

TWO NOTES ON THE MIDRASH ON 2 SAM. VII

I. THE TEMPLE 'NOT MADE WITH HANDS' IN THE QUMRAN DOCTRINE

THE 'Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrâšîm', recently published by Allegro¹, provide another piece of evidence for the ancient roots of the Jewish medieval belief that the future eschatological temple will 'not be built by human hands, but will descend ready built and whole from heavens'.² This tenet, though widespread in medieval Judaism, did not originate with the destruction of the Second Temple; it goes back to the time when the Second Temple was still standing. The exalted vision of an ideal temple at the end of days did not arise either from the people's mourning for the destroyed Temple or from the protracted crisis which accompanied the apocalyptic movement in the period of the Second Temple. It arose rather in earlier times, when the Jews returning from the Babylonian exile felt keenly the contrast between the poverty of the house which they were building and the real or imagined splendours of the Solomonic Temple. The prophet Haggai (ii, 3) voices this sentiment. The hope of the people that they would eventually return led to the belief that the tabernacle, the ark, and other holy vessels would be revealed at the end of days (2 Macc. ii, 5-8).³ The author of Tobit also knew that the Temple of his time was not 'like the first one', and he believed that at the end of days the sons of Israel 'will build Jerusalem with honour and the House of God shall be built in her, even as the prophets of Israel spoke concerning her' (Tob. xiv, 5).

The next step is the belief that the eschatological temple will not be built by men, but by God himself. But what is to be done with the existing

¹ *JBL*, 77, 1958, pp. 350-354.

² G. Sholem: *Shabetai Zevi*, Jerusalem, 1957, p. 223 (Hebrew).

³ See L. Ginzberg: *Legends of the Jews*, III. Philadelphia, 1947, p. 48; VI, 1946, p. 112.

Temple? An answer to this question is supplied by the Book of Enoch (XC, 28-29): 'And I stood up to see till they folded up that old house... and they carried it off and laid it in a place in the south of the land. And I saw till the Lord... brought a new house greater and loftier than that first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up...'

The author of this vision has no complaint against the Temple of his time; he even speaks with sympathy of the Hasmonean rulers, but he nevertheless hopes for a better, God-made, temple at the end of days. This shows that the belief in the eventual removal of the actual Temple and its supernatural replacement had its origin not in any antagonism to the actual sanctuary, but simply in the hope for a more splendid future. Somewhat later, however, when external and internal conditions became more oppressive, many Jews saw in their Temple a den of thieves, and the Qumran Covenanters went so far as to declare it unclean. Some, like the prophets of old, even predicted the destruction of the Temple as a fitting punishment for the sins committed in it, or as the result of a general national disaster. One of these prophets of destruction was Jesus.

Evidently, the older legend of the house to be built at the end of days was interpreted and broadened by the added foreboding of doom for the existing Temple. Of this combination⁴ we had — up to the publication of the fragments of our 'midrash' — but one example, the words of the Gospel: 'I will pull down this temple that is made with hands and in three days build another not made with hands'⁵ (Mark xiv, 58; Matt. xxvi, 61; John ii, 19; see also Mark xv, 29; Matt. xxvii, 40 and Acts vi, 14).

Nowadays many scholars believe — rightly, in our opinion — that the verse quoted represents a kind of apocalyptic eschatological prophecy typical of the time.⁶ I also agree with those who think that these words are an authentic saying of Jesus (according to John, in a somewhat modified form) and not a false testimony before the High Priests and the Sanhedrin (as the Synoptic Gospels have it). This view can be supported by the story of the trial of Stephen, against whom false witnesses testified: 'We heard him say that

⁴ On the supernaturally built eschatological temple in Jewish literature, see A. Aptowitzer: *The Heavenly Temple According to the Aggadah*, *Tarbiz*, 2, 1931, pp. 270-272 (Hebrew).

⁵ Translation according to C. H. Rieu: *The Four Gospels*, 1956.

⁶ See R. Bultmann: *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen, 1957, pp. 126-127; and *Ergänzungsheft*, 1958, pp. 17-18.

Jesus the Nazarene will destroy this place' (Acts vi, 14). According to John, Jesus said these words when overturning the moneychangers' tables. This happened, according to the Synoptic Gospels, on Jesus' last visit to Jerusalem.⁷ Could the announcement of the destruction of the Temple be one of the main reasons for Jesus' execution?

This possibility seems to be supported by another event from A. D. 62. Josephus tells us of another Jesus, Jesus the son of Ananias, 'a rude peasant', who, at that time, prophesied the destruction of the Temple. 'Therefore the magistrates, supposing, as it was indeed the case, that the man was under some supernatural impulse, brought him before the Roman governor; there, although flayed to the bone with scourges, he neither sued for mercy nor shed a tear, but, merely introducing the most mournful of variations into his ejaculation, responded to each stroke with: 'Woe to Jerusalem'. When Albinus, the governor, asked him who and whence he was, and why he uttered these cries, he answered him never a word, but unceasingly reiterated his dirge over the city, until Albinus pronounced him a maniac, and let him go' (Bell. Jud., VI, 300-309). If a prophecy of doom was sufficient, in this later case, for the magistrates of the Jews to hand over the 'blasphemer' to the Roman governor, there is no reason to doubt that in an analogous case some thirty years earlier, Jesus suffered the same fate for the same reason, as the Gospel tells us.

This is only a rough sketch of the problem of Jesus' prophecy of destruction. We need not examine the question further, because the prophecy in Mark xiv, 58 is in any case an instructive and relevant parallel to the new Qumran fragment; the question of the authenticity of this saying is irrelevant to a comparison between the two texts, which is the proper subject of this study.

The new fragment contains part of a midrash on the prophecy of Nathan (2 Sam. vii, 6-16) and the beginning of another midrash on the first chapters of Psalms. The first midrash includes a comparison between the present and the future temple (lines 1-7). The future temple 'will move him no more neither will a son of wickedness afflict him (or: it) any more as at first' (based on 2 Sam. vii, 10).⁸ The future temple 'is the House where there shall not enter any one in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish and an Ammonite

⁷ John is well known to have transposed the deed and the saying to the beginning of Jesus' career and to have interpreted the saying allegorically.

⁸ See additional note below.

and a Moabite and a bastard and an alien for ever and ever for His holy ones there will be for ever; and He shall be seen continually upon it, and strangers shall not again make it desolate, as they desolated at first the Sanctuary of Israel because of their sins.' The present Temple is evidently desecrated and polluted (a meaning contained in the expression 'desolate'⁹), therefore in the future there will be revealed 'the House which He shall make in the End of Days, as it is written in the Book of Moses: the sanctuary of the Lord thy hands have established, the Lord shall reign for ever and ever' (Exod. xv, 17-18). The verse from Exodus is quoted to explain the text of 2 Sam. vii, 11: 'for a house shall the Lord make for thee':¹⁰ the house of the future shall be made by God's own hands, not by human hands. Interpreting his text, our author makes the distinction between the 'sanctuary of Israel' and the 'sanctuary of the Lord' of Exod. xv, 17 (מקדש אדוני). Concerning this eschatological temple he says further: 'And He purposed to build Him a Sanctuary amongst men,¹¹ in which will be sacrificed before Him deeds of Law' (i.e. sacrifices).¹²

In my opinion, the parallel between this sectarian midrash and the saying in Mark xiv, 58 is very striking indeed. In both texts the expectation of a new temple is linked with a negative attitude to the existing sanctuary. Jesus called the Temple a 'den of thieves' (Mark xi, 17; Matt. xxi, 13; Luke xix, 46) and our midrash says that it is 'desolate', viz. polluted. Even if the small fragment of the midrash does not in so many words say that the actual Temple is to be

⁹ The word does not mean 'to destroy'—the Temple is still standing!—but is used as ἐρημόω in 1 Macc. i, 39; iv, 38; and especially ii, 12: 'And behold our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory have been desecrated (ἡιερώθη) and the heathen have profaned them.' The meaning of the root פטט in our midrash and (probably) in the Hebrew original of 1 Macc. is identical with one of the meanings brought into play in the expression שיקון מטובים in Dan. ix, 27; xii, 11.

¹⁰ My translation.

¹¹ It would be easy to amend (as my pupil M. Sheschar has suggested) אדוני to אדם (see DST Col. II, l. 26; and the variations of *geri* and *ketiv* in Joshua v, 1; cf. also 2 Kings xxii, 4 with 2 Chron. xxxiv, 9). But the reading אדם is made certain by the biblical text adjoining the interpreted passage, which reads: וואת חורת האדם אדוני ה' (2 Sam. vii, 19). The apparent combination אדוני האדם seems to have enabled the author of our midrash to call the אדוני of Exod. xv by the cryptic name אדם מקדש. Could he mean that this temple will be built for the Davidic messiah? This is possible in view of his messianic interpretation of 2 Sam. vii, 12 (צמח דוד). The next verse says 'he (evidently: the messiah) shall build a house for my name' a house of which our commentator can only suppose that it is identical with the house of which the preceding verse (11) says 'a house shall God make for thee'.

¹² The statement is meant positively, cf. the positive attitude to future sacrifices in DSW II, 5-6; cf. also Ecclesiasticus xlv, 24-29 (Segal's ed.).

destroyed, its author must have had an idea of this kind in mind. The old house has to be done away with somehow, if a new one is to be erected in its place; we saw this even in the apocalyptic prophecy in the Book of Enoch (*loc. cit.* above, p. 100), which is not as hostile to the existing Temple as our midrash. Thus the apocalypse ascribed to Enoch, the words put into Jesus' mouth in the Gospel, our midrash, and the late Jewish legend amply attested in talmudic literature, all share the belief in a new temple, *not made with hands*. It was this belief that led the author of our midrash to link Exod. xv, 17 'a sanctuary of the Lord thy hands have established', with the prophecy of Nathan in 2 Sam. vii, 11 on the future house.¹³ It is therefore quite possible that the saying of Jesus is also ultimately dependent on a similar interpretation of Exod. xv, 17.

The belief in a future, divinely-built temple consoled the Jewish people for hundreds of years after the destruction of the real edifice. We cannot in this paper pursue the various literary forms which this belief assumed through the centuries. Even so, the following quotation from the late *Midrash Vayosha*¹⁴ should be interesting in our context: 'When Moses saw the love of the Holy Blessed One (=God) to Israel, he said before Him: O Master of the World, Thou wilt bring them there and plant them there,¹⁵ and with this planting there shall be no pulling-up for ever, and Thou wilt make Jerusalem to come down for them from heaven, and will not destroy it for ever, and the Exiles of Israel shall be gathered in her and they shall dwell there in security. Therefore it is written: Thou shalt bring them in and plant them etc., a sanctuary of the Lord Thine hands have established.'

¹³ The whole text is interpreted as speaking of the future temple; thus 'a son of wickedness will not afflict it any more' was not understood to mean Israel, but the future temple, and interpreted accordingly. It is therefore probable that the word *וּתְעַצְתִּי* in this verse served as a further link with Exod. xv. See also below, n. 15.

¹⁴ A. Jellinek, ed.: *Beth ha-Midrash*, I. Jerusalem, 1938, p. 55.

¹⁵ Here these words are interpreted as meaning Israel, but at another place the same work says: והיהכל יוריד הקב"ה מן השמים כמו שהראו הקב"ה למשה, שגאמר: תביאנו ומעצבו בהר נחלתך מנון לשבחך פעלת ה'. And the temple, God will bring it down from Heaven, as He has shown it to Moses, as it is written: Thou shalt bring them in and plant them, etc.

¹⁶ (Hebrew text) כיוון שראה משה אהבתו של הקב"ה שאהב את ישראל אמר לפניו: רבש"י תביאנו ומעצבו בהר נחלתך מנון לשבחך פעלת ה'. וכן נלומתים של ישראל אותה נשיעה שלא יהיה לה נתישה לעולם ותורידו ירושלים מן השמים ולא תהרס אותה לעולם. וכן נלומתים של ישראל לתוכה וישבו עליה לבשה. לך נאמר: תביאנו ומעצבו בהר נחלתך, מנון לשבחך פעלת ה'. מקדש אדני כוננו ידיו. כביכול אין בית המקדש נבנה בידי אדם אלא בידו של קדשו אדני כוננו ידיו

The work quoted is, according to Zunz, as late as the eleventh or even the twelfth century,¹⁷ but probably contains material which is considerably older. Even so, there need be no direct connection between the Qumranic and the medieval midrash; the basic belief in a renewed, divinely-built, eschatological temple could have taken the verse in Exodus xv as a scriptural justification on two separate and independent occasions.

II. 'THE SHOOT OF DAVID WHO WILL STAND WITH THE INTERPRETER OF THE LAW'

The sectarian midrash interprets 2 Sam. vii, 14 'I will be his father and he shall be my son' as referring to the 'shoot of David', i. e. as the Davidic messiah, but combines with the Davidic messiah another eschatological personality, the interpreter of the law. Evidently, this personality was of such importance to the sect that the midrash found it necessary to include him, although the biblical passage speaks about one man only. As is well known, the sect believed that there would be three leaders on the last days¹⁸: it hoped for the coming of the Davidic messiah, of the anointed high-priest of the last days and the prophet who will renew prophecy in Israel. As we shall see, the interpreter of the law in the sectarian midrash is identical with the eschatological high priest. Our problem is to explain why the anointed priest of the last days should be called 'interpreter of the law'.

It is well known that Num. xxiv, 17: 'There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel', is regarded by Jewish tradition as a messianic testimony. This was also the view of the sect; but, because it believed in two anointed ones, it saw in the 'star' and the 'sceptre' two different personalities. According to its interpretation, the 'sceptre' is evidently the Davidic messiah ('the messiah of Israel') because it is written in Gen. xlix, 10 'the sceptre shall not depart from Judah'. It follows logically that the 'star' is, according to the sect, the Aaronic messiah ('the messiah of Aaron'), the high priest of the last days. This is also the interpretation of the Testaments of the Patriarchs, a work apparently composed on the periphery of the sect and based on sectarian sources. The star of the eschatological 'new priests' shall arise in heaven as of a king (*Test. Levi XVIII, 3*); the *Testament of Judah*

¹⁷ L. Zunz: *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*. Frankfurt a/M, 1892, pp. 294-295.

¹⁸ See especially J. Liver: *The House of David*. Jerusalem, 1959, pp. 117-140 (Hebrew) and A. S. Van der Woude: *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Essen, 1957.

(XXIV, 1-6) speaks about the two anointed ones in the following manner: 'And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace,¹⁹ like the son of righteousness walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness... Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth, and from your root shall arise a stem...' The 'sceptre' of Num. xxiv, 17 is evidently the Davidic ruler of the last days and the 'star from Jacob' the eschatological 'new priest'.

Num. xxiv, 17 is also interpreted as referring to *two* personalities in the Damascus document (CDC VII; 18-20: '... the star is the interpreter of the law who came (or: shall come) to Damascus, as it is written: 'There shall come a star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel'—the sceptre is the prince of all the congregation, and when he arises, he shall strike violently all sons of Seth'. The prince of all the congregation is the Davidic messiah,²⁰ as is the 'sceptre' in the 'Testaments of the Patriarchs'. It follows therefore that the 'star' in CDC is the messiah from Aaron, the eschatological high priest. The star is, according to this source, to be identified with the interpreter of the law as well, who shall, according to the sect, stand with the 'shoot of David', i. e. with the Davidic messiah. The conclusion must be that in both texts the interpreter of the law will be manifested as the new priest of the last days. The sectarian midrash confirms our supposition²¹ that the personal titles in the scrolls are not used merely with intent to mystify but rather as precise terms (with connotations known to the initiated), designating the chief *dramatis personae* in the sacred history of the sect. It is thus highly unlikely that the sect used the same personal title to describe different persons. In our case it is clear that the interpreter of the law, who, according to the sectarian midrash will stand with the Davidic messiah, is (according to the CDC) the 'star', i. e. the new priest who is named with the prince of all the congregation, i. e. with the Davidic messiah.

There can be no doubt that the interpreter of the law is a historical personality.²² We learn *inter alia* from the text of CDC VII, 19 that he came to

¹⁹ The following words 'And a man shall arise from my seed,' which are missing in the Armenian version, seem to be an interpretation formed on the basis of the Septuagint version of Num. xxiv, 17 see Van der Woude, *ibid.*, p. 208.

²⁰ See Van der Woude, *ibid.*, p. 58.

²¹ See our recension of: J. T. Milik: Dix ans etc., in *Kirjath Sepher*, 33, 1958, p. 457.

²² Van den Woude, *op. cit.* (above, n. 18), pp. 54, 185 et *passim* supposes that the interpreter of the law in CDC VII, 18 and of the sectarian midrash is the future sacerdotal messiah, and that this

Damascus²³; he is named in CDC VI, 5-6 with those 'who went out from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus'.²⁴ It is almost certain that the CDC was written after the death of the teacher of righteousness, the founder of the sect.²⁵ If so, it seems that the interpreter of the law was the successor of the founder and the spiritual leader of the community in Damascus. Is it, therefore, possible that a real personality is designated in CDC VII, 18 as the 'star', the eschatological high priest, and in the sectarian midrash as the man who will stand with the shoot of David? Or, in other words, is it possible that the sect expected that one of its members would manifest himself in his lifetime as the new priest of the last days?

The hypothesis that the sect expected one of its members to be the messiah of Aaron seems to us not merely a possibility, but an inevitable postulate of its ideology. From the political point of view, the chief aim of the sect was originally to conquer the Land of Israel, to take possession of the Temple of Jerusalem and to dethrone the wicked priests. It is also well known²⁶ that the Zadokite priests held a very prominent position in the sect. The community hoped evidently that a priest of this family, which ruled in the Temple before the Hasmoneans, would replace the wicked priests of the present and it is logical to assume that the future Zadokite high priest would come from the branch of this family which had joined the sect. The sect was an apocalyptic movement and believed that the re-enthroning of a Zadokite high priest would be realized in the last days. The legitimate high priest would be the eschatolo-

person is *not* identical with the interpreter of the law of CDC VI, 7, who is an historical personality. Liver, *op. cit.* (above, n. 18) p. 126, supposes that the interpreter of the law in CDC is an historical personality and that the same term in the sectarian midrash designates the new priest of the last days. I hope to demonstrate in the present article that these suppositions are not necessary. See also the next note.

²³ The meaning of *דמסק* could also be 'who shall come to Damascus,' but scholars are right in assuming that the interpreter of the law, mentioned in CDC VI, 8 with the sojourners in Damascus, was an historical leader of the sect in this locality.

²⁴ It is not important to our purpose whether Damascus is a real geographical term or a name for Qumrân. I am personally convinced that 'Damascus' refers to the city in Syria, because there is no absolute necessity to deny the assertions of CDC, that the exodus of the sect to Damascus was 'from the land of Judah' (IV, 2-3; VI, 5) 'to the land of north' (VII, 13-14)—and Qumrân is situated in the Judean desert.

²⁵ At the time when the Damascus document was composed, the teacher of the community (מורה היתיר) was already dead (VIII, 21; XX, 13-5), and it is probable but not certain that he is identical with the teacher of righteousness. As regards CDC VI, 10-11 see note 29 below.

²⁶ See e. g. Van den Woude, *op. cit.* (above, n. 18), p. 220.

gical new priest, the messiah from Aaron. But all apocalyptic sects believe that the last days are imminent, and it seemed probable to our sectarians that one of their Zadokite priest would be very soon revealed as the messiah from Aaron. There is therefore nothing astonishing in the fact that the CDC (VII, 18-20) describes the interpreter of the law as the 'star', i. e. the 'new priest' of the last days—it is on the contrary quite natural, if we assume that the interpreter of the law was a Zadokite priest. Our supposition seems obvious, because the sect was a messianic movement and messianic movements regularly have their pretenders to messiahship.

But how is it possible that the same document speaks of the coming of the two anointed ones, the messiahs of Aaron and of Israel, as something about to happen in the future (CDC VII, 21; XII, 23; XIV, 19; XX, 1)? It seems that the interpreter of the law was only a pretender to the messianic role; only when the Davidic messiah appeared ('when he will arise' — בעמרו, CDC VII, 20) would the interpreter of the law become the messiah of Aaron; only then 'the shoot of David will stand with the interpreter of the law'.

The use of messianic titles for the actual living leaders of the sect seems to contradict the hope for a future revelation of the two anointed ones. Yet the difficulty can be resolved by theological considerations. From the strictly theological point of view no man can be defined as a messiah before he has accomplished the task of the anointed. From this point of view there can exist only messianic pretenders and there is always some doubt whether the pretender will really succeed in his task. It seems that in the time of the Temple and after its destruction such theological doubts and restrictions had their practical consequences. Thus Bar-Kochba called himself *nasi* (prince),²⁷ and not king or messiah, because he had not yet completed the task traditionally assigned to the messiah; it seems that Jesus did not proclaim himself explicitly as the Christ before his death for the same reason. We can find another proof that a pretender was not yet a messiah in the story of Judas of Galilee who 'rose up in the days of the taxing and drew away much people after him, he also perished' (Acts v, 37). His name is found in the Acts in a list of men who boasted themselves 'to be somebody.' We learn from Josephus (*B. J.* II, 444)

²⁷ See e. g. Van den Woude, *ibid.*, p. 116, and Liver, *op. cit.* (above, n. 18), p. 146. There is a significant parallel to the messianic connotation of the interpreter of the law in Haggai ii, 20-23, where Zerubbabel is designated for the present time as 'governor of Judah,' but in the day of Lord he will be God's servant, 'for I have chosen thee, saith the Lord of hosts.' See Liver, *ibid.* pp. 96-7.

that Judas' son, Menahem, was murdered in the Temple, being 'arrayed in royal robes.' It seems that after Judas' death, his partisans transferred the status of pretender to the kingship to his son. It is clear that if a pretender did not succeed in being a real messiah in his lifetime, his adherents would not believe after his death that he had revealed himself as an anointed one.²⁸

The case of Judas of Galilee and his son Menahem leads us to the question of whether the teacher of righteousness was once believed to have been a messianic pretender. This is by no means sure, but it is quite possible. The teacher of righteousness was the founder of the sect, and a priest (*Commentary to Psalms* III, 15, see II, 4 and DSH II, 8), possibly a Zadokite priest: while he was alive, the sect could believe that he would reveal himself at some future date as the sacerdotal messiah. As in the case of Judas of Galilee and his son, this claim was naturally abolished by his death and could then be transferred to the interpreter of the law. Admittedly much of this is hypothetical, but two points seem to be practically sure: Firstly the interpreter of the law, a real personality, was regarded as a pretender to the task of the sacerdotal messiah; and secondly, if the sect believed that in the time of the resurrection the teacher of righteousness would have a special task,²⁹ this task could not be that of the messiah, because he had not shown himself to be the messiah in his lifetime.

Our line of reasoning has possibly some relevance for the study of the Gospels. To my mind the sectarian ideas about the interpreter of the law furnish an interesting parallel to the so-called *Messiasgeheimnis*. Jesus, who is supposed by the Gospels to be the Christ, nevertheless sometimes speaks about the Saviour in the third person. The situation in CDC is basically similar; the same document invests a concrete historical person with the titles of the priestly messiah, and announces nevertheless the future coming of the messiah of Aaron. The solution offered here, namely that the interpreter of the

²⁸ Jesus, of course, is believed to be the Christ not after his death, but *because* of his death.

²⁹ CDC VI, 10-11 'until there shall arise the teacher of righteousness' is difficult to interpret; it seems that what is meant is the teacher of righteousness after his resurrection; assuming, of course, that the sect believed in a general resurrection in the end of times; in which context one should compare the words of the Patriarch Judah: 'And after these things shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life, and I and my brethren shall be chiefs to the tribes of Israel' (*Test. Jud.* XXV, 1). If we assume that the resurrected teacher of righteousness could not assume the function of the Aaronic messiah, there is no contradiction between the claim that the interpreter of the law could be possibly revealed in his lifetime as the sacerdotal messiah and the belief in the resurrection of the teacher of righteousness at the end of times.

law was in a way a pretender to the task of a messiah, who could not be clearly designed as such before being definitely revealed, might possibly apply also to the Synoptic Gospels. We can say that in them Jesus uses the same manner of speaking (in the third person) of the coming Saviour, but nevertheless implies that he himself is to be the Messiah.

As our midrash apparently considers the interpreter of the law to be still a potential messiah, it must have been composed during his lifetime. Unless other proof is forthcoming to the contrary, it would thus be one of the early documents of the sect.

ADDITIONAL NOTE: Since the writing of this article, the sectarian midrash on 2 Sam. VII has been fully published by J. Allegro, *DJD* V, Oxford, 1968, pp. 53-57, as no. 174. See also J. Strugnell, *RQ*, vol. 7, 1970, pp. 220-225. The Temple Scroll confirms my interpretation of the Temple 'not made with hands' from the sectarian midrash. In the Temple Scroll (29.9-10) God says that in the eschatological future, "And I will consecrate my [t]emple by my glory, (the temple) on which I will settle my glory, until the day of creation on which I will create my temple and establish it for myself for all times, according to the covenant which I have made with Jacob at Bethel" אֲשֶׁר אֲבָרַא אֲנִי אֶת מִקְדָּשִׁי לְהַכְיִנוּ לִי כּוֹל הַיָּמִים... עַד יוֹם הַבְּרִיאָה... (Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, Jerusalem, 1977, vol. I, pp. 141-143, vol. II, pp. 91-92, English edition, vol. II, pp. 128-129). Yadin reads "day of blessing" יוֹם הַבְּרִכָּה instead of "day of creation." See Qimron's reading, "day of creation" which is surely correct, cf. Yadin, op. cit. vol. II, p. 129 note 9. An exact parallel to this text appears in Jubilees 1.29, "from the time of the creation."

APPENDIX

1. THE TEXT OF ISA. xlix,17 IN THE DSS.

The *Epistle of Barnabas* was probably written at the time when Hadrian intended to rebuild the City of Jerusalem.¹ The project of the Emperor presumably aroused some hopes among the Jews, and there may be an allusion to these hopes in Barnabas' words: "it is said, see, they who destroyed this Temple, they themselves will build it" (Barn. xvi,3).² The quotation is indubitably a paraphrase of the Septuagint translation of Isa. xlix,17: "And quickly thou wilt be built by them that destroyed thee and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee."³ What was the Hebrew text upon which the Greek translation is based? The massoretic vocalization of מְהֵרָה בְּנִיךְ וּמְהֵרָה בְּנִיךְ מִמְּךָ יֵצֵאוּ is based on the supposition that בְּנִיךְ is to be read as meaning "thy children" and מְהֵרָה as "thy destroyers". But there was also a very good old tradition, as reflected by V,T, an Arabic version and the variant of a Hebrew manuscript⁴, that בְּנִיךְ is to be read as בְּנֵיךְ "thy builders", and this was surely also the tradition of the Greek translator (*οἰκοδομηθήσῃ*, "thou wilt be built"). The rest of the versions are in agreement against the Septuagint: they understand Isa. xlix,17 as saying: "Thy builders (or: children) shall make haste; thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee," whereas the Septuagint speaks about a quick rebuilding of the city by its destroyers. The prophet certainly did not mean that. This notion seems to be based on the historical fact that Jerusalem was destroyed by heathens in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and rebuilt by heathens in the Persian period. It is clear that this interpretation of Isa. xlix,17 could not be developed on the basis of our M.T. What was, therefore, the text of Isa. that could be wrongly understood by the Greek translator as referring to the rebuilding of Jerusalem by its destroyers? The solution of the problem was found by Hans Windisch in his commentary to the *Epistle of Barnabas*⁵: he says that the literal translation of the Hebrew text should be: "Thy builders shall be quicker than

1. See, e.g., E. Schürer *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* I (1901), pp. 672-3.
2. *πέρας γέ τοι πάλιν λέγει: 'Ιδοὺ, οἱ καθ' ἑλόντες τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, αὐτοὶ αὐτὸν οἰκοδομήσουσιν.*
3. *καὶ ταχὺ οἰκοδομηθήσῃ ὑφ' ὧν καθ' ἠθέθης, καὶ οἱ ἐρημώσαντές σε ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσονται.*
4. See BH ad. loc.
5. H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Tübingen 1920), p. 387.

they that destroyed thee".⁶ This ingenious hypothesis is now confirmed by the reading of DSIa: **מָהֵרָא בְנֵיךָ מִמְהַרְסֵיךָ וּמִמְהַרְבֵּיךָ מִמָּחַ יֵצֵאוּ** "Thy builders shall be quicker than thy destroyers, and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee."

It is clear that the reading in the Septuagint is based on the vocalization reflected in the Scroll: the Greek translator read **בְּנֵיךָ** as **בְּנֵיךָ** ("thy builders") and understood **מְהַרְסֵיךָ** wrongly, not as "than thy destroyers" but as "by thy destroyers". This interpretation is not against the spirit of the Hebrew which he translated and which is also preserved in DSIa where it is written plene. The meaning of **מָהֵרָא בְּנֵיךָ מִמְהַרְסֵיךָ** is that the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the return from the Babylonian captivity will be miraculous: it will be accomplished even more quickly than the destruction of the city.

It is not our task to solve the question as to whether the text of Isa. xlix,17 as preserved in DSIa, which was also the Hebrew text of the Greek translator, conforms to the utterance of the prophet himself. All the interpretations being clearly based upon the same consonant text, we have to try to fix our choice upon the authentic tradition. The reading of the Greek translator and of the Dead Sea Sect fits very well the tendency of Deutero-Isaiah to introduce miraculous traits into his description of the return from captivity. From the purely philological point of view, the reading of DSIa and G is a classic example of a *lectio difficilior*: we can easily explain how the massoretic text developed from the text preserved in DSIa, but it is practically impossible to imagine how a change in the opposite direction could have taken place. We have already seen that numerous sources attest the reading of **בְּנֵיךָ** as **בְּנֵיךָ**. We can also suppose that, because of the attraction of the following **מִמְהַרְבֵּיךָ**, the word **מִמְהַרְסֵיךָ** was taken to be a Pi'el of **הָרַס**, and not understood as **מְהַרְסֵיךָ** ("than thy destroyers"). Thus the phrase "thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee" came into existence. At this point the word **בְּנֵיךָ** (read: **בְּנֵיךָ**) "thy builders" became more or less incomprehensible and it could be read as meaning "thy children", especially when verse 20 of the same chapter speaks about "the children which thou shalt have after thou hast lost the others" (the fluctuation between **בְּנֵי** and **בָּנִים** is a well-known feature in the various traditions of the Hebrew text of the Bible). By this last change the verse took on a new meaning: the Children of the devastated City of Jerusalem will hasten to enter the city, whereas its destroyers and devastators

6. "eine wörtliche Uebersetzung des hebr. Textes würde etwa gelautet haben: *οι ολκωμοιυτοις σε ταχύτεροι η οι καθελόντες σε.*"
7. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery I* (New Haven 1950), The Isaiah Manuscript, plate XLI. (See the illustration in the present volume).

will leave it. The rebuilding of Jerusalem in a miraculously short time was transformed into the happy return of the Children of Israel from the Babylonian captivity. It is therefore easy to trace a development from the DSIa text to our massoretic version, and consequently it seems to me to be highly probable that the DSIa text, which was also the text of the Greek translator, is the original one. We can find an additional support for our supposition in the fact that a Pi'el form of the root **הָרַס** can be found in the Hebrew Bible only in the massoretic reading of our verse.

The reading **מָהֵרָא בְּנֵיךָ מִמְהַרְסֵיךָ**, which holds out the promise that Jerusalem will be built more quickly than it was destroyed, *i.e.* in a miraculously short time, appears to account for the rabbinical expression voicing the wish that the Temple shall be built quickly (**מִהֲרָא**)⁸; the meaning of this wish is identical with the meaning of Isa. xlix,17 in DSIa, namely that the Temple shall be built suddenly, overnight. This notion was current in some Jewish circles even before the destruction of the Second Temple, and the opinion that the eschatological Temple will be built in three days seems to be reflected in Mark xiv,58.⁹ It is therefore possible that the notion that the Temple shall be built quickly (**מִהֲרָא**) is based upon the tradition reading Isa xlix,17 **מָהֵרָא בְּנֵיךָ מִמְהַרְסֵיךָ**. This would account for the use in the rabbinical saying of the word **מִהֲרָא**, the primary meaning of which is not "soon" but "quickly".

Additional Note: On the Epistle of Barnabas, see now also S. Lowy, *JJS.* 11 (1960), 1—33 (publ. Dec. 1961).

8. Cf. B.T. Sukk. 41a, Taan. 17b, Beṣ. 5b, R. Sh. 30a, Sanh. 22b, Bekh. 53b, Men. 68b.
9. See the preceding study.