Stefan Beyerle

Temples and Sanctuaries within Their Apocalyptic Setting

Abstract: References to cult and sacrifices in Jewish apocalyptic literature from Hellenistic-Roman times are rather meager. This is also true with regards to places, better say the place, that may function as a dedicated site for those sacrifices: the temple. Temple imagery is clearly attested in Jewish apocalyptic traditions, but its role can at best be described as ambiguous. While sources from the "real-life" sphere, like the coins of the Bar Kokhba revolt—whose leader obviously was a figure within a messianic-apocalyptic setting—refer explicitly to the Jerusalem Temple, the earlier apocalyptic writings like the Book of the Watchers, the Apocalypse of Weeks or the Animal Apocalypse tend to turn the temple, or temples and sanctuaries, into metaphors—like "Heaven," "Adam" or "God"—and to adopt a more or less hesitant attitude towards cult and locations for cult. In my opinion, the reason for this opaque treatment of the temple or temples is that apocalypticism integrates those places for worship into its "cosmic" worldview.

Keywords: Temple; Apocalypticism; Dead Sea Scrolls; 1 Enoch; Sanctuaries in the Second Temple Era

1 Temples and sanctuaries in the Second Temple Period

In general, the study of temples and sanctuaries embraces different topics and contexts: architecture, material remains, ritual implications, literary descriptions or religious and cultural environments. With regard to the temple sphere, several rival temples existed besides, or against, the one in Jerusalem in Hellenistic times and earlier in the Persian period. Generally speaking, the archaeological evidence of those rival temples and of archaeological findings from the Jerusalem Temple is rather meager. Consequently, if we speak of sanctuaries other than the Jerusalem Temple, the attribute "rival" stems only from ideologically biased literary sources, especially from the Bible, and should be chal-

DOI 10.1515/9783110467406-005

lenged.[1] While the so-called "Temple of Onias" in Egyptian Leontopolis/Heliopolis is only preserved literarily (see Josephus, *B.J.* 1.33; 7.426-436; *A.J.* 12.388; 13.62-73, 285; 20.236),[2] the temples or sanctuaries on Mount Gerizim and at Elephantine are good cases in point, as they illustrate how archaeological remains were interpreted in combination with data stemming from canonical and non-canonical Jewish literature. Thus, in a way, the material evidence was understood and interpreted by "reading" the archaeological material against the background of evidence of Second Temple Jewish literature.

Yitzhak Magen, who has collected new finds from Mount Gerizim during his excavations since the early 1980s, unearthed a sacred precinct. He also identified a Samaritan temple from Persian (5th century BCE) and Hellenistic times. In Magen's opinion the temple was modeled after the Jerusalem Temple (cf. *A.J.* 11.310-311; *B.J.* 1.63) and is reminiscent of both Ezekiel's temple (cf. Ezek 40-48) and also the inaugurated future temple in the Temple Scroll (11QT). This Samaritan temple was already installed around 450 BCE, modified and enlarged in the early Hellenistic period, and destroyed under John Hyrcanus in the latter third of the second century BCE.[3] Furthermore, Ephraim Stern and Yitzhak Magen uncovered three limestone capitals at the site, in "proto-Aeolic" or "proto-Ionic" style of Phoenician provenance. They interpreted these as stemming from the foreign people, whom Assyrian kings had brought to Shechem and Samaria to replace the exiled Israelites (cf. 2 Kgs 17:24)—as early as the seventh century

1 For the textual evidence of "rival temples" in Leontopolis, on Mount Gerizim and on the island of Elephantine cf. Frey, Temple and Rival Temple, 171-198.

2 Cf. Frey, Temple and Rival Temple, 186-188. Cf. also Bohak, *CPJ III, 520*, 32-41, who adds a Jewish papyrus to the textual evidence.

3 Cf. Magen, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume I, 1-10; idem, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II, 97-180 (esp. 113-114, 141-162); idem, Gerizim, Mount, 487; idem, Gerizim, Mount (Update), 1746-1748; Regev, The Hasmoneans, 70-71. For the destruction of the temple at Mount Gerizim two possible dates are discussed: 128 or 112/111 BCE. The only source for the destruction under John Hyrcanus is Josephus (*A.J.* 13.254-257; *B.J.* 1.62-63), and the texts do not include clear references to the historical time of destruction. Cf. the discussion in Kartveit, The Origin of the Samaritans, 100-103, and Zsengellér, Gerizim as Israel, 164-165, who discusses 128, 112/111, and 107 BCE. as possible dates as they relate to the destruction of different places around Mount Gerizim: the temple, the city of Samaria, and Shechem. Beyond those assumptions, Magen, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume I, 12-13; idem, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II, 170-171, 178, prefers a date for the destruction around 111/110 BCE, due to the numismatic evidence. In general, the question remains whether Mount Gerizim was destroyed in the early days of John Hyrcanus or later.

BCE.[4] Finally, Magen and other modern interpreters of the archaeological evidence emphasize that the inscriptions, found within the compound of the "Samaritan temple," attest to the self-designation of the temple as "House of YHWH."[5] In sum, textual and archaeological insights create a picture of a monotheistic YHWH religion that included syncretistic influences and formed a rival cult at the temple on Mount Gerizim. Methodologically speaking, this view to the Samaritan temple and cult not only combines literary history and the history of material remains, but tends to confirm the biased anti-Samaritan traditions of the Hebrew Bible and, to some extent, also of Josephus' work.[6] Nevertheless especially the historiographer Josephus has marked historical reconstructions of the "origins of the Samaritans" for some time.[7]

A critical assessment should consider the following aspects: First of all, archaeologically speaking, there is only meager evidence for a *temple* on the site of Mount Gerizim and none at all for "a temple modeled after the Jerusalem Temple." Even Yitzhak Magen has to admit in his excavation report:

> The sacred precinct at Mt. Gerizim, including its courts and auxiliary structures, was destroyed during the construction of the Byzantine church. Numerous soundings conducted at the precinct revealed no remains from the temple and surrounding structures. The only remains, discovered at the edge of the precinct that was unaffected by Byzantine construction, were mainly from the Persian period, as the Hellenistic stratum was completely razed. [...] Due to the major damage caused by the Byzantines when constructing the Church of Mary Theotokos (Mother of God) at the center of the sacred precinct, we cannot present a plan of the Samaritan temple at Mt. Gerizim. The Byzantine builders completely razed the remains of the temple and the encompassing structures. [...] nothing remains of the two temples except for a row of large stones known as the "Twelve Stones," sacred to

4 Cf. STERN and MAGEN, Archaeological Evidence, 49-56; MAGEN, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II, 152-153.

5 Cf. STERN and MAGEN, Archaeological Evidence, 56. For further references see MAGEN, Gerizim, Mount (Update), 1747-1748; IDEM, The Dating of the First Phase, 166-168. Cf. esp. MAGEN, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II, 155, Fig. 275; and also IDEM, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume I, 254-255, no. 383. For the inscriptions from Mount Gerizim in general and, especially, the question of "YHWH religion" as reflected therein, see DUŠEK, Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions, esp. 3-4, 83-85 (cf. also BECKING, Do the Earliest Samaritan Inscriptions, 111-116).

6 For an overview of the remarks on "Samaria" and the "Samaritans" by Josephus see the translations in ZANGENBERG, ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΑ, 44-91. Cf. especially *A.J.* 11.302-312, 321-325 and the comments in MAGEN, The Dating of the First Phase, 190-193.

7 For a history of scholarship cf. HJELM, The Samaritans and Early Judaism, 13-75; EADEM, What Do Samaritans and Jews, 13-30.

> the Samaritans to this day, and meager nearby foundations, apparently belonging to the Hellenistic-period temple.[8]

To the best of our knowledge, only a sacred precinct or sanctuary can be identified.[9] Furthermore, the Samaritan sanctuary was, as attested in the inscriptions, a YHWH sanctuary—whatever this means—but not a "rival temple." At the most, we could call the "Samaritan temple" a sanctuary dedicated to the god YHWH, as it is also known from several other places in Egypt (e.g., at Elephantine: see below) and the Levant since the ninth century BCE.[10] Additionally and more importantly, the question of what kind of religious ideas or attitudes were represented in this sanctuary from Persian until Hellenistic times cannot be answered by simply mixing archaeological data with information from literary sources.

From the example of the so-called temple of the Samaritans we can learn that not only do modern studies tend to accept and use ideological biases for their historical approaches, but also that already in ancient literary sources religious elements were used differently in comparison with archaeological settings. This also holds true for the "Yahô temple" at Elephantine. The island of Elephantine or Jeb, located at the first cataract of the river Nile near Assuan, had made the southern boundary of the Persian Empire since Cambyses' conquest of Egypt (525 BCE). People who called themselves "Yehudites" and "Arameans" in the Aramaic Elephantine papyri and inscriptions stemming from the fifth century BCE show several coincidences with Yahwism from Persian times and later Judaism(s): the observance of the Sabbath, the god Yahô or "god/lord of heaven(s)," Mazzot (or Passover), theophoric names with the ending "-yah," and: a temple dedicated to Yahô. Yet, despite such shared characteristics, we remain unable to sufficiently describe the religious identity of these groups.[11] Firstly, regarding the chronology, the label "Jews" or "Jewish" seems

8 MAGEN, Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II, 141, 151-152. For further critical assumptions concerning the very existence of a temple at Mount Gerizim cf. ibid., 163, n. 22.

9 Cf. the critical remarks in ZANGENBERG, The Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, 404-414. See also SCHORCH, The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity, 139-140, and a very critical appraisal in ZSENGELLÉR, Gerizim as Israel, 150-151, based on the older scholarly discussion.

10 Cf., e.g., BECKING, Do the Earliest Samaritan Inscriptions, 116-117, and SCHORCH, The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity, 135-148, who distinguishes "Samarian," as pointing to a YHWH religion until the Persian era, from "Samaritan" that signifies the religious schism with other "Jewish religion(s)," dating not earlier than the second century BCE.

11 Cf. BECKING, Yehudite Identity in Elephantine, 130-142. Other scholars, like GERSTENBERGER, Israel in der Perserzeit, 105-115, are more optimistic in calling the group "Jewish."

to be an anachronism, since, as Shaye Cohen has shown, a religious Jewish identity dates no earlier than the third century BCE.[12] Secondly, and in view of religious contents, one may question which kind of "Jewishness" should be labeled as common, whether the canonized form from the Hebrew Bible and the Pseudepigrapha or another "Jewishness," tempered with life experience, such as the one attested, among others, in the remains from the island of Elephantine.[13] Only on the basis of those requirements is it possible to attribute common features of a "Jewish" identity to the temples in Egypt and Jerusalem. In the end, these sanctuaries, such as the one from Mount Gerizim, were testimonies of very different kinds of "Jewishness."[14] Even the "Jewish temple" in Jeb left only very meager archaeological traces.[15] Beyond archaeological remains, textual evidence, stemming from the Aramaic papyri, records the ambition to reconstruct the temple of Yahô that was once, in the 14th regnal year of King Darius II (410 BCE), destroyed by the Egyptian "Chnum priests." The request for a letter of recommendation that dates back to 407 BCE was transmitted in two drafts from the "Jedaniah archive" (TAD A4.7 and TAD A4.8)[16]; it was part of a tradition that a "inner-group" initiated as an independent *traditio*, which was based on the destroyed first temple.[17] As with the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, the temple of Yahô at Jeb should be interpreted and understood as within an autonomous religious context. Its references are connected primarily with the Yehudites and Arameans at Elephantine. The relationship to the Jerusalem Temple and "biblical" concepts of "Jewishness" is secondary. In the end, "biblical" Judaism was only one of many Judaisms in the Second Temple period; this is evident from

12 Cf. COHEN, The Beginnings of Jewishness, passim.

13 KRATZ, Der Zweite Tempel, 60, correctly states: "Doch das ägyptische Judentum dürfte dem historischen Israel der vor- wie der nachexilischen Zeit in Palästina sehr viel näher gestanden haben als das biblische. Nicht Elephantine, sondern die Bibel ist die Ausnahme."

14 For a comparison of the temples in Elephantine and Jerusalem in Persian times cf. KRATZ, Der Zweite Tempel, 65-78. For the differences within Jewish identities see also KNAUF, Elephantine, 233-240.

15 For a very optimistic view cf. ROSENBERG, The Jewish Temple, 4-12. For a more detailed and accurate description cf. KRATZ, Der Zweite Tempel, 61-63.

16 For an English translation with short introduction and commentaries cf. PORTEN, The Elephantine Papyri in English, 139-147: B19 and B20.

17 For the tradition-historical process within the Elephantine papyri cf. GRANERØD, The Former and the Future Temple, 67-76.

the Judaisms of the Samaritans, the Enoch-oriented traditions and the groups that are considered in the sectarian texts from the Dead Sea.[18]

To sum up, the temples or sanctuaries at Samaria and on the island of Elephantine are the focus of different types of "Yahwisms" or "Jewish identities." They conceptualized their specific identities within a large degree of operational autonomy. The most important prerequisite for achieving this goal was an autonomous religiousness, which was transmitted independently and derived from archaeological and literary remains.

2 The ideology of Temple in Hellenistic Judaism(s)

Apocalypses and apocalypticism came to the fore in the Hellenistic-Roman period, an era when the temple, especially the Second Temple at Jerusalem, was in focus. Our knowledge of details from the Hasmonean and Herodian temple(s) and sanctuaries primarily derives from literary sources, as Josephus or the Maccabean traditions. On the one hand, the Jerusalem Temple serves as an important focus of Jewish identity in the main land and, to some extent, also among Diaspora Jews in the Cyrenaica and in Alexandria. On the other hand, we also must keep in mind a general opposition against the Jerusalem Temple, especially in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Psalms of Solomon.[19]

The temple critique in these documents is vital. The critical evaluation of the Jerusalem Temple reflects a perspective on the central sanctuary since Josiah's reform in the late seventh century BCE and is evident in texts such as Haggai and Isa 66:1-2. Recent scholarship has identified this antipathy toward the existing temple as a major identity marker of the Dead Sea sect and other "sectarian Jewish" groups in the literature from the Dead Sea. Many scholars correctly emphasize that the "temple" concepts in the Dead Sea Scrolls evoke a wide range of associations which reflect such a diverse background that they could

18 Cf., e.g., KRATZ, Historisches und biblisches Israel, 181-291. In recent times, Daniel Boyarin, opines that it is no less than consequent to avoid all references to attributes like "Jewish" or "Jewishness:" cf. his seminal work in BOYARIN, Border lines, passim.

19 Cf. REGEV, The Hasmoneans, 58-102, who emphasizes that the importance of the Jerusalem Temple has increased rather gradually, from the Persian into the Hellenistic period. Furthermore, Regev lays a special focus on the Hasmonean ruler ideology and its influence on the Temple in Jerusalem.

not belong to a singular critical assessment of the Jerusalem Temple. This is even more the case since many manuscripts from the Dead Sea reflect different religious and social backgrounds of Jewish groups that were part in this critical struggle against the temple. Nevertheless, many scholars still agree that the diversity of new temple concepts within the Dead Sea Scrolls generally grew out of a common withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple and its festivals, also from the priestly calendar or from sacrificial rituals in Hellenistic-Roman times.[20]

2.1 Temple and temples in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Even on the basis of texts from the eleven caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran, it is apparent that the so-called sectarian sources, like the Damascus Document or the Rule of the Community, clearly refer to different groups. It goes without saying that not all of them could have stayed at the location called Qumran. Most scholars refer to the different textual forms and copies or editions of both, Damascus Document and the Serekh ha-Yaḥad, or hint at different concepts of community in the various editions, which are indicated in the terminology for the communities: The Damascus Document includes different terms like: *maḥ^{a}næh*, [*særæk*] *hārabbîm* or *'edāh*, while the Serekh prefers: *yaḥad*.[21] What is more, while the Damascus Document is critical of the Jerusalem Temple (cf. CD iv 17-18; v 6-7; vi 13-14), the Serekh ha-Yaḥad speaks of the community as—a renewed—"temple" (cf. 1QS viii 4-10).[22] The passages that include a certain "temple attitude" of the groups are the following:

> (CD vi 11-14 [4Q266 3 ii 17-19]) 11 [...] And everyone who was brought into the covenant 12 not to enter the Temple (Hebr. *hmqdš*) to light his altar in vain. They are lockers[23] 13 of the door of whom God said: "Who of you will close my door? And you will not light my altar in vain.

20 Cf., e.g., SCHIFFMAN, Community Without Temple, 267-272, as an example of the older classical view of one sectarian community that should be associated with the sectarian texts (esp. the Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community). For a more recent approach cf. WASSÉN, Visions of the Temple, 41-43, 59, and, with regard to the Temple Scroll, PAGANINI, Von Ezechiel zur Tempelrolle, 405-419.

21 Cf. 1QS i 1 (cf. 4Q255 i 1); iii 11-12 (cf. 4Q255 2 9); xi 8; vi 24-vii 25; viii 11 resp. CD vii 6; x 23; xiv 12 or i 1; ii 1; iii 9; vii 20; viii 13; x 4-5, 8; xiii 11, 13; xiv 10; xv 17; xix 26; xx 2-3.

22 Cf. COLLINS, Beyond the Qumran Community, 59-60, 149-150; IDEM, Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 156.

23 4Q266 3 ii 18 reads the singular of the participle: cf. BAUMGARTEN, Qumran Cave 4, 41-42.

In the allusion to Mal 1:10 at the end of the passage, CD vi refers to the people of the covenant (cf., e.g., CD ii 2; iii 10; viii 1, 21; xii 11; xix 16, 33). The accusation in Mal 1:6-10 criticizes the priest's ignorance of offerings appropriate to YHWH.[24] The quotation in the Damascus Document differs from the prophetic text. But both texts have in common that they start with a rhetorical question, which leads to an avoidance of inappropriate sacrifices. In CD vi, the question arises whether the place of the inaugurated temple is in the vicinity of the "people of the covenant" or group, or is the Jerusalem Temple at Zion. The problem can only be solved by discerning the relationship between the Serekh and the Damascus Document in general, in view of their different editions.[25] Even if one agrees with the majority of scholars by viewing the ordinances of the Damascus Document as the older ones, the quoted passage in CD vi nevertheless remains ambiguous.[26] Although the Jerusalem Temple is probably in view, the question remains as to whether the qualification "vain" (Hebr. *ḥnm*) points to the "people of the covenant" as generally refraining from the cult or only criticizing improper cultic activities at the Jerusalem Temple.[27] If the latter interpretation is appropriate, the passage from the Serekh ha-Yaḥad is more radical:

> (1QS viii 4-7 [4Q259 ii 13-16]): 4 [...] When these are in Israel, 5 the established council of the *Yaḥad* in truth, an eternal plant (Hebr. *lmṭʿt ʿwlm*),[28] the house of holiness for Israel, and an assembly, most 6 holy, for Aaron. Witnesses of truth for judgment and chosen ones of the [divine] favor to atone for the earth and to requite 7 the wicked ones their recompense.

The text calls the "established council of the *Yaḥad*" an "eternal plant" (cf. 1QS xi 8; 1QH xiv 18; xvi 7; 4QInstruction: 4Q418 81+81a 13), the "house of holiness"

---

24 Cf. also Nogalski, The Book of the Twelve, 1021.

25 Cf. the discussion and excellent overview of scholarly arguments in Kapfer, The Relationship, 152-164.

26 For those scholars who assume that CD is older than the Community Rule cf. Collins, Sectarian Communities, 156.

27 Cf. Collins, Jerusalem and the Temple, 165; Kapfer, The Relationship, 165-167, both of which prefer the latter interpretation (Kapfer, op. cit., 167 [italics in the text]): "The community of the Damascus Document did not reject the temple and its cult *ipso facto*, as evidenced by these passages. Because the fulfillment of the law obligates Jews to have some connection to the temple, the community of the Damascus Document did not initially break with the temple over their objections to the inappropriate practices that defiled it."

28 The reading *lm]špṭ ʿwlm* in 4Q259 ii 14 is ridiculous and obviously a misreading: cf. Alexander and Vermes, Qumran Cave 4, 139, 141, 143.

(cf. 1QS ix 6; 4Q176 16 3) and the "most holy assembly."[29] While the latter expressions relate to the temple, the idea of atonement refers to the functional aspect of sacrifices in the temple. The Serekh ha-Yaḥad does not even mention the Jerusalem Temple. Indeed, this is consistent with the identification of the community with the temple.[30] "Thus, in great contrast to the Damascus Document, the Community Rule assumes no relationship with the temple and the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem."[31] In other words, while the Damascus Document criticizes—and in the end rejects—the Jerusalem Temple, the Rule of the Community ignores the central sanctuary in order to replace it with the community itself.[32]

Therefore, the question arises: Was there a certain *place* for the community where the common life of the people was conceptualized as a "sanctuary" or a "temple?" By answering this question, the vast majority of scholars point out that the archaeological site next to the caves, Khirbet Qumran, is the best candidate for such a place. But, in the recent discussions, the identification of the community with the so-called "Qumranites" is a matter of dispute.[33] Consequently, the noticeable lack of any sacrificial remains at the archaeological site at Khirbet Qumran cannot be used as an argument to identify the place of the community. Thus, and beyond every speculation, the replacement of the Jerusalem Temple by the community in the Serekh ha-Yaḥad says more about the textually designed worldview than about the community's real-life setting.

2.2 Temple and temples in "Enochic Judaism"

Before getting to the heart of the matter, I would like to stress two preliminary points. First of all, "Enochic Judaism" should not be misunderstood in terms of

29 On the very frequently attested expression *qwdš qwdšym* cf. 1QS ix 9; x 4; 1QSb iv 28; 4Q502 6-10 13; 97 3-4; 4Q503 15-16 2-5; 23 1, and, especially, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: 4Q403 1 i 41, 44; 1 ii 1, 7-8, 27; 4Q405 14-15 i 2, 4, 7, or the Temple Scroll: 11Q19 xxxv 1, 9.

30 Cf. Kapfer, The Relationship, 169-170, and Wassén, Visions of the Temple, 50-51, who stresses the metaphorical implications of the used expressions in 1QS viii 4-10.

31 Kapfer, The Relationship, 171.

32 E.g., Kim, The Jerusalem Tradition, 48-53, among others, underestimates, if not lacks, this split between different attitudes towards the temple in the Dead Sea Scrolls. An alternative way of replacing the Jerusalem Temple could have been the role and function of institutionalized prayers; but see the rather skeptical discussion in Falk, Qumran Prayer Texts, 113-126.

33 Cf. the discussion of arguments in Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 166-208; Beyerle, Qumran und die Apokalyptik, 164-177.

an "Enochic" socio-religious circle, as Gabriele Boccaccini and others have suggested.[34] Contrary to their hypothesis, the following assertions only refer to "Enochic Judaism" as a literary phenomenon, with a special focus on the early Enochic literature. Second, if the term "Enochic Judaism" has in mind the scriptures, as they pertain to Enoch as an antediluvian righteous figure (cf. Gen 5:21–24), the early Enochic compositions in the Aramaic textual provenance, as they were also part of the scrolls from the Dead Sea, probably formed a religious worldview that was to some extent compatible with worldviews of the sectarian sources, as examined above. In other words, it seems possible to highlight the community's temple ideology further if one takes into consideration those apocalypses that were later assembled as 1 Enoch.

The composite text of 1 Enoch consists of five parts: The Book of the Watchers (1 En. 1-36), the Book of Similitudes (1 En. 37-71), the Astronomical Book (1 En. 72-82), the Book of Dreams (1 En. 83-90) and the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 91-108). Aramaic fragments from cave four near Khirbet Qumran, which date to the Hasmonean and Herodian times, contain passages from all books, except the Book of Similitudes, the most recent part of the composition, dating to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning first century CE. The oldest sections in the composition, which date from the late third or beginning second century BCE, include passages from the Book of the Watchers and the Astronomical Book. Furthermore, the Book of Dreams and the Epistle comprise sub-sections that once existed as independent text units: the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85-90) and the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1-10; 91:11-17).[35]

Nearly all the books and sections within 1 Enoch allude to temples, sanctuaries and sacrifices. Some allusions are rather obvious. Other traditions tend to build metaphorical speeches or, simply include ideas and expressions, which are very well known from texts of a cultic setting. For example, the Astronomical Book in general avoids explicit allusions to the temple and touches religious motifs relevant to the cult and temple by referring to questions of the calendar. What is more interesting, the chapter about the twelve winds and their gates (1 En. 76:1-14) not only represents a clearly segmented cosmology that recalls the

34 Cf., e.g., BOCCACCINI, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, passim; JACKSON, Enochic Judaism, passim. For a critical examination of the hypothesis cf., e.g., COLLINS, Enochic Judaism, 291-299.

35 Cf. the introductions and overviews to the Enoch material in COLLINS, Enoch, Ethiopic Apocalypse, 585; STOKES, Watchers, Book, 1332-1334; KNIBB, Enoch, Similitudes, 585-587; VANDERKAM, Enoch, Astronomical Book, 581-583; ASSEFA, Dreams, Book, 552-553; STUCKENBRUCK, Enoch, Epistle, 583-585.

segmentation in sanctuaries from the Ancient Near East but also includes motifs of prosperous life under the "garden-temple" typology (1 En. 76:7-8):[36]

> 7 Following these the winds toward the south emerge through three gates. First, through the first gate that inclines toward the east a hot wind emerges. 8 Through the middle gate next to it there emerge [*sic*!] a fragrant aroma, dew rain prosperity, and life.

From texts like in Ezek 47 or the New Jerusalem fragments among the Dead Sea Scrolls we learn that water and moisture, as factors that cause nature to flourish, correspond with the paraphernalia of sanctuaries. Ancient Near Eastern iconography had already combined motifs from the architecture of paradisiacal gardens and temples.[37]

However, other parts of 1 Enoch conceptualized temple geography and temple references in a much more elaborated way. Especially those apocalypses, which review Israelite history, remind the reader of the Jerusalem Temple and also the post-exilic sanctuary on Mount Zion. What is more, some compositions either allude to a future temple or inaugurate a heavenly sanctuary. For example, the temple in the heavens is an ingredient in apocalypses with an otherworldly journey, as in the Book of the Watchers. If we consider those findings in 1 Enoch, which explicitly mention a certain temple, then we have to take into account the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Book of the Watchers. While the Animal Apocalypse harshly criticizes the polluted cult and the absence of the Lord in the post-exilic Temple (1 En. 89:72-74), the Apocalypse of Weeks generally ignores the existence of a Second Temple. Only the Temple of Solomon is mentioned (1 En. 93:7) together with an eschatological sanctuary (1 En. 91:13).[38] It can be provisionally concluded that these apocalypses of the Enoch tradition correspond with the sectarian attitudes toward the Jerusalem Temple in many respects. Firstly, both either only partly recognize or completely ignore the sanctuary at Mount Zion. Secondly, the distinct critical position towards the Jerusalem Temple is either explicit or focuses on the replacement of the Second Temple—in a community or an eschatological temple. These different ways of dealing with the temple possibly stem from the author's

36 Translation: NICKELSBURG and VANDERKAM, 1 Enoch 2, 468. For the interpretation see ibid., 474–477, and on the motif of "dew" see JUHÁS, Dew in the Enochic Literature, 360-366.

37 Cf. DIETRICH, Das biblische Paradies, 281-320. See also EGO, Die Wasser der Gottesstadt, 361-385, and COLLINS, Jerusalem and the Temple, 172-173.

38 Cf. BEYERLE, The Imagined World, 382-383.

dissatisfaction with the reinstitution of the Jerusalem Temple cult in the time of the Maccabean crisis.[39]

Analysis of the traditions and the inventory of motifs discloses three different types of temple concepts: firstly, a replacement of the temple by a certain vision of an eschatological communion, as in the literary traditions from the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf. 1QS viii; Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice); secondly, the conceptualization of a heavenly sanctuary, as in the Book of the Watchers (cf. 1 En. 14) and in the Apocalypse of Weeks (cf. 1 En. 91:13); and thirdly, the complete silence over what occurs in the cult at the end of the days, as in the Book of Daniel, the Animal Apocalypse and the Book of Revelation (cf. Rev 21 [esp. 21:3]). In spite of all differences, there are intimate connections between these three concepts: the replacement of the temple by the community, ignorance of end-time sanctuaries, and the heavenly future sanctuary.[40] E.g., the Dead Sea Scrolls combine the communal aspect with the placement of the joyful communion in "Heaven" (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice),[41] in which they separate the "heavenly" sanctuary from an earthly temple: i.e., the physical temple at Jerusalem and, perhaps, the "Miqdash of Adam" (cf. 4Q174 1 i 6).[42] It is beyond any doubt that "Heaven" is also the place for the grace-filled encounter with God, whether the heavenly realm includes a temple (1 En. 14) or lacks the physical sanctuary (Rev 21).[43] Besides this differentiation, the imagined "temple" could also reflect on an earthly ideal of a sanctuary, as in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 40-48). Alternatively, it could provide a vision of a future place for God's dwelling, as in the New Jerusalem texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Leaving the Book of Revelations and the non-sectarian texts of the Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem aside, all apocalypses mentioned above date to

39 Cf. Collins, Jerusalem and the Temple, 163-165.

40 Cf. also the comments on the Book of Revelation and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in Yarbro Collins, The Dream of a New Jerusalem, 251-252.

41 On the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the heavenly cult cf. the recent review article of Ego, Le Temple imaginaire, 58-62.

42 For an interpretation of the Miqdash Adam as a "human temple" cf. Collins, Jerusalem and the Temple, 171-172. For a more polyvalent or ambiguous understanding of the phrase as "human temple" and as the future or "eschatological" temple cf. Yarbro Collins, The Dream of the New Jerusalem, 244-245; Brooke, Miqdash Adam, 288-289. For the discussion of the whole fragment cf. Dimant, 4QFlorilegium, 269-288, esp. 281-288.

43 Also the later apocalyptic compositions attest visions of a heavenly temple: cf. 2 Bar. 4:3-6; 4 Ezra 10; 2 En. 20; 3 Bar. 6:1-2; 11:1-2; Apoc. Ab. 18-19; 29:17-19; cf. Beyerle, The Imagined World, 382-383.

the second century BCE and are strongly related to the defilement of the Jerusalem Temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Maccabean revolt. Despite the fact that their historical settings refer to one and the same event, their "solutions" are variously nuanced by their distinctive worldviews.[44] In general, already the Enochic apocalypses' taxonomy distinguishes two sub-types of the genre: "historical apocalypses" (Animal Apocalypse and Apocalypse of Weeks) and an apocalypse with an otherworldly journey (Book of the Watchers).[45] For accurate results, one must attent to the details in the textual evidence.

Firstly, with regard to the Animal Apocalypse, Enoch recounts, in a dream vision to his son Methuselah, human history from creation to the Hellenistic period. History is divided into three eras, from creation to the flood (1 En. 85:3-89:8), from the renewal of creation to the great judgment (89:9-90:27) and from the second renewal into an open future (90:28-38).[46] In terms of worldview, all history is codified by metaphorical speech that changes from one era to the next.

Furthermore, the end-time vision recalls ideas and motifs that were previously used in the first era of creation—this indicates a correspondence between primeval time and end time. The first appearance of a sanctuary in the Animal Apocalypse is the tabernacle in the wilderness (cf. Exod 35-40) that is represented by a "house," with the qualifier that "all the sheep stand in the house" (1 En. 89:36). Thus, the "house" signifies the sanctuary *together with* the Israelite camp.[47] With regard to the Temple of Solomon and the Second Temple, the codification is different but clear. In the depiction of Jerusalem in the early kingdom, the "house, became large and broad" and "a large and high tower", i.e., the First Temple, "was built upon that house for the Lord of the sheep" (1 En. 89:50). But after the exile, "they began again to build as before and they raised up that tower," i.e., the Second Temple; but all the bread on the table before that "tower" was polluted (89:73). In these passages the "house" clearly repre-

44 Pace, e.g., KIM, The Jerusalem Tradition, 86: "Indeed, the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls should be perceived as very helpful in understanding the general tenor of Second Temple Judaism." Obviously, there was no "general tenor" in Second Temple Judaism(s) that could be detected.

45 On the taxonomy of "apocalypse" as genre cf. COLLINS, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 2-9; IDEM, Introduction: The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered, 4-5, and the critiques on the taxonomy, description and theory: ibid., 5-9.

46 Cf. for the structure and content of the Animal Apocalypse NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 354-355.

47 Cf. NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 381-382; HIMMELFARB, Temple and Priests, 87.

sents Jerusalem, and the "tower" stands for the sanctuary. In 1 En. 90:28-29, the new beginning after judgment starts as follows:[48]

> 28 And I stood up to see, until the old house was folded up—and they removed all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of that house were folded up with it—and they removed it and put it in a place to the south of the land. 29 And I saw until the Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than that first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one that had been rolled up. And all its pillars were new, and its beams were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than (those of) the first one, the old one that he had removed. And all the sheep were within it.

The metaphors in the quoted passage are ambiguous: while the pillars, ornaments and beams might suggest a heavenly sanctuary, the "house" rather bespeaks the new Jerusalem or Zion.[49] As an analogy to the tabernacle in the wilderness, the future temple could have been imagined as being *included* within the future Jerusalem.[50] Anyway, the lack of any explicit reference to the Temple is in accordance with the cosmic concept of the Animal Apocalypse in which the primeval universe did not require any sanctuary just as the future world will be able to exist without a temple. Beyond the literary level, every historical reconstruction on the basis of this concept is hypothetical.[51] Despite these difficulties, it is commonly accepted that apocalypticism from the second century BCE refers to the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 BCE. Consequently, apocalypses mainly represent "resistance literature;" this is also the case with the Animal Apocalypse, even though the text makes no clear reference to Antiochus.[52] But, for example, the "polluted bread" on the table before the "so-called high tower" (1 En. 89:73) in combination with the "blind sheep and shepherds," as they were "handed over for greater destruction" (v. 74), possibly reflects the crisis under Antiochus IV.

---

48 For the passages from the Animal Apocalypse, as quoted above, and the following quotation see NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 366, 387, and 402.

49 Cf. the discussion in NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 404-405; HIMMELFARB, Temple and Priests, 86-90. Recently, POPKES, Vorstellungen von der Einwohnung Gottes, 99-100, pleads for an understanding of the "house" as a "temple" (cf. already HAMERTON-KELLY, The Temple and the Origins, 2). For a different approach, emphasizing the rigor of metaphorical notions in the Animal Apocalypse cf. OLSON, A New Reading, 199-200, 225-228.

50 Cf. also the motif: "all the sheep were within it" (1 En. 90:29) with "and made all the sheep stand in that house" (1 En. 89:36).

51 Cf., e.g., ASSEFA, L'Apocalypse des animaux, 194-198.

52 Cf. PORTIER-YOUNG, Apocalypse against Empire, 346-381.

However, these resemblances do not correspond with the apocalyptic chronology in the Animal Apocalypse: Here, the focus is on the second period, which runs from 587/586 to 426/416 BCE.[53] Consequently, it makes much sense to interpret the remembrances of the desecration under Antiochus IV as literary conventions. Those conventions were helpful for the author(s) to underline the parallels of the polluted Second Temple—in general—with the desecrated Hellenistic sanctuary in the time of Antiochus IV.

An interpretation of the early Second Temple in the Persian era that alludes to the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple under Antiochus IV (cf. 1 En. 89:72b-90:1) is also supported by some details in the text. Firstly, the motif in 1 En. 89:74b ("and they [the 'wild beasts' as Gentiles] trampled the sheep with their feet and devoured them") can be compared with Dan 8:7 ("and it [the 'he-goat'] cast it [the 'ram'] to earth and trampled [Hebr. *rms*] on it") or Dan 8:10 ("and it [the small horn, probably as Antiochus IV] grew great up to the host of heaven, and it cast to earth some of the host and some of the stars, and it trampled [Hebr. *rms*] on them"). Secondly, in 1 En. 89:50b it is said of Solomon's Temple: "And the Lord of the sheep stood upon that tower (the temple), and they spread a full table before him." By contrast, the notice about the post-exilic temple in 1 En. 89:73—in some respects including parallels with v. 50b—lacks every notion of God, and in v. 75 we hear about the "silence of God."[54] In various ways, this fits with the absence of God in the Temple as is illustrated by the "desolating abomination" (cf. Dan 11:31), the God-like presentation of Antiochus IV (Dan 11:36), his addressing as "God manifest" on coins, and Antiochus' ignorance of all other gods and his veneration of the "God of Strongholds" (cf. Dan 11:37-38). Thirdly, and with a view to the date and composition of the Animal Apocalypse, the vision in 1 En. 90:6-19 clearly alludes to the Maccabean wars. As a consequence, at least a late redaction of the text dates to the time after the restoration of the Jerusalem Temple in 164 BCE, if not the whole of the apocalypse.[55]

The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1-10; 91:11-17) offers another example of a structured historical review that leads to an eschaton. The timetable of human history is clearly discernable through the implied structure into ten weeks. The time of the author(s) is situated in the seventh week, when the "wicked generation" arises (1 En. 93:9). But the "chosen ones" will be given instruction with a

53 Cf. the commentary of NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 394-395, and the excursus on the chronology in the Animal Apocalypse in ibid., 391-393.

54 Cf. NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 394-395.

55 Cf. the discussion in TILLER, A Commentary, 70-79, and 357, 359-362; NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 360-361, 396-398, 400; ASSEFA, L'Apocalypse des animaux, 121-135.

view to the whole creation (v. 10)—and they are in the focus from the beginning of the apocalypse (cf. 1 En. 93:1-2). Weeks eight to ten, which follow, examine the "judgment" and the "new heaven."[56] In the eighth week a new temple appears (1 En. 91:12-13):[57]

> 12 And after this there shall be another, an eighth week, which is (of) righteousness, and to it shall be given a sword, so that judgment and righteousness will be executed on those who oppress, and sinners will be delivered into their hands. 13 At its end they shall obtain possessions through their righteousness, and the Temple of the Great King shall be built in glory forever.

It is first of all apparent that the well-preserved Aramaic text differs to some extent from the Ethiopic (4QEn^{g} ar [4Q212] 1 iv 17-18):

> Aram.: 17 *wʿm swph yqnwn nksyn bqšwṭ* 18 *wytbnʾ hykl [m]l[k]wt rbʾ brbwt zwh lkwl dry ʿlmyn*.
> Transl.: 17 And with its end, they shall acquire possessions through righteousness, 18 and there shall be built a Temple of the kingdom of the Great One in his splendorous greatness for all generations of eternity.

While the Ethiopic text speaks of the "Temple of the Great King," the Aramaic version presents a more direct contrast to the Temple of Solomon (called a "house of glory and royalty" 1 En. 93:7), in the fifth week, when it refers to the eschatological temple as a "Temple of the kingdom of the Great One in his splendorous greatness" (Aram.: *hykl [m]l[k]wt rbʾ brbwt*). It is obvious that the Apocalypse of Weeks contrasts the earthly kingdom with the heavenly kingdom of God. Furthermore, the post-exilic temple is simply ignored, and this is different from what we read in the Animal Apocalypse. But the reason for this is that, contrary to the worldview and cosmological concept of the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks did not incorporate the Second Temple and its religious implications into its concept of resistance policy—as a reaction to the pollution of the temple in the second century bce.[58] The new temple, probably conceptualized as a heavenly sanctuary at least in the Aramaic version (1 En. 91:12-13) will be built *after* the successful defeat of the "Hellenizers" in the beginning of

56 For the structure of the Apocalypse of Weeks cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 438-440; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91-108, 57-60.

57 Translations and Aramaic text with reconstructions: Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91-108, 131, 133.

58 Cf. Portier-Young, Apocalypse against Empire, 340-345.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes' reign (ca. 175-170 BCE).[59] In 1 En. 91:12-13a the sword is given to the righteous people, "so that judgment and righteousness will be executed on those who oppress" (v. 12). This already happens *before* the new temple of the eschaton will be established. Consequently, the implied worldview in the Apocalypse of Weeks conceptualizes a new heavenly temple by avoiding any associations of the eschaton and its temple to the polluted Second Temple. The latter is simply ignored in the apocalypse; this is different from the concept in the Animal Apocalypse. Nevertheless, both apocalypses have in common that their worldview alludes to a model of future actions that is exclusively being led by God.[60] This idea fits with the concept of both historically based apocalypses and is due to the fact that the eschaton and its visible signs are part of a coherent divine plan, which culminates in a New Jerusalem and a future temple. The main difference in the Book of the Watchers compared with divinely established models in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse lies in the preexistence of the sanctuary. In the Book of the Watchers Enoch ascents to heaven and only sees the already existing, heavenly temple (cf. 1 En. 14:8-23).[61]

3 Conclusion

The explanation of different concepts of temples and sanctuaries in Second Temple Judaism distinguishes between various provenances stemming from archaeological sites and inscriptions on the one hand and literary evidence on

59 For the date of the Apocalypse of Weeks and the question whether a reference to Maccabean conflicts is included in the text cf. the discussion in STUCKENBRUCK, 1 Enoch 91-108, 60-62, and the interpretation of 1 En. 91:12-13a in ibid., 133-137.

60 In the Animal Apocalypse it is said, with regard to the New Jerusalem (1 En. 90:29): "And I saw until the Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than that first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one that had been rolled up." The Apocalypse of Weeks indicates the building of the new temple with the divine help by using the verbal passive, already in the Aramaic (cf. 1 En. 91:13, after 4QEn^{g} ar [4Q212] 1 iv 18: "and there shall be built a Temple of the kingdom of the Great One," Aram.: *wytbnʾ hykl [m]l[k]wt rbʾ*, using the verb *bnʾ* in the *Ithpeʿel*): see above.

61 The concept of a heavenly temple in 1 En. 14:8-23 is closely linked to visions like those in Isa 6; Ezek 1-2 or Dan 7: cf. NICKELSBURG, 1 Enoch 1, 254-256. Beyond the difference mentioned above, HIMMELFARB, Temple and Priests, 91-92, also points to the ignorance of priests in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse. By contrast, the Book of Watchers could be understood as referring to a priestly conflict, albeit this interpretation of the book is a matter of scholarly dispute.

the other hand. While the former more directly mirrors the every-day-life religious attitudes of Jewish groups in Samaria and at the island of Elephantine,[62] the literary evidence from "Enochic Judaism(s)" rather alludes to conceptualized religious models whose origins can no longer be fully traced.[63] The Dead Sea Scrolls in general can be located somewhere in-between the archaeological and literary evidence.

Firstly, the archaeological remains from sanctuaries at Samaria and on the island of Elephantine—if they can be interpreted together with inscriptions and papyri found at those locations—point to different "Judaisms." Secondly, the groups, as they are reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, attest to different, more or less critical, attitudes towards the Jerusalem Temple and its concepts of sacrificial practice. Furthermore, a real-life setting of alternative temple ideologies within those groups can only scarcely be described. Thirdly, "Enochic Judaism" embraces different apocalyptic texts from different periods in Hellenistic-Roman times. Although, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks relate to one and the same religious conflict in the first half of the second century BCE, their worldviews are different. While the Animal Apocalypse describes the Second Temple as polluted, without reference to the divine presence, and includes the sanctuary at best within its concept of a New Jerusalem, due to an "*Urzeit–Endzeit*" scheme, the Apocalypse of Weeks is able to refrain from a vision of the Second Temple in general. The harshly contested and desecrated temple had simply no place in an "eschatological" timetable, wherein the judgment of the oppressors, the evil ones, had already been implemented. Finally, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks coincide in their idea of an "eschaton," wherein God himself is the decisive subject. Therefore, while the Aramaic text of the Apocalypse of Weeks only alludes to a heavenly temple, the concepts of a New Jerusalem or the heavenly temple differ from what the Book of the Watchers has in mind, when it speaks of a heavenly sanctuary that was already at hand for the visionary Enoch on his cosmic journey.

62 The religious life embraces also, e.g., the veneration of divine beings and gods in Samaria and on the island of Elephantine; cf. on the former the discussion of inscriptions from Samaria in DUŠEK, Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions, passim, and on the latter Elephantine papyri VAN DER TOORN, Anat-Yahu, 80-101; BECKING, Die Gottheiten der Juden, 203-226.

63 This is true besides the fact that both, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks, refer to experiences and events in the times of the desecration of the Jerusalem Temple in the period of the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Bibliography

Alexander, Philip S. and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: Serekh Ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26), Oxford: Clarendon 1994.

Assefa, Daniel, *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85–90) une propagande militaire? Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques* (JSJSup 120), Leiden: Brill 2007.

Assefa, Daniel, Dreams, Book of (1 Enoch 83–90), in: J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 552-553.

Baumgarten, Joseph M., *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273), On the Basis of Transcriptions by Józef T. Milik* (DJD 18), Oxford: Clarendon 1996.

Becking, Bob, Die Gottheiten der Juden in Elephantine, in: M. Oeming and K. Schmid (eds.), *Der eine Gott und die Götter: Polytheismus und Monotheismus im antiken Israel* (AThANT 82), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag 2003, 203-226.

Becking, Bob, Do the Earliest Samaritan Inscriptions Already Indicate a Parting of the Ways?, in: O. Lipschitz et al. (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans In the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2007, 213-222; reprint in: Idem, *Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Construction of Early Jewish Identity* (FAT 80), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011, 109-117.

Becking, Bob, Yehudite Identity in Elephantine, in: *Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Construction of Early Jewish Identity* (FAT 80), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011, 128-142.

Beyerle, Stefan, Qumran und die Apokalyptik, in: Idem and J. Frey (eds.), *Qumran aktuell: Texte und Themen der Schriften vom Toten Meer* (BThSt 120), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 2011, 159-223.

Beyerle, Stefan, The Imagined World of the Apocalypses, in: J.J. Collins (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, Oxford: OUP 2014, 373-387.

Boccaccini, Gabriele, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998.

Bohak, Gideon, CPJ III, 520: The Egyptian Reaction to Onias' Temple: *JSJ* 26 (1995) 32-41.

Boyarin, Daniel, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 2007.

Brooke, George J., Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community, in: B. Ego et al. (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, 285-301.

Cohen, Shaye J. D., *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 31), Berkeley: University of California Press 1999.

Collins, John J., *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (The Biblical Resource Series, 2nd ed.), Grand Rapids: Eerdmasn 1998.

Collins, John J., *Jerusalem and the Temple in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature of the Second Temple Period* (International Rennert Guest Lecture Series 1), Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University 1998; reprint in: Idem, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2015, 159-177.

Collins, John J., "Enochic Judaism" and the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: G. Boccaccini and J. J. Collins (eds.), *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121), Leiden: Brill 2007, 283-299.

Collins, John J., *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010.

Collins, John J., Enoch, Ethiopic Apocalypse of (1 Enoch), in: Idem and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 585.

Collins, John J., Sectarian Communities in the Dead Sea Scrolls, in: T.H. Lim and John J. Collins (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford: OUP 2010, 151-172.

Collins, John J., Introduction: The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered, in: Idem, *Apocalypse, Prophecy, and Pseudepigraphy: On Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2015, 1-20.

Dietrich, Manfried, Das biblische Paradies und der babylonische Tempelgarten: Überlegungen zur Lage des Gartens Eden, in: B. Janowski and B. Ego (eds.), *Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte* (FAT 32), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2001, 281-323.

Dimant, Devorah, 4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple, in: A. Caquot et al. (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, Leuven: Peeters 1986, 165-190; reprint in: Eadem, *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (FAT 90), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014, 269-288.

Dušek, Jan, *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria Between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* (CHANE 54), Leiden: Brill 2012.

Ego, Beate, Die Wasser der Gottesstadt: Zu einem Motiv der Zionstradition und seinen kosmologischen Implikationen, in: B. Janowski and B. Ego (eds.), *Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte* (FAT 32), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2001, 361-389.

Ego, Beate, Le "Temple imaginaire:" Himmlischer und irdischer Kult im antiken Judentum am Beispiel der Sabbatopferlieder: *Verkündigung und Forschung* 56 (2011) 58-62.

Falk, Daniel K., Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple, in: Idem et al. (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 35), Leiden: Brill 2000, 106-126.

Frey, Jörg, Temple and Rival Temple—The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis, in: B. Ego et al. (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, 171-203.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S., *Israel in der Perserzeit: 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie 8), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2005.

Granerød, Gard, The Former and the Future Temple of YHW in Elephantine: A Traditio-Historical Case Study of Ancient Near Eastern Antiquarianism: *ZAW* 127 (2015) 63-77.

Hamerton-Kelly, Robert G., The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic: *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15.

Himmelfarb, Martha, Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Weeks, in: G. Boccaccini and J.J. Collins (eds.), *The Early Enoch Literature* (JSJSup 121), Leiden: Brill 2007, 219-235; reprint in: Eadem, *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond* (TSAJ 151), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013, 79-92.

Hjelm, Ingrid, *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* (JSOTSup 303), Sheffield: Academic Press 2000.

Hjelm, Ingrid, What Do Samaritans and Jews Have in Common? Recent Trends in Samaritan Studies: *CBR* 3 (2004) 9-59.

Jackson, David R., *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (LSTS 49), London: T&T Clark 2004.

Juhás, Peter, Dew in the Enochic Literature, in: E. Ben Zvi and C. Levin (eds.), *Thinking of Water in the Early Second Temple Period* (BZAW 461), Berlin: de Gruyter 2014, 359-373.

Kapfer, Hilary Evans, The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes toward the Temple as a Test Case: *DSD* 14 (2007) 152-177.

Kartveit, Magnar, *The Origins of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128), Leiden: Brill 2009.

Kim, Heerak Christian, *The Jerusalem Tradition in the Late Second Temple Period: Diachronic and Synchronic Developments Surrounding Psalms of Solomon 11*, Lanham: University Press of America 2007.

Knauf, Ernst-Axel, Elephantine und das vor-biblische Judentum, in: R.G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden* (Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22), München: Gütersloher 2002, 165-174; reprint in: Idem, *Data and Debates: Essays in the History and Culture of Israel and Its Neighbors in Antiquity / Daten und Debatten: Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte des antiken Israel und seiner Nachbarn* (AOAT 407), Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2013, 233-242.

Knibb, Michael E., Enoch, Similitudes of (1 Enoch 37–71), in: J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 585-587.

Kratz, Reinhard Gregor, Der Zweite Tempel zu Jeb und zu Jerusalem, in: *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (FAT 42), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004, 60-78.

Kratz, Reinhard Gregor, *Historisches und biblisches Israel: Drei Überblicke zum Alten Testament*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013.

Magen, (Y)Itzhak, Gerizim, Mount: *NEAEHL* 2 (1993) 484-492.

Magen, (Y)Itzhak, The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence, in: O. Lipschitz et al. (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2007, 157-212.

Magen, (Y)Itzhak, *Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume II: The Temple City* (Judea and Samaria Publications 8), Jerusalem: IAA 2008.

Magen, (Y)Itzhak, Mount Gerizim (Update): *NEAEHL* 5 (2008) 1742-1748.

Magen, (Y)Itzhak et al., *Mount Gerizim Excavations. Volume I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (Judea and Samaria Publications 2), Jerusalem: IAA 2004.

Nickelsburg, George W.E., *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press 2001.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis: Fortress Press 2012.

Nogalski, James, *The Book of the Twelve: Micah—Malachi* (The Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary 18b), Macon: Smyth & Helwys 2011.

Olson, Daniel C., *A New Reading of the* Animal Apocalypse *of* 1 Enoch*: "All Nations Shall Be Blessed"* (SVTP 24), Leiden: Brill 2013.

Paganini, Simone, Von Ezechiel zur Tempelrolle: Der Tempel als Realität und Vision, in: J. Frey et al. (eds.), *Qumran und Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* (WUNT 278), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2011, 399-419.

Popkes, Enno Edzard, Vorstellungen von der Einwohnung Gottes in der Tempelrolle: 11QT 29,7b–10 und die Entwicklungsgeschichte frühjüdischer Schechina-Vorstellungen, in: B. Janowski and E.E. Popkes (eds.), *Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Gottes: Zur Schechina-Vorstellung in Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 318), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2014, 85-101.

Porten, Bezalel, *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (DMOA 22), Leiden: Brill 1996.

Portier-Young, Anathea, *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2011.

Regev, Eyal, *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity* (JAJSup 10), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2013.

Rosenberg, Stephen G., The Jewish Temple at Elephantine: *NEA* 67 (2004) 4-13.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple, in: B. Ego et al. (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (WUNT 118), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 1999, 267-284.

Schorch, Stefan, The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and from the Outside, in: R. Albertz and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (JAJSup 11), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2013, 135-149.

Stern, Ephraim and Yitzhak Magen, Archaeological Evidence for the First Stage of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim: *IEJ* 52 (2002) 49-57.

Stokes, Ryan E., Watchers, Book of the (1 Enoch 1–36), in: J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 1332-1334.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T., *1 Enoch 91–108* (CEJL), Berlin: de Gruyter 2007.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T., Enoch, Epistle of (1 Enoch 91–108), in: J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 583-585.

Tiller, Patrick A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of* 1 Enoch (SBLEJL 4), Atlanta: Scholars Press 1993.

Toorn, Karel van der, Anat-Yahu, Some Other Deities, and the Jews of Elephantine: *Numen* 39 (1992) 80-101.

VanderKam, James C., Enoch, Astronomical Book of (1 Enoch 72–82), in: J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2010, 581-583.

Wassén, Cecilia, Visions of the Temple: Conflicting Images of the Eschaton: *SEÅ* 76 (2011) 41-59.

Yarbro Collins, Adela, The Dream of the New Jerusalem at Qumran, in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 3: The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Waco 2006, 231-254.

Zangenberg, Jürgen, *ΣΑΜΑΡΕΙΑ: Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung* (TANZ 15), Tübingen: Francke 1994.

Zangenberg, Jürgen, The Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim: Observations on the Results of 20 Years of Excavations, in: J. Kamlah (ed.), *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant* (ADPV 41), Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2012, 399-418.

Zsengellér, József, *Gerizim as Israel: Northern Tradition of the Old Testament and the Early History of the Samaritans* (Utrechtse Theologische Reeks 38), Utrecht: University Press 1998.