

Gen 15:9–11 into an explicit offering including the sprinkling of blood (*Jub.* 14:11–12, 19) stresses the similarity of Abram's covenant with that of Noah (cf. *Jub.* 6:1–3, 11). Also the second conclusion between God and Abraham (*Jubilees* 15) shows these elements: a dating of the covenant and a mentioning of the festival (15:1) as well as an offering (15:2). This results in a comparable structure of *Jubilees* 14 and 15. This similarity is strengthened by the fact that in the description of the land (*Jub.* 14:7) the author integrates Gen 17:7–8 (the land identified by name; the eternal possession of it; the personal relationship between God and Abram and his progeny) in his use of Gen 15:7. However, the resemblance between *Jubilees* 14 and 15 draws attention to still another element.

In *Jubilees* 14, Abram demands for descendants, which is followed by the promise of descendants (14:1–6), and the promise of land (14:7). The integrated story of Ishmael's birth (14:21–24) is presented as a first answer to Abram's question in the beginning of the chapter. After the promise of descendants (15:6, 8) and land (15:10), in *Jubilees* 15 the announcement of Isaac's birth is made (15:15–22).⁴⁰ The parallel structure seems to point to the fact that Ishmael is of equal status of Isaac, but this is refuted more powerfully in *Jubilees* than in Genesis. *Jubilees* 15 stresses more than Genesis 17 the superiority of Isaac. It is not only said that God will conclude a covenant with Isaac alone (*Jub.* 15:18–22; cf. Gen 17:18–22), but also the multiple mention of Ishmael with regard to the circumcision of Abraham and his house (*Jub.* 15:23–24; cf. Gen 17:23–27) is pushed into the background. Moreover, in the halakhic addition, it is explicitly mentioned that God has not chosen Ishmael (*Jub.* 15:30: "For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham's children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people"). Therefore, the rewriting and interpretation of Genesis 15 and 16 by the author of *Jubilees* make clear how God's covenant with Abraham and the promises of land and progeny are fulfilled in the birth of Isaac.

⁴⁰ The commandment of circumcision (*Jub.* 15:11–14) has no parallel in *Jubilees* 14.

NEW JERUSALEM AT QUMRAN AND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ*

Among the Aramaic texts preserved at Qumran, the so-called "Description of the New Jerusalem," is attested to in fragmentary form in several copies found in caves 1 (1Q32), 2 (2Q24), 4 (4Q554, 554a, 555), 5 (5Q15) and 11 (11Q18).¹ In an article on this new Jerusalem text in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* that I wrote a few years ago I stated that: "The description of the city and the temple in the New Jerusalem is located midway between Ezekiel's description of the future Jerusalem and the Heavenly Jerusalem of the New Testament *Book of Revelation* 21–22."² The expression "located midway" is rather ambiguous and as such unimpeachable, but it is not very precise and can be interpreted in many different ways. The expression is true if it is understood chronologically (taking Ezekiel and Revelation as two temporal poles, *New Jerusalem* is somewhere in between, even if its precise date is not known); it is also true if it is understood spatially (the size of the city described in *New Jerusalem* is somewhere in between the city described in Ezekiel 40–48 and the gigantic Jerusalem of the book of Revelation); and it is even true when understood as referring to the recourse to the measuring angel,

* It is a pleasure to offer this small contribution to my colleague and friend of many years, Ed Noort. This text was written on the occasion of his 60th birthday, and has been rewritten and adapted on the occasion of his 65th.

¹ 1Q32 was published by J.T. Milik in *DJD* 1:134–135, pl. XXXI; 2Q24 by M. Baillet in *DJD* 3:84–89, pl. XVI; 5Q15 by J.T. Milik in *DJD* 3: 184–193, pls. XL–XLI and 11Q18 by F. García Martínez et al. in *DJD* 23:305–355, pls. XXXV–XL, LIII. 4Q554, 4Q554a and 4Q555 have not yet appeared in the final DJD edition. A preliminary edition is found in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden 2000), 2:1106–1113 (in what follows = DSSSE), in K. Bayer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen 2004), 2:129–139, and in D.W. Parry and E. Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. Part 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden 2005), 44–53 (edited and translated by E. Cook). They are also transcribed and translated in the monograph by L. DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts* (TSAJ 110; Tübingen 2005), 22–75.

² F. García Martínez, "New Jerusalem," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York 2000), 21609.

with its rod used to describe the dimensions of the city and its parts. However, the phrase I used in this article could also be misleading if it is understood as indicating a *continuum*, starting with Ezekiel 40–48 and ending with Revelation 21–22, of which the *New Jerusalem* from Qumran would be somewhere in the middle, bridging in this way the distance between the other two biblical texts. I do not think this is the case.

In the first article I wrote on the *New Jerusalem* text more than twenty years ago,³ I had already clearly indicated the different conceptual framework which informs the description we find in Revelation 20–21 of “the new Jerusalem, the holy city, coming down out of heaven from God, beautiful as a bride prepared to meet her husband,” the Jerusalem in which there is no temple, because God and the Lamb is the temple, and where there is no sun or moon, because the Lamb is the lamp which illuminate it with the glory of God. As well, the city described in the Aramaic *New Jerusalem* text from Qumran, is a city which has no name—at least in the preserved parts, as in Ezekiel, where the city is no longer called Jerusalem but “The Lord Is There”—, a city which is not heavenly but which represents a blueprint of the celestial model that will be restored in the messianic age.⁴

The unnamed city of the Qumran text, in my opinion at that time, was of a different sort to the new Jerusalem in the New Testament. I did not believe that a genetic relationship could be established between the *New Jerusalem* composition from Qumran and Revelation, nor that *New Jerusalem* could be used as background for the New Testament use of the metaphor of the heavenly Jerusalem of the New Testament.⁵ However, at that time, I was not able to place this conclusion within a larger hermeneutic framework that could account both for the similarities and for the differences between these two texts.

Now, twenty-two years later, I still believe that this is a correct assessment of the material recovered, but I think that I can now proceed further. The fact is that, after almost all the recovered manuscripts from the

³ To be precise it was 1986, in an article in Spanish in memory of Díez Macho, entitled “La ‘Nueva Jerusalén’ y el templo futuro en los Mss. de Qumrán,” in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum. Derash. Berit. En memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid 1986), 563–590, later translated into English and published as “The ‘New Jerusalem’ and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden 1992), 180–213. All the quotations are from this English translation.

⁴ García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem,’” 213.

⁵ García Martínez, “The ‘New Jerusalem,’” 186.

different caves from Qumran have been published,⁶ I can now place the conclusions drawn twenty years ago within a more general interpretative framework than was then possible. Now, after all the evidence has been published, we know that only a small part of the texts found at Qumran were written by the people living there, and that the great majority of the texts recovered have no elements which would allow us to consider them “Qumranic,” “Essene,” or something else entirely.⁷ They are instead, Jewish religious writings, which for the first time have given us access to the developments occurring within Judaism before the birth of Christianity.

Since the Dead Sea Scrolls explicitly present themselves as being based on the Hebrew Bible but are clearly different from it in a great many theological and legal respects, it is logical to consider these differences as witnesses to the evolution of the theological ideas and the legal norms reflected in the Hebrew Bible. This evolution took place within Judaism during a period of at least two centuries which elapsed between the writing of the latest book of the Hebrew Bible and the depositing of the manuscripts in the caves around Qumran.

Since the New Testament also presents itself as based on the Old Testament but is clearly different in many theological and legal respects from it, it is also logical to consider these differences as witness to the evolution and changes which took place in Judaism during the same period.

Since there is no proof of any direct relationship among the two corpora of writings (those from Qumran and the writings which form the New Testament), a genetic relationship among both corpora is not the most logical explanation of the similarities or of the differences that can be found among them. Therefore, I consider the relationship between these two corpora in terms of different phases of evolution that began from a commonly shared ground, the so-called “Hebrew Bible” or “Old Testament.”⁸

⁶ The publication of manuscripts from Cave 4 in the DJD Series, which will be edited by E. Puech, is expected in 2008. See now, *DJD* 37:91–152, pls. v–vii.

⁷ See an analysis of the evidence in F. García Martínez, “Qumrán, 60 ans après la découverte,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 15 (2007) 111–138.

⁸ This is the core of the project I have been working on in Louvain, which I presented in summary form in “De Dode-Zeerollen en het Nieuwe Testament,” in F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, eds., *Fragmenten uit de woestijn: De Dode-Zeerollen opnieuw bekeken* (Zoetermeer 2003), 111–131 and in “Emerging Christianity and Second Temple Judaism: A ‘Qumranic’ Perspective,” *RCatT* 29 (2004) 255–267. The ideas will be developed in more detail in the book of the Proceedings of the Expert Meeting held in Louvain on December 2007 on “Qumran and the New Testament,” forthcoming in the STDJ Series.

These developments (previously unknown to us) were numerous indeed, and the phases of growth out of the biblical texts complex and variegated. I hope that a quick and cursory look at the function of Jerusalem in the different eschatological scenarios represented both in the scrolls and in the New Testament will prove that this new hermeneutic framework is well-founded. In this presentation I will thus first look at the biblical starting point. I will then indicate the function (or the absence of function) of Jerusalem in New Testament eschatology, and will end with a summary of the function (or absence of function) of Jerusalem in Qumran eschatology. My conclusion will be that in pre-Christian Judaism as revealed by the Scrolls, the development of theological ideas that can be found in the New Testament had already taken place.

1. Ezekiel 40–48

Let us first look quickly at the basic text: the so-called Torah of Ezekiel: Ezekiel 40–48. Without going into technicalities, I think everybody agrees that what Ezekiel saw in the vision of the temple, the city and the land, is the blueprint, the plan, the heavenly model, which was to be realized at the moment of the restoration, when the glory of God returns to the temple He had previously abandoned.⁹ The biblical text is rather explicit. In Ezek 43:10–11 we read:

Now, you, O mortal, describe the Temple to the House of Israel, and let them measure its design. But let them be ashamed of their iniquities: When they are ashamed of what they have done, make known to them the plan of the Temple and its layout, its exits and entrances—its entire plan, and all the laws and instructions pertaining to the entire plan. Write it before their eyes, that they may faithfully follow its entire plan and all its laws.¹⁰

It is obvious that what Ezekiel is describing in these chapters is not a heavenly temple, a heavenly Jerusalem, and a heavenly land, but the heavenly layout of the new reality as it was to be established after the exile, much in the same way that in Exod 25:9 it is told: “Exactly as I show you—the pattern of the tabernacle and the pattern of all its

⁹ See the classical commentaries of W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel* (BKAT 13.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969); M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel* (AB 22A; New York 1997), or L.C. Allen, *Ezekiel* 20–48 (WBC 29; Dallas 1990). Even greater detail is to be found in the earlier work by H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezekiel (Kap. 40–48) traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 2; Tübingen 1957).

¹⁰ Translation from the JPS.

furnishings—so shall you make it,” (also in Exod 25:40; 26:30; 27:8; or in Num 8:4: “according to the pattern that the Lord had shown to Moses, so was the lampstand made”). This plan, pattern, model, blueprint, or whatever other translation we may give to the term *tabnīt* used by the Prophet, concerns the instructions for rebuilding the temple to which the glory of God will return (Ezek 40:1–43:12), the instructions for building the associated structures and activities of the temple complex (Ezek 43:13–47:12), and the guidelines for the settlement of the people around the temple, the setting apart of the *tērûmāh* or sacred reserve where the temple should be, and the city, with its measures and its ports (Ezek 47:13–48:35). It is equally obvious that the details and the terminology of this description of the temple, the city and the land are different from the biblical descriptions of the wilderness tabernacle, from the descriptions of Solomon’s temple, and from the Second Temple. The differences are so noticeable that according to rabbinic tradition Rabbi Hannaniah used three hundred barrels of oil during the nights he spent trying to resolve the contradictions of the book with the Torah in order to make the inclusion of the book within the Jewish canon possible.¹¹ It is completely obvious that the vision of Ezekiel, at least in the Hebrew text, has no eschatological overtones at all.¹² It is exclusively concerned with the restoration after the exile and its horizon is completely earthly and terrestrial. The land is the land of Israel, the city called “The Lord is there” is the city of the temple, that is, the reconstructed Jerusalem, and the temple is the earthly temple on which the Zadokite priests will offer their sacrifices.

2. The New Jerusalem of Revelation

If we now look at the new Jerusalem of Revelation, the transformation of the vision of Ezekiel is evident. The author of Revelation has taken from the vision of Ezekiel the measuring angel whose rod serves to precisely

¹¹ *b. Sanh.* 13b; *b. Hag.* 13a.

¹² In the older Hebrew text of Ezekiel that lies behind the Greek translation preserved on Papyrus 967 this could have been the case according to J. Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517–533, and this is certainly the case for the so-called *Pseudo-Ezekiel* texts found at Qumran, see F. García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; BETL 192; Louvain 2005), 163–176.

determine the dimensions of the city, the square form of the city, its wall, and its twelve gates with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. However, the author of Revelation has also borrowed from Isa 65:17–18:

For behold! I am creating a new heaven and a new earth, the former things shall not be remembered, they shall never come to mind. Be glad then and rejoice forever in what I am creating. For I shall create Jerusalem as a joy and her people as a delight.

He has also used the Christian interpretation of this new creation, where it is transferred completely to the eschaton, in order that the new Jerusalem would appear after the end, after the destruction of the world.

Within the New Testament, as is known, there are several different eschatological scenarios, with different approaches to the nature of Jerusalem and the temple. Jesus, for example, in the words of E.P. Sanders:

... was an eschatological prophet, a prophet who expected God himself to interrupt human history and create a new and better world, one in which Israel was redeemed and restored, and in which gentiles, too, would come to worship the God of Israel ... Jesus held fairly conventional views about Jerusalem and the Temple: he thought that they were central. He was, however, an eschatological prophet, and he expected that the Temple would be replaced in the coming kingdom of God.¹³

Paul's thought is more complex. In the same letter to the Galatians where we heard about Paul's visits to Jerusalem and about his collection of money for the church of Jerusalem, we also find (in Gal 4:24–26) the reference to "the present Jerusalem" and "the Jerusalem from above" in the allegory based on the story of Sarah and Hagar: "Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia; she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother," which seems to exclude any relevant function for the city in this eschatological thought.¹⁴ In Romans, Paul reasserts the traditional Jewish view of Jerusalem as the place where the tribes of Israel will gather and where the gentiles will come bearing gifts and worshipping the

¹³ E.P. Sanders, "Jerusalem and Its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1999), 90–103 at 93. Remember the temple "not made by human hands" in Mark 14:58.

¹⁴ The literature on the allegory of Hagar and Sarah is abundant. See the bibliographical references in G.H. van Kooten, "Hagar and Sarah as Antitypes of the Earthly and Heavenly City in Paul's Galatians," and A. Hogeterp, "Hagar and Paul's Covenant Thought," in *The Reception History of the Story of Hagar* (ed. G.H. van Kooten and J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten; Themes in Biblical Narrative 13; Leiden; forthcoming).

God of Israel, using the biblical prophecies which will be fulfilled when the Redeemer comes from Zion, as he says in Rom 11:26 (quoting Isa 59:20).¹⁵ This eschatological pilgrimage of Jews and Gentiles to Jerusalem is totally absent from Luke's work, which has Jerusalem as its centre—but only the historical Jerusalem, the place where Jesus died and from which Christianity expanded. Thus, an eschatological Jerusalem plays no role in the Christian hope for the future of Acts or of Luke.

In the eschatological scenario of Revelation 20–21 there is no place at all for an earthly Jerusalem.¹⁶ The new Jerusalem, the holy city coming out of heaven, is the bride of God, to which only the community of the faithful, of those whose names are inscribed in the book of the living kept by the Lamb had access. In fact, this new Jerusalem is a metaphor for the community of the elected, a symbolic expression of a life close to God who will be eternally present in it. This new Jerusalem, of course, has no temple and it has no other connection with the earthly Jerusalem than its name. It is a new reality, created "when the thousand years were over," after Satan's release and his final destruction, and after the opening of the book of the living and the judgement of all humans according to their deeds. The new Jerusalem metaphor of Revelation 20–21 represents such a deep transformation of its starting point (Ezekiel 40–48 and Isaiah 65), that it is difficult to understand how this can be considered a development of the basic Old Testament texts. We will now turn to the Dead Sea Scrolls to see if they help us to understand this development.

3. Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The presentation of the Qumran data has been greatly facilitated by an article by Schiffman which collected and duly classified most of the references to Jerusalem in the Scrolls.¹⁷ However, his classification did not take into account the character of the manuscripts. It is thus better to start with a more basic division: Jerusalem in the non-sectarian and in the sectarian documents.

¹⁵ See E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1983), 171–173.

¹⁶ See L. Pilchan, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of Its Background in Jewish Tradition* (WUNT 2.129; Tübingen 2001) and the bibliography quoted there.

¹⁷ L.H. Schiffman, "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (ed. M. Poorthuis and C. Safran; Kampen 1996), 73–88.

determine the dimensions of the city, the square form of the city, its wall, and its twelve gates with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. However, the author of Revelation has also borrowed from Isa 65:17–18:

For behold! I am creating a new heaven and a new earth, the former things shall not be remembered, they shall never come to mind. Be glad then and rejoice forever in what I am creating. For I shall create Jerusalem as a joy and her people as a delight.

He has also used the Christian interpretation of this new creation, where it is transferred completely to the eschaton, in order that the new Jerusalem would appear after the end, after the destruction of the world.

Within the New Testament, as is known, there are several different eschatological scenarios, with different approaches to the nature of Jerusalem and the temple. Jesus, for example, in the words of E.P. Sanders:

... was an eschatological prophet, a prophet who expected God himself to interrupt human history and create a new and better world, one in which Israel was redeemed and restored, and in which gentiles, too, would come to worship the God of Israel ... Jesus held fairly conventional views about Jerusalem and the Temple: he thought that they were central. He was, however, an eschatological prophet, and he expected that the Temple would be replaced in the coming kingdom of God.¹³

Paul's thought is more complex. In the same letter to the Galatians where we heard about Paul's visits to Jerusalem and about his collection of money for the church of Jerusalem, we also find (in Gal 4:24–26) the reference to "the present Jerusalem" and "the Jerusalem from above" in the allegory based on the story of Sarah and Hagar: "Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia; she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother," which seems to exclude any relevant function for the city in this eschatological thought.¹⁴ In Romans, Paul reasserts the traditional Jewish view of Jerusalem as the place where the tribes of Israel will gather and where the gentiles will come bearing gifts and worshipping the

¹³ E.P. Sanders, "Jerusalem and Its Temple in Early Christian Thought and Practice," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L.I. Levine, New York 1999), 90–103 at 93. Remember the temple "not made by human hands" in Mark 14:58.

¹⁴ The literature on the allegory of Hagar and Sarah is abundant. See the bibliographical references in G.H. van Kooten, "Hagar and Sarah as Antitypes of the Earthly and Heavenly City in Paul's Galatians," and A. Hogeterp, "Hagar and Paul's Covenant Thought," in *The Reception History of the Story of Hagar* (ed. G.H. van Kooten and J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten; Themes in Biblical Narrative 13; Leiden; forthcoming).

God of Israel, using the biblical prophecies which will be fulfilled: the Redeemer comes from Zion, as he says in Rom 11:26 (quoted in Rev 5:9:20).¹⁵ This eschatological pilgrimage of Jews and Gentiles to Jerusalem is totally absent from Luke's work, which has Jerusalem as its center, not only the historical Jerusalem, the place where Jesus died and from where Christianity expanded. Thus, an eschatological Jerusalem plays a role in the Christian hope for the future of Acts or of Luke.

In the eschatological scenario of Revelation 20–21 there is no place left all for an earthly Jerusalem.¹⁶ The new Jerusalem, the holy city coming out of heaven, is the bride of God, to which only the community of the faithful, of those whose names are inscribed in the book of the living which the Lamb had access. In fact, this new Jerusalem is a metaphor for the community of the elected, a symbolic expression of a life close to God who will be eternally present in it. This new Jerusalem, of course, is not the temple and it has no other connection with the earthly Jerusalem under its name. It is a new reality, created "when the thousand years were over" after Satan's release and his final destruction, and after the opening of the book of the living and the judgement of all humans according to their deeds. The new Jerusalem metaphor of Revelation 20–21 represents a deep transformation of its starting point (Ezekiel 40–48 and Isaiah 66) that it is difficult to understand how this can be considered a development of the basic Old Testament texts. We will now turn to the Dead Sea Scrolls to see if they help us to understand this development.

3. Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The presentation of the Qumran data has been greatly facilitated by an article by Schiffman which collected and duly classified most of the references to Jerusalem in the Scrolls.¹⁷ However, his classification does not take into account the character of the manuscripts. It is thus better to start with a more basic division: Jerusalem in the non-sectarian documents and the sectarian documents.

¹⁵ See E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia 1983), 118.

¹⁶ See L. Pilchan, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of Its Background in Jewish Tradition* (WUNT 2.129; Tübingen 2000) and the bibliography quoted there.

¹⁷ L.H. Schiffman, "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem: Historical Perspectives* (ed. M. Poorthuis and C. Safran; Kampen 1996), 73–88.

In the first category (non-sectarian documents) we find a simple linear continuation of the different literary compositions which deal with Jerusalem in the Hebrew Bible and which reflect the same concerns. We find laments over the destruction of Jerusalem as in 4Q179 (*4QLamentation*),¹⁸ which prolong the lament over the destruction of Jerusalem from the biblical Lamentations:

How solitary lies the large city Jerusalem, once full of people; the princess of all the nations has become desolate like an abandoned woman; all her daughters have been abandoned, like a woman without sons, like a distressed and abandoned woman. All her places and her squares are like a barren woman, and all her paths like an imprisoned woman, and her ... like a bitter woman. (4Q179 frg. 2 4-7)¹⁹

We also find a prolongation of the prophetic words of consolation after the destruction of Jerusalem in 4Q176 (*4QTanhumim*),²⁰ which links quotations from Isaiah 40-51 to reassure the downtrodden people, and announces that the reconstruction of Jerusalem is at hand and that Zion will be restored to its former glory.²¹ We also find a whole series of hymns to Zion that prolong the biblical poetry about or addressed to Jerusalem (from the Psalms, or Isaiah, to Tobit and Ben Sira), such as the *Apocryphal Psalm* 4Q380,²² or that contained in column IV of 4Q504,²³ or the beautiful *Apostrophe to Zion* contained in column XXII of 11QPsalms^a,²⁴ which begins: "I remember you, Zion, for blessing; with all my strength I have loved you. May your memory be blessed for ever! Great is your hope, O Zion; peace will come and the expectation of your salvation."²⁵

¹⁸ Published by J.M. Allegro in *Qumran Cave 4 (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford 1969), 75-77, pl. XXVI. See A. Berlin, "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature," in *Liturgical Perspectives* (ed. E.G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 48; Leiden 2003), 1-17.

¹⁹ Translation of DSSSE 1:371.

²⁰ Also published by J.M. Allegro in *DJD* 5:60-67, pls. XXII-XXIII.

²¹ See C.D. Stanley, "The Importance of 4QTanhumim (4Q176)," *RevQ* 15/60 (1992) 569-582.

²² Published by E. Schuller in E. Eshel et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts. Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford 1998), 75-85, pl. VIII.

²³ Published by M. Baillet, *Qumran Grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 137-168, pls. XLIX-LIII. This column corresponds to col. XV of the arrangement of the manuscript proposed by Puech in the review by Baillet in *RB* 95 (1988) 407-409, and generally adopted by other researchers. See D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden 1998), 59-94.

²⁴ Published by J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11* (DJD IV; Oxford 1965). Fragmentary remains of two other copies of the composition are found in 4Q88, cols. VII-VIII and 11Q6 frg. 6.

²⁵ DSSSE, 2:1177.

In the sectarian compositions, the image of Jerusalem is quite different. We have indeed a couple of texts which deal with Jerusalem from the perspective of the religious law (in Schiffman's classification), such as 4QMMT²⁶ (which mentions Jerusalem)²⁷ and the *Temple Scroll*²⁸ (where the name does not appear),²⁹ two texts which in my opinion belong to the formative period of the Qumran community. However, the most numerous references (found in the *pesharim*)³⁰ refer to the historical Jerusalem of the time of the authors, and this Jerusalem is thoroughly portrayed as ungodly. This Jerusalem is the seat of the illegitimate priesthood and of the wicked priests,³¹ it is the residence of "the scoffers"³² and of the "seekers of smooth things,"³³ it is the dwelling place of the gentiles, of "the lion of wrath"³⁴ and of the hated Hasmoneans who, as it is said in *4QTestimonia* 29-30, "they will shed blood like water upon the ramparts of the daughter of Zion and in the precincts of Jerusalem."³⁵ In short, Jerusalem is in the writings of the Qumran community, as the *Pesher Habakkuk* XII 7-9 put it when interpreting Hab 2:17: "the city is Jerusalem in which the Wicked Priest performed repulsive acts and defiled the Sanctuary of God."³⁶

No wonder that the community finally decided to separate itself from Jerusalem and from the temple in order to build in the desert "a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holiest for Aaron" (1QS VIII 5) or "a holy house for Aaron, in order to form a most holy

²⁶ Published by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma"se ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford 1994).

²⁷ And identifies it with the camp of holiness, MMT B 59-62 of the composite text.

²⁸ Published by Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-miqdash: The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem 1977).

²⁹ Neither in the copy edited by Yadin, (11Q19), nor in the copy 11Q20, published on DJD XXIII, 357-409, pls. XLI-XLVII, or in the small fragments from 4Q524, published in DJD XXIV, 85-114, pls. VII-VIII.

³⁰ Conveniently collected in volume 6B of The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation. Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (Tübingen 2002), and in D.W. Parry and E. Tov, eds., *Exegetical Texts (The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader 2; Leiden 2004)*.

³¹ According to the "Groningen Hypothesis," see A.S. van der Woude, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests: Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 33 (1982) 349-359.

³² 4Q162 II 6-7 and 10.

³³ 4Q163 frg. 23 II 10-11; 4Q169 frg. 3-4 I 2.

³⁴ 4Q169 frg. 3-4 I 4.

³⁵ DSSSE, 1:357.

³⁶ DSSSE, 1:21.

community, and a house of the Community for Israel, those who walk in perfection" (1QS IX 6), in the words of the *Serek ha Yahad*. The community clearly understood itself as a functional replacement of the temple, the residence of the divine presence, where atonement for the land was made, where sacrifices were replaced by prayer ("the offer of the lips"), and the freewill by offers of perfect behaviour.³⁷ The community of Qumran understood itself as a spiritual temple replacing the polluted temple, but it also understood itself as a new Jerusalem, replacing the polluted Jerusalem, since the *Serek* also applies the words of Isa 28:16 to the community: "This (the community) is the tested rampart, the precious cornerstone that does not/whose foundations do not/shake or tremble from their place" (1QS VIII 7–8). Nothing indicates, in this or related documents, that this substitution was thought a temporary solution, in the expectation of a return to Jerusalem and to the temple. In the *Rule of the Congregation of Israel in the last days* (1QSa) (as well as in the *Rule of Benedictions* [1QSB]) the regulations of purity for the temple are applied to the community (whatever it is), and when God begets the Messiah among them, the "liturgical" celebrations are not in the temple, but in their gathering for community meals, where the wine and the bread are blessed (1QSa II 4–12). In the expectations concerning the end of time in this and related documents there is no place for the historical Jerusalem, just as it does not figure in the expectation of the heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation.

However, we do have other texts from Qumran where Jerusalem and the temple play an important role in their eschatological programme. In 4Q177 (4QCatena A)³⁸ we can read in a fragmentary but clear eschatological context:

the just man will flee and God's great hand will be with them to rescue them from all the spirits of Belial ... those who fear God will sanctify his

³⁷ See the classic treatments of the topic by B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge 1965) and by G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 71 Göttingen 1971), and the more recent treatments by F. Schmidt, *La Pensée du Temple: De Jérusalem à Qoumrân* (La librairie du XX^e Siècle; Paris 1994) and by A. Hogeterp, *Paul and God's Temple: A Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence* (Biblical Tools and Studies 2; Louvain 2006).

³⁸ Published by J.M. Allegro in DJD 5:67–74, pls. XXIV–XXV, and now considered as part of an Eschatological Midrash together with 4Q174 (4QFlorilegium), see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde* (4QMidrEschat^{ab}) (STDJ 13; Leiden 1994).

name and enter Zion with joy, and Jerusalem ... Belial and all the men of his lot will be finished for ever and all the sons of light will be reunited. (4Q177 IV 14–16)³⁹

In this context we could also analyse the three temples of 4QFlorilegium,⁴⁰ a text which proves that at the end of times, *bē'ahārit hayāmīm*, God himself will create the new temple. We might also consider the single reference in column XXIX of the *Temple Scroll* that proves that the temple described in the Scroll is what I call "the normative temple," and that "on the day of creation/of the blessing"⁴¹ God himself will create a new temple. However, I would prefer to present briefly the text which led me (in the article referred to at the beginning) to identify the city and the temple described in *New Jerusalem* as the eschatological city and temple which God will establish at the end of days, the *Scroll of the War* or 1QMilḥama.⁴²

In this composition, which describes the eschatological battle between the sons of light and the armies of darkness, the battle starts "when the exiled sons of light return from the desert of the nations to camp in the desert of Jerusalem" (1QM I 3). There we find (twice! in col. XII and in col. XIX) a battle hymn of victory which shows that Jerusalem played an important role in eschatological expectations:

Get up, Hero, take your prisoners, Man of Glory, collect your spoil, Performer of Valiance! Place your hand on the neck of your enemies and your foot on the piles of slain! Strike the peoples, your foes, and may your sword consume guilty flesh! Fill your land with glory and your inheritance with blessing: may herds of flocks be in your fields, silver, gold, and precious stones in your palaces! Rejoice, Zion, passionately! Shine with jubilation, Jerusalem! Exult, all the cities of Judah! Open your gates continuously so that the wealth of nations can be brought to you! Their kings shall wait on you, all your oppressors lie prone before you, the dust of your feet they shall lick. Daughters of my nation, shout with jubilant voice! Adorn

³⁹ DSSSE 1:367.

⁴⁰ Published by J.M. Allegro in DJD V, 53–57, pls. XIX–XX. The text has been studied a great deal, but the book by G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTS 29; Sheffield 1985) remains fundamental.

⁴¹ The reading is disputed, Yadin reads *yom ha-berakhah* while Qimron prefers to read *yom ha-berī'a*, see E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva 1996).

⁴² Published by E.L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem 1955), 1–19, pls. 16–34, 47. For a recent presentation of the different manuscripts and a good bibliography, see J. Duhaime, *The War Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London 2004).

yourself with splendid finery! Rule over the kingdoms . . . and Israel to reign for ever. (1QM XII 10–16)⁴³

It is clear that this victory hymn places “the dream of the prophets which was sought for you” of the *Hymn to Zion* we quoted earlier, in the eschatological context of the final battle; and that Jerusalem and Zion are very much alive in this eschatological programme. However, what is even more important is that Jerusalem is the starting point of this phase of the battle: “And no young boy or any woman at all shall enter the camps when they leave Jerusalem to go to war, until they return” is said in 1QM VII 4, and in III 10–11 we also read: “And on the trumpets of the path of return from the battle with the enemy, to go back to the congregation of Jerusalem, they shall write ‘Exultations of God in a peaceful return.’” In this Jerusalem the sons of light fully participate in the temple cult:

They shall arrange the chiefs of the priests behind the High Priest and of his second, twelve chiefs to serve in perpetuity before God . . . The chiefs of the tribes, and after them the fathers of the congregation, shall take their positions in the gates of the sanctuary in perpetuity. And the chiefs of the divisions with their enlisted shall take their positions in their feast, their new moons, the sabbaths and all the days of the year—those of fifty years and upwards. These shall take their positions at the holocaust and the sacrifices, in order to prepare the pleasant incense for God’s approval, to atone for all his congregation and to satisfy themselves in perpetuity before him at the table of glory. (1QM II 1–5)⁴⁴

The sons of light, after having camped in the desert around Jerusalem at the beginning of the final battle, are installed in Jerusalem, participate in the cult of the temple, and from there conduct the war until the final victory. The retreat to the desert of the nations, was thus temporary, as was the abandonment of the temple—only until the time they could reintroduce the cult in accordance with their own particular conception.

This seems to be the logical perspective from which to read the description of the city and of the temple of the *New Jerusalem* text. It is a revelation of the model of the temple and the city that God will build at the end of times. This interpretation is confirmed by the fragmentary reference we find in a copy from Cave 4 (in 4Q554 frg. 2 III 16) to the final war against Kittim, Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Babel.⁴⁵ The

⁴³ DSSSE, 1:133.

⁴⁴ DSSSE, 1:115.

⁴⁵ For this text, see the preliminary edition of DSSSE, 2:1106–1113, the transcription by DiTomasso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 62–67, and now DJD 37:136–138.

Old Testament model (the Torah of Ezekiel 40–48) has been thoroughly eschatologized and developed into the *New Jerusalem* along the same lines that we find in other apocalyptic writings (such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*). The plans for the city and the temple of the *New Jerusalem* text represent a city of gigantic dimensions, covered with precious stones, a city that will be built by God at the end of days: not a heavenly Jerusalem, but the very earthly city and the very earthly temple described in the *War Scroll*, and destined to endure forever.

4. Conclusions

After this brief panorama, I think we can conclude that the conceptual framework for the function of Jerusalem in the *War Scroll* and in the *New Jerusalem* text is closer to the function that Jerusalem plays in the eschatological thought of Jesus and Paul than to the heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation 20–21, where there is no temple and which is a metaphor for the eternal life of the community of saints and God. However, we can also conclude that an eschatological model in which the earthly Jerusalem plays no role, as is the case of Revelation 20–21, was already developed in pre-Christian Judaism within a Jewish community that lived in the desert, a community that believed itself to be a substitute for the Jerusalem temple, that God and the angels were in its midst, and that its liturgy could associate the community with the angelic liturgy of the heavenly temple. It did not need Jerusalem, either in the present, or in the eschatological scenario.