

DREAM-VISIONS IN THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS

DREAM-VISIONS IN THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS:
SHARED COMPOSITIONAL PATTERNS AND CONCERNS

By ANDREW B. PERRIN, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University © Copyright by Andrew B. Perrin, September 2013

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2013) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Dream-Visions in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Shared Compositional Patterns and Concerns

AUTHOR: Andrew B. Perrin, B.A. (Rocky Mountain College), M.A. (Trinity Western University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Daniel A. Machiela

NUMBER OF PAGES: xii + 291

Abstract

Twenty-nine of the some 900 fragmentary Scrolls recovered from the caves off the northwest shores of the Dead Sea were penned in the Aramaic language. It is generally agreed that this cross-section of Aramaic literature among the predominantly Hebrew collection derives from before and beyond the scribal community that lived at Qumran. Whether or not the Aramaic texts constitute a cohesive collection, however, is an ongoing debate. While their compositional origins are unknown, this dissertation avers that enough common traits exist among the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls to indicate an inherent unity in the group. Paramount among these traits is the pervasive usage of the dream-vision in a constellation of at least nineteen Aramaic writings.

This study advances our understanding of the Aramaic texts by exploring the dream-vision as a literary convention from two interrelated perspectives. Part One maps out the major compositional patterns of dream-vision episodes across the collection. Special attention is paid to recurring literary-philological features (e.g., motifs, images, phrases, idioms, etc.), which suggest that pairs or clusters of texts are affiliated intertextually, tradition-historically, or originated in scribal circles in close proximity. Part Two articulates three predominant concerns advanced or addressed by dream-vision revelation. It is argued that the authors of these materials utilized the dream-vision (i) for scriptural exegesis of the patriarchal traditions, (ii) to endorse particular understandings of the origins and functions of the priesthood, and (iii) for historiography by creating *ex eventu* revelations of aspects or all of world history. In tandem these two components affirm the centrality of the dream-vision to the thought world of the Aramaic texts as well as demonstrate that this revelatory *topos* was deployed using a shared stock of language in order to introduce a closely defined set of concerns.

Acknowledgements

I was first introduced to the Aramaic language and invited into the world of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls in a doctoral seminar facilitated by Prof. Daniel Machiela in 2010. Since then I have had the great pleasure of researching and writing this project under his guidance. I was also fortunate to have Prof. Eileen Schuller and Prof. Stephen Westerholm serve on my advisory committee. I cannot imagine a more genuine, accomplished, and insightful trio of teachers to oversee this dissertation. Their work and wisdom challenged my thinking and shaped me as a young scholar. Special thanks also go to Prof. Loren Stuckenbruck, who critiqued and commented on the project as an external reader, and to Prof. Anders Runesson, who stepped in at the eleventh hour to serve as the internal-external reader for the defence.

My studies at McMaster were made possible through the generous financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Harry Lyman Hooker Senior Fellowship. My dissertation research was enhanced by my time as the George A. Barton Fellow at the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem in the fall of 2012. This trip was also supported by a doctoral travel scholarship from the Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion. Much of chapters two through four were crafted in the libraries of the Albright Institute and École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem. I am grateful to both Dr. Adolfo Roitman of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum and Pnina Shor of the Israel Antiquities Authority for granting me the invaluable experience of working with the Aramaic Scrolls in their care. Joseph Angel and John Collins graciously shared unpublished articles that served as welcome sparring partners when finalizing chapters six and seven. Esther Eshel, Peter Flint, Dorothy Peters, Eugene Ulrich, and the participants in the 2012 Graduate Enoch Seminar at the University of Notre Dame reflected on the topic at hand in various ways. Closer to home, I should thank Ian Koiter, Andrew Krause, Anthony Meyer, John Screnock, and Matthew Walsh for regularly pointing out the best and worst of my ideas.

My academic life would not be as enriching were it not for the family members who have journeyed with me throughout my post-secondary years. From my enrollment as an undergraduate to dissertation defence, my parents Daryl and Rosanne Perrin have supported me in more ways than I care to admit. To my young children Emma and Jude, I am grateful for the energy and warmth with which you fill our home each day. To my wife Tanya, I cannot offer enough thanks. You are the truest of friends, a faithful companion on this adventure, and make every place we find ourselves feel like home.

Andrew B. Perrin
September 17, 2013
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: ENTERING THE WORLD OF THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1	Introduction	1
2	A corpus or collection? Dream-visions and the (dis)unity of the Aramaic Scrolls....	8
3	Plan of this study	16

PART ONE: SHARED COMPOSITIONAL PATTERNS

CHAPTER TWO: A PROSPECTUS OF DREAMS AND DREAMERS IN THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS

1	Introduction	19
2	Compositions featuring dream-visions.....	20
2.1	<i>1 Enoch</i>	20
2.1.1	The <i>Book of Watchers</i> (<i>1 En.</i> 1-36)	21
2.1.2	The <i>Book of the Luminaries</i> (<i>1 En.</i> 72-82)	23
2.1.3	The <i>Book of Dreams</i> (<i>1 En.</i> 83-91).....	25
2.1.4	The <i>Epistle of Enoch</i> (<i>1 En.</i> 92-105)	26
2.1.5	The <i>Birth of Noah</i> (<i>1 En.</i> 106-107).....	27
2.2	The <i>Book of Giants</i>	28
2.3	<i>4QWords of Michael</i>	31
2.4	The <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	33
2.5	<i>4QTestament of Jacob?</i>	40
2.6	The <i>New Jerusalem</i> text.....	41
2.7	The <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>	44
2.8	<i>4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?</i>	49
2.9	<i>4QVisions of Amram</i>	51
2.10	Daniel 2-7	54
2.11	<i>4QAramaic Apocalypse</i>	57
2.12	<i>4QFour Kingdoms</i>	59
3	Fragmentary texts exhibiting dream-vision features	60

3.1	<i>4QVision^a</i>	60
3.2	<i>4QpapVision^b</i>	61
3.3	<i>4QVision^d</i>	62
3.4	<i>4QpapApocalypse</i>	63
4	Texts not directly associated with dream-vision revelation	63
4.1	Tobit.....	64
4.2	<i>4QPseudo Daniel^{a-c}</i>	65
4.3	<i>4QExorcism</i>	66
4.4	<i>4QJews in the Persian Court</i>	67
4.5	<i>4QVision^c?</i>	68
5	Summary of findings	69

CHAPTER THREE: THE LANGUAGE OF DREAM-VISIONS: FORMS,
STRUCTURES, IDIOMS, AND PHRASES

1	Introduction	73
2	Overlapping terminology for ‘dreams’ and ‘visions’	74
3	Formulae introducing dream-visions.....	77
4	Phrases and idioms marking narrative movement.....	79
5	Oneirocritical terminology and methods.....	85
6	Awakening formulae and responses elicited by dream-visions	88
7	Summary of findings	94

PART TWO: SHARED COMPOSITIONAL CONCERNS

CHAPTER FOUR: THE EXEGETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF SOME PATRIARCHAL DREAMERS

1	Introduction	101
2	The <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i> : uncovering scripture’s intimations of dream-visions... 103	
2.1	A threefold combination of verbs alluding to revelation in Gen 9:21 and 24 ... 104	
2.2	Informing Abram of the plan behind the ‘brother-husband’ ruse in Gen 12:11..... 109	
2.3	From theophany to dream-vision: harmonizing Gen 12:7, 13:14, and 15:1..... 112	

2.4	An underlying interest in casting the patriarchs as prophetic dreamers?	117
3	The exegetical root of <i>1 Enoch</i> 's expansive dream-vision tradition	123
3.1	Hints at an angelic association: philological flexibility in Gen 5:22 and 24	124
3.2	Did Noah, Abram, Levi, and Jacob also 'walk about with the angels?'	127
4	Levi's visionary installment as a priest in the <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>	129
4.1	The suggestiveness of Mal 2:5-6: Levi 'descended' after 'walking with' God ..	133
4.2	A complementary clue in 1 Sam 2:27: the Lord 'revealed' himself to Levi	136
5	Summary of findings	139

CHAPTER FIVE: DREAMING OF THE TEMPLE AND PRIESTHOOD IN THIS WORLD,
THE HEAVENS, AND THE ESCHATON

1	Introduction	142
2	<i>4QVisions of Amram</i> on the genetics of the priesthood	144
2.1	Incorporating Amram and Aaron into (Aramaic) Levi's priestly family tree ...	144
2.2	An otherworldly endorsement from celestial Melchizedek	149
3	Interpreting the cult: sacerdotal halakhah in the <i>New Jerusalem</i> text	155
4	Further glimpses of priestly dreams and dreamers	164
4.1	<i>4QTestament of Jacob?</i> : a view of priestly precincts, praxis, and promises	165
4.2	<i>4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?</i> : envisioning an eschatological priest-savior	168
5	Summary of findings	173

CHAPTER SIX: DISCLOSING THE COURSE AND CONFIGURATION OF HISTORY
THROUGH DREAM-VISION REVELATION

1	Introduction	175
2	The scope and structure of human history in the 'Apocalypse of Weeks'	178
3	The flood in historical retrospect and prospect	183
3.1	<i>Urzeit und Endzeit</i> as a historiographical principle in the <i>Book of Giants</i>	184
3.2	The deluge, the lay of the land, and eschatology in <i>1QapGen XII 19-XV 21</i> ..	189
4	The eras of empires: four kingdom chronologies from the exile to the eschaton ..	199

4.1	Daniel 2 and 7: the God of Israel’s direction of pagan dominions	199
4.2	Updating history: retrofitting Rome into the scheme in <i>4QFour Kingdoms</i>	202
5	Other views of geopolitical upheaval or succession	209
5.1	The culmination of Israelite history in the <i>New Jerusalem</i> text	209
5.2	<i>4QAramaic Apocalypse</i> : another monarch learns his place in world history	213
6	Summary of findings	219

CHAPTER SEVEN: OVERVIEW AND OUTCOMES

1	Toward a description of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corpus	222
2	Pseudepigraphy, epistemology, and dream-vision discourses	227
3	The quest for the ancient Jewish apocalypse.....	233
4	Closing remarks.....	242
	Bibliography.....	244

List of Tables

Table I: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance I: Prominent Literary Themes, Images, and Motifs.....	71-72
Table II: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance II: Prominent Formal and Philological Features.....	98-99
Table III: Priestly Terminology for Levitical and Aaronide Priesthoods in the <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> and <i>4QVisions of Amram</i>	148
Table IV: Proposed Referents Underlying the Historical Schema of <i>4QFour Kingdoms</i>	204
Table V: Lists of Apocalypses and Apocalyptically Oriented Texts among the Aramaic Corpus.....	236-37

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in this dissertation typically follow those in *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies* (eds. Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, and Shirley A. Decker-Lucke; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). Abbreviations and sigla not found in this resource are given in the following forms.

<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> (ed. David Noel Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992).
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AJ</i>	<i>Ancient Judaism</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin of Biblical Research</i>
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DCLY	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> (eds. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000).
DSSSE	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> (Florentino García-Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
DSSR	<i>The Dead Sea Scroll Reader</i> (eds. Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov; 6 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>EDEJ</i>	<i>Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism</i> (eds. John J. Collins and Daniel Harolow; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).
<i>EDSS</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.: Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FoSub	Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
IEOLA	Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien
IRT	Issues in Religion and Theology
<i>JAJ</i>	Journal of Ancient Judaism
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
NETS	<i>New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> (eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright III; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
PsvTGr	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
SBLAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
<i>SJC</i>	<i>Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia</i>
SJS	Studia Judaeoslavica

- TDOT* *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (eds. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry; trans. David E. Green; 15 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006).
- ThWQ* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band 1* (eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011).
- WAC* *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005).

Sigla Used in Dead Sea Scrolls Transcriptions and Citations

- (?) Some doubt concerning certainty of reading or reconstruction
- [] Bracketed text not extant
- { } Bracketed text erased
- < > Emended text
- Ⓢ, Ⓢ̄, Ⓢ̅ Possible letter, probable letter, certain letter
- Visible ink traces of an unknown character
- // Overlapping text between manuscripts cited

CHAPTER ONE

ENTERING THE WORLD OF THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS

“Dreams that are not remembered in their entirety – if someone forgets either the middle or the end – must be considered doubtful ... the interpreter of dreams should not give an opinion or comment in an offhand fashion upon those things which he is unable to comprehend accurately, since this will result in ill repute for him and damage to the dreamer.”

Artemidorus of Daldis, *Oneirocritica* 1.12 (2nd century CE)¹

1 Introduction

As the *lingua franca* of the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Achaemenid empires, Aramaic was the language the Israelites inherited during the exile and became a primary compositional language of Judaeon literature in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods.² Until relatively recently, knowledge of such writings was limited to the imperial correspondences in Ezra, the tales and visions in Dan 2-7, some outlying evidence from

¹ Translation from Robert J. White, *The Interpretation of Dreams, Oneirocritica by Artemidorus* (Park Ridge, N.J.: Noyes Classical Studies, 1975). For a concise introduction to the world and writings of Artemidorus, see Luther H. Martin, “Artemidorus: Dream Theory in Late Antiquity,” *The Second Century* 8 (1991): 97-108.

² Beyer ascribed the increased usage of Aramaic across the ancient Near East from the 8th century BCE onward to the language’s simplicity, flexibility, and adoption in imperial policy and communication (Klaus Beyer, *The Aramaic Language: Its Distribution and Subdivisions* [trans. John F. Healey; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], 9-10). For a more detailed and nuanced account of the appropriation of Aramaic in this period than I can give here, see Paul-Alain Beaulieu, “Official and Vernacular Languages: The Shifting Sands of Imperial and Cultural Identities in First-Millennium B.C. Mesopotamia,” in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (ed. Seth L. Sanders; OIS 2; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2006), 187-216. Fitzmyer described the phase of the Aramaic language generally reflected in the Qumran Aramaic texts as “middle” Aramaic, situated between standard/official Aramaic (ca. 700-200 BCE) and late Aramaic (ca. 200-700 CE) (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Phases of the Aramaic Language,” in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament, Volume II: A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 57-84; see also, idem, “Aramaic,” *EDSS* 1:48-51). The linguistic study of these materials is now aided by two key resources: Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* (ANESSup 38; Leuven: Peeters, 2011); and Ursula Schattner-Rieser, *L’araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte, I. Grammaire* (IELOA 5; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004).

Elephantine, and scholarly suspicions that Aramaic traditions lingered behind some apocryphal and pseudepigraphal works. With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Cairo Genizah fragments, and medieval witnesses to such Aramaic writings in modern libraries and archives, our corpus of ancient Jewish Aramaic literature swelled to twenty-nine compositions.³ These include copies of works that were received as scripture in various Jewish and Christian traditions, such as *I Enoch*, *Daniel*, or *Tobit*. A number of other works were known in part from adaptations in subsequent writings, such as the *Aramaic Levi Document (ALD)* in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* or the *Enochic Book of Giants (BG)* in Manichean literature. Other compositions were not so fortunate in their reception history. As far as we know, works like the *Genesis Apocryphon (IQapGen)*, the *New Jerusalem text (NJ)*, or *4QVisions of Amram (4QVisAmram)* remained vouchsafed in the Qumran caves, unknown and unread for nearly two millennia. Because it is generally accepted that the Qumranites penned their works in Hebrew and the compositional dates for the Aramaic Scrolls span the 4th-2nd centuries BCE, these materials hold important

³ Naturally, the sum total of manuscripts and the state of preservation of individual texts influences the statistical distribution of Aramaic material in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dimant counts a total of 900 manuscripts in the Qumran collection, of which 121 (approximately 13%) were penned in Aramaic (Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* [eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 197-205). Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra's slightly more conservative figure of approximately 10% is based on a calculation of 87 of 129 Aramaic texts that are "sufficiently well-preserved to be studied" among the "some 900 manuscripts found at Qumran" (Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Aramaica Qumranica: Introduction," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* [eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 1-12, here 1). García Martínez counts twenty-nine compositions among 120 legible and usable Aramaic manuscripts (Florentino García Martínez, "Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran," in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honor of Jan N. Bremmer* [eds. Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper; SHR 127; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 329-41).

insights into the forms of thought that were inherited by and inspired the scribal community at Qumran.⁴

One of the more pressing questions in recent scholarship is the degree to which the Aramaic writings among the Dead Sea Scrolls should be considered a coherent group or disparate ingathering. This issue was at the root of a conference held in Aix-en-Provence, France in 2008. Among the questions that conveners Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra sought to answer was: “Can we find categories that allow us to regard the Aramaic texts as one corpus?”⁵ For all the valuable contributions and rich conversation that ensued, the (dis)unity of the Aramaic texts remains an open question. One way of providing an affirmative answer to this question is mapping out the ideological and literary-linguistic contours of these texts in order to gauge levels of continuity throughout the collection. While such a comprehensive description is beyond the bounds of a single study, this dissertation contributes to addressing the issue of unity or disunity in the

⁴ The pre/non-sectarian origin of the Aramaic Scrolls is generally agreed upon. For statements in this regard, see Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 198-99; Jan Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 351-74; Daniel A. Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts,” *AJ* 1 (2013), forthcoming; J. T. Milik, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d’Hénoch à Amram,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, se théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978), 91-106; Eibert Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155-71; Stanislav Seger, “Bedeutung der Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer für die Aramäistik,” in *Bibel und Qumran* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 183-87; Ben Zion Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500-164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 267-82; and Michael O. Wise, “Accidents and Accident: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (ed. T. Muraoka; Abr-Nahrain Supplement 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 124-67. However, VanderKam (James C. VanderKam, “Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [eds. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; SSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 113-34) and García Martínez (“Scribal Practices,” 336-39) have cautioned that it is unproven that composition in Aramaic immediately disqualifies a work from originating at Qumran.

⁵ Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra, “Aramaica Qumranica: Introduction,” 2.

Aramaic Scrolls by exploring the form and function of one literary convention that is well-represented across the collection: the dream-vision.

Among the Aramaic Scrolls is a constellation of nineteen identifiable narrative works containing dream-vision episodes, allusions, and interpretations. These include: the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of the Luminaries*, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle of Enoch*, the *Book of Giants*, *4QWords of Michael*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *4QTestament of Jacob?*, the *New Jerusalem* text, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*, *4QVisions of Amram*, *Dan 2-7*, *4QAramaic Apocalypse*, *4QFour Kingdoms*, *4QVision^a*, *4QpapVision^b*, *4QVision^d*, and *4QpapApocalypse⁶*.⁶ Unfortunately, like much of the Qumran collection, many of the Aramaic dream-vision accounts survive only in the vestiges of columns or in scattered, jagged fragments of parchment and papyrus. As Artemidorus the famed oneirocritic cautioned in the quote at the outset of this chapter, there is an inherent risk in interpreting dreams known only in patches: a full interpretation cannot be given for incomplete dreams. As a consequence of the fragmentary nature of the manuscript evidence, our knowledge of dream-visions in many Aramaic texts is

⁶ It is immediately apparent that this proclivity for dream-vision revelation sets the Aramaic texts apart from their Hebrew counterparts in the Qumran caves, as the latter scarcely feature this form of divine encounter. Notwithstanding the dream-visions in the earlier portions of the Hebrew Scriptures, the exceptions to this trend in Second Temple Hebrew works include the latter chapters of Daniel (Dan 8; 9:20-12:13), *Jubilees* (14:1-17; 27:21-25; 32:1-2, 16-26; 39:16-18; 40:1-5), *4QpsEzek^{d-e}* (4Q395-388, 4Q391), and the harmonization of Jacob's dream in *4QRP^b* (4Q364) 4b-e ii 22. The text known as *4QVisInterp* (4Q410) is too fragmentary to be of real consequence for considering dream-visions in the Hebrew Scrolls. Most of these Hebrew dream-visions derive from a corresponding account in an underlying scriptural source. Therefore, the production of entirely 'new' episodes was not common in this Hebrew literature. Despite the lack of full blown dream-vision episodes, the Hebrew materials (sectarian or otherwise) contain numerous references to "seers (חזיה/רואי)" (1QH^a X 17; XII 11; XII 21; CD II 12-13; 1QM X 10-11; XI 8; *4QCurses* [4Q280] 2 7; *4QpapUnc^d* [4Q517] 15 1; *4QpapUnc^e* [4Q518] 2 1) and "visions (חזון/חזיון/מחזה)" (1QH^a VI 18; XII 19//*4QH^d* [4Q430] 1 6; *4QMyst^b* [4Q300] 1ii 2, 3, 6; 8 1; *4QNPC^a* [4Q371] 1a-b 4//*4QNPC^b* [4Q372] 1 7; *4QVisInterp* [4Q410] 1 9; *4QInstruction^c* [4Q417] 1i 16//*4QInstruction^d* [4Q418] 43-45 i 12; 4Q417 1 i 22).

lacking. Nonetheless, when the partially extant episodes of individual works are placed alongside those from neighboring Aramaic writings an intriguing collage emerges. One thing that comes to the fore is that the authors of these Aramaic dream-visions often presented their works using common formal and structural patterns. Of course, not every seemingly common stylistic feature indicates continuity among the corpus. As A. Leo Oppenheim established in his magisterial work *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*, ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern authors penned dream episodes according to some well-worn formal patterns.⁷ Frances Flannery-Dailey has

⁷ A. Leo Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 46.3; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956). The pioneering contribution of this work is the form-critical delineation of dream accounts as either ‘message’ or ‘symbolic’ types. The former “contain without exception a divine message (command or warning) couched in clearly understandable terms which do not necessitate interpretation” (ibid., 191). Whereas, the directives and information contained in symbolic dreams are “not expressed in clear words but transmitted in a specific way by which certain selected elements of the message, such as persons, key-words, actions, etc., are replaced by other elements” (ibid., 206). Perhaps the greatest strength of this typology is that it hews closely to Artemidorus’ typology of “theorematic (θεωρηματικοί)” and “allegorical (ἀλληγορικοί)” dreams (*Oneir* 1.1-2; 4.1). For some other ancient dream typologies, see Macrobius in *Comm. In Somn. Scip.* 3.2, Cicero in *Div.* 1.64, and Philo in *Somn.* 1.1, 2; 2.1, 4. For contextualizations of these systems, see Derek S. Dodson, “Philo’s *De somniis* in the Context of Ancient Dream Theories and Classifications,” *PrRS* 30 (2003): 299-312; and A. H. M. Kessels, “Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification,” *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969): 389-424. Other modern, academic proposals of ancient dream typologies often differ little from Oppenheim’s archetype. See for example Bar’s “prophetic” and “symbolic” dreams (Shaul Bar, *A Letter That Has Not Been Read: Dreams in the Hebrew Bible* [MHUC 25; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2001], 3-4) and Husser’s “message-dreams,” “allegorical or symbolic dreams,” and “prophetic dreams” (Jean-Marie Husser, *Dreams and Dream Narratives in the Biblical World* [The Biblical Seminar 63; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996], 99-103). Even those critical of Oppenheim’s typology affirm its basic usefulness by at times employing his terminology (e.g., Scott Noegel, “Dreams and Dream Interpreters in Mesopotamia and in the Hebrew Bible [Old Testament],” in *Dreams: A Reader on the Religious, Cultural, and Psychological Dimensions of Dreaming* [ed. Kelly Bulkeley; New York: Palgrave 2001], 45-71; and Ann Jeffers, *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria* [SHCANE 8; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 129-30).

In addition to establishing this typology, Oppenheim observed some striking commonalities in the formal presentation of ancient dreams. Oppenheim described four main elements which comprise the “dream frame.” These include: (i) a basic introduction about the dreamer, (ii) information regarding the place and circumstance of the dream, (iii) the content of the episode itself, and (iv) a formal closure of the account, referring to the dreamer’s reaction and/or fulfillment of the dream in waking reality (*The Interpretation*, 187). This raises the classic, circular problem of whether actual dream experiences gave rise to recognizable literary forms or the stylized literary expression of experiences was the result of cultural conditioning. For comments on the problematics associated with this issue, see idem, “Mantic Dreams in

extended Oppenheim's form-critical work into Second Temple studies by illustrating how Jewish authors of this period, including some among the Aramaic texts, adopted and adapted this wider literary-cultural formal paradigm.⁸ The Aramaic Scrolls, then, must be considered in light of these broader compositional norms. However, at many points

the Ancient Near East," in *The Dream and Human Societies* (eds. G. E. von Grunebaum and Roger Caillois; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 341-63, esp. 348; and Robert Karl Gnuse, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984), 17. Since my concern in this dissertation is the usage of the dream-vision as a literary convention and rhetorical tool, it is of little significance if any actual experience lingers behind the revelations presented in the Aramaic texts; although, I am skeptical that this was the case. At the very least, one would expect writers to portray literary dreams in a way that approximated their imagined audiences' experiences of dream-vision phenomena and/or their familiarity with the presentation of such experiences in other literatures. Husser provided a helpful way of negotiating the problem: "[w]e may conclude that if certain *practices* or institutions were responsible for bringing to birth these literary forms [i.e., message and symbolic dreams], the authors who used them do so in order to evoke a variety of oneiric *experiences*, experiences sometimes quite different from those that originally served as model (*sic*)" (*Dreams and Dream Narratives*, 101, italics original). For similar evaluations, see Ernst Ludwig Ehrlich, *Der Traum im Alten Testament* (BZAW 73; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1953), v; Bar, *A Letter That Has Not Been Read*, 3; and with particular concern for the literary quality of apocalyptic dream-visions, Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 98. Similarly, while I do not agree with all of his views on the experiential backgrounds of apocalyptic dream-visions, Fletcher-Louis' recognition that this literature "espouses a particular kind of religious experience" may be a way of finding middle ground (Crispin Fletcher-Louis, "Religious Experience and the Apocalypses," in *Experientia, Volume 1: Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity* [eds. Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz, and Rodney A. Werline; SBLSymS 40; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 125-44). This, however, does not alleviate the problematics of excavating an experience from a literary source. This may be more attainable in personal accounts in epigraphic materials. For example, as in the case of the terse dream-vision report penned in Aramaic on a potsherd from Elephantine (*COS* 3.88/*CIS* 2.137; for discussion, see Baruch A. Levine, "Notes on an Aramaic Dream Text from Egypt," *JAOS* 84 [1964]: 18-22). Or in the case of the 3rd century BCE slave manumission inscription from Oropus that relates a certain "Moschos son of Moschion the Jew (Ἰουδαῖος)" received a command by the gods Amphiaros and Hygieia in a dream (ἐνύπνιον) to inscribe, dedicate, and install a document at a pagan altar (*CIJ* 1.8; for discussion, see D. W. Lewis, "The First Greek Jew," *JSS* 2/3 [1957]: 264-662). This problem is compounded when dealing with texts, like those in the Aramaic Scrolls, which are presented in pseudepigraphic garb or attributed to imagined characters from historically-fictive settings. For more optimistic appraisals of the experiential aspects of dream-visions, especially in apocalyptic literature, see Susan Niditch, "The Visionary," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (eds. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980), 153-79; Dan Merkur, "Cultivating Visions through Exegetical Meditations," in *With Letters of Light: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Early Jewish Apocalypticism, Magic, and Mysticism in Honor of Rachel Elior* (eds. Daphna V. Arbel and Andrei A. Orlov; Ekstasis 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 62-91; Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 61-70, 240-47; Michael E. Stone, "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions," *HTR* 96 (2003): 167-80; and idem, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011) 90-121.

⁸ Frances Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (JSJSup 90; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

similarities between Aramaic dream-visions extends to a deeper level than the mere adherence to a pan cultural literary template. Many episodes exhibit shared literary tropes and linguistic idioms suggesting a closer degree of relation. Some such correspondences may indicate intertextual or tradition-historical affiliation. In most cases the collective evidence points to the composition of these Aramaic works in closely-knit scribal circles. This is further suggested by the usage of the dream-vision as a vehicle for advancing or addressing a rather limited set of ideological and exegetical interests. Since many ancient sources associate dream-visions with divine revelation, the usage of this literary convention is a clever authorial strategy.⁹ By locating their ideas and ideals in dream-visions attributed to figures from the past, authors could claim the highest endorsement possible for their works. In these ways, it is not merely the concentration of dream-visions

⁹ Flannery-Dailey has well-captured this distinctive perspective that obtains across the ancient world: “[w]hereas we tend to view dreams as unreal, interior, subjective phenomena, ancient peoples believed that some dreams were genuine visits from deities or their divine representatives. One did not ‘have’ a dream; one ‘saw’ a dream, or a dream ‘met’ or ‘visited’ the dreamer” (ibid., 1). The work of the Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) represents the fulcrum between ancient and modern conceptions and perceptions of dreams. Freud theorized that the “scientific consideration of dreams starts off from the assumption that they are products of our own mental activity” (Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams* [trans. J. Strachey; 8th ed.; New York: Basic Books, 1965], 80). This is not to say that every dream-vision in antiquity was conceived as being divine sent. Philo (*Spec. Laws* 1.219) and Ben Sira (Sir 34:1-3) provide the clearest examples of Second Temple Jewish authors who explained some dream-visions as the bi-product of mental activity. Harris observed the naturalistic explanation of some dream-visions in classical sources as early as the 6th/5th centuries BCE down through the Common Era (William V. Harris, *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 2009], 229-78). The more apparent examples of this include: Aristotle (*De insom.* 460b.28-462a.32), Epicurus (*Vatican Sayings* 24), Lucretius (*De Rerum Natura*, 4.961ff), and Cicero (*De div.* 2.120, 128). Oppenheim observed a subtype of ancient Near Eastern dreams “which reflect, symptomatically, the state of mind, the spiritual and bodily ‘health’ of the dreamer, which are only mentioned but never recorded” (*The Interpretation*, 184; cf. idem, “Mantic Dreams,” 346). Bar pointed to *b. Ber.* 55b and 56a as examples of the “Talmudic belief that daytime thoughts and waking cares are the stuff of dreams” (*A Letter That Has Not Been Read*, 44). These rabbinic references provide an interesting case. As Alexander has observed, the Rabbis had to negotiate the thorny issue of permitting the voice of God in scriptural dream-visions while limiting the validity of contemporary claims to nocturnal revelation (Philip S. Alexander, “Bavli Berakhot 55a-57b: The Talmudic Dreambook in Context,” *JJS* 46 [1995]: 230-48). Such naturalistic explanations, however, are not found among the Aramaic texts, indicating that the authors of these materials align with the common ancient perspective on the divine aetiology of dream-visions.

in the Aramaic texts that is noteworthy; it is the close correspondences in their form and function that serve as key indicators of the unity of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.

This dissertation is structured around the tandem interests of describing *what these dream-visions do* (shared concerns) and *how they do it* (shared compositional patterns). However, before tracking these trends in the texts themselves, it would be worthwhile to consider the work of four scholars who have significantly shaped the current understanding of the Aramaic Scrolls. My review of research in the following pages is not intended to be exhaustive. Throughout the dissertation I will look to several other scholars whose focused studies on individual compositions have deepened our knowledgebase of the Aramaic corpus. The goal of the present chapter is to call special attention to how dream-visions have factored into the question of the nature of the Aramaic texts as a group in recent research. Once it has been established that there is something of a scholarly consensus regarding the importance of dream-visions to this collection of Aramaic writings, the chapter will conclude by describing how the rest of the dissertation will unfold.

2 *A corpus or collection? Dream-visions and the (dis)unity of the Aramaic Scrolls*

The topic of dream-visions in the Dead Sea Scrolls has been addressed at intervals over the last fifty years. A small collection of survey articles have attempted to dovetail some dream-vision traditions discovered at Qumran with Josephus' views on Essene mantic practices.¹⁰ A more extensive conversation has centered on the analogies between

¹⁰ The earliest discussions of this sort are found in articles by Menachem Brayer ("Psychosomatics, Hermetic Medicine, and Dream Interpretation in the Qumran Literature: Psychological and Exegetical

the lemma-plus-comment style of interpretation in the *Pesharim* and the oneirocritical methods featured in ancient Near Eastern texts, the Hebrew Scriptures, the Aramaic Scrolls, and rabbinic literature.¹¹ Ben Zion Wacholder, Devorah Dimant, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Florentino García Martínez have made the most valuable contributions to describing how dream-vision revelation constitutes a core component of the Qumran Aramaic texts.

In 1990 Wacholder conducted a “preliminary and provisional overview of ancient Jewish Aramaic literature.”¹² This survey integrated a diversity of texts from the Hebrew

Considerations,” *JQR* 60/2 [1969]: 112-27; *JQR* 60/3 [1970]: 213-30) and Solomon Zeitlin (“Dreams and their Interpretation from the Biblical Period to the Tannaitic Time: An Historical Study.” *JQR* 66 [1975]: 1-18). These early soundings were understandably preliminary, since, at the time of their writing, *1QapGen* was the only ‘new’ dream-vision text available. This meant that Josephus had a near monopoly on the topic (cf. *Ant.* 13.311; 15.373-79; 17.345-48; *J.W.* 2.113). These studies, however, are beset by an awkward mix of Freudian psychoanalysis with exegetical approaches. This resulted in some peculiar findings that blurred the line between literary form and purported experience. More recent and successful surveys include those of James VanderKam (“Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 4 [1997]: 336-53) and Armin Lange (“The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* [eds. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen; *STDJ* 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 376-435). While both scholars recognize the prevalence of dream-visions in the Qumran collection and references to Essene oneirocritical expertise in Josephus, the scope demanded by their topics permitted only passing treatment of the traditions among the Aramaic Scrolls.

¹¹ For representative research in this regard, see Asher Finkel, “The Peshar of Dreams and Scriptures,” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357-70; Michael Fishbane, “The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies Held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1973, Volume 1* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1977), 97-114; repr. in idem, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); Alex P. Jassen, “The Pesharim and the Rise of Commentary in Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation,” *DSD* 19 (2012): 363-98; Daniel A. Machiela, “The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries: Historical Context and Lines of Development,” *DSD* 19 (2012): 313-62; Maren Niehoff, “A Dream which is not Interpreted is like a Letter which is not Read,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 58-84; and Isaac Rabinowitz, “‘Pēsher/Pittārōn’: Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219-32.

¹² Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature,” 257. García Martínez noted that prior to the work of Dimant and Tigchelaar, this is the only article attempting to elucidate the nature of the Aramaic corpus (“Scribal Practices,” 331, n. 9). Some years before Wacholder’s contribution, however, Bickerman preliminarily explored a cross-section of Aramaic literature in a short essay published posthumously (Elias J. Bickerman, “Aramaic Literature,” in *The Jews in the Greek Age* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1988], 51-65). Due to the time of his writing, his limited inclusion of materials from the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls is understandable. Bickerman dedicated most of this study to detailing the scriptural allusions, generic features, historicity, and language/date of composition of the book of Tobit (*ibid.*, 52-58). He also

Scriptures, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as literary and inscriptional evidence from Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia. While Wacholder's proposed schema for ancient Aramaic literature – *broadly* defined – is problematic on a number of fronts, his proposal included some valuable insights into the texts from the Aramaic Scrolls known at the time of his writing. For example, Wacholder recognized the strong didactic tone of the literature and the increased interest in *Urzeit und Endzeit*.¹³ Additionally, he stressed the importance of visionary revelation and interpretation in the worldview of Aramaic writings:

A literary motif that appears frequently within the Judaeo-Aramaic literature is that of dream interpretation. Dreams presage future events and, if properly interpreted, possess universal significance. One notes that an active dream life figures heavily in these texts. [In *BG*] The two giant progeny of Shemihazah dream of the obliteration of two hundred trees with a luscious garden. [In *IQapGen*] Abram dreams about a threatened cedar, which intimates his possible death if precautions are not taken. Dreams and their proper interpretation form an essential part of the Danielic corpus. As in the biblical story of Joseph, dreams are the circumstances that motivate events and dramatize action.¹⁴

This quotation captures three fundamental methodological contributions of Wacholder's study: (i) the recognition of common features or interplay between Aramaic dream-vision traditions, (ii) the consideration of Daniel alongside other approximately contemporary Aramaic texts, and (iii) the importance of recognizing how scriptural material and motifs were adopted and adapted to new contexts. While Wacholder's wider typology left much

considered aspects of *Dan 2-7*, *4QprNab*, and *Aḥiqar*. Since Bickerman's interests centred more on describing these individual works than in accounting for the place of Aramaic writings in the literary landscape of ancient Judaism, his short study is of limited use to the present project.

¹³ While I agree with these observations generally, I cannot accept Wacholder's suggestion that the didactic character of the Aramaic texts was linked with or derived from proselytization ("The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature," 272). The concept of *Urzeit und Endzeit* stems from the work of Hermann Gunkel in *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895).

¹⁴ Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature," 271-72.

to be desired, his study provided some promising insights for exploring the contours and nature of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus.

The next scholar after Wacholder to attempt to capture the nature and scope of ancient, Jewish Aramaic literature was Devorah Dimant. In her earlier work, Dimant sought to categorize the entire Qumran library.¹⁵ The Aramaic texts among these finds began to factor more significantly in her developing schema when she posited that they fall into a category of works that “stand between sectarian and nonsectarian” in their ideology and proximity to the biblical text.¹⁶ Despite this proposed situation, she maintained that the Aramaic texts are uniformly non-sectarian in origin.¹⁷ More recently Dimant has attempted to describe the Aramaic Scrolls as a discrete body of literature. She proposed a six-fold classification based on the literary themes a work presupposes or expands upon. These are as follows: (i) works about the period of the flood, (ii) works dealing with the history of the patriarchs, (iii) visionary compositions, (iv) legendary narratives and court-tales, (v) astronomy and magic, and (vi) varia.¹⁸ This paradigm is

¹⁵ Dimant proposed a tripartite model of “biblical texts,” “documents employing terminology connected to the Qumran community,” and “works which do not contain clusters of terms and ideas related to the community” (Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness, Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* [eds. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 23-58).

¹⁶ Idem, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (eds. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105-34.

¹⁷ Ibid., 105. See also idem, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 175-91; and idem, “The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery, 1947-1997* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: Jerusalem, 2000), 170-76.

¹⁸ Idem., “The Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 201-202.

heuristically helpful but not without problems. The most fundamental issue is that, although Dimant creates an entire category for “visionary compositions,” texts in other categories also contain dream-vision episodes. For example, *IQapGen* is split in two, the earlier section allocated to category one and the latter to category two. This segmentation does not account for the fact that both of these ‘halves’ feature dream-visions.

Additionally, despite *4QVisAmram*’s incipit, which frames the work as “A copy of ‘The writing of the words of the vision(s) (נִיִּין) of Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi’”

(*4QVisAmram*^a [4Q543] 1a, b, c 1; *4QVisAmram*^c [4Q545] 1a i 1), Dimant does not list this composition under “visionary compositions.”¹⁹ Lastly, the book of Daniel is strikingly absent from the list. Portions of the Aramaic visionary sections from Dan 2, 4, and 7 are extant among *IQDan*^a (1Q71) and *4QDan*^{a, b, d} (4Q112-113, 4Q115).

¹⁹ Unless otherwise noted, all translations of Dead Sea Scrolls texts are my own, based upon transcriptions in the DJD series. The majority of the Aramaic texts may be found in George Brooke, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon: 1996); 1-184; Émile Puech, *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001); idem., *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587* (DJD XXXVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009). For those Enochic texts not included in the DJD series, I will draw upon J. T. Milik, with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). Primary texts of *IQapGen* derive from Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 31-84. The editions of Klaus Beyer are another important resource for comparison: *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten, Band 1* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); and *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Ergänzungsband: Band 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004). When pertinent, I will note differences between the Qumran and Masoretic tradition for Aramaic Daniel, but will derive the Aramaic text from R. Kittel, et al., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (4th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997). For the publication of the Qumran Daniel texts, see Eugene Ulrich, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 239-89. All other translations of the Hebrew Scriptures are from the NRSV.

In a more recent essay, Dimant refined her thematic classification by “defining the genres of the Aramaic texts by their particular stylistic and contextual markers.”²⁰ In this treatment she highlighted antediluvian and patriarchal narratives as the “two most important groups of Aramaic texts that turned up at Qumran.”²¹ Woven into the fabric of such works are the following forms/genres: (i) addresses, (ii) first-person autobiographical accounts, and (iii) third person narratives. Along with emphases on dualism and the transmission of book lore, Dimant averred that the study of revelatory mediums in the Aramaic texts is crucial to the task of articulating the nature of the corpus. She writes,

[t]he means, by which the specific revelations are imparted especially about history, is the predictive dream-vision. Dream-visions appear in most of the specimens belonging to this group [antediluvian and patriarchal narratives]: *I Enoch*, the *Book of Giants*, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, the *Visions of Amram* and the *Genesis Apocryphon*. But while the farewell address is peculiar to writings about ancient seers and sages, narratives and predictive dreams are not; they also appear in other types of Aramaic works.²²

While this statement does not resolve the issues of the six categories formerly proposed, Dimant indicates here that dream-visions have a broader historiological application across the Aramaic texts.

Like Dimant, Tigchelaar has attempted to describe the Aramaic texts among the Scrolls. He is reluctant, however, to speak in terms of an Aramaic ‘corpus,’ for fear of implying a degree of internal homogeneity that may be more perceived than actual. His

²⁰ Devorah Dimant, “Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 15-45, here 17.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

²² *Ibid.*, 36. For *brief* comment on dream-visions about history, see *ibid.*, 20-21.

caution on this point is due to the likely multiple sources of origin and diversity of concerns of the Aramaic texts.²³ In this respect, Tigchelaar's approach is not properly taxonomical. He observed that the Aramaic Scrolls contain narratives either "associated with pre-Mosaic figures or to persons connected with the Eastern Diaspora."²⁴

Additionally, visionary revelations, their inspired interpretations, and the transmission of book lore through approved genealogical lines are prevalent pseudepigraphic mechanisms in both settings.²⁵ These features represent a fundamental difference in claimed epistemology and authorial strategies for conferring authority in the Aramaic texts over and against the Hebrew materials, since the latter "rarely refer to such means of knowledge."²⁶

García Martínez recognized that the common denominator between Dimant and Tigchelaar is the shared insight that "the Aramaic literature found at Qumran is characterized by a predominant interest in 'pre-mosaic' protagonists or by a setting in the Diaspora."²⁷ However, when it comes to evaluating Dimant's categorization, García Martínez also harbored reservations on the viability of her "visionary compositions" category.²⁸ He suggested that a way forward might be to rethink this category, terming it

²³ Tigchelaar, "Aramaic Texts from Qumran," 160.

²⁴ Ibid., 157. See also idem, "The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 257-70, esp. 261.

²⁵ Idem, "Aramaic Texts from Qumran," 161, 171.

²⁶ Ibid., 170.

²⁷ García Martínez, "Scribal Practices," 333. See also, idem, "Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?" *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 435-50.

²⁸ Ibid., 438.

“apocalyptic writings.”²⁹ However, he is aware of the hazards invited by such a prescription. On this point García Martínez writes,

I am not claiming for any of those Aramaic compositions from Qumran that they are apocalypses according to the definition of *Semeia* 14, although several of them definitely are. But the apocalyptic outlook of all of these compositions seems to me to be clear. At the same time, I am not pretending that apocalypticism is absent from the Hebrew compositions (sectarian or not) found at Qumran (it is enough to think of the *War Scroll* for the first category or of the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* for the second). The only thing I am claiming is that a disproportionately large number of Aramaic compositions of the collection demonstrate an apocalyptic outlook, and that this (if we are not afraid of apocalypticism) allows us to conclude that a predominant interest in apocalypticism is also a specific characteristic of the Aramaic texts found at Qumran (although we cannot find it, of course, in all Aramaic compositions).³⁰

It is evident in the above statement that exploring the forms of revelatory phenomena in the Aramaic Scrolls will not only result in a clearer understanding of the Aramaic corpus, but perhaps provides fresh insight into the inception and development of the apocalypse genre and apocalyptic worldview in early Judaism. One of the most immediate benefits of such a venture, García Martínez suggests, is a more accurate understanding of a corpus of literature that appears to “have so profoundly shaped the group of Qumran that we can define it as an ‘apocalyptic community.’”³¹

It is evident from this brief survey of research that Wacholder, Dimant, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez have cleared a trail into the largely uncharted terrain of

²⁹ Idem., “Scribal Practices,” 334; idem., “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica,” 446. This proposal reflects García Martínez’ earlier contention that the Aramaic Scrolls are infused with a deep-seated apocalyptic character and outlook. For several early studies on the Aramaic texts that continue to have lasting value, see idem., *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

³⁰ Idem., “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica,” 438.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 447.

the Aramaic Scrolls. Their work, however, has also indicated that there remains much to explore ahead. While their approaches and conclusions clash at points, it seems all agree that the authors of these materials exhibit a certain proclivity for including dream-visions in their writing. This consensus affirms the basic premise of my project.

3 Plan of this study

Following this introductory chapter, the dissertation is comprised of two parts that together provide a comprehensive description of the usage of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus. Part One is comprised of two chapters, which detail the major literary-linguistic compositional features that give shape and structure to dream-vision episodes. Chapter Two serves as a foundation for the rest of the study by providing a basic orientation to each text containing or alluding to a dream-vision. In the process of collating the list of Aramaic dream-visions, special attention will be paid to salient and recurring literary themes, images, and motifs in revelatory accounts. Subsequent chapters will add greater detail to the content of individual dream-vision episodes. Chapter Three contributes further to this understanding of compositional patterns through an exploration of prevalent Aramaic phrases and idioms used in dream-visions. Together these chapters outline in some detail the linguistic tropes and literary structures that characterize dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus. For future reference, all the features noted in these surveys are collected and presented in tables at the close each chapter.

Part Two of the dissertation consists of three chapters, which describe three primary concerns addressed or advanced by dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus. The first of these is a particular form of exegesis. Chapter Four explores how the patriarchal

dream-visions in *1QapGen*, *1 Enoch*, and *ALD* were occasioned by the allusive or suggestive phrasing of the Hebrew Scriptures. For the scribes that crafted these works, scripture's hints at dream-vision revelation served as a departure point for alleviating interpretive tensions or extending the tradition in new directions. The second concern that is shared by many Aramaic dream-visions is the interest in priestly issues and theology. Chapter Five details how the dream-vision served as a vehicle for endorsing aspects of priestly praxis, genealogies, or eschatology in *4QVisAmram, NJ*, *4QTJacob?*, and *4QapocrLevi^b?*. The third major concern is the revelation of history. Chapter Six explores the (p)reviewing of history, either in episodes or its entirety, in the Enochic 'Apocalypse of Weeks,' *BG*, *1QapGen*, Dan 2 and 7; *4QFourKgdms, NJ*, and *4QAramApoc*. Special attention will be paid to detailing both the aspects of the historical record that are revealed and the historiographical mechanisms used in the presentation of historically oriented dream-visions. In framing the study in this way I am not dismissing that other interests factor into the dream-visions of the Aramaic Scrolls. Rather, my goal is to account for how these three major concerns that permeate the collection indicate a level in continuity in the overarching usages, functions, and purposes met by dream-vision revelation.

Chapter Seven concludes with a retrospective of the dissertation and some proposals regarding the nature and scope of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corpus. Some of my findings will also be brought to bear on questions related to discourses in ancient Judaism and the origins of apocalyptic literature.

PART ONE
SHARED COMPOSITIONAL PATTERNS

CHAPTER TWO

A PROSPECTUS OF DREAMS AND DREAMERS IN THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS

1 Introduction

The survey of research in Chapter One demonstrated that several scholars have remarked about the Aramaic Scrolls' perennial interest in dream-visions. However, statements of this kind were often made in passing, with few pages committed to exploring the pervasiveness of dream-vision episodes, allusions, and interpretations across the Aramaic corpus. For this reason, before exploring the ways in which dream-visions were created and used in these materials, it is necessary to comb the collection in order to establish exactly which works include this literary convention. In this survey it will become increasingly apparent that, for all their diversity, the dream-visions of the Aramaic corpus feature a surprising number of common images, motifs, and scenes. Recognizing such features makes a step in the direction of understanding more fully how the Aramaic texts drew upon and contributed to a fund of common literary tropes and *topoi*. This chapter, therefore, serves a dual purpose of orienting ourselves to the Aramaic dream-vision literature and amassing a knowledge base of their literary qualities. This overview will set the stage for Chapter Three, where I will explore the structure of dream-visions in the Aramaic language on the level of words, phrases, and idioms.

In the pages that follow I introduce individual texts under three sections. First, I will describe compositions thoroughly informed by, and infused with, dream-visions. Second, I will focus in on a small collection of highly fragmentary texts exhibiting some

fixtures common in dream-vision texts, but whose contents are largely lost. Third, I will close with a consideration of texts that at one time or another have been mistaken for containing visionary phenomena. In adopting this approach I am not presenting a classification or typology of the collection. My aim, rather, is to address a *desideratum* in current research by providing an annotated list of dream-visions in the Aramaic texts. At the close of the chapter I will offer some overarching observations complemented by a convenient table of the major literary themes and images underscored throughout this prospectus.

2 *Compositions featuring dream-visions*

This class of literature consists of *I Enoch*, the *Book of Giants*, *4QWords of Michael*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *4QTestament of Jacob?*, the *New Jerusalem* text, *Aramaic Levi Document*, *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*, *4QVisions of Amram*, Dan 2-7, *4QAramaic Apocalypse*, and *4QFour Kingdoms*. Since many of these works are linked pseudepigraphically to personalities in the Hebrew Scriptures, for the sake of ease I will progress through the materials in an order that traces the approximate biblical sequence. I commence with the Enochic suite of literature and end with texts associated with Daniel.

2.1 *I Enoch*

The once independent works that now comprise Ethiopic *I Enoch* are known by eleven Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran cave four (*4QEn^a* [4Q201], *4QEn^b* [4Q202], *4QEn^c* [4Q204], *4QEn^d* [4Q205], *4QEn^e* [4Q206], *4QEn^f* [4Q207], *4QEn^g* [4Q212], *4QEnastr^a* [4Q208], *4QEnastr^b* [4Q209], *4QEnastr^c* [4Q210], and *4QEnastr^d* [4Q211]),

one unprovenanced Aramaic papyrus fragment (*XQpapEnoch*), and likely an additional fragmentary Greek manuscript from cave seven (*7QpapEn*, comprised of 7Q4 + 7Q8 + 7Q11-14).¹ In Chapter Four I will establish how Enoch's reputation as a dreamer in this tradition is rooted in scriptural exegesis. The following overviews give a sense of how this exegetical maneuver positioned Enoch for otherworldly revelation on a variety of topics.

2.1.1 *The Book of Watchers (1 En. 1-36)*

The Watchers myth of *1 En.* 6-11, which recounts the illicit revelation and unnatural blending of the angelic and human spheres, gives rise to Enoch's career as a dreamer and otherworldly traveller. The lines following the superscription of *1 Enoch* emphasize Enoch's visionary credentials by attributing to him "the vision of the Holy One of heaven (*τὴν ὄρασιν τοῦ ἁγίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*)" (*1 En.* 1:2). Enoch's first full dream-vision in the *Book of Watchers* (hereafter *BW*) spans from *1 En.* 12:3 to 16:4, and is complemented with a cycle of visionary journeys to the four corners of the earth and far

¹ The editions for these materials are found mainly in Milik's *The Books of Enoch* and Stephen J. Pfann, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 3-171. For *XQpapEnoch*, see Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, "New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XpapEnoch," *DSD* 12 (2005): 134-57. For a discussion on the cave seven texts, see Peter W. Flint, "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on A Forgotten Connection* (eds. Gabriele Boccaccini, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 224-33. Helpful surveys of the Qumran Aramaic Enoch texts include, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Early Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls: an Overview and Assessment," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins; JSJSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 41-63; and George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 9-11, 21. I will interact with the Qumran Aramaic evidence when available. When the Aramaic is lacking I will cite the Greek from Matthew Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 5-36. When referencing content extant only in the Ethiopic, I will cite this in translation from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation: Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004). There is a good deal of correspondence in content and phrasing where the Aramaic, Greek, and Ethiopic witnesses to *1 Enoch* are preserved. As such, the later traditions may be used with measured confidence as a guide for illuminating the basic shape of now lost Aramaic sections.

reaches of the cosmos in *1 En.* 17-36. This content is sporadically extant at Qumran among *4QEn^b* (4Q202) 1 vi (*1 En.* 14:4-6), *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 vi, vii, viii, xii, xiii (*1 En.* 13:6-14:16; 14:18-20; 15:11 [?]; 18:8-12; 30:1-32:1; 35:35-36:4), and *4QEn^d* (4Q205) 1 xi and xii (*1 En.* 22:13-24:2; 25:7-27:1), with *4QEn^b* being the earliest manuscript, dated palaeographically to *ca.* 200-150 BCE.²

Having been dispatched to deliver a verdict of judgment against the fallen watchers, and then obliged to record and submit their plea for mercy, Enoch retires to the waters of Dan, recites their petition until sleep overtakes him, and “dreams (*ὄνειροι*)” and “visions (*ὀράσεις*)” of wrath fall upon him (*1 En.* 12:3-13:8). The content of the dream-vision is not related in full until Enoch recounts it before the fallen watchers at “Abel-Main (*Ἐβελσατά*)” (*1 En.* 13:9). Enoch tells of being whisked into the heavens and ushered into a divine throne room, whereat the “Great Glory (*ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη*)” affirms his original mission and message. Despite the desperate plea of the watchers for themselves and their ravenous progeny, judgment is imminent (*1 En.* 14:24-16:4). Following this, Enoch finds himself in the care of Uriel for an elaborate cycle of visionary journeys (*1 En.* 17-36). This introduces us to a common motif in the Aramaic texts: the use of an *angelus interpres* to render intelligible the sights and sounds of the revelation.³

In the present case, the angelic explanations pertain to natural phenomena and the

² Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 164, 178, 217.

³ Schöpflin has demonstrated that this motif in Israelite/Jewish literature originated in Zech 1-8 (Karin Schöpflin, “God’s Interpreter: The Interpreting Angel in Post-Exilic Prophetic Visions of the Old Testament,” in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception* [eds. Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin; DCLY 2007; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007], 189-203). Flannery-Dailey confirmed this finding and contextualized early Jewish uses of this motif in light of the *oneiros*, a god-sent dream messenger, in Greek literary dream-visions (*Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 64-65; 174; 204).

workings of the cosmos. These are juxtaposed with the guilty fallen watchers who abandoned their ordained heavenly stations (*1 En.* 18:1-19:2). The remaining chapters of *BW* consist of detailed guided journeys to the north, west, south and east. In this process Enoch beholds locales prepared for judgment and learns of astrological phenomena. The latter of these themes is the most pronounced in *The Book of the Luminaries*.⁴

2.1.2 *The Book of the Luminaries (1 En. 72-82)*

Luminaries is an Enochic pseudepigraphon penned sometime in the 3rd century BCE.⁵ While there has been some speculation regarding the textual status of the work at Qumran, I consider *4QEnastr^{a-d}* (4Q208-211) to be related to the later Ethiopic form of the composition, even if we are unable to discern the transmission process between these

⁴ I omit treatment of the *Book of Parables (1 En. 37-71)*, since, at present, it has not been identified among the Dead Sea Scrolls. This situation has been explained in a number of ways. Stone pointed to the thousands of yet unidentified Qumran fragments suggesting that the vestiges of *Parables* (and other ‘absent’ works) may lie therein (Michael E. Stone, “Enoch’s Date in Limbo or Some Considerations on David Suter’s Analysis of the Book of Parables,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* [ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Michigan, 2007], 444-49). With considerable variation in their proposals, Boccaccini, Nickelsburg and Sacchi have advanced the case that *Parables* was penned by a group like the Qumranites, but who developed the Enochic tradition in a different direction (Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 144-49; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Parables of Enoch and the Manuscripts from Qumran” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* [eds. Eric F. Mason, et al.; vol. 2.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012], 655-68; George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37-82* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012], 60; Paolo Sacchi, “Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Volume 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006], 377-395). Still others have proposed that ideological tensions between *Parables* and select ‘sectarian’ works indicate that the work would not have been favorably received at Qumran (compare the views of Nickelsburg, “The Parables of Enoch,” 664-65; and Ida Fröhlich, “The Parables of Enoch and Qumran Literature,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* [ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Michigan, 2007], 343-51). Whether the lack of *Parables* at Qumran was accidental or intentional, its absence is problematic for a study that rests primarily on Aramaic evidence – for *Parables*, we have none.

⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 44; James C. Vanderkam, “Enoch, Astronomical Book of (1 Enoch 72-82),” *EDEJ*, 581-83.

two points.⁶ 4Q208 is the earliest of these manuscripts, dated by Cross to *ca.* 175-125 BCE, a date in the neighborhood of the AMS dating of 172-48 BCE in the 2σ range.⁷ In *Luminaries* Uriel guides Enoch through the heavens, explaining in great detail the workings of natural and astrological phenomena and their implications for proper calendrical halakhah. This emphasis on orderliness is starkly contrasted with a prediction of human sin that will cause irregularities in the natural world (*I En.* 80:1-8). Following this prophecy, Enoch is shown the heavenly tablets containing the predetermined record of human history (*I En.* 81:1-4). At this point, Enoch is escorted back to earth and adjured to transmit the revelation to his son Methuselah, a task which he expediently completes (*I En.* 81:5-10). In sum, *Luminaries* claims that the 364 day calendar is

⁶ Stuckenbruck observed that “[n]othing from the manuscripts 4Q208-211 themselves actually make any reference to Enoch the visionary at all” (Stuckenbruck, “The Early Traditions Related to I Enoch,” 59, n. 74). However, their Enochic association is probable on three counts. First, we must account for the fact that material resembling 4Q208-211 was eventually subsumed into *I Enoch*. Second, as observed by VanderKam, references to Enoch’s astrological knowledge in Pseudo-Eupolemus (*ca.* 2nd century BCE) and *Jub.* 4:16-25 (*ca.* 160-150 BCE; cf. *4QPseudoJubilees*^c [4Q227] 2) evidence Enoch’s early association with this sort of knowledge (*I Enoch* 2, 342-44). Third, fragments of first-person speech from father to son in *4QEnastr*^b (4Q209) 23 2; 26 6 (= *I En.* 77:1; 79:1) best fit the mode of transmission from Enoch to Methuselah featured in *Luminaries*. At the core of this issue is that 4Q208 contains material pertaining only to the synchronistic calendar. The other Qumran manuscripts exhibit marginal overlap with other known versions of *Luminaries*, albeit often in sequences that do not align with the Ethiopic version. Milik suggested that 4Q208 contained only the synchronistic calendar and that “[t]he résumé of this calendar is to found in *En.* 73:1-74:9” (*The Books of Enoch*, 273). García Martínez and Tigchelaar concluded that 4Q208 was a copy of *Luminaries* in some form, “[h]owever, it cannot be ruled out that 4Q208 contained only the synchronistic calendar” (DJD XXXVI, 95). Tigchelaar later revised his position, favoring the option that 4Q208 should not be considered an Enochic work, but a text pertaining only to the synchronistic calendar (Eibert Tigchelaar, “Some Remarks on the Book of Watchers, the Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208,” *Henoch* 24 [2002]: 143-45). VanderKam stated that we cannot know for certain what transpired from the Aramaic to Ethiopic forms of *Luminaries*, suggesting that “[w]e should leave open the possibility that at an early point there was only a synchronistic calendar that was later combined with other sections as in 4Q209” (*I Enoch* 2, 357-58).

⁷ Frank Moore Cross, “The Development of Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. Ernest Wright; Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), 133-202; Greg Doudna, “Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998-99), 430-71, esp. 468. On account of the corroboration of the AMS range, Cross’ proposal is to be preferred over Milik’s dating “to the end of the third century or else beginning of the second century B.C.” (*ca.* 275-175 BCE), which was accepted by García Martínez and Tigchelaar in the official edition (Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 273; DJD XXXVI, 106).

ingrained into the fabric of the cosmos, a revelation which bears the authoritative approval of none other than Uriel himself, channeled through Enoch.

2.1.3 *The Book of Dreams (1 En. 83-91)*

The Enochic *Book of Dreams* (hereafter, *BD*) contains two separate dream-visions, the first of which (*1 En.* 83:3-5) does not appear to be extant at Qumran.⁸ The second dream-vision, often dubbed the ‘Animal Apocalypse’ (*1 En.* 85-90; hereafter, *AnAp*), is partially extant in *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 4 (*1 En.* 89:31-37), *4QEn^d* (4Q205) 2 i, ii, iii (*1 En.* 89:11-14, 29-31, 43-44), *4QEn^e* (4Q212) 4 i, ii, iii (*1 En.* 88:3-89:6; 89:7-16; 26-30), and *4QEn^f* (4Q207) 1 (*1 En.* 86:1-3). *4QEn^f* is the earliest of these, dated palaeographically by Milik to *ca.* 150-125 BCE.⁹ The dream-vision presents a version of Israelite history, commencing in the days of Adam and Eve and concluding with the rise of an eschatological messiah using symbolic ciphers, such as animals, stars, and shepherds, to represent a cast of human and angelic figures.¹⁰ The dream-vision crescendos toward a utopian eschatological age, complete with a new temple, which attracts the worship of the entire world (*1 En.* 90:28-38). At this point, Enoch awakes and both blesses the Lord for

⁸ Nickelsburg concluded that evidence for this Enochic dream-vision is lacking at Qumran (*1 Enoch*, 352-53). Stuckenbruck, however, averred that material similar to *1 En.* 84:2-4 may be found in *4QEnGiants^a* (4Q204) 9-10 (Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* [CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007], 11, n. 31). Tiller has compellingly argued that the two episodes were written independently and later redacted into a common composition (Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* [SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], 99). The editorial attempt to unify the two accounts is most evident in *1 En.* 83:2; 85:1; 90:42.

⁹ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 244.

¹⁰ For a table of symbols and referents, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 358. For more detailed discussions of the allegorical and symbolic elements, see Tiller, *The Animal Apocalypse*, 21-60; and Bennie H. Reynolds III, *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses, 333-63 B.C.E.* (JAJSup 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 167-90.

the eventual salvation of the righteous and bitterly weeps over the afflictions Israel will endure along the way (*1 En.* 90:39-42).

2.1.4 *The Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 92-105)*

The dream-vision of the ‘Apocalypse of Weeks’ (hereafter, *ApW*) within the *Epistle* is partially extant in *4QEn^s* (4Q212) 1 iii-iv, dated palaeographically by Cross to 50-1 BCE.¹¹ The work comprises Enoch’s recollection of a dream-vision in which he was shown celestial tablets that detailed the course of human history according to a periodized schema of ten ‘weeks’ (4Q212 1 iii 20-22; *1 En.* 93:2b). The historical prospectus begins in the antediluvian days, traces some downward spirals throughout Israelite history, and culminates in the election of a righteous group whose role is pivotal in ushering in the eschaton. I will pay greater attention to the contours of this presentation in Chapter Six. For the time being, I will simply note that Enoch’s reputation as a dreamer and tablet reader positions him as a reliable source for information regarding the perils of this age and the climax of human history.

¹¹ Cross, “The Development of Jewish Scripts,” 149. *4QEn^s* confirms that the sequence of the later Ethiopic version is disjointed and that *ApW* originally proceeded from *1 En.* 93:1-10 to 91:11-17. Beyond this, however, there is some debate concerning the arrangement of *ApW* in *4QEn^s*. See, for example, Matthew Black, “The Fragments of the Aramaic Enoch from Qumran,” in *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques problèmes* (ed. W. C. van Unnik; RechBib 9; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 15-28; idem, “The Apocalypse of Weeks in the Light of *4QEn^s*,” *VT* 28 (1978): 464-69; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 247; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 414-15; Daniel C. Olson, “Recovering the Original Sequence of *1 Enoch* 91-93,” *JSP* 11 (1993): 69-94; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Evaluating the Discussions Concerning the Original Order of Chapters 91-93 and Codicological Data Pertaining to 4Q212 and Chester Beatty XII Enoch,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on A Forgotten Connection* (eds. Gabriele Boccaccini, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 220-23; and James C. VanderKam, “Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1-10; 91:11-17),” in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 366-79.

2.1.5 *The Birth of Noah (1 En. 106-107)*

Following on the *Epistle* is a short Enochic, or better, Noachic booklet expanding upon the notice of Noah's birth in Gen 5:28-29. This work is partially extant in *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 5 i 26-30; 5 ii (*1 En.* 106:1-2; 106:13-107:2) but finds close parallels in *1QapGen* (1Q20) 2, *1QNoah* (1Q19) 3, and perhaps *4QBirthNoah^{a-c}* (4Q534-536).¹² In *1 Enoch* when Noah emerges from the womb with remarkable physical features and the ability to speak, Lamech suspects the child is the result of an adulterous union between his wife and a fallen watcher. He seeks advice from his father Methuselah, who in turn seeks truth on the matter from Enoch. When asked by Enoch why he has come, Methuselah explains that he is greatly distressed on account of a terrible "vision (Ethiopic: *rā'y*)" (*1 En.* 106:9).¹³ Stuckenbruck has suggested that this reference "is ambiguous with respect to whether the 'vision' refers specifically to the appearance of the child or if, in effect, the matter is being regarded as a dream vision."¹⁴ Since Methuselah is not subject to a dream-vision elsewhere in *1 En.* 106-107 it is unlikely that Enoch was sought for oneirocriticism. Additionally, "image," "sight," and "appearance" fall within the semantic range of the Ethiopic *rə'ya*.¹⁵ Therefore, Methuselah is not asking for an interpretation of a dream-vision, but is seeking an explanation of a frightful or miraculous sight. Since Enoch has learned the mysteries of the Lord from heavenly tablets (*4QEn^c* [4Q204] 5 ii 26-29; =*1 En.* 106:19b-107:1), he is capable of interpreting the sight of

¹² See Aryeh Amihay and Daniel A. Machiela, "Traditions of the Birth of Noah," in *Noah and his Book(s)* (eds. Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel; SBLEJL 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 53-69.

¹³ The Aramaic is not extant here and the Greek has suffered from a scribal error omitting the phrase in question.

¹⁴ Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 652.

¹⁵ Wolf Leslau, "*rə'ya*," in *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), 458-59.

Noah's birth for Methuselah. In this regard, *1 En.* 106-107 do not add any dream-vision episodes to our data set but contribute further to the elevation of Enoch as a source of divinely endowed insight and wisdom achieved through dream-vision revelation elsewhere in the tradition.¹⁶

2.2 *The Book of Giants*

Prior to the discovery of Aramaic *BG* manuscripts at Qumran, various 'giants' traditions were known from later literary allusions, Manichean literature, and some Rabbinic sources. It was not until Milik's evaluation of the Qumran *BG* fragments that the antiquity of the tradition was appreciated.¹⁷ Milik identified between six and eleven *BG* manuscripts at Qumran; however, differing assessments have since been presented by Beyer, García Martínez, Puech, Reeves, and Stuckenbruck.¹⁸ A survey of these proposals

¹⁶ As was the case with *Parables*, I will not include the Enochic booklet of *1 En.* 108 in my consideration, since material from this section of *1 Enoch* has not been identified among the Qumran fragments. Stuckenbruck concluded on codicological grounds that there would have been insufficient space after *1 En.* 107:2 in *4QEn^c* (204) 5 ii 30 to accommodate *1 En.* 108:1-15 (*1 Enoch* 91-108, 691). Milik drew a similar conclusion, suggesting that the following column would have contained only *1 En.* 107:3 (*The Books of Enoch*, 217). It is noteworthy that the 4th century CE Greek Chester Beatty-Michigan Papyrus ends at *1 En.* 107:3 (Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch* 91-108, 693-94). Both scholars concur that *1 En.* 108 should be dated to the years up to and including 100 CE, indicating that this material postdated the Qumran Scrolls (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 554; Stuckenbruck *1 Enoch* 91-108, 694).

¹⁷ Henning cobbled together a partial 'Book of Giants' using Middle Persian, Sogdian, Coptic, and Parthian sources (W. B. Henning, "The Book of Giants," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 [1943]: 52-74). Henning identified these traditions with the Manichean "Book of Giants (Γραφή τῶν Γυγάντων)," composed in part on the basis of Aramaic sources stemming from the 2nd century BCE. Milik echoed this sentiment, titling the abbreviated work the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*, and further observed that aspects of the tradition found their way into various medieval Rabbinic sources, including *Bereshit Rabbah*, *Yalqut Shimoni*, and the *Chronicles of Jerahme'el* (*The Books of Enoch*, 321-39). I will take the opportunity to highlight some of the more significant parallels with these in a later chapter.

¹⁸ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 309; idem, "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt, Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 117-27; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte, Band 1*, 258-68; idem, *Die aramäischen Texte, Band 2*, 155-62; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 110-13; Puech, DJD XXXI, 11-12; John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* [MHUC 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992], 57-67; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 41; idem, "The

indicates that the narrative structure of *BG* is somewhat elusive, although Stuckenbruck's evaluation proves to be the most compelling and is accepted here in its essential points.¹⁹ *BG* is part of the ancient suite of Enochic literature that emerged as an interpretive spin-off from Gen 6:1-4. Unlike the pseudepigraphic perspective of *I Enoch*, *BG* adopts the standpoint of an anonymous narrator reporting on the plight and eventual punishment of the giants. *BG* is undoubtedly related to *BW* as it tells the tale of how the giants learned of their fate – an awkward unresolved narrative detail for the Enochic tradition. Dream-visions play an important role in delivering this foreboding edict to the giants, as evidenced by at least three partially extant episodes and allusions in *2QEnGiants* (2Q26), *4QEnGiants*^f (4Q206 2-3), *4QEnGiants*^b (4Q530), *4QEnGiants*^c (4Q531), and *6QpapEnGiants* (6Q8).²⁰

Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran Book of Giants: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 3-24.

A hallmark of Milik's work on the Enochic literature at Qumran was his proposal that as early as 100 BCE, an Enochic Pentateuch existed, comprised of *Luminaries*, *BW*, *BG*, *BD*, and the *Epistle* (*The Books of Enoch*, 4, 22, 54-55, 76-77, 183-43). This proposal, however, has been extensively critiqued and was generally not accepted in subsequent research. See Devorah Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 14-29; Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, “The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes,” *HTR* 70 (1977): 51-65; and James C. VanderKam, “The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch,” *Numen* 26 (1979): 89-103.

¹⁹ My treatment here coheres with Stuckenbruck's proposal in most respects. I disagree, however, that 6Q8 2 derives from an episode separate from Hahya's dream-vision in 4Q530 (Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 201-203; cf. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte*, 265 n. 1). Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 309), Reeves (*Jewish Lore*, 95) and Puech (DJD XXXI, 28; idem, “Les fragments 1 à 3 du *Livre des Géants* de la grotte 6 (*pap6Q8*),” *RevQ* 74 [1999]: 227-38; idem, “Les songes des fils de Semihazah dans le *Livre des Géants* de Qumrân,” *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, January-March [2000]: 7-26) have shown that these texts are mutually illuminating and stem from the same dream-vision. Machiela, though less convinced of Puech's proposal here, nonetheless concludes that “it is clear that both [the episodes of 4Q530 and 6Q8 2] include a garden, trees, gardeners, shoots, and are visionary in nature. There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that both texts refer to the same basic dream, even if they represent two distinct versions of it” (*The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 98). I also diverge from Stuckenbruck's reading of 4Q531 22 as possibly alluding to a dream-vision of Gilgamesh (see n. 20 below).

²⁰ In addition to the instances discussed here, Puech proposed that 4Q531 46 perhaps contains a dream-vision ascent (DJD XXXI, 93). As Goff remarked, “the evidence is too meager to state this conclusively” (Matthew Goff, “Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants' Appropriation of Gilgamesh Motifs,” *DSD* 16 [2009]: 221-53, here 242 n. 66). Beyer proposed that 4Q531 4 evidences

The first indication of a dream-vision is found in 4Q531 22 9-12. 'Ohaya, brother to Hahya, and son of the fallen watcher Shemihazah, relates to Gilgamesh that he beheld a troubling dream-vision.²¹ This seems to be a reference to the partially extant episode found in 2Q26, which featured the imagery of washing a tablet to forecast the giants' doom in the deluge. This episode results in the first of two journeys to Enoch for the purpose of oneirocriticism. As Stuckenbruck has shown, 6Q8 1 relates how upon his return from Enoch, the giant Mahaway carried two tablets in hand and relayed an unfavorable message, which resulted in some discord among his compatriots.²²

The theme of certain destruction is most pronounced in the dream-visions attributed to Hayhah and 'Ohaya in 4Q530 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?). These comprise what Wikenhauser has described as a *Doppelträume*, whereby tandem revelations reify the veracity and immanency of the dream-visions' fulfillment in waking reality.²³ The first dream-vision juxtaposes arboreal imagery and fiery destruction in order to

Enoch's interpretation of Hayhah and 'Ohaya's dream-visions, which included a list of the guilty parties among the Watchers and giants (*Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 121). The context of this fragment is tenuous. Stuckenbruck has commented that this proposal "merits consideration" ("The Sequencing of Fragments," 11-12.)

²¹ Stuckenbruck first understood 4Q531 22 9-12 as a plea for Gilgamesh to relate a dream-vision (*The Book of Giants*, 164). Puech (DJD XXXI, 77-78) and Goff ("Gilgamesh the Giant," 242), however, have argued compellingly that 'Ohaya is the only dreamer in view here. In a more recent treatment, Stuckenbruck stated that the words at this point in the text are "ambiguous," and conceded that both options are possible (Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Giant Mythology and Demonology: From the Ancient Near East to the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* [eds. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 313-38). In the end, since 'Ohaya is the only dreamer explicitly mentioned in the immediate context, it is preferable to understand 4Q531 22 9-12 as a reference to 'Ohaya's revelation via a dream-vision.

²² Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 199. Milik ("Turfan et Qumran," 119), García-Martínez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 101), Puech ("Les fragments 1 à 3," 231) and Machiela (*The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 98) have suggested that 6Q8 1 presents Mahaway recounting his own dream-vision. Stuckenbruck's reading is to be preferred on the basis that Mahaway is not cast as a dreamer in *BG* but exclusively as an emissary to Enoch (cf. 4Q530 7 ii).

²³ Alfred Wikenhauser, "Doppelträume," *Biblica* 29 (1948): 100-111; cf. Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 145. Examples of this motif in the Hebrew Scriptures include, Gen 37:5-7, 9; 40:9-15, 16-19; 41:1-4, 5-8; and 1 Sam 3:2-15.

communicate certain judgment upon the giants in the near future (lines 6-12). In similar form to *I En.* 14 and Dan 7, the second dream-vision included a throne room judgment scene, connoting an eschatological judgment. If the outlook from Hahya's dream-vision was not gloomy enough, at the news of 'Ohaya's episode "all the giants were afraid (דחלו (כל גבריא" (line 20). With renewed urgency, the giants dispatch Mahaway to Enoch stating, "He will t[ell you] the inter[preta]tion of the dreams, so that you might know everything from him with certainty, whether there is deception in it... (יחון[א לכה] פ[ש]ר) [חלמיה ודי כלא מנה תנדע ביצבא הן איתיה בה ארבא] (4Q530 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (? 23-24).²⁴ Unfortunately, only part of Enoch's interpretation of 'Ohaya's dream-vision has survived in the manuscript evidence. In 4Q530 7 ii 11 we read, "concerning the gard]eners that c[ame down] from heaven (תחתו) (על גנ]נין די מן שמין נחתו)." While these episodes are diverse in their imagery and presentation, in a later chapter it will be demonstrated that their collaborative function is to establish an *Urzeit und Endzeit* typology of history. The developing tradition of Aramaic texts associated with, but not attributed to, Enoch is found in another previously unknown work, which I consider next.

2.3 *4QWords of Michael*

This Aramaic composition is represented chiefly by *4QWordsMich* (4Q529).

Milik also referred to a second copy, *4QWordsMich^a* (4Q571), and perhaps a third,

²⁴ On this reading, see Daniel A. Machiela and Andrew B. Perrin, "‘That you may know everything from him with certainty’: A New Reading in 4QEnGiants^b ar (4Q530) and a Literary Connection between the Book of Giants and Genesis Apocryphon," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 113-125. See also the response to our proposal in Émile Puech, "4Q530 9-10 – Addenda et corrigenda," *RevQ* 25 (2011): 127-31.

6QpapUnclassified (6Q23).²⁵ *4QWordsMich^a* is likely the earliest of these, palaeographically dated to *ca.* 150-100 BCE.²⁶ The ancient title of this work is partially preserved in a superscription in 4Q529 1 1, which presents the text as “The words of the writing that Michael said to the angels conc[erning (מלי כתבא די אמר מיכאל למלאכיא (תשעה טורין תרין (ע]ל).” References to seeing “nine mountains, two to [the] sout[h (למדנ]חא” and presumably additional mountains “to] the [no]rth (לדר[ומא)” (4Q529 1 3-4) may imply a visionary journey. Immediately following this we hear a first-person voice, presumably it is Michael who relates, “There I saw the angel Gabriel (תמה חזית (לגבריא מלאכא.” Shortly afterwards the text reads, “according to the vision, and I showed him the vision and he said to me ... in my book of the Great Eternal Lord it is written (בספרי די רבי מרא עלמא כתיב)” (4Q529 1 5-6). The descendants of Ham and Shem are mentioned in line 7, which is followed in line 9 by the phrase, “And behold! A city will be built for the name of the great Lo[r]d (והא מתבניה קריה לשמה די רבי מ[רא] (רא)”. As the leather of 4Q529 narrows, the available text steadily decreases. Noteworthy features of the fragmentary remains, however, include references to doing evil before the Lord in line 10, and a “man (גבר)” from a “distant province (מדינתא רחיקתא)” in line 13.²⁷ On account of the above noted features of 4Q529, Puech is likely correct that the seer is Enoch,

²⁵ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 91.

²⁶ DJD XXXVII, 40.

²⁷ Puech posited that line 13 may be an allusion to Terah or Abram’s coming out of Haran/Ur (Gen 11:31; 12:4-6; 13:1-7) (*ibid.*).

suggesting that 4Q529 fits within the general tradition of Enochic visionary journeys and heavenly ascents.²⁸ *4QWordsMich*'s perspective, therefore, presents a unique vantage point on the Enochic tradition by purporting to capture a message relayed from Michael to his fellow angels regarding some experience shared with Enoch (cf. *1 En.* 18:6; 24:1; and 25).

The next text I will introduce certainly incorporated Enochic themes into its narrative, but its author used a considerably wider swath of the book of Genesis as his basis and exhibited a special proclivity for the rewriting and creation of dream-visions.

2.4 *The Genesis Apocryphon*

1QapGen (1Q20) is comprised of 23 columns in varying states of preservation. The work features episodic narratives couched primarily in the pseudepigraphic voices of Enoch, Lamech, Noah, and Abram. Establishing the compositional date of this work has been a contentious issue, though a date in the mid 2nd century BCE is most probable.²⁹ The plots of *1QapGen* derive principally from Gen 6-15, though the author's proximity to, and reliance upon, his scriptural source fluctuates. Dream-visions are featured at several critical narrative junctures and play an important role in plot progression and characterization.

²⁸ Ibid., 1. Milik first observed the proximity of 4Q529 to the Enochic tradition, suggesting that the author of *Parables* was aware of the text, though not familiar with its contents (*The Books of Enoch*, 91). For a recent consideration of the intertextuality of this text some other ancient literature, see David Hamidović, "La transtextualité dans *le livre de Michel* (4Q529; 6Q23): Une étude du répertoire des motifs littéraires apocalyptiques sur Hénoch, Daniel et les *Jubilés*," *Semitica* 55 (2013): 117-37.

²⁹ Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 134-42.

Noah is the first dreamer in *IQapGen*.³⁰ As noted by Eshel and Machiela this characterization is a marked departure from the Noah of Genesis, who is not associated with dream-visions in the scriptural narrative.³¹ Noah is the subject of as few as three and as many as five dream-visions in *IQapGen*.³² The first is evident from a brief notice in

³⁰ Falk suspected that 1Q20 0-I contained some type of revelatory episode, perhaps attributed to Enoch or Lamech (Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [LSTS 63; CQS 8; London; T & T Clark, 2007], 77). This surmise may very well be correct; however, the paucity of text inhibits the study of this section of *IQapGen*. Bernstein observed that the first-person plural voice in cols. 0-I may comprise statements from the lips of the fallen Watchers (Moshe J. Bernstein, "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* [eds. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth Anne Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 39-63, esp. 44-45). Stuckenbruck observed an additional first-person singular "I" in 1Q20 1 10, 13, presumably from the Watchers' interlocutor, perhaps an angel or Enoch (Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the Yahad," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* [eds. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011], 295-326, esp. 317). Such a narrative framework hints that the opening columns of *IQapGen* may be in some relation to *BG*.

³¹ Esther Eshel, "The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Text," in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (eds. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange with the assistance of Lucas L. Schulte; CBET 52; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 119-32, esp. 122; Daniel A. Machiela, "Genesis Revealed: The Apocalyptic Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* (eds. Daniel K. Falk, et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 205-21, esp. 219. Peters suggested that the portrait of Noah in *IQapGen* was crafted in part on the prototype of the priestly Levi in *ALD* (Dorothy M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* [SBLEJL 26; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008], 55-59; idem, "The Recombination and Evolution of Noah Traditions as Found in the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees: The DNA of Fraternal Twins," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* [eds. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 223-32). This is a particularly intriguing (re)characterization strategy, since Levi's profile as a dreamer in *ALD* has been shown to derive in part from the prototype of Enoch (see George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 [1981]: 575-600; idem, *1 Enoch*, 246; Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* [JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 227-28).

³² The precise number and scope of Noachic dream-visions in *IQapGen* cannot be determined conclusively. I consider the following narrative units to be singular dream-visions: 1Q20 VI 11-VII 6; XI 15-XII 6; and XII 19-XV 21. The content of 1Q20 7-8 contains at least one episode, perhaps two. I do not regard the phrase "So I girded my loins in the חזון of truth and wisdom" in 1Q20 VI 4 to be an additional allusion. Rather, as Fitzmyer has observed, the occurrence of חזון here is better rendered as "appearance," i.e., Noah displayed his uprightness and wisdom (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon from*

1Q20 VI 10-12, which reads, “Then the time of my sons taking women for themselves in marriage came to a close, [and the Lord of] Heaven [appeared to me] in a vision (חזיון). I looked and was shown and informed about the conduct of the sons of Heaven, and how all [] heaven. I hid this mystery within my heart, and did not make it known to anyone.”³³ In the following chapter it will be seen this phrasing closely resembles the awakening formulae of *ALD* and Dan 7:28. Despite this statement of secrecy, in 1Q20 VI 14 and following Noah explains that his revelation derived from a “vision (חזיון).” Machiela noted that it is unclear if this material pertains to the dream-vision referenced in lines 11-12 or comprises material from a separate account.³⁴ Given the close proximity of these references, I am inclined to take them as referring to the same event. In the same episode, then, Noah received revelation from “an emissary of the great Holy One (משלחת קדושה) (אֱלֹהִים)” (1Q20 VI 13, 15). The fragmentary text that follows is steeped in motifs associated with the Watchers myth (1Q20 VI 19-21). Shortly thereafter we read of Noah’s self-

Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary [3rd ed.; BibOr 18/B; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004], 146). My enumeration resembles Machiela’s, save for his delineation of the third account from 1Q20 XII 26(?)–XV, and his preferred translation of “vision” in 1Q20 VI 4 (“Genesis Revealed,” 215; idem, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 43). Falk indicated that Noah was the subject of at least two “apocalyptic” revelations: 1Q20 VI 9-22; XII ?–XV 20 (*The Parabiblical Texts*, 31-32, 77). Eshel counts between three and four episodes; however, her segmentation of these is problematic. Like Falk, she does not adequately account for the revelatory context of cols. VII-VIII. More problematic is her segmentation of the dream-vision commencing in col. XIII into two separate episodes (“The Dream Visions,” 123-24). It seems that she has understood the phrase “So the water ceased, and it ended (וַיִּסַּח מִיַּד וַיִּסַּח)” in line 11 as the conclusion of a dream-vision episode. However, from the fragmentary interpretation retained in col. XIV, it is evident that the trees described before and after XIII 11 were portrayed in the same episode. As such, this phrase is better taken as a transitional marker from one scene to the next within a single dream-vision.

³³ Falk astutely recognized that this episode takes place in Noah’s 500th year (1Q20 VI 9-10; cf. Gen 5:32), and that *I En.* 60:1 also “mentions a vision of the angelic hosts and divine judgment at this date” (Daniel K. Falk, “Divergence from Genesis in the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* [eds. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 193-203, here 195).

³⁴ Machiela, “Genesis Revealed,” 213-14.

asserted righteousness and what appears to be a comprehensive list of the victims of the impending deluge (1Q20 VI 23, 26).³⁵ Some 10 lines later the text picks up at the top of col. VII with a reference to Noah's rulership over the earth and seas, followed by a fragmentary description of meteorological phenomena and some chronological calculation. The *vacat* in 1Q20 VII 6 and Noah's response "Then I rejoiced at the words of the Lord of Heaven" in line 7 likely indicate the close of the account.

The following phrases "to all humanity through you (לְכֹל אֲנָשָׁא בְדָךְ)" and "sp]oke with me and made k[nown] to me, and revealing all (מְלִלְתִּי וְעִמִּי וְאֵחָהּ [וְהָ] לִי וְלִמְגֹלָא בֹּל)" suggest that Noah received additional revelation(s) featuring an otherworldly interpreting figure (1Q20 VII 13, 22). The phrase "wh]at I dreamt. So I blessed the great Hol[y O]ne (דְּ[י] חִלְמַת וּבְרִכַתְּ קִדְ[י] שְׂא רַבָּא)" in 1Q20 VII 20 confirms that the medium of revelation was a dream-vision. The scope and content of the episode(s) in these columns cannot be determined.

Upon disembarking from the ark Noah again receives a divine revelation. This account opens in 1Q20 XI 15 with the phrase, "And a[pp]eared] to me (וְאִתְחַזֵּי לִי) ... from heaven, speaking with me and saying, 'Do not fear, O Noah! I am with you and with those of your sons who will be like you forever.'" The ensuing four fragmentary lines indicate that this revelation pertained to the post-deluge Noachic blessing and covenant. The phrase "it was revealed to me (אֵתְחַזֵּי לִי)" in 1Q20 XII 4 suggests that we are at or near the end of the account, which is concluded by the *vacat* in 1Q20 XII 6.

³⁵ Ibid., 214.

It is a mere thirteen lines until Noah is once more subject to a dream-vision. This final account spans from 1Q20 XII 19 to XV 21, but is not consistently preserved. The patches of extant text indicate that the episode cryptically presented a historical glance back to the flood and ahead to the near and distant future. The flood and the division of the land are encoded using arboreal imagery in cols. XII-XIII. The dream-vision culminates in a judgment scene, the imagery of which is generic. Prior to his awakening, Noah is assured that this revelation is in step with the divine plan written concerning him. With this injunction, Noah awakes and, once again, blesses God. This time, however, he is quick to divulge the entire revelation to his son Shem (1Q20 XV 22). In Chapter Six I will contextualize this Noachic dream-vision in light of other historiographically oriented revelations.

As with Noah, Abram is also recast as a dreamer in *1QapGen*. Ego, Falk, and Machiela have all observed that Abram's ability to receive and interpret divine dream-visions is but one aspect of the composite portrayal of Abram as a sagacious figure.³⁶ In Chapter Four it will be demonstrated how this overarching recharacterization may be explained in terms of scriptural exegesis. Abram first receives divine revelation in 1Q20 XIX 8, stating that "he (i.e., the 'King of Eternity') spoke with me in the night ([גַּלְגַּל עִמִּי] (בְּלַיְלָאִ),)" apparently to set him on a proper course for his travels to Hebron. Shortly thereafter, upon his descent into Egypt, Abram receives an additional dream-vision. Here

³⁶ Beate Ego, "The Figure of Abraham in the Genesis Apocryphon's Re-Narration of Gen 12:20-20," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* (eds. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 233-43; Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 88-89; and Machiela, "Genesis Revealed," 217-20.

he saw a “cedar” (ארז) and “date palm” (תמר), the former of which was under threat of being chopped down and uprooted (1Q20 XIX 14-15).³⁷ At the intercession of the date palm, the cedar is spared (1Q20 XIX 16-17). The thinly veiled meaning of the nightmare is not lost on Abram. Upon awakening he relates to Sarai that his life will be in constant jeopardy on account of her beauty; therefore, the couple must travel under the guise of siblings to avoid danger (1Q20 XIX 19-21).³⁸ While this white lie saves Abram, Sarai is

³⁷ An extensive discussion has taken place around the origin and application of this imagery in *IQapGen*. Avigad and Yadin suggested an analogous symbolic correlation in the exegesis of Ps 92:13 in *Gen. Rab.* 40:1 (Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* [Jerusalem: Magness, 1956], 23-24). Lehmann observed further similarities with the exegetical applications of Ps 42:3 in *Zohar* on Gen 12, *Tanḥuma* on Gen 12, and *Tanḥuma* on Num 10:15 (M. R. Lehmann, “1 Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim,” *RevQ* 1 [1958]: 249-63). Oßwald suggested that *IQapGen* was inspired by the erotic metaphorical imagery of a cedar and palm in Song 5:15; 7:7-9 (Eva Oßwald, “Beobachtungen zur Erzählung von Abrahams Aufenthalt in Ägypten in ‘Genesis-Apokryphon,’” *ZAW* 72 [1960]: 7-25, esp. 21 n. 17). More recent interpreters are split between these options. Following the lead of Lignée (H. Lignée, “l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” in *Les Textes de Qumran: Traduits et Annotés* [eds. J. Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée; vol. 2; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963], 207-42, esp. 229 n. 10), Dehandschutter concluded that the exegetical tradition of *Genesis Rabbah* was already circulating at the time of *IQapGen*’s composition (Boudewijn Dehandschutter, “Le rêve dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” in *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques problèmes* [ed. Willem C. van Unnik; RechBib 9; Leiden: Brill, 1974], 48-55, esp. 51-52). Eshel sharply disagreed, arguing that *IQapGen* represents the “missing link” in the exegetical trajectory from Ps 92:13 to *Genesis Rabbah* 41:1 (“The Dream-Visions,” 129-31). Fitzmyer noted both potential exegetical backgrounds in Ps 92:13 and Song 5:15; 7:7-9, but stated that these elements are drawn primarily from the former (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 185). Luijken Gevirtz critiqued seeking too close a connection between *IQapGen*’s imagery and the later rabbinic sources, suggesting that the similarity was “purely coincidental” and does not hold up to close scrutiny (Marianne Luijken Gevirtz, “Abram’s Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and their Function,” *Maarav* 8 [1992]: 229-43, esp. 237-39). Block argued that *IQapGen*’s background is to be found in the imagery of Song of Songs, but more importantly, underlying this choice of specific arboreal symbols are gender-based associations (Ariel Block, “The Cedar and the Palm Tree: A Paired Male/Female Symbol in Hebrew and Aramaic,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* [eds. Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin, and Michael Sokoloff; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995], 13-17). I am not convinced that we are able to ascertain which tradition was of primary influence. Rather, with Block, I consider the Psalms and Songs texts as contributing to broader gender associations that were conducive to symbolizing the patriarchal couple as trees. As for the possible associations with subsequent rabbinic interpretation, I am less certain than Eshel that *IQapGen* constitutes the “missing link,” but more optimistic than Luijken Gevirtz, who perhaps downplayed the similarities.

³⁸ It has been noted that Abram’s ability to immediately discern the meaning of the dream-vision puts him in the company of figures such as Joseph and Daniel, who too had the divine endowment of oneirocriticism (cf. Dehandschutter, “Le rêve dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” 50; Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 89; and Luijken Gevirtz, “Abram’s Dream,” 239-40). Flannery-Dailey observed that it is rare in early

nonetheless absconded into Pharaoh Zoan's harem, her only safety being the smiting of the royal house with a "pestilential spirit (רוח מכדש)" that inhibited his ability to have sexual relations (1Q20 XX 16-20). This situation results in an intriguing reference to nocturnal revelation. It seems that Pharaoh Zoan was enlightened about Abram's apotropaic prowess through a dream-vision. In 1Q20 XX 21-22 Abram relates that, "At this point Herqanosh came to me asking that I come pray over the king and lay my hands upon him, so that he would live. This was because he had seen [me] in a dream (בְּחֵלֶם) (חֹזֵן)."

The final two Abramic revelatory episodes in *1QapGen* have close counterparts in Genesis. The first takes place immediately after Abram and Lot had parted company. In similar fashion to 1Q20 XIX 8, God again appears to Abram "in a vision of the night (חֹזֵן דִּי לִילִיא)," directing him to travel to Ramat-Hazor to view the land of his inheritance (1Q20 XXI 8-10). In Chapter Four I will describe how this dream-vision is the result of harmonistic exegesis with parallel phrasing in the covenantal theophanies of Gen 12:7 and 15:1. The second dream-vision occurs as the extant text of *1QapGen* draws to a close in 1Q20 XXII 27-34 and comprises a slight reworking of Gen 15:1-4 (cf. *Jub.* 14:1-3). In this instance the author of *1QapGen* has retained a dream-vision already present in his

Jewish literature for a dreamer to interpret their own dream-vision (cf. Add Esth 10:4-8; *J.W.* 3.351-354) (*Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 128). On account of this feature, Miller categorized this episode as a "self-explanatory" account, a subset of Oppenheim's symbolic category (John B. F. Miller, "Exploring the Function of Symbolic Dream-Visions in the Literature of Antiquity, with Another Look at 1QapGen 19 and Acts 10," *PRSt* 37 [2010]: 441-55). While I agree with this assessment from a form-critical perspective, a strictly typological explanation glosses over how the portrait of 'biblical' Abram is here strategically altered and enhanced.

source, since, as Machiela has noted, “[i]n both Genesis and the *Genesis Apocryphon* the encounter is called a vision (מתחזה/חזויה).”³⁹ This is the only dream-vision in *1QapGen* after the switch to the third person voice around 1Q20 XXI 22.

The nature and extent of the lost material prior to 1Q20 col. 0 and after XXII 34 is unknown. In its current state, the narrative landscape of *1QapGen* is punctuated with dream-visions. It will be seen that many of the themes and images presented in the dream-visions of *1 Enoch*, *BG*, *4QWordsMich*, and *1QapGen* continue to develop in the texts treated below. However, the concern for the priesthood and temple in the texts that follow points to another important aspect of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus, to be taken up in greater detail in Chapter Five. For now it will suffice to familiarize ourselves with these priestly compositions and the place of dream-visions within them.

2.5 *4QTestament of Jacob?*

4QJacob? (4Q537) is a *unicum* dated palaeographically to 50-1 BCE, but the composition itself likely stems from sometime in the early to mid 2nd century BCE.⁴⁰ Several clues indicate the presence of a dream-vision. The phrase “your seed (זרעך),” found in the context of dialogue with an otherworldly being, strongly suggests a patriarchal personage (4Q537 1 + 2 + 3 1). The concern for priestly and sacerdotal matters in 4Q537 12 narrows the list of candidates to those patriarchs with priestly credentials. Milik suggested that the seer was Jacob. This view has since been accepted

³⁹ Machiela, “Genesis Revealed,” 217.

⁴⁰ DJD XXXI, 173-74.

by Puech and Eshel.⁴¹ Jacob remains a plausible candidate, but the fragmentary evidence does not permit certainty on the matter. At some point the seer read from “tablet(s)” (4Q537 1 + 2 + 3 3-5), which *may* have included some type of historical forecast of the exodus.⁴² It is *possible* that the episode also featured a visionary journey on account of the phrase “he showed me (אֶחֱזִינִי)” in close proximity to several toponyms in 4Q537 24 3. It will be seen that this same set of concerns and motifs (historical outlook, visionary journey, otherworldly writings, and priestly matters) are prevalent in the *New Jerusalem* text.

2.6 *The New Jerusalem text*

Five caves in the Judaean desert offered up a total of seven copies of the *New Jerusalem* text: 1QNJ (1Q32), 2QNJ (2Q24), 4QNJ^a (4Q554), 4QNJ^b (4Q554a), 4QNJ^c (4Q555), 5QNJ (5Q15), and 11QNJ (11Q18). The earliest of these manuscripts appears to be 4QNJ^b (4Q554a), dated palaeographically to the first half of the 1st century BCE.⁴³ The

⁴¹ Milik, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân,” 104; DJD XXXI, 172-73; Esther Eshel, “Jubilees 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature,” in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in honor of Michael E. Stone* (eds. Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21-36.

⁴² A potential reference to this theme is found in 4Q537 1 + 2 + 3 5-6: “you will come out from it and in the day[]n empty from before (] תפקון מנה וביום[]ן ריקין מן קודם[]”). Heavily influenced by the analogous episode in *Jub.* 32, Puech reconstructed the end of line 5 with a prohibition against founding a cultic site at Bethel (DJD XXXI, 175-76). This, however, is highly speculative. Milik proposed that the close of 4Q^TJacob[?] contained a view of the exodus. “On y lit quelques détails sur la future histoire sainte, à la manière de ce qu’on a au bas du fragment I sur la sortie de l’Égypte, et ‘pas les mains vides’, l. 6” (“Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân,” 104). Eshel recently advocated this position and proposed a tentative textual reconstruction based on *Tg. Neof.* to Exod 3:22, in which Moses is promised “you will not go away empty-handed (לא תיזלון ריקין)” (“Jubilees 32 and the Bethel Cult,” 34, n. 38).

⁴³ DJD XXXVII, 98. For a convenient palaeographical summary, see Florentino García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez; vol. 2.; Leiden: Brill, 1998-99), 446-49.

composition itself likely originated sometime in the late 3rd or early 2nd centuries BCE.⁴⁴ *NJ* features an unnamed seer guided by an ever-present interpreting figure, who displays and measures Jerusalem and its temple, effectively providing a blueprint of the city and its cultic site. In these ways, the author of *NJ* was heavily informed by Ezek 40-48.⁴⁵ The city in *NJ* is configured in a massive rectangle, fortified with walls running along its perimeter, which are interspersed with twelve gates named after the twelve tribes of Israel. Within its walls, the city is configured on an orthogonal grid system of streets, city blocks, and residences – all of which are peculiarly uninhabited. Once in the temple, the seer beholds various cultic implements, images, and even sacrifices performed by human priests (e.g., 11Q18 8; 13; 14 ii; 18). In Chapter Five I will demonstrate how this last detail has significant halakhic implications. At some point, in the temple precinct, the seer

⁴⁴ This is suggested by linguistic features (cf. DJD III, 184; DJD XXXVII, 98; and García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 456), architectural details (cf. Magen Broshi, “Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* [eds. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 9-22; and Hugo Antonissen, “The Visionary Architecture of New Jerusalem in Qumran,” in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte* [eds. Jörg Frey, Carsten Claussen and Nadine Kessler; WUNT I 278; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 439-80), and the lack of any mention of the Maccabean revolt or Antiochene crisis (cf. Lorenzo DiTomasso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts* [TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005], 192; and Jörg Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text, in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* [eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum], 800-16, esp. 810-11). As Puech has observed, the thoroughgoing priestly flavor of the work squares well with other Aramaic priestly writings dating roughly to this period (Émile Puech, “The Names of the Gates of the New Jerusalem (4Q554),” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [eds. Shalom M. Paul, et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 379-92).

⁴⁵ For contrasts and consistencies between *NJ* and Ezek 40-48, see García Martínez, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 451; Frey, “The New Jerusalem Text,” 812-15; and Armin Lange, “Between Zion and Heaven: The *New Jerusalem* from Qumran as a Paratext,” in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008: Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* (eds. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittman-Richert; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 397-412. For an overview of how *NJ* fits within a wider complex of ‘New Jerusalem’ traditions, see Adela Yarbro Collins, “The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Vol. 3, The Scriptures and the Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 231-54.

receives revelation from a “writing (כתב)” (11Q18 19 5-6), which *may* be related to the eschatological prophecy of Israel’s affliction by the nations fragmentarily described in 4Q554 3 iii.

While the extant *NJ* materials consist entirely of a dream-vision, the wider narrative framework is unknown. As Lange observed, presumably “[t]he lost parts of *NJ* must have once included a narrative introduction, which explained how and when the vision was received” and “[t]he end of *NJ* might have included a description of what happened after the vision.”⁴⁶ More perplexing still is the question of the identity of the unnamed seer. While there has been considerable speculation on potential candidates, Tigchelaar’s proposal that *NJ*’s seer is likely Jacob remains the most compelling explanation to date, and is accepted in the present study.⁴⁷ Therefore, in light of *NJ* and

⁴⁶ Lange, “Between Zion and Heaven,” 397.

⁴⁷ Tigchelaar arrived at this explanation on the basis of five internal and external indicators. (i) The reference “and they will do evil to your seed (ויבאשון לזרעך)” in 4Q544 3 iii 20 is found in a context prophesying geopolitical disruptions among ancient Near Eastern nations. Tigchelaar inferred that the “seed” here is not a group specific minority (i.e., the priestly progeny) but a reference to the nation of Israel, which is fitting of a patriarch. (ii) The Aramaic Scrolls associate their narratives with pre-Mosaic or Eastern Diaspora personages. Thus, a prophetic or exilic seer would cut against this broader trend. (iii) *4QTJacob?* likely provides parallel evidence of some patriarch receiving a temple dream-vision. (iv) *Jub. 32:20-26* retells Gen 28, in which Jacob read the heavenly tablets and was commanded not to build a temple at Bethel. (v) The *Temple Scroll* references an eschatological temple which was created “according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel (11QT^a XXIX 8-10) (“The Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem” 260-68; “The Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*” in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions* [eds. Tobias Nicklas, et al.; JSJSup 143; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 117-31, esp. 118-19).

Other proposals of the identity of *NJ*’s seer are more reserved and speculative. García Martínez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 193-94; “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 449-51) and DiTommaso (*The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 111-12; “New Jerusalem Text,” *EDEJ*, 996-97) refrain from naming the seer at all. Dimant does likewise in her most recent assessment of the topic, although previously she considered Ezekiel a good candidate (“The Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 204; “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 183). Beyer proposed that 4Q544 3 iii 20 referred to the descendants of the seer, thus implying either a national lineage or a lineage of priests, which might associate *NJ* with Jacob, Levi, Qahat, or Anram (*Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 95; *Die aramäischen Texte: Band 2*, 129). Frey concluded more generally that the seer is “probably one of the ancestors of Israel” (“The New Jerusalem Texts,” 804). Puech initially queried whether or not the seer was Moses (Émile Puech, “À propos de la Jérusalem

4QTJacob?, the patriarch Jacob ranks alongside Enoch and Daniel as the most active dreamers in the Aramaic Scrolls. It will be seen, however, from *ALD* and *4QVisAmram* that his progeny too saw their fair share of dream-visions.

2.7 *The Aramaic Levi Document*

Preceding the Qumran discoveries *ALD* was known in patches from other modern manuscript discoveries. Content of *ALD* had been identified among the Cairo Genizah fragments in the Cambridge Shechter-Taylor Collection and Oxford Bodleian Library, in a Greek folium interpolated into a version of *T. 12 Patr.* from the Mount Athos Koutloumousiou monastery, and lastly, in a Syriac fragment in the collection of the British Museum.⁴⁸ The discovery of the Scrolls confirmed that these later witnesses

Nouvelle d'après les manuscrits de la mer Morte," *Semitica* 43-44 [1995]: 87-102, esp. 92 n. 15), but more recently endorsed the priestly nature and association of the composition as a whole ("The Names of the Gates," 391-92). Ezekiel is often presented as a best guess for *NJ*'s leading man (cf. Dimant, "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran," 183; Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature," 264; and David Aune, "Qumran and the Book of Revelation," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* [eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1998-99], 622-48). Lange has recently taken up this case anew; however, his reasoning is highly problematic ("Between Zion and Heaven," cf. *DJD* XXIX.126 n. 9). Lange concluded that *NJ*'s paratextual orientation to Ezek 40-48 confirms that *NJ*'s "putative visionary can be identified as the prophet Ezekiel himself" (ibid., 408). Most problematic about this assertion is that it fails to account for how an author could draw upon an existing visionary tradition attributed to one persona in the process of creating the profile of a *different* pseudepigraphic dreamer. Contra Lange, authors of the Aramaic Scrolls often looked to prototypical dreamers in authoritative texts to re-characterize other figures as dreamers: *ALD* drew upon the visionary career of Enoch in *1 Enoch*; *4QVisAmram* looked to the prototype of Levi in *ALD*; and Daniel is clearly crafted on the sagely-oneirocritic Joseph from Gen 37 and 41. Furthermore, Lange's critique of Tigchelaar rests on a misreading of his proposal. Lange attributes to Tigchelaar the position that "the Aramaic texts in Qumran are interested neither in Moses nor in post-Mosaic figures," critiquing that this "is clearly contradicted by the Daniel-literature from Qumran as well as by the book of Tobit" (ibid., 401). This statement is inaccurate, since it is exactly texts like Daniel and Tobit which Tigchelaar accommodates into his proposal by underscoring the interest in Eastern Diasporic tales. Lastly, Lange's three proposed counterarguments to Tigchelaar's proposal of the meaning "your seed" in 4Q544 3 iii fail to persuade, since they neither account for whose descendants are in view nor provide a better solution based on the *extant* text (see ibid., 400).

⁴⁸ For early twentieth century discoveries, see H. Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen, "A Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," *JQR* 12 (1900): 651-61; and R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs," *JQR* 19 (1907): 566-83. All of these would be republished in R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford:

reflected a Second Temple composition. In total, seven fragmentary copies of *ALD* were found among the Scrolls: *1QLevi* (1Q21), *4QLevi^a* (4Q213), *4QLevi^b* (4Q213a), *4QLevi^c* (4Q213b), *4QLevi^d* (4Q214), *4QLevi^e* (4Q214a), and *4QLevi^f* (4Q214b). In general, these manuscripts have been dated palaeographically to the mid 1st century BCE, with *4QLevi^f* being quite possibly the earliest manuscript, dated to *ca.* 150-30 BCE.⁴⁹ Since *ALD* was likely known by the authors of *Jubilees*, the *Damascus Document*, *4QTQahat*, and *4QVisAmram*, Stone has suggested that it circulated with some authority in the 3rd-2nd centuries BCE.⁵⁰ *ALD*'s literary legacy is most evident in its reception and redaction in the

Clarendon, 1908), 245-56. An additional *ALD* Genizah fragment has been recently identified in the University of Manchester Rylands Library by Gideon Bohak ("A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document" *Tarbiz* 79 [2011]: 373-383 [Hebrew]). The fragment is inscribed on both sides of a folia, providing eleven lines of fragmentary text on the recto and thirteen on the verso. The fragment relates some of the details of the plot against the Shechemites.

⁴⁹ For exact palaeographic dates of all the Qumran manuscripts, see Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 4. *4QLevi^a*, dated palaeographically to 50-25 BCE, was radiocarbon dated to the ranges of 197-105 BCE (1 σ range; with 68% confidence) and 344-324/203-48 BCE (2 σ range; with 95% confidence) (Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls," 468). For a discussion of *ALD*'s language with reference to dating, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Levi Document," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 237-48.

⁵⁰ Michael E. Stone, "Aramaic Levi in its Contexts," *JSQ* (2002): 307-26. Of the above mentioned literary relationships, *ALD*'s influence upon the *Damascus Document* and *Jubilees* has been the most problematized. On the possible allusion to *ALD* in CD 4:15, see Hanan Eshel, "The Damascus Document's 'Three Nets of Belial': A Reference to the Aramaic Levi Document?" in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (eds. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 243-55; and Jonas C. Greenfield, "The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document 4.15-19," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 319-22. Kugel has adamantly asserted that *Jubilees* predated and informed the composition of *ALD* (James Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 [1993]: 1-64; idem, "How Old is the Aramaic Levi Document?" in *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation* [JSJSup 156; Leiden: Brill, 2012], 343-64). The burden of proof, as established by several scholars, suggests that the reverse is the more likely scenario. For variations on this position, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 10-11; Martha Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1-23; Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 154-55; James C. VanderKam, "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 359-73; idem, "Isaac's Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 497-519; and Cana Werman, "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 4 (1997): 211-25.

Greek *T. Levi*, which features Levi having a pair of dream-visions in *T. Levi* 2:5-5:7 and 8.⁵¹ However, navigating the intertextual relationship between *ALD* and *T. Levi*, and triangulating all of the *ALD* witnesses to reconstruct the shape of the original composition, is no small task. Kugler's earlier work on *ALD* was based largely on the critique that research on the Aramaic Levi texts was overly influenced by the later Greek tradition.⁵² Kugler attempted to reconstruct the trajectory of traditions from *ALD* to *T. Levi*, and argued that the two texts differ principally in their number of dream-visions. He concluded that the Aramaic materials at our disposal reflect a single dream-vision

⁵¹ The first episode occurs while Levi is at "Abelmaoul (Ἀβελμαούλ)" (*T. Levi* 2:3) and spans from *T. Levi* 2:5-5:7. Levi ascends through a tiered heaven with the aid of an *angelus interpres* who explains the functions of each level. The original version likely featured a three level cosmology which was later redacted into a seven layered heavenly realm (Marinus de Jonge, "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* [ed. M. de Jonge; SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975], 247-60; and Adela Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* [JSJSup 50; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 26). Nearing the peak of his descent, Levi is assured that injustice cannot escape the watchful eye of the Lord (*T. Levi* 4:1-2). At this, the doors to the heavenly throne room swing open and Levi beholds the "Holy Most High sitting on the throne," who bestows a priestly blessing upon Levi (*T. Levi* 5:1-2). Levi is ushered back to the earth and is equipped with a sword and shield for the task of avenging his sister's rape, which is specified in *T. Levi* 5:5 as in accord with the "tablets of the fathers." Upon awakening, Levi blesses the Lord (*T. Levi* 5:7) and, while en route to visit his father, stumbles upon a brass shield, a token that reifies the authenticity of the dream-vision (*T. Levi* 6:1). Levi's second dream-vision in *T. Levi* 8 focuses on his priestly ordination and the socio-political position of the high priestly office. A cohort of seven angels outfit Levi with his priestly vestments and provide their collective endorsement of his priestly status and that of the Levitical line (*T. Levi* 8:3-11). It is said that his descendants will occupy cultic, judicial, and scribal roles (*T. Levi* 8:17). Shortly after his awakening Levi is blessed by his grandfather Isaac, and reflects that the act was "in accord with the vision that I had seen," suggesting that this earthly ordination complemented the heavenly investiture (*T. Levi* 9:2). This connection is further implied by *T. Levi* 9:6, which states that Isaac continually brought to Levi's attention "the Law of the Lord, just as the angel had shown me." Levi reflects on some visionary experience one final time in *T. Levi* 11:5, stating that he learned of Qahat's priestly elevation for the next generation in a "vision (ὄραμα)." Note also that in *T. Naph* 5-7:1 Naphtali also has a pair of dream-visions. On these, see Th. Korteweg, "The Meaning of Naphtali's Visions," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* (ed. M. de Jonge; SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 261-91. The Hebrew text 4QNaph (4Q215) does not appear to contain any such revelatory material. All quotations of the Greek text of *T. Levi* are from, M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PsVTGr I, 2; Leiden: Brill, 1978).

⁵² Robert Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*. Kugler's nomenclature for the Qumran Levi texts differs from that of DJD XXII. Anders Aschim has compiled a helpful table comparing the two systems (review of Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, RBL (1998): n.p. Cited 15 November 2012. Online: <http://www.bookreviews.org>).

version, to be distinguished from the more developed dual dream-vision structure of *T. Levi*. In response, de Jonge demonstrated that *ALD* and *T. Levi* often run parallel to one another in structure and detail, suggesting that both works probably contained a pair of dream-visions.⁵³ More recently, Kugler has criticized the entire enterprise of reconstructing *ALD*, since it is evident that the Aramaic texts themselves exhibit some variation. However, since these differences are barely perceptible in the context of the dream-vision episodes, Kugler has over-problematized the matter.⁵⁴ In light of Kugler's earlier work, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel adopted an indeterminate position, concluding that there is nothing intrinsic to *ALD* to suggest a one or two dream-vision structure.⁵⁵ However, at various points *ALD* hints toward tandem dream-visions, analogous to those of *T. Levi*. In line with de Jonge, Drawnel has given greater weight to such factors and

⁵³ Marinus de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Esther Chazon and Michael Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 71-89. For an assessment of the issues related to elucidating the underlying Jewish source material of the Christian *T. Levi*, see idem, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints," *ANRW* 20.1:359-420.

⁵⁴ The most extensive differences are evident in the autobiographical and poetic sections near the end of the composition, which are presented in a shorter form in *4QLevi^e* (4Q214) compared with *4QLevi^{af}* (4Q213, 4Q214b) and the later Genizah text (DJD XXII, 56-57, 60, 70). Beyond this major departure, textual variants between the manuscript traditions fall within the expected realm of differences that emerge in scribal transmission. Kugler argued that the reading "I made you greater (רְבִיתֶךָ)" in 4Q213b 1 1 compared with "we made you greater (רְבִינֶךָ)" in Bodl. a 6 (line 7) is an example of "divine revoicing." He described this as a Qumran scribal-compositional strategy whereby a scribe might rewrite an aspect of a text such that it more explicitly originates on the lips of God ("Whose Scripture? Whose Community? Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, By Way of Aramaic Levi," *DSD* 15 [2008]: 5-23). However, given the lack of context for the Qumran fragment, it is inadvisable to build too lofty a case on a single, elusive textual variant. García Martínez has also commented that this example and others in Kugler's study are "very minor" ("Aramaica Qumranica," 443). For collations of variant readings between all witnesses, see DJD XXII; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*; and Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*.

⁵⁵ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 13.

compellingly demonstrated that the Aramaic work at Qumran included two dream-visions, which is the narrative framework accepted in what follows.⁵⁶

Like Noah and Abram in *IQapGen*, Levi is not associated with dream-visions in the biblical narrative. In Chapter Four it will be demonstrated that Levi's characterization as a dreamer is also founded on scriptural exegesis. According to Drawnel's structure, Levi experienced his first dream-vision after a prayer and visit to his father Jacob in the vicinity of "Abel-Mayin (אבל מין)," which is to be identified with the mid-country location "Abel-Meholah (אבל מחולה)," near Shechem, west of the Jordan River valley.⁵⁷

The content of this episode is nearly entirely lost at Qumran. It is known only by a few fragmentary lines in 4Q213a 2 14-18, and, I would suggest, perhaps 4Q213a 6, which may reflect dialogue between Levi and his *angelus interpres*.⁵⁸ From these materials we

⁵⁶ For Drawnel's proposed structure, see *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 54-55. Citations of *ALD* witnesses other than the Qumran texts are from Drawnel's edition and commentary. For a concise and helpful overview of *ALD*, see idem, "The Aramaic Levi Document – An Overview of its Content and Problematics," *SJC* 3 (2005): 7-17.

⁵⁷ Cf. Judg 7:22; 1 Kgs 4:12; 19:16; 1 Sam 18:19; and 2 Sam 21:8. Some have identified the toponym in *ALD* with "Abel-Maim/n (אבל מים; LXX Αβελμαϊν)," referenced in 2 Sam 16:4 (cf. 1 Kgs 15:20; 2 Kgs 15:29) and the site where Enoch delivered the verdict of divine wrath to the fallen Watchers in *1 En.* 13:9 (cf. Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 158; Kugel, "Levi's Elevation," 10-11, 60; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 246; and Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 403-4). For arguments in favor of identifying the locale with the mid-country location of "Abel-Meholah (אבל מחולה)," see H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 145; T. Baarda, "The Shechem Episode in the Testament of Levi: A Comparison with Other Traditions," in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. Van Der Woude* (eds. J. N. Bremmer and Florentino García Martínez; CBET 5; Kampen: Pharos, 1992), 11-73; David W. Suter, "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6-16," *Henocho* 25 (2003): 167-212, esp. 179, 182 n. 69; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 225-26; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 135-38; and Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel, "Separating Levi from Enoch: Response to 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,'" in *George W. E. in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (eds. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck; JSJSup 80; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 458-68.

⁵⁸ The latter fragment consists of the phrase "I said, 'What (אמרת מא)'" (4Q213a 6 1). While their context is fleeting, these words likely represent discourse and feature a question from a first-person speaker

learn that Levi lay down and experienced a heavenly ascent to the gates of heaven where he encountered a single angel, who presumably served as a guide for the rest of the account (4Q213a 2 14-18). Drawnel proposed that the Shechem incident and a recounting of the sale of Joseph intervene between Levi's first and second dream-visions.

The second dream-vision is slightly better attested among the Qumran Scrolls (cf. 1Q21 1, 3; 4Q213a 3-4, 5; 4Q213b) and benefits from overlap with Bodl. a (ALD 4-7). The major themes of the account include intimations of a royal-priestly Levitical line, the founding of an eternal priesthood, a rejoinder on the necessity of endogamous marriage in light of the Shechem indecent, and a discussion of two kingdoms. It will be seen that the notion of a perpetual and celestially ordained priesthood is further developed in *4QVisAmram*, but prior to considering that text I will introduce another potential Levitical visionary work.

2.8 *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*

4QapocrLevi^b? (4Q541) has been dated palaeographically to *ca.* 100 BCE, though its compositional date cannot be determined conclusively.⁵⁹ In broad terms, the work envisages an eschatological figure, who will play a role in the cultic and sapiential

to another party. The nature of the question cannot be known. Its framing with the Aramaic interrogative particle **מא** resembles Amram's questioning the *angelus interpres* in *4QVisAmram^d*: "And I asked [and] said to him, 'What (מא) [ו]אמרת לה מא)'" (4Q546 4 3). There is strong precedent for this style of question-and-answer dialogue using the corresponding Hebrew particle **מה** in the book of Zechariah and the latter half of Daniel (Zech 1:0, 19 [2:2], 21 [2:4]; 2:2 [6]; 4:2, 4, 11, 12; 5:6; Dan 12:8). Twice in *Levi*'s first dream-vision in *T. Levi*, Levi addresses the *angelus interpres* using similar language (*T. Levi* 2:9; 5:5). It is possible that 4Q213a 6 provides an Aramaic background for this aspect of the later Greek tradition.

⁵⁹ DJD XXXI, 217. Despite being published alongside a text titled *4QapocrLevi^a?* (4Q540), Puech never sufficiently explained the potential relation between these two manuscripts. With Dimant and Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, I am skeptical of associating the two texts (Devorah Dimant, review of É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529-549*, DSD 10 [2003]: 292-304; Greenfield, Eshel, and Stone, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 32). In any event, the sparse contents of *4QapocrLevi^a?* contain no indication of a dream-vision.

spheres of an undisclosed future time. For all its unknown variables, it is quite certain that *4QapocrLevi^b?* is cast in a revelatory context. Cook observed that the divine disclosure may have consisted of knowledge derived from an angel, prophet, or a sage.⁶⁰ However, as will be made clear in the next chapter, *4QapocrLevi^b?* is punctuated with formal-linguistic indicators that best fit a dream-vision context. This is also suggested by some literary themes. References to “writings” and “writeness” (כתב/כתיב) and the phrase “then [the] books of wisd[om] will be open[ed] ספרי חכמ[ת] [א]ד[ו]ן יתפתחו[ן]” suggest revelation from celestial booklore (4Q541 2 i 6; 7 2, 4; 14 3). The references to “Yawan/Greece (יואן)” in 4Q541 2ii 7, and “the Great Sea (ימא רבא)” (i.e. the Mediterranean) in 4Q541 7 3 may suggest a geopolitical prophecy of some sort, although no more can be said in view of the fragmentary evidence. In Chapter Five I will attempt to recover some priestly interests from the fragments of *4QapocrLevi^b?*. Venturing beyond this preliminary summary, however, one finds that *4QapocrLevi^b?* presents many interpretive cruxes. Foremost among these is the identity of the visionary. The earliest scholars to consider *4QapocrLevi^b?* associated the work with Jacob or Levi.⁶¹ Naturally,

⁶⁰ Edward Cook, “4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered,” in *Puzzling out the Past: Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures in Honor of Bruce Zuckerman* (eds. Marilyn J. Lundberg, Steven Fine, and Wayne T. Pitard; CHANE 55; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 13-17.

⁶¹ Starcky first described the work as “Aharonique,” suggesting that the work perhaps contains Jacob’s words to Levi (Jean Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 70 [1963]: 481-505, esp. 492). Shortly thereafter Milik proposed the title “*Testament (or: Visions) of Levi*” for the Qumran Levi traditions (“Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân,” 95). It is now clear from Schattner-Rieser’s preliminary publication of Milik’s unfinished research on the Qumran Levi texts that his reconstruction of the work integrated 4Q540 and 4Q541 (Ursula Schattner-Rieser, “J. T. Milik’s Monograph on the Testament of Levi and the Reconstructed Aramaic Text of the Prayer of Levi and the Vision of Levi’s Ascent to Heaven from Qumran Cave 4 and 1,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 15 [2007]: 139-55). The question mark in Puech’s title *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*, suggests a plausible but not certain association with the patriarch Levi (Émile Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLevi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa,” in

if the seer is Levi, we may ask how 4Q541 correlates with *ALD* or the later Greek *T. Levi*. Puech and Cook have posited either intertextual or genetic relationships among these texts; however, this approach has been sharply critiqued.⁶² While the work is plausibly associated with some priestly figure, in view of the wider suite of priestly-patriarchal pseudepigraphs discovered among the Aramaic Scrolls (e.g., *ALD*, *4QTQahat*, *4QVisAmram*, and *NJ*), the seer's identity cannot be known for certain.

2.9 *4QVisions of Amram*

Five certain copies of *4QVisAmram* (*4QVisAmram^{a-e}*; 4Q543-547) were discovered in Qumran cave four.⁶³ The palaeographic dates of these texts indicate a *terminus ante quem* in the general range of ca. 150-33 BCE.⁶⁴ An approximate *terminus post quem* is provided by *4QVisAmram*'s literary dependence upon *ALD* (ca. 3rd century

The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991 [eds. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 449-501; DJD XXXI, 213-16). Fitzmyer critiqued that the absence of the name 'Levi' in the extant materials, coincidental or otherwise, is problematic for a Levitical association ("The Aramaic Levi Document," 242).

⁶² Puech, DJD XXXI, 214; Cook, "4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered," 13. For critiques of these optimistic proposals, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 18; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 32; Lester Grabbe, review of É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529-549*, *JSOT* 99 (2002): 32-33; and Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Levi Document," 242. Collins, and more recently Angel, left open the possibility of some relationship between the *4QapocrLevi^b?* and Greek *T. Levi*, but concluded that the nature of the relationship is not clear (John J. Collins, "Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts, Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* [eds. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm, assisted by Christer D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995], 579-90; Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [STDJ 86; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 79).

⁶³ I will comment further on one aspect of this dependence in Chapter Five. *4QVisAmram^f* (4Q548) and *4QVisAmram^g* (?) (4Q549) were published along with these in DJD XXXI. Neither text, however, overlaps with *4QVisAmram^{a-e}*. Duke demonstrated that the narrative voice in 4Q548, and relaxed concern for Miriam's endogamous marriage in 4Q549 makes these two manuscripts unlikely candidates for inclusion in *4QVisAmram* (Robert R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543-547)* [Studies in Biblical Literature 135; New York: Peter Lang, 2010], 35-42).

⁶⁴ For palaeographic analyses of individual manuscripts, see DJD XXXI, 291, 320-21, 332-33, 353, 377.

BCE).⁶⁵ Therefore, *4QVisAmram* likely originated in the early 2nd century BCE, if not late in the 3rd century BCE.

The work opens with an incipit that establishes the pseudepigraphic perspective of the writing and accentuates the centrality of the dream-vision to the narrative:

“A copy of ‘The Writing of the Words of the Vision(s) of Amram, son of[Qahat, son of Levi (פרשגן כתב מלי חזות עמרם בר[קהת בר לוי)’. All that] he told his sons and that he instructed them on [the day of his death in the one hundred] and thirty sixth [year], the year of[his death, in the one hundred] and fifty second [year] of the e[xile of I]s[ra]el to E[gyp]t” (4Q543 1a, b, c 1-4; reconstructed text drawn from overlap in 4Q545 1a i 1-4; 4Q546 1 1-2).⁶⁶

The first-person narrative that follows infuses select events from Amram’s early life with strong didactic undertones.⁶⁷ Paramount among these is a dream-vision Amram experienced while in Hebron. The episode starts abruptly with a pair of angels “judging (דאניק)” and locked in a “great dispute (תגר רב)” (*4QVisAmram*^d [4Q544] 1 10-11).⁶⁸

⁶⁵ Puech and Drawnel concluded that the author of *Jubilees* derived his knowledge of Hebron as the patriarchal burial site and the Egypt-Canaan war from *4QVisAmram* (cf. *Jub.* 46:9-47:1) (Puech, DJD XXXI, 285-87; Henryk Drawnel, “Amram, Visions of,” in *EDEJ*, 326-27). VanderKam and Duke, however, have independently demonstrated that the two works refer to a shared tradition and appear to be unaware of one another, making *Jubilees* of limited use for dating *4QVisAmram* (James C. VanderKam, “*Jubilees* 46:6-47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram,” *DSD* 17 [2010]: 141-58; Duke, *The Social Location*, 98-100).

⁶⁶ For a comparative study of the patterned usages of incipits in the Aramaic corpus, see Andrew B. Perrin, “Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 98-123.

⁶⁷ The Hebrew Scriptures only mention Amram for his place in the priestly genealogy (cf. Exod 6:18; Num 3:19; 26:58; 1 Chr 5:28-29 [6:2-3]; 23:12-13; 24:20 26:59). Josephus attributed a dream-vision to Amram in which Moses’ role in the future deliverance from Egypt is emphasized, while only brief mention is made of Aaron’s election to the priesthood (*Ant.* 2.212-217). The Qumran and Josephus Amram texts, however, are of no relation. For discussion of the latter, see Robert K. Gnuse, *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus* (AGJU 36; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 162-64; 206-25.

⁶⁸ Some commentators have misconstrued the narrative location of the dream-vision by assuming a deathbed setting and, by implication, suggesting an angelic contest over Amram’s body or soul. This has often led to comparison of *4QVisAmram* with a diversity of later texts that envisage such disputes (e.g., Jude 9; *T. Abr.* 13:9-14 [rec. A]; *Apoc. Paul* 14-17; *Ques. Ezra.* 1:14-15 [rec. A]; and *Deut. Rab.* 11:10). Milik, Kobelski, and Philonenko all proposed that the dispute concerned which angel was the rightful

Amram is understandably perplexed at the scene and challenges the angelic duo, “Who are you that you are ru[l]ing over me? (אנתון מן די בדן מש[לטין עלי])” (4Q544 1 11; 4Q543 5-9 1). The angels respond in 4Q544 1 12 that they indeed rule over all of humanity (כול בני אדם). This statement reveals the basic dualistic outlook of *4QVisAmram*: the world is subject to the competitive and antagonistic oversight of the angels of light and darkness. Dialogue is temporarily suspended for the description of the angels’ contrasting countenances and clothing, which reflects their respective domains. When the dialogue resumes it is between Amram and the angel of light alone, who functions as an *angelus interpres* for the rest of the account. The final scenes of Amram’s dream-vision are concerned with the “mystery (רז)” of the priestly line issuing from Amram. In Chapter Five I will argue that this connotes a particular understanding of the priestly duties and association with the celestial priesthood. Amram’s dream-vision may have also foretold the exodus.⁶⁹ However, without a more complete view of the work, the extent and detail

beneficiary of Amram’s body at death (J. T. Milik, “4Q Visions de ‘Amram et une Citation d’Origene,” *RB* 79 [1972]: 77-97; Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša* [CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982], 24; Marc Philonenko, “Melkireša’ et Melkira’: Note sur les Visions de ‘Amram,” *Semitica* 41-42 [1993]: 159-62). Berger attempted to widen the tradition-historical scope by amassing a number of late (and rare!) Christian texts featuring angelic disputes (Klaus Berger, “Die Streit des guten und des bösen Engels um die Seele: Beobachtungen zu 4Q Amr^b und Judas 9,” *JSJ* 4 [1973]: 1-18). As noted by Goldman, despite the fact that the dream-vision is a component of the material recollected on Amram’s dying day, an angelic dispute over his body or soul would be premature for the internal narrative flow of the composition (Liora Goldman, “Dualism in the *Visions of Amram*,” *RevQ* 24 [2010]: 421-32). Therefore, the judicial-legal language and setting of the account are better interpreted in light of angelic courtroom disputes. Bauckham traced the origin of this form to the dispute over the suitability of the High Priest Joshua between Satan and the angel of the Lord in Zech 3 (Richard Bauckham, *Jude, 2 Peter* [WBC 50; Waco: Word Books, 1983], 65-66).

⁶⁹ Prior to Amram’s awakening in *4QVisAmram*^e, we find some references to activity at “Mount Sinai (בהר סיני)” (4Q547 9 4). *4QVisAmram*^d (4Q546) 10 1-3 may also contain exodus themes. Puech inferred that the partial phrase “against al fles[h] (בכל בש[ר])” “ferait allusion aux plaies d’Égypte que Dieu

of this outlook cannot be determined with certainty. At the close of the dream-vision, Amram states, “and I awoke from the sleep of my eyes and wrot[e] the vision (ואנה ת]אתעירת מן שנת עיני וחזוא כתב[ת) (4Q547 9 8).

With the transition from *4QVisAmram* to the book of Daniel, we should recall Tigchelaar’s observation on the settings of the Aramaic Scrolls’ narratives in either the days of the patriarchs or exilic diaspora.⁷⁰ From the evidence at our disposal it seems that Amram was the last of the priestly-patriarchal dreamers in the Aramaic corpus. The next dreamers we meet hail from a much later time and place. Despite this difference, several of the themes, images, and motifs already observed will continue to crop up.

2.10 Daniel 2-7

Due to its subsequent canonical status, the dream-vision traditions of the book of Daniel are likely the most familiar among the Aramaic Scrolls. I will keep my treatment here to a broad overview and will reserve detailed comment on the historiographical qualities of Dan 2 and 7 until Chapter Six. Daniel was discovered in eight copies among the Scrolls, five of which contain Aramaic material from Dan 2:4b-7:28: *1QDan^a* (1Q71), *1QDan^b* (1Q72), *4QDan^a* (4Q112), *4QDan^b* (4Q113), and *4QDan^d* (4Q115). Ulrich dated these manuscripts palaeographically from the late 2nd or early 1st centuries BCE to the first half of the 1st century CE. Of these manuscripts, *4QDan^c* (4Q114) and *4QDan^e* (4Q116)

infigera à Pharaon par l’intermédiaire de Moïse at d’Aaron” (DJD XXXI, 363). This motif is complemented by the reference to “sig]ns and wonders be[fore (אחי]ן ומפתין ק]דם) in line 2 of this fragment. This pairing of terms often denotes the divine acts that afflicted the Egyptians leading up to the exodus (cf. Exod 7:3; Deut 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 34:11; Jer 32:20; Ps 78:43; 135:9; and Neh 9:10). If it is to be located in Amram’s dream-vision, the phrasing “in the tablet (בְּלוּחָא) in *4QVisAmram^d* (4Q546) 20 2 may connote the revelation of history through the reading of celestial records.

⁷⁰ Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” 157; idem, “The Imaginal Context,” 261.

appear to be the earliest.⁷¹ Collins has argued persuasively that Aramaic Daniel existed independently prior to its amalgamation with the Hebrew material in Dan 8:1-12:13, which took place between 167-164 BCE.⁷² Aramaic Daniel contains three dream-vision accounts, all of which are fragmentarily attested among the Qumran finds.

The first of these is found in Dan 2 and presents Daniel as both a dreamer and oneirocritic in King Nebuchadnezzar's court. Intriguingly, the "mystery (רז)" of both the content and meaning of the king's dream-vision are revealed to Daniel in a "vision of the night (חזון די ליליא)" (Dan 2:19). The dream-vision prognosticated the tumultuous succession of kingdoms using the imagery of a four-tiered statue constructed of materials of decreasing value (gold, silver, bronze, and iron mixed with clay), which was subsequently reduced to rubble by a massive stone (Dan 2:31-45).

Daniel comes to the oneirocritical aid of Nebuchadnezzar once more in Dan 4. Here the king beheld a lush tree that gave respite to all creatures. However, at the command of a "holy watcher coming down from heaven (עיר וקדיש מן שמיא נחת)" it was

⁷¹ DJD XVI, 270, 287. For a general survey of the biblical Daniel tradition at Qumran, see Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception* (eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps; VTSup 83; FIOTL 2; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 573-85. Ulrich established that our textual evidence preserves two ancient literary editions of the book of Daniel: the first is represented by a shorter, earlier version attested by the Masoretic text and the Qumran manuscripts, and the second represented in a longer edition in the Old Greek and Theodotion Septuagint texts. On but four occasions *4QDan^a* and *4QDan^b* share common, secondary readings over and against the Masoretic text, with which the Old Greek agrees variously (idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* [SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 95-98). This suggests that we can expect a degree of fluidity among the Semitic language and Greek texts, but, in general, when a passage of Daniel is not extant among the Scrolls, the Masoretic text may be looked to as a reliable guide.

⁷² John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 38. To be sure, Collins argues that the opening Hebrew section of Dan 1:1-2:4a was originally penned in Aramaic and translated into Hebrew at the time of the incorporation of Dan 8-12 to provide a "Hebrew frame for the Aramaic chapters" (ibid.).

abruptly chopped down and its stump shackled in the ground (Dan 4:9-17). Shortly after hearing the king's dream-vision Daniel delivers a foreboding interpretation: the tree represents the king who will be driven away and humiliated until he recognizes the sovereignty of Israel's God (Dan 4:19-27).⁷³ In its present literary context, however, the dream-vision reinforces the theme of divine sovereignty established in Dan 2. Regarding the use of dream-visions for characterization, Makiello observed that Daniel's onirocritical prowess crescendos throughout the work, such that in this case his abilities are no longer contingent on divine revelation but derive from an innate quality.⁷⁴

Daniel's characterization as a dreamer climaxes in Dan 7 as he receives a vivid, complete dream-vision of his own. The motif of successive kingdoms again looms large as Daniel observes four horrific beasts emerging from the sea (Dan 7:2-7). This segues into a heavenly throne room judgment scene headed by the "Ancient of Days (עתיק יומין)."

⁷³ It is widely recognized that this tradition is a reshaping of material originally associated with Nabonidus known from ancient Near Eastern sources and *4QPrayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242). The intertextual and tradition-historical relationship between these materials has been a point of debate. Collins (DJD XXII, 86), García Martínez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 129-35) and Eshel (Esther Eshel, "Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception* [eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps; vol. 2; VTSup 83; FIOTL 2; Leiden: Brill, 2001], 387-89) view *4QPrNab* as an intermediate stage between the Babylonian and biblical accounts. Henze proposed that the Aramaic Daniel traditions and *4QPrNab* independently used the Harran inscription (Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* [JSJSup 61; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 68-73). Hasel argued that *4QPrNab* and the Danielic legends are of no certain relation (Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Book of Daniel: Evidences Relating to Persons and Chronology," *AUSS* 19 [1981]: 37-49). Steinmann proposed that *4QPrNab* relies on Dan 2-5 (Andrew Steinmann, "The Chicken and the Egg: A New Proposal for the Relationship between the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and the *Book of Daniel*," *RevQ* 20 [2002]: 557-70).

⁷⁴ Phoebe Makiello, "Daniel as Mediator of Divine Knowledge in the Book of Daniel," *JJS* 60 (2009): 18-31. Daniel's prowess as a divinely endowed interpreter is also developed in Dan 5. Not unlike the dream-vision court tales of Dan 2 and 4, Dan 5 centres upon a pagan king's desire to know the "interpretation (פִּשְׁרָה)" of a cryptic message (Dan 5:8, 15-16). In this tale, however, the medium of revelation is an enigmatic wall inscription written before the very eyes of King Belshazzar and his nobles. For a helpful studies on the setting of Dan 5 in the context of Aramaic Daniel, see A. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 169-90; and William H. Shea, "Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 5, and the Broader Relationships within Chapters 2-7," *AUSS* 23 (1985): 277-95.

Praise resounds, books are opened, and judgment is meted out against the four beasts, whose dominion is exchanged for rule under “one like a son of man (כבר אנוש)” (Dan 7:9-14).

Despite its distinctive narrative setting in a foreign court and attribution to a character previously unknown in the Hebrew Scriptures, subsequent chapters will show how the language and themes of the Aramaic Daniel dream-visions resonate with a number of other texts, not least *1QapGen*, *BG*, and *4QVisAmram*. From the next two works, however, it is evident that Daniel’s resume as an oneirocritic likely extended beyond his capabilities exercised in Dan 2, 4, and 7.

2.11 *4QAramaic Apocalypse*

The compositional date of *4QArAmApoc* (4Q246) is not certain. Milik’s palaeographic dating of the manuscript to the last third of the 1st century BCE sets a general *terminus ante quem*.⁷⁵ Phrases such as “he fell before the throne (נפל קדם),” “wrath is coming to the world, and your years (עלמא אתה רגז ושניך),” and “is your vision, and all of it is about to come unto the world (חזוך וכלא אתה עד ארעא)” indicate that the extant text picks up midway through a court scene featuring the interpretation of a royal figure’s dream-vision (4Q246 i 1 3). Milik suggested that this setting has similarities with Enoch falling before the celestial throne in *1 En.* 14:24, but left open that the visionary may be Enoch or “another visionary of sacred history, such as

⁷⁵ DJD XXII, 166.

Levi, Moses, Elias, or Daniel, or even an angel.”⁷⁶ In response to Milik, Flusser, Fitzmyer, and García Martínez correctly observed that the individual enthroned in 4Q246 is a human figure, suggesting a setting in an earthly, royal court.⁷⁷ Given this setting it is perhaps not surprising that *4QArAmApoc* exhibits significant verbal and thematic correspondences with the Danielic dream-vision cycle, leading many to suspect that Daniel is the figure before the king.⁷⁸ While Collins is correct that the identification of Daniel on this basis is “controversial,”⁷⁹ given the analogies in narrative setting and vocabulary with the Danielic dream-vision cycle, Daniel, or someone like him, is the best candidate for the oneirocritic of 4Q246. From the surviving evidence, it seems that the dream-vision concerned a symbolic depiction of upheaval and violence among the nations, after which the emergence of an eschatological figure will enable the people of God to arise and establish an everlasting kingdom. The notion of the succession of kingdoms evinced here, and in several other texts considered thus far, is perhaps the most pronounced in one final, major dream-vision text, *4QFour Kingdoms*.

⁷⁶ Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 60.

⁷⁷ David Flusser, “The New Testament and Judaism on the First Centuries C.E.: The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran,” *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31-37; repr. in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 207-13; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Son of God’ Text from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q246),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 41-61; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 164.

⁷⁸ Apart from the inclusion of Daniel in Milik’s original roster of candidates, Flusser was the earliest proponent for identifying the figure with Daniel (“The Hubris of the Antichrist”). This position has garnered support from Puech (DJD XXII, 181; idem, “Le fils de Dieu, le fils du Très-Haut, messie roi en 4Q246,” in *Le Jugement dans l’un et l’autre Testament I: Mélanges offerts à Raymond Kuntzmann* [ed. Eberhard Bons; Lectio Divina 197; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2004], 271-86), Cross (Frank Moore Cross, “The Structure of the Apocalypse of ‘Son of God’ (4Q246),” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* [eds. Shalom M. Paul, et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 151-58), and was considered a possibility by Fitzmyer (“The Aramaic ‘Son of God’ Text,” 46-54). García Martínez notes some similarities between 4Q246 and the Danielic tradition but did not posit the identity of the figure in question (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 164-68).

⁷⁹ John J. Collins, “New Light on the Book of Daniel from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 180-96, here 189.

2.12 4QFour Kingdoms

The compositional date of the work preserved in 4QFourKgdms^{a-c} (4Q552, 4Q553, 4Q553a) is not easily discerned. The palaeographic date of 4Q553, the earliest of the three manuscripts, provides a working *terminus ante quem* of ca.100-50 BCE.⁸⁰ The dream-vision of 4QFourKgdms is known only in patches. The surviving materials symbolically depict the historical succession of four kingdoms represented by four trees. These symbols converse directly with the seer and divulge their identities. The reference to “four trees (ארבעה אילנין)” confirms that the scheme involved a total of four empires (4Q552 1 ii 1//4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 2).⁸¹ In Chapter Six it will be seen that this motif resonates with Dan 2 and 7, but likely represents an update of world history under Roman rule. The fragmentary phrase, “And the king said to me (ואמר לי מלכא)” in 4Q552 1 i + 2 8 indicates a court tale setting. Presumably a royal figure is addressing a Jewish seer-sage inquiring after the meaning of a dream-vision. In addition to the self-interpreting symbolic trees, some mention is made of “holy angels (מלאכי קד[ישיא])” in 4Q553a 2 i 1. The phrase “to me the angel (לי מלאכא)” may derive from first-person dialogue with an *angelus interpres*. The progression from interrogating the symbolic props to dialogical revelation from an otherworldly figure is perhaps akin to the sequence of the dream-vision in 4QVisAmram. However, given the small amount of available text, it cannot be

⁸⁰ DJD XXXVII, 74.

⁸¹ This symbolism is intriguing given that in the *Bahman Yasht* the four metals representing successive empires are four branches on a tree. Similarly, in a four kingdom dream-vision sequence in 2 Bar. 39:3-8, the final Roman king of the scheme is represented by a cedar. On the historical outlook of this episode, see John F. Hibbins, “The Summing Up of History in 2 Baruch,” *JQR* 89 (1998): 45-79.

known if *4QFourKgdms*' symbolic scenes proceeded in such a direction. A final noteworthy element is the naming of Moses in 4Q553 1 i 12. While the context of this reference evades us, it is relatively certain that Moses was not the dreamer or oneirocritic.

3 *Fragmentary texts exhibiting dream-vision features*

The texts surveyed above are fragmentary to varying degrees, yet most often the available text provided some insight into the narrative shape and setting of dream-vision episodes. This, however, is not the case for *4QVision^a* (4Q557), *4QpapVision^b* (4Q558), *4QVision^d* (4Q575), and *4QpapApocalypse* (4Q489). These manuscripts are in advanced states of decay. Nonetheless, it is necessary to say a few words on each of these, if for no other reason than to illustrate the pervasiveness of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus.

3.1 *4QVision^a*

4QVision^a (4Q557) consists of two meager fragments inscribed in a hand dated to *ca.* 150-100 BCE.⁸² The reference to “Gabriel [the] ange[l מלאך] (כא)” in 4Q557 1 1 strongly suggests a context of divine revelation. As observed by Puech, this angelic personality is known from the Hebrew Danielic dream-vision cycle (Dan 8:16; 9:21) and the Enochic tradition of ascents and visionary journeys (e.g. *1 En.* 10:9; 20:7).⁸³ To these we may add Gabriel's presence in *4QWordsMich* (4Q529) 1 4. Beyond this basic detail nothing more can be said of the content or context of *4QVision^a*.

⁸² DJD XXXVII, 175.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

3.2 *4QpapVision^b*

4QpapVision^b (4Q558) is known by 141 papyrus fragments, most of which contain single, letters, words, phrases, or at best, a few fragmentary lines. Puech's palaeographic analysis locates its production in the early to mid 1st century BCE.⁸⁴ There are a number of linguistic idioms and thematic features indicating a dream-vision context. Verbal forms from the root *חזי are found in 4Q558 7 1; 48 2; and 65 2. Additionally, the exclamation "behold (הא)" occurs in 4Q558 20 2; 34 2; and 51 ii 3. The first-person statement "and he said to me (] ◦ ואמר לי ת]" in 4Q558 4 1 and the phrase "my lord (מרי)" in 4Q558 80 1 suggest a dialogue between a seer and *angelus interpres* (cf. *4QVisAmram^b* [4Q544] 2 13; *4QVisAmram^d* [4Q546] 8 5).⁸⁵ This is a good possibility in light of several references to angels (4Q558 1 3; 2 2; 10 3). Scattered references to a "cedar (ארז)" (4Q558 10 2; 134 1), "roots (שרשין)" (4Q558 21a-b 2; cf. 26 1), and "branches (לולבין)" (4Q558 31 3) likely connote some type of symbolic tree or forest imagery. The theme of "writing" (*כתב) appears in 4Q558 8 2 and 104 1. The verb "th[ey] will atone (יכפרו[ן])" in 4Q558 30 1 may suggest a priestly component. Lastly, references to "kings," "kingdoms," and "rulers" perhaps imply a concern for geopolitical historiography (cf. 4Q558 21a-b 3; 22 3; 61 2; 85 1). The reference to an "eagle (נשר)" in

⁸⁴ Ibid., 181.

⁸⁵ For analogous terminology in the Aramaic Scrolls and Hebrew Scriptures, see n. 58 above.

the immediate context of the phrase “ru]lers in the kingdoms (של[טין במלכות)” may indicate a symbolic representation of imperial successions (4Q558 22 3). Mention is also made of “Egypt” (4Q558 36 2; 62 3; 67 1; 98 1), “Aram” (4Q558 62 2; 77 1), and “Horeb” (4Q558 29 5). The most intriguing element of the text, however, is the reference to the “Kingdom of Uzziah (מלכות עוזיה)” in 4Q558 29 4 (cf. 2 Kgs 14:21-22; 2 Chr 26:1-15). This is the only historical reference to a kingdom of the Israelite monarchic period in the entire Aramaic corpus. Equally significant is the promise “therefore, I will send Elijah be[fore (לכן אשלח לאליה קד[ם)” in 4Q558 51 ii 4 and a likely reference to his protégé “Elisha (אליש[ע)” in 4Q558 62 2.⁸⁶ From what can be recovered from the slew of postage-stamp sized fragments comprising 4Q558, we are dealing here with a remarkable puzzle of a dream-vision text, for which we hold but a handful of tantalizing pieces.

3.3 *4QVision^d*

Puech palaeographically dated the fragment known as *4QVision^d* (4Q575) to the 1st century BCE.⁸⁷ Twelve of its fifteen extant words comprise periphrastic constructions featured exclusively in Aramaic dream-vision texts: “[I] was looking (א[נ]ה[ה] חז[ה] הוית),” “I was looking (חז[ה] הוית),” and “I was [look]ing (חז[ה] א[נ]ה הוית)” (4Q575 1 5, 6, 7). It will be seen in the next chapter that this idiom abounds in Aramaic dream-visions. Beyond this detail nothing more can be said regarding the lost episode.

⁸⁶ Starcky perceived here an allusion to the eschatological promise to send Elijah in Mal 4:5 (3:23) (“Les quatre étapes,” 498).

⁸⁷ DJD XXXVII, 411.

3.4 *4QpapApocalypse*

4QpapApocalypse (4Q489) is represented by eight small fragments, dated palaeographically by Baillet to *ca.* 50 BCE.⁸⁸ Of these, 4Q489 1 contains two verbs that suggest the presence of a dream-vision. Line 1 contains the phrase “And his appearance/and his vision (וְחִזְיוֹתָהּ).” The phrase “And I saw him/it (וְחִזְיוֹתָהּ)” in line 2 may represent a first-person recollection/description of revelation. Baillet remarked that “ces termes sont caractéristiques des apocalypses,” calling particular attention to corresponding phrases in Dan 2:41; 4:8, 17; *I En.* 14:18; 25:3; 46:4; and 52:4.⁸⁹ Note also that Amram considered the “appearance (חִזּוֹן)” of the angels of light and darkness in *4QVisAmram^b* (4Q544) 1 13-14. While the broader context of these phrases is unknown, analogies with the narrative voice and phrasing of other Aramaic texts suggest a dream-vision setting.

4 *Texts not directly associated with dream-vision revelation*

Even though it was difficult to recover many details from *4QVision^a*, *4QpapVision^b*, *4QVision^d*, and *4QpapApoc*, these works contained clues hinting at the presence of dream-visions in their original forms. Among the Aramaic Scrolls are several other compositions that at first glance appear to allude to dream-vision activity. However, upon closer inspection, this is not the case. I include these in the discussion not because they add to our roster of dream-visions in the Aramaic texts, but as a corrective for some common suppositions that these works include visionary revelations. I will resolve this

⁸⁸ Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 10.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

misunderstanding in the book of Tobit, *4QPseudoDan*^{a-c} (4Q243-245), *4QExorcism* (4Q460), *4QJews in the Persian Court* (4Q550), and *4QVision*^c (4Q565).

4.1 Tobit

The book of Tobit was discovered in five Aramaic manuscripts (*4QpapTob*^a, *4QTob*^{b-d} [4Q196-199]; *Schøyen Tobit* [4Q196a]) and one Hebrew manuscript (*4QTob*^e [4Q200]) at Qumran. Apart from a few detracting voices, the current consensus is that Tobit was originally penned in Aramaic, making it an integral part of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus.⁹⁰ In the work's dénouement, as Raphael discloses his angelic identity he explains to Tobias and family that “[a]lthough you were watching me, I really did not eat or drink anything—but what you saw was a vision (G^I ὄρασιν; G^{II} ὄρασις; Syr^I ܪܘܐ)” (NRSV, Tob 12:19).⁹¹ Following this, Raphael instructs Tobit to “write down all these things that have happened to you” and quickly ascends to heaven, after which Tobit’s family blesses God and sings his praises (Tob 12:20-22). What is the meaning of “vision” here? Moore observed that in Lk 24:36-43 the resurrected Jesus ate “to prove to his disciples that he

⁹⁰ For a review of arguments in favour of Tobit’s Aramaic composition, see Carey A. Moore, *Tobit*, (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 33-39; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 18-28; and Michaela Hallermayer, *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit* (DCLS 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 175-79. Daniel Machiela and I have argued for Tobit’s composition in Aramaic on the basis of shared literary idioms and motifs with *IQapGen* (“Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon: Toward a Family Portrait,” *JBL*, forthcoming). Beyer (*Die aramäischen Texte, Band 1*, 298-300; *Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 134-47; *Die aramäischen Texte, Band 2*, 172-73), Wise (Michael O. Wise, “A Note on 4Q196 [papTob Ar^a] and Tobit i 22,” *VT* 43 [1993]: 556-70), and Eshel (Esther Eshel, “Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* [ed. Menahem Kister; The Ancient Literature of Eretz Israel and Its World: Between Bible and Mishnah: The David and Jemima Jeselsohn Library; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009], 573-600, esp. 590-91 [Hebrew]) advocate Tobit’s composition in Hebrew. The arguments for this position, however, fail to convince.

⁹¹ For the Qumran Tobit texts, see Magen Broshi, et al., *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1-76. All other original language texts for Tobit are from Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions* (FoSub 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

was *not* a vision.”⁹² This analogy suggests that the reference in Tobit pertains to the question of the sustenance of otherworldly figures visiting earth. Fitzmyer noted that the Vulgate has paraphrased Tob 12:19 in light of this issue.⁹³ Therefore, here Raphael is not referring to a dream-vision, but rather is explaining that his actions were merely an illusion intended to convince those around him of his humanness. While Tobit’s actions of recording the account (cf. Tob 1:1; 12:20) and blessing God are like the common responses elicited by dream-visions, the book of Tobit does not provide additional material for this study.

4.2 *4QPseudo Daniel*^{a-c}

It is not certain whether *4QPseudoDan*^{a-b} (4Q243-244) and *4QPseudoDan*^c (4Q245) derive from the same composition. Nonetheless, I will treat this pair together due to their common association with Daniel.⁹⁴ These texts are rich in references to episodes, epochs, and individuals from Israelite history, including traditions from the pre-deluge to exilic eras, and, in the case of 4Q245, a partial priestly genealogy extending into the Second Temple period. However, there are no clear indicators of a dream-vision, or interpretation thereof, in the extant texts. Regarding *4QPseudoDan*^{a-b}, Collins and Flint observed that “[u]nlike Dan 2 or the ‘Son of God’ text [4Q246], there is no dream or

⁹² Moore, *Tobit*, 273, italics original.

⁹³ Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 297. “I seemed indeed to eat and drink with you, but I use invisible food and a drink that cannot be seen by humans (*Videbar quidem vobiscum manducare et bibere: sed ego cibo invisibili, et potu qui ab hominibus videri non potest, utor*).”

⁹⁴ The name “Daniel (דניאל)” occurs in 4Q243 1 1; 2 1; 5 1; 6 3; 4Q244 4 2; and 4Q245 1 i 3. Collins and Flint dated the scribal hands of 4Q243-244 to the early 1st century BCE and concluded that the compositional date was likely between the beginning of the 2nd century BCE and the arrival of Pompey (DJD XXII, 137-38). Collins and Flint observed a similar scribal hand in 4Q245. On account of the name “Simon (שמעון)” in the priestly list in 4Q245 1 i 10, they concluded that “the document can be dated no earlier than 142 BCE” (ibid., 158).

vision. Instead, there is mention of a writing in 4Q243 6. It seems reasonable to infer that the body of the work contains Daniel's exposition of this writing. The nature and status of this writing remain enigmatic."⁹⁵ DiTomasso observed that the reference to "Belshazar (בלשצר)" in 4Q243 2 2, may indicate an association with some sort of cryptic writing, as in Dan 5.⁹⁶ While we cannot be sure of the narrative frames of these Aramaic texts, it does not seem that *4QpseudDan*^{a-c} add to our data set. At most what can be said is that these manuscripts attest to the extension of the Danielic tradition to include an intriguing blend of historiographical and priestly interests in a court-tale setting.

4.3 *4QExorcism*

4QExorcism (4Q560) consists of two fragments dated palaeographically to *ca.* 75 BCE.⁹⁷ Unlike the literary compositions reviewed thus far, 4Q560 is a collection of exorcisms against a demon causing discomfort, illness, and perhaps, disruption during sleep. Whether or not the demon is a bringer of nightmares or some other nocturnal malady hinges on the interpretation of the word בַּשְׁנָא in 4Q560 1 i 5. Penney and Wise rendered this as "in sleep," and posited an extensive reconstruction of an incantation to dispel a demon causing disturbance through unfavorable dreams.⁹⁸ However, as Naveh noted, in light of the physiological ailments referenced in the foregoing lines, this phrase

⁹⁵ Ibid., 135.

⁹⁶ Lorenzo DiTomasso, "4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-b} (4Q243-4Q244) and the Book of Daniel," *DSD* 12 (2005): 101-33.

⁹⁷ DJD XXII, 295.

⁹⁸ Douglas L. Penney and Michael O. Wise, "By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)," *JBL* 113 (1994): 627-50.

may be rendered “into the tooth.”⁹⁹ In view of the scarcity of context for this phrase, Puech’s remark that “[i]l faut reconnaître que l’état du texte ne permet pas de trancher,” is well warranted.¹⁰⁰ Thus his more conservative reconstruction and inclusion of both possibilities in translation is advisable.

4.4 *4QJews in the Persian Court*

4QJews in the Persian Court (4Q550) has been dated palaeographically to ca. 100-50 BCE and relates the tale of a group of Jews in the courtly service of the Persian Kings Darius and Xerxes.¹⁰¹ At issue for the present topic is whether or not this tale featured a Jewish courtier turned oneirocritic, as in Aramaic Daniel or LXX Esther. This question centres on 4Q550 7 + 7a 3. Milik provided the reconstruction and rendering, “tout c]e qu’il avait vu dans les deux [visions de la nuit (בחזות ליליא) כול מ]א די חזה ב[חזות ליליא (].”¹⁰² Based on this reading, White Crawford suggested that “these last lines [lines 2-3] may contain two parallels to the book of *Esther*: in line 3, Bagasraw appears to be a

⁹⁹ Joseph Naveh, “Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran,” *IEJ* 48 (1998): 252-61.

¹⁰⁰ DJD XXXVII, 299.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 9. There has been extensive discussion regarding the relationship between 4Q550 and the ancient Esther traditions. Milik concluded that 4Q550 represents the “modèles,” “archétypes,” or “sources” of the received Hebrew, Greek, and Latin forms of Esther (J. T. Milik, “Les modèles araméens du livre d’Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 15 [1992]: 321-99). White Crawford argued that the relation between 4Q550 and the canonical book of Esther is analogous to that of *4QPrNab* and the book of Daniel (Sidnie White Crawford, “Has Esther Been Found at Qumran? 4Qproto-Esther and the Esther Corpus,” *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 307-25). The genetic relationship between these traditions, however, has been sharply critiqued. Talmon as well as Collins and Green concluded that the seemingly common themes, conventions, and plots of 4Q550 and Esther are not particular enough to posit any tradition-historical trajectory between the two works (Shemarayahu Talmon, “Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?” *DSD* 2 [1995]: 249-67; John Collins and Deborah Green, “The Tales from the Persian Court [4Q550a-e],” in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* [eds. Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinhold, and Annette Steudel; BZAW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999], 39-50). In view of such developments, it seems best to maintain some distance between 4Q550 and the book of Esther, while at the same time recognizing that they both contribute to the court-tale tradition in ancient Jewish literature.

¹⁰² Milik, “Les modèles araméens,” 352.

seer or a visionary ('all that he saw in the two ...'), which Milik equates with Mordecai's dream in Add A. However, a literary parallel could just as easily be drawn with Daniel or with Joseph, both of whom rise to prominence because of their visionary capabilities."¹⁰³ Puech extended Milik's surmise with the transcription and translation, "D[élivra Bagasrava] la [vision] qu'il avait vue d[ans les] deux [visions de la nuit] (שׁיזב בגסרו) [חזו] אֵ דִי ח'ה בְּ[חזות ליליא] תרתין".¹⁰⁴ These proposals, however, have little backing in the extant text. Collins and Green rightfully critiqued that the reconstruction "visions of the night" is not obvious from the immediate context and conclude that "[t]here is no reason to introduce a prophet or visionary into this story."¹⁰⁵ To further problematize the issue, they emphasized that rendering חזו as "appropriate" or "customary" in line 3 is equally feasible (cf. Dan 3:19).¹⁰⁶ In light of the fragmentary nature of 4Q550, it is advisable to limit our estimations of its narrative details to what can be discerned in the available text. At present, it is unknown whether the courtiers in 4Q550 were dreamers or oneirocritics.

4.5 4QVision^c?

The question mark in the title of 4QVision^c? (4Q565) accurately reflects the work's elusive content and character. It is possible that the phrase "in/by the four corners (בְּאַרְבַּע זוֹיתָה)" in 4Q565 1 4 derives from a visionary setting. Puech observed that this phrasing might be compared with references to corners in the measurements of *NJ* (cf.

¹⁰³ White Crawford, "Has Esther Been Found at Qumran?" 321.

¹⁰⁴ DJD XXXVII, 37, italics original.

¹⁰⁵ Collins and Green, "The Tales from the Persian Court," 46.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 46, n. 22.

5QNJ [5Q15] 1 ii 7; 4QNJ^a [4Q554] 1 i 16-17; 1 ii 9; 4QNJ^b [4Q554a] 1 3).¹⁰⁷ Four corners motifs are variously applied in the Ezekelian visionary cycles (Ezek 7:2; 43:20; 45:19; 46:21-22) as well as in Peter's vision of the (un)clean animals (Acts 10:11; 11:5) and John the seer's visions (Rev 7:1; 20:8). Without a broader context, however, the meaning of this phrase lies beyond our grasp.

5 Summary of findings

The above survey established that dream-vision episodes or allusions occur in a constellation of nineteen of the twenty-nine literary works of the Aramaic corpus. These include the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of the Luminaries*, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle of Enoch*, the *Book of Giants*, *4QWords of Michael*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *4QTestament of Jacob?*, the *New Jerusalem* text, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*, *4QVisions of Amram*, *Dan 2-7*, *4QAramaic Apocalypse*, *4QFour Kingdoms*, *4QVision^a*, *4QpapVision^b*, *4QVision^d*, and *4QpapApocalypse*. Many of these works contained multiple dream-vision accounts, suggesting that the dream-vision is not only a prominent feature of this literature as a group but also gave depth and shape to the narratives and characters of individual compositions. Even texts in advanced stages of decay, such as *4QVision^a*, *4QpapVision^b*, *4QVision^d*, and *4QpapApoc*, appear to have been steeped in dream-vision language. These texts on the fringes of the corpus are a good reminder that dream-visions likely extended further in the Qumran Aramaic Scrolls than can be discerned on the basis of the materials currently available. It was seen that most often the authors of these writings cast their dream-visions in the first-person voices

¹⁰⁷ DJD XXXVII, 344.

of characters drawn from the patriarchal narratives in the Hebrew Scriptures, specifically the book of Genesis. In select cases, this perspective was abandoned in favor of an external third-person voice. This was certainly the case in the later Abram section of *IQapGen*. As far as we can tell from the extant evidence, an anonymous third-person narrative voice also dominated in *BG*. Additionally, the authors of *BG* and *4QWordsMich* ventured beyond the cast of characters explicitly mentioned in Genesis and created dreams and dreamers from the Enochic parascriptural expansions of Genesis. The visionary court-tales of Daniel 2, 4, and 7 evidence the creation of dream/oneirocritical cycles in the historically-fictive setting of the Babylonian exile. *4QAramApoc* and *4QFourKgdms* indicate the existence of dream-visions embedded in similar literary settings.

It is evident that these dream-visions were created and shaped by a number of concerns and are found in a variety of contexts. For all this diversity, however, a number of common themes and motifs were woven into dream-vision presentations across the corpus. While the origins and development of each of these tropes could be the subject of entire studies of their own, in the interest of mapping out the major features of dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls it will be useful to highlight the basic characteristics of revelatory episodes that repeatedly cropped up in the foregoing descriptions. The table that follows is a summary of the major literary features of dream-visions in the Aramaic texts. This table will be augmented by another like it at the close of Chapter Two, which will add greater detail from the perspective of common Aramaic idioms.

TABLE: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance I: Prominent Literary Themes, Images, and Motifs (continued on next page)

	<i>Doppelträume</i>	Visionary journey	<i>Angelus interpres</i>	Seer engages symbols	Interpretation within episode	Interpretation upon awakening	Setting in a foreign court	Tablets or writings	Inscribing episode content	Seer hides revelation	Visionary temple	Sacerdotal display or description
<i>BW</i>		●	●		●							
<i>Luminaries</i>		●	●		●			●				
<i>BD</i>											●	
<i>Epistle</i>			●					●				
<i>BG</i>	●					▲		▲				
<i>4QWordsMich</i>		○	●					●				
<i>1QapGen</i>			▲		▲	●		●		●		
<i>4QTJacob?</i>								●				●
<i>NJ</i>		○	●					●			●	●
<i>ALD</i>			▲							●		
<i>4QapocrLevi^b?</i>								●				●
<i>4QVisAmram</i>			●	●	●				●			
<i>Dan 2-7</i>			●		●	▲	▲		●	●		
<i>4QAramApoc</i>						●	●					
<i>4QFourKgdms</i>			○				●					
<i>4QVision^a</i>			●									
<i>4QpapVision^b</i>			○					○				○
<i>4QVision^d</i>												
<i>4QpapApoc</i>												

Legend:

- = Presence of motif/idiom certain
- = Presence of motif/idiom probable
- ▲ = Motif/idiom present in more than one episode

TABLE: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance I: Prominent Literary Themes, Images, and Motifs (continued from previous page)

	Interest in priestly genealogy	Messianic figure	View of the eschaton	Flood imagery or allusion	Reference to Watchers myth	Throne room judgment scene	Successive earthly kingdoms	Four metals or elements	View of unfolding history	Reclining before sleep	Arboreal imagery	Dualism	Astral phenomena
<i>BW</i>				●	●	●							●
<i>Luminaries</i>					●				●				●
<i>BD</i>			●	●					●	●			
<i>Epistle</i>			●		●				●				
<i>BG</i>				▲	●	●					●		
<i>4QWordsMich</i>					○				○				
<i>1QapGen</i>				●	●			○	▲	●	▲		○
<i>4QTJacob?</i>									●				
<i>NJ</i>							○		●				
<i>ALD</i>	●									●		●	
<i>4QapocrLevi^b?</i>		○					○		○			○	
<i>4QVisAmram</i>	●											●	
<i>Dan 2-7</i>		●	●			●	▲	●	▲	●	●		
<i>4QAramApoc</i>		●	●				●						●
<i>4QFourKgdms</i>							●				●		
<i>4QVision^a</i>													
<i>4QpapVision^b</i>							○				●		
<i>4QVision^d</i>													
<i>4QpapApoc</i>													

Legend:

- = Presence of motif/idiom certain
- = Presence of motif/idiom probable
- ▲ = Motif/idiom present in more than one episode

CHAPTER THREE

THE LANGUAGE OF DREAM-VISIONS: FORMS, STRUCTURES, IDIOMS, AND PHRASES¹

1 Introduction

The prospectus in the previous chapter established that dream-visions are a core component of at least nineteen different Aramaic texts among the Qumran Scrolls. In this process it became increasingly apparent that some common *literary* themes, images, and motifs flow through these texts. The present chapter complements this finding by detailing some common *linguistic* aspects of Aramaic dream-visions. This section is based upon a close, comparative reading of all the dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus which aimed to isolate patterns of recurring linguistic, philological, or formal features. Such features include but are not limited to: vocabulary items, semantic associations, idiomatic expressions, syntactical configurations, and in some cases, near verbatim parallels of full phrases or sentences. Since the last chapter provided an orientation to individual texts, I will adopt a more synthetic approach by describing five broad categories that encapsulate the most significant components of the expression of dream-visions in the Aramaic language. These include: (i) the terminology for ‘dreams’ and ‘visions;’ (ii) introductory formulae; (iii) structural phrases and idioms marking narrative movement; (iv) awakening or concluding formulae; and (v) the terminology and methods of interpretation. As with the previous chapter, I will conclude this description with a

¹ An earlier version of this chapter was discussed at the Graduate Enoch Seminar at the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, June 19, 2012, under the title “The Compositional Structure of Dream-Visions in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Report.”

short discussion of findings and implications as well as a ‘quick reference’ table of the features highlighted. In describing the materials in this way I am not arguing for a new understanding of the dream-vision as a literary form. As Flannery-Dailey has shown, many of the dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus cohere with the formal patterns of ancient dream-vision established by Oppenheim.² There is no need to re-establish this point. Rather, what I wish to illustrate is that by virtue of their composition in the same language, it is possible to track a broader set of literary-linguistic similarities throughout this literary form.

2 *Overlapping terminology for ‘dreams’ and ‘visions’*

The Aramaic Scrolls provide further evidence that the modern dichotomy of ‘dreams’ (understood as a nocturnal, subconscious phenomena) and ‘visions’ (typically understood as a type of hypnotic or transcendental experience) is somewhat arbitrary and betrays an anachronistic supposition about revelatory mediums. Such a dichotomy is especially problematic when considering the literary level of a text rather than a purported experience. The Aramaic texts thoroughly blend terminology for dreams and visions to such an extent that the line between the two is not easily discerned. The nouns “dream (חלום)” and “vision (חזון)” are both amply attested, and occur in similar contexts.³ That

² For an overview of Oppenheim’s and Flannery-Dailey’s contributions see pages 5-6, n. 7-8.

³ For חלום, see: *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIV 9; XV 19; XIX 14 (2x), 17, 18 (3x), 19; XX 22; *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 vi 10; *4QEn^e* (4Q206) 4 ii 1; *4QEnGiants^b* (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 14, 15, 23; *4QEnGiants^c* (4Q531) 22 9, 12; Dan 2:3, 4, 5, 6 (2x), 7, 9 (2x), 26, 28, 36, 46; 4:5 (2), 6 (3), 7 (4), 8 (5), 9 (6), 18 (15), 19 (16; 2x); and 7:1 (2x).

For חזון, see: *IQapGen* (1Q20) XXII 27; *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 vi 8; *4QLevi^b* (4Q213a) 2 16; *4QAramApoc* (4Q246) 1 i 3; *4QWordsMich* (4Q529) 1 5 (2x); *4QEnGiants^b* (4Q530) 1 i 7; *4QEnGiants^c* (4Q531) 11 2; *4QapocrLevi^b?* (4Q541) 2 i 9; *4QVisAmram^a* (4Q543) 1 a-c 1; *4QVisAmram^c* (4Q545) 1 a i

these Aramaic nouns were interchangeable or closely related is evident in a number of collocations for dream-vision phenomena. For example, in Dan 2:28, Daniel announces to Nebuchadnezzar, “[y]our dream and the visions (חלמך וחזויו) of your head as you lay in bed were these.” Similarly, when coupled with a verbal form, the overwhelming trend is to speak of “seeing” (*חזה) a dream, rather than “dreaming” (*חלם) a dream. Compare, for example, the opening of Hahya’s and ’Ohaya’s dream-visions in *BG*: “[I] was looking [in] my dream in this night (ב[חלמי הוית חזא בליליא דן)” and “I saw in my dream in this night (אנה חזית בחלמי בליליא דן)” (*4QEnGiants*^b [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 [?] 6, 16).⁴ The only instances of characters “dreaming a dream” are found in Abram’s dream-vision in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIX 14, 17-18 (cf. VII 20) and at the introduction of the *Doppelträume* sequence in *4QEnGiants*^b (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 3. The porous boundary between a ‘dream’ and a ‘vision’ is also evidenced by variations of the phrase “the vision of the night (חזוא די ליליא)” that is common to *IQapGen* and Aramaic

1; *4QFourKingoms*^a (4Q552) 4 10; *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 9 8; Dan 2:19, 28; 4:5 (2), 4:9 (6), 10 (7), 13 (10); 7:1, 2, 7, and 15. Note also the two occurrences of the form חזיה in *4QEn*^c (4Q204) 1vi 8, 13. The Hebraism “vision (חזיון)” occurs on five occasions: *IQapGen* (1Q20) VI 4, 11, 14; *4QEn*^c (4Q204) 1 vi 5; and *4QLevi*^b (4Q213a) 2 15. The sole occurrence of the noun in the Hebrew Scrolls is in the phrase “Valley of the Vision (בְּבֵי החזיון)” in *4QNarrative and Poetic Composition*^a (4Q371) 1 a-b 4 (cf. Isa 22:1, 5). It is widely recognized that the appearance of this noun in the Aramaic texts is a Hebraism (Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 148; Christian Stadel, *Hebraismen in den aramäischen Texten vom Toten Meer* [Schriften der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg 11; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008], 44; Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, 74). Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel overlooked this explanation and take the occurrence of the form in *4QLevi*^b (4Q213a) 2 15 as an erroneous plural noun, suggesting that the correct Aramaic form would be חזון (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 103-104, 138).

⁴ Cf. also *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIX 14; XX 22; *4QEn*^c (4Q204) 1 vi 5; Dan 2:26; 4:4 (2); 9 (6); 18 (15); 7:1, 2, and 7.

Daniel (1Q20 XXI 8; Dan 2:19; 7:7, 13; cf. Dan 7:2).⁵ This idiom was also likely present at the outset of Amram's dream-vision in *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 1-2 9-10.⁶ In view of this cross-section of examples, the application of revelatory terminology in the Aramaic Scrolls coheres well with DiTommaso's estimation of the usages of the roots חזוה and חלם in the Qumran collection:

Einige apokalyptische Texte markieren die semantischen Nuancen von חזון und חלם: Träume geschehen immer nachts und werden mit Schlaf und Nacht assoziiert, wohingegen Visionen zu jeder Zeit stattfinden können. *In anderen Texten erscheinen חזוה und חלם als austauschbar ...* In allen Fällen werden חזוה und חלם von Vokabeln des Sehens und der apokalyptischen Kontextualität begleitet. Beide Wörter drücken, wenn auch nur unvollständig, die jenseitige Qualität der offenbarten Erfahrung und transzendenten Wirklichkeit aus.⁷

⁵ In this instance, Fitzmyer suggested that *1QapGen* "borrowed" terminology from Daniel (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 220). Likewise, Dehandschutter attributed the common phrasing to the "certain influence" of Daniel on *1QapGen* ("Le rêve dans l'Apocryphe de la Genèse," 54). Rowley also pointed to this phraseological correspondence suggesting that it is one of several features that indicate "the closeness of the links between the language of the scroll [*1QapGen*] and the Aramaic of Daniel" (Harold H. Rowley, "Notes on the Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver* [eds. D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy Oxford: Clarendon, 1963], 116-29). However, the priority of Daniel should not be assumed. If we accept Machiela's dating of *1QapGen* to the mid 2nd century BCE, then the usages of this phrase in *1QapGen* and Daniel occur in nearly the same period.

⁶ Amram relates, "I saw in the vision(s) of [חזויה בחזויה], leaving us guessing as to the *nomen rectum* of the construct phrase. In light of the terminology of Dan 2:28; 4:2 (5), 7 (10), 10 (13); 7:1, Puech reconstructed the phrase with the suffixed noun "my head (ראשי)" (DJD XXXI, 379). Duke recognized that a *nomen rectum* is required here and accepts that Puech's reconstruction "seems reasonable" (*The Social Location*, 20). In Daniel, however, the phrase "visions of my/your head (חזויה ראשי/ך)" is predominantly coupled with the phrase "while upon my/your bed (על משכבי/ך)," which we know from the partially overlapping, fragmentary text of *4QVisAmram*^b (4Q544) 1-2 10 was not contained in the opening phrase. Therefore, it is preferable, to conclude that Amram here spoke of seeing "vision(s) of the night."

⁷ Lorenzo DiTommaso, "חזויה" *ThWQ* 1:928-34, here 933 (emphasis mine). See also the conclusions of Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 130; Dehandschutter, "Le rêve dans l'Apocryphe de la Genèse," 49); and Collins, *Daniel*, 160.

In these respects, the terminology used for dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus reflects broader trends in other ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean literatures.⁸

Based on these insights, rather than envisage dreams and visions as two separate categories of revelatory mediums, we ought to consider them as overlapping phenomena that were described using analogous terminology in our Aramaic literature. Consequently, the term ‘dream-vision’ best captures the type of revelatory phenomena in the Aramaic Scrolls. I will now consider some aspects of the structure of dream-vision accounts.

3 *Formulae introducing dream-visions*

Authors used various turns of phrase to usher literary characters from normal, waking states into dream worlds. I will highlight three more recognizable idioms that served this purpose. First, the prevailing terminology in *1QapGen* is for a dreamer to say that the Lord “appeared,” using an *Ithpe’el* form of the root *חזה. In 1Q20 XXI 8 Abram

⁸ Oppenheim observed the interchangeability of terms for dreams and visions and the common understanding of ‘seeing a dream’ in Egyptian, Hittite, and Akkadian (Oppenheim, *Interpretation*, 226-27; see also J. Bergman, et al., “חָלַם,” *TDOT* 4:421-32; and Bar, *A Letter that Has Not Been Read*, 10-13). Flannery-Dailey observed that this situation obtains across the literature of Hellenistic Judaism, leading her to suggest that we might locate both revelatory media on “a spectrum of hypnagogic events in which an altered state of perception facilitates an encounter with a divine being and/or the receipt of divine revelation” (Frances Flannery-Dailey, “Dreams and Vision Reports,” *EDEJ*, 550-552, here 550). In the Hebrew Scriptures, the phrasing for ‘seeing a dream’ is equally prevalent as ‘dreaming a dream’ (cf. Gen 31:10; 37:5; 41: 11, 22; Deut 13:1 [2], 3 [4]; and Judg 7:13). The terms ‘dream’ and ‘vision’ are also frequently featured in parallel, suggesting that for some authors the phenomena overlapped or were even interchangeable (cf. Num 12:6; Job 20:8; 33:15; Isa 29:7; and Joel 2:28 [3:1]). In light of this close pairing, Noegel recommended abandoning a strict delineation between dreams and visions in favor of a spectrum of mantic experiences (Scott B. Noegel, *Nocturnal Ciphers: The Allusive Language of Dreams in the Ancient Near East* [AOS 89; New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2007], 265). Hanson drew attention to the overlap, even synonymy, between the Greek terminology for dreams and visions, leading him to conclude that “[t]he rather rigid modern distinction between the terms dream (a sleeping phenomena) and vision (a waking phenomena) is not paralleled in antiquity” (John S. Hanson, “Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity,” *ANRW* II.23.2 [1980]: 1395-1427, here 1409; cf. also E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973], 105).

states, “And God appeared to me in a vision of the night (ואתחזי לי אלהא בחזוא די ליליא),” which is similar to the statement in 1Q20 XXII 27, where the narrator relates that “God appeared to Abram in a vision (אתחזיני אלהא לאברם בחזוא)” (cf. 1Q20 VI 11; XI 15).

Second, some writers portray prospective dreamers as “lying down (שכב)” before sleep. Eshel noted that *1QapGen* and *4QLevi*^b feature similar such idioms: Noah’s dream-vision commences in 1Q20 XII 19 with the phrase “And I laid down upon my bed and fell asleep (ושכבת על מְשַׁכְבִי וְדִמְכָת),” which is like Levi’s statement in 4Q213a 2 14-15, “I laid down and I stayed unt[il ...] (שכבת ויתבת אנה ע[ל]) *vacat* Then I was shown a vision (אדין חזיון אחזית).”⁹ Granting the dreamer this posture reflects a well-established formal convention in ancient Near Eastern dream-vision texts.¹⁰

Third, the opening formulae of the dream-visions in *4QVisAmram* and Daniel reassert the visual nature of the revelation about to be described. Whereas Nebuchadnezzar demanded that Daniel tell him “the visions of my dream that I saw (חזוי חזית) (Dan 4:9 [6]), Amram’s episode begins with the phrase, “I saw] in my vision, the vision of the dream (חזית) [בחזוי חזוה די חלמא) (4Q544 1 9-10).¹¹ In all of

⁹ Eshel, “The Dream Visions,” 122-23; idem, “The Noah Cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Noah and his Book(s)* (eds. Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel; SBLEJL 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 77-95, esp. 85.

¹⁰ Oppenheim, *The Interpretation*, 187; Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 20.

¹¹ There is some variation in the overlapping text of *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 1-2 9-10.

these cases, the formulae mark the beginning of the dream-vision account, corresponding to Oppenheim's dream 'frame.'

4 Phrases and idioms marking narrative movement

Between drifting off to sleep and awakening, characters express their revelations using some similar idioms and phrases. These give structure and progression to dream-vision episodes. While my listing is not exhaustive, the idioms highlighted here suggest some unity in the diversity of dream-vision depictions in the Aramaic corpus.

The first such idiom is the unmistakable prevalence of interjections and exclamations. In several cases the very first word following an introductory formula is a particle that directs the reader to the miraculous sights and sounds encountered by the dreamer. At the outset of his dream-vision in *4QVisAmram^b*, Amram remarks, "Behold (הא)! Two of them (i.e., angels) were judging over me" (4Q544 1 10).¹² More frequent still are exclamations and interjections interspersed throughout dream-vision episodes, as dreamers revel at the sights before their eyes.¹³ Various scholars have observed the use of

¹² Similar uses of exclamations occur at the beginning of the dream-visions of Abram in *1QapGen* (הא, 1Q20 XIX 14; הא, XXII 27), the giant 'Ohaya in the *BG* (הא; *4QEnGiants^b* [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 16), Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel (אלו, Dan 2:31; אלו, 4:10 (7); ארו, 7:2), and Enoch in *1 En.* 12:3 (ארו, *4QEn^c* [4Q204] 1v 19).

¹³ Cf. *1QapGen* (1Q20) XI 16 (הא); XII 1 (הא); XIII 13 (ארי הא), 14 (ארי^ה); XIV 7 (הלוי), 11 (הא), 12 (ה[ה]); XIX 16 (ארי); XX 22 (ארי); 4Q206 1 xxii 1 (הא); 2 3 (הא); 4 i 16 (הא), 17 (הא); *4QEn^e* (4Q206) 4 i 16, 17 (both הא); *4QEn^f* (4Q207) 1 2, 4 (both הא); *4QEnGiants^b* (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 18 (הוא); *4QapocrLevi^b?* (4Q541) 2 ii 1 (ארו), 6 (ארו); *4QVisAmram^a* (4Q543) 5-9 6 (הא); *4QVisAmram^b* (4Q544) 1 14 (הא); *4QVisAmram^d* (4Q546) 8 2 (ארו); *4QNJ^a* (4Q554) 2 iii 16 (הא); *4QpapVision^b* (4Q558) 20 2 (הא); 34 2 (הא); 51 ii 3 (הא); Dan 4:13 (10); 7:5, 6, 7, 13 (all ארו); and 7:8 (2x אלו). That this feature had a broader usage in Aramaic dream-vision accounts is evident in the presence of הא in line 3 of the Aramaic Balaam inscription from Deir 'Alla (*COS* 3.88), and הלוי in the Elephantine Aramaic dream-vision

exclamatory particles in some combinations and clusters of Aramaic dream-visions. Puech noted their use at the beginning of dream-visions in *4QVisAmram* and *IQapGen*.¹⁴ In light of *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIX 14, Fitzmyer remarked, “[h]ere one has the characteristic use of אה in the account of visions or theophanies,” calling particular attention to analogous uses in *BW* and *BD*.¹⁵ Dehandschutter observed the use of the Aramaic אה in Daniel and *IQapGen*, noting in particular that “h’ est l’équivalent de l’hébreu ‘whinne’ [והנה], introduisant la représentation symbolique dans le rêves bibliques.”¹⁶ With respect to the use of the particle in Daniel, Collins noted that “[t]he introductory ‘behold’ is characteristic of Hebrew vision reports (e.g., Amos 7:1, 4, 7; 8:1; Jer 24:1; also Gen 37:7, 9; 41:2, 3, 17).”¹⁷ In light of the precedent for the Hebrew particle הנה in the dream-visions of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is likely that the stereotypical use of exclamatory particles in the Aramaic Scrolls should be attributed to the influence of authoritative Hebrew exemplars.

Second, when remarking at the contents of an episode, dreamers may state “I saw x,” using an active finite form of the verb חזה or, more typically, passive/causative

potsherd (*CIS* 2.137). For concise discussions of these texts, see Levine, “Notes on an Aramaic Dream Text,” and Meindert Dijkstra, “Is Balaam Also among the Prophets?” *JBL* 114 (1995): 43-64.

¹⁴ *DJD* XXXI, 325.

¹⁵ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 184.

¹⁶ Dehandschutter, “Le rêve dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” 53.

¹⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 162. To these occurrences we may add Gen 31:10; 40:9, 16; 41:1, 5, 22; Judg 7:13, as well as occurrences in the latter half of the book of Daniel in Dan 8:3, 5, 15; 10:5, 10, 13, 16; 11:12; and 12:5 (3x).

constructions for “I was shown *x*.”¹⁸ Examples of these idioms are found in *4QNJ^a* (4Q554) 2ii 12, 15, where Jacob relates, “and he brought me to the midst of the city (ואעלני לגוא קריתא) ... and thus he showed me the meas[ure]ment of all the blocks (וכדן) (אחזיני מש[ח]ת פרוזיא כלהן)” (cf. *4QNJ^a* [4Q554] 2 iii 16; *5QNJ* [5Q15] 1 i 11; 1 ii 6). In light of such language, Lange observed that “[i]n its use of the root חזי, *NJ* compares well with Enochic literature. In the *Book of Watchers*, the *’af’el* of חזי is used to describe how Enoch is shown otherworldly realities during his otherworldly journey.”¹⁹

More prevalent than these basic verbal phrases, however, are instances where the Aramaic periphrastic construction denotes iterative or durative “looking.” This usually comes in the form, participle + finite verb “to be” (חזה הוית).²⁰ For example, Daniel recounted to Nebuchadnezzar that “you continued looking until (חזה הוית עד די) a stone was cut out without hands, and it struck the statue on its feet of iron and clay and crushed them” (Dan 2:34).²¹ Similarly, while observing the sacrificial tableau in the visionary temple in *NJ*, Jacob stated, “I was looking until (חזי הוית עד) it was given to a[ll] the

¹⁸ For uses of active verbs, see: *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 xii 25, 26; *4QEn^e* (4Q206) 1 xxii 3; *4QEn^f* (4Q207) 1 2; *4QWordsMich* (4Q529) 1 5; *4QVisAmram^a* (4Q543) 5-9 6; *4QpapApoc* (4Q489) 1 2. For uses of the passive/causative construction, see: *1QapGen* (1Q20) XII 3; (cf. the reconstructed form at 1Q20 XI 15); *2QNJ* (2Q24) 1 3; 8 7; *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 xi 3; 1 xii 26; 27, 30; 5 ii 26; *4QEn^e* (4Q206) 1 xxvi 17; 1 xxvii 1, 21; *4QEnastr^b* (4Q209) 25 3; *4QEn^s* (4Q212) 1 iii 20; *4QLevi^b* (4Q213a) 2 15; *4QNJ^a* (4Q554) 2 ii 15; 2 iii 20; *5QNJ* (5Q15) 1 ii 2.

¹⁹ Lange, “Between Zion and Heaven,” 398-99. Examples of this phrasing in *BW* include: *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 1 xiii 25; *4QEn^d* (4Q205) 1 xi 3; *4QEn^e* (4Q206) 1 xxvi 19; and 1 xxvii 21.

²⁰ On three occasions in the Enochic tradition the inverse construction, finite “to be” verb + participle (הוית חזה), serves the very same purpose (cf. *4QEn^f* [4Q206] 4 i 16 [partially reconstructed], 18; and *4QEnGiants^b* [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 [?] 6).

²¹ Cf. Dan: 2:31; 4:13 (10); 7:2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 21.

priests” (2QNJ [2Q24] 4 17; cf. 4 14-15). Baillet observed the correspondence between these two texts in a preliminary study of *NJ*.²² In light of the fully published collection of Aramaic texts it is evident that this syntagm enjoyed wider usage in Aramaic dream-vision literature. The best example of this is found in Noah’s dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XIII 9-11:

I continued watching (חזיה הוית), the gold, the sil[ver], the..., the iron, and all of the trees all of them, they were chopping and taking from it for themselves. I continued watching (חזיה הוית), the sun and the moon and the stars, chopping and taking from it for themselves. I continued watching until (הזיה הוית עד די) they brought an end to it, the swarming things of the earth and the swarming things of the water. And the water ceased, and it ended.

Additional examples of this construction are found in the giants’ dream-visions in *BG* (*4QEnGiants*^b [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 9 [partially reconstructed]; *6QpapGiants* [6Q8] 2 1-2) and *4QVision*^d (4Q575) 1 5-6. In view of such occurrences, Fassberg concluded that “[t]he similarity between חזיה/חזי הוית at Qumran and חזיה הוית in Daniel, particularly the identical reversed word order, point to the influence of the book of Daniel on the language of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.”²³ Likewise, Muraoka’s statement that “[w]hilst a couple of authors like that of 1Q20 may have found at times the familiar BA locution handy, one wonders how deeply it was integrated in their *langue*” indicates the assumption that this specific periphrastic construction in Daniel constitutes

²² Maurice Baillet, “Fragments araméens de Qumrân 2: Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle,” *RB* 62 (1955): 222-45, esp. 244.

²³ Steven E. Fassberg, “Salient Features of the Verbal System in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 65-100, here 72.

an established, isolated idiom.²⁴ However, as already indicated, since Aramaic Daniel emerged in the same period as many of the Aramaic Scrolls, we must exercise special caution in granting this tradition a privileged status on the basis of its subsequent canonical status. When taken together, variations of the periphrastic construction featuring the verb חזוה in Daniel, *1QapGen*, *BG*, *NJ*, and *4QVision*^d are best explained as an idiom that was deeply ingrained in the register of the Aramaic Scrolls' scribal milieu(s) in the latter centuries of the first millennium BCE.

A third idiom that occurs with some regularity portrays the dreamer as lifting their eyes to observe different visual or symbolic representations. This idiom is featured in three texts. In *4QVisAmram*^a Amram stated, "I lifted up my eyes and saw (נטלת עיני) (וחזית)" (4Q543 5-9 4). In *1QapGen* Abram is adjured by God, "Lift up your eyes and look (ושקול עיניך וחזי)" (1Q20 XXI 9). In *4QEn*^e Enoch related, "I lifted] my eyelids to the gates of the te[mple of heaven (יכל שמיא) ה' לתרעי ה' (נטלת) לשכני עיני לתרעי ה' (יכל שמיא)" (4Q204 1 vi 4; cf *4QEn*^f [4Q207] 1 1 [reconstructed]). In these instances it is likely that the authors of the Aramaic texts were again influenced by the prototypical language of dream-visions in the Hebrew Scriptures. The most prolific use of the Hebrew idiom is found in the visionary oracles of Zechariah 1-6, in which Zechariah repeatedly states, "I lifted up my eyes and saw (אשא את) עיני וארא(ה))" (Zech 1:18 [2:1]; 2:1 [2:5]; 5:1, 9; 6:1).²⁵ Duke proposed

²⁴ Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, 177.

²⁵ Smith noted that the use of this phrase in Zechariah was a key means of reporting dream-visions throughout the work (Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi* [WBC 32; Waco: Word Books, 1984], 192). Cf. also

that the occurrence of this idiom in *4QVisAmram* is a circumlocution for “seeing the reality behind the facade.”²⁶ Duke based this understanding on the analogous phrase “he [Joseph] looked up and saw (ἀνέβλεψα καὶ εἶδον)” in *T. Jos.* 6:2, which he took to mean that Joseph “saw there was an evil force behind the scenario.”²⁷ However, the use of parallel Aramaic/Hebrew idioms in theophanies, prophetic visionary oracles, and dream-visions suggests that this is not the case. It is more likely that in *4QVisAmram* we are, yet again, witnessing the deployment of stock biblical idiom in the Aramaic Scrolls.

A final noteworthy feature concerns short statements that pause narrative action and relate that the dreamer reflected on the content of their dream-visions. Such language occurs six times in the Aramaic Scrolls with some variation in specific phrasing.

Dreamers “pondered (בִּיָּן; *Ithpa'al*)” (*1QapGen* [1Q20] XIII 14), “marvelled (תממה)” (*4QEn^d* [4Q205] 1 xii 8; *1QapGen* [1Q20] XII 15 [2x], cf. XV 19), “considered (חשב)” (*1QapGen* [1Q20] VI 16), and “contemplated (שכל)” (Dan 7:8) the symbolic depictions presented before them. Most of these cases are supplemented with an interpretation. This association comes through most clearly in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XIV 4, as the interpreting angel begins to explain Noah’s dream-vision by saying, “You were pondering (תתבונן) the [wo]od of the topmost bra[nc]h.” This example leads us to consider some formal aspects of oneirocritical methods presented in the Aramaic texts.

similar terminology in Gen 18:2; 31:10, 12; Josh 5:13; Ezek 8:5; Dan 8:3; 10:5; and *4QRP^b* (4Q364) 4b-e ii 22 (reconstructed).

²⁶ Duke, *The Social Location*, 21.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

5 *Oneirocritical terminology and methods*

The otherworldly quality and cryptic meaning of some dream-visions is evident in the terminology authors use to describe them. Dreamers frequently encounter and learn of realities that constitute a “mystery (רז).”²⁸ This is especially pronounced in Aramaic Daniel, which frequently correlates oneirocriticism with unlocking the meaning of revealed mysteries (Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 30, 47). Despite the uncertainties of the immediate context of *IQapGen* XIV, it is clear from the lines leading up to the phrase “to understand the mystery (לְהַשְׁתַּכֵּל לְרִזָּא)” in line 19 that the interpretation of Noah’s symbolic dream-vision involved revealing a mystery (cf. XIV 20). In Chapter Six it will be seen that the content of this mystery concerned the outworking of history. In *4QVisAmram^c*, the *angelus interpretes* relates, “[I] will tell to you the mystery of his (i.e., Aaron’s) work (א[ח]וה לכה רז עובדה)” (4Q545 4 16). In Chapter Five I will explore the priestly application of this terminology. Lastly, in *I En.* 106:19 Enoch makes the encompassing statement, “For I know the mysteries (רִזָּא; *4QEn^c* [4Q204] 5 ii 26) of the Lord that the holy ones have revealed and shown to me, and I have read in the tablets of heaven” (*I En.* 106:19; cf. *4QEn^c* [4Q203] 9 3). These few examples indicate how the רז was understood as a broad concept, components of which could be revealed by an otherworldly agent in a dream-vision.

²⁸ For an explanation of the nature and function of this word/concept at Qumran, see the brief discussion and bibliography on pages 153-54, n. 27.

A less common descriptor of the elusive quality of dream-vision content is the collocation with “deep” and “hidden” things. After learning the mystery of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-vision and its interpretation, Daniel prays and acknowledges that God is the revealer of “deep and hidden things (הוא גלא עמיקתא ומסתרתא)” (Dan 2:22). *4QapocrLevi*^b? features this terminology on two occasions. 4Q541 7 1 states that “he revealed hi[dden thin]gs, de[ep things (הגלו מ[סת]ר עמי[קתא]).” Conversely, 4Q541 2 i 9 relates that “his [vi]sion wil[l no]t b[e] de[ep] (ה[ל]א להו[י]ה [ע]מ[יק] ח[זוה])” (cf. 4Q541 3 3; 24 ii 3).

The most recognizable oneirocritical method to unlock such mysteries or hidden knowledge in the Aramaic texts is the atomistic interpretation of dream-visions. In Aramaic Daniel this is achieved principally by delineating the dream-vision episode from its subsequent interpretation by the root פשר* (Dan 2:36; 4:24 [21]; cf. פתר* in Gen 40:12, 18). A subset of this approach is found in the recurring use of the idiom (די חזיתא) (“as you saw”) to break the dream-vision down into smaller elements, which are then interpreted individually. This style is most recognizable in Aramaic Daniel, which Goldingay has observed frequently quotes, identifies, and explains successive dream-vision elements.²⁹ Cross noted that this phrasing appeared to be a feature common to the book of Daniel and *4QArAmApoc*.³⁰ The author of *1QapGen* also utilized this approach. Machiela recently observed that, as in Daniel, “[t]he phrase די חזיתא is used [in

²⁹ John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 39.

³⁰ Cross, “The Structure of the Apocalypse,” 156, n. 13.

IQapGen] to introduce atomized, successive parts of a preceding dream (14:11, 14, 15, 17; 15:9 [twice], 13).³¹ The following examples illustrate this approach.

***IQapGen* (1Q20) XV 9**

“And as you saw (וּדִי חֲזִיתָא) all of them crying out and turning away, most of them will be evil. And as you saw[(וּדִי חֲזִיתָהּ).”

Dan 2:43

“As you saw (דִּי חֲזִיתָ) the iron mixed with clay, so will they mix with one another in marriage, but they will not hold together, just as iron does not mix with clay.”³²

***4QArAmApoc* (4Q246) 1 ii 1-2**

“Like the meteors that you saw (דִּי חֲזִיתָא), so their kingdom(s) will be.”³³

These examples evidence a common oneirocritical approach that involved the lemmatization of symbolic elements, which were then correlated with intelligible meanings using the relative pronoun דִּי and a finite verb from the root *חזי. The formal similarity between the methods applied in Aramaic Daniel, *IQapGen*, and *4QArAmApoc*

³¹ Machiela, “The Qumran Pesharim,” 341. See also the more general comments of Dehandschutter, “Le rêve dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” 50.

³² Cf. Dan 2:41 (2x), 45; 4:20 (17), and 23 (20).

³³ García Martínez (Florentino García Martínez, “4Q246: The “Son of God” Document from Qumran,” *Biblica* 74 [1993]: 153-74), and Puech (DJD XXII.167-68) transcribed חֲזִיתָא (with varying uses of diacritics over the *waw*). However, Cook is correct that despite their similarities in this hand, the scribe’s *yod* is distinguishable from the *waw* and the reading חֲזִיתָא is preferable (Edward M. Cook “4Q246,” *BBR* 5 [1995]: 43-66). The reading חֲזִיתָא is included in DSSSE, 1:494; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 111; and Årstein Justnes, *The Time of Salvation: An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)* (European University Studies, Series 23, Theology, 893; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009), 83. Based on this reading, the most natural understanding of the text is to parse a 2nd masc. sg. perfect verb introduced by דִּי, which functions as a relative pronoun (i.e., “that you saw”), not a noun with the particle דִּי comprising a genitive construction (i.e., “of the vision”). While I agree with Cook that the noun is unlikely here, his statement that “the emphatic state of the word חֲזוֹ, ‘vision,’ is חֲזוֹא (*sic* = חֲזוֹא), not חֲזוֹתָא” (“4Q246,” 55) overlooks the occurrence of the peculiar nominal form חֲזוֹתָא in *4QEnGiants*^a (4Q530) 1 i 7. For a discussion on the possible emergence of this form, see Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, 75.

demonstrates the prominence of this style of interpretation in the Aramaic Scrolls and further indicates the relevance of these materials for tracing the development from oneirocriticism to lemmatized scriptural commentary.

6 *Awakening formulae and responses elicited by dream-visions*

As was the case with introductory formulae, we are in the fortunate position of having a number of texts that relate the awakening and reaction of the dreamer. These formal features generally reflect the lower limit of Oppenheim's dream 'frame.'

Stuckenbruck noted that the conclusions of Hahya and 'Ohaya's dream-visions in *BG* and of Daniel's in Dan 7:28 are almost identical.³⁴ The concluding formulae in *BG* read, "Here, the end of the dream (כא סוף חלמא; כה סוף חלמא)" (*4QEnGiants*^b [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 12, 20)." In Daniel, the dream-vision cycle concludes with the phrase, "As far as here, the end of the matter (עד כה סופא די מלתא)" (Dan 7:28).³⁵ To this we might also compare the abrupt ending of one symbolic scene of Noah's dream-vision in *1QapGen*, which tersely concluded, "and it ended (וסף)" (1Q20 XIII 12).

Caquot observed a more verbose parallel awakening formulae in *4QLevi*^c and *4QVisAmram*^e.³⁶ As Levi stated, "I awoke from my sleep (אָנאָ אתעירת מן שנתִי)" (*4QLevi*^c [4Q213b] 1 2), so too Amram related, "and I awoke from the sleep of my eyes and wrot[e] the vision (ואנא אתעירת מן שנת עיני וחזוא כתבִּית)" (*4QVisAmram*^e [4Q547] 9

³⁴ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 113.

³⁵ Collins noted the similar phrasing "The end of the matter (סוף דבר)" in the final verse of the epilogue in Eccl 12:13 (*Daniel*, 323).

³⁶ André Caquot, "Les Testaments Qoumrâniens des Pères du Sacerdoce," *RHPR* 78 (1998): 3-26.

8). This similarity extends to *IQapGen* in Abram's statement, "And I awoke in the night from my sleep (ואתעירת בליליא מן שנת) (1Q20 XIX 17). Fitzmyer observed some resemblance between these idioms and the formula in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XV 21: "And] I Noah [awoke] from my sleep (ואתעירת א[א] נזח מן שנת)."³⁷ Greenfield and Stone suggested that coupling the verb "to awaken (עיר)" with the noun "sleep (שנת)" "may be regarded as one of the elements of Late Biblical Hebrew style" (cf. Job 14:12; Zech 4:1).³⁸ If this is the case, then we may have another example of the manifestation of scriptural language in the register of Aramaic dream-visions.

Another idiom for awakening found in *BG* is expressed as "sleep fleeing (נדד) from the eyes" (*4QEnGiants*^b [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 +7 i +8-11 +12 (?) 4, 11 [reconstructed]). This phrasing resonates with Levi's second dream-vision in *ALD*, in which the "kingdom of the sword" is said to be fraught with sleeplessness, described as "sleep fleeing (נדד) from the eyes" (*ALD* 5; Bodl. a 6-7). Drawnel concluded that this correlation indicates "unquestionable vocabulary contacts with the *Book of Giants*."³⁹ While I suspect he is correct, the existence of a similar idiom in 1 Macc 6:10 suggests that this phrasing may have had a wider usage in this period. Furthermore, Stuckenbruck and Puech have observed the rendering of the Hebrew phrasing תדד שנת מעיני ("sleep fled from my

³⁷ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 170.

³⁸ DJD XXII, 40. See also, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 138.

³⁹ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 245.

eyes”) of Gen 31:40 as *ונדת שנתי מעיני* in *Tg. Onq.*⁴⁰ This may suggest that on some level the Aramaic phrasing derives from scriptural idiom.

Concluding formulae at times also include some common responses elicited by dream-visions. In some cases dreamers readily relayed their experiences. For some, this involved immediately inscribing the account. Prior to the recollection of Daniel’s dream-vision of the four beasts, we are told that Daniel “wrote down the dream (חלמא כתב)” (Dan 7:1). There is a strong penchant for recording otherworldly knowledge divulged in dream-visions in the Enochic tradition (*I En.* 40:8; 81:6; 82:1). The incipit of *4QVisAmram* (cf. *4QVisAmram*^a [4Q543] 1a, b, c 1-4; *4QVisAmram*^c [4Q545] 1a i) serves to reinforce the veracity of the pseudepigraphic claim by linking the work with a putative document penned within the narrative. This incipit undoubtedly alludes to *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 9 8, which, as seen above, portrays Amram as expediently inscribing his dream-vision upon awakening.⁴¹ In light of such examples Flannery-Dailey and Drawnel have underscored the link between dream-vision revelation and the scribal activities of reading and writing in this period.⁴² This trend finds its roots in the Hebrew Scriptures with the inscribing of some prophetic, visionary oracles (e.g., Nah 1:1; Hab 2:2; cf. Isa 1:1; Obad 1:1; Mic 1:1; Hab 1:1). What we witness in the cases of Enoch,

⁴⁰ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 110; DJD XXXI, 33. Cf. Dan 6:19 (18); and Est 6:1.

⁴¹ This pseudepigraphic mechanism has a broader usage in the Aramaic texts, as evidenced by incipits linked with documents produced within the narratives of the book of Tobit, *BW*, *BG*, *4QprNab*, and perhaps *4QWordsMich* and *1QapGen* (Perrin, “Capturing the Voices”).

⁴² Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 136-47; Henryk Drawnel, “The Initial Narrative of the *Visions of Amram* and its Literary Characteristics,” *RevQ* 24 (2010): 517-54.

Daniel, and Amram in the Aramaic Scrolls, therefore, is the continued outworking of the ‘dream writer’ motif in Second Temple literature.

In other cases, dreamers verbally related their dream-vision to another character. In an early narrative unit in *1QapGen*, Noah awakens and states, “[And] I [we]nt to Shem, my son, and I relat[ed] everything to [him] (ואז ליהת אנא לשם ברי וכולא אהו]ת) [ל]” (1Q20 XV 22; cf. XIX 17-18). On four occasions dreamers state that they related their revelation using *Ithpa’al* verbs from the root *שעה (*1QapGen* [1Q20] XIX 17-18 [2x]; *4QEnGiants*^b [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 [?] 5; *6QpapGiants* [6Q8] 1 5). Given this association, the phrase “te]lling to al[1 לב]ל[מ]שתעא” in *4QVisAmram*^d (4Q546) 6 3 likely connotes Amram’s verbal recollection of his dream-vision before his children.

Not all dreamers, however, were so eager to document or divulge their revelations. Greenfield and Stone noted similar expressions for concealing revelation in *ALD*, Dan 7, and *1QapGen*.⁴³ The closest parallel in phrasing among these is found in *4QLevi*^c and *1QapGen*. Upon awakening Levi stated, “[and I hid] this also in my heart and did not [reveal it] to anyone (גליתה) לא אנש ולכל אנש לא (וטמר]ת אף דן בלבבי ולכל אנש לא גליתה)” (*4QLevi*^c [4Q213b] 1 3-4; reconstructed with Bodl. a 12-13).⁴⁴ Similarly Noah said, “and I hid this mystery in my

⁴³ DJD XXII, 40.

⁴⁴ The element דן אף in *4QLevi*^c was a key piece of Kugler’s argument that *ALD* contained only a single dream-vision episode, not two as in the Greek *T. Levi* 2:5-5:7; 8. Kugler understood דן אף as a means of emphasizing “what Levi hid,” and translated the text as “And I hid this very thing in my heart, and I revealed it to no one” (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 49-50). This proposal has been highly criticized. The most natural reading of this phrase is that Levi hid a second dream-vision in his heart. For critiques of Kugler’s

heart and did not tell it to anyone (וטמרת רוא דן בלבבי ולכול אנוש לא אהויתה) (1Q20 VI 12).” An analogous turn of phrase draws the Aramaic Daniel dream-vision cycle to a close: “I, Daniel, my thoughts greatly terrified me, and my face turned pale; but I kept the matter in my heart (אנה דניאל שגיא רעיוני יבהלנני וזווי ישתנון עלי ומלתא בלבי נטרת) (Dan 7:28).⁴⁵

The emotional response of dreamers is also a common motif in this Aramaic literature. As in many ancient Near Eastern and scriptural dream-visions, several Aramaic dreamers are fearfully distressed at the enigmatic and foreboding contents of their revelations.⁴⁶ For example, both Abram and Nebuchadnezzar were “frightened (דחל)” at their own dream-visions, and the group of giants “were frightened (דחלו)” upon hearing those of Hayha and ’Ohaya (*IQapGen* [1Q20] XIX 18; Dan 4:5 [2]; *4QEnGiants*^b

understanding of the text, see the reviews of *From Patriarch to Priest* by Matthew Morgenstern (*JSS* 44 [1999]: 135-37) and Eileen Schuller (*Hebrew Studies* 39 [1998]: 120-21), and the comments of Greenfield, Stone and Eshel (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 46-47), and Marinus de Jonge (“Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 71-89). In a more recent foray into *ALD* Kugler adjusted his translation to “[I hid] this too in my heart and to nobody” (“Whose Scripture?” 13). Therefore, it is most likely that Aramaic phrasing similar to *ALD* underlies the later tradition of *T. Levi* 8:19: “And I hid this in my heart as well, and I did not report it to any human being on the earth (και ἔκρυψα καιγε τοῦτο ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου και οὐκ ἀνήγγειλα αὐτό παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς).”

⁴⁵ Note also the fragmentary phrasing “you shall hide in [your] heart (ד[ו]תטשא בלבב[ך])” in an overlooked Aramaic fragment on PAM 43.598, labeled 4Q561 11 9 by Søren Holst and Jesper Høgenhaven (“Physiognomy and Eschatology: Some More Fragments of 4Q561,” *JJS* 57 [2006]: 26-43). Unaware of the glaring resemblance with *ALD*, *IQapGen*, and Daniel, Holst and Høgenhaven stated that this partial expression is “of course reminiscent of Luke 2:52 (*sic.* = 2:51); an exact parallel does not seem to be attested in Aramaic elsewhere, but there is nothing implausible in the construction” (*ibid.*, 30). The text does not appear to come from the same work as 4Q561, though it perhaps derives from the same scribe (*ibid.*, 39; cf. Mladen Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* [STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 57).

⁴⁶ Oppenheim included the sudden awakening and response as a key element of the dream ‘frame’ (*Interpretation*, 191). While I have reservations about Bar’s dream typology, his treatment of responses to a cross-section of dream-visions in the Hebrew Scriptures remains a valuable one (*A Letter that Has Not Been Read*, 35-43; 70-77).

[4Q530] 2 ii + 6 +7 i +8-11 +12 [?] 20).⁴⁷ In some cases we also find dreamers remarking at the frightening nature of the images encountered in dream-visions. Daniel 7:7 depicts the fourth beast as “dreadful and terrifying (דחילה ואימתני).” Cook has suggested that the appearance of the fourth beast in Daniel mirrors the description of Melchiresha in *4QVisAmram*. In the latter, Amram remarked that Melchiresha’s visage was “dreadful [and terrify]yng (דחיל [ואימ]תן)” (*4QVisAmram*^b [4Q544] 1 13).⁴⁸ If Cook’s reading is accepted, this is a remarkable example of two seers using precisely the same terminology to describe the horrid appearance and ominous presence of an otherworldly being.

Unlike these frightened dreamers, others awake and immediately “bless (ברך)” God. In *1QapGen*, Noah states, “[I] Noah [awoke] from my sleep. And the sun rose and I [Noah ...] to bless the Everlasting God (למברך אל עלמא)” (1Q20 XV 22).” Noah’s actions here reflect his response to an earlier fragmentary dream-vision in 1Q20 VII 20. Similarly, upon awaking from his nocturnal revelation, Daniel arose and “blessed the God of heaven (אדין דניאל ברך לאלה שמיא)” (Dan 2:19). In the course of his visionary journey, Enoch blessed the Lord for showing him the mountain of the dead (*1 En.* 22:14; *4QEn*^d

⁴⁷ For other responses of distress or alarm, see *4QEnGiants*^c (4Q531) 22 9; Dan 4:19 (16); 7:15, and 28.

⁴⁸ Edward Cook, “חשל,” *A Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic* (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming). Puech presented the text as חשל[כפ]תן, connoting the image of a snake shedding its skin (DJD XXXI, 325). Cook’s reading, however, is preferable on account of the literary context of the episode, the scarcity of serpentine imagery in early Jewish literature, and the available space and letter traces visible in 4Q544 1 13. Compare also the depiction of the Lord of the sheep in *1 En.* 89:30: “and his appearance was strong and great and dr[e]adful (וחזיה תקיף ורב וד[חיל])” (*4QEn*^d [4Q205] 2 ii 29).

[4Q205] 1 xi 2). At the conclusion of his journey, Enoch stated that he will continually bless the Lord on account of the things seen (*1 En.* 36:4; *4QEn^c* [4Q204] 1 xiii 29-30). In light of the trend observed here, the concluding formula “and after this I awoke and blessed the Most High (καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡσπερ ἔξυπνος γενόμενος εὐλόγησα τὸν ὕψιστον)” in *T. Levi* 5:7 may derive from the author’s Aramaic source.

7 *Summary of findings*

This chapter highlighted some of the formal and philological building blocks that gave structure to the dream-visions of the Aramaic Scrolls. All of these features are collected and presented in the table below. Since the evidence at our disposal is highly fragmentary we cannot establish a complete picture of the compositional structure of most dream-vision accounts. Nevertheless, the bits and pieces of available text reveal a surprising degree of similarity. In some respects, the Aramaic dream-visions reflect the compositional patterns of visionary literature in the ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean worlds. It was also seen that select features had precursors in the dream-vision accounts of the Hebrew Scriptures. That the authors of these materials employed such language with the intention of echoing authoritative, scriptural idiom is an intriguing possibility. If this was the case, authors may have sought credibility for their pseudepigraphic dream-visions or, in the case of Danielic texts, shaped the career and personality of a ‘new’ dreamer by evoking phrasing that echoed earlier precedents.

This chapter also problematized some common understandings of the priority and place of Daniel in the Aramaic corpus. At many points in the above discussion it was demonstrated that aspects of the compositional style of Aramaic Daniel’s dream-vision

cycle repeatedly reflected that of contemporary, or in some cases, earlier revelatory episodes among the Aramaic corpus. It is true that the Daniel traditions in ancient Judaism were rapidly developing and that the book of Daniel ascended to scriptural status among some groups in the mid Second Temple period.⁴⁹ It is quite possible that works like *4QFourKgdms* and *4QAramApoc* should be understood as parascriptural developments from Dan 2 and 7. Additionally, there may be some linguistic grounds for seeing the Aramaic Daniel traditions as slightly earlier than some of the Qumran Aramaic texts; however, until much more comparative study is done in this area, the entire enterprise of the linguistic dating of the Aramaic texts, *including* Dan 2-7, remains an open question.⁵⁰ Even if the language and idiom of Aramaic Daniel could be verified as

⁴⁹ See, for example, the survey of Peter W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; VTSup 83; FIOTL 2; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 329-67.

⁵⁰ Even in Fitzmyer’s typology, Aramaic Daniel is located at the “very end” of the phase of Official Aramaic, on the cusp of the transition to Middle Aramaic (“The Phases of the Aramaic Language,” 61). Upon comparison of the Qumran fragments of Daniel and the Masoretic text, Collins has remarked that some alleged dialectical or diachronic linguistic features are better understood as orthographical or morphological in nature (*Daniel*, 16). Such slight shifts cannot be used for linguistic dating. Note, for example, the variation between *aleph* and *heh* for the emphatic state on the words פשרה (*4QDan^a* [4Q112] 3 i + 17 7; 12 3) and פשרא in the Masoretic text of Dan 2:24; and 5:17. This was but one piece of evidence that led Collins to conclude that “[i]t is doubtful whether a firm line can be drawn between the Aramaic of Daniel and that of Qumran” (ibid. 17). In a recent study Norin compared overlaps between the *ALD* witnesses and found that at times the Genizah witnesses exhibited earlier traits than the Qumran texts (Stig Norin, “The Aramaic Levi – Comparing the Qumran Fragments with the Genizah Text,” *SJOT* 27 [2013]: 118-30). This was evidenced by some fluctuation between the use of *aleph* and *heh* for the emphatic state (e.g., למדבחא *4QLevi^c* [4Q213b] 5-6 i 3//למדבחה in Bodl. c 23 [line 14]), instances where the Genizah texts read *Ha’fel* forms where the corresponding Qumran fragments have *Afel* verbs (e.g., לאסקא *4QLevi^c* [4Q213b] 5-6 i 3//להסקה in Bodl. c 23 [line 14]), and in some cases where what are thought to be later forms of the pronoun show up in the Qumran Aramaic texts (e.g., אנון *4QLevi^a* [4Q213] 1 i 3//הנון Cambr. e 82 [line 6]). Such instances of variation within and between manuscripts indicate that the language reflected in the Aramaic texts is not uniform. These examples indicate that linguistic variation is not always a clear indicator of compositional date. Late forms can show up in early manuscripts and *vice versa*. As such, some linguistic differences are a symptom of scribal culture. Manuscripts are artifacts created by human scribes whose understanding of a (written or spoken) language will inevitably impact their scribal handiwork. The only study to give serious consideration to the interrelatedness of language and scribal culture in these

deriving from an earlier time, chronological antecedence cannot be equated with literary priority. It does not follow that Dan 2 and 7 must have exerted a formative influence on the language of the dream-visions in *IQapGen*, *4QVisAmram*, *BG*, and *NJ*, to name a few examples from above where scholars have made this tacit assumption. One of the positive outcomes of the type of comparative study is that the Aramaic Scrolls provide the most appropriate interpretive arena for understanding Daniel. As Wacholder has reminded us, Aramaic Daniel is an important piece of a wider puzzle of Aramaic literature in this era.

The echoes and phrasing that resound throughout the Aramaic dream-visions also engender questions of intertextuality and social location. For the moment I would suggest that most often we are not dealing with a direct carryover of idioms in a complex web of intertextual dependencies. In most cases we cannot say with certainty that a shared feature derives necessarily from literary borrowing, be it from Daniel, or another text. The cumulative weight of the above presentation suggests that there existed something of a repertoire of Aramaic idioms upon which authors drew and to which they contributed when penning their works in the 3rd-2nd centuries BCE. This may indicate that clusters of these Aramaic texts emerged in closely associated scribal milieus. Some similarities in phrasing, however, bordered on isomorphic parallels. This was especially pronounced in the concluding dream-vision formulae in *IQapGen* and *ALD*, *ALD* and *4QVisAmram*, and Daniel and *BG*. In the previous chapter it was seen that these texts also exhibited the common use of some literary motifs, images, and themes (see table above). Such

materials is that of Wise, who explored some of the Aramaic texts in light of the presupposition of a diglossia linguistic environment (“Accidents and Accidence,” 124-67).

resemblances open the door for us to begin to ask whether these works were related textually, tradition-historically, or derive from a more narrowly defined scribal circle.

By this point it is clear that dream-visions occupy a central place in the Aramaic corpus and that there is a good deal of commonality in their literary-linguistic shape. The remaining chapters of the study will focus in on different parts of this picture by detailing the exegetical, priestly, and historiographical concerns and application of dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls. As with the approach of these last two chapters, our aim will be on isolating trends in usage that obtain across the corpus.

TABLE: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance II: Prominent Formal and Philological Features (continued on next page)

	“dream” (חלם)	“vision” (חזו)	“vision” (חזין)	“vision of the night” (חזוא די ליליא)	“vision of my/your head” (חזוי ראשי/ך)	Construct “vision of the dream”	“to see” (חזה) a dream	“to dream” (חלם) a dream	Deity “appears” (*חזה)	Exclamations (הא, ארו, or אלו)	“I saw x” (active חזה)	“I was shown x” (passive חזה)	Periphrastic: חזה הוית	Periphrastic: הוית חזה
<i>BW</i>	●	●	●				●		▲	●	●	●		
<i>Luminaries</i>												●		
<i>BD</i>	●									●	●	●		●
<i>Epistle</i>														
<i>BG</i>	▲	▲					▲	●		●			●	●
<i>4QWordsMich</i>		●									●			
<i>1QapGen</i>	▲	●	●	●			▲	▲		▲		●	●	
<i>4QTJacob?</i>														
<i>NJ</i>										●		●	●	
<i>ALD</i>		●	●											
<i>4QapocrLevi^b?</i>		●												
<i>4QVisAmram</i>		●		○		●				●	●			
<i>Dan 2-7</i>	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲			▲			▲	
<i>4QArAmApoc</i>		●												
<i>4QFourKgdms</i>		●												
<i>4QVision^a</i>														
<i>4QpapVision^b</i>							○			●				
<i>4QVision^d</i>							○							
<i>4QpapApoc</i>											●			

Legend:

- = Presence of motif/idiom certain
- = Presence of motif/idiom probable
- ▲ = Motif/idiom present in more than one episode

TABLE: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Scrolls at a Glance II: Prominent Formal and Philological Features (continued from previous page)

	“lifting” (שקל or נטל) the eyes	“Mystery” (רז)	“Deep” (עמיק) and/or “hidden”	פִּשְׁר for “interpretation”	Atomized interpretation by phrase “that you saw” (דִּי חִזַּיתָ[א/ה/ו])	“End” (ספ) of episode	“awakening” (*ערך) from “sleep” (שנה)	Sleep “fleeing” (נודד) from the eyes	“telling” (שעה) episode to audience	“relating” (חזה) episode to audience	Dreamer conceals revelation in heart	Dreamer “frightened” (דהל)	Dreamer “blesses” (*ברך) God
<i>BW</i>	●												▲
<i>Luminaries</i>													
<i>BD</i>													
<i>Epistle</i>													
<i>BG</i>				▲		▲		●	▲				
<i>4QWordsMich</i>													
<i>1QapGen</i>	●	●			●	●	●		●	●	●	●	▲
<i>4QTJacob?</i>													
<i>NJ</i>													
<i>ALD</i>	○						●	●			●		
<i>4QapocrLevi^b?</i>			▲										
<i>4QVisAmram</i>	●	●					●		○				
<i>Dan 2-7</i>		●	●	▲	▲	●					●	●	●
<i>4QAramApoc</i>					●								
<i>4QFourKgdms</i>													
<i>4QVision^a</i>													
<i>4QpapVision^b</i>													
<i>4QVision^d</i>													
<i>4QpapApoc</i>													

Legend:

- = Presence of motif/idiom certain
- = Presence of motif/idiom probable
- ▲ = Motif/idiom present in more than one episode

PART TWO
SHARED COMPOSITIONAL CONCERNS

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EXEGETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF SOME PATRIARCHAL DREAMERS

1 Introduction

The retelling of scriptural tales with ‘new’ material, themes, and emphases is a pervasive feature of ancient Israelite/Jewish literature. In many ways, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has drawn greater attention to the fact that the ‘rewriting’ of traditional materials was an integral part of the composition-transmission process of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves and an ongoing literary phenomenon that flourished in various forms in the Second Temple period.¹ It was shown in Chapter Two that the majority of

¹ Brooke underscored that Deuteronomy and 1-2 Chronicles attest to the reframing and interpretation of prior traditions *within* the books of received scripture (George Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaeen Desert Discoveries* [eds. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: The British Museum; New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2002], 31-40). These examples may be considered part of a broader network of intertextuality and interpretation that has been described as “inner biblical exegesis.” See especially, Fishbane’s formulation of this idea in *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, and the recent reappraisal by Yair Zakovitch, “Inner-biblical Interpretation,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 227-63. Eugene Ulrich has demonstrated that the types of scribal exegesis that occur in the early strata of scriptural literature continue to emerge in the transmission process, as evidenced by the Scrolls, Septuagint, Masoretic text, and Samaritan Pentateuch (Ulrich’s more recent research in this regard includes, “Clearer Insight into the Development of the Bible – A Gift of the Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* [eds. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011], 119-37; and “The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* [eds. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 209-25). The extensive bibliography on parascriptural or ‘rewritten’ literature testifies to a growing awareness of the continuation of this type of activity among ancient Jewish scribes. For overviews of recent developments in this vein of research and the *status quaestionis* as it has emerged in a number of studies, see Daniel A. Machiela, “Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism – A Review of Recent Developments,” *JJS* 61 (2010): 308-20; and Molly M. Zahn, “Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (eds. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila; BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 93-120. In light of such trends, Segal proposed that when it comes to the production, transmission, and interpretation of scripture in the Second Temple period, rewriting is the rule rather than the exception

dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls are attributed to patriarchal figures. When readers encounter Noah and Abram in *1QapGen*, Enoch in *1 Enoch*, or Levi in *ALD*, they are not meeting these figures for the first time but are becoming reacquainted with individuals that are already familiar in the Hebrew Scriptures. However, these figures are *not* especially associated with dream-vision revelation in the scriptural patriarchal narratives. In this respect there is something of a disparity between the portrayal of the patriarchs in the Hebrew Scriptures and the Aramaic corpus: the patriarchs in the Aramaic Scrolls are still the patriarchs of the Hebrew Scriptures, but are enhanced with a characteristic that is foreign to their scriptural selves. Or is it?

In this chapter I will explore how some authors of the Aramaic texts added to the portrayal of select patriarchs by taking advantage of the elusive phrasing of their Hebrew sources. By toying with semantic ranges of Hebrew words and allusive syntactical arrangements, as well as by drawing upon parallel language elsewhere in scripture, these authors were able to tease out intimations of patriarchal dream-visions. Once such an allusion was perceived in the text of scripture, authors could step into the tradition, augmenting it with an account of the 'lost' episode. In such cases, dream-visions could be viewed not as impositions on the patriarchal narratives but as responses to stimuli inherent in scripture. In the course of my treatment, it will be seen that aspects of this phenomenon have been treated by Dimant, Falk, Kugel, Legrand, Machiela, and VanderKam. The insights of these scholars are essential to my undertaking here.

However, what has not been recognized is that this type of creative philological exegesis

(Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* [ed. Mattias Henze; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 10-28).

is not incidental or limited to a single text. Rather, when tracked across the corpus it becomes apparent that this method was plied in a small constellation of Aramaic visionary traditions. In some cases similar types of exegetical stimuli linger in the background of more than one Aramaic text. The present chapter aims to (i) give greater detail and depth to our understanding of the exegetical underpinnings of some individual Aramaic dreamers, and to (ii) underscore that this approach is something of a current that runs throughout a cluster of core texts to the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corpus.

I will explore the exegetical backgrounds of patriarchal dreamers in three texts and traditions. The first of these, *IQapGen*, will receive the most attention, since its proximity to the running scriptural narrative of Genesis will allow us to more easily retrace the exegetical steps that gave rise to dream-visions. Following this, I will review how the abrupt and enigmatic biography of Enoch in Gen 5:22-24 provided the ideal scriptural basis for creating the diverse tradition of Enochic dream-visions and otherworldly journeys that pervade *I Enoch*. Lastly, I will explore how the author of *ALD* ventured beyond Genesis to consider how, if read in a particular way, Mal 2:5-6 and 1 Sam 2:27 implied that Levi was a dreamer. The chapter will close with a summary of findings and some observations on how this exegetical aspect of dream-visions should inform our understanding of these texts as parascriptural literature.

2 *The Genesis Apocryphon: uncovering scripture's intimations of dream-visions*

In the prospectus of Chapter Two, it was established that *IQapGen* is dotted with between three and five Noachic dream-visions and four Abramic dream-visions. Here I will focus on elucidating the exegetical underpinnings of the dream-visions at 1Q20 XXII

19-XV 22; XIX 14-17; and XXI 8-10. While I will not consider all of the dream-visions of *IQapGen*, my discussion will explore the possibility that the broader recharacterization of these patriarchs as prophets could have occasioned the creation of dream-visions throughout the composition.

2.1 *A threefold combination of verbs alluding to revelation in Gen 9:21 and 24*

At the outset of his study on ancient and rabbinic traditions concerned with Noah's drunkenness in Gen 9, Cohen observed that

[t]he arresting contrast between the antediluvian Noah, rescued from death by his goodness, and the postdiluvian Noah, sprawled out in drunken disarray, has provoked a running controversy over the centuries between the apologists, who try to salvage Noah's reputation as the man 'blameless in his age,' and the more kindly critics, who regard him as perhaps the best of a degenerate lot.²

While this estimation is perhaps an oversimplification, Cohen has captured the inescapable tension readers are left with when Noah, the champion of the flood and emblem of righteousness in his day, drinks himself into a stupor only to be discovered naked in his tent by his sons. This incident is recounted in Gen 9:20-27 as follows:

Noah, a man of the soil, was the first to plant a vineyard. He drank some of the wine and became drunk, and *he lay uncovered* (ויתגל) in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brothers outside. Then Shem and Japheth took a garment, laid it on both their shoulders, and walked backward and covered the nakedness of their father; their faces were turned away, and they did not see their father's nakedness. When Noah *awoke* (וייקץ) from his wine and *knew* (וידע) what his youngest son had done to him, he said, "Cursed be Canaan; lowest of slaves shall he be to his brothers." He also said, "Blessed by the Lord my God be Shem; and let Canaan be his slave. May

² H. Hirsch Cohen, *The Drunkenness of Noah* (Judaic Studies 4; Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1974), 1.

God make space for Japheth, and let him live in the tents of Shem; and let Canaan be his slave.”

This scene takes on a different shape in its retelling in *1QapGen*. After enjoying the first cask of his vineyard’s yield, Noah relates, “And I lay down upon my bed and fell asleep” (1Q20 XII 19). This sleep brought with it a divine revelation via a dream-vision (1Q20 XII 19-XV 22). In Chapter Six I will detail the historiographical function of this episode. My interest here is to discern what gave rise to the inclusion of this dream-vision in the first place. By reading Gen 9:20-27 with an eye for hints toward dream-vision activity, it is evident that *1QapGen*’s telling of this tale was created by a clever reading of a combination of three Hebrew verbs.

The first exegetical impetus for the creation of Noah’s dream-vision is the Hebrew verb *גלה* in Gen 9:21. Zobel established that the root *גלה* “has a wide variety of nuances” in the Hebrew Scriptures, but that “these nuances revolve around the two basic concepts, ‘to uncover, ‘reveal,’ and ‘to emigrate,’ ‘go away,’ ‘go into captivity.’”³ Machiela observed that, most often, the verb *גלה* in Gen 9:21 is understood with reference to the ‘uncovering’ of Noah’s nakedness.⁴ He also argued that the syntax of the clause and semantic association of the root **גלה* engenders another way of understanding the episode. He writes,

the author of the Apocryphon appears to have neither taken Noah as the subject of *גלה* (going back to 9:20a), nor connected it with Noah’s nakedness in 9:22.

³ Hans-Jürgen Zobel, “*גלה* *gālāh*,” *TDOT* 2:476-88.

⁴ Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 102.

Rather, he seemingly read **ויתגל** in reference to an unstated, but implied, subject – a revelatory vision received by Noah. A translation to accompany this understanding might be, “Having drunk of the wine he became inebriated, and it [i.e. a vision] was revealed inside of his tent.”⁵

Machiela also demonstrated that there is a strong association between the root **גלה** and hidden, prophetic, or otherworldly knowledge in the Hebrew Scriptures, Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls, and Aramaic corpus.⁶ In some cases in the Aramaic texts, the root is linked directly with dream-vision revelation. In *4QVisAmram^d*, Amram states, “[it] was revealed to me (**א[תגלה לי]**)” (4Q546 9 2). In *4QapocrLevi^b* the phrases “they revealed (**הגלו**)” and “revelations (**מגליא**)” occur in a visionary context (4Q541 7 1; 24 ii 3). Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-vision is repeatedly said to have derived from special revelation (**גלה***) (Dan 2:19, 22, 28-30, 47). Thus, there is good reason to think that the verb **יתגל** piqued the exegetical

⁵ Ibid. A number of recent studies have accepted Machiela’s proposal of this exegetical background. See Eshel, “The Noah Cycle,” 85; James L. Kugel, “Which is Older, Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon? An Exegetical Approach,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (eds. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref; STDJ 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 257-94, esp. 269-70; Moshe J. Bernstein, “The *Genesis Apocryphon*: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 157-79, esp. 169 n. 55.

⁶ The more salient examples from the Hebrew Scriptures include: Gen 35:7; Num 24:4, 16; Ps 119:18; Dan 10:1; and Amos 3:7. Similarly, a cross-section of examples in the Hebrew Scrolls illustrates the point: *CD* II 14; *IQS* V 9; *IQpHab* 11 1; *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) 1 11; *4QD^c* (4Q268) 1 7; *4QMysteries^a* (4Q299) 8 6; and *4QInstruction^b* (4Q416) 2 iii 18. For examples in the Aramaic texts, see *4QEn^s* (212) 1 iv 14; *4QNoah^a* (4Q534) 1 i 12; 3 1; *4QNoah^c* (4Q536) 2 i + 3 3; and 2 i + 3 8. Eshel called attention to the fragmentary text of *4QEn^a* (4Q201) iv 4-5 as perhaps evidencing the link between the root **גלה** and the disclosure of heavenly revelation (“The Noah Cycle,” 85; cf. *4QEn^b* (4Q202) 1 iii 5). For a survey of **גלה** at Qumran, with special attention to the Aramaic corpus, see now Daniel A. Machiela, “**גלה** *gālāh*,” in *ThWQ* 1:605-12.

curiosity of the author of *IQapGen* and raised the possibility that scripture implied Noah's drunkenness had occasioned a dream-vision.

The second element of the exegetical equation that resulted in this Noachic dream-vision is found in the statement “And Noah awoke from his wine (וַיִּיקָץ נֹחַ מִיַּיִנוֹ)” in Gen 9:24. Wallis established that when the verb יקץ takes a human subject in the Hebrew Scriptures, it denotes awakening from sleep in general (e.g., Judg 16:14; Jer 31:26; Eccl 5:12 [11]) or awakening from intoxication (e.g., Gen 9:24; Prov 23:35; Joel 1:5; Hab 2:7).⁷ However, when used in theological contexts the verb may connote awakening from dreaming (e.g., 1 Kgs 3:15).⁸ By narrowing the focus to occurrences in Genesis it is evident that, apart from Gen 9:24, the verb is featured *exclusively* in the context of awakening from dream-visions (cf. Gen 28:16; 41:4, 7, 21).⁹ A similar situation obtains for the usage of the root עיר (“to awake”) in the Aramaic corpus. In the previous chapter this verb figured in awakening formulae for the dream-visions of Abram in *IQapGen* (אתעירת [1Q20 XIX 16]), Levi in *4QLevi^c* (אתעירת [4Q213b 1 2]), and Amram in

⁷ G. Wallis, “קץ יקץ; קץ יקץ,” *TDOT* 6:274-79.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 277.

⁹ Note that the Targumim render the *Qal* forms of יקץ in Gen 9:24; 28:16; 41:4, 7, and 21 with *Ithpe'el* forms of the Aramaic root עיר. In the Peshitta the *Ethpe'el* forms of the verb יאח (“to wake, awaken”) achieve this correspondence. These uses reflect the basic semantic range of the Hebrew verbal root עור, which can take on the meaning “to wake up” in the *Hifil* (e.g., Zech 4:1; Isa 50:4). While LXX Genesis renders the Hebrew יקץ with either ἐγείρω (“to wake, rouse”) or ἐξεγείρω (“to awaken”), in Gen 9:24 Noah's drunkenness is emphasized by the use of the verb ἐναύφω (“to become sober”).

4QVisAmram^e (אתעירתה [4Q547 9 8]).¹⁰ In view of the usage of the Hebrew root יקץ in Genesis and its Aramaic counterpart עיר in the Aramaic corpus, it is conceivable that the author of *IQapGen* may not have understood Gen 9:24 as referring simply to Noah's sobering up. Rather, it could be inferred that Noah 'awoke' from a dream-vision.

The third component that contributed to the exegetical creation of Noah's dream-vision here in *IQapGen* is found in Gen 9:24, which reads "and he (Noah) knew what his youngest son had done to him (וידע את אשר עשה לו בנו הקטן)." Hamilton has captured well the exegetical impasse of this verse: "After he regained sobriety, Noah *learned what his youngest son had done to him*. How he found out we do not know."¹¹ Intriguingly, the translator of *Tg. Ps.-J.* at Gen 9:24 posited that Noah had learned of Ham's actions from a "dream (חלם)." As with the verbs reviewed above, there is a plausible association between the root ידע and dream-vision revelation. In the section that follows, I will explain how Abram's dream-vision in *IQapGen* XIX derived from such an understanding of the Hebrew verb ידע in Gen 12:11. Fitzmyer observed that when Methuselah ran to his father "to know (למנדע)" the truth about the origins of Noah (1Q20 II 22), the author presupposed Enoch's privileged knowledge attained through dream-visions.¹² *BG* features

¹⁰ Note also the possible occurrence of the verb in the fragmentary text of *4QTob*^b (4Q197) 4 ii 16 (= Tob 6:18). On account of the Greek verbs ἐγέρθητε in G^I and ἐξέγέρθητε in G^{II} here in LXX Tobit, Fitzmyer reconstructed the *Peal* plural imperative עו]ר]ו (DJD XIX, 48). In this context the verb would connote Tobias and Sarah's arising from the bridal chamber to offer prayers.

¹¹ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 323, italics original.

¹² Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 135.

analogous terminology when Mahaway was dispatched to Enoch so that “you might know (ܘܢܝܢܐ)” the meaning of ’Ohaya and Hayah’s dream-visions (*4QEnGiants^b* [4Q530] 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 23-24).¹³ On numerous occasions Aramaic Daniel associates knowledge (*ܘܕܥܝ) with dream-vision revelation (Dan 2:23, 26, 28-30, 45; 7:16). In light of this trend it would have been reasonable for the author of *IQapGen* to locate the source of Noah’s knowledge in a dream-vision.

On account of the combination of three allusive verbs in Gen 9 – “revealed (ܘܗܘܘܐ),” “awoke (ܘܩܝܢ),” and “knew (ܘܕܥܝ)” – it was a short exegetical leap for the author of *IQapGen* to presume that Noah received a divine revelation. This episode provides an important example of an author who was acutely attuned to the malleability and suggestiveness of his Hebrew source. This ‘reading-in-between-the-lines’ approach to the book of Genesis enabled him to augment Noah’s story in such a way that the inclusion of a dream-vision was not an imposition on the text, but, arguably, a natural conclusion to be drawn from scripture’s intimations. In the examples that follow I will illustrate how the author of *IQapGen* engaged in this type of strategic and creative exegesis in at least two other instances involving Abramic dream-visions.

2.2 *Informing Abram of the plan behind the ‘brother-husband’ ruse in Gen 12:11*

Perhaps the best known example of the exegetical function of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus is Abram’s revelation upon his descent into Egypt in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIX 14-17. The text for this short episode reads as follows:

¹³ For this reading and terminology, see Machiela and Perrin, “That you may know,” 119-25.

14	vacat	וחלמת אנה אברם חלם בלילה מעלי לארע מצרין וחזית בחלמי והא ארוז חד ותמרא
15		חדא כחדא צמח[ו] מן שר[ש] חד] וב[ג] אנזש אתו ובעין למקץ ולמעקר ל[א]רזא ולמשבך תמר[ת]א בלחודיהה
16		ואכליאת תמרתא ואמרת אל תקוצו לארזא ארי תרינא מן שרש[ח]ד] צ[מח]נא ושביק ארזא בטלל תמרתא
17		ולא קצצוני

- 14 *vacat* I, Abram, dreamed a dream on the night of my descent into the land of Egypt. And I saw in my dream, behold, a single cedar and a single date palm
15 that sprout[ed] from [the same] ro[ot]. And m[e]n came seeking to chop down and to uproot the [c]edar, leaving the date palm on its own.
16 But the date palm cried out and said, “Do not cut chop down the cedar! Behold, the two of us have spr[outed] from the sa[me] root!” So the cedar was left on account of the date palm
17 and they did not chop me down.

As noted in Chapter Two, the strategic use of revelation here is clearly aimed to improve on Abram’s less than flattering portrait in Genesis. Not only did his fib about the nature of his relationship with Sarai endanger her and risk compromising her purity, it resulted in his own material gain. Ego commented that in the version of the episode in *IQapGen*, Abram’s character flaw and actions are absolved by way of a dream-vision: “[s]ince in antiquity, people usually regarded dreams as divine revelations, Abraham is clearly disburdened by this dream. He does not act from egoism or self-interest when he instructs Sara to impersonate his sister, but in some way from divine authorisation.”¹⁴ The

¹⁴ Ego, “The Figure of Abram,” 235. For similar estimations of the exegetical function of this dream-vision, see Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999), 129-59; Craig A. Evans, “Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation* (ed. Peter Flint; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 149-58; Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 80-81; Luijken Gevirtz, “Abram’s Dream,” 240-41; Kugel, “Which is Older,” 270-72; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Patriarchs Who Worry about their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of*

exegesis of *IQapGen* served a narrative function by presenting Abram's actions in Gen 12 (and by extension, Gen 20) in a positive light. However, the underlying Hebrew source contains a more fundamental exegetical impetus for the creation of the dream-vision.

Genesis 12:11-13 reads as follows:

When he (i.e., Abram) was about to enter Egypt, he said to his wife Sarai, “Behold! Now I know (הנה נא ידעתי)¹⁵ that you are a woman beautiful in appearance; and when the Egyptians see you, they will say, ‘This is his wife’; then they will kill me, but they will let you live. Say that you are my sister, so that it may go well with me because of you, and that my life may be spared on your account.”

This short passage contains Abram's first recorded words in scripture. Yet the patriarch's sudden recognition of Sarai's beauty presents several exegetical questions. How did Abram come to 'know' Sarai's beauty? Why did he realize this only now? Falk suggested that the author of *IQapGen* inferred that the statement “Now I know” in Gen 12:11 implied that Abram's knowledge derived from a dream-vision.¹⁶ Kugel also picked up on this suggestive language, proposing that the Hebrew phrase הנה נא ידעתי may be read as “I have just found out,” begging the question of *what* Abram just found out.¹⁷ For Kugel, the newly acquired knowledge does not pertain as much to Abram's sudden realization of Sarai's beauty as it does to how the couple might evade danger by disguising the true nature of their relationship. Kugel writes,

the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May 1996 (eds. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137-58; and Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 118.

¹⁵ I have adapted the NRSV translation here toward a more literal rendering of this phrase.

¹⁶ Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 89.

¹⁷ James Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1998), 256.

[a]pparently, the author of the *Apocryphon* understood “now I know” *not* as connected to what immediately follows, “that you are a beautiful woman,” but to what comes next: “Now I know that, *since* you are a beautiful woman, when the Egyptians see you they will say, ‘This is his wife,’ and they will kill me and let you live ...” But if that is what the sentence means, one is left to wonder how Abram could have *known* (and not merely feared, suspected, believed, etc.) that such a thing would happen. It would only be possible for Abram to *know* the future if he had just had a divinely sent dream that revealed it; that is why Abram says “Now I *know* ...”¹⁸

In Gen 9:24 the verb עָדַי contributed to the creation of a Noachic dream-vision in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XII 19-XV 22. This association was part a broader trend of linking knowledge with dream-vision revelation in the Aramaic Scrolls. Thus, Abram’s statement “Behold! Now I *know*” in Gen 12:11 conceivably provided the same exegetical stimulus for the inclusion of the dream-vision in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XIX 14-17. Here again, the author of *IQapGen* merely stepped in to supply what he took scripture to imply.

In the episodes surveyed thus far, the author of *IQapGen* generated dream-visions where they are not explicit in Genesis. The example that follows indicates that he was also interested in reframing existing scriptural theophanies as dream-visions.

2.3 From theophany to dream-vision: harmonizing Gen 12:7, 13:14, and 15:1

In the book of Genesis Abram frequently dialogues with God in various types of divine encounters. One such example that received attention in *IQapGen* is found in Gen 13:14-17. The scriptural version of this passage reads as follows:

The Lord said to Abram, after Lot had separated from him, “Raise your eyes now, and look from the place where you are, northward and southward and eastward and westward; for all the land that you see I will give to you and to your offspring

¹⁸ Idem, “Which is Older,” 272, emphasis original.

forever. I will make your offspring like the dust of the earth; so that if one can count the dust of the earth, your offspring also can be counted. Rise up, walk through the length and the breadth of the land, for I will give it to you.”

White Crawford observed that “[t]he Genesis Apocryphon takes over the pericope [of Gen 13:14-17] but introduces certain elements to present a smoother story,” such as the command for Abram to ascend Ramath Hazor and view the land, the specification that Abram fulfilled God’s command to tour the land, and the inclusion of geographical boundaries according to traditional material.¹⁹ However, one unique element that White Crawford did not single out is *IQapGen*’s specification that the revelation was delivered in a dream-vision. This change is evident in the first few words of the episode in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XXI 8-10:

<p>ואתחזי לי אלהא בחזווא די ליליא ואמר לי סלק לך לרמת חצור די על בית אל אתר די אנתה יתב ושקול עיניך וחזי למדנחא ולמערבא ולדרומא ולצפונא וחזי כול ארעא דא די אנה יהב לך ולזרעך לכול עלמים</p>	<p><i>vacat</i> 8 שמאל 9 10</p>
<p>8 <i>vacat</i> And God appeared to me in a vision of the night and he said to me, “Get yourself up to Ramat-Hazor, which is on the north 9 of Bethel, the place where you are dwelling. And lift up your eyes and look to the east, to the west, to the south, to the north. See all</p>	

¹⁹ White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 124. Cf. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 93; and Kugel, “Which is Older,” 264. The exegetical concern for striking accord between commands and fulfillments has been observed in some Qumran biblical manuscripts, especially those in the so-called pre-Samaritan tradition. See, for example, *4Q(Reworked)Pentateuch^a* (4Q158) 4 (Exod 3:12; 24:4-6), 7-8 5 (Deut 5:30), and *4QpaleoExod^m* (4Q22) II 6-11 (Exod 7:16-18, 20). For discussions on these and other harmonizations, see Emanuel Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3-29; idem, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 334-54; Michael Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62; and Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 37-40; 43-45; 144-45. In light of this trend it is perhaps significant that *IQapGen*’s underlying textual character hews most closely with the pre-Samaritan tradition (see James C. VanderKam, “The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *JBL* 97 [1978]: 45-55).

10 this land that I am giving to you and to your seed for all ages.

On account of this shift to the narrative framework, Fitzmyer has characterized the resultant episode in light of Ehrlich's typology of "Befehle und Weisungen, die Gott durch den Traum übermittelt."²⁰ But what occasioned the shift from theophany to dream-vision? It may be that the ambiguity of the phrase "The Lord said to Abram (וְה' אָמַר אֶל אַבְרָם)" in Gen 13:14 compelled the author of *IQapGen* to specify the mode of revelation.²¹ This has been suggested by Legrand. He considered this reworking in light of an alleged exegetical approach in the Targumim, whereby a translator may preemptively answer minor questions that could arise when reading or hearing the scriptural narrative.²² Legrand is partly correct. *IQapGen* does clarify the medium of revelation. However, *IQapGen*'s determination is not without an exegetical basis in the words of scripture itself. That the revelation of Gen 13:14 was delivered within a dream-vision could be deduced from the parallel settings and terminology of Gen 12:7 and 15:1.

Research on the composition and transmission of scripture has shown that scribal tradents were acutely aware of echoes and parallels in the texts before them. Zakovitch has discussed the phenomena of "assimilation," in which "a traditionist or editor increases the affinity of stories already similar in themselves by adding to one of them material

²⁰ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 220. Ehrlich defined this use of dream-visions in the Hebrew Scriptures on the rather slim basis of Gen 20:3-7; 31:10-13 24 (*Der Traum im Alten Testament*, 125-36).

²¹ It is possible that similarly ambiguous language in a Noachic theophany of Gen 9:1 was reframed as a dream-vision at *IQapGen* (1Q20) XI 15. This line, however, is highly fragmentary, so we cannot know its exact context.

²² Thierry Legrand, "Exégèses targumiques et techniques de réécriture dans l'*Apocryphe de la Genèse* (1QapGen ar)," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 225-52.

borrowed from the parallel tradition or composed by him under the influence of the parallel tradition.”²³ Bernstein proposed that *IQapGen* exhibits two types of harmonistic exegesis: “reductionist harmonization,” whereby two episodes are combined in a single episode bearing traits of both, and “constructive harmonization,” which aims to consciously smooth out the narrative by anticipating or filling in information referred to later in scripture.²⁴ In less specific terms, Falk observed that one of *IQapGen*’s exegetical tactics involved the addition of small details, most of which “might be regarded as implicit in the narrative of Genesis, either by inference or anticipation.”²⁵ When considering the reframing of Gen 13:13-17 as a dream-vision in *IQapGen* in light of these scribal-exegetical approaches, it is evident that the author engaged in harmonizing exegesis.

Promises of land and lineage to Abram occur twice before the formal conferral of the Abrahamic covenant in Gen 15 in Gen 12:7 and 13:14-17. For the present purposes, the most important aspects of these passages are the introductory formulae that frame the revelation in these texts. These can be read with an eye for how their differences are mediated in the re-presentation of Gen 13:14 in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XXI 8. The parallel introductory formulae are as follows:

Gen 12:7

“Then the Lord appeared to Abram, and said (וַיֵּרָא ה' אֶל אַבְרָם וַיֹּאמֶר).”

²³ Yair Zakovitch, “Assimilation in Biblical Narratives,” in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), 175-96, here 176. For descriptions of related phenomena in the Samaritan Pentateuch, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 82-85; and in the Targumim, see Michael L. Klein, “Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim,” *Eretz-Israel* 17 (1982): 134-40.

²⁴ Moshe J. Bernstein, “Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 37-57, here 50 and 55.

²⁵ Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 101.

Gen 13:14

“The Lord said to Abram (וה' אמר אל אברם).”

Gen 15:1

“After these things the word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision (אחר הדברים האלה היה דבר ה' אל אברם במחזה).”

***IQapGen* (1Q20) XXI 8**

“And the Lord appeared to me in a vision of the night, and said (ואתחזי לי אלהא בחזוא די ליליא ואמר).”

Apart from the reconfiguration from the third to first-person voice, *IQapGen* exhibits phrasing from all three formulae in Gen 12:7; 13:14; and 15:1. The Aramaic verb that signals the revelation as a divine apparition (*Ithpe'el* of חזיה) finds a clear analogy to the Hebrew of Gen 12:7 (*Niphal* of ראה). Likewise, the Aramaic term that presents the revelation as a “vision of the night (חזוא די ליליא)” is partially reflected in the Hebrew reference to a “vision (מחזה)” in Gen 15:1. The command in Gen 15:5 for Abram to look up and count the stars in the night sky indicates that at least part of Gen 15 took place nocturnally. This may have compelled the author of *IQapGen* to specify that Gen 13:14-17 was a “vision of the night,” although we cannot be sure of this potential connection.²⁶ In light of these observations, *IQapGen* (1Q20) XXI 8 coheres with Zakovitch’s proposal that parallel traditions in ancient Israelite/Jewish literature were conducive to rephrasing

²⁶ Incidentally, the resultant formula in *IQapGen* XXI 8 bears some resemblance to Gen 26:24 which extends the covenantal promises to Isaac, beginning with the phrase “And the Lord appeared to him that night, and said (וירא אליו ה' בלילה ההוא ויאמר).”

that increased their affinity. More specifically, the reframing of the theophany as a dream-vision coheres with Bernstein's "constructive harmonization." By casting Gen 13:14-17 as a dream-vision the author of *IQapGen* has simultaneously addressed the question of how God communicated with Abram and accentuated Abram's profile as a dreamer.

In the cases reviewed so far, the dream-visions of *IQapGen* were generated by creative philological exegesis. This suggests an interpretive-compositional method that involved playing at the borders of the Hebrew source text, exploiting its potential meanings, and developing them in such a way that the resultant dream-vision episodes are not an imposition on the tradition but could be justified as the teasing out of allusions to revelation. However, the question remains: why carry out such an exegetical task in the first place? Why cast Noah and Abram as dreamers? An answer to these foundational questions may lie in the understanding of these patriarchs as dreaming prophets.

2.4 *An underlying interest in casting the patriarchs as prophetic dreamers?*

"Is Saul also among the prophets?" This is the question bystanders asked themselves after their king was cast into a prophetic frenzy that left him stark naked on the ground after a failed attempt to retrieve David from Samuel in 1 Sam 19:24. This expression indicates that the witnesses of this unusual scene recognized that Saul's behavior reflected the actions of prophets in their own day. Analogous to this, due to their propensity for dreaming in *IQapGen*, Noah and Abram are acting in a way that is unlike their scriptural selves and more in tune with the mediums of prophetic revelation as described in the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus, we may ask, for the author of *IQapGen*, 'Were Noah and Abram also among the prophets?' To this point I have explored instances where

Genesis invited an interpretation that accentuated the prominence of dream-visions in select patriarchal narratives. But it is possible to recover a broader motivation for the exegetical task of resolving scripture's loose ends, gaps, and tensions with dream-vision revelation. I suggest that that this trend stems from a foundational understanding of Abram and Noah as prophets who, like the scriptural prophets of old, *should* receive divine dream-visions. This association suggests itself upon considering (i) the connection between biblical models for prophecy and dream-visions and (ii) the increased signification of the patriarchs as prophets in some Second Temple literature.

Divine communication occurs in prophetic literature in a number of ways. The dream-vision, however, is unequivocally the traditional revelatory medium of classical prophecy. This pairing is especially pronounced in two key pentateuchal passages reflecting on the subject:

When there are prophets among you, I the Lord make myself known to them in visions (מראה); I speak to them in dreams (חלום). Not so with my servant Moses; he is entrusted with all my house. With him I speak face to face – clearly, not in riddles; and he beholds the form of the Lord (Num 12:6-8).

If prophets or those who divine by dreams (חלם חלום) appear among you and promise you omens or portents, and the omens or the portents declared by them take place, and they say, “Let us follow other gods” (whom you have not known) “and let us serve them,” you must not heed the words of those prophets or those who divine by dreams (חולם החלום); for the Lord your God is testing you, to know whether you indeed love the Lord your God with all your heart and soul (Deut 13:1-3 [2-4]).

Husser observed that, while primarily emphasizing Moses' unique prophetic position, Num 12:6-8 affirms that dreams and visions were accepted mediums for

prophetic revelation.²⁷ Likewise, Bar noted that the Deuteronomic qualification of this description “does not necessarily repudiate the phenomenon of dreams. What it does reject are false prophets who use dreams for propaganda purposes and divert the people from the correct path.”²⁸ In later prophetic literature the connection between prophecy and dream-visions is maintained and developed in new directions. In keeping with the Deuteronomic heritage, Jeremiah decries his contemporaries who “speak visions of their own minds (חזון לבם)” and claim authority for their oracles by stating, “I have dreamed, I have dreamed (חלמתי חלמתי)!” For Jeremiah, these are none other than “lying dreams (חלמות שקר)” (Jer 23:16-17, 32).²⁹ In such cases the critique is levelled against contrived dream-visions, *not* the validity of the medium itself. This is illustrated further by passages that characterize periods of prophetic silence by a lack of visionary activity (1 Sam 3:1; 28:6, 15; Lam 2:9; Mic 3:5-8) or, conversely, associate the day of the Lord with an abundance of prophetic dream-visions (Joel 2:28 [3:1]). From all of this, one thing is clear: in the Hebrew Scriptures prophets are dreamers.

This frame of reference is helpful for understanding the increasing association of patriarchs with prophecy in and beyond the Hebrew Scriptures. For Abram, this development begins in Gen 20:7, which explicitly labels him a “prophet (נביא).” Hossfeld and Zenger observed that Ps 105:15 is built upon this identification by designating

²⁷ Husser, *Dreams and Dream Narratives*, 94.

²⁸ Bar, *A Letter That Has Not Been Read*, 124.

²⁹ Cf. Lam 2:14; Ezek 22:28; and Zech 10:2.

Abraham, Jacob, and Isaac as “my prophets (נביאי)”³⁰ These scriptural traditions were subject to exegetical treatment by later Jewish writers. In *Who is Heir of Divine Things* 258, Philo used Gen 20:7 to underscore that Abraham was inspired by God. Luijken Gevirtz called attention to *b. B. Qam* 92a, which also draws on Gen 20:7 to stress Abraham’s “ability to receive and understand divine revelation.”³¹ On account of the integration of Gen 20 into *IQapGen*’s retelling of Gen 12, it is certain that our author would have been aware of the application of the title “prophet” to Abram.³² This is confirmed by Bernstein’s observation that a near verbatim translation of Gen 20:7b was integrated into the conversation between Lot and Hirqanosh in *IQapGen* (1Q20) XX 23.³³ Falk recently posited that the inclusion of a dream-vision in the story of Abram and Sarai’s sojourning in Egypt in *IQapGen* was encouraged in part by Gen 20:7.³⁴ However, Falk did not go as far as using Gen 20:7 as a means of explaining the concentration and creation of *all* Abramic dream-visions in *IQapGen*. If our author was aware of the broader scriptural precedent for dream-vision revelation in classical prophecy, then the statement in Gen 20:7 is highly suggestive: as a prophet Abram *should* dream. By

³⁰ Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101-150* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 71.

³¹ Luijken Gevirtz, “Abram’s Dream,” 242, n. 47.

³² For discussions of how Gen 20 informed and influenced *IQapGen*’s version of Gen 12, see Bernstein, “Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization,” 49-51; Dehanschutter, “Le rêve dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse,” 50; Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 80-94; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 205; and Oßwald, “Beobachtungen zur Erzählung,” 23.

³³ Moshe J. Bernstein, “The *Genesis Apocryphon* and the Aramaic *Targumim* Revisited: A View from Both Perspectives,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages and Cultures* (eds. Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold, in association with Bennie H. Reynolds III; VTSup 140; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 651-71. Compare the phrase “and he will pray for you and you shall live (ויתפלל בעדך וחייה)” from Gen 20:7b with 1Q20 XX 23 “and he will pray over him so that he might live (ויעלה עלוהי ויחה).”

³⁴ Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 89.

creating new dream-visions or revising existing theophanies into dream-visions, the author of *IQapGen* ensured that Abram's life and times reflected the prophetic office accorded him in Genesis.

It is possible to make a similar case for the treatment of Noah. As Bernstein has suggested, *IQapGen* sought to solidify Noah's place as "another 'patriarch' in the chain of the tradition" by integrating language from the Abram saga into the Noachic tale.³⁵ Unlike Abram, Noah is not explicitly granted prophetic status in the book of Genesis. Noah does, however, boast a burgeoning tradition linking him with prophecy in some ancient Jewish literature. The clearest representation of this trend is found elsewhere within the Aramaic corpus, in the book of Tobit. After adjuring his son Tobias to seek out a wife from among their kin, Tobit substantiates this practice by appealing to their national heritage: "for we are the descendants of the prophets (διότι υἱοὶ προφητῶν ἐσμεν). Remember, my son, that Noah (Νῶε), Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, our ancestors of old, all took wives from among their kindred" (Tob 4:12).³⁶ Fitzmyer observed that the phrase "sons of the prophets (בְּנֵי הַנְּבִיאִים)" is a technical term in the Hebrew Scriptures to designate a prophetic guild; however, the collective term "is not being used in that sense

³⁵ Bernstein, "The *Genesis Apocryphon*," 663-64; idem, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199-231, esp. 209, 220-21; idem, "From the Watchers to the Flood," 60-61. This association is particularly evident in the use of covenant language and themes. Cf. 1Q20 XI 11 with Gen 13:17, and 1Q20 XI 15 with Gen 15:1.

³⁶ The text for this verse is lacking among the Qumran manuscripts and there are significant differences in the Greek versions, with G^{II} being a shorter version lacking material from Tob 4:7-19a. That material from this section was known at Qumran is evidenced by the Aramaic fragment *4QpapTob^a* (4Q196) 10 (= Tob 4:7) and the Hebrew fragment *4QTob^e* (4Q200) 2 (= Tob 4:3-9).

here, where Tobit is speaking of the patriarchs as prophets.”³⁷ The author of *Jubilees* also connected Noah with prophecy. *Jubilees* 8:18 relates that Noah rejoiced at the territorial lots that fell to his sons and “recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth.” Philo deduced that, since Abram is called a prophet in Gen 20:7, and since Abram and Noah are both described as “just persons” in scripture, Noah must also have been a prophet (*Who is Heir of Divine Things* 258). Ginzberg collected a number of rabbinic texts that further develop Noah’s association with prophecy.³⁸ While Noah is not explicitly identified as a prophet in the Hebrew Scriptures, texts like Tobit, *Jubilees*, and Philo’s *Who is the Heir of Divine Things* evidence the growth of a tradition that ascribed him such a status. Peters has demonstrated compellingly that the Noah of *IQapGen* is a “hybrid” character, the result of weaving together various wisdom, apocalyptic, priestly, halakhic, and scribal strands in the representation of an already familiar character.³⁹ To this equation I would add ‘prophecy’ as a way of explaining Noah’s credentials as a dreamer. Like Abram, as a prophet Noah *should* dream. This suggests that the re-

³⁷ Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 173. Cf. 1 Kgs 20:35; 2 Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, and 15. For phrasing similar to Tob 4:12, see also Acts 2:35. Miller has observed that “Tobit [4:12] uses ‘prophet’ as a synonym for ‘patriarch’” (Geoffrey D. Miller, *Marriage in the Book of Tobit* [DCLS 10; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011], 79). Hieke proposed that the “shining example of the Patriarchs” who are identified as “prophets” in Tob 4:12 underscores the necessity of endogamous marriage in Israelite tradition (Thomas Hieke, “Endogamy in the Book of Tobit, Genesis, and Ezra-Nehemiah,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology; Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20-21 May, 2004* [eds. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; JSJSup 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 103-20, here 105). Oeming suggested that this association served a rhetorical purpose of maintaining and securing Jewish identity in the present (Manfred Oeming, “Jewish Identity in the Eastern Diaspora in Light of the Book of Tobit,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in and International Context* [eds. Oped Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011], 545-61).

³⁸ Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews V: Notes to Volumes I and II, From the Creation to the Exodus* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1968), 167. Cf. *Da’at* and *Hadar* on Gen 5:29; *Sabba Bereshit* 9b; *Ephraim* I 47; and *Seder ’Olam* 21. Related to this, Donelson has described a growing tradition that portrayed Noah as a figure who sought to persuade his unrighteous neighbours (Lewis R. Donelson, *I & II Peter and Jude* [NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010], 244). Cf. 2 Pet 2:5; *Sib. Or.* 1.129; *Ant.* 1.74; and *b. Sanh.* 108.

³⁹ Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 97-124.

characterization of patriarchs as dreamers in *IQapGen* is not circumstantial. Dream-visions were not simply spliced into the text on an *ad hoc* basis. Rather, the integration of dream-visions into this retelling of Genesis points to an overarching exegetical supposition that both Noah and Abram were prophets.

3 *The exegetical root of 1 Enoch's expansive dream-vision tradition*

As was the case with Noah and Abram in *IQapGen*, the exegesis underlying Enoch's recasting as a dreamer in the once independent works that now comprise Ethiopic *1 Enoch* derives from suggestive Hebrew phrasing in Genesis. The scriptural background for Enoch, however, was much slimmer than for Noah or Abram. Apart from the notice of his birth in Gen 4:17, and a genealogical note in 1 Chr 1:3, Enoch's biography is related briefly in Gen 5:21-24:

When Enoch had lived sixty-five years, he became the father of Methuselah. *Enoch walked with God* (וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים) after the birth of Methuselah three hundred years, and had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days of Enoch were three hundred sixty-five. *Enoch walked with God* (וַיִּתְהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים); then he was no more, because *God* (אֱלֹהִים) took him.

Enoch's abrupt exit from the scriptural narrative left much to be explained by early interpreters. Many exegetes concluded that Enoch's upright character must have allowed him to evade natural death and transfer directly to the heavens.⁴⁰ This interpretation correctly recognizes that Gen 5:24 indicates Enoch's *final* translation. However, it is possible to interpret the repetitious phrasing of Gen 5:22 and 24 in a way that implied Enoch acquired heavenly knowledge *before* his final ascent. It is this aspect of Enoch's

⁴⁰ See, for example, *Change of Names* 38; *Ant.* 9.28; and Heb 11:5.

untold story that is thoroughly embellished in the Aramaic Enoch tradition.⁴¹ I will demonstrate below how the twice repeated phrase ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים, often translated as “and Enoch walked with God,” in Gen 5:22 and 24 provided a basis for the creation of pseudepigraphic dream-visions and otherworldly knowledge that saturate the Enochic writings. Following this, I will consider the degree to which this exegetical background for Enoch’s dream life influenced the crafting of other Aramaic dreamers whom scripture remembers for their walking with or before God.

3.1 Hints at an angelic association: philological flexibility in Gen 5:22 and 24

Many early Jewish and Christian exegetes/authors followed what is arguably the ‘plain meaning’ of the expression ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים. That is, Enoch’s walking with God connotes his personal piety and righteous character.⁴² However, the creators of the early Enochic tradition saw something more in this phrasing. To begin with, the Imperfect

⁴¹ For the present purposes I am less concerned with locating which Enochic work was first to develop Enoch’s career as a dreamer and otherworldly traveler than I am with illustrating the general point that the snowballing tradition of Enochic dream-visions in *1 Enoch* ultimately owe their origins to a creative exegetical technique. See Chapter Two for surveys of the individual Enochic works and their respective compositional dates. Aspects of particular Enochic dream-visions will be detailed in the following chapters. For discussions of the early development of the works that now comprise Ethiopic *1 Enoch*, see García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 45-96; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Books of Enoch (*1 Enoch*) and the Aramaic Fragments from Qumran,” *RevQ* 14 (1989): 131-46; James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 17-101; and Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 43-52, 83-86, 110-14.

⁴² The earliest example of this is found in LXX Genesis, where the translator rendered the Hebrew as “Now Enoch was well pleasing to God (εὐηρέστησεν δὲ Ἐνωχ τῷ θεῷ)” (NETS; Gen 5:22, 24). Wevers characterized the Greek as the correct interpretation of the Hebrew idiom, which he suggested means to have right fellowship with God (John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* [SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], 71), or as Helfmeyer has proposed, to follow “the way of life God requires” (F. J. Helfmeyer, “הֲלַךְ *hālakh*,” *TDOT* 3:388-403). This Greek rendering likely influenced later references to Enoch “pleasing” God in Ben Sira 44:16; Wis 4:10, 14; and Heb 11:5. Compare also *Tg. Neof.*, *Tg. Ps.-J*, and *Tg. Onq.* at Gen 5:22 and 24. The Hebrew idiom “to walk *before* (לפני) God” served as an expression for faithful piety in Solomon’s prayers (cf. 1 Kgs 2:4; 3:6; 8:23, 25; 9:4; 2 Chr 6:16; and 7:17), Hezekiah’s prayer (cf. 2 Kgs 20:3; and Isa 38:3), and the psalmist’s cries/praises for deliverance (cf. Ps 26:3; 56:13 [14]; and 116:9). Analogous phrasing for Noah, Abraham, and Levi will be treated below.

Hithpa'el form of הלך is open to interpretation. Typically, this form might be rendered with the gloss “to walk” or with the reflexive-iterative sense “to go to and fro, walk about.”⁴³ The latter usage is found in 1 Sam 25:15 where David’s men congenially “walk about” (*Hithpa'el* הלך) with Nabal’s herders among fields.⁴⁴ In this light, the verbal forms in Gen 5:22 and 24 could be read to suggest not merely a metaphorical ‘walking’ but the physical movement of ‘walking about.’

The indirect object may also be taken in more than one way. Most English translations render האלהים as “God.” VanderKam has observed that אלהים in Gen 5:22 and 24a is articular, whereas it is anarthrous in the phrase “God (אלהים) took him” in Gen 5:24b.⁴⁵ He further noted that it is common for האלהים to reference angels in the Hebrew Scriptures (e.g., Ps 8:6; 82:1, 6; 97:7 [LXX reads ἄγγελοι]; 138:1).⁴⁶ In light of these nuances it would not be a far stretch for a creative exegete to take the phrase ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים to mean “And Enoch walked about with the angels.”⁴⁷ This creative reading naturally lends itself to the development of Enoch’s role as an otherworldly traveller, dreamer, and repository of divine revelation.

⁴³ HALOT, “הלך,” 1:246-48.

⁴⁴ Ronald J. Williams, *Williams’ Hebrew Syntax* (3rd ed.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 64. Similar uses of the *Hithpa'el* of הלך include Gen 3:8; Josh 18:4, 8; 1 Sam 23:13; Esth 2:11; Job 1:7; 2:2; Ps 12:8 (9); 35:14; 39:6 (7); 43:2; Zech 1:10, 11; and 6:7 (cf. Dan 3:25 and 4:26 for analogous inflected uses in Aramaic).

⁴⁵ VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 13; idem, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 31.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Note that 1QH^a XI 21 and 4QShirShabb^d (4Q403) 1 ii 7 use the *Hithpa'el* of הלך for traversing in the heavens.

Nickelsburg and Dimant have independently recognized that such an interpretation played a special part in the developing tradition of Enoch's ascents in *BW* and *Jubilees*. Regarding *BW*, Nickelsburg proposed that *1 En.* 12:1-2 creatively drew upon the language and themes of Gen 5:24 to establish Enoch's dreaming credentials. He writes, "[i]n the present context, this paraphrase of Gen 5:24 refers not to Enoch's disappearance at the end of his life, but to the beginning of a period of association with the angels (v 2), during which he is instructed in the secrets of the universe and, to some extent, of the end of time."⁴⁸ It is significant that the paraphrase of Gen 5:24 in *1 En.* 12:1-2 comes mere verses before the core dream-vision of *BW* in *1 En.* 13:7-16. Likewise, Dimant proposed that Enoch's rewritten biography in *Jub.* 4:16-25 utilized the same interpretation to establish Enoch's association with the angels, including his experience of a revelatory "night vision" in *Jub.* 4:19 (cf. *4QpsJub^c? [4Q227] 2 1-6*).⁴⁹ While Dimant preferred to view the Enochic traditions of *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* as "witnesses of a single exegetical tradition,"⁵⁰ others have compellingly demonstrated that the former knew and used the latter.⁵¹ Therefore, *Jubilees'* interpretation of the phrasing

⁴⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 233. See also the comments on the association between Gen 5:22, 24 and *1 En.* 12:1 by Black (Matthew Black, in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* [SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 141-42) and Charles (R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1912], 27-28).

⁴⁹ Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch," 21.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁵¹ See Pierre Grelot, "Hénoch et ses écritures," *RB* 82 (1975): 481-500; Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 11, 24-25, 45; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 233; and James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978* (ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; SBLSP 13; vol. 1; Missoula, Mon.: Scholars Press, 1978), 229-51. This raises the question of to which Enochic dream-vision *Jub.* 4:19 refers. With some variation in their proposals, Charles (R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis* [Translations of Early Documents Series: Palestinian Jewish Texts [Pre-Rabbinic]; London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917], 54), Grelot (Pierre Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les Apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et Signification," *RSR* 46 [1958]: 5-26; *idem*, "Hénoch et ses écritures," 485), and Milik (*The Books of Enoch*, 45) suggest *Jubilees* alludes to *BD*.

וּיְתַהַלֵּךְ חֲנוּךְ אֵת הָאֱלֹהִים in Gen 5:22 and 24 can be understood as an exegetical extension of an early Aramaic tradition that already established Enoch's profile as a dreamer on the basis of this allusive Hebrew terminology.

3.2 *Did Noah, Abram, Levi, and Jacob also 'walk about with the angels?'*

Four other patriarchs are described in terms analogous to Gen 5:22 and 24. Like Enoch, Noah and Levi are both reputed for walking *with* (אֵת) God, whereas Abraham and Jacob are remembered for walking *before* (לְפָנֵי) God. Hamilton observed that these two expressions are comparable; although, the former connotes a heightened fellowship with the divine.⁵² In light of Enoch's role as a dreamer derived from Gen 5:22 and 24, is it possible that similar descriptors of Noah, Abram, Levi, and Jacob fostered their recasting as dreamers in the Aramaic corpus? In most cases we cannot know for certain. Nonetheless, it is worth surveying the evidence and entertaining the notion of a broader exegetical trend.

I argued above that Noah's re-characterization as a dreamer in *IQapGen* was to be attributed to both his identification as a prophet and several exegetical hooks in the Hebrew phrasing of Genesis. One piece of data not yet considered is the statement "Noah walked with God (אֵת הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֵּךְ נֹחַ)" in Gen 6:9. Sasson proposed that the language common to Gen 5:22, 24 and 6:9 would have invited ancient readers/hearers to draw a

VanderKam concluded that the opening of the *Epistle* is the most suitable reference ("Enoch Traditions in Jubilees," 235).

⁵² Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17*, 258.

comparison between Enoch and Noah.⁵³ In light of this common vocabulary, Gen 6:9 could be read as “Noah walked about with the angels,” suggesting that, like his ancestor Enoch, Noah was a natural candidate for revelation. A similar conclusion could be drawn for Levi. Malachi 2:6 states that “He walked with me (הלך איתי) in integrity and uprightness.”⁵⁴ I will argue in greater detail below that, in combination with multiple other hints, this phrase was significant for the casting of Levi as a dreamer in *ALD*. At this point, it is important to note only that the similarity of the language used in Gen 6:9 and Mal 2:6 to that of Gen 5:22 and 24 encouraged the development of dream-visions.

Abraham and Jacob are also described in terms reminiscent of Enoch. In Gen 17:1, 24:40, and 48:15 Abraham is adjured to or described as walking (*Hithpa'el* of הלך) before (לפני) the Lord. It is possible that this language contributed to the casting of Abram as a dreamer in *IQapGen*; although, as demonstrated above, there are more direct hints at his receiving divine revelations. It may be that the language of walking before God was a secondary factor in the exegetical decision to create Abramic dream-visions. Genesis 48:15 also esteems Jacob in the same terms. In this case, however, Jacob's role as a dreamer is already established in scripture (Gen 28; 31:10-13). While likely enhanced in

⁵³ Jack M. Sasson, “Word-Play in Gen 6:8-9,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 165-66.

⁵⁴ Of course, the use of the *Qal* instead of the *Hithpa'el* verb here diminishes the suggestiveness of the phrase. Despite this difference in conjugation, occurrences of the verb הלך in the *Qal* stem can be fientive, expressing action or movement (e.g., Gen 3:14; 12:9; 27:14; Deut 11:19; 1 Sam 6:12) (Williams, *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*, 57; Bruce K. Waltke and Murphy O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990], §20.2k; 22.2.1b; 22.4a-b). If an interpreter was aware of the exegetical underpinnings of Enoch's dreaming career in Gen 5:22 and 24, the generic association between 'walking' with God and otherworldly revelation could present itself. As demonstrated throughout this chapter, the authors of the Aramaic texts were experts in perceiving shades of meaning within the words and phrasing of scripture. Therefore, this potential reading cannot be ruled out on account of a mere difference in verbal stem.

Aramaic texts like *NJ* and *4QTJacob?*, on account of his existing portrayal as a dreamer in Genesis, an exegetical basis for Jacob was not as necessary as for Enoch, Noah, Abram, or Levi.

In sum, we cannot know the extent to which the phrasing of walking with or before God factored into the creation of other dreamers. However, it is remarkable that the patriarchs described in these terms in the Hebrew Scriptures (Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Levi, and Jacob), constitute a large portion of the patriarchal dreaming *dramatis personae* of the Aramaic corpus. A creative reading of Gen 5:22 and 24 provided the necessary scriptural seeds for the budding tradition of Enochic dream-visions and otherworldly journeys. We may entertain the possibility that this interpretation had a ripple effect, resulting in or contributing to analogous exegetical treatments of Noah, Abram, Levi, and Jacob in the Aramaic Scrolls. In the following chapter I will detail some aspects of the priestly dream-vision traditions in *NJ* and *4QTJacob?*. Before doing this I will round off the discussion of dream-visions and exegesis by considering the presentation of Levi in *ALD*.

4 *Levi's visionary installment as a priest in the Aramaic Levi Document*

The portrait of Levi in Genesis is far from favorable. Levi is remembered there less for his priestly presence than for his involvement in the plot against the Shechemites in response to the rape of Dinah in Gen 34. While Levi and Simeon justified their violence in the name of vengeance (Gen 34:31), their father viewed their actions as

juvenile rage that compromised his position in the land (Gen 34:34; 49:5-7).⁵⁵ This background gave rise to a plethora of tradition-historical and exegetical developments within and beyond the Hebrew Scriptures. Kugler perceived that Deut 33:8-11 is the first text to link “Levi’s violent past and his appointment to the priesthood,” and that the patriarch’s bloody legacy is manifested in Exod 32:29 and Num 25:12-13.⁵⁶ In these cases the violent acts of Levi’s descendants do not compromise their cultic office but qualify them for priestly covenants. Why then should Gen 34 blemish the record of the forefather of the entire Levitical line? Is it possible that, like his progeny in the passages noted above, Levi’s actions in Gen 34 in fact positioned him for a priestly covenant?

De Jonge observed that in *ALD* “[s]omehow there is a connection between Levi’s calling to the priesthood and his exploits at Schechem but, in view of the very fragmentary state of our evidence at that point, it is difficult to make out the exact nature of that connection.”⁵⁷ In Chapter Two it was indicated that *ALD* featured two dream-vision accounts, which, as far as we can tell, exhibited priestly emphases. If the Greek *T. Levi* is of any help here, Levi’s first dream-vision presumably drew a connection between the Shechem episode and his priestly elevation. From the Aramaic materials that have come down to us, however, Levi’s priestly election also comes to the fore in his second

⁵⁵ Baden argued that due to the complexity of Pentateuchal sources and traditions, Gen 49:5-7 is at best an oblique allusion to Gen 34 (Joel S. Baden, “The Violent Origins of the Levites: Text and Tradition,” in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition* [ed. Steven L. McKenzie; SBLAIL 9; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011], 103-16). However, as Hamilton (Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 18-50* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 651) and Wenham (Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* [WBC 2; Dallas: Word Books, 1994], 473) have concluded, it is hard to imagine Jacob’s curse with reference to anything other than this incident. 4 Maccabees 2:19-20 provides an ancient example of the linking of Gen 34 with Gen 49:5-7.

⁵⁶ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 18. Additional references to Levitical covenants include Exod 40:15; Jer 33:21; Neh 13:29; and Ben Sira 45:24.

⁵⁷ De Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 84.

dream-vision. Aspects of this account survive in some *ALD* fragments from Qumran and in a later witness discovered in the Oxford Bodleian library. I present the more complete version on the right, with underlined text indicating overlaps with the material at the left. The bolded texts are those sections relevant to Levi's priestly election.

1QLevi (1Q21) 3

1 ק/ח]רבא 1
 2 תעמל וזמנין תנ]וח 2
 3 ש]לם ע"ל]מא 3

- 1 w]ar or s]word
 2 you will labor and at times you
 [will] r[est]
 3 eter[nal pe]ace

4QLevi^f (4Q214b) 7 1

1 מן כול בשר]א 1

- 1 over all fles[h

4QLevi^c (4Q213b) 1-3

1 [כ"ה רביתך מן כל בשר]א 1
 2 [א"נה אתעירת מן שנתי אדין 2
 3 [ת אף דן בלבבי ולכל אנש לא 3

- 1 **]how I made you greater than all
 fles[h**
 2]I awoke from my sleep. Then
 3]... this too in my heart and to
 anyone not

Bodl. a (*ALD* 4-7)

1 ו]שלמא וכל חמדת בכורי ארעא 1
 2 כולה למאכל ולמלכות חרבא פגשא 2
 3 וקרבא ונחשירותא ועמלא 3
 4 ונצפתא וקטלא וכפנא זמנין תאכול 4
 5 וזמנין תכפן וזמנין תעמול וזמנין 5
 6 תנוח וזמנין תדמוך וזמנין תגוד 6
 7 שנת עינא כען חזי לך הכין רבינך 7
 8 מן כולה והיך יהבנא לך רבות שלם 8
 9 עלמא vacat ונגדו שבעתון מן לותי 9
 10 ואנה אתעירת מן שנתי אדין 10
 11 אמרת חזוא הוא דן וכדן אנה 11
 12 מתמה די יהוי לה כל חזוה וטמרת 12
 13 אף דן בלבי ולכל אינש לא גליתה 13

- 1 and] peace and all desirable first-
 fruits of the entire land
 2 to eat. But for the kingdom of the
 sword, struggle,
 3 and war, and carnage, and labor,
 4 and derision, and killing, and
 hunger. Sometimes you will eat
 5 and sometimes you will go hungry;
 and sometimes you will labor and
 sometimes
 6 you will rest; and sometimes you
 will sleep and sometimes
 7 the sleep of the eyes will flee. **Now,**
see, we made you greater
 8 **than all and how we granted you**

the greatness of
9 **eternal peace.** *vacat* And the seven
departed from me.
10 And I awoke from my sleep. Then
11 I said, “This is the vision, and at this
I
12 was amazed that I had any vision!”
And I hid
13 this too in my heart, and did not
reveal it to anyone.

There is clearly more to this visionary scene than I can comment on here. The most important aspect of this dream-vision for the present topic are the statements of Levi’s elevation in *4QLevi^c* (4Q213b) 1 and Bodl. a 6 (lines 7-9) (see bolded text above). There is some textual variation here among the witnesses, particularly concerning the verb.⁵⁸ Despite these differences, the general idea is that Levi’s special status is endorsed within the dream-vision from a divine source. This most certainly refers to his priestly elevation. That the plural verb in the Geniza text reflects the collective endorsement of seven angels is evident by Levi’s statement in line 9, “And the seven departed from me.” This hews closely to *T. Levi* 8:2, which specified that Levi saw seven men (i.e., angels)

⁵⁸ In addition to differences in verbal number, there is some debate about the verbal root of the second word in *4QLevi^c* (4Q213b) 1. Only the lower portions of the initial letters of the word are extant. This has resulted in various proposals, though the general consensus is that the reading רביתך is to be preferred, with varying use of diacritical markings over the first two characters (see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 181; Kugler, “Whose Scripture?” 11; and Émile Puech, “Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Geniza du Caire,” *RevQ* 20 [2002]: 511-556, esp. 523). The reading רעיתך was presented by Greenfield and Stone, who asserted that this reading “is quite certain in the MS” and suggested that the stem change from רבי* to רעי* may have arisen as a graphic variant (DJD XXII, 39). Similarly Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 68) and García-Martínez and Tigchelaar (DSSSE 1:450) read רעיתך. This reading of the verb has been rightfully critiqued by Kugler for its misreading a crack in the leather that “obscures the full extension to the left of the long bottom stroke characteristic of *bet* in this fragment” (“Whose Scripture?” 12).

dressed in white at the outset of the account, who outfitted him for his priestly role.⁵⁹ However, as with the Aramaic dreamers above, Levi's experiencing dream-visions is a significant departure from his portrayal in the Hebrew Scriptures. To successfully carry out the interpretive maneuver of inaugurating his priesthood in the heavens, the author of *ALD* could benefit from an exegetical basis *within* scripture. This was achieved by creatively interpreting two non-Pentateuchal passages that lent themselves to a reading that suggested Levi received divine revelation.

4.1 *The suggestiveness of Mal 2:5-6: Levi 'descended' after 'walking with' God*

The most significant text for explaining the exegetical basis of *ALD*'s portrayal of

Levi as a dreamer is Mal 2:5-6:

Know, then, that I have sent this command to you, that my covenant with Levi may hold, says the Lord of hosts. My covenant with him was a covenant of life and well-being, which I gave him; this called for reverence, and *he revered me* (נחת) and stood in awe of my name. True instruction was in his mouth, and no wrong was found on his lips. *He walked with me* (הלך איתי) in integrity and uprightness, and he turned many from iniquity. For the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and people should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.

In their original context in the book of Malachi these words are nestled within a section of imprecations and injunctions for priests who have fallen short of their calling. In Mal 2:8 we learn that this waywardness ultimately corrupted “the covenant of Levi (ברית הלוי),” a covenant which Mal 2:5 states was established directly with Levi. The references to a Levitical covenant in Mal 2:5 and 8 are problematic. Genesis contains no record of such a

⁵⁹ For comments on the interrelatedness of Levi's two dream-visions in the Greek text and some correspondences to the earlier Aramaic work, see Hollander and de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 150-55.

covenant.⁶⁰ Having reviewed the potential solutions to this interpretive crux, Kugler concluded that “the most reasonable reading leaves us with the conundrum of a covenant with the *individual named Levi*.”⁶¹ This text, then, is an important stage in the tradition-historical development of the Levi tradition. But is it possible that Mal 2:5-6 contains some inklings of where and how Levi’s covenant might have been established? Two aspects of this passage contributed to *ALD*’s conclusion that Levi was subject to dream-vision ascents, which provided an ideal context for explicating the otherworldly basis of his priestly covenant.

Kugel observed one aspect of the phrasing of Mal 2:5 that opened the door to this understanding. He argued that, while the passage states in Hebrew that Levi was “awestruck” (גוּחַ, a *Niphal* perfect from the root *חַתַּח) at the name of the Lord, for an exegete versed in Aramaic, this Hebrew form could call to mind the Aramaic root גוּחַ, which means “to descend.”⁶² For Kugel this serves as the exegetical background of Levi’s profile as a dreamer in *ALD*. The question then becomes, from where did Levi descend?

To build on Kugel’s proposal, I suggest that Mal 2:6 provides a complementary exegetical hook that answers this question. Here the Lord states that Levi “walked with

⁶⁰ Commentators have entertained various explanations of this disconnect. Smith contended that this verse referred to Deut 33:8-11 (*Micah-Malachi*, 317). Meyers proposed that Num 25:6-13 is of direct influence (Eric Meyers, “Priestly Language in the Book of Malachi,” *HAR* 10 [1986]: 225-37). Verhoef suggested Malachi here points to a collective reference for all Levites (Pieter Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 244). O’Brien maintained that multiple texts and traditions are behind Malachi’s reference (Julia O’Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi* [SBLDS 121; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990], 104-6). For a concise review of potential passages operating in the background of this text, see Steven L. McKenzie and Howard N. Wallace, “Covenant Themes in Malachi,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 549-63.

⁶¹ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 19, emphasis original.

⁶² Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 33.

me (הלך אתי) in integrity and uprightness, and he turned many from iniquity.” At first glance, this verse would seem to accentuate Levi’s upright character.⁶³ However, as discussed in the previous section on *I Enoch*, the language of “walking with God” provided the exegetical impetus for establishing Enoch as a repository of divine revelation and otherworldly knowledge. Notwithstanding the use of a *Qal* instead of a *Hithpa’el* verb form here (see n. 54 above), the use of the preposition את in Mal 2:6 is reminiscent of the phrasing of Gen 5:22 and 24. It is conceivable that the author of *ALD* recognized this analogy, since, as many have shown, he was aware of and drew upon the Enochic tradition.⁶⁴ In addition to broad thematic analogies that imply *ALD*’s awareness and adaptation of aspects of *BW*, I suggest that the parallels between the dreaming

⁶³ Hill, for example, concludes that the phrase “means [to] ‘walk’ in the theological sense of covenant obedience and a worshipful lifestyle” (Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi*, [AB 25D; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 205).

⁶⁴ On account of similarities between *BW* and *ALD*’s presentation of patriarchal dreamers, Drawnel concluded that “[t]his parallelism indicates that the author of the [*Aramaic Levi*] *Document* was wittingly building on the Enochic visionary tradition in order to adapt it to his own purposes: [the] creation of a priest and visionary in one person” (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 227). The features Drawnel drew attention to include: the association with a place called “Abel-Mayin/m” (*4QLevi^b* [4Q213a] 2 13//*I En.* 13:9); the posture of lying (*4QLevi^b* [4Q213a] 2 14) or sitting down (*I En.* 13:7) before a dream-vision; the reference first to a single “vision” and then to plural “visions” within the opening formula (*4QLevi^b* [4Q213a] 2 15-16//*I En.* 13:8, *4QEn^c* [4Q204] 1 vi 5); the dreamer beholding the “gates of heaven (תרעי שמיא)” (*4QLevi^b* [4Q213a] 2 18) or the “gates of the pa[lace of heaven] (תרעי ה[יכל שמיא)” (*4QEn^c* [4Q204] 1 vi 4); and an angelic voice at the outset of both dream-visions (*4QLevi^b* [4Q213b] 2 18//*I En.* 13:8). Nickelsburg has compiled a more extensive list of parallels between *I Enoch* and the later Greek *T. Levi*. (“Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 588). Many of the features he highlights cannot be confirmed or denied on the basis of the known *ALD* fragments. Stuckenbruck concluded that, “[t]he affinities between *ALD* and the Enochic tradition, then, have mostly to do with the early strands within the Enochic tradition,” of which he singled out the elevation and visionary commissioning of Enoch in *I En.* 12-14 (“Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse,” 309-10). Stuckenbruck noted that Levi’s first dream-vision is “[s]imilar to the otherworldly journeys in *I Enoch* (cf. chapters 17-36)” in that “the vision is mediated by an angelic figure” (ibid., 308). With respect to Levi’s second dream-vision in *ALD*, he states that its concluding formula bears some semblance to that of *AnAp* in *I En.* 90:42, which is “the only such narrative conclusion extant for the early Enochic works” (ibid.).

priest. It is this figure to whom God also revealed (גלה) himself in an age past. Many recent commentators accept the conclusions of Wellhausen and Cross that 1 Sam 2:27 refers to the house of Moses and perhaps a line of Mushite priests.⁶⁶ Stoebe advanced the case that another, more ancient priestly figure is in view here. He writes, “Meint wohl den Stamm Levi, nicht die Aaroniden in eigentlichem Sinne.”⁶⁷ To further complicate matters, there has been considerable discussion on the compositional and redactional history of this passage and its alleged interest in legitimizing the Zadokite line.⁶⁸ For the present purposes it is not necessary to locate the ‘original’ referent at the earliest stage of composition. Rather, what matters is that 1 Sam 2:27-36 is ambiguous and that, like their modern counterparts, ancient exegetes could have detected allusions to a number of priestly individuals.

VanderKam made the case that the author of *Jubilees* perceived an allusion to the founding of the Levitical line in 1 Sam 2:27-36. He proposed that this association contributed to the establishment of an exegetical basis for Levi’s ordination to the priesthood in *Jub.* 30. VanderKam contended that 1 Sam 2:27-36 “could be read as referring to the ‘father,’ Levi, and to his descendants, the Levites in Egypt. On that reading, God chose Levi out of the other tribes to be his priest, and he gave the fire

⁶⁶ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983; repr. 1994), 142; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 196-197; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 89; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 26. This view often includes a Mosaic association with the Shiloh priesthood in Ps 99:6.

⁶⁷ Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT 8.1; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973), 116, n. 27b.

⁶⁸ For this ongoing conversation, see Marc Brettler, “The Composition of 1 Samuel 1-2,” *JBL* 116 (1997): 601-11; Gary A. Rendsburg, “Some False Leads in the Identification Of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Case of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2:27-36,” *JBL* 121 (2002): 23-36; and Mark Leuchter, “Something Old, Something Older: Reconsidering 1 Sam 2:27-36,” *JHS* 4 (2003): n.p. (cited 19 January 2013). Online: <https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/jhs/article/viewFile/5855/4908>).

offering to his descendants.”⁶⁹ Is it possible that the author of *ALD* also perceived such an allusion or that the writer of *Jubilees* inherited this idea from *ALD*? Either situation would provide yet another opportunity to explore how the language of scripture may have occasioned the creation of this Aramaic dreamer.

The oracle in 1 Sam 2:27 begins with the statement, “I revealed myself (הנגלה) to the house of your father in Egypt.” As seen above, the Hebrew root *גלה in Gen 9:21 enabled the author of *IQapGen* to weave a Noachic dream-vision into his narrative. It was also seen how this root was closely associated with dream-vision revelation in the Aramaic Scrolls.⁷⁰ If the author of *ALD* read 1 Sam 2:27 in a similar way as the author of *IQapGen* read Gen 9:21, then the language of revelation (*גלה) could have furthered the case for *ALD*’s presentation of Levi as a dreamer.⁷¹

If texts like Mal 2:5-6 and 1 Sam 2:27 are operating in the background of *ALD*, it is plausible that the dream-vision addressed an unexplained gap in Levi’s biography. By playing with the semantics of the Hebrew word נחת and meanings of the phrase הלך אתי in Mal 2:5-6, as well as drawing an association with visionary revelation from the root גלה in 1 Sam 2:27, the author of *ALD* inferred what scripture implied: Levi was subject to otherworldly encounters. Once this interpretive vista was opened, the author of *ALD*

⁶⁹ VanderKam, “Isaac’s Blessing,” 519.

⁷⁰ Cf. *4QVisAmram*^d (4Q546) 9 2; *4QEn*^b (4Q202) 1 iii 5; *4QEn*^g (4Q212) 1 iv 19; (4Q536) 2 i + 3 3, 8; *4QapocrLevi*^b? (4Q541) 7 1; and 24 ii 3.

⁷¹ In this light, it is intriguing that at the conclusion of his second dream-vision in *ALD* 7, Levi states “[and I hid] this also in my heart and did not [reveal it] to anyone (ושמר[ת] אף דן בלבבי ולכל אנש לא ([גליתיה])” (*4QLevi*^c [4Q213b] 1 3-4; verb reconstructed from Bodl. a 12-13).

could strategically locate the conferral of the Levitical covenant in a dream-vision context. In this respect, the presentation of Levi as a dreamer in *ALD* was not conducted apart from scripture but indeed arose out of creative engagement with it.

5 *Summary of findings*

The foregoing investigation retraced the exegetical steps that gave rise to some dream-visions in *IQapGen*, *I Enoch*, and *ALD*. The authors of these Aramaic works exhibited an acute awareness of philological aspects of their Hebrew sources. Their ability to develop potential meanings of texts to imply that Abram, Noah, Enoch, and Levi enjoyed active dream lives connotes a common exegetical approach. Some dream-visions in this triad of texts were even created on the basis of similar exegetical triggers. The Hebrew root גלה in Gen 9:21 and 1 Sam 2:27 contributed to the characterization of Noah and Levi as dreamers in *IQapGen* and *ALD* respectively. Likewise, the phrase “walking with God” in Gen 5:22 and 24 occasioned the Enochic dream-visions that would eventually settle in *I Enoch*. Analogous phrasing in Mal 2:6 added to the background for *ALD*’s presentation of Levi as a dreamer. This language may have comprised a wider complex that associated Noah, Abram, and perhaps Jacob, with divine revelation on account of their walking *with* (אִתּוֹ) or *before* (לְפָנָיו) God. Lastly, the occurrences of the Hebrew verb ידע in Gen 9:24 and 12:11 contributed to the exegetical creation of Noah and Abram’s dream-visions in both *IQapGen* (1Q20) XXII 19-XV 22 and XIX 14-17.

I opened this chapter by asking whether or not the casting of the patriarchs as dreamers in the Aramaic Scrolls is an augmentation to their scriptural portraits. Having established that this characterization could be justified as the exegetical embellishments of implied yet untold dream-visions *within* scripture, some dream-visions of the Aramaic Scrolls purport merely to tell an aspect of the patriarchal tales that is nascent in the scriptural narrative. On this understanding, the Aramaic authors were not so much adding new brush strokes to scriptural character portraits as they were bringing existing aspects into sharper relief. *IQapGen* could accentuate Abram's and Noah's profiles as prophets; *ALD* could give greater prominence to the founding of a covenant with Levi; and the Enochic tradition could cast a spotlight on Enoch as a repository of otherworldly knowledge. In these ways, in their literary afterlives in the Aramaic corpus, the patriarchs become more than their scriptural selves.

The study of the exegetical origins of some dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls indicates that works like *IQapGen*, *1 Enoch*, and *ALD* function parascripturally insofar as they aim to enhance, explain, and extend their underlying authoritative scriptural sources. To take this finding a step further, it was seen that, in some respects, aspects of *1 Enoch's* characterization of Enoch as a dreamer contributed to the exegesis that went into the creation of other dreamers, certainly Levi in *ALD*, and perhaps also Noah and Abram in *IQapGen*. This notion should cause us to continually evaluate the networks and forms of inter/paratextuality that exist within this literature. It is evident that the Enochic tradition had a formative role on other texts and traditions. This trajectory would extend further into other works, especially *4QWordsMich* and *BG*. This extension of traditions from one

text to another is also apparent in *4QVisAmram*'s redeployment of the language and themes of *ALD*. This pair of Aramaic texts provides a convenient transition into the next major function of dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls: revelation concerned with priestly topics and practice.

CHAPTER FIVE

DREAMING OF THE TEMPLE AND PRIESTHOOD IN THIS WORLD, THE HEAVENS, AND THE ESCHATON¹

1 Introduction

A significant cross-section of the Aramaic Scrolls is marked by priestly knowledge and concerns.² It is significant that nearly all of the priestly compositions among the Aramaic corpus advance or address their priestly theologies with dream-visions. The pairing of priestly concerns and dream-visions is, however, not necessarily unique to the Aramaic Scrolls. As Flannery-Dailey has demonstrated, Second Temple Jewish dream-vision literature in general associated otherworldly knowledge with the

¹ Aspects of this chapter were presented in the Qumran section of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies at the University of Waterloo/Wilfred Laurier University in Waterloo, ON, May 29, 2012, under the title “Picking Up Where Levi Left Off: Dream-Vision Discourse and Priestly Tradition from the Aramaic Levi Document to 4QVisions of Amram.”

² Stone proposed that texts such as *ALD*, *4QTQahat*, and *4QVisAmram*, indicate that the cultivation and transmission of priestly knowledge was a prominent feature of Aramaic patriarchal pseudepigraphs aligned with a priestly-Noachic axis (Michael E. Stone, “Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age,” in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* [eds. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988], 575-86; idem, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January, 1997* [eds. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 133-49; idem, *Ancient Judaism*, 31-58). Milik’s earlier synthesis of pre-Qumranic literature recognized the presence of such priestly texts (“Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân”). The priestly outlook of these materials has led some to hypothesize about the priestly-scribal social location(s) that could have produced and promulgated this literature. Kugler proposed that the traditions contained in *ALD* attest to competing views of the priesthood prior to and during the Qumran sectarian movement (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 225). Drawnel argued that *ALD* was intended as a priestly manual originating in the religious-political sphere of the Levitical priesthood in 4th century BCE Persian Yehud (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 63-69). Duke concluded that *4QVisAmram* was likely the propagandistic product of a group of disenfranchised priests living in Hebron, who expressed concerns over priestly marital practice and involvement in international affairs (*The Social Location*, 110). A number of scholars have proposed that *NJ*’s knowledge of the temple and cult reflect a priestly setting of some description (DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 190; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 212; idem, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” 457; Lange, “Between Zion and Heaven,” 403; Michael O. Wise, “New Jerusalem Texts,” *DNTB*, 742-45).

priestly domain.³ The detailed priestly knowledge and integration of priestly issues into these Aramaic texts no doubt betrays something of the social setting of this literature. It is not my intention to discern the precise scribal setting(s) of these works. Rather, I wish to use the basic recognition of the concentration of priestly themes in the Aramaic texts as a point of departure for exploring how the dream-vision served as a vehicle for introducing specific priestly interests, endorsing priestly ideals, and associating the historic priesthood with otherworldly and eschatological priesthoods.

In this chapter I detail how dream-visions served and supported priestly interests in four Aramaic writings. *4QVisAmram* will serve as my leading example. It will be seen that this work exhibits a concern for the earthly genealogy and celestial associations of the levitical line, an interest that it derives and extends from *ALD*. Following this, I will describe how *NJ*'s perspective on the sacrificial cult in the eschatological temple evidences an early halakhic-exegetical discourse that squares with what Gary Anderson has termed the "scripturalization of the cult."⁴ The final two examples, *4QTJacob?* and *4QapocrLevi^b?*, though highly fragmentary, provide further glimpses of how priestly topics emerge in eschatologically oriented dream-visions.⁵ In all of this, my goal is not to

³ Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 147-52, 263. While Flannery-Dailey's conclusion is acceptable in its essential points, she does not fully account for or sufficiently explain the largely supporting evidence among the Aramaic Scrolls. She singles out *ALD* for its priestly revelation but perhaps makes too much of the heavenly *hehkal* motifs in *1 Enoch* and *Daniel*.

⁴ Gary Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT)," *ABD* 5:870-76.

⁵ The absence of *ALD* from my list is noteworthy. As indicated in Chapter Two, *ALD* is an important part of the Aramaic corpus; however, the contents of its dream-visions are not well attested among the Qumran, Genizah, and Mount Athos witnesses. Despite this situation, it was demonstrated in the previous chapter that *ALD*'s dream-visions owe their origins to scriptural exegesis and that a main motivation for the resultant 'new' revelation was to elevate Levi to the priesthood. As such, we have already learned of the main priestly concern of dream-visions in *ALD*. Rather than rehearse this background here, I will not treat *ALD* again in its own right but will integrate it into the treatment of the above mentioned texts when appropriate.

trace a single strand of priestly thought in these works – though, in some cases potential links between texts will be considered – but to detail the facets of priestly theology that are advanced by dream-visions across the Aramaic corpus.

2 *4QVisions of Amram on the genetics of the priesthood*

The content of Amram’s dream-vision is often referenced for its distinctive dualistic outlook.⁶ This is an important aspect of Amram’s revelation. However, as the episode progresses beyond the dualistic presentation, the knowledge divulged to Amram concerns the nature of the priesthood inherited by Amram from Levi, and issuing forth through his son, Aaron. This priestly interest, therefore, pertains primarily to the genealogical record of the priesthood in the patriarchal era. I will elucidate two aspects of *4QVisAmram*’s perspective on the priestly lineage: (i) its understanding of Aaron’s status within the levitical line, and (ii) its association of the earthly priestly line/duties with the celestial priesthood of Melchizedek.

2.1 *Incorporating Amram and Aaron into (Aramaic) Levi’s priestly family tree*

Despite its pseudepigraphic attribution to Amram, *4QVisAmram* is undoubtedly focused on establishing the place of Aaron within the genealogy of the priestly forefathers. The main fragment that illustrates this is *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 4, presented here with minimal reconstructions retained from DJD XXXI:

] א/ת[עבד] 13
]די תשמ[ע ואחזה לכה שמה[ת]ד] 14

⁶ This aspect of Amram’s dream-vision has been preliminarily treated by Duke (*The Social Location*, 80-88) and Goldman (“Dualism in the *Visions of Amram*,” esp. 424-25).

15 [די] כְּתֹב בְּאַרְעָא לֵה מוֹשֶׁה וְאַף עַל אֲ[הַרְוֹן
16 [א] הוּוה לְכֵה רַז עוֹבְדָה כְּהֵן קְדִישׁ הוּא[] לֵאל עֲלִיוֹן
17 קִדְ[י] שׁ לְהוּוה לֵה כֹל זִרְעָה בְכוֹל דְרִי עֲ[לְמִין
18 שְׁבִיעִי בְּאַנּוֹשׁ רַעוּת[] הַ יִתְקַרֵּה וִיתַאמְרֵ[]
19 יִתְבַחַר לְכֵהן עֲלִמִין[]] *vacat* []

13 [I/you will] do
14 [that you hea]rd and I will tell you your name[s]
15 [that] is written in the land to him, Moses. And also concerning A[aron
16 [I will] tell you the mystery of his work: a holy priest is he[to God Most High
17 all his descendants will be ho[I]y to him for all generations of et[ernity
18 seventh among men, of [his] will [he will be] called. And it will be said[
19 he will be chosen as a priest for eternity. [] *vacat* []

Puech, Drawnel, and Duke concur that this fragment is to be placed within Amram's dream-vision, suggesting that we are hearing a priestly endorsement from the *angelus interpretes*.⁷ Line 15 contains a clear reference to Moses followed by a plausible reference to Aaron.⁸ The thoroughgoing priestly character of lines 16-19 enhances the likelihood of this reconstruction. Therefore, we can proceed with confidence that this fragment describes the continuation of the Levitical line through Amram's son Aaron.

The use of a dream-vision to prognosticate the direction of the priestly line among future generations, however, is not original to *4QVisAmram*. It is likely that this

⁷ DJD XXXI, 343; Duke, *The Social Location*, 140; Henryk Drawnel, "Amram, Visions of," *EDEJ*, 326-27.

⁸ Puech extends this assumption in his reconstruction[*הַרְוֹן אַחֵוהי/וּכְהוֹנָתָא (רְבִתָּא)*] וְאַף עַל אֲ[הַרְוֹן אַחֵוהי/וּכְהוֹנָתָא (רְבִתָּא)] ("A[aron his brother and the high priesthood") (DJD XXXI, 342). Cook translated the latter half of this line as "And also concerning the o[ther one]," presumably based on reconstructing א[חֵוהי] at the end of the line (WAC, 550). Despite this difference, in his introductory note to this fragment, Cook states that it pertains to "*the future of the priestly clan, of Moses and Aaron, and predicts the coming of a great high priest*" (ibid., italics original).

application of the dream-vision was carried over from *ALD*.⁹ Recall that *ALD* originally contained two full dream-vision episodes. *Aramaic Levi Document* 63-67, however, likely alludes to an additional episode that pertained to the priestly election of Levi's son Qahat. Having established a composite reading of the available witnesses for this section of *ALD*, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel offer the following translation:

She (Milka) became pregnant by me and bore a first son, and I called his name Gershom, for I said, "My seed shall be sojourners in the land in which I was born. We are sojourners as now in the land which is reckoned ours." *And concerning the youth, I saw in my dream (or: vision) that he and his seed will be cast out of the highpriesthood (sic)*. I was thirty years old in the course of my life when he was born, and he was born in the tenth month towards sunset. And she conceived again and she bore by me according to the proper time of women and I called his name Ko[hath. *And*] *I [sa]w*¹⁰ that to him [would] be an assembly of all [the people and that] he would have the high-priesthood; he and his seed will be the beginning of kings, a priesthood for [all Is]rael.¹¹

As Drawnel has observed "[i]t is unlikely that this reference to Levi's visionary experience should denote the two fragmentary visions contained in the text; it rather offers an explanation for Levi's knowledge of the future destiny of his child and supposes Levi's constant ability to foretell the future related to his visionary dream experiences."¹²

⁹ *2 Enoch* uses the dream-vision for an analogous purpose. Flannery-Dailey stated that "Methusaleh (*sic*) and Nir learn of their son's ordination as priests" in *2 En.* 1-2 (*Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 137). These chapters, however, do not contain such material. It is not until *2 En.* 69:5-6 that Methuselah is appointed to a priestly position through a dream-vision, and *2 En.* 70:3-11 that he is informed of the priestly election of Nir. On these aspects of *2 Enoch*, see Andrei A. Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother: The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*," *Henocho* 22 (2000): 207-221.

¹⁰ *T. Levi* 11:5 here reads, "But in a vision I saw him standing in the heights (εἶδον δὲ ἐν ὄραματι ὅτι μέσος ἐν ὑψηλοῖς ἴστατο πάσης τῆς συναγωγῆς)."

¹¹ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 94-95 (= 11:2-6, according to their versification), emphasis mine. For Drawnel's corresponding text and translation, see *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 142-47.

¹² Henryk Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics of the *Visions of Levi* (so-called *Aramaic Levi Document*)," *JAJ* 1 (2010): 303-19, here 313. Drawnel also pointed to *4QLevi^a* (4Q213) 2 9, which may suggest that Levi's knowledge of the future also derived from booklore (*ibid.*).

This passage from *ALD* specifies that it was revealed to Levi in an additional dream-vision (Athos: ὄραμα) that his royal-priestly progeny would be traced through the line of Qahat and *not* Gershom. *Aramaic Levi Document* 63-67 thus represents the final component of the priestly lineage that has been masterfully established for five generations from Abraham to Qahat (cf. *ALD* 50-51; 66-67). However, *ALD* does not articulate the branches of the priestly family tree that extend beyond Qahat. The above text speaks generally of Qahat's "seed" – there is no mention of Amram, Aaron, or endless Aaronides thereafter. It may be that this reference to a dream-vision that forecasted the future priestly lineage in *ALD* provided a paradigm for *4QVisAmram* to do the same for the next generation. In addition to this general point of contact, it is also possible to discern at a more detailed level how *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 4 accentuated Aaron's place in the priestly heritage by presenting him in a way that mirrored Levi's priestly election in *ALD*.

To begin, this fragment implies a genealogical framework that connects Aaron with the lineage of the priestly forefathers. As Puech observed, the phrase "seventh among men of [his] favor [he will be] called (שביעי באנוש רעות[ה ית]קררה)" in 4Q545 4 18 likely connotes Aaron's genetic association with the priestly forefathers, since Aaron was the seventh generation from Abraham, the point of origin for *ALD*'s priesthood.¹³ In addition to this, *4QVisAmram* drew upon the language originally used to describe Levi in

¹³ DJD XXXI, 343. Beyer also noted the genealogical significance of this phrasing; however, the heritage he proposed spanned Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Aaron (*Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, Band 1*, 213). While *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q547) 5 3 mentions Noah, the context of this reference is speculative. From this fleeting evidence we cannot know if Noah factored into *4QVisAmram*'s priestly outlook. Furthermore, it is unclear why Amram would be left out of the genealogy in a text that is attributed to him. For these reasons, Puech's proposal is preferable.

ALD and reapplied it in the *angelus interpres*' endorsement of Aaron's priestly position and progeny. Several approximate echoes may be heard in the priestly endorsements of *ALD* and *4QVisAmram*.

TABLE: Priestly Terminology for Levitical and Aaronide Priesthoods
in the *Aramaic Levi Document* and *4QVisions of Amram*

<i>ALD</i> (describing Levi)	<i>4QVisAmram</i> ^c (describing Aaron)
“you are a holy priest of the Lord (Athos: ἱερεὺς σὺ ἅγιος κυρίου)” (<i>ALD</i> 48).	“A holy priest is he[to God Most High (כֹּהֵן קדִישׁ הוּאֵ] לֵאלֵל עֲלִיּוֹן)” (4Q545 4 16).
“your seed shall be blessed upon the earth for all generations of eternity (Athos: πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων)” (<i>ALD</i> 61) ¹⁴	all his descendants will be ho[l]y to him for all generations of et[ernity (קד[ו]שׁ לְהוֹוֶה לֵה) (כל זרעה בכול דרי ע[ל]מין” ¹⁵ (4Q545 4 17).
“you were elected for the holy priesthood (Athos: ἐξελέχθης εἰς ἱερωσύνην ἁγίαν)” (<i>ALD</i> 51).	“he will be chosen (as) an eternal priest (יתבחר לכהן עלמין)” (4Q545 5 19). ¹⁶

Although the above words from *ALD* are not found in a dream-vision, their similarity to those in *4QVisAmram* suggests that the latter sought to identify Aaron with the levitical line by adopting traditional language associated with his priestly forebear, Levi. It will be seen below that these words in *4QVisAmram* fall from the lips of an authoritative priestly revealer. Both men are called “a holy priest,” whose progeny will extend “for all generations of eternity” as part of an “elected” or “chosen” priestly office. By reapplying the language of *ALD*, the author of *4QVisAmram* augmented the priestly line such that Aaron is described in terms strongly reminiscent of Levi. In this,

¹⁴ Cf. also “and all your seed will be priests (Athos: καὶ ἱερεῖς ἔσονται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα σου)” (*ALD* 49).

¹⁵ With this passage compare also *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 9 6-7. Angel recognized that the language of this passage is “reminiscent of the priestly ordination traditions in *ALD*, *T. Levi* and *Jubilees* 30-32” (*Eschatological and Otherworldly Priesthood*, 133).

¹⁶ The phrases “for all the generations of eternity (לכל דרי עלמא)” and “eternal priesthood (כְּהֹנֵת (עלמא)” are also featured in *4QLevi*^b (4Q213a) 3-4 7; 5 i 3.

4QVisAmram developed the priestly tradition by ensuring that it encompassed the seven priestly forefathers in a continuous, traceable lineage.

4QVisAmram's understanding of the priesthood, however, was not defined solely by patriarchal genetics. By considering *who* delivered this endorsement in Amram's dream-vision, it will become evident that the true nature of the priesthood lies in the celestial realm.

2.2 *An otherworldly endorsement from celestial Melchizedek*

Angel has recently observed that *4QVisAmram*^a (4Q543) 2a-b and *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 1a i attest to the "notion that the human priesthood was perceived as possessing a supernatural quality."¹⁷ To deepen our knowledge of this otherworldly component of *4QVisAmram*'s priestly theology it is necessary to consider the identity of the *angelus interpres* in Amram's dream-vision. This component will further evidence how *4QVisAmram* built upon *ALD*, by extending the association between the levitical

¹⁷ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 54-55. Angel also noted that immediately prior to Amram's awakening, *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 9 7 speaks of the exaltation or ordination of a priest in a visionary context (ibid., 55). He concluded that the reference to one being called an "angel of God (מלאך אלהים)" refers to Aaron (*4QVisAmram*^a [4Q543] 2a-b 4; *4QVisAmram*^c [4Q545] 1a i 17). However, the content and context of these references are not easily discerned. Additionally, Angel's statement that "Moses is nowhere mentioned explicitly in the document," overlooks the clear reference to "Moses (מושה)" in *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 4 15 and the plausible reconstruction "Mo[ses (מושה)" in *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 9 3. Furthermore, as Duke has shown, there is good reason to believe that the name "Malachiya (מלאכיה)" in *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 1a i 9 is a name applied by Aaron to his brother Moses (Robert R. Duke, "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the Vision of Amram," *DSD* 14 [2007]: 34-48; cf. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*, 118-19). If Duke's and Beyer's proposals are accepted, it is Moses who is given an angelomorphic name in *4QVisAmram*, not Aaron.

priesthood and that of Melchizedek. Such an identification allows for a fresh understanding of the priestly “mystery (רז)” in *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 4 16.¹⁸

Part of *4QVisAmram*'s dualistic presentation consisted of the naming of the angels of light and darkness. Unfortunately, only one appellation is preserved in *4QVisAmram*^b (4Q544) 2 13, where the malevolent angel is named “Melchiresha (מלכי רשע).” Milik observed that the angel of light seems to have disclosed his own identity by “three name[s] (תלתה שמה[ן])” (4Q544 3 1-2). From this he inferred that the angels' names were presented in a triad of juxtaposed pairs. The final pair, Milik proposed, were the appositional names “Melchiresha (מלכי רשע)” and “Melchizedek (מלכי צדק),” though the latter is not preserved in the manuscript.¹⁹ Genesis 14:18 describes Melchizedek as a

¹⁸ In addition to this occurrence of the term, *4QVisAmram*^d (4Q546) 12 4 contains an intriguing, but not readily intelligible, mention of the “mystery of Miriam (רז מרים).” The lines prior to this reference seem to have some sort of priestly interest. Puech proposed that the “mystery of Miriam” referred to the revelation of the spirit of God in Miriam's dream-vision regarding the birth of Moses in *L.A.B. IX 10* (DJD XXXI, 365). This is possible, but far from certain. Note also that in the announcement of Levi's priesthood in *T. Levi 2:10*, the angel states that Levi will “declare his (i.e., God's) mysteries to men (μυστήρια αὐτοῦ ἐξαγγελεῖς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις).”

¹⁹ J. T. Milik, “4Q Visions de ‘Amram,” 85-86; idem., “Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95-144. This proposal is admittedly conjectural. Most scholars are willing to accept Milik's schema as a working hypothesis and proceed with some confidence that the angelic figures of *4QVisAmram* claimed the names Melchiresha and Melchizedek. See Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 264-68; James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (ECDSS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 165; Florentino García Martínez, “4Q‘Amram b, i, 14: ¿Melki-reša o Melki-šedeq?” *RevQ* 12 (1985): 111-14; idem., *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 177; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, 27; Eric F. Mason, “Melchizedek Traditions in Second Temple Judaism,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* (eds. Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski; SJS 4; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 343-60; idem., “You Are a Priest Forever’: *Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* [STDJ 74; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 167-68); DJD XXXI, 327-29; and WAC, 549. In disagreement with this point of consensus, Dimant averred that the reconstruction of the name Melchizedek in *4QVisAmram* is “speculative and should not be exploited to develop further theories” (Devorah Dimant, “Melchizedek at Qumran and in Judaism: A Response,” in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only* [eds. Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski; SJS 4; Leiden: Brill, 2012], 361-67, here 366).

“priest to God Most High (כהן לאל עליון),” and Ps 110:4 later grants him an eternal priesthood. In some Second Temple literature Melchizedek’s character is enhanced, such that he is invested with various priestly, celestial roles. For example, in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* it is almost certain that Melchizedek is at the head of the angelic priesthood offering liturgical praise in the celestial temple.²⁰ The thematic Peshet text *11QMelch* “features a heavenly figure named Melchizedek who executes divine judgment and deliverance in the context of an eschatological jubilee and Day of Atonement.”²¹

²⁰ The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* comprises a fragmentary collection of hymns offered by the angelic hosts in the liturgy of the heavenly temple. The work is attested by eight copies at Qumran (*4QShirShabb*^{a-s} [4Q400-407]; *11QShirShabb* [11Q17]) and a single fragmentary manuscript recovered from Masada (*MasIk*). “[O]n paleographical grounds, it is likely that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice was composed not much later than approximately 100 BCE” (Carol A. Newsom, “Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *EDSS* 2:887-89, here 887). The phrase “Melchi]zedek, priest in the assemb[ly of God (מלכי [צדק)” is likely to be read at *4QShirShabb*^b (4Q401) 11 3 (cf. DJD XI, 205; DJD XXIII, 270; DSSSE, 2:810-11; and Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 162). *11QShirShabb* (11Q17) II 7 contains the partial phrase “the won]derful [priesthoods] of mlk (להלל) (with partial overlap in *4QShirShabb*^f (4Q405) 8 a, b- 9 5-6). Garcia Martínez and van der Woude (Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* [DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 269-70) and Davila (*Liturgical Works*, 133) find the end of line reconstruction להלל]י [צדק] “attractive.” Mason commented that if this reading is accepted “[t]he striking feature is that Melchizedek would stand at the head of the heavenly priesthood, reminiscent of ‘the order of Melchizedek’ in Ps 110:4” (“Melchizedek Traditions,” 335). A third reference may be found in the characters ל]י צדק] inscribed on the small fragment of *4QShirShabb*^b (4Q401) 22 3 (cf. Esther Eshel, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* [DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997], 205; and Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 162). Note also, that this work refers to the ר in the context of the liturgy of the celestial temple (*4QShirShabb*^a [4Q401] 14 ii 2; 17 6; *4QShirShabb*^c [4Q403] 1ii 27). It is evident that this mystery has implications for the earthly community that saw itself as participating in the heavenly worship (Markus Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* [WUNT 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990], 55; Benjamin Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism and Its Bearing on First Corinthians* [BZNTW 160; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008], 79).

²¹ Eric F. Mason, “Melchizedek Scroll (11Q13),” *EDEJ*, 932-34, here 932. The scribal hand of *11QMelch* dates to the mid to late 1st century BCE (DJD XXIII, 223). The principal text indicating Melchizedek’s cultic action in the eschatological scenario is 11Q13 2 7-9. Reiling cautioned that it is not “clear whether Melchizedek is the priestly agent of atonement” (J. Reiling, “Melchizedek,” *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* [eds. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1995], 1048-53, here 1051). However, Melchizedek is repeatedly named in this fragment (cf. 11Q13 2 5, 9, 13), and is the central eschatological agent throughout the composition. Furthermore, as Lang has demonstrated, the semantic range of the root כפר* and its derivatives is shaped significantly by usage in

Hebrews 7 develops the priestly Melchizedek tradition by way of a Christological interpretation and application of Ps 110:4.²² While *ALD* does not speak of an angelic Melchizedek, on two occasions *ALD* describes Levi as a “priest to God Most High” (*ALD* 9, Bodl. a: <יזן>{ על־מִין א } לֹאֵל כַּהֵן לֹאֵל; *ALD* 13, Bodl. b: כַּהֵן לֹאֵל עֲלִיזָן).²³ This is a conspicuous use of the very same appellation granted to Melchizedek in Gen 14:18. These parallels caused Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel to ask, “[i]s the attribution to Levi of a title used of Melchizedek intentional[?]”²⁴ Based on this clue and others, Aschim has argued compellingly that the author of *ALD* indeed desired to “establish a connection between the earthly cult, performed by Levi and his descendants, and the heavenly cult, performed by angels” (cf. *Jub.* 31:14-15; *ALD* 18).²⁵ This brief survey of traditions demonstrates that there is strong penchant for elevating Melchizedek to a heavenly

priestly traditions, not least Lev 16:32-34, which uniformly associate the word with acts of mediating atonement in cultic settings (B. Lang, “כִּפֶּרֶת *kipper*,” *TDOT* 7:288-303). Therefore, *11QMelch* likely associates Melchizedek with the priestly ministry on the Day of Atonement in the final jubilee (cf. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 165; M. Delcor, “Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” *JSJ* 2 [1971]: 115-35, esp. 125; and Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*, 57).

²² For a discussion of Hebrews’ contribution to this tradition, see the comments of George H. Guthrie in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 960-62; 967-68. For an overview of additional Melchizedek traditions and supplementary bibliography, see W. M. Schniedewind, “Melchizedek, Traditions of,” *DNTB*, 693-65.

²³ The occurrence in *ALD* 9 consists of a correction in the Geniza manuscript from עֲלִיזָן to עֲלִיזָן (Émile Puech, “*Le Testament de Lévi*,” 113). Puech and Drawnel proposed that a similar correction is to be found in the corresponding Qumran *ALD* text in *4QLevi*^c (4Q213b) 1 6. However, such a conclusion cannot be drawn from the meager ink traces of letter tops at the bottom of this fragment (cf. PAM 43.242).

Greenfield and Stone read “of the G]od of eternity[(לֹאֵל עֲלִיזָן אֱלֹהֵי הָעוֹלָם),” which seems a more judicious handling of the limited textual evidence (DJD XXII, 38-39). It is possible that *ALD* contained a third occurrence of this language in *1QLevi* (1Q21) 3, though the text is highly fragmentary (cf. D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* [DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955], 88; and Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 111).

²⁴ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 155. Cf. Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 33.

²⁵ Anders Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 773-88, here 780. Collins also considered the degree to which *ALD* forged a connection between Levi and Melchizedek on account of both figures’ royal associations (John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 87-88).

priestly status in Second Temple period literature and that this understanding was present in a key text in the Aramaic corpus.

It was already established that *4QVisAmram*'s understanding of the priestly genealogy was to some degree shaped by *ALD*. In light of this formative influence we might expect that these Aramaic works shared a similar understanding of the celestial associations of the priesthood. While we cannot know the full nature and implications of *4QVisAmram*'s angelology, it is suggestive that this work apparently featured a celestial Melchizedek who both conferred an eternal priesthood to Aaron and acted as a revealer of a priestly mystery. According Melchizedek these roles in a visionary context may have been a means by which the author of *4QVisAmram* extended *ALD*'s Melchizedek typology to Aaron. If Puech's reconstruction at the end of *4QVisAmram*^c (4Q545) 4 16, which describes Aaron as a holy priest "[to God Most High] (לאל עליון)" is accepted, then we would have further support for this proposal.²⁶

Such an understanding has ramifications for how to understand the term מְסֵתֵר in 4Q545 4 16.²⁷ Thomas suggested that "[i]t would appear that Amram and Aaron are

²⁶ DJD XXXI, 343. Puech's reconstruction is based on the common usage of this divine epithet in *ALD* (Bodl. b 5-6), *IQapGen* (1Q20) XX 15, and the partially extant occurrence in *4QVisAmram*^a (4Q543) 22 2. He does not, however, offer any statement of the significance of this epithet for the Melchizedek traditions.

²⁷ Mystery language in ancient Judaism, the New Testament, and particularly the Qumran collection, has received extensive attention. See, especially Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*; Raymond Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Biblical Series 21; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968); Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*; and Samuel I. Thomas, *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SBLEJL 25; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009). In some ways, the variety of usage and applications of מְסֵתֵר makes it difficult to establish a simple understanding of the term. Bockmuehl proposed that מְסֵתֵר is semantically distinct from other esoteric terms in that it "invariably denotes a mystery or secret purpose" (*Revelation and Mystery*, 54). Gladd proposed that "[m]ystery [מְסֵתֵר], according to the DSS, can be a revelation or special insight that is

associated with ‘mysteries’ because they are descendants of Levi, who is understood to be the first priest and the father of all priests.”²⁸ However, an earthly genetic connection with the priestly forefathers hardly qualifies as a רז . Closer to the mark, Puech proposed that the mystery is the priesthood itself, but provided no further comment on what this entails.²⁹ It is significant that *4QVisAmram* specifies that Melchizedek made known the רז of Aaron’s “work (עֹבֵד).” That is, there is something about the priests’ cultic duties that constitutes a mystery or indicates an otherworldly transaction. In light of this,

concerned with either the entire process or a specific aspect of redemption, including all related physical and spiritual intricacies” (Revealing the Mystery, 84, italics original). It is generally accepted that רז is a Persian loanword taken over into the Aramaic language, which subsequently entered the Hebrew register. This trajectory is not without its problems, however, as the Persian ‘background’ for the term is found in the 5th century CE Zoroastrian Avestas. Not including its occurrences in Aramaic Daniel, רז occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures only in Isa 24:16. In the Hebrew Scrolls the noun occurs 118 times (cf. Margin Abegg Jr., et al, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* [vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 680-81). A desideratum in current research is a comprehensive account of the origins and tailored usage of this term in Aramaic literature. Including the occurrences in Aramaic Daniel and *1QapGen* (according to the concordance in Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 300), I count twenty-seven extant occurrences of the noun רז in the Aramaic corpus: Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47; 4:6; *1QapGen* (1Q20) I 2, 3, 7; V 21, 25; VI 12; XIV 19, 20; *4QEn^a* (4Q201) 1 iv 5; *4QEnGiants^a* (4Q203) 9 3; *4QEn^c* (4Q204) 5 ii 26; *4QBirth of Noah^a* (4Q534) 1 i 7, 8 (2x); *4QBirth of Noah^c* (4Q536) 2 i + 3 8, 9, 12; *4QVisAmram^c* (4Q545) 4 16; and *4QVisAmram^d* (4Q546) 12 4. For brief evaluations of the quality and application רז in some of our Aramaic texts, see Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 54; Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 48; Machiela, “Genesis Revealed,” 211; and DJD XXXI, 139-40, 167.

²⁸ Thomas, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran*, 120; cf. idem, “Esoteric Knowledge in Qumran Aramaic Texts,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 403-32, esp. 418-19. Thomas proposed that in priestly contexts the רז may refer to proper observance of festivals, purity laws, and practices of atonement (*The “Mysteries” of Qumran*, 235). *4QVisAmram*, however, does not easily fall into this category of usage, since the author of *4QVisAmram* is unconcerned with the teaching and transmission of proper sacerdotal duties. This might be explained by the fact that the complementary tradition in *4QTQahat* (4Q542) 1 i-1 ii already traced the Abrahamic priestly lore down to Amram. On this aspect of the priestly tradition in *4QTQahat*, see Robert Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 465-79.

²⁹ DJD XXXI, 343.

4QVisAmram may connote a specific understanding of the channels of interchange that are open and active in cultic service. As the mediators of an ongoing divine-human exchange through sacrificial rites, the priest's work is inherently 'mysterious' in that it involves atonement offered from a deity above to human supplicants on earth below. Viewed from this perspective, the earthly priests are mediators of heavenly mysteries in continuity and close association with the celestial priesthood. The revelation of this reality by a celestial Melchizedek in *4QVisAmram* may be a means of linking the earthly priests into a chain of command that stretches upwards to the heavens, ultimately to the head of the priestly order, Melchizedek himself.

3 *Interpreting the cult: sacerdotal halakhah in the New Jerusalem text*

4QVisAmram's main priestly interest concerned the earthly and celestial associations of the priesthood. While *NJ* is likely another patriarchal pseudepigraph, plausibly attributed to Jacob, the author of this work used the dream-vision to address a different sort of priestly concern. As García Martínez has remarked, in *NJ* there is a curious juxtaposition of the barren, motionless streets and residences of the city of Jerusalem with the bustling, vibrant display of the sacrificial cult in the visionary temple.³⁰ As a result, interwoven into *NJ*'s visionary blueprint of the temple is a unique display of cultic duties. While there is some precedent for founding a cult or endorsing cultic practices through dream-visions in ancient Near Eastern and Graeco-Roman sources, this is rare in ancient Israelite/Jewish literature.³¹ My discussion will explore the

³⁰ García Martínez, "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem," 451.

³¹ The only other possible occurrences of sacrificial service within a dream-vision in the Aramaic Scrolls are found in *4QVisAmram*^e (4Q547) 5 1-2; 6 2-3; 8; 9 1-5, though the content and context of all of

significance of the visual display of priestly duties in *NJ* by way of a case study on the sacerdotal halakhah of the bovine offering as depicted in *11QNJ* (11Q18) 13.³² The surviving text of this fragment reads as follows:

]בארבע רגלוהי ונשט תורא]	1
]ר[חע רגלוהי וקרבוהי ומלח כולה]	2
]ו[שויה על גורא ואיתי קמח סולת]	3
]ר[ובע סתא ואסקה למדבחא כולה]	4
]רו[בע סתא ונסך לגוא מורכי]ותא	5
]א ובשרא מתערב בחדא]	6
] ר'יחא vacat [7

these references are not easily discerned. Of course, Ezek 40-48 provides a schematic of the city and temple; however, these matters of cultic practice are briefly described, not visually enacted (cf. Ezek 42:14; 43:18-27; 44:9-31; and 45:10-46:24). For a concise overview of this aspect of Ezekiel's prophetic dream-vision, see Paul M. Joyce, "Temple and Worship in Ezekiel 40-48," in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; LHB/OTS 422; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 145-63. Though the revelatory medium is not specified, 1 Chr 28:19 attributes David's knowledge of the plan for Jerusalem's first temple to divine revelation. Oppenheim assumed that this divine "plan (תבנית)" derived from a dream-vision (*Interpretation*, 193). This is possible, but by no means certain. At most what can be said is that this verse contributes to the Chronicler's endorsement of David as the legitimate, divinely commissioned founder of the Solomonic temple (cf. Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993], 493-94; Ralph W. Klein, *I Chronicles: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006], 527; and Simon J. De Vries, "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles," *JBL* 107 [1988]: 619-39). At various points *2 Baruch's* dream-vision interpretations mention issues pertaining to the temple and cult (*2 Bar.* 59:4; 61:2; 66:2; 68:5). Stone sees these as in some continuity with the type of temple revelation in *NJ* (Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* [eds. Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, Jr.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976], 414-52). See n. 9 above for visionary priestly elections in *2 Enoch*. Hanson drew attention to the divine directive to found temples through dream-visions in Pap. Cair. Zenon I.59034; Inscr. Gr. XI, 4, 1299, 56-58; and Pausanias 3.14.4 ("Dreams and Visions," 1398, n. 19-20). Oppenheim discussed the intriguing example of a Sumerian dream-vision incubation account in Cylinder A, whereby an individual collected the materials to build a sanctuary and slept beside them to induce revelation of the temple's plan (*Interpretation*, 224).

³² Other instances of sacrificial language in *NJ* include: "making atonement (מכפרין)" (*2QNJ* [2Q24] 8 5); "sacrifices (נכסת)" and "blessing (מברכין)" (*11QNJ* [11Q18] 23 ii 3-4); offering of "tw[o] bulls (תורין תרין)" (*11QNJ* [11Q18] 28 4-5); the pouring of "oil and wine (משח וחמ[ר])" on the altar (*11QNJ* [11Q18] 29); a reference to levitical "sacrific[ce] (דבחין)" (*11QNJ* [11Q18] 30 2); and "the rams (איליא)" (*11QNJ* [11Q18] 33 2).

1]by its four legs, and stripped the bull [
2 he wa]shed its legs and its entrails, and salted all of it[
3 and] placed it on the fire, and brought fine sifted flour[
4 a fo]urth of ^{a seah}, and he brought all of it to the altar[
5 a fou]rth of a seah, and he poured it into [the] receptacle [
6]a and the flesh was mixed together[
7] the aroma. *vacat* [

This fragment exhibits at least three, perhaps four, aspects of development or tension with analogous sacrificial halakhah in the Hebrew Scriptures, Second Temple period writings, and rabbinic traditions. After discussing these items, I will consider the implications of *NJ* couching this cultic material within a patriarchal dream-vision.

(i) *Binding the bull's four legs before slaughter*. Kister observed that 11Q18 13 1 “may refer to tying the four legs of the animal before it is slaughtered and its hide removed.”³³ This practice is found neither in corresponding pentateuch texts nor in other Second Temple sources outlining the process of the bovine offering.³⁴ Kister noted that while *m. Tamid* 4:1 rules that the offering of a lamb is not to be fully bound, *b. Tamid* 31b qualifies that the practice of tying the four legs is according to the “law of the *minim* (חוקי המינים).”³⁵ This practice is also found in *2 En.* 59:3, in which Enoch instructs Methuselah that “everything which you have for food, bind it by four legs.” As Pines and Orlov

³³ Menahem Kister, “Notes on Some Texts from Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 280-90, here 284. Cf. DJD XXIII, 326.

³⁴ Cf. Lev 1:3-9; Num 15:8-10; *Jub.* 7:3-4; *ALD* 26-31; and *11QTemple^a* [11Q19] XXXVII 7-14.

³⁵ Kister, “Notes on Some Texts,” 284. See also, S. Pines, “Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch,” in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem, 14th to 19th 1968* (eds. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker; SHR 18; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72-87, esp. 74-75.

observed, Methuselah enacts this practice when conducting sacrifices in 2 *En.* 69:5-6 (cf. 70:20).³⁶

(ii) *The salting of sacrifices.* This halakhah in 11Q18 13 2 develops beyond levitical sacrificial prescriptions for the bovine offering.³⁷ Given the pervasive influence of Ezek 40-48 on *NJ*, the inclusion of salt in the animal sacrifice likely derives from the mention of this practice in Ezek 43:23.³⁸ This specific sacerdotal halakhah enjoyed wide approval among Second Temple period authors, including Josephus and those of *ALD*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *1QapGen*. However, there is some internal diversity among these sources. Upon comparison with *ALD* and *NJ*, we find that the *Temple Scroll* prescribes the use of salt at two stages of the sacrificial process: once for the butchered flesh, and once after the washing of the entrails and legs (*11QTemple^a* [11Q19] XXXVII 9-11).³⁹ *ALD* 26-31, and from what we can tell, *NJ*, mirror one another by incorporating salt only

³⁶ Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time," 84; Orlov, "Noah's Younger Brother," 211-12.

³⁷ Kugler noted that Lev 2:13 rules that salt should accompany all forms of offering, although salt is not explicitly mentioned in the prescriptions for the burnt offering in Lev 1:3-9 (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 105). Himmelfarb observed that even if Lev 2:13 is read back onto Lev 1, "there is no retrospective indication of when in the process of sacrifice the salting is to take place" (Martha Himmelfarb, "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in *Aramaic Levi* and Jubilees," in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* [eds. Ra'anan S. Boustan and Annette Yoshiko Reed; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 103-122, here 110).

³⁸ Zimmerli proposed that Ezek 43:24 "must fairly certainly represent, vis-à-vis the ritual of Leviticus 1, an older form of the whole burnt offering in which the priests had to carry out a particular salt rite" (Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2* [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983], 434). Allen remarked more generally that Ezekiel's vision of the temple and cult are heavily informed by earlier traditions but at points create "new details of cultic expression" (Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20-48* [WBC 29; Dallas: Word Books, 1990], 270).

³⁹ Yadin commented that the phrasing of *11QTemple^a* (11Q19) XXXVII 10 is drawn from Lev 2:13, and invites comparison with Ezek 43:24 (Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* [vol. 2; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983], 146). Wise proposed that the inclusion of salt in the animal sacrifice here is likely drawn from Lev 2:13 (Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* [SAOC 49; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990], 221).

once, after the butchering and washing of the legs and entrails.⁴⁰ Though found in different contexts, *IQapGen* (1Q20) X 17 (cf. *Jub.* 6:3) and *Ant.* 3.277 both include salt at the penultimate stage of the sacrificial process before meat is presented on the altar.⁴¹ In view of this strong precedent in Second Temple period sources, it is not surprising that this practice is later affirmed by *m. Tamid* 4:3. As Schiffman remarked, for the rabbinic sages this rulings “seems to be uncontroversial.”⁴²

(iii) *The pouring out and proportions of the libation offering.* While there is no clear reference to “wine (חמר)” in the extant text of 11Q18 13, it is certain that wine is the object offered in line 5.⁴³ There are two noteworthy aspects of *NJ*'s description of the libation offering. First, in 11Q18 13 4-5 the oil and wine are presented in equal proportion according to *post-exilic* measurements: “a fourth of a seah (ר[ו]בַע סתא [ר; וּבַע סתא]).” In this detail, *NJ* agrees with the measurements in *ALD* 42-44. Numbers 15:8-10 prescribes the same amount and proportion using a *pre-exilic* measurement: “a half of a hin (חצי

⁴⁰ Drawnel observed that the offering of salt is explicitly formulated here but receives subsequent attention in *ALD* 37-40a, which specifies the quantities of salt for different animal sacrifices (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 135).

⁴¹ Sagiv highlighted that Philo did not mention the use of salt in his brief description of the sacerdotal process in *Spec. Laws* I.199 (Yonatan Sagiv, “Leviticus 1 and 6: From Contextual to Extra-Textual Exegesis,” *JJS* 63 [2012]: 49-61). Note also that salt is not mentioned in *Let. Aris.* 92-95.

⁴² Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002* (eds. Ester G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 177-202, here 190.

⁴³ 11Q18 13 3 already referenced “fine sifted flour (קמח סולת),” so the two references to offerings of “a fourth of a seah” in lines 4-5 must refer to the liquid offerings that accompany the burnt offering. Since oil and flour are typically referenced sequentially and mixed in this process (e.g., Exod 29:40; Lev 2:1; 7:12; 23:13; Num 6:15; 7:13, 19), I infer that line 5 concerned the libation offering. In light of Num 15:10, García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude suggested that the beginning of 11Q18 13 5 may be reconstructed as ויתי חמר ר[ו]בַע סתא (DJD XXIII, 327).

ההין).” Schiffman observed that the author of *ALD* “assumed that 2 biblical *hin* = 1 *se’ah*, hence $1/4 \textit{saton} = 1/2 \textit{hin}$.”⁴⁴ This indicates a certain metrical knowledge in both *ALD* and *NJ*: both affirm Num 15:8-10 but update its requirement to a contemporary system.

Second, *NJ*'s libation offering is to be poured into מורכ⁹והא (11Q18 13 5). On account of the usage of this word in the Targumim, García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude concluded that 11Q18 13 5 must connote “some special receptacle into which the wine libation should be poured.”⁴⁵ Kister observed that while this practice accords with *m. Sukkah* 4:9 and *t. Sukkah* 3:14, “[t]his halakhah contradicts the law found in the Temple Scroll and in the Book of Jubilees, according to which the wine should be poured over the fire of the altar” (cf. *11QTemple*^a [11Q19] XXXIV 13; and *Jub.* 7:3-5).⁴⁶

(iv) *The (non)mixing of sacrificial flesh.* The final potential halakhic issue in *NJ* is found in the highly fragmentary phrase “and the flesh was mixed together (מתערב ובשרא)

⁴⁴ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 197. Himmelfarb also finds a “basic agreement” between the required measurements in *ALD* and the corresponding pentateuchal prescriptions (“Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense,” 114-15). Based on Powell’s values for these measurements, the amount required by both estimations is approximately three litres (Marvin A. Powell, “Weights and Measures,” *ABD* 6:897-908).

⁴⁵ DJD XXIII, 327. The Aramaic noun מורכ⁹ is used to translate the Hebrew כד (“jug”) (cf. *Tg. Neof.* at Gen 24:20; and *Tg. Ps.-J.* at Gen 24:20) as well as רהט (“trough”) (cf. *Tg. Neof.* at Gen 30:38, 41; *Tg. Ps.-J.* at Gen 30:38, and 41). Mention is also made of “a clay vessel of (חסף די מורד) ...” in a fragmentary inscription from Masada (Ms 556:3) (Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic* [Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003], 61).

⁴⁶ Kister, “Notes on Some Texts,” 285. See also the brief mention in idem, “Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 571-88, esp. 585-85, n. 54. No such receptacle is mentioned in *ALD*, so, presumably, this Aramaic text aligns with *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*. Note also that in *Jub.* 6:3, Noah sprinkled wine over the sacrifice. It is curious that in the analogous episode in *1QapGen* wine is missing from the list of elements that typically accompany the burnt offering (1Q20 X 16). One wonders whether or not this omission is exegetical: since Noah had not yet planted his vineyard, from where could he acquire wine?

בחדא)” in 11Q18 13 6. Chyutin proposed that this reference “is probably connected with the tithe and with the mixing of the meat of the bull and the lamb.”⁴⁷ He noted further that *m. Zebahim* 8:2 allows for the mixing of meat offerings, save for the sin and guilt offerings, which are to be kept separate.⁴⁸ To this we may add that *11QTemple^a* (11Q19) XXXVII 11-12 speaks of not mixing the peace offerings of the Israelites with the sacrifices of the priests. It is possible that *NJ* has something to offer to this conversation; although, we cannot be sure that the text here speaks of different types of flesh.

How can *NJ*'s prescriptions for the bovine offering inform our understanding of the priestly function of dream-visions? Tigchelaar stated that “[a]part from being a text describing the ideal temple and city, the description of the rituals in the new temple also may actually reflect a discourse of correct ritual *halakha*.”⁴⁹ It is true that the Dead Sea Scrolls provide invaluable data for our understanding of the development of early Jewish halakhah, and, as seen in this case study, these materials often reveal differing perspectives on specific issues.⁵⁰ However, the question of the degree to which these

⁴⁷ Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction* (JSPSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 59. For a discussion of the problematics of Chyutin's study as a whole, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, *JTS* 50 (1999): 658-64.

⁴⁸ Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll*, 59.

⁴⁹ Tigchelaar, “The Character of the City,” 130.

⁵⁰ For some methodological considerations on the (dis)continuity of halakhic perspectives and exegesis from the Scrolls to rabbinic literature, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, “The Judaeon Legal Tradition and the *Halakhah* of the Mishnah,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic Literature* (eds. Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 121-43; Lutz Doering, “Parallels without ‘Parallelomania’: Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 7-9 January, 2003 (eds. Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13-42; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic *Halakhah*,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. James R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 3-24; and Aharon

materials reflect halakhic *realia* of the times must always be taken into consideration, particularly when dealing with opinions of the Israelite cult at any stage of its existence. For this reason, there has been an increasing recognition that halakhic speculation on cultic praxis and processes reveals something of an ongoing interpretive process that commenced within the Hebrew Scriptures and carried on in Jewish writings of late antiquity. It is in this conversation that we should locate *NJ*'s halakhic presentation.

Anderson set the stage for this line of inquiry when he discussed “the scripturalization of the cult.”⁵¹ Anderson proposed that the pentateuchal strands that outline the cultic halakhah consist of “disparate and fragmentary cultic materials which were presented en masse as a perpetual coherent system” and that “[a]t no time in Israel’s cultic history did this book as a collective whole function as a priest’s manual.”⁵² For Anderson, in the Hebrew Scriptures and beyond “[n]o longer are we speaking of *development of cultic practice* but rather of *learned reflection on a developing canon of textual material*.”⁵³ Recent research has underscored this phenomenon at the level of the

Shemesh, “Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 595-616.

⁵¹ Anderson, “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings,” 870-76.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 885. Likewise, Himmelfarb suggested that the composite collection of legal material concentrated in the Pentateuch invites, even demands, interpretation: “despite the profusion of details it offers, the priestly source of the Torah is certainly not a handbook for priests. Anyone attempting to perform a sacrifice on the basis of the laws in Leviticus and Numbers alone would be left wondering how to proceed at many points” (“Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense,” 105).

⁵³ Anderson, “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings,” 883, emphasis original. This perspective on the development of legal material may be considered a subset of the approaches of Fishbane (*Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*) and Kugel (James L. Kugel, “Early Interpretation: The Common Background of Late Forms of Biblical Exegesis,” in *Early Biblical Interpretation* [eds. James L. Kugel and R. Greer; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986], 11-106), both of whom emphasize the rolling, interactive, compositional nature of the earliest strata of the Hebrew Scriptures. For a more recent theoretical discussion on the methods of modification and innovation in legal traditions, see Bernard M. Levinson, “*You Must Not Add Anything to What I Command You: Paradoxes of Canon and Authorship in Ancient Israel*,” *Numen* 50 (2003): 1-51.

scribal composition and transmission of some of our earliest pentateuchal manuscripts and traditions.⁵⁴ In a similar way, there has been an increased recognition of the compositional strategies used by some Second Temple period authors to achieve an authoritative presentation of their ritual halakhah and legal materials in ‘new’ works.⁵⁵ It is necessary to reiterate at this point the common perspective on the origin of dream-visions that pervades writings of the ancient world: dreams and visions were primarily viewed as the vehicle that delivered divine communication and divulged directives or knowledge to the earthly realm. By implication, this medium carried with it an air of authority. When *NJ*’s priestly halakhah are considered in light of this aetiology, several aspects of the composition’s rhetoric come to the fore. First, by delivering sacrificial halakhah in a dream-vision, *NJ* claims authenticity and authority for its priestly prescriptions. Second, since it is likely that *NJ* was attributed to Jacob, the priestly halakhah subverts the Sinai revelation by divinely disclosing sacerdotal prescriptions

⁵⁴ A representative sampling of such research illustrates how this topic has been considered in light of various textual traditions. See, for example, Dirk Büchner, “Exegetical Variants in the LXX of Exodus: An Evaluation,” *JNSL* 22 (1996): 35-58; Moshe Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24-49; Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*; and David Andrew Teeter, “Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies” (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008). Such studies on the scribal interpretation of legal passages reflect the wider recognition of the pluriform nature of the Hebrew Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism.

⁵⁵ A few examples will suffice to make the point. 1-2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah emphasize that the cultic service and festival observance in Jerusalem’s first and second temples were instituted according to Mosaic ordinances (e.g., 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 8:13), “instruction (תורה)” (e.g., 2 Chr 23:18; Ezra 3:2; 7:6) or even the “book (ספר)” of Moses (e.g., 2 Chr 35:12; Neh 8:18). The *Temple Scroll* presents itself as divine speech, effectively claiming that its cultic stipulations are the verbal disclosure of the deity to his worshipping community. (For the cultic halakhah of the *Temple Scroll*, see *11QTemple*^a [11Q19] XIV 1-XXIX 6; XLIII 1-17; LII 4-21; and LX 2-14). Some authors espouse the antiquity and reliability of their cultic traditions by locating their origins in patriarchal instruction and/or booklore (e.g., *ALD* 13; 19-57; *4QTQahat* [4Q242] 1 ii 1, 9-13; *Jub.* 21:6-18). Others provided exemplary models of sacrificial ritual in the lives of the pre-Sinai patriarchs (e.g., *Jub.* 6:1-3; 15:1-2; 16:22-25; 22:3-4; 32:4-9; *1QapGen* [1Q20] X 13-17). These examples illustrate how speculation about cultic ideals could take a number of forms and appeal to a variety of authoritative sources, figures, or discourses.

before the giving of the Mosaic Torah. Third, as Flannery-Dailey has observed, the dream world was one of unconstrained boundaries and limitless possibilities so that “*almost anything imaginable is logical.*”⁵⁶ In this respect, *NJ* could do what other sacerdotal halakhic treatments could not: the author could vividly *display* the functioning Israelite cult, rather than merely *describe* its obligatory duties in a theoretical framework. Fourth, there is widespread consensus that *NJ* envisages the eschatological Jerusalem and its eschatological cult.⁵⁷ As a patriarchal pseudepigraph, *NJ* emphasizes the lasting, even eternal, significance of the priestly service as well as accentuates the continuity of its practice from the patriarchal era to the end of days.

NJ makes an important contribution to our understanding of how priestly concerns could be addressed through special revelation, since it is the primary work to detail the specifics of the cultic site and service within a dream-vision episode.

4 Further glimpses of priestly dreams and dreamers

4QVisAmram and *NJ* have served as the key examples of how pseudepigraphic dream-visions endorsed specific ideals of priestly thought and practice. However, priestly themes and language are also found among the surviving fragments of *4QTJacob?* and

⁵⁶ Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes and Priests*, 249, emphasis original.

⁵⁷ While scholars agree on the centrality of cultic worship in the eschatological scenario of *NJ*, there are differing opinions on the function of the temple in this future context. García Martínez concluded that *NJ* provides a view of the eschatological city that will be founded by God at the time of the eschatological battle (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 201; idem, “New Jerusalem at Qumran and in the New Testament,” in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* [eds. Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos; VTSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 277-89). With some variation in their proposals, Licht (J. Licht, “An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran: The Description of the New Jerusalem,” *IEJ* 29 [1979]: 45-59), Puech (“À propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle,” 102), and Tigchelaar (“The Character of the City,” 127-31) suggest that the infrastructure and accommodation capacity of the city indicate that *NJ* envisages Jerusalem as an eschatological pilgrimage site. DiTommaso argued that the city is intended to be the permanent dwelling place of the ingathered tribes for the worship of God, in the tradition of texts like Isa 60 and *1 En.* 90:29 (*The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 178).

4QapocrLevi^b? Due to their highly fragmentary remains, our knowledge of these two Aramaic compositions is limited. Nonetheless, to extend our understanding of the forms in which priestly interests and concerns could manifest themselves in dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus I will give brief consideration to how priests and priestly topics surface in the available materials.

4.1 *4QTestament of Jacob?: a view of priestly precincts, praxis, and promises*

Topics related to the temple and priesthood are prominent in *4QTestament of Jacob?* (4Q537)

12. This fragment reads as follows, with minimal reconstructions retained from Puech in DJD XXXI:

א] והיד להוא בנינ] א והיד כהנ] יהון להון לבשין וטהירן	1
[ידיהון והיד להון] מסקין דבחיא למדבחא וה] יד כל יו]ם] להון בכ]ל] אר]עא אכלין מן קצת דבחיהון	2
[והיד להון שתין מיא] די להון נפקין מן קריתא ומן תחות שוריהא ואן להון מש]תפכין מין שגיאין	3
] vacat [4
[קדמי ארע רבעין תרין וא]רע	5
]ל]	6

- 1]a and how the structu[re] will be[and how] their [priest]s will be dressed and [their hands] purified
- 2 [and how they will] offer up the offerings to the altar and h[ow each da]y[in al]l the [lan]d [they will] eat a part of their sacrifices
- 3 [and how they will drink the water] that will go out from the city and from beneath its walls and where there will be [much water] gu[shing
- 4] vacat [
- 5] before me a land of two quarters/squares and [a] l[and
- 6]/[

The six partial lines of this fragment touch on at least three priestly topics. First, lines 1-2 indicate a concern for ceremonial purity and proper adornment for participation in cultic service. As Puech noted, the washing of the priests' hands and feet is prescribed in *ALD* 19-20.⁵⁸ Similarly, Drawnel observed that *ALD* 19-20, 26 (cf. *T. Levi* 9:11) and *Jub.* 21:16 present a developed order of sacrificial ablutions at various stages throughout cultic duty.⁵⁹ The only indication of such an interest in the surviving text of *4QTIacob?* is the verb טהירן, from the root טהר ("to purify"), in 4Q537 12 1. In the Hebrew Scriptures, this verb is often found in descriptions of the purification and/or consecration of priests for cultic participation.⁶⁰ In the end, the limited textual evidence does not reveal whether the ablutions are general, as in the biblical tradition, or are part of a more complex set of rituals, as in texts like *ALD*, *Jubilees*, and later, *T. Levi*.

Second, the issue of the priests' sustenance and limited land inheritance is implied at various points. The end of line 2 indicates that the cultic duties of the priest are ongoing, and that the officiants of this service receive a share of the offerings. This resonates with descriptions of the privileges and portions for the priests and Levites outlined in Num 18, Deut 18:1-8, and *Jub.* 13:16. It is intriguing that Greek *T. Levi* endorses this aspect of the priestly inheritance in both of Levi's dream-visions (*T. Levi* 2:12; 8:16). It is also possible that *4QTIacob?* refers to the priests' rights to some outlying pasture lands surrounding urban centres. Mention of "the structu[re (בנין)]", "the city (קריתא)", and "its walls (שוריהא)" in lines 1 and 3 indicates that this component

⁵⁸ DJD XXXI, 182.

⁵⁹ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 269-70.

⁶⁰ Cf. Num 8:6, 7, 15, 21; Ezra 6:20; and Neh 12:30.

of the episode envisages an urban location. Line 5 references what DiTomasso has described as “a land measurement whose referent might be a feature of the city or the territory immediately outside the pale.”⁶¹ In light of the priestly context of the fragment, Puech suggested that line 5 “semble faire allusion à la tribu de Lévi et à sa part dans le pays comme tribu consacrée au culte divin au sanctuaire central de Jérusalem.”⁶² If this is the case, then 4Q537 12 5 should be interpreted in light of Num 35:1-5 (cf. Deut 12:12; Josh 21), which prescribes that the tribes of Israel are to reserve some towns, with their rural environs, for the Levites’ use.⁶³ This implies that *4Q7Jacob?*’s priestly outlook included a visionary affirmation of the earthly priests’ provision through the sacerdotal system and territorial allotment of suburban pasture lands.

Third, the visionary context of this fragment begs the question of where *4Q7Jacob?* locates the city and its temple in time and space. Like *NJ*, the city is never named, although it is hard to imagine a location other than Jerusalem. Since this work is most likely a patriarchal pseudepigraph, from a narrative standpoint any reference to the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood is necessarily future-oriented. Grammatically, the fragment is narrated by recurring future-oriented verbs, either Imperfect forms of הִיָּה or periphrastic constructions in the form of an Imperfect הִיָּה verb + a participle.⁶⁴ Therefore, in 4Q537 12 the seer is shown or told how the temple *will be* and how its priests *will*

⁶¹ DiTomasso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 165.

⁶² DJD XXXI, 182.

⁶³ On this passage, see Jacob Milgrom, “The Levitic Town: An Exercise in Town Planning,” *JJS* 33 (1982; *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*; eds. Geza Vermes and Jacob Neusner): 185-88.

⁶⁴ Muraoka proposed that this style of periphrastic construction “does not mark time only” but “appears to be well suited for injunctions of permanent validity” (*A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, 177-78). Muraoka cites 4Q537 12 1 (“they will be wearing [לְבִשׁוֹן לְהוֹן]”) as an example of this usage (*ibid.*, 178).

function. The question then becomes, how far into the future is this seer looking? Does *4QTTJacob?* envisage the Solomonic, Second, or eschatological temple? If it is either the Solomonic or Second temple, from an ancient reader's perspective the dream-vision would provide a divine endorsement of Israel's historic priesthoods and temple(s) in Jerusalem. Conversely, if an eschatological city and temple is in view, as is the case in *NJ*, then *4QTTJacob?* has something to say about the trajectory and permanence of these institutions into the eschaton. In light of the fragmentary evidence for this text, however, it seems best to conclude with DiTommaso that it is beyond our grasp to know whether the city is the Jerusalem of history or a 'new' Jerusalem of the future.⁶⁵ The final text of this survey provides a clearer view of the eschatological age and carves out an important place for a priestly figure.

4.2 *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?: envisioning an eschatological priest-savior*

As indicated in Chapter Two, there is some disagreement about the identity of the seer and priestly figure of *4QapocrLevi^b?*. On account of his making atonement (*כפר*) in 4Q541 9 i 2, most agree that the envisaged individual is a priest of some description. For example, before the text was made public, Starcky described its leading man as “une figure eschatologique qui est certainement le grand prêtre de l'ère messianique.”⁶⁶ Shortly after the preliminary publication of this text by Puech,⁶⁷ Brooke commented that “this fragment of 4QTLevi^d [= *4QapocrLevi^b?*] speaks of a priest, possibly the eschatological

⁶⁵ DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 165.

⁶⁶ Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme,” 492.

⁶⁷ Émile Puech, “Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique. 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (eds. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 449-501.

high priest, since his atoning function may be that of a particular Day of Atonement and his teaching and character is so brilliant and far-reaching.”⁶⁸ Apart from this figure’s atoning function, can anything more be said about *4QapocrLevi^b*’s priestly outlook?

Brooke pointed to a small collection of fragmentary phrases elsewhere in the composition that *may* represent the priestly tone of *4QapocrLevi^b*.⁶⁹ These references are often found at the fringes of fragments, making their full content or context unknowable.

First, in 4Q541 2 ii 4 the scribe has corrected the text from “I will bless you (וְאֵבְרִיכָה)”

to “I will bless the burnt offering (וְאֵבְרִיכַ עֹלָה).” Second, the only surviving word in

4Q541 ii 4, דַּמְכָה, if taken as “your blood,” could derive from a cultic context, although,

the pronominal suffix is not easily reconciled with such a reading. Conversely, Puech

⁶⁸ George Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. Martinus C. De Boer; JSNTSup 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 83-100, here 89. For similar evaluations, see Angel, *Eschatological and Otherworldly Priesthood*, 77; Collins, “Asking for the Meaning;” idem, *The Scepter and the Star*, 89; Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 83; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 409; Michael A. Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 165-84; Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 493-94; Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme,” 492; and Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 111.

Puech observed that this is the earliest attestation to the use of *כַּפַּר to denote an individual making human expiation on behalf of others (DJD XXXI, 243). This appears to be the case, but the claim could be nuanced somewhat. Verbal forms of the root *כַּפַּר are found in the context of Jacob’s viewing of the eschatological temple in 2QNJ (2Q24) 8 5, on a small fragment of the Aramaic work *4QpapVision^b* (4Q558) 30 1, as well as in the context of Noah’s atoning for the earth in *1QapGen* (1Q20) X 13. Puech noted that the occurrence of כַּפַּר in the Elephantine papyrus no 37, 14 is damaged (see A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1923], 133-34; Dirk Schwiderski, *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften, Band 2: Texte und Bibliographie* [FoSub 2; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004], 6-7; *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften, Band 1: Konkordanz* [FoSub 4; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008], 413). This letter is indeed fragmentary, but it seems that the verb is functioning in a legal sense (i.e., “to pardon/compensate”). It is possible that the root is also found in a sacrificial context in and Idumean Ostracon (IdOstr-En:118 [4]), though this text is also fragmentary (ibid., 217).

⁶⁹ Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi,” 94-95.

indicated that this form could be taken as a suffixed participle from the root דמך (“to sleep”).⁷⁰ Third, while partially contingent upon a reconstruction, it is possible that 4Q541 4 ii 6 contains the phrase “from the tem[ple (מן היבלא)].” Brooke is at least open to this suggestion and observed that temple rebuilding may be found in *4QapocrLevi*^a? (4Q540) 1 5.⁷¹ Fourth, it is possible that 4Q541 9 ii 5 contains a reference to sacrificial animals. The line begins with the words דכרין שבעא, which may be taken as either “seven males” or “seven rams.” Seven rams are commonly featured in sacrificial contexts in the Hebrew Scriptures (cf. Num 23:1; 1 Chr 15:26; 2 Chr 13:9; 29:21; Job 42:8; and Ezek 45:23).⁷² Brooke suggested that this may be akin to *ALD*’s sacerdotal discussion, “where what needs to be added to sacrifice is described.” Conversely, both Brooke and Puech note that Levi’s second dream-vision in the Greek *T. Levi* 8:2 features “seven men in white clothing (ἐπτά ἀνθρώπους ἐν ἐσθήτι λευκῇ).”⁷³ In all of these cases, there is not enough surviving text to discern how these potential priestly themes are functioning, but collectively they suggest the broader priestly tenor of this work.

The final potential reference to a priestly topic in *4QapocrLevi*^b? has been widely debated. The text in question is the initial phrase of 4Q541 24 ii 5, which reads וצצא אל תִּקְרוֹב. At issue is how to take the word צצא. Puech understood this form as a noun

⁷⁰ DJD XXXI, 236.

⁷¹ Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi,” 95. In that fragmentary text the holy place is called a מקדשא.

⁷² DJD XXXI, 244. The only other reference to a “ram (דכר)” as a sacrificial animal in the Aramaic corpus is in Tob 7:9 (*4QTob*^b [4Q197] 4 iii 10). Cf. also the not easily contextualized reference לדכר (“to a ram/male”) in *4QVisAmram*^a (4Q543 16 1). The “ram (דכר)” is also featured in the cast of symbolic actors in *AnAp* (cf. *4QEn*^d [4Q205] 2 i 26, 29; and *4QEn*^e [4Q206] 4 ii 16).

⁷³ Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi,” 88; DJD XXXI, 244.

meaning “nail,” which he interpreted as a reference to the crucifixion of a suffering salvific figure (hence his translation, “et de *clou* n’approche pas de lui”).⁷⁴ Collins criticized the insufficiency of the lexical gloss “nail,” since this meaning is “unknown in Eastern Aramaic, and is translated on the basis of its Syriac usage.”⁷⁵ Furthermore, it is now clear that the syntax of the line references actions that should be avoided, not of an action that has been committed against someone.⁷⁶ For Knibb, these problems are insurmountable, leading him to conclude that “the idea of crucifixion seems alien to the passage.”⁷⁷ These issues compel us to seek other meanings for אצצ.

While Puech strongly favored a reading that allowed for crucifixion imagery, he also entertained the possibility that אצצ is a defective form of אציצ, meaning “diadem,” perhaps referencing a priestly headpiece. In the end, he quickly dismissed this option on account of the orthographic profile of the manuscript.⁷⁸ Beyer, however, did take this word as a reference to “das Stirndiadem (des Hohenpriesters).”⁷⁹ This understanding is backed by biblical usage of the Hebrew word ציץ in Exod 28:36; 39:30; and Lev 8:9, which refers to the inscribed portion of the high priestly head piece. In these verses the Targumim uniformly translate the Hebrew with the Aramaic form אציצ.⁸⁰ If this

⁷⁴ Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 477-78, 496-98; DJD XXXI, 214, 253.

⁷⁵ Collins, “Asking for the Meaning,” 585.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 585, 588; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 114.

⁷⁷ Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha,” 184.

⁷⁸ Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 477; DJD XXXI, 255.

⁷⁹ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*, 112. Angel also enters this as a good possibility (*Eschatological and Otherworldly Priesthood*, 79, n. 241).

⁸⁰ In addition to these, Sokoloff cites the phrase “he swore to the head plate (אישתבע לציצא)” in *Shir ha-Shirim Rabba* 38c (Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine*

identification is accepted for 4Q541, Cook initially posited that “the meaning of ‘...and the frontlet, do not touch it,’ [in 4Q541 24 ii 5] may be a warning against aspiring to the authority of the high priesthood; or it may be an exhortation to respect the holiness of the name of God which was written on the frontlet (Jos. *Ant.* 3.178).”⁸¹ He discards these explanations, however, in favor of understanding **צצ** as a reference to a “magical amulet or lamella,” as in *Sefer ha-Razim* 1:35; 6:30 (cf. *Tg. Ps.-J.* at Gen 31:19), suggesting that 4Q541 24 ii 5 warns “against involvement in idolatrous magic.”⁸² While this proposal is creative, it does not adequately account for the priestly background of the analogous Hebrew term in Leviticus. More problematic for Cook’s proposal is a Jewish amulet from the 2nd-5th centuries CE that invokes power “by the head plate of Aaron (**בציצה דאהרן**)” *within* an apotropaic incantation.⁸³ As such, our understanding of **צצ** in 4Q541 24 ii 5 should take into account the priestly language scattered elsewhere throughout the fragments of this Aramaic work. 4Q541 24 ii 5 most likely refers to the high priestly headpiece, though the precise nature of its warning is unclear in the fragmentary text.

Period [Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002], 464).

Note also that a “diadem (**διάδημα**)” is bestowed on Levi in his second dream-vision in *T. Levi* 8:10.

⁸¹ Cook, “4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered,” 17.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ This amulet is cited by Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, 464. In the original publication of this text, Montgomery stated that “[t]he **ציצה** is the biblical **צִיץ**, the plate of gold on the high priest’s mitre, e.g. Lev 8 9” (J. A. Montgomery, “Some Early Amulets from Palestine,” *JAOS* 31 [1911]: 272-281, here 275).

5 *Summary of findings*

The cluster of Aramaic dream-vision texts discussed in this chapter evidenced how various types of priestly interests surfaced in pseudepigraphs attributed to the forefathers of the Israelite priesthood. One of the major strands of this priestly thought in *ALD* and *4QVisAmram* was the articulation of the early genealogy of the priesthood. Taken together, these two Aramaic texts establish a stable priestly lineage that spans seven generations, from Abraham to Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Qahat, Amram, and Aaron. One implication of this genealogy is that the priesthood is neither subordinated to, nor originates from, a Sinaitic legal system that included a sacerdotal cult; rather, the priesthood was a central Israelite institution that is as old as the (pre-Mosaic) founding fathers. In the foregoing chapter it was established that Levi's priestly election and covenant in *ALD* were rooted in exegesis. In the present chapter it was detected that *ALD* alludes to Qahat's election to the priesthood for a future generation. This provided a paradigm for *4QVisAmram*'s inclusion of Amram in the priestly lineage, and the election of his son Aaron to a perpetual priesthood like his great-grandfather Levi. This was achieved in part by the use of common priestly language to describe Levi and Aaron. In these two texts the priesthoods of Levi and Aaron are also drawn into close association and continuity with the heavenly priesthood. For *4QVisAmram* I argued that this connection was established in part by the influence of the typology between Levi and Melchizedek in *ALD*, but, more significantly, by positioning Melchizedek as the celestial agent who endorsed Aaron's eternal priesthood. By virtue of the earthly line's close connection to the celestial order it seems that *4QVisAmram* also understood priestly

duties as a ‘mystery,’ insofar as the priests manage the channel of interaction between human and the divine realms. In these ways, some priestly dream-vision texts of the Aramaic corpus articulate how the priesthood was much more than a religious institution whose services were limited to the earthly, historical plane.

While these Aramaic texts emphasize the antiquarian origins and otherworldly significance of the priestly line, they also made bold claims regarding the eschatological importance of the priesthood. *ALD* and *4QVisAmram* espoused the eternality of the priesthood. *NJ*, *4QapocrLevi^b?*, and possibly *4QTJacob?*, gave priestly figures different roles in their eschatological outlooks. Of course, the full shape of the eschatological scenarios offered by these last three texts cannot be known, and it would be inadvisable to conflate them. Despite such caveats, a common current running through these works is the inclusion of a priestly agent and/or cultic activity in the eschatological scenario. All such knowledge was disclosed through dream-visions. With respect to the eschatological temple cult, I singled out *NJ* for its visionary display of sacerdotal halakhah as well as its contribution to our understanding of the exegetical enterprise of articulating the specifics of the sacrificial process. *NJ* is an important example of how the authoritative endorsement of a dream-vision supported a precise understanding of cultic praxis in the eschatological temple, which, presumably, carries on the traditions of historical Israel’s cultic centre. This outlook from the past to the eschaton provides a convenient segue into the last chapter of the dissertation, which explores the concentration of historiographically oriented dream-visions in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCLOSING THE COURSE AND CONFIGURATION OF HISTORY THROUGH DREAM-VISION REVELATION

1 Introduction

Our final look at the Aramaic dream-visions focuses on what is arguably their most pervasive usage in the corpus. *Ex eventu* dream-visions that dovetail the past, present, and future into a coherent, unfolding series of events permeate the Aramaic Scrolls. This trait rests on a simple epistemological presupposition: there is an expansive divine plan for human history from start to finish. What is needed is a means of accessing this plan. Through special revelation, knowledge of the course and configuration of history is attainable. In relating this privileged information, then, authors engage in a type of historiography. Through symbolic and dramatic depictions they selectively order and evaluate aspects of the timeline from the antediluvian days to the eschatological culmination of history. Brooke has preliminarily explored the forms of historiography attested in the Qumran collection; however, he did not account for how these Aramaic visionary historiographies portend history.¹ Over the years, a number of scholars have

¹ George J. Brooke, "Types of Historiography in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography; l'Historiographie Biblique, Ancienne et Moderne* (eds. George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer; BETL 207; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007), 211-30. Brooke observed that narrative historiographies are limited to the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic histories (*ibid.*, 212-16). For a primer on current issues in historiography in the Hebrew Scriptures, see Ehud Ben Zvi, "General Observations on Ancient Israelite Histories in their Ancient Contexts," in *Enquire of the Former Age: Ancient Historiography and Writing the History of Israel* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe; European Seminar in Historical Methodology 9; LHB/OTS 554; London: T & T Clark, 2011), 21-39. *1-2 Maccabees* is the primary exemplar of this sort of historiography in the Second Temple (see H. W. Attridge, "Historiography," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* [ed. Michael E. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], 157-84, esp. 171-83). Alternatively, Brooke proposed three non-narrative forms of historiography in sectarian literature (history writing as exhortation, prophesied history, and periodized history) and six forms among non-sectarian writings (the historical novel, rewritten

underscored the centrality of historically-oriented revelations to apocalyptic literature.²

More recently, this aspect has been a point in ongoing discussions of ‘apocalyptic historiography.’ DiTommaso has remarked that

[r]ather than serving to express the mythic aspect of apocalyptic eschatology, the historical data in these texts [i.e., historical apocalyptic literature] operate as elements of an underlying and pervasive *apocalyptic historiography* ... [which] refers to the intellectual construct characteristic to historical apocalypica by which data about the past, present, and future are selected and arranged. These tasks, of course, are common to histories *qua* histories...³

This form of historiography aims to “make sense of history” as it is divinely purposed and progresses towards its inevitable eschatological consummation.⁴ Likewise, Stone has observed that “[i]t is the apocalyptic literature that first strives to embrace the whole span

scriptural texts, periodized history, historical acts, liturgical history, listed history) (“Types of Historiography,” 216-30). The question of history and historiography in Scrolls studies has focused largely on the immediate social, political, and religious historical worlds inhabited by the Qumranites. For a recent discussion of methodological considerations for extracting such data from the Scrolls, see Hayim Lapin, “Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 108-27. Geza Vermes’ “Historiographical Elements in the Qumran Writings: A Synopsis of the Textual Evidence,” *JJS* 48 (2007): 121-39 provides a handy reference for exploring the ways in which historical personages feature in the Qumran collection.

² The ‘historical’ apocalypse was proposed as a subtype of the genre of the apocalypse in John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (ed. John J. Collins; *Semeia* 14; Missoula, Mon.: Scholars Press, 1979), 1-19. Around this time G. I. Davies (“Apocalyptic and Historiography,” *JSOT* 5 [1978]: 15-28), Martin Hengel (see section on “The Universal Picture of History in Early Apocalyptic,” in *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* [vol. 1; London: SCM Press, 1974], 181-96), and Carol Newsom (“The Past as Revelation: History in Apocalyptic Literature,” *QR* 4 [1984]: 40-53) drew attention to some different ways in which the Enochic and Danielic apocalypses cast an eye to the past in their prophecies of the future. Years before these studies, Martin Noth conducted a basic study of some historiographical qualities of the book of Daniel (“The Understanding of History in Old Testament Apocalyptic” in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* [trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas; Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967], 194-214).

³ Lorenzo DiTommaso, “History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo,” *VT* 56 (2006): 413-18, here 415, italics original. DiTommaso coined this terminology in “4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-b} (4Q243-4Q244),” 115-24, and developed its theoretical framework more fully in “The Development of Apocalyptic Historiography in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection* (eds. Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek; SBLEJL 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 487-522.

⁴ Idem, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II),” *CBR* 5 (2007): 367-432, here 389.

of time, to comprehend the overall structure of history in a pattern from the beginning to the eschaton.”⁵

In addition to the already documented examples of this phenomenon in Aramaic Daniel and *1 Enoch*, there are a number of historiographically oriented dream-visions in other Aramaic writings.⁶ The task of this chapter is to describe *what* aspects of history are presented in dream-visions (i.e., what episodes or epochs of the past, present, or future are reported) and *how* this information is packaged (i.e., how is this data selected, configured, and encoded). I will begin with a treatment of the Enochic ‘Apocalypse of Weeks’ (*ApW*), which provides a selective yet comprehensive view of history from creation to the eschaton. Following this, I will consider two works that use the flood as a departure point for their historical presentations. *BG*, while not foretelling events of world history in the traditional

⁵ Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 60. The notion of apocalyptic historiography is also discussed briefly by Doron Mendels (“Historiography,” *EDEJ*, 743-47), although apart from *ApW*, *AnAp*, and Dan 7, the Aramaic Scrolls are glossed over. While not using the same terminology, Portier-Young has shown that the apocalypses in Daniel and *1 Enoch* revert to historical frameworks “as a means of revealing the contingency of present realities” (Anathea E. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 13). Prior to the availability of much of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus, Hall conducted a broad study on historical revelation in writings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (R. G. Hall, *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* [JSPSup 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991]). Likewise, Frölich’s study picked up on some aspects of visionary historiographical traditions in the Aramaic sections of Daniel and *1 Enoch* (Ida Frölich, ‘Time and Times and Half a Time’: *Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* [JSPSup 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996]). At the time of Hall’s and Frölich’s writing, much of the Aramaic corpus remained unpublished and could not be considered. The rising wave of research on the historiographical qualities of apocalyptic literature shows that Rappaport’s low view of the apocalypses’ use of historical reviews as a manipulative tool should not be accepted (U. Rappaport, “Apocalyptic Vision and Preservation of Historical Memory,” *JSJ* 23 [1992]: 217-26). This is not to say that we can derive historical information from every revelatory account. For example, Hilbert stretches the idea of revelatory history nearly to its breaking point when he argues that Joseph’s dream-visions in Gen 37 foretell and prefigure a broad scope of Israelite history (Benjamin D. H. Hilbert, “Joseph’s Dreams, Part One: From Abimelech to Saul,” *JSOT* 35 [2011]: 259-83; idem, “Joseph’s Dreams, Part Two: From Saul to Solomon,” *JSOT* 35 [2011]: 435-461).

⁶ Naturally, this topic has implications for how we understand the formation of the apocalypse as a genre in ancient Judaism. Indeed, some of the texts treated below are measure up well even to the *Semeia* 14 definition of the apocalypse. Others are apocalyptically oriented. Still others are too fragmentary to determine their genre with certainty. Entering into this discussion, however, at this point of the study could easily lead us off course. For this reason, I will table this important issue until the close of the dissertation.

sense, forecasts the imminent and eschatological future by way of an *Urzeit und Endzeit* typology. Likewise, Noah's dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XII 19-XV 21 begins with a symbolic retrospective of the flood and proceeds with an episodic forecast of historical events culminating in the eschaton. The final two sections of the chapter assess configurations of history on the world stage in Dan 2 and 7 and *4QFourKgdms*, on the one hand, and *4QAramApoc* and *NJ*, on the other.

2 *The scope and structure of human history in the 'Apocalypse of Weeks'*

The most extensive historiographical presentations in the Aramaic corpus are the so-called 'Apocalypse of Weeks' (*ApW*; *1 En.* 93:1-10; 91:11-17) and the 'Animal Apocalypse' (*AnAp*; *1 En.* 85-90) of *1 Enoch*. There are a number of analogies between the historiographical perspectives of this pair. Both provide panoramic views of *all* of human history, which is made possible through visionary revelation (*1 En.* 85:1; 93:2). As indicated in Chapter Two, the distinguishing feature of *AnAp* is the presentation of history using allegory and symbolism. Despite this unique portrayal, however, Tiller has remarked that *ApW* and *AnAp* "include almost exactly the same events in their histories of the world from beginning to end."⁷ In addition to the close correspondence in contents, both works structure and divide history into historical epochs. Hall pointed out that the clearest indicator of this in *AnAp* is Enoch's concluding statement that "everything will come to pass and be fulfilled, and every deed of humanity was shown to me *in its order*"

⁷ Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 97. For a useful comparison between the content of the two apocalypses, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 398.

(*1 En.* 90:41).⁸ In conversation with one another, Tiller and Nickelsburg have proposed that *AnAp*'s history is divided into three basic periods, suggesting some structural understanding of history.⁹ This division of history is slightly less developed than that of *ApW*, which, as will be demonstrated below, relies on some recurring Aramaic phrases in combination with a measured chronology. Another commonality between the two is that the focal point of the historical drama is undoubtedly the authors' present day, which is understood as being on the brink of the eschatological phase of history. In these ways, the Enochic visionary historiographies exhibit closely paralleled understandings of the configuration, contents, and course of history. Because *ApW* is the shorter and more manageable of the two accounts, I will use it as my main example of the historiographical function of the dream-vision in the Enochic tradition.

As is the case in all of the historiographical dream-visions in the Aramaic Scrolls, *ApW* presents itself as a historical preview from the distant past.¹⁰ This historiography, however, ultimately derives from divine records. In the *Epistle* the motif of celestial

⁸ Hall, *Revealed Histories*, 64, n. 1. Tiller commented that "[t]he correct meaning seems to be that each event was shown to Enoch in its respective place in the foreordained course of history" (*A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse*, 391).

⁹ I say 'in conversation' because Tiller's comments are based on an earlier draft of Nickelsburg's Hermeneia commentary. Tiller, citing Nickelsburg, notes that the three ages are marked out by the ascendancy of a white bull representing a righteous figure (*ibid.*, 15). This would correspond with *1 En.* 85:3; 89:9; and 90:37. For Tiller, the three ages are "the remote past, the present, and the ideal future" (*ibid.*). This structural division is apparently adjusted in the published version of Nickelsburg's work. There he divides the historical presentation into three major eras: creation to the flood (*1 En.* 85:3-89:8); renewal of creation to the great judgment (*1 En.* 89:9-90:27); and second renewal into an open future (*1 En.* 90:28-38) (*1 Enoch 1*, 354).

¹⁰ As Oßwald remarked, in apocalyptic literature in particular "Das Problem der *vaticinia ex eventu* kann nicht isoliert vom Problem der Pseudonymität betrachtet werden" (Eva Oßwald, "Zum Problem der *vaticinia ex eventu*," *ZAW* 34 [1963]: 27-44, here 34).

tablets is exclusively linked with the revelation of historical details (cf. *1 En.* 103:2;

106:19).¹¹ At the outset of his discourse in *ApW*, Enoch relates,

I myself, Enoch, was sho[wn everything in a vision of heaven and from] the words of the watchers and holy ones I know everything. [And in the tablets of heaven I] re[ad and understo]od[everythi]ng (אנה הוא חנוך אחזי[ת] אנה כלא בחזית) (שמין ומן) ממר עיריין וקדשין אנה כלא ידעת [ובלוחת שמיא אנה כל] אקר[ית ואתבוננ]ת (*4QEn*^s [4Q212] 1 iii 20-22; *1 En.* 93:2).

Nickelsburg concluded that this statement likely refers back to *1 En.* 81:2, where Enoch is said to have read tablets of the deeds of humanity.¹² This motif gives the impression that history is predetermined and that true knowledge of its course can only be achieved through privileged revelation. Taken together, the use of a patriarchal voice, claim to visionary revelation, and knowledge of heavenly records lend the historiographical presentation authority and veracity.

The perspective Enoch offers on history is selective and schematized. Human history is parceled out into ten sequential periods.¹³ Each unit of time is described as a

¹¹ The notion of divine legers of various sorts is well-represented in the Hebrew Scriptures, literatures of the ancient Near East, as well as in the writings of early Judaism and Christianity. In the Hebrew Scriptures, cf. Exod 32:32-44; Jer 17:13; Mal 3:16; Ps 87:6; and 139:16. VanderKam pointed to the intriguing case of Hab 2:2-3, where the prophet is commanded to inscribe his dream-vision of future events onto a tablet (*Enoch and the Growth*, 152). Heavenly records are referenced three times in the book of Daniel (Dan 7:10; 10:21; 12:1). The Hebrew Scrolls also offered up some additional mentions of heavenly writings (*IQH*^a XIX 25-26; *4QAgasCreat A* [4Q180] 1 3; *4QDibHam*^a [4Q504] XIX 15). For references to otherworldly writings or tablets in Aramaic dream-vision texts, see Chapter Two. Perhaps more than any other ancient Jewish writing, the book of *Jubilees* locates various sorts of knowledge in celestial tablets (see Florentino García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* [eds. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997], 243-60). For uses of this motif in other ancient literatures, see R. Eppel, “Les tables de la loi et les tables celestes,” *RHPR* 17 (1937): 401-12; and Shalom M. Paul, “Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,” *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 345-53.

¹² Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 360, 442.

¹³ Collins has observed that the periodization of history into ten chronological units becomes something of a common fixture in apocalyptic texts (John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* [2nd ed.; The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids:

“week.” This aspect of *ApW*’s historiographical presentation has been described as a “Sabbatical structure,” since in various ways the historical presentation centres on the number seven.¹⁴ This configuration of history is manifested on both the macro and micro structure of the presentation. Significant events and individuals are placed at the close of a given week of history, on the Sabbath as it were. This is most evident in two details reported in the first and tenth week respectively. In *1 En.* 93:3 Enoch states he was born seventh from Adam; in *1 En.* 91:5 the judgment of the watchers occurs in the seventh part of the week.¹⁵ There are also some refrains that contribute to this emphasis on the level of the Aramaic phrasing. For example, the righteous elect will be chosen “at the end (ועם סופה)” of the week (*4QEn*^s [4Q212] iv 17 [= *1 En.* 93:10]).¹⁶ A complementary feature marking the close of each week and the announcement of a new one are phrases introduced with the word “after (בתר).” In the Qumran Aramaic Scrolls we benefit from

Eerdmans; Livona, Mich.: Dove Books, 1998], 63). Cf. *Sib. Or.* 1, 2, 4; *11QMelch* (11Q13) II 7; and *4QAgnesCreat A* (4Q180) 2 3. Stuckenbruck responded that “[i]t is hard to determine anything more than a loose connection between the sources, though it is interesting that in these writings the notion of ten eras combines with other schemes” (*1 Enoch 91-108*, 53, n. 97).

¹⁴ See especially, Klaus Koch, “Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (I Hen 93:1-10; 91:11-17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum,” *ZNW* 96 (1983): 403-31. A fragmentary portion of Noah’s first dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) VI 18 references “two weeks (שבועין תריין).” While the context of this phrase is lost, it is intriguing that Noah’s dream-vision precedes the flood, an event that *ApW* places in the second week of history (cf. *1 En.* 93:4).

¹⁵ Licht noted this feature in his study on the symmetry of *ApW*’s historiography (Jacob Licht, “Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran,” *JJS* 16 [1965]: 177-82). See also, VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 374; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 107-108; and Matthias Henze, “The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End Time,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 207-209.

¹⁶ Cf. *1 En.* 93:5-8, 10; and 91:13. Note also the plausible reconstruction of these Aramaic phrases at *4QEn*^s (4Q212) iv 12 (= *1 En.* 93:10), iv 22 (= *1 En.* 93:15) and iv 25 (= *1 En.* 93:17). The precise wording of the formulae at the outset of each week is not always consistent in later witnesses. In light of the Qumran Aramaic evidence, Milik commented that the introductory formulae likely originated in the form “and after that, will arise the *n*th Week” (*The Books of Enoch*, 265; cf. the textual comments on respective verses in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 435-37).

one fully extant example of such a formula in *4QEn*⁸ (4Q212) 1 iv 15 (= *1 En.* 91:12):

“After it will arise an eighth week (ומן בתרה יקום שבוע).”¹⁷ Reid remarked that this

“temporal clause acts as an indication of a new part of the timetable; it is a clear indication of the subdivisions.”¹⁸ These two related features serve as hinges between the individual weeks, drive the historical presentation forward, and accentuate the sabbatical structure of history.

This structure also establishes the critical importance of the events that transpire on the seventh week of human history. It is generally accepted that the seventh week brings the historical telling up to the author’s present day. As Hartman observed, locating the present in a broader historical framework allows the informed reader “to spot his place in the developing drama.”¹⁹ The most plausible historical background for the “perverse generation” referenced in *1 En.* 93:9 is the tension brought about by the openness and endorsement of some Jewish groups to the Hellenising policies of Antiochus IV.²⁰ The juncture at week seven, then, marks the development of Israel’s

¹⁷ Cf. *1 En.* 93:4 (2x) 5-9; 91:12, 14-15, and 17.

¹⁸ Reid, “The Structure,” 194.

¹⁹ Lars Hartman, “The Function of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables,” *NTS* 22 (1976): 1-14, here 1.

²⁰ As VanderKam has convincingly argued, *ApW*’s critique is directed at pockets of Jewish society that enthusiastically supported Hellenising measures in the early days of Antiochus IV’s reign, not the intense persecution that would commence in 167 BCE (*Enoch and the Growth*, 142-49; cf. idem, “Studies in the Apocalypse,” 377). For similar positions, see Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 288; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 92; and Michael A. Knibb, “The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids Eerdmans, 2005), 213-219, esp. 217. Stuckenbruck concurred but proposed a more specific background incident in Jason’s early efforts to Hellenize Jerusalem (*1 Enoch 91-108*, 62). Attempts to read *ApW* against the background of the Antiochene religious persecution require more implicit references. See, for example, Klaus Koch, “History as a Battlefield of Two Antagonistic Powers in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Rule of the Community,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids Eerdmans, 2005), 185-99; Andreas Bedenbender, “Reflection on Ideology and Date of the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten*

national history into a group-specific history. One of the key ways that these two components are merged in *ApW* is by demonstrating how the past prefigures the present and prognosticates the future. This is achieved by highlighting cycles of apostasy and iniquity in Israel's past that resulted in the election of a righteous few. As Nickelsburg has summarized, "[w]eeks 2, 6, 7 create a paradigm according to which the wicked are judged and the righteous saved" (*1 En.* 93:4, 8, 9).²¹ This paradigm provides assurance that the ascendancy of the chosen in the wayward and iniquitous era described in *1 En.* 93:5 is in accord with the divinely determined pattern of history. In *ApW*, therefore, we find a historiographical principle at work that reflects a broader trend for revealed histories observed by Hall: "[p]atterns echoing the present are revealed in the past so that what happens in the past can serve as a model for what happens in the present and future."²²

3 *The flood in historical retrospect and prospect*

Unlike the expansive presentations of history in *1 Enoch*, the dream-visions embedded within *BG* and *IQapGen* adopt a narrower historical purview. Newsom remarked that apocalyptic histories place events "in the shadow of a great paradigmatic event, an event that transcends human history but which involves the entire cosmos."²³ In *BG* and *IQapGen*, history pivots on the flood. It will be seen that *BG* is strictly concerned with coordinating the flood and eschaton and that *IQapGen* pauses between these to poles to reveal some intervening events. While I will not consider it here because it has

Connection (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 200-203; and Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire*, 316-19.

²¹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 438. Cf. Reid, "The Structure," 195; Henze, "The Apocalypse of Weeks," 209.

²² Hall, *Revealed Histories*, 119.

²³ Newsom, "The Past as Revelation," 43.

not been identified at Qumran, Enoch's first dream-vision at the outset of *BD* implies a similar coordination of imminent judgment and destruction (presumably by the flood) with an eschatological outlook (*I En.* 83-84). If this work did circulate in Aramaic, then there would be additional attestation for this historiographical vantage point in the Aramaic texts.²⁴

3.1 *Urzeit und Endzeit as a historiographical principle in the Book of Giants*

The basic function of dream-visions in *BG* is to communicate that the misdeeds of the giants were neither unnoticed nor will go unpunished. Due to the giants' unnatural human-angelic parentage, their DNA is a double helix of flesh and spirit. As Stuckenbruck has observed, this bifurcated makeup requires a dual judgment.²⁵ Their bodies will be eradicated by the deluge and their surviving spirits will await eventual judgment in the eschaton (cf. *I En.* 16:1). In the course of developing this understanding, the dream-visions of the giants draw together some historiographical perspectives regarding the interrelatedness of the past, present, and future.

The flood is a *leitmotif* throughout the giants' dream-visions. The first prognostication of the flood is found in 'Ohaya's dream-vision referenced in *4QEnGiants^c* (4Q531) 22, but related in *2QEnGiants* (2Q26). The available text for this episode reads as follows:

הִדְיָחוּ לִוְחָא לְמַמְּ[חַק]	1	1]they washed the tablet for was[hing
		(?)
וּסְלָקוּ מִיָּא עֵלָא מִן [לִוְ]חָא]	2	2]and the water went over the [tab]let[

²⁴ For brief comment on this episode, see page 25, n. 8.

²⁵ Stuckenbruck, "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1-4," 365; *The Book of Giants from Qumran*, 160.

<p>3] ... and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet that[</p>	<p>3] ... and they lifted the tablet from the water, the tablet that[</p>
<p>4] ... []to them all ...[</p>	<p>4] ... []to them all ...[</p>

This fragmentary dream-vision may be illumined by the rabbinic tradition that Milik dubbed the *Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael*.²⁶ There the two brothers Heyah and Aheya (analogues to the giant brothers in *BG*) have dream-visions. Aheya dreams of an inscribed stone, the contents of which were effaced by an angel, leaving but four words undamaged. Various scholars have remarked that the parallel imagery suggests that the dream-vision in the *Midrash* derives in some way from *BG*.²⁷ Based on this it seems that *2QEnGiants* featured the rinsing of an inscribed tablet, presumably leaving only four words/lines intact. Both texts, then, presumably foretell the giants' death in the deluge by envisaging only four survivors: Noah and his three sons.

The connection between the recent past and the flood in the near future is more clearly established in Hahya's dream-vision, the first episode in the *Doppelträume* sequence of *4QEnGiants*^b (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 6-12 (underlined text from *6QpapGiants* [6Q8] 3 +2; additional text reconstructed by Puech):

<p>6 נפיליא] ואמר ההיה גברוא אנה ב[חלמי חוית חזא בליליא דן [הא]</p>	<p>6 נפיליא] ואמר ההיה גברוא אנה ב[חלמי חוית חזא בליליא דן [הא]</p>
<p>7 [גנתה רבה הות נציבה בכל מיני עעין ו[ל]ה [הוא גננין והוא משקיין</p>	<p>7 [גנתה רבה הות נציבה בכל מיני עעין ו[ל]ה [הוא גננין והוא משקיין</p>
<p>8 [כל עע בגנתה דא כל יומין(?) ושר[שין רברבין נפקו מן עקרה[ו]</p>	<p>8 [כל עע בגנתה דא כל יומין(?) ושר[שין רברבין נפקו מן עקרה[ו]</p>
<p>9 [ומן עע חד נפקו תלתת שרשהי חזא [הוית עד די לשנין די נור מן</p>	<p>9 [ומן עע חד נפקו תלתת שרשהי חזא [הוית עד די לשנין די נור מן</p>
<p>10 [שמין נחתו חזא הוית עד די אתבסי עפ[רא בכל מיא ונורא דלק בכל</p>	<p>10 [שמין נחתו חזא הוית עד די אתבסי עפ[רא בכל מיא ונורא דלק בכל</p>

²⁶ For text, translation, and discussion on this source, see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 321-39.

²⁷ There exists a general consensus on this correlation, though with some differences of opinion on the nature of symbolism featured in Qumran *BG*. See Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 324; García-Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 101; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 84; Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 64-66; DJD XXXVI, 73-75; and Goff, "Gilgamesh the Giant," 247-48.

[עעי פרדסא דן בלה ולא דלק בעעא ושרשוהי ב] ארעא כד'י היא (?) הות] 11

[מתאבדה בלשנין די נור ובמיא די מבול] א עד כא סוף חלמא vacat 12

- 6 the Nephilin. [And Hahya the giant said, “In] my dream [I] was looking in this night, [behold]
- 7 [a great garden was being planted with every kind of wood. And it] had gardeners and they were watering
- 8 [all the wood of this garden, all days. And] great [ro]ots came out from the stum[p]s.
- 9 [And from one wood came out three shoots.] I was [looking] until tongues of fire from
- 10 [heaven came down. I was looking until du]st [covered] over all the water and fire burned in all
- 11 [the wood of this paradise, all of it. But the wood and its shoots did not burn in] the earth whe[n it was]
- 12 [destroyed by tongues of fire and by the water of] the [flood.] Thus, here ends the dream. vacat

The episode opens with gardeners “watering (משקיז)” stumps, out of which roots sprout (lines 7-8). As Stuckenbruck has observed, “[t]he ‘watering’ activity is hence a metaphor for impregnation and the ‘gardeners’ represent the Watchers.”²⁸ Following this euphemistic reference, Hahya beholds a scene of universal destruction which is evaded by a single tree. This serves as a symbolic reference for Noah and his sons, which is a reframing of the symbolism of ’Ohaya’s dream-vision in *4QEnGiants*^c.²⁹ This scene is also informative for Noah’s historically oriented dream-vision in *1QapGen* (see below).

In the context of *BG*, the opening imagery that cryptically depicts the errant watchers and

²⁸ Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 114. In this detail *BG* shares a common vantage point with Noah’s dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) VI 11-VII 6: both episodes review aspects of the watchers myth after the events had already taken place. Milik correlated this imagery with the beneficent angels (i.e., “shepherds”) in *AnAp* (*Books of Enoch*, 304). Reeves understood the imagery in *BG* as a reference to the Watchers’ initial task of instructing humans on proper moral conduct, as in *Jub.* 4:15 (*Jewish Lore*, 95-96). However, in the *BG* traditions at our disposal there is no reference or allusion to the watchers’ divine dispatching for human benefit.

²⁹ Puech, “Les songes,” 23.

birth of the giants flows directly into a foretelling of the destruction by the deluge. The immediate past and imminent future are dovetailed.³⁰

The historiographical outlook of *BG* takes on a new dynamic in 'Ohaya's dream-vision, which completes the *Doppelträume* sequence in *4QEnGiants^b* (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 16-20. In this revelation he now learns of the dire consequences of the giants' ravenous behavior that awaits them in the distant future. The episode reads as follows:

16 אנה חזית בחלמי בליליא דן גברוא [ה]א שלטן שמיא לארעא נחת
17 וברסון יחיתו וקדישא רבא ית[ב מאה מ]אין לה משמשין אלף אלפין לה
18 [סגדין כ]ל[ק] דמוהי הוא קאמין וארו[?] [ספ]רין פתיחו ודין אמיר ודין
19 [רבא בכתב כ]תיב וברושם רשים ו[מלך רבא] על כל היא וברסרא ועל
20 [כל די שלי]טין עד כה סוף חלמא]

- 16 I looked in my dream in this night, O giants. []Behold! The rulers of heaven descended to the earth
17 and thrones were set up and the great Holy One sa[t. A hundred h]undreds were serving him; a thousand thousands [worshipped] him.
18 [Al]l were standing [be]fore him. And behold, [boo]ks were opened and judgment was said.
19 And a [great] judgement was [wr]itten [in a writing] and with signatures (it was) inscribed. And[the great king] over all the living and flesh and over
20 [all rul]ers. Thus, the end of the dream[

In previous dream-visions the giants learned of the judgment of their bodies by the flood. This scene connotes the certitude of the final judgment of their spirits. This gloomy

³⁰ Several scholars have remarked that explanations of the past are an important component of historically oriented visionary and/or apocalyptic revelations. See, for example, Davies, "Apocalyptic and Historiography," 19-22; Machiela, "Genesis Revealed," 214, n. 27; Newsom, "The Past as Revelation," 43; and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 32-33. On a focused level *BG* may be considered another example of this trend.

reality is communicated by way of a throne room judgment scene that has remarkable semblance to those in *1 En.* 14 and *Dan 7*.³¹ The application of this scene in *BG* draws on at least three historiographical principles. First, the course of history is the result of divine determination. The motif of the opening of books in line 18 almost certainly reflects a common understanding in the literature of this period that heaven holds the records of human history. Second, God is not an amanuensis of history as events occur, but is the playwright who pens the historical drama before it takes place. By inscribing the final judgment of the giants into the record books, their punishment is inevitable, written into the final act of history. Third, and most importantly, the two-staged judgment of the giants in the flood and the distant eschaton establishes an *Urzeit und Endzeit* typology. The judgments forecasted are in close parallel and resolve a common evil.³²

³¹ The web of potential relations between this triad of texts has been explained in various ways. Milik favored Danielic priority (*The Books of Enoch*, 205; idem, "Turfan et Qumran," 122). Stokes argued that *1 En.* 14 depended on something like the vision of *Dan 7*, while *BG* and *Dan 7* adapted a common tradition in different ways (Ryan E. Stokes, "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 14, and the Qumran Book of Giants (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship," *DSD* 15 [2008]: 340-58). Both Puech ("Les songes," 21, n. 48) and Eshel ("Possible Sources," 392) suggest that *Dan 7* relied on *BG* or a common source like it. Angel sees both dream-visions in 4Q530 as in some interplay with *Dan 2* and *7* and proposed that *BG* served as a model story for human crisis in the face of oppression (Joseph Angel, "A Paradigmatic Approach to the Qumran Book of Giants" [paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Chicago, 19 November 2012]; idem, "On the Origins and Purpose of the Qumran *Book of Giants*," forthcoming). Stuckenbruck demonstrated that *BG* is structurally and theologically less complex than *Dan 7*, making it more likely that the latter drew upon and added to the *BG* tradition (Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* [eds. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997], 211-20; idem, "The Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor, 2006], 101-30). Trotter argued that all three texts drew on a common fund of oral traditions (Jonathan R. Trotter, "The Tradition of the Throne Vision in the Second Temple Period: Daniel 7:9-10, 1 Enoch 14:18-23, and the Book of Giants (4Q530)," *RevQ* 25 [2012]: 451-66).

³² Stuckenbruck (*The Book of Giants*, 40) and Angel ("On the Origins," 16) have also called attention to this particular aspect of *BG*.

3.2 *The deluge, the lay of the land, and eschatology in 1QapGen XII 19-XV 21*

In Chapter Four it was demonstrated that Noah's dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XII 19-XV 21 was occasioned by creative philological exegesis. Despite its fragmentary nature, one aspect of this dream-vision that is relatively clear is its interest in providing a limited historical outlook. Machiela recognized this quality when he described the episode as comprising an apocalyptic review of history.³³ Precisely which aspects of Noah's past, present, and future are depicted is a matter of some debate. Divergences of opinion stem from the episode's allusive symbolic language. To complicate this situation, the surviving material from the symbolic depiction and its corresponding interpretation scarcely align. Understanding this dream-vision, therefore, requires a 'mirror-reading' of these two fragmentary components as well as the consideration of associated, external traditions.

The first available section of Noah's dream-vision picks up midway through a description of two trees in 1Q20 XIII 7-20.³⁴ This section reads as follows:

7] ◦ [וְאִזְדָּא] א אֲפָ [כְּה לְכוּל]
8] ◦ [אֲעָא] צ [עו] הָ שְׁמִיא וְחִיּוֹת בְּרָא וְ[בְּעִי] רְ אֲדַמָּא וְרַחֵשׁ יְבִישְׁתָּא הֲלֻכִין [] וְ[
9] א [] אֲבֻנִיא וְחֹסְפִיא הוּוּה קֻצִין וְנֹסְבִין לְהוֹן מְנָה חִזָּה הוּיִת לְדַהְבִּיא וְלֻכְסָ [פִי] אֲ
10 לֻכְסָ [] אֲ לְפֻרְזֻלָּא וְלֹאִילְנִיא כּוּלְהוֹן קֻצִין וְנֹסְבִין לְהוֹן מְנָה חִזָּה הוּיִת לְשִׁמְשָׁא וְלִשְׁהֲרָא
11 וְלֻכְכְּבִיא קֻצִין וְנֹסְבִין לְהוֹן מְנָה חִזָּה הוּיִת עַד דִּי אֲסִיפּוּהִי שְׂרַץ אֲרַעָא וְשִׂרַץ מִיא וְסִרְפָּא

³³ Machiela, "Genesis Revealed," 215-16; cf. idem, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 94-96.

³⁴ While the "olive tree (זית)" is the only named tree in this section, the material preceding this reference in lines 8-12 most certainly refers to another tree of some unknown species. This is suggested by the reference to "wood (אֲעָא)" in 1Q20 XIII 8 and the repeated use of the root קֻצַּץ ("to cut") in lines 9-11. In the Aramaic Scrolls this verbal root figures exclusively in visionary contexts of woodcutting (cf. *1QapGen* [1Q20] XIX 15, 16, 17; *4QpapVision*^b [4Q558] 37 ii 3; and Dan 4:11). Schwiderski cites the reference to a קֻצִין/קֻצַּץ ("woodcutter") in an Egyptian document (*Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften, Band 1*, 737; *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften, Band 2*, 174).

	<i>vacat</i>	מִיָּא וּסְף 12
◦[]	וְאֶתְפָּנִית לְמַחֲזָה זִיתָא וְאֵלִי הָא זִיתָא גַּבְר בְּרוּמָה וְשַׁעַן שְׂגִיָּאן בְּבַעֲי עֲנִפִּיאן שְׂגִיָּאן ◦[]	13
י[]	אֲנִי[בָּא] רְבִירָב וְשִׁפִּיר וּמַתְחַזָּה בְּהַן מַתְבוּנָן הוּיָת בִּזִּיתָא דִּן וְאֵרִי הִיא מִשְׁגִּית עֲלוּהִי[]	14
[]	כֹּלְאֵל וְשִׁדִּיאָן קֶשֶׁרֶן בְּהַ וְהוּיָת תַּמָּה עַל זִיתָא דִּן וְעֲלוּהִי שְׂגִי לְחֻדָּא תַּמָּה עֵד דִּי[]	15
[]	[אַרְבַּע] רוּחֵי שְׁמִיָּא נִשְׁבֵּן בְּתַקּוּף וְחִבְלָא בִּזִּיתָא דִּן וּמַעֲנַפֵּן לָהּ וְיִתְבַּרֵּן לָהּ לְקַדְמִין עֲבֵרְתָּ [רוּחַ] מִן	16
	[עֲבַרְתָּ רוּחַ]	17
אֵ[]	◦[] וּמִן אֲנַבְהָ אֵ[]	18
[]	בִּזֵּ אֵ הַדְּבֵל לֵא[]	19
[]	[בִּזֵּ אֲנַבְהָ]	20

- 7 []... and the decree[]...[]you to all
- 8 ...[]the wood []...[bir]ds of the heavens and beasts of the field and [catt]le of the soil and creeping things of the dry ground going []...
- 9 []... the stones and clay *objects* were chopping and taking from it for themselves. I continued watching the gold and the si[lv]er
- 10 ... the iron, and the trees all of them, they were chopping and taking from it for themselves. I continued watching the sun and the moon
- 11 and the stars, chopping and taking from it for themselves. I continued watching until they brought an end to it, the swarming things of the earth and the swarming things of the water.
- 12 And the water ceased, and it ended. *vacat*
- 13 And I turned to see the olive tree. And behold (!), how the olive tree had grown in its height! And *for* many hours, with a bursting of many branches ... []...
- 14 abundant and beautiful fr[uit] and appearing in them. I was thinking over this olive tree, and behold (!), ^{look (!)} the abundant foliage [] ...
- 15 []everything and tying ropes on it. And I was amazed at this olive tree, and I was exceedingly astonished at it until that[]
- 16 [four] winds of heaven blew with strength and power against this olive tree and its branches, even knocking them off. First, [a wind] came from
- 17 ... west. It struck it and made some of its foliage and some of its fruit fall and scattered it to the winds. And after [a wind came] ...
- 18 and a northern wind from[]... and some of its fruit ...[]...
- 19 []...[]

20 []... and its fruit[]

The next block of extant text begins in 1Q20 XIV 4. At this point in the episode, Noah is provided with an explanation of the arboreal imagery. From this it is clear that another tree was depicted after the olive tree. This material is as follows:

[אֲנַבְּ] [ה] תַּתְּבוּנָןְ [א] עֵץ אֲחֻב מְעַנְּ [ג] מִןְ] 4
 [תִּגְּ] 5
 כוּ [ל] נֹפֵי [א] וְכֹל אֲנַבְּ י עֵלָה] 6
 [מֵא רִמֵּ בִּינְּ] [א] נְחֻנָּא ידְעִין הִלִּי] 7
 [] 8
 [וּכְעַן] אֲצֵת וּשְׁמַע אַנְתָּה הוּא אַרְזָא רַבָּא דִּי הוּא קַאם לְקוּבֻלְךָ בַּחֲלֻמְךָ עַל רַאִישׁ טוּרִים] 9
 [וּר] אֲמַתְּ חֲלֻפְתָּא דִּי נַפְקָא מִנָּה וּרַאמָא עַד רִמָּה תִּלְתַּת בְּנִיןְ אֲלֵלֵּ מִיָּא מִןְ] 10
 אֲרַעָא
 [] 11
 [ה] אֲ בַר קְדָמִיָּא כֹּל יוֹמוּהִי לֹא יַפְרֵשׁ מִנְךָ וּבִזְרַע יִתְקַרֵּה שְׁמִיךָ מִן פְּלִגְהָ כִּי [ו] לְבִנְיָןְ אֲ] 12
 [] 13
 [] 14
 [] 15
 [] 16
 פִּיסְ [ג] יָ
 [] 17
 [] 18
 [א] יָ
 [] 19
 [] 20
 [] 21

4 [its] fruit. You were pondering the [wo]od of the topmost bra[n]ch from
 5 []...
 6 al]l [the] boughs and all the fr[uit] of the foliage
 7 [] ... [] ... [w]e know. Behold!
 8 []... in you take ... [] ... vacat

- 9 [But now,] listen and hear: you are the great cedar that was standing before you in your dream on the peak of the mountains.
- 10 [And] the shoot that [eme]rged and came out from it and grew up to a height *represents* three sons ... water from ... the earth. ...
- 11 [] and that you saw the first shoot clinging to the trunk of the cedar, behold, the one division moved aside, and the wood from it ...
- 12 [Beh]old, the first son, will not separate from you all his days. And among his seed your name will be called. And from his division a[ll] your sons ...
- 13 and in it/him ... the [fi]rst son will come forth as a righteous planting for all ... the day and...[]
- 14 []...standing forever. As you saw the shoot clinging to the tr[un]k of [the cedar]...
- 15 []... and as you saw the branch of the next/last shoot that ... from it ...[]...[]
- 16 [] *vacat* ... from the dark and some of the tips of their bough entered into the midst of the first bough *represents* two sons ... bran[ch]es
- 17 []... one to the south of the earth and one to the north of the earth. As you saw some of the tips of their bough entering into the midst of the first bough
- 18 []...of this shoot dwelling in his land and all the coastlands ... to the Great Sea and not []...they [s]ettled in the midst of the [coast]lands
- 19 []...[]to understand the mystery, there will be an end for you ... it/you will scatter ... water that ... []
- 20 []...[]and the mystery ...[]... entered into it and [the] first ... to it/him every god that ... []
- 21 []... to it/him ... in an allotment in Amania alongside Elam ... the [Gr]eat [S]ea ...[]³⁵

Taken together, these sections comprise symbolic representations of Noah's past, present, and imminent future. The imagery of 1Q20 XIII 7-20 may be taken in one of two

³⁵ I have not included the fragmentary text of line 22. Machiela originally translated and transcribed this material as "...serve; first, exchanging his allotment for an allotment... (𐤇𐤍𐤏𐤍 𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 [] 𐤏𐤏𐤏 [] 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏𐤏)" (*The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 61). However, in a more recent consideration of the text he concludes that this reading is not likely correct (Daniel A. Machiela, "Genesis Apocryphon," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Daniel A. Machiela; vol. 8; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, forthcoming). There are also a few scattered words and characters lower down in the column, none of which add further detail to the account. The last legible word in the column is "[]to the cedar tree[(]𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 [])" in line 27, suggesting that we are missing at least five lines of explanation concerning Noah's representation in the dream-vision.

ways. The first approach understands the three trees as having specific referents in chronological sequence (cf. 1Q20 XIII 13). If this is the case, then Noah's revelation may resemble *4QFourKgdms*, where the seer beheld four trees in successive order (see discussion below). The most pressing question for advocates of this view is the identities of the olive tree and the other tree of an unknown species. White Crawford has proposed that the "olive tree is probably Adam and his offspring, since it is blown down in [col. XIII] line 17."³⁶ However, if the trees do succeed chronologically, this leaves few options for the identity of the first tree. Furthermore, it is unclear why Noah would be a separate tree when the genealogy of Gen 5 establishes that he is part of Adam's family tree, as it were. Extending from White Crawford's proposal, Reynolds suggested that if the olive tree is Adam, the first tree may be identified as the tree of life or the created earth.³⁷ Both of these options are unlikely. Such an understanding would interrupt the nature of the symbolism by either mixing literal and symbolic referents or using one symbol type to represent different sorts of referents. Because of the difficulties of determining the identities of the trees from the internal evidence alone, it is advisable to look to parallel traditions in hopes of illuminating the meaning of the fragmentary text.

A second approach, which can yield more promising results, understands this scene as depicting a forest or garden within which the cedar (i.e., Noah) is the focal point and is likely the only tree given an explicit referent. This understanding benefits from some wider tradition-historical associations in the arboreal dream-visions of 2 *Baruch* and

³⁶ White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 114.

³⁷ Reynolds, *Between Symbolism and Realism*, 218.

BG.³⁸ Eshel called attention to a potential parallel in *2 Bar.* 36-37 wherein Baruch saw a forest that was destroyed by a flood, save for the momentary survival of a cedar, which was then quickly cast down.³⁹ In the subsequent interpretation it is made known that the cedar represents a wicked ruler over Rome (*2 Bar.* 39-40). This text features some symbolic depictions similar to the dream-vision in *1QapGen*, but develops them into a prophecy of geopolitical successions.

Machiela identified a closer parallel to Noah's dream-vision in *4QEnGiants*^b (4Q530) 2 ii + 6 + 7 i + 8-11 + 12 (?) 6-12.⁴⁰ As seen above, Hahya's revelation represented the flood and the continuation of Noah and his sons by featuring a single, surviving tree with three shoots (cf. the analogous imagery of *2QEnGiants* [2Q26]). Viewed from this perspective, the opening scene of Noah's dream-vision served to communicate the comprehensive destruction of the flood. Unfortunately, the identities of the agents of destruction that are cryptically referenced in the fragmentary text of 1Q20 XII 9-11 are unknown. We are also left in the dark concerning the exact meaning of the destruction of the olive tree that follows thereafter in 1Q20 XIII 15-20. One possibility is that the dual images of destruction are intended to mimic the *Doppelträume* motif. Only here, rather than comprise two separate episodes, the same foreboding event (i.e., the flood) is foretold by two mutually confirming scenes of destruction within the same

³⁸ A third dream-vision is also worth noting. Falk has suggested that "[i]t is likely that the vision is related to fragments of a second Noachic apocalypse incorporated into the Book of Parables in garbled form (*1 En.* 65.1-69.1)" (*The Parabiblical Texts*, 78). Falk concluded that the most likely explanation is that both episodes derive from a common source (ibid.). The most significant correlation between these episodes is that Noah is subject to a dream-vision that coordinates the flood and eschaton. Beyond this parallel, however, Noah's dream-vision in *Parables* and here in *1QapGen* do not share any major common themes or language.

³⁹ Eshel, "The Dream Visions," 120-21.

⁴⁰ Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 96-98.

dream-vision. The fragmentary text limits our knowledge of this section of the dream-vision. Lacking more complete manuscript evidence for *IQapGen*, it is advisable to understand this symbolic representation of the past in light of similar dream-visions, not least *BG*, and secondarily, *2 Baruch*.

With the introduction of the cedar tree, Noah's dream-vision shifts focus from a telling of the recent past to a forecast of the near future (1Q20 XIV 4-27). The first shoot that adhered closely to the trunk of the cedar represents Noah's first son, Shem, who is called "a righteous planting (נצבת קושט)" (1Q20 XIV 11, 14). Unlike this natural growth pattern, the boughs of a second shoot unnaturally impose upon those sent forth by the first shoot (1Q20 XIV 16). Reynolds interpreted this as a prophecy of the inappropriate exogamous marriages between the families of Noah's two sons.⁴¹ In light of the interpretation of this aspect of the dream-vision in lines 17-18, it is more likely that this section pertained to improper geographical movements of the sons of Ham. Machiela is likely correct that this material is a prophetic address of "Canaan illegally settling in the inherited lands of Arpachshad" (cf. *Jub.* 9:4; 10:29).⁴² The geographical prognostication of this section is furthered by the phrasing "one to the south of the earth and one to the north of the earth" in line 17. Eshel observed that this foretells "Japheth's inhabitation of Europe, and Ham's of Africa, as later described in the division of the world (cols. 16-

⁴¹ Reynolds, *Between Symbolism and Realism*, 215.

⁴² Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 99. For discussions on cartography and the division of the land in *IQapGen*, see *ibid.*, 105-30; *idem*, "'Each to His Own Inheritance: Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon,'" *DSD* 15 (2008): 50-66; and Esther Eshel, "The *Imago Mundi* of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (eds. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111-31.

17).”⁴³ For our purposes, this aspect of the revelation holds threefold significance: not only does the dream-vision foretell future interactions among people groups, it alleges a divine mandate for the lines drawn between the territories allotted to Noah’s sons in 1Q20 XVI-XVII (cf. III 17), and thus makes a theological statement regarding Israel’s legitimate claim on the land. For these reasons, the dream-vision revelation can be aptly described as a “mystery (רזא)” (1Q20 XIV 19).

To this point, Noah’s revelation has had a fairly limited historical depth of field. As the text picks up again in 1Q20 XV 5 and builds towards the conclusion of the dream-vision in XV 21, Noah is offered a view of the more distant future. This section reads as follows:

[ברשע לכול מות]	5
[[ע]ד הוא בשל]	6
[רחמנא לרחמ מוע ממות ד ל צל למם] אלין]	7
[ואנון לכול]] מנהון נבע און וישבין ב[אר]עד]	8
[קצי ארעא ודי חזיתא כולהון יבבין וסורין משגיתהון להון רשיעין ודי חזיתנה]	9
[לגברא רבא אתה מן ימין ארעא מגלא בידה ונורא עמה ארציץ כול]	10
רב]	ל] ומרה רבותא הוא די יתה מן ימין ארעא]	11
[לפדיא ורשעא ורמי על נורא כול פש]עיא]	12
יתחבון לדקירת וישפין]	רא ודי חזיתה עדרו]	13
ד]	ממין] פין בהון שור ארבעא מלאכין רברבין]	14
[ל] אה להון שור מן כול עממי ארעא די לא ישלטו]	15
ל]	הבם] בא] מ]תנדודא ביען הליכהון ושגהון ונופהן בגדף שגי ואנבהן]	16
עמאל לרם ל איכנה יצמד לה עמא דך יקיץ טור שגאי ומנה ינדב ויהבדל בין]		17
לב לא]	ל בין כול עממיא וכולהון להון פלחין ומשתבשין] כול]	18
אנת נוח אל תתמה על חלמא דן ואל יהירבה עלוהי]	<i>vacat</i>	19

⁴³ Ibid., 113.

- [כולא בקושט אחויתך וכן כתיב עליך] 20
 זאל[פ] ה' מעמך לך לך ואתערת א[נא] נוח מן שנתי ושמשא רמה זאנה [נוח] 21
 למברך אל עלמא ו' ואז לית אנה לשם ברי וכולא אחו[ת] ל[ה] 22
- 5 []with evil for all ... []
 6 [un]til he/it is ... []
 7 the Merciful one ... []these []
 8 and them for all ... []... []from them a gushing of iniquity and settling in your [lan]d []
 9 the ends of the earth. And as you saw all of them crying and turning away, most of them will be evil. And as you saw []
 10 for a great warrior is coming from the south of the earth, sickle in hand and fire with him, he crushed all ... []
 11 great []...and the Mighty Lord, he is the one who will come from the south of the earth []...
 12 []the torches and the evil one. And he threw all the rebel[lious ones] onto the fire []
 13 And they will be hidden in the darkness and will []... as that you saw they plucked ... []south
 14 ... []... []... a chain on them, four mighty angels []
 15 []... []... a chain for them from all peoples of the earth that will not have power
 16 ... []... []...the [de]spised one because of their conduct, and their error, and their swaying, and excessive blaspheming. And their fruit ...
 17 ...where he will bind the people to himself. He will cut a great mountain and from it he will consecrate and separate between ... []
 18 ... []... []... all peoples and all of them will be worshipping and being confounded... []all
 19 *vacat* You, Noah, neither be amazed at this dream nor add to it []
 20 []I have told everything to you in truth and thus it is written concerning you []
 21 And I will a[d]d some of your people to you ... to you. [And] I, Noah, [awoke] from my sleep and the sun arose and I, [Noah
 22 to bless the everlasting God and [And] I [we]nt to Shem, my son, and tol[d] everything to [him

It is evident that the final scene of Noah's dream-vision depicted eschatological upheaval, affliction, and judgment. 1Q20 XV 8-9 speak generically of wrongdoing and evil, culminating with the arrival of a warrior from the south in XV 10 (cf. Rev 14:17-19).

The qualification of line 11 seems to indicate that this figure is the Lord himself. The tradition of God waging war from the south (i.e., Edom) is found in Judg 5:4-5 and Isa 63:1 (cf. *I En.* 1:4).⁴⁴ Thus Eshel's proposal that this reference "seems to refer to a non-Semitic king coming from the south, who will presumably engage in violence against the Shemites," is unlikely.⁴⁵ As Fitzmyer and Machiela have concluded, this imagery connotes general eschatological judgment.⁴⁶ Similarly, the extant descriptors of those standing in judgment could conceivably point to any number of referents, be they individuals, groups, or nations.⁴⁷ From the evidence available to us it seems that the view of the eschaton was *not* specific to an exclusive group or targeted at a specific adversary.

At the close of the episode the interpreting figure assures Noah that his revelation was thoroughly reliable, since it derives from what "is written (כתיב)" concerning him (1Q20 XV 19-20). In this way, the historiographical underpinnings of the entirety of Noah's revelation – the flood, the mandate for the division of the land, the transgression of Ham and his descendants, and the outworking of the eschaton – are found in a divinely inscribed course of events. This squares with the notion of scripted history already observed in *ApW* and *BG*. The texts that follow continue to present the God of Israel as determining and directing history but do so by different means.

⁴⁴ White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 115.

⁴⁵ Eshel, "The Dream Visions," 127, n. 21. She suggested that this line may reference Antiochus IV's ferocious return from Egypt in 168 BCE (ibid.).

⁴⁶ Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 169; Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 96. Falk considered both options as a possibility, writing that "it is unclear whether the agent is an angel or an enemy nation, and whether the recipient is Israel or the wicked nations" (*The Parabiblical Texts*, 78).

⁴⁷ For general speculations, see Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 169; Mathew Morgenstern, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan, with an appendix by Gregory H. Bearman and Sheila Spiro "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *AbrN* 33 (1995): 30-54, esp. 32; and Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 32.

4 *The eras of empires: four kingdom chronologies from the exile to the eschaton*

The visionary historiographies discussed so far have offered wide-angle views of history. *ApW* and *AnAp* provided selective and structured tours of Israelite history down through the Hellenistic era. *BG*'s and *IQapGen*'s visionary historiographies coordinated the deluge and eschaton with passing interest in the scenes between. The histories in the works that follow are also eschatologically driven. Their point of departure, however, is not the patriarchal era. Rather, world history is traced from the more recent past in the post-exilic period using four kingdom schemes. This historiographical mechanism figures prominently in Aramaic Daniel and constitutes the core of another diaspora court-tale, *4QFourKgdms*.

4.1 *Daniel 2 and 7: the God of Israel's direction of pagan dominions*

The configuration of world history into a schema of four successive empires has become synonymous with the dream-visions of Dan 2 and 7. This understanding of history is indeed central to the work as a whole.⁴⁸ The now classic articles by Swain and Flusser established that the periodization of history into three or four periods that align with imperial reigns was a well-worn historiographical mechanism in antiquity.⁴⁹ In this

⁴⁸ As Hall has observed, of the six historically oriented prophecies in the book (Dan 2:27-45; 5:17-28; 7; 8; 9; and 10-12), “[a]ll but the vision interpreting Jeremiah’s seventy years depend on the system of four world empires explained most clearly in chs. 2 and 7” (*Revealed Histories*, 82). Although I will not discuss it in great detail here, Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-vision in Dan 4 also has a limited historiographical bent in that it foretells his loss and subsequent return to power. For the tradition-historical context of this tale, see page 56, n. 73. For a concise study of this episode, see P. W. Coxon, “The Great Tree of Daniel 4,” in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (eds. James D. Martin and Philip R. Davies; JSOTSup 42; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986), 91-111.

⁴⁹ Joseph Ward Swain, “The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire,” *CP* 35 (1940): 1-21; David Flusser, “The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel,” *IOS* 2 (1972): 148-75. See now also Collins, “Excursus: Four Kingdoms,” in *Daniel*, 166-70. Swain noted that the threefold designation of Assyria-Media-Persia was used by Greek writers as early as the 5th-4th centuries BCE (cf. Herodotus i.95, 130; and Ctesias in *Diod. Sic.* ii.1-34) (“Four Monarchies,” 6).

respect, the configuration of world history in Dan 2 and 7 is a domestication of a common historiographical motif into a Jewish, theological context. The traditional historiographical scheme, however, in Dan 2 and 7 is symbolically encoded. The depiction of successive empires as metals/elements of decreasing value in Dan 2 has some antecedent in Hesiod's *Work and Days* 1.109-201 and finds a close parallel in the Persian *Bahman Yasht*.⁵⁰ The origin of the more developed symbolism of the mythological four beasts in Dan 7 is less certain.⁵¹ Irrespective of its background, on a literary level Dan 7 serves to rearticulate the world history of Dan 2 in light of the acute historical crisis under the rule of Antiochus IV.⁵² Commentators, both ancient and modern, have tried to sort out which four kingdoms are represented in these two dream-visions. Caragonis observed two basic positions in the history of research: (i) Babylon,

Flusser observed that the fourfold sequence of Assyria-Media-Persia-Macedonia already functioned "as a political ideology in the first years of the second century B.C.E." ("The Four Empires," 153).

⁵⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 162-63; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 40.

⁵¹ For overviews of potential background in ancient Near Eastern materials, see Collins, *Daniel*, 280-94; and Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 442-555. Frölich has garnered the evidence for the origins of this imagery in common symbolic referents for Hellenistic kingdoms ('*Time and Times and Half Time*', 75-76). Kratz critiqued that searches for external background are unnecessary, arguing that much of the imagery derives from the combination of Dan 4 and Hos 13:7-8 (Reinhard Kratz, "The Visions of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* [eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps; VTSup 83; FIOTL 2; vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2001], 91-113).

⁵² Noth, "The Understanding of History," 209; Frölich, '*Time and Times and Half Time*', 13, 69. Kratz has explained the extension of the scheme in Dan 2 to include the brutality and instability of Diodochian politics as evidence for the redactional growth of an earlier version of the dream-vision. For Kratz, the substratum of Dan 2 is a three kingdom scheme, wherein the stone that obliterates the statue was not the eschatological kingdom but the Medo-Persian Empire. On this understanding Dan 2:40-44 is a later addition to an earlier form of the dream-vision. Likewise, Kratz understands the reference to the ten horns and the little horn of Dan 7 as further evidence of the redaction of the book at the time of the Antiochene crisis. On this thesis, see his detailed argumentation in Reinhard G. Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (WMANT 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987). Aspects of his proposal also figure in his "Reich Gottes und Gesetz im Danielbuch und im werdenden Judentum," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 56; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 435-79; and "The Visions of Daniel."

Media-Persia, Greece, and Rome, and (ii) Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece.⁵³ The latter list is the consensus in modern, critical scholarship.

It is sufficiently clear from this brief orientation that Dan 2 and 7 parcel out (recent) history into periods corresponding to the major geopolitical movements of the Near East and Mediterranean worlds. A closer look at these presentations, however, reveals that this notion is given a distinctly theological profile. The dream-visions of Dan 2 and 7 present God as operating just behind the curtain of the historical drama performed on the world stage. This idea is made explicit in Dan 2:21, which states that the God of Israel “deposes kings and appoints kings (מהעדה מלכין ומהקים מלכין)” (cf. Dan 2:39, 44; 5:21). This notion also figures in Dan 7 in a more structured manner. As Hall has observed, there is a heavenly comment on the (dis)approval of respective kingdoms following the depiction of each beast.⁵⁴ This theologized telling of history certainly has a political edge.⁵⁵ However, it also provides a way of extending Israelite history from the

⁵³ C. C. Caragounis, “History and Supra-History: Daniel and the Four Empires,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 56; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 387-97. Rowley collated a rather comprehensive listing of positions taken in the literature from antiquity down to his own day (H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: A Historical Study of Contemporary Theories* [Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1935], 191-93).

⁵⁴ Hall, *Revealed Histories*, 84-88. The first beast (Babylon) is lifted up and takes on the form and mind of a human (Dan 7:4). This imagery is reminiscent of *AnAp*, where the transformation of an animal into a human being represents an elevation of their status (cf. *1 En.* 84:4; 89:36). This imagery, therefore, connotes divine approval of Babylonian rule (ibid., 85). The second beast (Media) is told to “Arise (קומי), devour much flesh” (Dan 7:5). This interjection may allude to the divine agency accorded the Medes in their prophesied uprising against Babylon in Jer 51:11, 27 (Collins, *Daniel*, 298). Of the third beast it is said that “Dominion was given to it (ושלטן יהיב לה)” (Dan 7:7). This succinct statement indicates that the Persians exercised universal rule, as is also accorded them in Dan 2:39 (ibid.). This neutral evaluation may hint at an approval of Persian rule for their supporting the resettlement of Yehud as reported in Ezra-Nehemiah. In the case of the fourth beast (Greece), the pattern is broken. Rather than a short interjection of allowance or approval, the judgement scene that follows demonstrates that God is the ultimate arbiter of powers on earth. His ability to depose monarchs is accentuated by the swift abolition of the little horn of the fourth kingdom, while the first three kingdoms are diminished but spared for a time (Dan 7:11-12).

⁵⁵ On this aspect, see now especially Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire*, 223-79.

exilic to Hellenistic periods and beyond. One of the distinctives of Daniel's four kingdom configuration when compared with those in other ancient literatures is the positioning of Babylon as the first empire, rather than Assyria. Goldingay has suggested that this starting point was intended to pick up on world history precisely at the point where Israel's story as an independent nation ceased.⁵⁶ By the Hellenistic period the experiment of the Israelite monarchy was well past and for centuries the Judaeans had been subjugated by the powers of their imperial neighbours. The message of Daniel's visionary historiography is that these international forces are not independent actors external to Israelite history but are a core part of the next chapters of a divinely determined plan that will crescendo toward God's eschatological rule.

4.2 *Updating history: retrofitting Rome into the scheme in 4QFour Kingdoms*

4QFourKgdms' historical presentation also relied on the notion of successive empires. Since I have already summarized the ancient background for this mechanism, I will proceed directly to which kingdoms are included in the framework. The main section containing historiographical material in this Aramaic work is *4QFourKgdms^a* (4Q552) 1 ii, which exhibits some overlap with *4QFourKgdms^b* (4Q553) 2 ii + 3 (underlined below). This transcription derives from Puech's work in DJD XXXVII. However, for reasons that will be explained immediately, I have not included his extensive reconstructions, which do not derive from known overlaps.

1 נוגהא קאם] אמרין לה

2 וקאם אילנא ורחקו מנה ואמר]

⁵⁶ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 57-58

צורתא ואמרת אן אתב[ונ] ב[ה וחזית	3
אילנא די [קאם] ⁵⁷ ה'וא שים במ']	4
ושאלתה מן שמך ואמר לי בבל' ואמרת לה	5
אנת'ה הוא די שליט בפרס ו[הזית אילנא ⁵⁸ אחרנא	6
va]cat [ה/וית ⁵⁹ למערבא ל]	7
למשנק ושאלתה מן שמ'ך]	8
ואמרת לה אנתה הוא ד'י	9
תקפי ימא ועל מחוזא [ועל/כול עמיא	10
אילנא תלית'י[א ו]אמרת' ל'ה	11
חזוך ש']	12

- 1 the dawn arose, and four trees[saying to it
- 2 and the tree stood and they went far from it and it said[
- 3 the image. And I said, “Where may I look and under[stan]d it?” [And I saw
- 4 the tree that [arose] was set in ...[
- 5 And I asked it, “What *is* your name?” And he said to me, “Babylon.”[and I said to
- 6 it,
- 7 “You are him who rules in Persia.” And[I saw ^{another} tree
- 8 *va[cat]*... west[
- 9 to torment. And I asked it, “What *is* [your] name?”[
- 10 And I said to it, “You are him wh[o
- 11 the vigor of the sea and over the harbour[and over/all the peoples
- 12 [the] third tree. [And] I asked i[t
- 13 your appearance ...[

The mention of “four trees (ארבעה אילנין)” in 4Q552 1 ii 1 confirms that the

scheme was limited to a total of four kingdoms. Scholars have put forth various proposals

⁵⁷ There is an effaced section of the manuscript here that is not likely a *vacat*. The restoration of this verb is proposed by Puech (DJD XXXVII, 66). It is not certain but makes sense in light of the context of the previous lines and fits the available space in the manuscript. Note also that in 4QFourKgdms^a (4Q552) 1 i + 2 9 the monarch may have referenced trees “standing (קאמין)” before him.

⁵⁸ Puech suggested that this adjective that is extant in the overlapping text of 4QFourKgdms^b (4Q553) 3 + 2 ii + 4 5 may have been inserted supralinearly at the end of this line or perhaps included in the lacuna at the opening of line 7 (DJD XXXVII, 66). For a similar presentation, see Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 108.

⁵⁹ My reading of this character cluster differs from that of Puech in DJD XXXVII (see below).

regarding which four powers loom behind these symbols (see table). In what follows I will demonstrate that the most plausible sequence was Babylon-Persia, Greece, Rome, and the eschatological kingdom of God.

TABLE: Proposed Referents Underlying the Historical Schema of *4QFour Kingdoms*⁶⁰

	Kingdom #1	Kingdom #2	Kingdom #3	Kingdom #4
Collins	Babylon-Persia	Greece	a) Ptolemaic Egypt	a) Seleucid Syria
			b) Seleucid Syria	b) Rome
Cook	Babylon-Persia	Greece	Rome	Kingdom of God
Flint	Babylon-Persia	Greece	a) Syria	a) Rome
			b) Rome	b) Kingdom of God
Hogeterp	Babylon-Persia	Media	“Yawan” (i.e., Greece) representing either:	“Kittim” (i.e., Rome)
			a) Kings of south and north	
Puech	Babylon-Persia	Media	Greece	Kingdom of God
Reynolds	Babylon-Persia (and Media?)	Greece (or Macedonia)	Ptolemaic Egypt	Seleucid Syria

The first kingdom can be determined with certainty. When asked its name, the first tree identifies itself as “Babylon” (4Q552 1 ii 6; 4Q553 3 + 2 ii 4).⁶¹ This terse

⁶⁰ The data in this table derive from the following: John J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez; vol. 2.; Brill: Leiden, 1999), 403-30; Cook, WAC, 556; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 362-65; Hogeterp, “Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle,” 178-79, 190; Puech, DJD XXXVII, 57-58; and Reynolds, *Between Symbolism and Realism*, 191, 199-201. In cases where two options have been proposed for a given kingdom, I include these under the same column as ‘a’ and ‘b.’

⁶¹ While this self-interpreting symbol is remarkable, the motif of talking trees is found in a host of ancient literatures. The most ready example is the date-palm (i.e., Sarai) who speaks out against the cedar’s (i.e., Abram’s) assailants in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XIX 16. Talking trees also figure in parables in Judg 9:7-15

response is complemented by the seer's recognition that this figure rules in "Persia (פרס)" (4Q552 1 ii 7). As Puech noted, historically speaking, the inverse is more accurate: the Achaemenid kings were Persians whose rules encompassed Babylon.⁶² The important thing to recognize is that this author was less concerned with historical accuracy than he was in adhering to the four kingdom schema. As argued below, empires were merged on the front end of the configuration in order to accommodate more recent kingdoms later in the sequence without compromising the traditional fourfold scheme. At the beginning, then, the conflation of Babylon and Persia into a single entity serves to present them a generic imperial power in the east.

There is some disagreement over whether the second tree represents Media or Greece. The primary factor that tips the scales in favour of its identification with Greece is found in 4Q552 1 ii 10. This portion of the text seems to associate the empire in question with dominance over the seas and harbors. This reference is more intelligible as a descriptor of a coastal kingdom with seafaring proficiencies than of a landlocked one hailing from the eastern stretch of the Fertile Crescent. As Reynolds observed, when one imagines the geopolitical map of the ancient Mediterranean and Near East after the time of the Babylonian and Persian empires, Greece is the most natural candidate for this association.⁶³

and 2 Kgs 14:9 (cf. also the arboreal imagery of Ezek 31 and Dan 4). Gevirtz drew attention to some additional examples of personified trees in ancient Near Eastern fables ("Abram's Dream," 235-37). In 2 *Baruch's* politically charged arboreal dream-vision, Baruch observes a vine and cedar conversing (2 *Bar.* 36:7-10).

⁶² DJD XXXVII, 66.

⁶³ Reynolds, *Between Symbolism and Realism*, 200.

Beyond this detail, however, it is difficult to know what to make of other clues of the kingdom's identification in the fragmentary text. For example, Puech claimed that the toponym Media may be reconstructed in 4Q553 4. Despite the lack of a physical join with 4Q553 2 ii, without hesitation he accepted the adjacent situation of these fragments as presented on PAM 43.579.⁶⁴ As a result, he rendered and reconstructed this tiny fragment as the second tree's response to the seer's asking his name: "Et il me dit: 'M[édie] ([אמר] (לי מן די)." ⁶⁵ Puech's reconstruction and placement of this fragment are highly speculative.

A more likely explanation is that 4Q553 4 represents an overlap with 4Q552 1 8, which reads "And the king said to me (ואמר לי מלכא)." If this is accepted, the alleged textual evidence for the second kingdom as Media evaporates.⁶⁶

Another quandary concerns the directional notation in 4Q552 1 ii 7. Due to a lacuna at the beginning of the line and a sizable diagonal crack in the leather, the nature of the lost word at the outset of this phrase cannot be known (cf. PAM 43.576). The *lamed* prefixed to the following noun למערב suggests that the first word was a verb. There is simply not enough text to determine whether the subject of this verb is the seer or the second tree. Both possibilities have been presented in editions of *4QFourKgdms*. For

⁶⁴ Ibid., 78, plate iv.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 78-79. Hogeterp took the reading for granted, stating that the second tree "calls itself Media" ("Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle," 178)

⁶⁶ Even *if* one accepts Puech's orientation of this fragment, there is but a partial ink stroke at the left hand side that is said to derive from the second tree's answer. Medial *mem* is possible, but this is not the only option. A medial *tsaday* cannot be ruled out, which is transcribed and reconstructed as [צ]ר ("Tyre") in DSSR, 6:78 (numbered there as 4Q553 6 ii 6). In this semi-cursive scribal hand *yod* is drawn with some variation, at times with a slight curvature to the lower left. Thus, the reading "Y[awan (ואן)]" would be another possibility.

example, DSSR reads “I looked to the west (חזית למערב[])” (cf. WAC).⁶⁷ On this understanding of the text, 4Q552 1 ii 7 depicts a symbol that is located at a westward location on the compass (i.e., Greece). Conversely, Puech rendered the text as, “qui]est [des]cendu à l’ouest pour[(די נ[חית למערבא)” This option locates the second kingdom in an eastern location moving toward the west (i.e., Media). Due to the highly fragmentary nature of the text at this point, we cannot know the content or context of this phrase with certainty. On account of these difficulties, the determination of the identity of the second kingdom must rest primarily on the mention of the kingdom’s maritime authority in 4Q552 1 ii 10. Therefore, with Collins, Cook, Flint, and Reynolds, I conclude that *4QFourKgdms* most likely positioned Greece as the successor to the hybrid kingdom of Babylon-Persia.

Rome is the natural successor to this empire. In different ways, Collins, Hogeterp, and Reynolds attempt to capture the internal divisions of the Greek empire. Collins suggested that there is some precedent for this segmentation in *Sib. Or.* 3:161.⁶⁸ However, the sibylline tradition is not a four kingdom presentation but a listing of numerous empires. In known Jewish four kingdom schemes there is an overwhelming precedent for

⁶⁷ There is some precedent in ancient four kingdom chronologies for dubbing the Greeks as the major imperial power in/from the west. Daniel 8:5 specifies that the “male goat” (i.e., Alexander the Great) “came from the west (בא מן המערב).” As noted by Bruce and Vermes, Josephus merged this identification with Dan 2 when he wrote of the ascendancy of the third kingdom: “[b]ut their empire will be destroyed by another king from the west (ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως), clad in bronze” (*Ant.* 10.209 [Marcus, LCL]) (F. F. Bruce, “Josephus and Daniel,” in *A Mind for What Matters: Collected Essays of F. F. Bruce* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 19-31; Geza Vermes, “Josephus’ Treatment of the Book of Daniel,” *JJS* 42 [1991]: 149-166). However, without a clearer knowledge of the nature and syntax of the verb at the beginning of 4Q552 1 ii 7, these traditions provide minor assistance.

⁶⁸ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 416, n. 35.

positioning Rome as the successor of Greece.⁶⁹ If *4QFourKgdms* did position the third kingdom as Rome, then this visionary historiography postdates Dan 2 and 7. This is not to say it is an update of Daniel's *ex eventu* prophecy specifically, although this remains an intriguing possibility.⁷⁰

This leads to the fourth kingdom. As with the third kingdom, there is no extant text to guide our determination. However, if Rome is the penultimate kingdom – understood without divisions – then the fourth tree must have represented divine, eschatological rule. It is *possible* that the phrase “chief of the tre[es (רַב אֵילִי נִיא)” in *4QFourKgdms*^c (4Q553a) 7 2 reflects the idea that the fourth tree superseded the others. As Collins and Flint have remarked, the inclusion of the eschatological kingdom within the scheme itself is possible but unprecedented.⁷¹ Their evaluation on this point, however, warrants some qualification. There is a trend in later Roman political propaganda to underscore that the final kingdom of the configuration is superior to its predecessors and represents the capstone of history.⁷² If the rule of God was included in the fourth slot, then the need to amalgamate Babylon and Persia earlier in the chronology is readily explained. Rome would have been bumped into the third position, which demanded the

⁶⁹ Cf. *Ant.* 10.276; *Sib. Or.* 4:101-102; *Tg. Ps. J.* at Gen 15:12; and *Exod. Rab.* 35:5. Compare also the five kingdom scheme of *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael Tractate Beshallah* II.130-42.

⁷⁰ Hogeterp tallied a list of philological features that may indicate that *4QFourKgdms* knew Aramaic Danielic (“Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle,” 179-83).

⁷¹ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 416; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 363.

⁷² Swain (“The Theory of the Four Monarchies,” 13-14) and Flusser (“The Four Empires,” 159-60) observed that some writers achieved this by augmenting the schema to include Rome as the fifth kingdom. See, for example, Tacitus (*Historiae* V, 8-9), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* i.2.2-4), Appian (*Praef.* 9), and Claudian (*De consulatu Stilichonis* iii.159-66). *Sib. Or.* 4 102 is the exception to this trend in Jewish literature; although, the criticism of Rome is a secondary addition (John J. Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009], 317-472, esp. 381).

merging of two earlier kingdoms, resulting in the hybrid Babylon-Persia. Swain and Flusser noted that after the ascendancy of Rome, some Jewish and Christian authors did just this, rather than extend the chronology to a fifth kingdom.⁷³ If this proposal is accepted, *4QFourKgdms* would be the earliest example of this historiographical phenomenon.

5 *Other views of geopolitical upheaval or succession*

The final two texts I will discuss deserve to be considered after Dan 2, 7 and *4QFourKgdms*. It is possible that in their original forms *NJ* and *4QAramApoc* contained a schematization of the final chapters of history. However, there is insufficient evidence to make this determination with certainty. What is clear is that these works further evidence the use of the dream-vision to forecast geopolitical movements on the eve of the eschaton.

5.1 *The culmination of Israelite history in the New Jerusalem text*

NJ's concern for geopolitical matters is evidenced by *4QNJ^a* (4Q554) 13. My translation presented below is based on Puech's transcription in DJD XXXVII, although I have not retained much of his proposed reconstructions.⁷⁴

⁷³ Swain, "The Theory of the Four Monarchies," 20; Flusser, "The Four Empires," 157-58. Cf. variations on this approach in *Ant.* 10.267-77; *4 Ezra* 12:11-12; *2 Bar.* 39:3-7; and in Jerome's commentary on Dan 2:39.

⁷⁴ The narrative location of this fragment is unknown. Following the arrangement of PAM 43.589, Chyutin (*The New Jerusalem Scroll*, 31-32) and DiTommaso (*The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 62-63) aver that the stitching at the right of this fragment aligns with that at the leftmost margin of 4Q554 2 ii. Tigchelaar critiqued that this may not be a proper join (review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, *RevQ* 18 [1998]: 453-57, esp. 454). Note also that Tigchelaar rightfully critiqued DiTommaso for integrating a small fragment of Aramaic Daniel into his text, alleging that it provided additional material toward the ends of lines 19-22 (DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 64; Tigchelaar, "The Character of the City," 122; cf DJD XVI, 247). Puech included 4Q554 14 to the lower left of 4Q554 13 and proposed an extensive reconstruction of the column (DJD XXXVII, 136-37). If 4Q544 13 originated elsewhere in the composition, it may be that the conversation on history between seer and *angelus interpretes* was occasioned by Jacob's reading/hearing of the course of

14	יִתְּוֹן לְקַן]
15	בְּאַתְרָהּ וּמַלְכוּת מַ]
16	כְּתִיא בְּאַתְרָהּ כְּלֵהוֹן בְּסוּף כְּלֵהוֹן]
17	אַחֲרֵין שְׂגִיאָן וְרִשִׁין עִמְהוֹן מַ]
18	עִמְהוֹן אֲדוּם וּמוֹאֵב וּבְנֵי אֲמוֹן]
19	דֵי בָבֶל אֲרַעָא כְּלָה דֵי לֹא יִשְׂרָאֵל]
20	וְיִבְאַשׁוּן לְזַרְעֶךָ עַד עֵדֶן דֵי יִ]
21	בְּכָל עַמְמֵי [י] מְלַכּוּתָ[הוֹן] דֵי לָ]
22	וְיַעֲבֹדוּן [דוֹן] בְּהוֹן עִמְמִין]

- 14 they will bring to ...[
15 in its place. And the kingdom of ...[
16 the Kittim in its place. All of them at the end of all of them[
17 others, numerous/great and powerful with them ...[
18 with them Edom, and Moab, and the Ammonites[
19 of Babylon, the land, all of it, which is not ...[
20 and they will be wicked toward your seed until the time of ...[
21 with all peoples [of their] kingdoms who ...[
22 and the nations will mak[e] in them

It is likely that this fragment of *NJ* forecasts an eschatological war between Israel and the nations. This perspective has been advanced by several scholars, with some variation in their estimations of the function of the eschatological city and temple in this scenario.⁷⁵ DiTommaso proposed that the fragment commenced with a schematized

history from a divine record. *11QNJ* (11Q18) 19 5-6 may refer to such a document. Although, Tigchelaar is right to point out that the source mentioned there is not explicitly a “tablet (לוח),” as we might expect in such a context (“The Character of the City,” 124). García-Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, commented that “[t]he mention of showing a כתב” in 11Q18 19 6 “indicates that the כתב need not be a book, but that it may have been a writing of some kind (an inscription?) in the Temple complex” (DJD XXIII, 336). Chyutin’s proposal that 11Q18 19 refers to a “Reading of the Book Ceremony” presided over by the High Priest, while imaginative, extends well beyond the fragmentary evidence (*The New Jerusalem Scroll*, 52-55). Note also that if 4Q544 13 does consist of angelic speech, these would be the first and only words uttered by *NJ*’s angelic guide.

⁷⁵ See Jean Carmignac, “La future intervention de Dieu selon la pensée de Qumrân,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978), 219-29, esp 227; John

review of history, which is complemented by a list of nations who will be humbled in the eschaton.⁷⁶ The reading I offer here finds a middle path between these two options. The latter lines of this fragment likely envisage an eschatological upheaval, but this motif seems to have been preceded by a historical review of some description.

The triad of names in line 18 is the primary indicator of an eschatological war. Collins observed that “Edom, Moab, and Ammon were the traditional enemies of Israel.”⁷⁷ From the listing of these nations in Isa 11:14, Dan 11:41, and *IQM* I 1-2, it is evident that this grouping acquired a place in contexts of eschatological unrest, affliction, or battle. It is likely that this same situation obtains in *NJ*. Lines 17 and 20 perhaps connote the staging of additional foes alongside Israel’s classic enemies. Some or all of these are likely the subject of the statement of the ongoing affliction of the seer’s “seed” (i.e., the Israelites) in line 20.

The opening lines of 4Q544 13 likely comprise a historical prelude leading up to this climactic event. The twice used phrase “in its place/after it (באתרה)” suggests a structure where one nation supplants another. Similar language served to mark the overturn of ages in *4QEn*⁸ (4Q212) 1 iv 15 (= *1 En.* 91:12) and empires in Dan 2:39; 7:6-7. Additionally, the construct “and the kingdom of (ומלכות)” in line 15 and the reference to the “Kittim (כתיא)” in line 16 imply that multiple empires or nations are in view.

J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1997), 260; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 201; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 178; Puech, DJD XXXVII, 94; and Tigchelaar, “The Character of the City,” 123-24.

⁷⁶ DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 174-76.

⁷⁷ Collins, *Daniel*, 389. See, for example, Num 20:14-21; 21:10-31; 22-24; Judg 11:1-28; 1 Sam 14:47; 2 Sam 8:12; and Jer 9:26. DiTommaso noted that the listing of these nations “en bloc” became something of a fixed eschatological motif (*The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 182-83).

Extrapolating from these references, DiTommaso and Puech present extensive reconstructions of kingdom schemes that are allegedly lost in the lacuna.⁷⁸ In view of the fragmentary evidence, however, these proposals are far from certain. The latent motif of geopolitical succession is also suggested by the not easily translated phrase בלהון בסוף בלהון at the close of line 16. This phrase appears to function as a type of summative statement of the historiographical principle of waxing and waning world powers.⁷⁹ In

⁷⁸ DiTommaso argued that lines 14-16 contain the remains of a four kingdom scheme, comprised of Babylon, Persia, Media, and the Kittim (ibid., 63-64). Puech proposed the more extensive list of Assyria, Babylon, Media, Persia, the Kittim, Egypt or Greece, Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites (DJD XXXI, 136). Both scholars garner marginal support by reconstructing “M[edia (מדי)]” at the close of line 15. In his commentary, however, Puech indicated that “E[gypt (מצריים)]” was another possibility (ibid., 133).

⁷⁹ These three little words have proved notoriously difficult to translate. Compare, for example, the following: García-Martínez and Tigchelaar: “the Kittim after it, all of them at the end of all of them” (DSSSE 2:1111); Cook: “the Kittim in place of it. All these kingdoms shall appear one after another” (WAC 562; DSSR 6:49, listed as 4Q554 3 iii 16); Beyer: “der Zyprier nach ihm, sie alle am Ende von ihnen allen (*Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 98); Maier: “Die Kittäer, danach sie alle. Zuletzt (werden) sie alle” (Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das “Neue Jerusalem”* [Uni-Taschenbücher 829; München: Ernst Reinhardt, 1997], 324); Chyutin: “the Kittim after him, all of them, at the end, all of them” (*The New Jerusalem Scroll*, 32); Puech¹: “les Kittéens après lui, eux tous, à la fin de chacun d’eux” (Émile Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien, Tome II: Les données qumraniennes et classiques* [Études bibliques: Nouvelle Série 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993], 593, italics original); Puech²: “des Kittéens après lui, eux tous. À la fin d’eux tous” (DJD XXXVII, 133); and DiTommaso: “the Kittim after it. All these kingdoms shall appear one after another” (*The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 62). The biggest problem in this Aramaic phrase (aside from the lack of context!) concerns whether or not it constitutes one or two sense units. That is, either the whole phrase is a subordinate clause to the lost preceding material or the initial בלהון marks the end of a complete clause. There has been some discussion among Aramaicists regarding the appositive use of כל, whereat the suffixed particle is placed at the end of a clause and refers back to the lead noun(s) of the preceding phrase (Joseph Fitzmyer, “The Syntax of כל, בלא, ‘All’ in Aramaic,” in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament, Volume 2: A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 205-17, esp. 212-13; Takamitsu Muraoka, “Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *RevQ* 8 [1972]: 7-51, esp. 20; idem, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, 206). This construction is amply attested in the Aramaic Scrolls corpus (e.g., *1QapGen* [1Q20] X 13; XII 10; XVI 10; *4QEn^a* [4Q201] 1 ii 4; *4QEn^s* [4Q212] 1 iv 20). The difficulty with seeing this usage in 4Q554 13 16 is that the plural suffix must refer back to an entire list of singular entities. This is not impossible, but stretches the limits of our known examples of this construction. Note also that this phrase is not to be mistaken for the related double כל construction (e.g., *1QapGen* [1Q20] X 13; XVI 10; *4QEn^a* [4Q201] 1 ii 4; *4QEn^c* [4Q204] 1 i 28; *4QEn^s* [4Q212] 1 iv 20-21).

short, while the precise content of this presentation cannot be discerned, it is most likely that a geopolitical explanation of history built up to the eschatological battle.

5.2 *4QAramaic Apocalypse: another monarch learns his place in world history*

As was the case in *NJ*, the surviving text of *4QAramApoc* allows only for a preliminary assessment of the lost dream-vision's historiographical qualities. The known text of this intriguing work is as follows:

col. i

1	[ע]לוהי שרת נפל קדם כרסיא
2	[מ]לכא {<ל>} <מ>עלמא אתה רגז ושניד
3	[ר]א חזוך וכלא אתה עד עלמא
4	[ר]בִּרְבִּין עקה תתא על ארעא
5	[ו]נחשירין רב בְּמַדִּינַתָּא
6	[מ]לך אתור [ומ]צרין
7	[ר]ב להוה על אַרעא
8	[י]עבדון וכלא ישמִשון
9	[ר]בִּא יתקרא ובשמה יתכנה

col. ii

1	ברה די אל יתאמר ובר עליון יקרונה כזיקיא
2	די חזיתא ⁸⁰ כן מלכותהן תהוה שני[ן] ימלכון על
3	ארעא וכלא ידשון עם לעם ידוש ומדינה למדי[נ]ה
4	<i>vacat</i> עד יקו/ים עם אל וכלא ינו/יח מן חרב
5	מלכותה מלכות עלם וכל ארחתה בקשוט ידי[ן]
6	ארעא בקשט וכלא יעבד שלם חרב מן ארעא יסף
7	וכל מדינתא לה יסגדון אל רבא באילה
8	הוא ועבד לה קרב עממין ינתן בידה וכלהן
9	ירמה קדמוהי שלטנה שלטן עלם וכל תהומי

⁸⁰ On the reading די חזיתא, see page 87 n. 33.

col. i

- 1 rested [up]on him, he fell before the throne
- 2 O [k]ing, wrath is coming to the world, and your years
- 3]... your vision, and everything is coming until the world
- 4 [g]reat [] trouble will come to the earth
- 5]and great carnage in the provinces
- 6]kings of Assyria[and of E]gypt⁸¹
- 7] he will be great upon the earth
- 8 they [will] make and all will serve
- 9 he will be called the gr[eat], and by his name he will be called

col. ii

- 1 the son of God he will be called and son of the Most High they will call him. Like the meteors
- 2 that you saw, so their kingdom(s) will be. *For* yea[rs] they will reign over
- 3 the earth. And all will trample: nation against nation, province will trample provi[n]ce.
- 4 *vacat* Until the people of God arise and all will have rest from the sword.
- 5 his kingdom *will be* an everlasting kingdom and all his ways are in righteousness. He will jud[ge]
- 6 the earth with righteousness and he will make everything at peace. The sword will be no more on the land
- 7 and all the provinces will bow down to him. The Great God is his strength.
- 8 He will do battle for him, giving the nations into his hand,
- 9 and he will overthrow them all before him. His rule *will be* an everlasting rule. And all the depths of

⁸¹ The *nomen regens* at the outset of the line is singular, and there is not enough room on the effaced manuscript to reconstruct a second singular head noun (i.e., “the King of Assyria[and the King of E]gypt (מלך אתור[ומלך מ[צרין])”). I have followed Justnes’ lead here in allowing the singular מלך to qualify two entities (*The Time of Salvation*, 112; see also Peuch’s remarks in “Notes sur le Fragment,” 112). Justnes points to the example of an analogous Hebrew syntagm in Gen 14:10: “the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah (מלך סדם ועמרה).”

One of the main issues in this text is whether the “son of God (בריה די אל)” and “son of the Most High (בר עליון)” in 4Q246 ii 1 is a positive eschatological agent or a blasphemous pagan agitator. Milik advocated the latter view, which has been developed in different directions over the years.⁸² From various angles, Collins, Cross, Fitzmyer, García-Martínez, and others have built the opposite case.⁸³ This position is adopted here.

⁸² Milik identified the figure with Alexander Balas or Antiochus IV (“Les modèles araméens,” 383-84). Apart from the short mentions in the aforementioned article, much of Milik’s views on 4Q246 derive from a Harvard lecture in 1972. There is no published record of this event, save for Fitzmyer’s account in “The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament,” *NTS* 20 (1973): 382-407. My engagement with this study will be based on the revised and reprinted version in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament, Volume 2: A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 85-113). Puech echoed the options set forth by Milik (Émile Puech, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 [1992]: 98-131; *DJD* XXII, 183). At one point between these publications, however, he indicated the possibility of a messianic interpretation (idem, “Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et le Nouveau Testament,” *Le Monde de la Bible* 86 [1994]: 34-41), a position that he affirmed in his most recent comment on the topic (idem, “Le volume XXXVII des *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* et les manuscrits araméens du lot Starky,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* [eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; *STDJ* 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 47-61). Beyer identified him as Antiochus IV (*Die aramäischen Texte: Ergänzungsband*, 111). Against the background of Akkadian dynastic prophecies, Cook argued that 4Q246 foretold the succession of rulers, in this case, the Syrian kings (“4Q246,” 62-66). Justnes proposed that the figure is an evil blasphemer “partly drawn in the image of Antiochus IV Epiphanes” (*The Time of Salvation*, 150). Before all of the text was available, Flusser offered the provocative interpretation that the figure is not a historical individual, but the antichrist (Flusser, “The Hubris of the Antichrist.”)

⁸³ Fitzmyer understood the figure as a successor to the Davidic throne, but did not approve of describing him as a ‘messiah’ (“The Contribution,” 106; “The Aramaic ‘Son of God,’” 59-61). Kim concluded that the titles are a messianic interpretation of the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7:13 (Seyoon Kim, *The ‘Son of Man’ as the Son of God* [WUNT 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983], 22). García-Martínez considered the figure an angelic agent, who would aid in ushering in the everlasting rule of the people of God (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 172-78). Cross concluded that the figure was a messianic king (“Notes on the Doctrine,” 5; “The Structure,” 153, 157 n. 20). Collins argued that he represents the earliest fusion of Dan 7:13 with the expectation of a Davidic messiah (John J. Collins, “The *Son of God* Text from Qumran,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* [ed. Martinus C. De Boer; *JSNTSup* 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 65-82; cf. idem, “The Background of the Son of God Text,” *BBR* 7 [1997]: 51-62; and idem, *The Scepter and the Star*, 171-90). Evans noted that even if a negative view is taken, 4Q246 “provides some insight into the messianic potential” of the titles claimed in col. i 1 (Craig A. Evans, “Are the ‘Son’ Texts at Qumran ‘Messianic’? Reflection on 4Q369 and Related Scrolls,” in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [eds. James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998], 135-53). Likewise, Zimmerman concluded that the negative application of titles that have a strong heritage of positive usage in Israelite tradition would be exceptionally rare (Johannes Zimmerman, “Observations on 4Q246 – The ‘Son of God,’” in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on*

What I wish to do, however, is to shift the focus away from this question that has dominated research on *4QArAmApoc* to offer an appreciation of how the emergence of this individual is but one component and a wider historiographical framework.

Cook, Cross, Lee, and Puech have established that this fragmentary work is a carefully crafted piece of Aramaic poetry.⁸⁴ In light of this literary quality, it is inadvisable to read the text as a sequence of events. Reading this poetry as if it were episodic prose quickly runs into problems. For example, one is left wondering how the warfare referenced in col. ii 8 could follow the peaceful laying down of arms in col. ii 6-7. In light of such difficulties, understanding the historiographical quality of *4QArAmApoc* must take into account how its poetical structures point to its central emphases. Zimmerman has obviated this difficulty by demonstrating how col. ii is structured by concentric units of appositional phrases and themes, all of which draw attention to the arrival and establishment of “the kingdom of peace” described in col. ii 4-

the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls [eds. James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998], 175-90).

Hengel submitted a third possibility that has received less scholarly attention: the titles are collective references for the Jewish people (Martin Hengel, *The Son of God* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976], 44). A variation on this perspective factors into Flusser’s hypothesis, since he takes the subject of the third person pronouns in col. ii 5 and following to refer to Israel (“The Hubris of the Antichrist,” 33). Steudel argued essentially the same position, save for her identification of the figure in col. i 1 as Antiochus IV (Annette Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 507-525). While there are some similarities with Hengel’s proposal, Steudel uses Stegemann’s notion of “collective messianism” as her departure point (see Hartumut Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17 [1996]: 479-505).

⁸⁴ Cook, “4Q246,” 44-60; Peter Y. Lee, “Aramaic Poetry in Qumran,” (Ph. D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 2010), 193-217; Puech “Fragment d’une Apocalypse,” 107-09. Cross’ proposed poetical structure is less specific in that it concerns the stanza level (Cross, “The Structure of the Apocalypse,” 151-58; cf. idem, “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical *Daniel Apocalypse* (4Q246),” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* [eds. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 1-13).

7.⁸⁵ This element of the text comprises the main historiographical principle of *4QArAmApoc*.

The depiction of this kingdom and the events leading up to its ascendancy are described by way of juxtaposition between earthly and eschatological dominions. The first indication of this outlook are the references to the kings of Assyria and Egypt in col. i 6. Since the lost dream-vision was symbolic in nature (see below), it is likely that these kingdoms correspond to some symbolic protasis(es). A number of commentators have observed that Assyria and Egypt are among the ranks of eschatological foes in the *War Scroll*.⁸⁶ This calls to mind what was seen above in *NJ*. The classic foes of early Israelite history re-emerge in the tumult leading up to the eschaton. As Fitzmyer has suggested, the apocalyptic orientation of *4QArAmApoc* and the *War Scroll* – and we may add, *NJ* – diminishes the historical value of these references.⁸⁷ Therefore, with Justnes I conclude that, “[r]ather than searching for identifications, which seem far-fetched ... Assyria and Egypt probably figure in the text because they are the old enemies of Israel.”⁸⁸

The next aspect of the historiographical presentation concerns the contrast between the temporality of earthly kingdoms and the eternity of the rule of God. This is

⁸⁵ Zimmerman, “Observations on 4Q246,” 182-83.

⁸⁶ Cf. Collins, “The *Son of God* Text,” 72; Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Son of God,’” 48; García-Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 165; Justnes, *The Time of Salvation*, 113; and Puech, DJD XXII, 172. However, 1QM I 2 refers to the “Kittim of Assyria (כְּתִי אַשּׁוּר),” while 1QM I 4 refers to the Kittim entering “into Egypt (בְּמִצְרַיִם).” Thus the resemblance between *4QArAmApoc* and the *War Scroll* in this detail is less clear than is often stated.

⁸⁷ Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Son of God,’” 54. Despite this probability, some have viewed these references as ciphers for individual empires. Milik rendered אַתּוּר in col. ii 4 as “Syria” and identified the king of this nation as Alexander Balas (“Les modèles araméens,” 383). Cross interpreted these referents more broadly as alluding to Seleucid-Ptolemaic battles (“The Structure of the Apocalypse,” 156 n. 15; “Notes,” 3).

⁸⁸ Justnes, *The Time of Salvation*, 151.

indicated by the phrase “Like the meteors that you saw, so their kingdom(s) will be (בזיקיא די חזיתא בן מלכותהן תהוה)” in 4Q246 ii 3. This phrase communicates that *4QArAmApoc*’s lost dream-vision was symbolic and featured astral phenomena, which were then interpreted in a lemmatized format. To use Fitzmyer’s words, the longevity of such kingdoms is “like comets that appear to the eye momentarily as they speed across the heavens.”⁸⁹ In addition to their fleeting nature, earthly reigns are marked by ongoing infighting, or “trampling” (דוש) (4Q246 ii 3-4; cf. Dan 7:23). This will continue “until the people of God arise (עד יקוים עם אל)” who will hold an “everlasting kingdom (מלכות עלם),” that is righteous, self-governed, and with the aid of divine intervention, will demand the homage of surrounding peoples (4Q246 ii 4-9).

When all of these features are taken together, the core of *4QArAmApoc*’s historiographical perspective comes to the fore: throughout the course of history, world powers will come and go, tensions among them will rise, but the establishment of the rule of God will be eternal and peaceful.

⁸⁹ Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Son of God,’” 51. See also, García Martínez, “4Q246: The ‘Son of God,’” 163; Puech, DJD XXII, 174; Cook, “4Q246,” 56; and Cross, “The Structure,” 153, 158, n. 22. Lange’s reading this reference as a descriptor of the kingdom of the eschatological people is problematic (Armin Lange, “Dream Visions and Apocalyptic Milieus,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* [ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005], 27-34, esp. 31). The plural “their kingdom (מלכותהן)” is to be understood in light of the plural references to upheavals among peoples and provinces in col. ii 3. The eschatological kingdom of God (or of the son of God) is referred to as “his kingdom (מלכותה)” in col. ii 5.

6 *Summary of findings*

The survey of texts in the foregoing pages gave greater context and meaning to Dimant's passing remark that in the Aramaic corpus "[t]he means, by which the specific revelations are imparted especially about history, is the predictive dream-vision."⁹⁰ This close study of visionary historiographical presentations warrants some more specific observations on how the authors of these materials conceptualized history. The common denominator between these works is the understanding that the entire record of human history is laid out before the God of Israel. He is understood as the author of the historical drama that is played out on earth below. At his discretion he may choose to reveal aspects or all of history to individuals. The dream-vision served as the channel that made this knowledge attainable.

There were two main ways in which history was shown to progress according to divine plan or direction. First, the notion of a heavenly "tablet (לוּחַ)" containing a script of human history was clearest in *ApW*. Analogous understandings of the writtenness (*כתב*) of aspects of history figured in Noah's dream-vision in *1QapGen*, 'Ohayha's second dream-vision in *BG*, and perhaps, in *NJ*. Second, the revelations of Dan 2 and 7 did not defer to the idea of scripted history. Rather, the God of Israel was presented as the director of movements on the world stage. Both mechanisms communicate the orderliness of history by configuring world events into patterns. *ApW*, Dan 2 and 7, *4QFourKgdms*, and to some extent, *NJ* and *4QAramApoc*, structured and schematized aspects of history

⁹⁰ Dimant, "Themes and Genres," 36.

such that its positive eschatological outcome could be expected in light of established paradigms.

All of these historically oriented dream-visions are presented from a *vaticinium ex eventu* perspective, from either the reader's remote or recent past. This mechanism gives the impression that history has been rolling on as predetermined and revealed long ago. In a sense, then, these works participate in a type of mantic historiography. The omen of the past portends and prefigures the future. The dream-vision is the medium by which the omen is made intelligible. Once the plan or pattern has been revealed, writers (and readers) could plot their place in the developing history, which grants assurance in the present and a hope for the future.

The chapters of history that are revealed also indicate how the authors of these materials conceived of the nature of history itself. Stone has observed that many writings at Qumran, including some among the Aramaic corpus, underscore the historical axis between the flood and the eschaton.⁹¹ This understanding figured into *ApW* (and *AnAp*), but was accentuated in the giants' dream-visions in *BG* and Noah's dream-vision in *IQapGen*. To extend Stone's proposal, it seems that we have another major line of history operating in the Aramaic corpus, which cuts between the post-exilic period and the eschaton. In *Dan 2* and *7*, *4QFourKgdms*, and *4QAramApoc* the movements of ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern empires was the angle from which the eschaton was explained and anticipated. The primordial past was of no concern for this brand of historiography. Rather, as was seen particularly in those works using a four kingdoms

⁹¹ Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran."

chronology, explaining the overturn of world empires between the exile and eschaton served to show how this period of seeming foreign domination was effectually an important interlude in the history of Israel. While Israel may not have been the lead character on the world stage at this point, her God remained the director of the action. In light of these two vantage points on history, *NJ* is an interesting case. This composition likely comprises a patriarchal pseudepigraph containing a historical revelation that is more akin to the post-exilic/eschatological historiographies than it is to the flood/eschatological perspective.

In all of this, it is safe to conclude that there is no single historiography that defines the dream-visions of the Aramaic texts. While there are some clear commonalities, in the end, these components were tailored to the specific concerns of individual authors. Once again these dream-visions are earmarked by both unity and diversity. This brings the study back to our leading question of how to characterize the Aramaic texts as a group in light of the concentration, compositional patterns, and concerns of dream-visions.

CHAPTER SEVEN

OVERVIEW AND OUTCOMES

This dissertation charted a course through the world of the Aramaic corpus, stopping along the way to consider those writings that feature dream-visions. In this process my aim was to describe an important component of the collection that balanced the consideration of individual writings with some comparative study between groups of texts. This was achieved by meeting the interrelated goals of detailing some aspects of the composition (Part One) and concerns (Part Two) of dream-visions. In these last pages I will give an overview of the main contours of the study and will outline two implications of Aramaic dream-visions for questions of discourses in ancient Judaism, and for casting further light on the origins and development of the apocalypse as a literary genre.

1 Toward a description of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corpus

The basic contention that bound the two parts of this study together is that the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls contain some rather similar dream-visions, which accomplish some rather similar things. In Chapter Two it was determined that dream-vision revelation figured in nineteen identifiable compositions among the some twenty-nine narrative works attested among the Aramaic Scrolls discovered in the Qumran caves. These include: the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of the Luminaries*, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle of Enoch*, the *Book of Giants*, *4QWords of Michael*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *4QTestament of Jacob?*, the *New Jerusalem* text, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, *4Qapocryphon of Levi^b?*, *4QVisions of Amram*, *Dan 2-7*, *4QAramaic Apocalypse*, *4QFour Kingdoms*, *4QVision^a*, *4QpapVision^b*, *4QVision^d*, and *4QpapApocalypse*. In

establishing a prospectus of these works I began to collect some of the major recurring literary motifs, images, and emphases that crop up in accounts across the collection. An important aspect of this broad survey was to formulate a working outline of the features that give shape and context to the dream-vision as literary convention. Chapter Three enhanced the detail of this developing picture by calling attention to how some authors phrased and framed their dream-visions using a common stock of Aramaic idioms. This component of the study underscored some overarching philological similarities as well as how some pairs or clusters of texts used closely paralleled language to structure their accounts. A synopsis of the major literary-linguistic features of the Aramaic dream-visions was presented at the ends of Chapters Two and Three. Taken together, these chapters provide a thorough orientation to the prominence and literary-linguistic shape of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus.

The goal of Part One was not to mask the great diversity that is inherent to these dream-visions. Rather, it was to highlight that there are strands of unity within this diversity. This situation could be explained in a number of ways. When a given idiom or image was found in Aramaic Daniel and one or more other Aramaic dream-vision texts, it was not uncommon to find that some commentators assume or imply Danielic priority. This cannot be ruled out. However, it is unlikely to be the case for every echo heard between Daniel and another work. It is natural to initially explain fresh evidence in light of data with which we are already familiar. By virtue of its subsequent canonical position in both Judaism and Christianity, by the time the Aramaic texts had come to light, scholarly (and confessional) circles had already established a deep knowledge and

appreciation of Daniel. In light of this, at first glance, certain features found in *1QapGen*, *BG*, or *4QVisAmram*, to name a few, indeed appear ‘Danielic.’ However, such explanations often have less to do with anything intrinsic to the evidence than with how the evidence has come down to us. That is, the reception history of biblical literature has influenced how we read and explain non-received texts. Even if one is confident in alleged linguistic features of Aramaic Daniel that *may* locate its composition slightly before some of the Qumran Aramaic texts, it cannot be concluded on this basis alone that Daniel is at the hub of the Aramaic dream-vision tradition.¹ Therefore, it is necessary to move beyond first impressions and exercise a greater sensitivity to canonical anachronism when working with this Aramaic literature.

The concentration of similarities between these Aramaic dream-visions suggests that *all* of these works should be plotted on a constellation *together*, with no single text being the brightest star of the bunch. To develop this metaphor a step further, it may be that an individual star is at the nexus of more than one constellation. In those instances where Aramaic Daniel – or any other composition for that matter – may be shown to have verifiable influence on another text or subset of texts, these may be conceived of as comprising a smaller constellation linked to, but offset from, the central configuration. This understanding allows that Daniel may have been the point of departure for a smaller cluster of Aramaic dream-vision literature (e.g., possibly *4QFourKgdms* and *4QAramApoc*) without demanding that this tradition wielded formative influence over *all* corners of the corpus. This finding of the dissertation, however, should not be understood

¹ For a preliminary critique of the linguistic dating of Aramaic Daniel as evidence for Danielic priority in the Aramaic corpus, see pages 95-96, n. 50.

as wholly critical of Daniel, as a demotion, as it were. On the contrary, the surge of new Aramaic evidence among the Dead Sea Scrolls provides a fresh interpretive arena for a text that has been read and revered for centuries. In light of this new evidence we can ask both old and new questions of the atmosphere in which Aramaic Daniel took shape and developed.

Part Two of the dissertation contributed further to the understanding of the nature of this constellation by describing three overarching concerns manifested in the dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus. The findings of Chapter Four dovetailed with those of Chapter Three in that *IQapGen*, *1 Enoch*, and *ALD* were found to deduce dream-visions from some closely paralleled philological features of their respective sources in the Hebrew Scriptures. This triad of works exhibited an enhanced exegetical acumen that used some common building blocks to create dreams and dreamers in a paratextual relation to the inherited, authoritative scriptures. Chapter Five outlined how some dream-visions were informed in various ways by priestly concepts and concerns. *4QVisAmram* and *NJ* were found to have highly focused priestly interests and knowledge that pertained to the priesthood and cult. The former's understanding of the priestly heritage was shown to draw upon and extend from *ALD*. Insofar as can be discerned from their fragmentary remains, *4QTJacob?* and *4QapocrLevi^b?* blended priestly motifs with eschatological outlooks. Finally, Chapter Six captured how a sizable cross-section of the Aramaic texts utilized the dream-vision as a historiographical mechanism for explaining the intersections, continuity, and patterns of the past, present, and future. Broad sweeps of human history were couched in dream-visions attributed to Enoch in *ApW* and *AnAp*. *BG*

and *IQapGen* balanced history on the fulcrum of the flood and used this cataclysmic event from the past as a means of prognosticating the limited future and eschaton. Daniel 2, 7 and *4QFourKgdms* accentuated the advent of the eschatological kingdom of God by domesticating an ancient historiographical motif that aligned history with successive imperial reigns. *NJ* and *4QAramApoc* appear to have located the arrival of the eschaton on the heels of some sort of geopolitical upheavals among the nations. This group of texts espouse a view that all of history is predetermined and laid out before the God of Israel. Through visionary revelation he may choose to make known aspects or all of this unfolding drama to individuals on earth below.

By describing the common concerns of Aramaic dream-visions in this way it was not my aim to present three, separate categories that correspond with different ‘types’ of texts. In fact, I intend the opposite, to move away from a typological approach to the Aramaic corpus. It is less urgent to account for how all of the data exhibits exegetical, priestly, historiographical, or any other concerns that may be perceived in future research, than it is to recognize that the main concerns I have described here operate at different levels throughout the majority of the Aramaic dream-visions texts. Furthermore, it is important to allow for some overlap and interplay between the three proposed usages. This allowance lends further credence to the idea that these works exist in a constellation-type relationship *not* in separate categories. Just as there were some shared literary-linguistic features between groups of texts, so too there are some shared concerns addressed or advanced in dream-visions across the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.

For these reasons I am confident in using the term ‘corpus’ as a descriptor for the Aramaic texts. This terminology may be applied to a body of literature so long as there is sufficient evidence for some unity across a majority of the constitutive writings. No single criterion will achieve this. This study, however, confirmed that the dream-vision ranks as one of the more important criteria indicating corporeal unity. The sort of literary-ideological commonalities described here beg the question of how to conceive of the social world that produced this literature. While we are left in the dark on most aspects of the early composition and transmission history of the Aramaic texts, the handiwork of the scribes who penned them provides some indication that they originated in close-knit scribal circles in the 4th-2nd centuries BCE. Future research may cast additional light onto other major facets of this corpus by tracking other literary forms or ideas that flow throughout pairs, clusters, or networks of Aramaic texts. This longer term project, of course, will always require detailed study of individual Aramaic writings. The resultant body of knowledge would then provide an adequate background against which to conduct a more comprehensive project that maps out the characteristics of the corpus in full and reconstructs the scribal world responsible for its production in more concrete terms.

2 Pseudepigraphy, epistemology, and dream-vision discourses

The language and concept of discourses has been increasingly used to describe certain textual phenomena in the Hebrew Scriptures and literary heritage of Second Temple Judaism. Hindy Najman and Carol Newsom are among the more influential proponents of discourse theory in these areas. Najman theorized that a number of Second Temple Jewish authors linked the authority and authorship of their texts to the scriptural

heroes of Israel's past, most prominently to the character of Moses. The so-called development of "Mosaic discourse," she suggests, is one that is both native to, and extends beyond, the biblical texts. Najman writes,

[i]t has been noted that, in Deuteronomy, compared to earlier traditions, Moses plays a strikingly expanded role. Also noteworthy, however, is the continued expansion of Moses' role in Second Temple texts, both biblical and para-biblical. The development has at least two dimensions. On the one hand, authoritative law comes to be called the Torah of Moses, and the list of laws under that heading is subject to expansion and augmentation. On the other hand, the figure of Moses becomes increasingly central and Moses himself is idealized in various ways linked to various notions of authority: for example, as prophet, as lawgiver, as divine amanuensis, as king and as divine man.²

Following this general definition, Najman proposed four features that are present when compositions participate in and contribute to Mosaic discourse. In each case the 'new' text:

- (i) reworks and expands older traditions, thus claiming "for itself the authority that already attaches to those traditions;"
- (ii) "ascribes to itself the status of Torah" and presents itself "as an authentic expression of the Torah of Moses;"
- (iii) "is said to be a re-presentation of the revelation at Sinai," a strategy that "emphasizes the presentness of the Sinai event;" and
- (iv) "is said to be associated with, or produced by, the founding figure, Moses ... [t]he new text can then be seen as an extension of earlier ancestral discourse."³

² Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 10-11.

³ *Ibid.*, 16-17. Najman, however, is quick to qualify that, "I do not claim that the discourse of Moses is the only discourse operative in ancient Judaism, or even that it is the most important one" (*ibid.*, 17).

Using these four criteria, Najman concluded that Ezra-Nehemiah, *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and select writings of Philo evidence Mosaic discourse. Najman, however, demonstrated that individual authors negotiated this discourse differently by interweaving scriptural tradition with aspects of their contemporary culture and infusing their works with unique exegetical and theological concerns. Thus, Mosaic discourse is a recognizable phenomenon that flows through various literatures but cannot be reduced to a monolithic development.

Newsom explored discourses of identity formation and reinforcement in a cross-section of Qumran sectarian literature.⁴ Her work has implications for a number of areas in Second Temple studies. Here I will focus on Newsom's proposal for what she has described as the discourse of "apocalyptic scribalism." In contrast to the sapiential accent placed on torah (both textual and non-textual) and scribal culture in Ben Sira, Newsom observed that the presentation of Daniel as a sagacious figure in the book of Daniel was intricately linked to a different epistemology. Newsom described this difference as follows:

[t]he figure of Daniel as expert, developed in the narratives, is used explicitly as a foil in the apocalypses, where the expert appears repeatedly baffled. *Esoterism replaces expertise as the model of knowledge*. Its otherworldly quality is emphasized – far beyond Ben Sira's mild language of inspiration – through the media of dream visions and angelic interpreters, as well as through the physically devastating effects of revelation.⁵

⁴ Carol. A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 44, emphasis original. Newsom later notes that a similar understanding is also to be found in *Jubilees*, the *Testament of Moses*, and *4 Ezra* (*ibid.*, 48-55).

This transfer of the sphere of divine knowledge necessitated a shift in the ways in which divine disclosure was attained and conferred. Newsom later argued that the cultivation of knowledge in this discourse lies in ascending to and attaining the mysteries of God.⁶ This understanding of accessing divine knowledge, Newsom alleges, is evident in both sectarian and non-sectarian writings, with some representation from the later in the Aramaic Scrolls (e.g., *1 Enoch*, *1QapGen*, and *4QVisAmram*).⁷

Since I have not plied discourse theory throughout the dissertation, I do not intend to impose these models retrospectively on the study. However, it does seem that Najman's and Newsom's works provide a helpful space for contextualizing some components of this project. This may allow for beginning to think about a discourse of dream-visions that is especially well-presented in, and formative to, the Aramaic corpus. The relevance of Najman's model for the study of Aramaic dream-visions is that it grants a way of understanding how some scriptural figures became magnets for developing literary traditions in the Second Temple period. One of the primary ways this is manifested in the Aramaic corpus is the usage of pseudepigraphic voices.⁸ Apart from *BG* and the latter columns of *1QapGen*, all of the Aramaic texts included in this study are couched in the first-person voice. The vast majority of pseudepigraphic voices employed are those of patriarchal personages. This voicing technique coheres with those criteria laid out by Najman that are not necessarily unique to Mosaic discourse but may be reimagined as a means of linking new works to *any* ancient character in the scriptural tradition

⁶ Ibid., 72.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ On this feature, see especially Stuckenbruck, "Pseudepigraphy and First Person."

(especially her criteria one and four). The clever use of patriarchal pseudonyms in works like *1 Enoch*, *1QapGen*, *4QTJacob*, *NJ*, *ALD*, *4QapocrLevi^b?*, and *4QVisAmram* may be understood as an authorial attempt to extend and ascribe authority to the works being produced. This method of presentation enabled authors to underscore that the past continues to speak into the present. The dream-vision may be understood as the mechanism that legitimized the expansion of the older tradition. In light of the overwhelming trend for patriarchal pseudepigraphy in the Aramaic corpus, Dan 2-7 is an intriguing case. Because Daniel is not a figure with an established resume in the Pentateuch – a similar situation obtains in the book of Tobit and plausibly *4QJews in the Persian Court* – Aramaic Daniel cannot be understood as pseudepigraphic in the technical sense. As Collins observed, however, Daniel *becomes* a pseudonym in the budding tradition of works ascribed to and associated with his name.⁹ Among the Aramaic Scrolls this is true of *4QPseudDan^{a-c}* (4Q243-45), and perhaps for *4QFourKgdms* and *4QaramApoc* which, as was demonstrated in Chapters Two and Six, featured court-tale-like dream-vision narratives. In this respect, the first-person perspectives of the Danielic

⁹ John J. Collins, “Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January 1997* (eds. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 43-58, esp. 48-52. This is not to say that Daniel is entirely divorced from the patriarchal past. The characterization and narrative setting of the court-tales in Dan 2-7 are closely crafted on the Joseph traditions of Gen 37-41. Therefore, the Aramaic Daniel traditions exist in a different degree of paratextual orientation to the patriarchal traditions. For discussions on Daniel’s orientation to Genesis, see Collins, *Daniel*, 39-40; Robert Gnuse, “The Jewish Dream Interpreter in a Foreign Court: The Recurring Use of a Theme in Jewish Literature,” *JSP* 7 (1990): 29-53; Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), 38; Michael Segal, “From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2,” *VT* 59 (2009): 123-49; and Jan-Wim Wesseliuss, “The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic,” *AS* 3 (2005): 241-83.

traditions operate from a slightly different angle than much of the other dream-vision texts in the Aramaic Scrolls.

Firmer common ground between the patriarchal and Danielic dream-vision traditions is found in their shared epistemology. Here Newsom's work comes into view. No matter the identity of the dreamer or oneirocritic, in the Aramaic Scrolls the primary means of knowledge acquisition is the dream-vision. This suggests a common understanding of both where knowledge is vouchsafed and the preferred means of knowledge mediation. Newsom described the discourse of apocalyptic scribalism primarily in light of the book of Daniel and gave only brief mention of this phenomenon in the Aramaic texts. In light of the present study, her list can now be extended to at least nineteen works among the Aramaic corpus that looked to the dream-vision as a means of unlocking, understanding, and inscribing otherworldly knowledge (see list above). This type of discourse appears to have had a broader representation in the world of Aramaic literature, of which Aramaic Daniel was a part.

These insights on the Aramaic Scrolls point to an overlap in the discourse models proposed by Najman and Newsom. In the Aramaic patriarchal pseudepigraphs the literary convention of the dream-vision served as a mechanism by which the authors could (i) infuse their texts with an air of derived authority from the voices of scriptural personages, and (ii) associate their traditions with the sorts of revelation that are concerned with unlocking heavenly mysteries or attaining special knowledge. From this vantage point authors were well-poised to weave contemporary exegetical or ideological interests into their texts, rendering their inherited, scriptural traditions relevant for their contemporary

world. In these ways, a discourse model may help explain some underlying aspects of dream-visions in the Aramaic corpus. I now turn to consider how these Aramaic dream-visions might inform some underlying questions on the evolution of the apocalypse as a literary genre.

3 *The quest for the ancient Jewish apocalypse*

The Aramaic texts hold great potential for illuminating the origins and development of the apocalyptic genre and worldview in the Second Temple period. As more of the Aramaic texts came to light in the early years of research and the corpus at last saw full critical publication in DJD XXXI (2001) and DJD XXXVII (2009), scholars have increasingly recognized that the preponderance of apocalyptic literature that has come down to us is penned in Aramaic, *not* Hebrew.¹⁰ This situation has compelled some researchers to draw up lists of which Aramaic texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls may be described as apocalyptic in form or outlook (see table below). However, as is evident from this presentation, no two proposals are the same. Looming behind these variations are different conceptions – stated or implied – of what boundaries are drawn around the

¹⁰ This position has been stated with varying degrees of specificity, not least due to the limited amount of Aramaic materials publically available until relatively recently. See, for example, Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495-530; Dimant, “Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 179; Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 405; Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypticism and the Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 451-76; Jörg Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexts für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik in Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum,” in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (eds. Jörg Frey and Michael Becker; Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifantus, 2007), 11-62; García Martínez, “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica,” 437; and Daniel A. Machiela, “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature” (paper presented at The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview Nangeroni Meeting, Milan, 25-29 June 2012).

apocalypse as literary genre and/or what constitutes an apocalyptic worldview. This is emblematic of a trend in recent scholarship that emphasizes that genre parameters must be somewhat elastic and genre categories organic. This is perhaps best illustrated by some of Collins' recent reflections on the *Semeia* 14 project.¹¹ Commenting on the problematics of delineating genre types, Collins remarked that "no matter how we define them [genres], they always have fuzzy edges, borderline cases, and related types."¹² One of the reasons why these fuzzy edges can be expected to come in and out of focus in the lifespan of a genre is the emergence of new data. New works may be "perceived as belonging to a genre because they resemble the prototypical exemplars, but the understanding of the prototypes may be modified by the inclusion of the new texts."¹³ Statements on the transformative effect of new data and the necessity of ongoing evolution of genre classifications are also found in the writings of Brooke, Machiela, Reynolds, and Tigchelaar.¹⁴ Since the focus of this dissertation has not been on founding

¹¹ For the original statement on this definition, see Collins, "Towards the Morphology of a Genre," 1-19. Collins built upon this foundation most extensively in his *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. I choose the *Semeia* 14 definition to illustrate the point because it has enjoyed a wider acceptance and application than most other attempts to define the genre. The multiplicity of definitions and descriptions on offer is, of course, another indicator of the unsettledness of what qualifies a work as a formal apocalypse. For other major proposals, see the following: J. Carmignac, "Qu'est-ce-quel'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumran," *RevQ* 10 (1979) 3-33; Lorenzo DiTommaso, "The Apocalyptic Other," in *The Other in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins* (eds. Daniel C. Harlow, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 221-46; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975); Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1972); D. S. Russel, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (OTL: Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964); and Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (JSPSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997). For a detailed history of research on the question of definition, see Lorenzo DiTommaso, "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)," *CBR* 5 (2007): 235-86, esp. 238-47.

¹² John J. Collins, "Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 17 (2010): 418-30, here 420.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 424.

¹⁴ Brooke: "it must be acknowledged that genres change every time a new text is added as an illustration of a particular genre" (George J. Brooke, "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet," *DSD* 17 [2010]: 361-86, here 375). Machiela: "there is also the issue of shifting borders with every new apocalypse

a new generic definition of the apocalypse, I do not wish to overstep the outcomes of my project by wading too deeply into this important but delicate issue. Rather, I wish to point out a few ways in which Aramaic dream-vision traditions constitute an important piece of new data for this task. The following insights may be of some use when describing the contours of the apocalyptic worldview as well as for rethinking aspects of the *Semeia* 14 conception of the apocalypse. Before teasing out some possible contributions from the Aramaic dream-visions it will be helpful to have a sense of which of the Aramaic texts have been described as exhibiting either an apocalyptic outlook or containing/comprising formal apocalypses. This is achieved by the table on the following pages that represents of recent scholarly proposals.

identified: once a new text (e.g., *Visions of Amram*) is adopted as an apocalypse, it may potentially bring with it new associations, thereby re-jigging the base definition of our constructed genre” (“Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period”). Reynolds: “all generic definitions are imperfect because of the continual innovation and cross-fertilization of genres” (*Between Symbolism and Realism*, 31). Tigchelaar: “[o]ne might say genres are born, live and die ... In a way, each genre permanently undergoes transformations” (Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses,” *JSJ* 18 [1987]: 137-44, here 139).

TABLE: Lists of Apocalypses or Apocalyptically Oriented Texts among the Aramaic Corpus (continued on next page)

	Collins	Dimant	DiTommaso	Frey	García Martínez	Lange & Mittman-Richart	Machiela	Reynolds
<i>Works Containing Dream-Visions</i>								
<i>BW</i>	●	○	●	●	▲	●	○	
<i>Luminaries</i>	●	●	●	●	▲	●	●	
<i>BD</i>	●	●	●	●	▲	●	●	
<i>Epistle</i>	●	○	●	●	▲	●	○	
<i>BG</i>	▲	▲	▲	●	▲		○	●
<i>4QWordsMich</i>	■	▲	▲	●	▲		●	●
<i>1QapGen</i>		▲	▲				○	○
<i>4QTJacob?</i>		▲	▲		▲		●	
<i>NJ</i>	■	●	●	●	▲	●	●	●
<i>ALD</i>		▲	▲				○	
<i>4QapocrLevi^b?</i>	▲	▲	▲		▲		●	
<i>4QVisAmram</i>	●	▲	▲	●	▲		○	●
<i>Daniel</i>	●	▲	●	●		●	●	●
<i>4QAramApoc</i>	■	●	■		▲	●	▲	●
<i>4QFourKgdms</i>	■	●	▲	●	▲	●	●	●
<i>4QVision^a</i>	■	▲	▲			■	▲	
<i>4QpapVision^b</i>	■	▲	▲			■	●	
<i>4QVision^d</i>		▲				■	▲	
<i>4QpapApoc</i>			▲			■	■	
<i>Tobit</i>		▲						

Legend

- = Entire composition is an apocalypse
- = Apocalypse(s) embedded within composition
- ▲ = Composition not formally an apocalypse but has apocalyptic outlook/elements
- = Composition potentially an apocalypse, but evidence limits verification

TABLE: Lists of Apocalypses or Apocalyptically Oriented Texts among the Aramaic Corpus (continued from previous page)

	Collins	Dimant	DiTommaso	Frey	García Martínez	Lange & Mittman-Richart	Machiela	Reynolds
<i>Works Not Containing Dream-Visions</i>								
<i>Birth Noah (1 En. 106-107)</i>	▲					●	▲	
<i>1 En. 108</i>						●		
<i>4QBirth Noah^{a-c} (4Q534-36)</i>	▲	▲	▲		▲		▲	
<i>4QPseudoDan A (4Q234-44)</i>	■		■	●	▲	●	▲	●
<i>4QPseudoDan B (4Q245)</i>	■			●	▲	●	▲	
<i>4QapocrLev^{a?} (4Q540)</i>	▲	▲	▲		▲		▲	
<i>4QProphecy^a (4Q556)</i>	■						▲	
<i>4QProphecy^b (4Q556a)</i>	■	▲					▲	
<i>4QPrNab (4Q242)</i>		▲			▲			
<i>4QTQahat (4Q542)</i>		▲	▲					
<i>4QTJudah, 4QTJoseph (4Q538-539)</i>		▲						
<i>4QJews in the Persian Court (4Q550)</i>		▲						
<i>4QAccount (4Q551, formerly 4QDanSuz?)</i>		▲						
<i>6QApocalypse (6Q14)</i>			▲				■	
<i>Tobit</i>		▲						

Legend

- = Entire composition is an apocalypse
- = Apocalypse(s) embedded within composition
- ▲ = Composition not formally an apocalypse but has apocalyptic outlook/elements
- = Composition potentially an apocalypse, but evidence limits verification¹⁵

¹⁵ This table is intended to represent the *status quaestionis* on the representation of apocalyptic literature in the Aramaic Scrolls. For reasons that will become evident below, I have chosen to divide this presentation between those texts that feature dream-visions and those that do not. These data were collated from a number of studies and required certain liberties to be taken when representing scholarly discussions in this readily accessible format. For example, I have given Daniel a single slot, though scholars may have intended chapters or parts of the work. Conversely, I have segmented *1 Enoch* into its constituent works. Typically scholars are more direct as to which components of the Enochic traditions are (not) apocalyptic. This synthesis is not intended to reduce the careful work of these scholars to a page of dots and boxes. Whenever possible I have sought to reflect individual nuances in the following notes. Since my focus here

is on the Aramaic texts, I have not included instances of where these scholars have suggested the presence of Hebrew apocalypses among the Scrolls. Note that I have also updated sigla/nomenclature to allow for easier comparison.

Collins: This listing is drawn primarily from John J. Collins, “The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 547-64, esp. 555-58, but is beneficially informed by some of Collins’ other statements in “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 403-30; *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 5-7; and idem, “Apocalypse,” *EDEJ*, 341-45. Collins also stated “[t]here are a few other texts (4Q456, 457, 458) that might be added to the corpus of Aramaic apocalypses, but these are too fragmentary to be discussed with any confidence (“Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 419). I assume here that Collins meant *4QVision^a*, *4QVision^c*, and *4QpapVision^b*, since the sigla he referred to are for fragmentary Hebrew texts.

Dimant: Dimant has indicated that ten of the Aramaic texts may be described “as apocalypses or visionary narratives” and provided an appendix of nineteen Aramaic works that are related to apocalyptic literature (“Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran,” 180, 191). It is problematical that Dimant does not list the ten works she allocates to the first category. A similar issue besets her more recent description of the Aramaic texts. While she populated a category of “visionary compositions” with at least seven texts which are later described as “Aramaic visionary apocalyptic tales,” it is not clear how and where the apocalypse genre manifests itself and/or which works might be described more accurately as evidencing an apocalyptic worldview (cf. *ibid.*, 202-203). My understanding of Dimant’s work here starts with the default position that all of the texts she enumerates have apocalyptic leanings. I have indicated those instances where her comments were more direct regarding the apocalypse genre. Note that in her contribution to the *Aramaica Qumranica* volume (“Themes and Genres”), Dimant paid less attention to apocalypses and apocalypticism in the Aramaic Scrolls, but at various points accentuated the place of dream-visions in many of the texts included in the listing provided here.

DiTommaso: This listing is based on the appendix titled “Aramaic Apocalypica at Qumran,” compiled in “Apocalypticism and the Aramaic Texts,” 474-46. Earlier in his treatment, DiTommaso stated that “approximately two-thirds [of the Qumran Aramaic texts] contain portions of either formal apocalypses or texts that are otherwise constitutionally informed by the fundamental axioms of apocalypticism” (*ibid.*, 456). It is not always clear which texts DiTommaso would describe as formal apocalypses. I have tried to draw some conclusions from his study on the identification of specific Aramaic apocalypses. When this was not possible I assume that for DiTommaso all of these texts are informed by an apocalyptic worldview. See also the less detailed listing in DiTommaso, “The Development of Apocalyptic Historiography,” 499.

Frey: These data are drawn from Frey, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik.” Frey discusses those texts included in the table under the heading “‘Apokalypsen’ in der Bibliothek von Qumran” (*ibid.*, 23-32), suggesting that all of these works are deemed formal apocalypses or contain sub-units that qualify them for consideration under this generic rubric.

García Martínez: At one point or another García Martínez has described the above marked texts as apocalyptic in their outlook, as well as indicated that several other fragmentary texts may be added to this roster. Although, he has not specified which texts specifically should be characterized as formal apocalypses, he has indicated that some are generic apocalypses according to the *Semeia* 14 definition (“Aramaica Qumranica,” 438). For García Martínez’ listings of texts, see *Qumran and Apocalyptic*; “Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Texts, 334-35; and “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalypica,” 438.

Lange & Mittmann-Richert: This list derives from a classification of the Dead Sea Scrolls collection by content and genre in DJD XXXIX, 141-42. The compilers of this index rightfully recognize that the distinctions between the apocalypse as a genre, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism as a worldview are often difficult to discern (*ibid.*, 120-21). Their treatment of the category of “Apocalyptic and Eschatological Texts” (*ibid.*, 141-43) comprised five sub-sections: otherworldly journey, symbolic apocalypses, non-symbolic apocalypses, revelatory texts too fragmentary for further classification, and eschatological texts. I have integrated all of the Aramaic texts included in these subsections.

There are at least four outcomes of this study that may illumine the formation and background of ancient Jewish apocalyptic literature. First, the saturation of dream-visions in the Aramaic texts indicates the centrality of this divinatory medium to apocalyptic thought in general. This may give further reason to locate the origins of the apocalypse in dream-vision literature. This idea was first proposed by Carmignac in his contribution to the Uppsala conference in 1979. Carmignac suggested that the use of symbolic and metaphorical language in prophetic, visionary literature (e.g., the books of Amos, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) provided the impetus for the emergence of the apocalypse. At that time he described this budding genre in broad strokes as represented by “Daniel et d’autres auteurs de la période intertestamentaire, en attendant le Jean de l’Apocalypse.”¹⁶ After lying fallow for some years, Carmignac’s hypothesis was picked up and developed by Flannery-Dailey and Reynolds, who in their own ways demonstrated the significance of the dream-vision for our understanding the emergence of the apocalypse in ancient Judaism.¹⁷ As is evident in the table above, dream-visions factor into approximately half

Machiela: This list was proposed in “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” and further explained in “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period.” With respect to the apocalyptic character of *IQapGen*, see also his “Genesis Revealed.”

Reynolds: For this listing, see *Between Symbolism and Realism*, 29.

¹⁶ Jean Carmignac, “Description du phénomène de l’Apocalyptique dans l’Ancien Testament,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (ed. David Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 163-70, here 169. Note also Koch’s suggestive statements on the analogy between prophetic visions/auditions and the emergence of apocalyptic discourses (Klaus Koch, “What is Apocalyptic? An Attempt at a Preliminary Definition,” in *Visionaries and their Apocalypses* [ed. Paul D. Hanson; IRT 2; London: SPCK; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 16-36, esp. 21).

¹⁷ Flannery-Dailey emphasized that that the world traversed by the dreamer was one in which the ontological, spatial, and temporal constraints of waking reality were relaxed, reconfigured, and overcome so that “almost anything imaginable is logical” (*Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 249, emphasis original). Along with the use of polyvalent symbols, this so-called “dream logic” provided a catalyst for the construction of a limitless reality that is prevalent in and formative for apocalyptic literature (*ibid.*, 272). This thesis is developed further in her “Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature,” in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (ed. April D.

of those works that have been singled out as apocalyptic in form or outlook. If Carmignac's idea is accepted, then this overlap may suggest that the dream-visions of the Aramaic corpus provide an important snapshot of a critical evolutionary stage of the apocalypse from visionary prototype to a genre in its own right. Perhaps the best example of this is *NJ*. While we cannot know the narrative setting of the dream-vision, the author of this work is heavily informed by the prophetic, visionary tradition of Ezek 40-48, but has developed this material in such a way that the work is characterized by most scholars as a formal apocalypse. *4QVisAmram* may be another example along this trajectory. Amram's priestly dream-vision of a courtroom dispute is not unlike Zechariah's dream-vision of the contest between Satan and the Lord over the suitability of the high priest Joshua in Zech 3. This pair of texts, then, indicates some linkages between scriptural prophetic visionaries and the dreamers of the Aramaic apocalypses.

Second, many of the apocalyptic Aramaic dream-visions noted in the table above are not self-standing compositions but exist as literary units stitched into writings of various other genres. Noah's dream-vision in *1QapGen* (1Q20) XII 19-XV 21 is located within a broader narrative framework that may be characterized as rewritten scripture; Amram's dream-vision in *4QVisAmram* is situated in a work that has significant affinities with later testamentary literature; and Aramaic Daniel, *4QFourKgdms*, and *4QAramApoc* accentuate the centrality of dream-visions in historical-fiction court-tales. In this respect, the study of the development of the ancient apocalypse cannot be limited to those works

DeConick; SBLSymS 11; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 231-47. Reynolds studied a cross-section of Hebrew and Aramaic texts from among the Scrolls and aimed to dissolve the traditional historical apocalypse/otherworldly journey dichotomy in favor of a classification of ancient apocalypses that is guided by Artemidorus' and Oppenheim's analogous typologies of dream-visions (*Between Symbolism and Realism*, 62-79).

that *in their entirety* comprise an apocalypse. Attention must be paid to the important examples of *embedded* apocalypses. In this way, these Aramaic dream-visions may show how the apocalypse developed on the hosts of other types of literature en route to becoming an independent genre.

Third, the Aramaic texts provide important evidence for the priestly application of apocalyptic dream-vision revelation in the mid Second Temple period. It was shown in Chapters Four and Five that a variety of priestly ideologies were furthered by dream-vision revelation. Of the texts treated there, *NJ* and *4QVisAmram* are again the most salient examples. Both of these works are steeped in priestly thought and even measure up well against the *Semeia* 14 definition of the apocalypse. It is also necessary to account for how the eschatological outlooks of works like *4QTJacob* and *4QapocrLevi^b?* include a space for priestly actions and actors. This suite of Aramaic priestly works suggests that, in addition to parcelling out the apocalypses into otherworldly journeys or historical apocalypses (*a la* Collins), a slot should be reserved for apocalypses with strong priestly bents and concerns.

Fourth, the historiographical character of the dream-visions described in Chapter Six may indicate that the Aramaic Scrolls are integral to tracing the lineage of the historical apocalypse in particular. It is true that the most plausible ancient Near Eastern background for this subtype is found in what Neujahr has recently described as “Akkadian *ex eventu* compositions,” such as the (Prophecy) Text A, Marduk Prophetic

Speech, Shulgi Prophetic Speech, Uruk Prophecy, and Dynastic Prophecy.¹⁸ However, the historiographical outlook of these works did not only inspire and affect the historiographical project of the book of Daniel, as stated in the earlier studies by Grayson, Hallo, and Lambert.¹⁹ In view of the variations on apocalyptic historiography evidenced in the Enochic tradition, *1QapGen*, *BG*, *4QFourKgdms*, *NJ*, and *4QAramApoc* it is now evident that the visionary historiographies of Dan 2 and 7 were but a few examples of a broader Aramaic tradition.

4 *Closing remarks*

This study opened with a comment from Artemidorus on the hazards of interpreting dream-visions not known in their entirety. Were we bound by such a method when considering the fragments of the Aramaic Scrolls, we could hardly say anything at all. Among these finds were several dream-vision episodes that are invariably fragmentary, often lacking beginnings, middles, and ends. In light of our starting point, it seems fitting to close with yet another reflection on the nature of dreams and oneirocriticism from Artemidorus. In writing his five volume manual on the topic, he related that his knowledge was the result of much personal research that took him across the then known world to collect and document the dreams of people from all walks of life (cf. preface to *Oneir.* books 1 and 5). Only once this broad knowledge base was in place

¹⁸ Matthew Neujahr, *Predicting the Past in the Ancient Near East: Mantic Historiography in Ancient Mesopotamia, Judah, and the Mediterranean World* (BJS 354; Providence: Brown University Press, 2012), 8.

¹⁹ A. K. Grayson, "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature," *Atti dell 'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 148 (1989-1990): 203-18; William Hallo, "The Expansion of Cuneiform Literature," in *Jubilee Volume of the American Academy for Jewish Research* (eds. Salo Wittmayer Baron and Isaac E. Barzilay; Proceedings 46-47; Jerusalem: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1980), 307-22; and W. G. Lambert, *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: Athlone, 1978), 16.

did he begin to explain the significance and meaning of such revelations. Hopefully the tour through the dream-vision world of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls undertaken here provides an analogous knowledgebase for furthering our understanding of this important literary phenomenon in the Aramaic corpus.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, in consultation with Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Bavli Berakhot 55a-57b: The Talmudic Dreambook in Context." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995): 230-48.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 20-48*. Word Biblical Commentary 29. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- Amihay, Aryeh and Daniel A. Machiela. "Traditions of the Birth of Noah." Pages 53-69 in *Noah and his Book(s)*. Edited by Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Angel, Joseph L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 86. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "A Paradigmatic Approach to the Qumran Book of Giants." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Chicago, November 19, 2012.
- _____. "On the Origins and Purpose of the Qumran *Book of Giants*." Forthcoming.
- Antonissen, Hugo. "The Visionary Architecture of New Jerusalem in Qumran." Pages 439-80 in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Carsten Claussen and Nadine Kessler. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament I 278. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Aschim, Anders. Review of Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. *Reviews in Biblical Literature* (1998): No Pages. Cited 15 November 2012. Online: <http://bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=2176&CodePage=2176>
- _____. "Melchizedek and Levi." Pages 773-88 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: Jerusalem, 2000.

- Attridge, H. W. "Historiography." Pages 157-84 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Aune, David. "Qumran and the Book of Revelation." Pages 622-48 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 1998-99.
- Avigad, Nahman and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*. Jerusalem: Magness, 1956.
- Baarda, T. "The Shechem Episode in the Testament of Levi: A Comparison with Other Traditions." Pages 11-73 in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A. S. Van Der Woude*. Edited by J. N. Bremmer and Florentino García Martínez. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 5. Kampen: Pharos, 1992.
- Baden, Joel S. "The Violent Origins of the Levites: Text and Tradition." Pages 103-16 in *Levites and Priests in History and Tradition*. Edited by Steven L. McKenzie. Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and its Literature 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Fragments araméens de Qumrân 2: Description de la Jérusalem Nouvelle." *Revue Biblique* 62 (1955): 222-45.
- _____. *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Bar, Shaul. *A Letter That Has Not Been Read: Dreams in the Hebrew Bible*. Monographs of Hebrew Union College 25. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2001.
- Barthélemy, D. and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Cave I*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jude, 2 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary 50. Waco: Word Books, 1983.
- Beale, G. K. and D. A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Bedenbender, Andreas. "Reflection on Ideology and Date of the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pages 200-203 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids Eerdmans, 2005.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "General Observations on Ancient Israelite Histories in their Ancient Contexts." Pages 21-39 in *Enquire of the Former Age: Ancient Historiography and Writing the History of Israel*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe. European Seminar in Historical Methodology 9. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 554. London: T & T Clark, 2011.

Berger, Klaus. "Die Streit des guten und des bösen Engels um die Seele: Beobachtungen zu 4Q Amr^b und Judas 9." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 4 (1973): 1-18.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996): 37-57.

_____. "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran." Pages 129-59 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999.

_____. "Noah and the Flood at Qumran." Pages 199-231 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 39-63 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth Anne Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

_____. "What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 24-49.

_____. "The Genesis Apocryphon and the Aramaic Targumim Revisited: A View from Both Perspectives." Pages 651-71 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages*

and Cultures. Edited by Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold, in association with Bennie H. Reynolds III. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 140. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

_____. "The *Genesis Apocryphon*: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives." Pages 157-79 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.

Berthelot, Katell and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. "Aramaica Qumranica: Introduction." Pages 1-12 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten, Band 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

_____. *The Aramaic Language: Its Distribution and Subdivisions*. Translated by John F. Healey. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Ergänzungsband*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.

_____. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairo Genisa, der Fastentolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Band 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Bickerman, Elias J. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1988.

Black, Matthew. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

_____. "The Fragments of the Aramaic Enoch from Qumran." Pages 15-28 in *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mischna: Quelques problèmes*. Edited by W. C. van Unnik. Recherches bibliques 9. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

_____. "The Apocalypse of Weeks in the Light of 4QEn^g." *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978): 464-69.

- Black, Matthew in consultation with James C. VanderKam. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.
- Bohak, Gideon. "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document." *Tarbiz* 79 (2011): 373-83 (Hebrew).
- Botterweck, Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Trans. By David E. Green. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 Volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974-2006.
- Block, Ariel. "The Cedar and the Palm Tree: A Paired Male/Female Symbol in Hebrew and Aramaic." Pages 13-17 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gitin, and Michael. Sokoloff. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Brayer, Menachem. "Psychosomatics, Hermetic Medicine, and Dream Interpretation in the Qumran Literature: Psychological and Exegetical Considerations." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60/2 (1969): 112-27.
- _____. "Psychosomatics, Hermetic Medicine, and Dream Interpretation in the Qumran Literature: Psychological and Exegetical Considerations." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60/3 (1970): 213-30.
- Brettler, Marc. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 1-2." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 601-11.
- Brooke, George J. "4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest." Pages 83-100 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

_____. "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible." Pages 31-40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: The British Museum. New Castle: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

_____. "Types of Historiography in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 211-30 in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography; l'Historiographie Biblique, Ancienne et Moderne*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 207. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007.

_____. "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 361-86.

Brooke, George, John Collins, Peter Flint, Jonas Greenfield, Erik Larson, Carol Newsom, Émile Puech, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Michael Stone, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, in consultation with James VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII. Oxford: Clarendon: 1996.

Broshi, Magen. "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 9-22 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Broshi, Magen, Esther Eshel, Joseph Fitzmyer, Erik Larson, Carol Newsom, Lawrence Shiffman, Mark Smith, Michael Stone, John Strugnell, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Brown, Raymond. *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*. Biblical Series 21. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

Bruce, F. F. "Josephus and Daniel." Pages 19-31 in *A Mind for What Matters: Collected Essays of F. F. Bruce*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.

Büchner, Dirk. "Exegetical Variants in the LXX of Exodus: An Evaluation." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22 (1996): 35-58.

- Caragounis, C. C. "History and Supra-History: Daniel and the Four Empires." Pages 387-97 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 56. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.
- Carmignac, Jean. "La future intervention de Dieu selon la pensée de Qumrân." Pages 219-29 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978.
- _____. "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1979) 3-33.
- _____. "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament." Pages 163-70 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Caquot, André. "Les Testaments Qoumrâniens des Pères du Sacerdoce." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 78 (1998): 3-26.
- Charles, R. H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1908.
- _____. *The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.
- _____. *The Book of Jubilees or The Little Genesis*. Translations of Early Documents Series: Palestinian Jewish Texts (Pre-Rabbinic). London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917.
- Charles, R. H. and A. Cowley. "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1907): 566-83.
- Chyutin, Michael. *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction* Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Cohen, H. Hirsch. *The Drunkenness of Noah*. Judaic Studies 4. Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama, 1974.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. "The Judaeen Legal Tradition and the *Halakhah* of the Mishnah." Pages 121-43 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Talmud and Rabbinic*

Literature. Edited by Charlotte Elisheva Fonrobert and Martin S. Jaffee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Collins, John J. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." Pages 1-19 in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Edited by John J. Collins. *Semeia* 14. Missoula, Mon.: Scholars Press, 1979.

_____. "The *Son of God* Text from Qumran." Pages 65-82 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

_____. *Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

_____. "Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A." Pages 579-90 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts, Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm, assisted by Christer D. Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.

_____. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1997.

_____. "The Background of the Son of God Text." *Bulletin of Biblical Research* 7 (1997): 51-62.

_____. "New Light on the Book of Daniel from the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 180-96 in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. *Vetus Testamentum Supplement* 73. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

_____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Livonia, Mich.: Dove Books, 1998.

_____. "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 403-30 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Volume 2. Brill: Leiden, 1999.

_____. "Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 43-58 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January 1997. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "The Sibylline Oracles." Pages 317-472 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009.

_____. "Epilogue: Genre Analysis and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 418-30.

_____. "The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives." Pages 547-64 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008.* Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Collins, John and Deborah Green. "The Tales from the Persian Court [4Q550a-e]." Pages 39-50 in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag.* Edited by Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

Cook, Edward. "4Q246." *Bulletin of Biblical Research* 5 (1995): 43-66.

_____. "4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered." Pages 13-17 in *Puzzling out the Past: Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures in Honor of Bruce Zuckerman.* Edited by Marilyn J. Lundberg, Steven Fine, and Wayne T. Pitard. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 55. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

_____. *A Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic.* Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming.

Cowley, A. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.

Coxon, P. W. "The Great Tree of Daniel 4." Pages 91-111 in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane.* Edited by James D. Martin and Philip R.

- Davies. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 42*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Development of Jewish Scripts." Pages 133-202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.
- _____. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- _____. "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical *Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246)*." Pages 1-13 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "The Structure of the Apocalypse of 'Son of God' (4Q246)." Pages 151-58 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Sailey, and Eugene Ulrich. *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1-2 Samuel*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert XVII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.
- Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 11*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992.
- Davies, G. I. "Apocalyptic and Historiography." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 5 (1978): 15-28.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Dehandschutter, Boudewijn. "Le rêve dans l'Apocryphe de la Genèse." Pages 48-55 in *La littérature juive entre Tenach et Mishna: Quelques problèmes*. Edited by Willem C. van Unnik. Recherches Bibliques 9. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Delcor, M. "Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2 (1971): 115-35.

Dijkstra, Meindert. "Is Balaam Also among the Prophets?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 43-64.

Dimant, Devorah. "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983): 14-29.

_____. "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran." Pages 175-91 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.

_____. "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance." Pages 23-58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness, Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

_____. "The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character." Pages 170-76 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery, 1947-1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: Jerusalem, 2000.

_____. Review of É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529-549*. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 292-304.

_____. "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua." Pages 105-34 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

_____. "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community." Pages 197-205 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile

- Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. "Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran." Pages 15-45 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Melchizedek at Qumran and in Judaism: A Response." Pages 361-67 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski. *Studia Judaeoslavica* 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- DiTomasso, Lorenzo. "4QPseudo-Daniel^{a-b} (4Q243-4Q244) and the Book of Daniel." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 12 (2005): 101-33.
- _____. *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- _____. "History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo." *Vetus Testamentum* 56 (2006): 413-18.
- _____. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5 (2007): 235-86.
- _____. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part II)." *Currents in Biblical Research* 5 (2007): 367-432.
- _____. "Apocalypticism and the Aramaic Texts from Qumran." Pages 451-76 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "The Apocalyptic Other." Pages 221-46 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- _____. "The Development of Apocalyptic Historiography in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 487-522 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian*

- Collection*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Dodds, E. R. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
- Dodson, Derek S. "Philo's *De somniis* in the Context of Ancient Dream Theories and Classifications." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 30 (2003): 299-312.
- Doering, Lutz. "Parallels without 'Parallelomania': Methodological Reflections on Comparative Analysis of Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 13-42 in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7-9 January, 2003*. Edited by Steven D. Fraade, Aharon Shemesh, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 62. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Donelson, Lewis R. *I & II Peter and Jude*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010.
- Doudna, Greg. "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis." Pages 430-71 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998-99.
- Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 86. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. "The Aramaic Levi Document – An Overview of its Content and Problematics." *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* 3 (2005): 7-17.
- _____. "The Initial Narrative of the *Visions of Amram* and its Literary Characteristics." *Revue de Qumran* 24 (2010): 517-54.
- _____. "The Literary Characteristics of the *Visions of Levi* (so-called *Aramaic Levi Document*)." *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 1 (2010): 303-19.
- Duke, Robert R. "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the Vision of Amram." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2007): 34-48.

- _____. *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543-547)*. Studies in Biblical Literature 135. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Ego, Beate “The Figure of Abraham in the Genesis Apocryphon’s Re-Narration of Gen 12:20-20.” Pages 233-43 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Ehrlich, Ernst Ludwig. *Der Traum im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 73. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1953.
- Eppel, R. “Les tables de la loi et les tables celestes.” *Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 17 (1937): 401-12.
- Eshel, Esther. “Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel.” Pages 387-89 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 83. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 2. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- _____. “Jubilees 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature.” Pages 21-36 in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 89. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. “The *Imago Mundi* of the Genesis Apocryphon.” Pages 111-31 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. “Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls.” Pages 573-600 in *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*. Edited by Menahem Kister. The Ancient Literature of Eretz Israel and Its World: Between Bible and Mishnah: The David and Jemima Jeselsohn Library. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2009 (Hebrew).
- _____. “The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts.” Pages 119-32 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The*

Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange, with the assistance of Lucas L. Schulte. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 52. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

_____. "The Noah Cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 77-95 in *Noah and his Book(s)*. Edited by Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel. "Separating Levi from Enoch: Response to 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.'" Pages 458-68 in *George W. E. in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 80. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

_____. "New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XpapEnoch." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 12 (2005): 134-57.

Eshel, Esther, Hanan Eshel, Carol Newsom, Bilhah Nitzan, Eileen Schuller, and Ada Yardeni. *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Eshel, Hanan. "The Damascus Document's 'Three Nets of Belial': A Reference to the Aramaic Levi Document?" Pages 243-55 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Evans, Craig A. "Are the 'Son' Texts at Qumran 'Messianic'? Reflection on 4Q369 and Related Scrolls." Pages 135-53 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

_____. "Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure." Pages 149-58 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Evans, Craig A. and Stanley E. Porter. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000.

Fabry, Heinz-Josef and Ulrich Dahmen. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten, Band 1*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.

Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Library of Second Temple Studies 63. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8. London. T & T Clark, 2007.

_____. "Divergence from Genesis in the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 193-203 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Fassberg, Steven E. "Salient Features of the Verbal System in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 65-100 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Finkel, Asher. "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures." *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963): 357-70.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1973): 382-407.

_____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

_____. *The Semitic Background of the New Testament, Volume II: A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

_____. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

_____. *The Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3rd ed. Biblica et orientalia 18/B. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004.

Fishbane, Michael. "The Qumran Peshet and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics." Pages 97-114 in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies Held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1973, Volume 1*. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1977.

_____. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 90. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

_____. "Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature." Pages 231-47 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 11. Edited by April D. DeConick. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "Religious Experience and the Apocalypses." Pages 125-44 in *Experientia, Volume 1: Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Frances Flannery, Colleen Shantz, and Rodney A. Werline. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 40. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Flint, Peter W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 329-67 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 83. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 2. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

_____. "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7." Pages 224-33 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on A Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, Harold J. Ellens, and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Flusser, David. "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel." *Israel Oriental Society* 2 (1972): 148-75.

_____. "The New Testament and Judaism on the First Centuries C.E.: The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran." *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31-37. Repr. pages 207-13 in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.

Freud, Sigmund *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by J. Strachey. 8th ed. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Frey, Jörg. "The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context." Pages 800-16 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Israel Exploration Society/Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum: Jerusalem, 2000.

_____. "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexts für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik in Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum." Pages 11-62 in *Apokalyptik und Qumran*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Michael Becker. Einblicke 10. Paderborn: Bonifantus, 2007.

Fröhlich, Ida. *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

_____. "The Parables of Enoch and Qumran Literature." Pages 343-51 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

García Martínez, Florentino. "4Q^a Amram b, i, 14: ¿Melki-reša o Melki-šedeq?" *Revue de Qumran* 12 (1985): 111-14.

_____. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

_____. "4Q246: The "Son of God" Document from Qumran." *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153-74.

_____. "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 243-60 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

_____. "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem." Pages 446-49 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of Andrea E. Alvarez. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 1998-99.

_____. "New Jerusalem at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 277-89 in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*. Edited by Jacques van Ruiten and J. Cornelis de Vos. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 124. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

_____. "Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?" *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. "Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran." Pages 329-41 in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honor of Jan N. Bremmer*. Edited by Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper. Numen Book Series, Studies in the History of Religions 127. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. "The *Books of Enoch* (*1 Enoch*) and the Aramaic Fragments from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 131-46.

_____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 Volumes. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews V: Notes to Volumes I and II, From the Creation to the Exodus*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1968.

Gladd, Benjamin. *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism and Its Bearing on First Corinthians*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 160. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.

Gnuse, Robert K. *The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1984.

_____. "The Jewish Dream Interpreter in a Foreign Court: The Recurring Use of a Theme in Jewish Literature." *Journal for the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 29-53.

- _____. *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus*. Arbeitne zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 36. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Goff, Matthew. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. "Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants' Appropriation of Gilgamesh Motifs." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009): 221-53.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Goldman, Liora. "Dualism in the *Visions of Amram*." *Revue de Qumran* 24 (2010): 421-32.
- Grabbe, Lester. Review of É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529-549*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 99 (2002): 32-33.
- Grayson, A. K. "The Babylonian Origin of Apocalyptic Literature." *Atti dell 'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 148 (1989-1990): 203-18.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. "The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document 4.15-19." *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 319-22.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone. "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977): 51-65.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Grelot, Pierre. "La légende d'Hénoch dans les Apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et Signification." *Recherches de science religieuse* 46 (1958): 5-26, 181-210.
- _____. "Hénoch et ses écritures." *Revue Biblique* 82 (1975): 481-500.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.
- Hall, R. G. *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

- Hallermayer, Michaela. *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit*. Deuterocanoical and Cognate Literature Studies 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Hallo, William. "The Expansion of Cuneiform Literature." Pages 307-22 in *Jubilee Volume of the American Academy for Jewish Research*. Edited by Salo Wittmayer Baron and Isaac E. Barzilay. Proceedings 46-47. Jerusalem: American Academy of Jewish Research, 1980.
- Hamidović, David. "La transtextualité dans *le livre de Michel* (4Q529; 6Q23): Une étude du répertoire des motifs littéraires apocalyptiques sur Hénoch, Daniel et les *Jubilés*." *Semitica* 55 (2013): 117-37.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- _____. *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 18-50*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Hanson, John S. "Dreams and Visions in the Graeco-Roman World and Early Christianity." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 23.2:1395-1427. Part 2, *Principat* 23.2. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Harris, William V. *Dreams and Experience in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 2009.
- Hartman, Lars. "The Function of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1976): 1-14.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Book of Daniel: Evidences Relating to Persons and Chronology." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19 (1981): 37-49.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 Volumes. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- _____. *The Son of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Henning, W. B. "The Book of Giants." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11 (1943): 52-74.

- Henze, Matthias. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 61. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End Time." Pages 207-209 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hibbins, John F. "The Summing Up of History in 2 Baruch." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 89 (1998): 45-79.
- Hieke, Thomas. "Endogamy in the Book of Tobit, Genesis, and Ezra-Nehemiah." Pages 103-20 in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology; Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20-21 May, 2004*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 98. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Hilbert, Benjamin D. H. "Joseph's Dreams, Part One: From Abimelech to Saul." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35 (2011): 259-83.
- _____. "Joseph's Dreams, Part Two: From Saul to Solomon." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 35 (2011): 435-461.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi*. Anchor Bible 25D. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____. "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 6 (1999): 1-23.
- _____. "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in Aramaic Levi and Jubilees." Pages 103-22 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by Ra'anan S. Boustán and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 83. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- Hollander, H. W. and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Holst, Søren and Jesper Høgenhaven. "Physiognomy and Eschatology: Some More Fragments of 4Q561." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 57 (2006): 26-43.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Psalms 3: A Commentary on Psalms 101-150*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.
- Husser, Jean-Marie. *Dreams and Dream Narratives in the Biblical World*. The Biblical Seminar 63. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993.
- Jassen, Alex P. "The Pesharim and the Rise of Commentary in Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2012): 363-98.
- Jeffers, Ann. *Magic and Divination in Ancient Palestine and Syria*. Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East 8. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII." Pages 247-60 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- _____. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 20.1:359-420. Part 2, *Principat* 20.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987.
- _____. "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi." Pages 71-89 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Esther Chazon and Michael Stone. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Jonge, M. de, in cooperation with, H. W. Hollander, E. J. de Jonge, and Th. Korteweg. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece I, 2. Leiden: Brill, 1978/

- Joosten, Jan. "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 351-74 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Joyce, Paul M. "Temple and Worship in Ezekiel 40-48." Pages 145-63 in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 422. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Justnes, Årstein. *The Time of Salvation: An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)*. European University Studies, Series 23, Theology, 893. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Kessels, A. H. M. "Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification." *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969): 389-424.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The 'Son of Man' as the Son of God*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Kister, Menahem. "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah." Pages 571-88 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. "Notes on Some Texts from Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 280-90.
- Kittel, R., et al. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Klein, Michael L. "Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targumim." *Eretz-Israel* 17 (1982): 134-40.
- Klein, Ralph W. *1 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- _____. *1 Samuel, Second Edition*. Word Biblical Commentary 10. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2008.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 165-84.

_____. "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch." Pages 213-19 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 10. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.

Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. London: SCM Press, 1972.

_____. "Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte: Die sogenannte Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (I Hen 93:1-10; 91:11-17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 96 (1983): 403-31.

_____. "What is Apocalyptic? An Attempt at a Preliminary Definition." Pages 16-36 in *Visionaries and their Apocalypses*. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Issues in Religion and Theology 2. London: SPCK. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

_____. "History as a Battlefield of Two Antagonistic Powers in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in the Rule of the Community." Pages 185-99 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids Eerdmans, 2005.

Korteweg, Th. "The Meaning of Naphtali's Visions." Pages 261-91 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Kugel, James. "Early Interpretation: The Common Background of Late Forms of Biblical Exegesis." Pages 11-106 in *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by James L. Kugel and R. Greer. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

_____. "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 1-64.

_____. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1998.

_____. "Which is Older, Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon? An Exegetical Approach." Pages 257-94 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman,

Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

_____. "How Old is the Aramaic Levi Document?" Pages 343-64 in *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of its Creation*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Kratz, Reinhard G. *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 63. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987.

_____. "Reich Gottes und Gesetz im Danielbuch und im werdenden Judentum." Pages 435-79 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A. S. van der Woude. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 56. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.

_____. "The Visions of Daniel." Pages 91-113 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 2. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

_____. "The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites." Pages 465-79 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "Whose Scripture? Whose Community? Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, By Way of Aramaic Levi." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 5-23.

Lambert, W. G. *The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic*. London: Athlone, 1978.

Lange, Armin. "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination." Pages 376-435 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995, Published*

- in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. “Dream Visions and Apocalyptic Milieus.” Pages 27-34 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. “Between Zion and Heaven: The *New Jerusalem* from Qumran as a Paratext.” Pages 397-412 in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008: Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittman-Richert. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- Lapin, Hayim. “Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism.” Pages 108-27 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Lee, Peter Y. “Aramaic Poetry in Qumran.” Ph. D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 2010.
- Legrand, Thierry. “Exégèses targumiques et techniques de réécriture dans l’Apocryphe de la Genèse (1QapGen ar).” Pages 225-52 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Lehmann, M. R. “1 Q Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim.” *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958): 249-63.
- Lenglet, A. “La structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7.” *Biblica* 53 (1972): 169-90.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge‘ez (Classical Ethiopic)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991.
- Leuchter, Mark. “Something Old, Something Older: Reconsidering 1 Sam 2:27-36,” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 4 (2003). No Pages. Cited 19 January 2013. Online:
<https://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/jhs/article/viewFile/5855/4908>.

- Levine, Baruch A. "Notes on an Aramaic Dream Text from Egypt." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84 (1964): 18-22.
- Levinson, Bernard M. "You Must Not Add Anything to What I Command You: Paradoxes of Canon and Authorship in Ancient Israel." *Numen* 50 (2003): 1-51.
- Lewis, D. W. "The First Greek Jew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2/3 (1957): 264-662.
- Licht, Jacob. "Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 16 (1965): 177-82.
- _____. "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran: The Description of the New Jerusalem." *Israel Exploration Journal* 29 (1979): 45-59.
- Lignée H. "l'Apocryphe de la Genèse." Pages 207-42 in *Les Textes de Qumran: Traduits et Annotés*. Edited by J. Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée. Volume 2. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- Luijken Gevirtz, Marianne. "Abram's Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and their Function." *Maarav* 8 (1992): 229-43.
- Machiela, Daniel A. "'Each to His Own Inheritance:' Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 50-66.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13-17*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 79. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "Genesis Revealed: The Apocalyptic Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1." Pages 205-21 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism – A Review of Recent Developments." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 61 (2010): 308-20.
- _____. "The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Paper presented at The Seleucid and Hasmonean

Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview Nangeroni Meeting. Milan, June 25-29, 2012.

_____. "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries: Historical Context and Lines of Development." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2012): 313-62.

_____. "Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts." *Ancient Judaism* 1 (2013), forthcoming.

_____. "Genesis Apocryphon." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Daniel A. Machiela. Volume 8. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, forthcoming.

Machiela, Daniel A. and Andrew B. Perrin. "Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon: Toward a Family Portrait." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, forthcoming.

_____. "'That you may know everything from him with certainty': A New Reading in 4QEnGiants^b ar (4Q530) and a Literary Connection between the Book of Giants and Genesis Apocryphon." *Revue de Qumran* 25 (2011): 113-125.

Maier, Johann. *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das "Neue Jerusalem."* Uni-Taschenbucher 829. München: Ernst Reinhardt, 1997.

Makiello, Phoebe. "Daniel as Mediator of Divine Knowledge in the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 60 (2009): 18-31.

Martin, Luther H. "Artemidorus: Dream Theory in Late Antiquity." *The Second Century* 8 (1991): 97-108.

Mason, Eric F. *'You Are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. "Melchizedek Traditions in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 343-60 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski. Studia Judaeoslavica 4. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

McCarter, Jr., P. Kyle. *1 Samuel*. Anchor Bible 8. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.

- McKenzie, Steven L. and Howard N. Wallace. "Covenant Themes in Malachi." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 549-63.
- Merkur, Dan. "Cultivating Visions through Exegetical Meditations." Pages 62-91 in *With Letters of Light: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Early Jewish Apocalypticism, Magic, and Mysticism in Honor of Rachel Eilior*. Edited by Daphna V. Arbel and Andrei A. Orlov. Ekstasis 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Meyers, Eric. "Priestly Language in the Book of Malachi." *Hebrew Annual Review* 10 (1986): 225-37.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Levitic Town: An Exercise in Town Planning." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 185-88. *Essays in Honour of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Geza Vermes and Jacob Neusner.
- Milik, J. T. "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen." Pages 117-27 in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt, Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- _____. "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une Citation d'Origène." *Revue biblique* 79 (1972): 77-97.
- _____. "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (1972): 95-144.
- _____, with the collaboration of Matthew Black. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.
- _____. "Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram." Pages 91-106 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978.
- _____. "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1992): 321-99.
- Miller, Geoffrey D. *Marriage in the Book of Tobit*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 10. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.

- Miller, John B. F. "Exploring the Function of Symbolic Dream-Visions in the Literature of Antiquity, with Another Look at 1QapGen 19 and Acts 10." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 37 (2010): 441-55.
- Montgomery, J. A. "Some Early Amulets from Palestine." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31 (1911): 272-281.
- Morgenstern, Matthew. Review of Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 44 (1999): 135-37.
- Morgenstern, Mathew, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan, with an appendix by Gregory H. Bearman and Sheila Spiro. "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon." *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 30-54.
- Moore, Carey A. *Tobit*. Anchor Bible 40A. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1972): 7-51.
- _____. *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Naveh, Joseph. "Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran." *Israel Exploration Journal* 48 (1998): 252-61.
- Neujahr, Matthew. *Predicting the Past in the Ancient Near East: Mantic Historiography in Ancient Mesopotamia, Judah, and the Mediterranean World*. Brown Judaic Studies 354. Providence: Brown University Press, 2012.
- Newsom, Carol. "The Past as Revelation: History in Apocalyptic Literature." *Quarterly Review* 4 (1984): 40-53.
- _____. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 575-600.

_____. "Patriarchs Who Worry about their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 137-58 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May 1996*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

_____. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

_____. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

_____. "The Parables of Enoch and the Manuscripts from Qumran." Pages 655-68 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric F. Mason, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, Angela Kim Harkins, and Daniel A. Machiela. Volume 2. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation: Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

_____. *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37-82*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

Niditch, Susan. "The Visionary." Pages 153-79 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1980.

Niehoff, Maren "A Dream which is not Interpreted is like a Letter which is not Read." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992): 58-84.

Noegel, Scott B. "Dreams and Dream Interpreters in Mesopotamia and in the Hebrew Bible [Old Testament]." Pages 45-71 in *Dreams: A Reader on the Religious, Cultural, and Psychological Dimensions of Dreaming*. Edited by Kelly Bulkeley. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

_____. *Nocturnal Ciphers: The Allusive Language of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*. American Oriental Series 89. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 2007.

- Noth, Martin. *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies*. Translated by D. R. Ap-Thomas. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1967.
- O'Brien, Julia. *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 121. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Oeming, Manfred. "Jewish Identity in the Eastern Diaspora in Light of the Book of Tobit." Pages 545-61 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in and International Context*. Edited by Oped Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Olson, Daniel C. "Recovering the Original Sequence of *1 Enoch* 91-93." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11 (1993): 69-94.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 46.3. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956.
- _____. "Mantic Dreams in the Ancient Near East." Pages 341-63 in *The Dream and Human Societies*. Edited by G. E. von Grunebaum and Roger Caillois. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Orlov, Andrei A. "Noah's Younger Brother: The Anti-Noachic Polemics in *2 Enoch*." *Henoch* 22 (2000): 207-221.
- Oßwald, Eva. "Beobachtungen zur Erzählung von Abrahams Aufenthalt in Ägypten in 'Genesis-Apokryphon.'" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 72 (1960): 7-25.
- _____. "Zum Problem der *vaticinia ex eventu*." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 34 (1963): 27-44.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 Volumes. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Pass, H. Leonard and J. Arendzen. "A Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 12 (1900): 651-61.
- Paul, Shalom M. "Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 5 (1973): 345-53.

Penney, Douglas L. and Michael O. Wise. "By the Power of Beelzebul: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 627-50.

Perrin, Andrew B. "Picking Up Where Levi Left Off: Dream-Vision Discourse and Priestly Tradition from the Aramaic Levi Document to 4QVisions of Amram." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies at the University of Waterloo/Wilfred Laurier University. Waterloo, ON, May 29, 2012.

_____. "The Compositional Structure of Dream-Visions in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Report." Paper presented at the Graduate Enoch Seminar at the University of Notre Dame. South Bend, Ind., June 19, 2012.

_____. "Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20 (2013): 98-123.

Peters, Dorothy M. *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 26. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

_____. "The Recombination and Evolution of Noah Traditions as Found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*: The DNA of Fraternal Twins." Pages 223-32 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited, Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Pfann, Stephen J., Philip S. Alexander, Magen Broshi, Esther G. Chazon, Hannah Cotton, Frank Moore Cross, Torleif Elgvin, Dorothee Ernst, Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Florentino García Martínez, Jonas C. Greenfield, Menachem Kister, Armin Lange, Erik Larson, André Lemaire, Timothy H. Lim, Joseph Naveh, Dana M. Pike, Michael Sokoloff, Hartmut Stegemann, Annette Steudel, Michael E. Stone, Loren Stuckenbruck, Shemaryahu Talmon, Sarah Tanzer, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, Emanuel Tov, Geza Vermes, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James C. VanderKam and Monica Brady. *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

- Philonenko, Marc. "Melkireša' et Melkira': Note sur les Visions de 'Amram." *Semitica* 41-42 (1993): 159-62.
- Pietersma Albert and Benjamin G. Wright III, eds. *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Pines, S. "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." Pages 72-87 in *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study-Conference Held at Jerusalem, 14th to 19th 1968*. Edited to R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and C. Jouco Bleeker. Numen Book Series, Studies in the History of Religions 18. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Popović, Mladen. *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 67. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Puech, Émile. "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le 'Royaume de Dieu.'" *Revue Biblique* 99 (1992): 98-131.
- _____. "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLevi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa." Pages 449-501 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien, Tome II: Les données qumraniennes et classiques*. Études bibliques: Nouvelle Série 22. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.
- _____. "Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et le Nouveau Testament." *Le Monde de la Bible* 86 (1994): 34-41.
- _____. "À propos de la Jérusalem Nouvelle d'après les manuscrits de la mer Morte." *Semitica* 43-44 (1995): 87-102.

- _____. “Les fragments 1 à 3 du *Livre des Géants* de la grotte 6 (pap6Q8).” *Revue de Qumran* 74 (1999): 227-38.
- _____. “Les songes des fils de Semihazah dans le Livre des Géants de Qumrân.” *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* January-March (2000): 7-26.
- _____. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- _____. “Le Testament de Lévi en araméen de la Geniza du Caire.” *Revue de Qumran* 20 (2002): 511-556.
- _____. “The Names of the Gates of the New Jerusalem (4Q554).” Pages 379-92 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. “Le fils de Dieu, le fils du Très-Haut, messie roi en 4Q246.” Pages 271-86 in *Le Jugement dans l'un et l'autre Testament I: Mélanges offerts à Raymond Kuntzmann*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Lectio Divina 197. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2004.
- _____. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.
- _____. “Le volume XXXVII des *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* et les manuscrits araméens du lot Starky.” Pages 47-61 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “4Q530 9-10 – Addenda et corrigenda.” *Revue de Qumran* 25 (2011): 127-31.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. “‘Pēsher/Pittārōn’: Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature.” *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1973): 219-32.
- Rappaport, U. “Apocalyptic Vision and Preservation of Historical Memory.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 23 (1992): 217-26.

- Reeves, John C. *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmology: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. Monographs of Hebrew Union College 14. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992.
- Reid, S. B. "The Structure of the Ten Week Apocalypse and the Book of Dream Visions." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 16 (1985): 189-201.
- Rendsburg, Gary A. "Some False Leads in the Identification Of Late Biblical Hebrew Texts: The Case of Genesis 24 and 1 Samuel 2:27-36." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 23-36.
- Reynolds, III, Bennie H. *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses, 333-63 B.C.E.* Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Rowley, Harold H. *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: A Historical Study of Contemporary Theories*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1935.
- _____. "Notes on the Aramaic of the *Genesis Apocryphon*." Pages 116-29 in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver*. Edited by D. Winton Thomas and W. D. McHardy. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.
- Russel, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- _____. "Qumran and the Dating of the Parables of Enoch." Pages 377-95 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Volume 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Sagiv, Yonatan. "Leviticus 1 and 6: From Contextual to Extra-Textual Exegesis." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 63 (2012): 49-61.

Sasson, Jack M. "Word-Play in Gen 6:8-9." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 165-66.

Schattner-Rieser, Ursula. *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte, I. Grammaire. Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien 5*. Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004.

_____. "J. T. Milik's Monograph on the Testament of Levi and the Reconstructed Aramaic Text of the Prayer of Levi and the Vision of Levi's Ascent to Heaven from Qumran Cave 4 and 1." *The Qumran Chronicle* 15 (2007): 139-55.

Shea, William H. "Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 5, and the Broader Relationships within Chapters 2-7." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 23 (1985): 277-95.

Shemesh, Aharon. "Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature." Pages 595-616 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic *Halakhah*." Pages 3-24 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by James R. Davila. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

_____. "Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery." Pages 177-202 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran, Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002*. Edited by Ester G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 68. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. and James C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 Volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schöpflin, Karin. "God's Interpreter: The Interpreting Angel in Post-Exilic Prophetic Visions of the Old Testament." Pages 189-203 in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Friedrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, and Karin Schöpflin. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Schuller, Eileen. Review of Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998): 120-21.

Schwiderski, Dirk. *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inscripten, Band 2: Texte und Bibliographie*. Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 2. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.

_____. *Die alt- und reichsaramäischen Inscripten, Band 1: Konkordanz*. Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 4. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Segal, Michael. "Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre." *Textus* 19 (1998): 45-62.

_____. "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible." Pages 10-28 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

_____. "From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2." *Vetus Testamentum* 59 (2009): 123-49.

Seger, Stanislav. "Bedeutung der Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer für die Aramäistik." Pages 183-87 in *Bibel und Qumran*. Edited by S. Wagner. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968.

Smith, Ralph L. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Waco: Word Books, 1984.

Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

_____. *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003.

Starcky, Jean. "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân." *Revue biblique* 70 (1963): 481-505.

Stadel, Christian. *Hebraïsmen in den aramäischen Texten vom Toten Meer*. Schriften der Hochschule für Jüdische Studien Heidelberg 11. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2008.

Stegemann, Hartumut. "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik." Pages 495-530 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

_____. "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB and to Qumran Messianism." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 479-505.

Steinmann, Andrew. "The Chicken and the Egg: A New Proposal for the Relationship between the *Prayer of Nabonidus* and the *Book of Daniel*." *Revue de Qumran* 20 (2002): 557-70.

Stuedel, Annette. "The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM)." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 507-525.

Stoebe, Hans Joachim. *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament 8.1. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973.

Stokes, Ryan E. "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 14, and the Qumran Book of Giants (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15 (2008): 340-58.

Stone, Michael E. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 414-52 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God, Essays on the Bible and Archeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross, Werner E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, Jr. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.

_____. "Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age." Pages 575-86 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

- _____. "The Axis of History at Qumran." Pages 133-49 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, with the collaboration of Avital Pinnick. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. "Aramaic Levi in its Contexts." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* (2002): 307-26.
- _____. "A Reconsideration of Apocalyptic Visions." *Harvard Theological Review* 96 (2003): 167-80.
- _____. "Enoch's Date in Limbo or Some Considerations on David Suter's Analysis of the Book of Parables." Pages 444-49 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Michigan, 2007.
- _____. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- _____. "The Sequencing of Fragments Belonging to the Qumran *Book of Giants*: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of an Early Jewish Composition." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 16 (1997): 3-24.
- _____. "The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7." Pages 211-20 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- _____. Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999): 658-64.
- _____. "Giant Mythology and Demonology: From the Ancient Near East to the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 313-38 in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer*

Umwelt. Edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

_____. "The Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 101-30 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor, 2006.

_____. *1 Enoch 91-108*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

_____. "The Early Traditions Related to 1 Enoch from the Dead Sea Scrolls: an Overview and Assessment." Pages 41-63 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

_____. "Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the Yaḥad." Pages 295-326 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 93; Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Suter, David W. "Why Galilee? Galilean Regionalism in the Interpretation of 1 Enoch 6-16." *Henoch* 25 (2003): 167-212.

Swain, Joseph Ward. "The Theory of the Four Monarchies: Opposition History under the Roman Empire." *Classical Philology* 35 (1940): 1-21.

Talmon, Shemarayahu. "Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 249-67.

Teeter, David Andrew. "Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008.

Thomas, Samuel I. *The "Mysteries" of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.

_____. "Esoteric Knowledge in Qumran Aramaic Texts." Pages 403-32 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell

- Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. "More on Apocalyptic and Apocalypses." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987): 137-44.
- _____. Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 453-57.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the Book of Watchers, the Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208." *Henoch* 24 (2002): 143-45.
- _____. "Evaluating the Discussions Concerning the Original Order of Chapters 91-93 and Codicological Data Pertaining to 4Q212 and Chester Beatty XII Enoch." Pages 220-23 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on A Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, Harold J. Ellens, and James Alan Waddell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- _____. "The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem." Pages 257-70 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert Tigchelaar. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. "Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations." Pages 155-71 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "The Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic New Jerusalem." Pages 117-31 in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, Erik M. M. Eynikel, and Florentino García Martínez. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 143. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3-29.

_____. "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 334-54.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel, with contributions by Martin G. Abegg Jr., Armin Lange, Urilike Mittmann-Richert, Stephen J. Pfann, Eibert Tigchelaar, Eugene Ulrich, and Brian Webster. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

Trotter, Jonathan R. "The Tradition of the Throne Vision in the Second Temple Period: Daniel 7:9-10, 1 Enoch 14:18-23, and the Book of Giants (4Q530)." *Revue de Qumran* 25 (2012): 451-66.

Tsumura, David Toshio. *The First Book of Samuel*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

_____. "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 573-85 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 83. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 2. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

_____. "The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books." Pages 209-25 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. "Clearer Insight into the Development of the Bible – A Gift of the Scrolls." Pages 119-37 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H.

Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Ulrich, Eugene C., Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, Sarianna Metso, Catherine M. Murphy, Curt Niccum, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov, and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

VanderKam, James C. "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources." Pages 229-51 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 13. Volume 1. Missoula, Mon.: Scholars Press, 1978.

_____. "The Textual Affinities of the Biblical Citations in the Genesis Apocryphon," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 45-55.

_____. "The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch." *Numen* 26 (1979): 89-103.

_____. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

_____. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

_____. "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 359-73.

_____. "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 336-53.

_____. "Isaac's Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31." Pages 497-519 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 113-34 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

- _____. "Studies in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93:1-10; 91:11-17)." Pages 366-79 in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- _____. "Jubilees 46:6-47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 17 (2010): 141-58.
- Verhoef, Pieter. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Vermes, Geza. "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991): 149-166.
- _____. "Historiographical Elements in the Qumran Writings: A Synopsis of the Textual Evidence." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 48 (2007): 121-39.
- Vries, Simon J. De. "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 619-39.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500-164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts." Pages 267-82 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Waltke Bruce K. and Murphy O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Weeks, Stuart, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck. *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions*. Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1983; repr. 1994.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 16-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 2. Dallas: Word Books, 1994.
- Wesselius, Jan-Wim. "The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic." *Aramaic Studies* 3 (2005): 241-83.

- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Werman, Cana. "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 211-25.
- White, Robert J. *The Interpretation of Dreams, Oneirocritica by Artemidorus*. Park Ridge, NJ: Noyes Classical Studies, 1975.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "Has Esther Been Found at Qumran? 4Qproto-Esther and the Esther Corpus." *Revue de Qumran* 17 (1996): 307-25.
- _____. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. "Doppelträume." *Biblica* 29 (1948): 100-111.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.
- Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations 49. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- _____. "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran." Pages 124-67 in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*. Edited by T. Muraoka. Abr-Nahrain Supplement 3. Leuven: Peeters, 1992.
- _____. "A Note on 4Q196 (papTob Ar^a) and Tobit i 22." *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993): 556-70.
- Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005.
- Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 67. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Yadin, Yigael *The Temple Scroll*. 3 Volumes. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.

- Yarbro Collins, Adela., *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. "The Dream of a New Jerusalem at Qumran." Pages 231-54 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, Volume 3, The Scriptures and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- _____. "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology." Pages 93-120 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 419. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Zakovitch, Yair. "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives." Pages 175-96 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986.
- _____. "Inner-biblical Interpretation." Pages 227-63 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "Dreams and their Interpretation from the Biblical Period to the Tannaitic Time: An Historical Study." *Jewish Quarterly Review*. 66 (1975): 1-18.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezekiel 2*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Zimmermann, Johannes. "Observations on 4Q246 – The 'Son of God.'" Pages 175-90 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.