postpartum women, although these categories are included for ordinary cities (col. 49:16-17). I do not agree with Japhet's argument that the Temple City is simply subsumed under the category "all cities" in regard to women with *niddah* impurity; the author/redactor is too painstaking to ignore such an important category in regard to the Temple City. Finally, although there is extensive legislation for the proper purification procedures if someone dies בעריכמה ("in your cities," col. 49:15-21),²⁴ there is no mention of this in relation to the Temple City. Since the Scroll's predilection is for increasing the stringency of the purity regulations as we move inward toward the Temple, surely the regulations concerning the impurity of death would be more detailed for the Temple City than for other cities. The Scroll's silence on the subject leads one to suspect that the Scroll did not envision death occurring in the holy city (however unrealistic this may seem to be).

Finally, the legislation concerning the skins of animals emphasizes the special nature of the Temple City. Since only vessels made from the skins of animals properly slaughtered in the Temple were allowed into עיר בקדש, people coming to the Temple on pilgrimage would have had to exchange their ordinary vessels for these special vessels. This would necessitate a certain amount of economic hardship.

All of this internal evidence corroborates the thesis that the Temple Scroll does not envision the Temple City as an ordinary residential city, but as a special city to which worshippers would go on pilgrim-

²⁴ The use of בעריכמה here is parallel to the use of עריכמה in col. 47:15, where it is contrasted with עירי.

age and then return to their own cities. This special status of the Temple City would mean that only those people already ritually pure would go up to עיר המקדש; those who were ritually impure or could anticipate becoming ritually impure (e.g., through menstruation) would stay home.²⁵ This would include those with corpse impurity and menstruating and postpartum women; hence no quarantine areas were set aside for them. However, for those who became ritually impure after coming to the Temple City special procedures and quarantine areas were necessary. Thus if a man had an involuntary nocturnal emission he would have to leave the sacred compound and go to the special quarantine area set aside for him outside the city.

Given this entire argument, the meaning of the phrase עיר המקדש and the reason that those impure by reason of sexual intercourse were banned from עיר המקדש becomes clear. The phrase עיר המקדש can be understood in its plain meaning, the city that contains the sanctuary. Those who had had sexual intercourse were banned from the entire city, and that ban did have the effect of interdicting sexual intercourse within the entire city, as the parallel passage in the Damascus Document demonstrates. However, since the holy city was a pilgrimage city, a city of temporary, short-term residence (e.g., the length of a festival), a couple would abstain from relations while on pilgrimage and then resume normal relations upon returning home. Thus all women who were ritually pure were allowed into עיר המקדש, and indeed into the outer court of the Temple compound itself.

Cross-Cultural Comparisons

It may be argued that this view of the Temple City as only a pilgrimage city and not a residential city is unprecedented in the literature. This is true, but a comparison with other cultures' pilgrimage rites and sacred compounds shows that the kind of legislation found in the Temple Scroll is present in other cultures as well, and therefore may be part of a general trend concerning purity and impurity and sacred places.

M. Dillon, in discussing pilgrims and pilgrimages in ancient Greece, notes the presence of special regulations concerning those participating in the pilgrimage and the site of the pilgrimage itself. He states,

²⁵ There is biblical precedent for this idea; after Samuel is born, Hannah does not go up to Shiloh for the yearly sacrifice (1 Sam. 1:21-22).

“some of these regulations dealt with the need for ritual purity while participating in sacred rites, and these often concerned women, who from the male perspective were a source of impurity because of sexual activity and birth.”²⁶ While these regulations varied from sanctuary to sanctuary and rite to rite, there were often restrictions on diet, clothing, ornaments, sexual behavior, and the avoidance of the impurity of death. There were also rules designed to limit access to the sacred site.²⁷ A few examples will illustrate the point.

The sacred shrines of Greece such as Olympia and Epidauros had very few building accommodations for pilgrims; most pilgrims pitched tents or used other temporary measures. At the shrine of Isis at Tithorea, the holiest Greek shrine to the Egyptian goddess, no one was allowed to dwell in the vicinity of the shrine.²⁸

Death was a source of ritual impurity for the Greeks. At Delos, no one was allowed to be buried on the island: “those who were dying were taken to the nearby island of Rheneia, as were women in childbirth.” Dillon notes that the restriction on dying was primarily meant for local inhabitants.²⁹ Epidauros, the great healing sanctuary, had no provision for a cemetery. Evidently the dead were removed and buried elsewhere.

The rules of sexual intercourse chiefly concern women by removing them from the sacred site. For example, at Olympia women were barred from the sacred games, although virgins were allowed. Sometimes, however, the rule applied equally to men and women. For example, abstinence from sexual intercourse was called for at the shrine of Oropos in Pergamon, although both men and women were allowed in.³⁰

In Islam, chronologically later than Second Temple Judaism but on the same family tree, various regulations exist to maintain purity during the *hajj*, the great pilgrimage to Mecca. Pilgrims to Mecca are considered to be in *ihram*, a state of temporary consecration for one performing the *hajj*. Mecca is surrounded by a special zone within

²⁶ M. Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997) xvii.

²⁷ Dillon, *Pilgrims*, 202. Interestingly, none of the regulations have to do with menstruation. However, by the second century BCE inscriptions prohibiting menstruants from sacred sites do appear in the Greek world. It is possible that this is an eastern influence on the Greek world. See J.R. Branham, “Blood in Flux, Sanctity at Issue,” *Res* 31 (1997) 63.

²⁸ Dillon, *Pilgrims*, 207, 211.

²⁹ Dillon, *Pilgrims*, 219.

³⁰ Dillon, *Pilgrims*, 187, 194.

which a pilgrim is expected to maintain a higher degree of purity, and guard against ritual defilement.³¹ A pilgrim wears a special garment, and sexual intercourse is prohibited for the duration of the *hajj*. Access to the pilgrimage sites of Mecca and Medina are limited to Muslims; non-Muslims risk death for violating the prohibition.³² Hinduism likewise calls for asceticism while on pilgrimage; these ascetic practices (called *niyamas*) include special food laws and abstinence from sexual intercourse.³³

Conclusion

On internal grounds alone, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Temple Scroll envisages the city in which its ideal Temple is located not as an ordinary residential city, but as a city of particular special status, for which special rules of purity apply. Thus the ritually impure would be barred from the city, and special measures would be taken to safeguard the city's purity.³⁴ This would have the effect of making Jerusalem indeed the "city of the sanctuary" for it would be only the sanctuary and its activities that would be the purpose of Jerusalem's existence. It would, in effect, become a pilgrimage city. This concept of the Temple city, like other concepts concerning the architecture and practice of the Temple in the Temple Scroll, is unlike that found elsewhere in second temple Judaism, and further confirms the unique nature of the collection of documents found in the Qumran scrolls.

³¹ Peters, *Jerusalem and Mecca*, 68.

³² "Hadj" and "Ihram," in *The Encyclopedia of Islam* (eds B. Lewis, V.L. Ménage, C. Pellat, J. Schacht; new ed.; Leiden: Brill; London: Luzac, 1971) 31-38, 1052-53.

³³ D. Haberman, *Journey through the Twelve Forests* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994) 156. I would like to thank Tracy Pynchman for this reference.

³⁴ In an interesting corollary to my thesis, J. Magness has suggested that the architecture of the settlement at Qumran indicates that the owners of the scrolls found in the surrounding caves organized their space into sacred (pure) and non-sacred (impure) areas, using many of the same criteria as does the Temple Scroll. J. Magness, "Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran," *Shaping Community: The Art and Archaeology of Monasticism* (ed. S. McNally; BAR International Series 941; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2001) 15-27.

Appendix 1

Terminology used to refer to the Temple and its complex in the Temple Scroll:

- בֵּית
 11QT^a 3:4; 4:3; 29:3-4
- הַיֵּכָל
 11QT^a 30:5, 7, 8; 31:6, 7; 35:8, 10
- הַקֹּדֶשׁ
 11QT^a 17:9; 32:12; 35:1; 45:8, 10
- הַמִּקְדָּשׁ
 11QT^a 3:11; 35:7; 43:7; 46:10; 47:12, 17
 11QT^b 12:11-12
 11QT^c 3 4-5
- מִקְדָּשׁ
 11QT^a 29:8, 9; 45:10; 46:2, 3, 8, 9, 11; 47:3-4, 11, 13, 16, 18; 52:14-18;
 53:20
- הָעִיר
 11QT^a 44:2; 45:13; 46:10, 13, 14, 17; 47:3, 10
 לָהּ (refers to the city)
- 11QT^a 45:17-18
- עִיר
 11QT^a 47:15, 18; 53:19
 11QT^c 3 2
- עִיר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ
 11QT^a 45:11-12, 16-17; 47:9, 13

Comments:

- בֵּית and הַיֵּכָל refer only to the Temple building itself.
- הַקֹּדֶשׁ refers to the area within the courtyards of the Temple.
- הָעִיר and עִיר are often used as terms clearly distinct from מִקְדָּשׁ and מִקְדָּשׁי:
 11QT^a 46:10; 47:3, 11, 18.