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Abstract

A well-known characteristic of the Qumran sectarian texts is the boast that community membership included fellowship with the angels, but scholars disagree as to the precise meaning of these claims. In order to gain a better understanding of angelic fellowship at Qumran, this study utilizes the fact that an important facet of Early Jewish angelology was the concept that certain angels were closely associated with Israel. Specifically, these angels can be placed in one of two categories: guardians (i.e., warriors who strove against Israel’s enemies, celestial or otherwise) and priests (i.e., the celebrants of the heavenly temple). A crucial component of the presentation of both angelic guardians and angelic priests was that they were envisioned within apocalyptic worldviews that assumed that realities on earth mirrored those of heaven, with the latter serving as the ideal, archetypal, or “more real” world. After discussing the conceptual backgrounds of angels associated with Israel in the Ancient Near Eastern texts and in the pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic texts of the Hebrew Bible, this study sets out to compare how angelic guardians and angelic priests are presented in both the sectarian texts and the late Second Temple Period compositions of a non-sectarian provenance found among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

While the non-sectarian compositions clearly posit a connection, correspondence, or parallel relationship between the angels and the Jewish people, an interesting facet of these works is that they imply definitions of Israel that are either quite generous or more stringent but paradoxically tempered by universalistic sentiments. Conversely, the witness of the sectarian compositions is that the Yahad viewed itself alone as the true Israel of God, with these texts evincing the belief that the angels associated with Israel had a unique connection to the sectarians, who had effectively usurped for themselves the privileges that were formerly those of the entire nation. Moreover, the texts which speak of angelic fellowship – both during the eschatological war and in the present time – suggest that sect members upheld the lofty self-estimation that they were either equal to the angels in some sense or had even attained a rank and glory higher than the angels. Given that the sectarians were convinced that their reconstitution of Israel’s covenant was the nation as it ought to be, there arguably would have been no better way for the Yahad to promote itself as such than to boast that the sect members were equal to – and even outranked – the guardians and priests of heavenly, archetypal Israel. Thus, while there has been scholarly disagreement as to the exact meaning of the sectarian angelic fellowship claims, this thesis demonstrates that at least part of the meaning is to be found in the contribution these claims make to the identity of the sect as the true Israel of God.
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TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND SIGLA

Unless otherwise noted, quotations from the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha, and New Testament are from the *New Revised Standard Version* (with occasional minor alterations). Unless otherwise noted, text, sigla, and translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are from the Discoveries in the Judean Desert series (with occasional minor alterations).
CHAPTER ONE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION, HISTORY OF RESEARCH,
AND PLAN AND METHOD OF STUDY

1.1: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Angelic beings are depicted in a variety of ways in the Hebrew Bible: as messengers, as military commanders, and as protectors of the faithful, but for the most part they are unnamed and relatively undeveloped as characters. It is not until the literature of the late Second Temple Period (including the canonical Book of Daniel) that there is a virtual explosion of interest in angels. Much is a development that stems from reflection upon biblical themes and categories, as angels are creatively assigned names, ranks, and duties with ever-increasing specificity.¹

An aspect of Hebrew Bible angelology² that was the subject of considerable speculation in the Second Temple Period was the concept that certain angels were closely associated with Israel in some manner. These angels can be placed in one of two categories, though not infrequently there is overlap: 1.) Angels who served as the guardians of God’s people: to be sure, angelic assistance or support for Israel in times of trouble or war has considerable biblical precedent (cf., e.g., Josh 5:13-15; 2 Kgs 19:35), but the Early Jewish expansion of this concept includes the notions that certain angels were warriors who strived against the angels associated with Israel’s enemies in the celestial realm and/or were granted

---


² Kevin P. Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament (AJEC 55; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 7, echoes the oft-noted warning that the term “angelology” be used with caution as it can misleadingly suggest that a given text or corpus is systematic in its presentation of angelic beings. I use “angelology” here and elsewhere mindful of the diversity with which angels are portrayed both in the Hebrew Bible and in the literature of the late Second Temple Period.
a prominent role in the eschatological deliverance of God’s people. Angels who served as priests: a notion that is only implicit in the Hebrew Bible yet not infrequently expressed in the Second Temple period literature is that there were angelic priests who ministered in a heavenly temple. In this scenario, the celestial sanctuary and its priesthood seems to have been understood as models for the terrestrial sanctuary and its priests. A crucial component of the presentation of both angelic guardians and priests was that they were envisioned within apocalyptic worldviews that assumed that “earthly realities reflect and mirror heavenly ones,” with the result that there was thought to be some kind of connection, correspondence, or parallel relationship between the realms. While angels associated with Israel could be a named or titled individual, another development – and one found side-by-side with the notion of an angelic leader-figure in some texts – was that the existence, actions, and fates of the angelic host collectively (or specific classes thereof) were connected to the Jewish people on earth.

Certain texts will be key to my discussion and will form the basis of much of the analysis in subsequent chapters. Deuteronomy 32:8-9 is an obvious starting point, as according to this text Yahweh has assigned celestial beings a guardian-like role over other nations, but he rules Israel directly. In contrast, the Enochic Book of Watchers (cf. 1 En. 1-36) suggests that, at least by the 3rd cent. BCE, there were those who thought there were named angels in heaven such as Michael, who is said to have a special relationship with God’s

---


4 For a helpful summary of the concept of heaven as a temple and suggestions for this development, see Martha Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 19-20, who comments that in the Second Temple Period literature heaven is depicted as the “true temple, of which the Jerusalem temple is merely a copy.”

people (cf. 1 En. 20:5). Similarly, the Book of Daniel (2nd cent. BCE) has Michael standing at the head of the angelic host, whose struggles and victories in the heavenly realm are paralleled in the lives of God’s people on earth (cf. Dan 7:13-28; 8:9-12; 10:13, 21; 12:1). While Jubilees (also dated to the 2nd cent. BCE) contains no angels with proper names, a titled angelic class – “the angels of the presence” – and its eponymous leader are clearly marked as Israel’s heavenly counterparts and serve as priests before God (cf. Jub. 2:2, 18, 30; 6:18; 15:27-28).

But a parallel relationship between the realms does not sufficiently explain some of the claims of the Qumran texts, which speak of eschatological and even present interaction or communion between angels and humans. As I will discuss at length in Chapters Four and Five, the Qumranites seem to have anticipated that they would fight in conjunction with the angels at the eschaton, as the War Scroll predicts that Michael, the “Prince of Light,” would lead an angel-human coterie known as the “Sons of Light,” and together they would take their stand against the “Sons of Darkness” at the great eschatological battle (cf. 1QM 17:4-9). Scholars have also suggested that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice were employed liturgically by the sect to achieve fellowship with angelic priests in the here and now, a feat celebrated in the sectarian hymns (cf. 1QH 11:20-24; 19:13-17; 1QS 11:7-9).

However, the designations scholars have coined to express the connection, correspondence, parallel, or communion between heaven and earth are problematic insofar

---

6 The only exception being the wicked prince, Mastema; cf. O. S. Winternute, OTP, 2:47.

7 “The angels of presence” and “the angels of holiness” are created circumcised, keep the Sabbath, and celebrate Shavuot; see Chapter Three, below.

8 I will discuss how scholars refer to the group(s) associated with the DSS later in this chapter; until then I use “sect,” “Qumranites,” “Yahad,” “Qumran community,” and other designations cognizant of the fact that there is no consensus on this terminological issue.
as they are employed without technical precision, resulting in the same terms being used for both angelic guardians and angelic priests associated with Israel. For example, scholars commonly refer to individual angelic leaders charged with the guardianship of a people or nation with the word “patron.” Given that figures such as Michael wage war against the angels of other nations and have a role in securing eschatological salvation for the people of God (cf. Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1), “patron” is an appropriate – though vague – classificatory term. “Counterpart” is also used in reference to individual angelic guardians, and though this term is fitting insofar as it expresses the thought that the people have a chief angelic complement in the heavenly realm, the term is not without difficulties. First, “counterpart” is just as vague as “patron” and the former may be less apt than the latter to convey that the referenced angel is a benefactor, let alone one who leads the angelic host, protects God’s people, and fights on their behalf. Second, the plural, “counterparts,” is often used as a descriptor for the collective angelic host associated with Israel, be it “the angels of the presence” and “the angels of holiness,” who according to Jubilees bear the marks of the covenant and carry out priestly roles in the heavenly sanctuary, or the Danielic “holy ones of the Most High,” whose fates are closely intertwined with “the people of the holy ones of

---


10 John J. Collins, Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 310, 317, dubs Michael the “heavenly counterpart of Israel,” and similarly refers to the angel-like benefactor of the Similitudes of Enoch, “that Son of Man,” as both the people’s “patron” and their “counterpart.”

the Most High.” As with the singular, Collins uses the plural, “patrons” interchangeably with “counterparts,” but using these terms synonymously is far from ideal. As noted above, scholars have referred to priestly angels – such as those in Jubilees – as Israel’s heavenly “counterparts,” and perhaps as long as one recognizes that these priestly angels are “counterparts” of a different order than angelic guardians, confusion can be avoided. However, such usage is unnecessarily ambiguous, as scholars seem to refrain from using the term “patrons” in reference to priestly angels. In short, though there are no hard and fast rules, “patron(s)” is apparently reserved exclusively for angelic guardian figures. Thus, scholarly usage can be summarized as follows: angels referred to as “patrons” (e.g., Michael and “the holy ones of the Most High”) are also called “counterparts,” but not all angels referred to as “counterparts” (e.g., the priestly “angels of presence”) are called “patrons.” In order to mitigate confusion, less ambiguous terminology should be sought. Another term that has been used by scholars to refer to a chief angel figure is “Doppelgänger,” and insofar as Israel has a heavenly “double,” whose exaltation and power in heaven will ultimately mean salvation for the suffering community the angelic “double” represents, the use of “Doppelgänger” is accurate and could conceivably be applied to other angels associated with God’s people. A less frequently used designation is angelic

---

12 E.g., Collins, Daniel, 318, in a discussion of the “holy ones” of Dan 7 states, “There is … a synergism between the faithful Israelites on earth and their angelic counterparts in heaven … .”

13 Collins, Daniel, 318, again in reference to the “holy ones of the Most High,” writes, “to the pious Jews of the Maccabean era, who had a lively belief in supernatural beings, nothing could be more relevant than that their angelic patrons should ‘receive the kingdom.’”

“representatives,” and in light of the fact that the English word “representative(s)” can convey the concepts of “standing for” someone (as per the role of angelic guardians) and “epitomizing” or “corresponding to” someone (as per the role of priestly angels) it would not be an inappropriate term. Yet “Doppelgänger” and “representative(s)” ultimately suffer from the same lack of specificity that plagues “patrons” and “counterparts,” and for that reason I prefer the term *angels associated with Israel*, which is the general designation I will use throughout this thesis. More importantly, I will be careful to point out which of the two subcategories these angels fall under: angels who serve as Israel’s guardians, who were expected to defend God’s people against the nation’s aggressors, angelic and human; and angels who serve as priests in the heavenly temple, the celebrants of the archetypal priesthood of heaven. A final terminological caveat is this: whereas the designations just discussed are classificatory terms coined by scholars, the texts themselves refer to these angels associated with Israel in a variety of ways, and it is, of course, the description found in a given text that is most important for interpreting the nature and function of the angel(s) in question.

Thus, angels associated with Israel and the worldviews which envisioned these angels as connected to the people of God are the general foci of this thesis. Due to the constraints of space, I will largely limit my discussions to those texts extant among the DSS. First, I will examine the background of nationally associated angels in the relevant pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic passages of the Hebrew Bible, including Deut 32:8-9, which implies that

---

Israel does not have an angelic guardian. While two Second Temple Period statements from compositions extant at Qumran appear to echo Deut 32:8-9 (cf. Sir 17:17; Jub. 15:30-32), the prevalence of angels associated with Israel in contemporaneous texts suggests that, by at least the 3rd cent. BCE, this Deuteronomistic sentiment was not understood in a strictly literal fashion. Thus, the majority of my thesis will investigate angels associated with Israel in the late Second Temple Period compositions found among the DSS. More specifically, I will examine the texts that are widely considered to pre-date the sectarian occupation of Qumran (i.e., works that were part of broader literary heritage of the Jewish people); I will then examine the sectarian texts,\textsuperscript{16} and I will endeavor to show that the well-known assertions of the sect – both the confident expectation that fellowship with the angels would be a hallmark of the impending eschatological war as well as their boasts of angelic fellowship in the here and now – made a significant contribution to how the sect viewed itself vis-à-vis other Jews. I will also demonstrate that one of the ways that the sectarian notion of angelic fellowship can be explained is by their widening of the concept that earthly/human realities reflect and mirror heavenly/angelic realities. In order to provide a rationale for this thesis and to frame it in the context of modern critical scholarship, I will now present a brief history of research, which will be primarily focused on the intersection of angelology and Qumran studies.

\textbf{1.2: History of Research}

Studies of Early Jewish angelology have often been conducted in the course of investigating other topics, and it has been relatively rare for Second Temple Period angelology to be

\textsuperscript{16} I will discuss Qumran “non-sectarian” and “sectarian” literature in section 1.2.5, below.
studied for its own sake.\textsuperscript{17} Recent monographs and compilations have begun to address this void and rightly take into account the prominence of angels in the DSS. But angels associated with Israel and the worldviews within which these angels are presented have still not received the attention they deserve, especially as it pertains to investigating the relationship between these angels and the self-identity of the Qumranites. In this section, I will review relevant scholarship according to topic; I will then summarize the significance of this research for investigating angels associated with Israel in the DSS.

1.2.1: ANGEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY

Much angelological study has taken shape within NT scholarship on Christology. The relationship between angelology and Christology was, initially, an area of particular interest for German scholarship. Lueken’s study appeared at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} cent. and was followed by an intensified interest in the topic in the early 1940s.\textsuperscript{18} These German works were the beginnings of research into “angel Christology” and “angelmorphic Christology,” which have been the subjects of numerous studies in the last twenty-five years.

That ancient Judaism provided the earliest followers of Jesus with traditions of divine agency – the idea that the God of Israel, while maintaining his uniqueness, granted to a heavenly figure the role of chief vizier or agent – is central to the Christological thesis of

\textsuperscript{17} Cf., e.g., the observation of Aleksander R. Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Period Literature} (WUNT 2 330; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 4, who notes that angelology often functions as a “springboard” for other scholarly pursuits.

The diversity of Greco-Roman Judaism ensured that this chief agent could be envisioned in a variety of ways including that of a “principal angel,” and the conclusion of Hurtado and others is that the elevated profiles of these divine agents did not compromise Jewish monotheism. Moreover, since the existence and even veneration of these heavenly agents of mediation and protection did not impinge on the kind of devotion that was due God alone, early Christians found the language used to honour angels helpful in formulating their worship of Jesus, an act which the Church insisted did not contradict the oneness of the God of Israel. The worship of Jesus should thus be seen as a distinctive modification or mutation of Jewish divine agency traditions. As I will point out, it is not only true that Jewish and Christian monotheism was generally considered uncompromised by principal

---

19 Larry W. Hurtado, One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 12, 39. Examples include Michael (cf. Dan 7-12) and Melchizedek (11QMelch), who are pictured as having heavenly origins, exalted in heaven, and/or attributed with power and authority that approximate divine prerogatives. Thus, Hurtado argues that principal angel figures have more in common in common with the status accorded the risen Jesus by the Early Church than earthly agents of God such as prophets, priests, kings, and messiahs.

20 Hurtado, One God, 17-18, 71-92. In addition to principal angels, Hurtado classifies divine agency according to two other “types”: divine attributes or powers and exalted patriarchs (e.g., Enoch).

21 Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God’: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,” in Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism (eds., idem Wendy E. S. North; JSNTSup 263; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 69-70, who points out that while some Early Jewish sources “could tolerate language of prayer and praise as directed towards angels” (e.g., Tob 11:14; 4Q418 [=11QInstruction] frg. 81, 1-15; T. Levi 5:5-6; Jos. Asen. 11-12), … “even where the venerative language towards angelic beings is allowed, the authors ensure that it does not come at the price of reflection and focus on God. The logical tension remains, but the uniqueness of God continues to be asserted against any other possibility”; see also idem, Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John (WUNT 2 70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995); cf. Peter R. Carrell, Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John (SNTSMS 95; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).


23 Darrell D. Hannah, Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity (WUNT 2 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 218, explores the connections between Michael and Christology, concluding that the Early Church “utilized Michael traditions to illustrate the heavenly significance of Christ, particularly his protection of and intercession for Christians.”

24 Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 70.

25 So Hurtado, One God, 12, 93-124.
angels like Michael – it was also considered a defining characteristic of God’s people to have the support of these figures.

1.2.2: ANGEOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

A second area in which angelological investigation has taken place is the study of Early Jewish anthropology, which includes attempts to explain humans with an exalted status.

While some scholars have insisted on maintaining a distinction between angels and humans, the most ardent proponent of the juxtaposition of angelology and anthropology is Fletcher-Louis, who has claimed the original and eschatological-redeemed state of humanity envisioned by the Qumran sect was an exalted anthropology, which he describes as “divine (and/or angelic).” The Qumranites attained this true humanity through their worship, which transcended not only time and space but also human ontology. The notion of angelic humanity traditions has been criticized, however, for seeing an ontological ambiguity between angels and humans when the evidence suggests only “the possibility of crossing the boundary between the earthly and heavenly sphere, especially by angels and on rare occasions by very righteous humans.” Fletcher-Louis has clarified and supplemented his approach,

26 As Hannah, Michael and Christ, 217, observes: Michael traditions had more Christological usefulness than other principal angel traditions because “they were the most pervasive and the most multifarious” in the Second Temple Period.

27 So, e.g., Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels.


but an important observation is his earlier call for further investigation of the intersection of anthropology, angelology, and sectarian identity.\textsuperscript{31}

1.2.3: ANGEOLOGY AND MYSTICISM

Given the fascination with the heavenly realm in mystical texts, angelological investigation has also occurred in studies of mysticism. A particular focus of recent scholarship is the attempt to trace the development of Jewish and Christian mysticism, and often included in these investigations is a survey of the apocalyptic literature of the Second Temple Period, as this addresses a perceived weakness of the seminal work of Scholem,\textsuperscript{32} who could only allude to the significance of the DSS given their slow publication process. Access to the complete Qumran corpus has, not surprisingly, prompted explorations of the relationship between the DSS and the later Merkavah and Hekhalot literature.\textsuperscript{33} A particularly ambitious and controversial monograph is that of Elior,\textsuperscript{34} and though her work has been criticized for positing a centuries-spanning continuum of priestly ideology and for implying that the

\textsuperscript{31} Fletcher-Louis, \textit{All the Glory}, 88-89.


diverse texts of the Second Temple Period are univocal on a number of issues, she draws attention to an important theme in the Early Jewish literature: the correspondence between heaven and earth, particularly the correlation between angels and the priests. Texts like *Jubilees* and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* testify to the belief that the priesthood has angelic origins, and thus the angelic priesthood served as both a role model and a source of heavenly validity for the earthly priesthood.

Key features of mysticism for which the DSS are studied are the goal of the mystic and how mystical experience was achieved. Schäfer contends that ascent was the means by which the mystic bridged the gap between heaven and earth, an experience resulting in a vision of God on his throne and communion — not union — with the divine, and that the *Hodayot*, the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* were used to achieve this communion. Schäfer also makes the important observation that mystical ascent was,
with few exceptions, not an end in itself but the experience of a worthy individual for the sake of his community.  

In addition to situating the DSS in the history of Jewish and Christian mysticism, Alexander wrestles with two issues: how to define “mysticism” and whether mysticism was present at Qumran. In so doing, Alexander articulates an undercurrent in many discussions of mysticism and the DSS: there is no universally accepted definition of mysticism, and it is therefore a “hugely contested” term, a consequence of which is that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice become a lightning rod of sorts. Alexander concludes that mysticism was present at Qumran and defines it as the longing for a closer relationship with a transcendent presence. The transcendent presence longed for at Qumran was, of course, the God of Israel. But as Alexander notes, “the closest relationship to God which the texts envisage the mystic attaining is that enjoyed by the angels in heaven, who perpetually offer to him worship and adoration in the celestial Temple. … The Qumran mystics long to join the angels in their

40 Philip S. Alexander, Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts (LSTS 61; London: T & T Clark, 2006); cf. idem, “Qumran and the Genealogy of Western Mysticism,” in New Perspectives on Old Texts, 213-245, in which the author clarifies and expands aspects of his earlier work.
42 Alexander, “Qumran and the Genealogy,” 220.
liturgy, to form with them one worshipping community.” An indispensable component of Alexander’s understanding of “mysticism” is *praxis: a via mystica* is always necessary. It is for this reason that the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* is a key text, since many scholars consider it to be liturgical: the chanting of the *Songs* within the context of worship likely brought about a “communal ascent” and communion with the angelic host for which the sectarians longed.

In sum, this discussion of angelology and mysticism has highlighted an important point to which I will return in subsequent chapters: though scholars disagree as to the appropriateness of labeling the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and other documents as “mystical,” they are in general agreement that certain texts were used by the Qumranites in the context of worship to facilitate communion with the angels.

1.2.4: STUDIES FOCUSED SPECIFICALLY ON ANGELOLOGY

As noted above, recent scholarship has begun to take into consideration the prominence of angels in the Qumran literature. In 1950, Bietenhard did not have the luxury of incorporating the DSS into his study, but his monograph is nonetheless similar to later angelological studies in that it covers a wide variety of topics rather than providing detailed

---

43 Alexander, “Qumran and the Genealogy,” 220-221. Though Alexander uses the term *unio mystica* (mystical union) to describe the consummation of relationship to God envisaged by the texts, he suggests that a more appropriate term for theistic systems is *communion* (so Schäfer). However, Alexander also contends that “the language of union” is common in theistic systems, a claim that appears to be a justification for using *unio mystica* to describe mystical experiences of the Qumran texts; cf. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 101ff. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 349-350, would prefer that Alexander use “communion” and “union” more carefully and consistently.


45 Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 119; idem, “Qumran and the Genealogy,” 226 n. 23, concedes that the language of later “ascents” is not found in the *Songs* (cf. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 144; Wolfson, “Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical,” 194; Nitzan, “Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics,” 183). Alexander claims that the lack of ascent language is “probably less significant than some have supposed” because mystical texts do not universally use the language of ascents, and because he is using *ascent*, not in a technical sense, but as a “useful shorthand” for mystical communion with the angels.

46 Hans Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1951).
treatments of individual issues or concepts, including angels associated with Israel and the
worldviews in which they are depicted.

Numerous scholars have pointed out that nationally associated angels are related to
the ANE concept of the divine council, and as I will outline in the following chapter, an
important example of the biblical tradition’s incorporation of this ANE theme is Deut 32:8-9,
where members of Yahweh’s council have been appointed as the heavenly beings
associated with the Gentile nations. A not infrequently overlooked text for the study of
angels associated with Israel is Dan 7 (not least because it is a departure from the sentiment
of Deut 32), and Collins has championed two controversial interpretations of this key text:
(1) that the unnamed “one like a son of man” (cf. Dan 7:13-14) is Michael, the heavenly
guardian of the Jews and the leader of the angelic host; and (2) that “the holy ones of the
Most High” (cf. Dan 7:18, 22, 25) are the collective angelic representatives of the Jews and
should be distinguished from “the people of the Holy Ones of the Most High” (cf. Dan 7:27),

47 The classic treatments of the divine council include Frank Moore Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew
Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973); Conrad E.
L’Heurue, Rank Among the Canaanite Gods: El, Baal, and the Rephaim (HSM 21: Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979);
E. Theodore Mullen, Jr., The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature (HSM
24; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 175-201; Lowell K. Handy, Among the Host of Heaven: The Syro-Palestinian
Pantheon as Bureaucracy (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994). More recently, see the work of Mark S. Smith, The
Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel’s Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts (New York: Oxford University
Press, 2000); idem, The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 2002). Also see Ellen White, Yahweh’s Council: Its Structure and Membership (FAT 2 65; Tübingen:
Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

48 Cf. Culianu, “The Angels of the Nations,” 78-91, who largely focuses on texts beyond the scope of
this thesis (e.g., Ascension of Isaiah, 2 Enoch, 3 Enoch, Gnostic literature, and Rabbinic literature) but briefly draws
attention to Isa 24:21-22, which I will discuss in Chapter Two. See also Caird, Principalities and Powers, 1-11, who,
after discussing the Hebrew Bible background of the angelic guardians of the nations, argues that the
“principalities,” “authorities,” and “powers” of which the apostle Paul speaks (e.g., 1 Cor 15:24) are “spiritual
beings,” and “behind Pilate, Herod, and Caiaphas, behind the Roman state and the Jewish religion of which
these men were earthly representatives, Paul discerns the existence of angelic rulers who shared with their
human agents the responsibility for the crucifixion.”
who are the Jewish people on earth. In a discussion of Daniel and 1 Enoch, Collins cites Eliade, who points out that to the ancient mind “reality [was] a function of the imitation of the celestial archetype.” Similarly, Collins argues that national angels were viewed as both “more real” than and prior to the people with whom they were associated. But as Collins also points out, the opposite is true from the perspective of a modern critic; “it is,” in the words of Lacocque, “a question of men before it is a question of angels.” The angels associated with Israel thus symbolize the present ideals and anticipated destinies and fortunes of the people of God.

A comparison of the depictions of angels in the sections of 1 Enoch found among the DSS with the angelologies of the Qumran sectarian texts is the subject of Davidson’s study. While it is an invaluable starting point, it is far from exhaustive, as not all the pertinent texts were available when this book was published in the early 1990s. Most importantly, there is a need to move beyond observation and comparison to analysis with the aim of gaining a better understanding of the contribution angelological convictions made to the self-image of

---

55 Maxwell J. Davidson, Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).
56 Davidson Angels at Qumran, 323, concedes that “it would prove profitable to consider the angelology of the canonical book of Daniel in relation to those of the Enochic and other related books from the period of Second Temple Judaism.”
the Qumranites. Analogous comments can be or have been made concerning the helpful but even wider-ranging contributions of Mach\textsuperscript{57} and Olyan.\textsuperscript{58}

In addition to a collection of short angelological essays in the 2007 \textit{DCL Yearbook},\textsuperscript{59} an especially pertinent angelological study is that of Michalak, who investigates the martial function of angels in the late Second Temple Period. I will interact with Michalak’s insights in subsequent chapters, including the important observations that angels of high rank have “no independent power to initiate their own missions,”\textsuperscript{60} and that there are, generally speaking, two traditions: those in which earthly wars had heavenly equivalents\textsuperscript{61} and those in which soldiers could anticipate angelic assistance on the earthly battlefield.

\textsuperscript{57} Michael Mach, \textit{Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinner Zeit} (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), provides one of the most comprehensive studies of Jewish angelology ever written. His topics include angel traditions in the Hebrew Bible, Greek terminology for angels, and a lengthy discussion of the angels in the Early Jewish literature. However, it has been said that Mach’s “impressive breadth and comprehensiveness are attained at the cost of a somewhat superficial treatment”; see John J. Collins, review of Michael Mach, \textit{Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinner Zeit}, JBL 119 (1994): 140-141.

\textsuperscript{58} Saul M. Olyan, \textit{A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism} (TSAJ 36; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), looks into the exegetical foundations of the naming and organization of the angelic host. He highlights that many names for angels in the Second Temple Period and beyond stem from interpretive reflection on either specific words of the Hebrew Bible such as \textit{hapax legomena} occurring in a theophanic or angelphanic context. Focused as it is on the exegetical origins of nomenclature, Olyan’s study precludes detailed discussion of the characteristics and functions of the various angels and the contributions they make to the texts in which they are found.


\textsuperscript{60} Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 243.

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. James R. Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” \textit{SBL Seminar Papers}, 1996 (SBLSPP 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 259-272, who traces the origins of the eschatological battle between the forces of good and evil to Canaanite and Israelite mythological traditions regarding the conquest of Leviathan and the astral deity revolt (e.g., Isa 14:12-20); Davila contends that at some point Michael and, less frequently, Melchizedek replace Yahweh in both myths. For a discussion on the development of the figure of Melchizedek, see idem, “Melchizedek: King, Priest, and God,” in \textit{The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth: Challenge or Response?} (ed., S. Daniel Breslauer; Albany: State University of New York, 1997), 217-234.
Another study with which I will interact extensively is the recent monograph of Angel, who addresses the themes of the heavenly priesthood and eschatological priestly leadership in the DSS.\textsuperscript{62} I will especially focus on the first of these topics. His conclusion that the heavenly priesthood and the sect’s liturgical communion with it were “an innovative expression of confidence inasmuch as it argues that the community no longer has a need for the Jerusalem temple”\textsuperscript{63} is significant and will serve as a foundational point of my own analysis. Furthermore, Angel’s cautious approach as far as history is concerned is one I will share: influenced by Kugler, who has warned against pressing the DSS too hard for socio-historical realities, especially in relation to the priestly origins of the Qumran community,\textsuperscript{64} Angel makes it clear that his study “largely abandons … historical inquiry in favor of investigation of the imagined constructs of the priesthood in the Scrolls corpus.”\textsuperscript{65} Such an approach, Angel contends, is not the same as saying that historical information cannot be gleaned from Qumran texts, but it is to say that the texts tell us more about how the authors envisioned reality than reality itself.\textsuperscript{66}

It was noted at the outset of this section – and highlighted throughout – that angelological studies are often broad in scope and/or give little attention to the concept of angels associated with Israel and their corresponding worldviews. But as Collins contends, even if angels associated with Israel tend to be “superfluous to modern critics, … they are an

\textsuperscript{62} Joseph L. Angel, \textit{Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls} (STDJ 86; Leiden: Brill, 2010). Similar subject matter is treated in Tobias Nicklas et al., eds., \textit{Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Ancient Christian Traditions} (JSJSup 143; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

\textsuperscript{63} Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 305.

\textsuperscript{64} Robert A. Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” in \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment: Volume 2} (eds., Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 114, writes, “we have for too long asked the Scrolls to give us evidence of social realities where the literature more often seems to convey imagined realities instead.” For further discussion of this point, see below.

\textsuperscript{65} Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 15.

\textsuperscript{66} Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 13-16.
Yet even those studies which examine aspects of angelology in the DSS have not fully explored the relationship between angels associated with Israel and the self-identity of the sectarians. Thus, in order to provide the further rationale and framework for this thesis, the last sections of this history of research will survey scholarship on the notions of non-sectarian and sectarian texts and community identity at Qumran.

1.2.5: “NON-SECTARIAN” AND “SECTARIAN” TEXTS

In the last twenty-five years, discussions concerning the identification of both those responsible for producing and preserving the Qumran texts and their opponents have become increasingly complex as the validity of earlier consensuses have been questioned. Therefore, exactly to whom one is referring when using terms such as the Qumran “community” or “sect” and thus whether certain texts can justifiably be classified as “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” have become contentious issues in DSS scholarship. Here, I can only provide a concise overview, so I will establish and draw out the aspects of the debate most relevant to the present study.

When the first group of documents from Cave 1 came to light in the late 1940s, similarities between the content of the texts and what the classical sources – Josephus, Philo, and Pliny (cf. Josephus, B.J. 2:119-161; Ant.18:18-22; Philo, Prob. 75-91; Pliny, Nat. 5.17.4 [73]) – say about a Jewish sect called the “Essenes” were immediately noticed, and within a decade, a virtual consensus emerged which identified the authors of the texts as Essenes.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ Collins, Daniel, 319.

Though scholars who accept this general identification do not agree on all the particulars, the umbrella term, “Essene Hypothesis” (EH), is often used to describe their views. According to the EH, texts such as the Damascus Document and the pesharim recount events directly related to the emergence of the sect, events which were precipitated by the political and religious turbulence of the 170s and 160s BCE. When the non-Zadokite Hasmoneans usurped the high-priesthood in the wake of the Maccabean revolt in 152 BCE, this was not acceptable to a figure called the “Teacher of Righteousness,” who may have been a prominent Zadokite priest, perhaps even the high priest. As tensions over halakhic, calendrical, and moral issues surfaced, the “Teacher” was forced to flee from his Hasmonean adversary, villainized in the pesharim as the “Wicked Priest” (cf. 1QpHab 1:13; 8:8; 9:9; 11:4; 12:2, 8; 4QpPs a 4:8). Eventually, the “Teacher” and his followers ended up at Qumran, a location in close proximity to the caves where the texts were found. The DSS, therefore, were seen as the library of the Qumran Essenes.

In recent years, however, the EH has come under scrutiny. In addition to the objections of those who would caution that the cryptic or utopian nature of the sources

---

69 E.g., some contend that the Essenes originated in Babylon with the Qumran Essenes distancing themselves from the larger Essene movement shortly after they returned to Palestine, during Jonathan’s tenure as high-priest; see Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes and their History,” RB 81 (1974): 224-225. Another view is that Essenes emerged from a 2nd cent. BCE group about which little is known, the Hasidim (cf. 1 Macc 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc 14:6).


71 On the identity of this figure, see Michael Knibb, “Teacher of Righteousness,” EDSS, 2:918-921; also see the discussion of John J. Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 95ff.

72 Proponents of the EH usually identify the “Wicked Priest” as Jonathan or Simon (cf. CD 1:1-11; 20:32; 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 11:5; 4QpIsa a frg 1 2:3; 4QpPs a 3:15; 4:8, 27).
means that they should not be pressed for historical realities, the archaeological conclusions of de Vaux, who proposed a mid-2nd cent. BCE occupation of Qumran, have been questioned. In an influential study, Magness contends that the site was in use in the early or middle part of the 1st cent. BCE, and that there is little to support de Vaux’s conclusion of a 2nd cent. BCE occupation. It is, therefore, problematic to conclude that the “Teacher” had an acrimonious relationship with Jonathan (152-143 BCE) or Simon (143-135 BCE), and subsequently led his followers to Qumran.

Another reason the EH has come under scrutiny is the objection that the similarities between the Qumran texts and what the classical sources say about Essenes have been exaggerated; that is, the differences are too significant to label the Qumranites “Essenes.”

The “Groningen Hypothesis” (GH) attempts to account for these discrepancies by “making

---


75 Jodi Magness, The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls (SDSSRI; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

76 A modified version of the EH deals with this issue by claiming that 1st cent. BCE followers of the now deceased “Teacher” (cf. CD 20:13-15, which may refer to his death) made their way to Qumran to devote themselves to the proper study of Israel's scriptures (cf. 1QS 8:12-16); see VanderKam, The Dead Sea Scrolls Today, 132-133.

77 E.g., the well-known objections of Norman Golb, “Who Hid the Dead Scrolls?” BA 48 (1985): 68-82; cf. idem, Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran (New York: Scribner, 1995), who claims there is insufficient evidence to connect the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Essenes as depicted in the classical sources; he also is a vocal proponent of the view of that the DSS were hidden in the caves by those fleeing Jerusalem at the time of the first Jewish war (66-70 CE).

78 Martin Goodman argues that it would be incorrect to assume that the literary sources mention all of the Palestinian Jewish groups of the Second Temple Period and that these groups would have had many characteristics in common. Moreover, there are too many differences to label the Qumran group as Essene; see idem, “A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus,” JJS 46 (1995): 161-166; cf. Albert I. Baumgarten, “Who Cares and Why Does it Matter? Qumran and the Essenes Once Again!” DJD 11 (2004): 174-190.
a clear distinction between the origins of the Essene movement and those of the Qumran group.”⁷⁹ According to the GH, the Essenes emerged from the apocalyptic traditions of Palestinian Judaism in the 3rd cent. or early 2nd cent. BCE, and, in turn, the Qumran group – those loyal to the “Teacher” – resulted from a break with the parent Essene movement.⁸⁰ Thus, texts that resemble what the classical sources say about Essenism belonged to the parent Essenes; texts with more nuanced views were the product of the sect at various stages of its existence.⁸¹ A hypothesis offered by Boccaccini has affinities with the GH in that it sees the Essenes as part of a non-conformist priestly movement best described as “Enochic Judaism” (EJ),⁸² the texts of which were found at Qumran.⁸³ The EJ theory echoes the GH in that the Qumran group is a radicalized minority of Essenes (= Enochians) led by the “Teacher.” Quite a different approach has been advocated by those who question the appropriateness of using terms such as the “Qumran community.”⁸⁴ Given (a) that there are

---


⁸⁰ García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History,” 113.

⁸¹ The GH has four classifications of texts: (i) “common heritage” texts of the apocalyptic tradition from which the Essenes came; (ii) “Essene” works resembling the classical sources; (iii) “formative period” works, which evidence the Qumran group distancing itself from its Essene parents; (iv) “sectarian” texts reflecting the most developed thoughts of the Qumran group; see García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History,” 116.


⁸³ The “Enochic chain of documents” includes the (i) foundational texts of EJ (e.g., Book of Watchers; Astronomical Book; Aramaic Levi Document), (ii) texts reflecting the various communities of EJ in the post-Maccabean revolt period (e.g., Jubilees; Temple Scroll; 4QMMT), and (iii) sectarian texts of the Qumran group; see Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, 160-162; cf. Eckhard J. Schnabel, review of Gabriele Boccaccini Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, RBL (2000).

⁸⁴ Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 10.
different rule texts,\textsuperscript{85} (b) that there are different (and sometimes contradictory) recensions of the rule texts,\textsuperscript{86} and (c) that the Community Rule assumes the existence of more than one place of residence (cf. 1QS 6:1-8).\textsuperscript{87} Collins proposes that “the different forms of the text served different communities within the broader association, and that they were only taken to Qumran and hidden there secondarily, in a time of crisis.”\textsuperscript{88} The Qumranites should be viewed then, not as acrimoniously splitting from this broader association, but as separating from it amicably in order to pursue a higher degree of purity and holiness.\textsuperscript{89} In Collins’ words, “since both rules continued to be copied, it would seem that the kind of family-based movement envisioned in the Damascus Rule was not simply superseded, but continued to exist in tandem with the more intensive communities of the Yahad.”\textsuperscript{90} While texts such as 1 Enoch and Jubilees demonstrate some affinity with the thought of the rule texts, it goes beyond the evidence to classify them as “Essene”; it is more appropriate to conclude that these earlier texts emerged in a stream of Judaism similar to that of the Qumran sect.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{85} The main rule texts are the Damascus Document and the Community Rule. A well-known difference between the two is that the former assumes that some if not most of its addressees were married with children while the latter does not mention family matters, prompting some to suggest that the Community Rule assumes the celibacy of those who adhere to it; see Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 4-5.

\textsuperscript{86} The Damascus Document is represented by CD (the medieval copy from the Cairo Genizah) and the Cave 4 mss (4Q266-273); the Community Rule is represented by mss from Cave 1 (1Q5) and Cave 4 (4Q255-264); for a discussion of the differences in the recensions of both documents, see Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 3-4.

\textsuperscript{87} Also see Philo, Apologia pro Iudaies, as quoted in Eusebius, Praep. evang. 8:6-7; Josephus, BJ 2:122.

\textsuperscript{88} Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 3; cf. Allison Schofield, From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009).

\textsuperscript{89} Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 6, 155-156, 209, cautiously identifies both the broader association and the Qumranites as “Essene,” with the two groups respectively corresponding to Josephus’ characterization of Essenes as either marrying, as per the Damascus Document, or celibate, as per the Community Rule.

\textsuperscript{90} Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 79.

\textsuperscript{91} Contra the GH or the EJ theory; see Collins, Beyond the Qumran Community, 41-43, 50-51.
A significant aspect of the Qumran origins debate concerns the difficult task of determining who is responsible for specific texts or clusters thereof; that certain texts have seemingly complex recensional histories only compounds the matter. Since alternatives to the EH propose that the Qumranites were born from a split with its parent movement – whether acrimonious or amicable – one is justified in asking whether the traditional designations of “non-sectarian” and “sectarian” texts are still helpful. But the traditional distinction between non-sectarian and sectarian texts – the view supported here – has been defended by Dimant, who regards these categories as “indispensable for understanding the true nature of the Qumran collection,” and argues that to neglect these designations is to ignore the “distinct style, vocabulary and terminology displayed by the sectarian texts, and not shared by other Qumran manuscripts.” Recognizing the distinction between sectarian

---

92 E.g., Florentino García Martínez, “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?” in Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic texts from Qumran at Aix-en-Provence, 30 June-2 July 2008 (eds., Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 441; cf. “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,” RevQ 23 (2008): 383-394, who has argued that appropriation of texts – not a given text’s origin – is what is important. He proposes that the non-sectarian/sectarian discussion can be informed by scholarship on the so-called “biblical,” “para-biblical” and “re-written scripture” scrolls. He points out that scholars of these texts, in order to avoid anachronistic notions of canon, “refer to the study of the different authority-conferring strategies used in the various writings.” He also makes the bold claim that appropriation and authority mean that questions of origin are “no longer relevant.”


94 Dimant, “Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts,” 8 n. 4, who is directly responding to García Martínez; see also Dimant’s earlier work on the same topic: “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in Time to Prepare a 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., eadem and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58, a study which she compares to the well-known essay of Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters (eds., William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 179-185. Specifically, Dimant highlights the unique lexical characteristics of the Rule of the Community, Rule of the Congregation, Rule of Benedictions, Damascus Document, War Rule, Pesharim, and the Hodayot, which include 1.) the community’s organization (e.g., מִיחָל, a self-designation for the community; 2.) locutions alluding to historical events often in the form of cryptic epithets (e.g., מְשִׁיחַ, מְשִׁיחַ, “the Teacher of Righteousness,”) and 3.) terms reflecting religious ideas (e.g., צָאֵל, “the Sons of Light”). While the first two categories only occur in sectarian texts, theological terms similar to those
and non-sectarian texts enables scholars to understand how broader Jewish themes were interpreted, emphasized, and refined by the sect. Another facet of the sectarian and non-sectarian discussion concerns the texts composed in Aramaic. In the past, the differentiation of the respective themes and content of the Aramaic DSS received little attention, but scholars are now beginning to note the salient characteristics of the Aramaic texts as a corpus. The majority opinion is that the Aramaic texts are non-sectarian in origin, which is the viewpoint from which I will proceed.

---

95 Dimant and others have also argued for a third category of texts, one that is “between” sectarian and non-sectarian: these texts share ideas with the sectarian literature but do not have its distinct terminology; Jubilee and the Temple Scroll fit into this category; see, e.g., eadem, “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), 105-134.


97 So 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, Emile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 198ff, who points out that the Aramaic texts have specific thematic foci, such as the patriarchs/priestly line and the Jews in the Eastern Diaspora (e.g., Levi in ALD and the Babylonian setting of Dan 2-6, respectively); on the apocalyptic character of many of the Aramaic texts, see Daniel A. Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought,” AJ 2 (2014): 113-134; idem and Andrew B. Perrin, “Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon: Towards a Family Portrait,” JBL 133 (2014): 112-113; Florentino García Martínez, “Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts,” 334; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem,” in Flores Florentino, 257-270; for additional discussions of the Aramaic texts as a corpus, see the edited volume, Aramaica Qumranica (cited above).

98 It has been argued that the Aramaic literature largely pre-dates Qumran, as the nationalist sentiments of the Hasmonean era resulted in a resurgence in Hebrew as the language of composition for religious literature; on the 3rd or early-2nd cent. BCE (i.e., pre Qumran) dating of the Aramaic texts, see Ben Zion Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaic-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 the Memory of Yigael Yadin (ed., Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSOT/ASORMS 2; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 273-275; cf. Elias J. Bickerman, “Aramaic Literature,” in idem, The Jews in the GreekAge (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 51-65. For discussion and further bibliography, see Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts from Qumran the Authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations,” in Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism (ed., Mladen Popovic; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155-171. Contra García Martínez, “Scribal
In sum, there are competing theories as to the precise history and identity of those responsible for producing and preserving the DSS, and there is also debate concerning the importance of determining who wrote certain texts and even which texts were the product of group(s) who kept them. But the lack of consensus on these issues should not obscure the fact that scholars are in general agreement that some of the Qumran texts were written by the group referred to as the Yəhāḏ in the Scrolls themselves.

1.2.6: IDENTITY AT QUMRAN

Identity at Qumran has itself become a key question in recent scholarship, and in her exploration of how identity was constructed at Qumran, Newsom writes:

[T]hough the Qumran community was a sectarian group, its discourse cannot be thought of as a sort of mumbling to itself. Nothing that was said at Qumran can be understood without reference to the larger discursive context of Second Temple Period Judaism. This is true not only for the obviously polemical statements in Qumran texts but also for every utterance. The words they used, the forms of speech, the content of their prayers, and the claims they made about themselves were always in part replies, responses, and counter-claims to utterances made by others within a broader cultural context.99

Similarly, Jokiranta notes that “identity” is a concept often employed in the study of the DSS but warns that it is not exhausted by understanding the unique beliefs and practices of those responsible for producing and preserving the texts. What is frequently overlooked is that

---

“identity is defined in relations to others.” Jokiranta thus understands a “sect” as “a religious movement that is at the high-tension end on a continuum that reflects the relationship of the religious group to the wider socio-cultural movement, … [and] it is vital that the member categorize himself in terms of the shared social identity of the group.” A particularly powerful way to label outsiders is the (polemical) use of shared traditions such as the scriptures.

That the sectarian texts make assertions – even in works or passages that are not overtly polemical – vis-à-vis the claims found in other Second Temple Period literature is a valuable insight that will inform the present study. As Dimant suggests, it is important to ask how those responsible for the Qumran texts framed their existence: “What was the essential, basic idea which held together the entire system, and what was the self-image underlying it?” Dimant’s response to her own question begins to provide a helpful framework for understanding the contribution the sect’s angelological convictions made to their identity: an integral part of the Qumranites’ self-image was that they viewed themselves as “an angel-like priestly community.”

---


102 Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 217-218, highlights the importance of the (shared) base-text of the *pesharim*: “what the *pesharim* do is to make the listener/reader see the world in a new light. … [A] powerful way of labeling outsiders is to use a shared tradition, describing the enemy as wicked within that tradition [e.g., the Book of Habakkuk] that the enemy itself acknowledged.”

103 So Carol A. Newsom, “Constructing ‘We, You, and Others’ through Non-Polemical Discourse,” in *Defining Identities*, 13-22.

104 Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 95.

105 Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 95.
1:26-33; 2:31-32; 31:14), Dimant notes that *Jubilees* and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* – both of which were texts of apparent significance at Qumran – share a concern for priestly angels.\(^{106}\) Also noteworthy is that the detailed depictions of angelic priests in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* “reveal a striking resemblance” to the main activities of the sect.\(^ {107}\) In light of these similarities, Dimant suggests that the sectarian communion with angels best known from passages such as 1QH 11:20-24, 19:13-17, and 1QS 11:7-9 should be understood as a “communion by analogy rather than an actual one”\(^{108}\); that is, the members of the *Yahad* were connected to the angels because they emulated them. A slightly different reading is offered by Tuschling, who claims that the sectarians thought of themselves as the earthly counterparts to the priestly angels, and that use of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* at Qumran evoked the heavenly angel worship on earth. In her words, “earth and heaven are thus interpenetrated.”\(^ {109}\) Angelic fellowship or communion was intimately connected to the community’s priestly character, the roots of which lie in *Jubilees* (cf. *Jub.* 31:13-17; 1QSB 3:22-4:28).\(^ {110}\) Tuschling, then, states that angelic communion is more than simply a sharing of worship; it is a communion of identity. When functioning liturgically, the priestly member of the community becomes the same as angels. In fact, by doing what angels do, living the angelic life, they actually become angels, in the limited liturgical context [emphasis mine].\(^ {111}\)

---

\(^{106}\) Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99-100.

\(^{107}\) Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 100-101, provides a helpful chart comparing the actions ascribed to angels (as per *Songs*) and the actions of the community (as per CD, 1QS, etc.): e.g., covenant with God, offering of bloodless sacrifices, existing in perfect purity, praising of God, and teaching.

\(^{108}\) Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 101.

\(^{109}\) Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 119.


\(^{111}\) Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 118, uses the helpful phrase “communion of identity,” but it is rendered somewhat ambiguous when followed by the claim that the community members “become the same as angels” and “actually become angels.”
Tuschling is thereby contrasting her “communion of identity” with Dimant’s analogical understanding. Yet another understanding of angelic fellowship is articulated by those who argue that the promises of angelic fellowship after death in some texts (cf. 1 En. 104:2-6; Dan 12:3) were considered a present reality for sect members who have joined the angels in heaven via an ascent experience in the context of worship. Moreover, Schäfer highlights that there are various forms of angelic fellowship including the eschatological martial fellowship of the War Scroll as well as the present liturgical communion referred to in the Hodayot.

As Schuller has observed – and as the preceding paragraph confirms – “there is little agreement on what exactly is being claimed” when scholars refer to the sectarian notion of angelic fellowship. I would suggest that a helpful way forward lies in Tuschling’s proposal that angelic communion be understood within the overarching belief that the Yahad belonged to the lot of the righteous, which was headed by the principal angel variously called “Michael,” “the Prince of Light(s),” etc. She describes these beliefs as part of the mapping of the whole cosmos in terms of the influence of angelic and demonic armies. This is most clearly seen in the Treatise on the Two Spirits. The sphere of the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness find their equivalent within each human soul, the spirits of truth and of deceit (1QS 3:18f).

Tuschling is thus calling for angelic fellowship to be considered within the framework of the angel-led dualistic divide. Recent scholarship has tended to view the dualistic material in

---

112 Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 119.
114 Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 151-152.
116 Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 115, 136.
some of the sectarian texts – including cosmic or angelic dualism – as secondarily adopted “to provide a theological explanation”\(^{117}\) for the separation from other Jews that occurred primarily for halakhic and social reasons. That certain non-sectarian texts reveal such features (e.g., 4QVisions of Amram) lends credence to the possibility that angelic dualism was borrowed and developed by the sect to bolster legal, interpretive, or other arguments.

But the union between heaven and earth assumed by the sect’s angelic fellowship claims also reflects the conviction that access to the heavenly temple was a substitute for the Jerusalem temple, which they rejected as defiled.\(^ {118}\) Thus, angel-human interaction meant that issues of moral and ritual purity were of paramount concern at Qumran (cf. 1QSa 2:3-9).\(^ {119}\) As Harrington points out, the ritual impurity of outsiders – both Gentiles and non-sectarian Jews – “was primarily a label which preserved group identity as a ‘holy house for Aaron and Israel’ by reinforcing the barrier between member and non-member.”\(^ {120}\) Though some scholars do not find evidence of the belief that Gentiles were considered ritually impure by the sect,\(^ {121}\) most are convinced that outsiders were viewed in very negative terms

\(^{117}\) E.g., the dualism of the “Treatise on the Two Spirits” in the Community Rule (cf. 1QS 3:13-4:26); see John J. Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls (WUNT 332; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 193-194. For a recent collection of essays, see Géza G. Xeravits, ed., Dualism in Qumran (LSTS 76; London: T & T Clark, 2010). I will address the dualism of the Treatise in Chapter Four.


\(^{120}\) Hannah K. Harrington, “Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran,” in Defining Identities, 203.

\(^{121}\) Harrington, “Keeping Outsiders Out,” 187, cites Christine E. Hayes, Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 66, who claims there is no “smoking gun” proving that the Qumranites ascribed ritual impurity to Gentiles.

1.2.7: \textbf{Summary and Points of Departure for the Present Study}

In sum, it is clear that there is a need to move beyond description and observation and, to that end, to investigate more fully the intersection of angelology and sectarian identity in the DSS. The notions of a Michael-like principal angel figure and the existence of angelic priests were important features of Second Temple Period angelological speculation, and even in non-sectarian texts these angelic guardians and priests are envisioned as having some sort of \textit{connection} or \textit{correspondence} to the people of God (thereby justifying my descriptor, “angels associated with Israel”). And if Second Temple Period Jews considered angels associated with Israel as archetypal and “more real”\footnote{So Collins, \textit{The Apocalyptic Imagination}, 187.} than themselves, this association would have been valued and is therefore worthy of investigation, especially as it pertains to how a relationship with these angels was viewed to be a mark of the true people of God.

While there is some uncertainty as to what is indicated by sectarian angelic fellowship claims, presumably this phenomenon was related to but considered qualitatively greater than an angelic connection or correspondence. Moreover, Tuschling’s call to view sectarian angelic fellowship within the framework of an angel-led dualistic divide may shed light on this matter when it is remembered that to be a sect member – and thus on the righteous side of this divide – is, by definition, to be part of true Israel. That is, if sectarian membership
includes not just a *connection/correspondence* but also *fellowship* with both the Prince of Light/Michael-led angelic guardians and the priestly angels of whom the sectarians have been said to be earthly counterparts (and *vice versa*), then *to be part of true Israel is to have fellowship with the angels associated with Israel*. Boasts of angelic communion would have thus constituted a powerful assertion vis-à-vis the claims of other Jews, and, indeed, far more than a “mumbling to itself”\(^{124}\) – especially as it pertains to who constitutes the ideal embodiment of God’s people. Said another way, it is not merely the sect’s standing in the proper dualistic camp that is at stake: given its claims to be the correct interpreters of Torah and the recipients of unique and timely revelations from the God of Israel, the *Yahad’s* boasts of fellowship with angels associated with Israel would have greatly strengthened assertions that they were the true and faithful Israel of God. Schuller has suggested that a comparison of angelic fellowship passages in the sectarian literature may highlight “what all these texts share in common”\(^{125}\). I am convinced that the *Yahad’s* attempt to assert itself as ideal or true Israel is one such commonality. But in order to gain the fullest possible appreciation of sectarian angelic fellowship claims, it is necessary to differentiate them from the wider idea of an angelic connection/correspondence. Thus, the late Second Temple Period texts that were not composed by the sectarians will have to be compared and contrasted with the texts that have a sectarian provenance.

**1.3: Method and Plan of the Present Study**

In light of the above history of research, the primary objectives of this thesis are to determine the contributions angels associated with Israel make to the works in which they are found

\(^{124}\) So Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 3.

\(^{125}\) Schuller, “Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot,” 152.
and to note the relationship between these angels and a given work’s understanding of Israel.

Thus, my primary and secondary research questions are as follows:

1.) How do the late Second Temple Period DSS of a non-sectarian provenance depict angels associated with Israel? (primary)
2.) How do the sectarian texts depict angels associated with Israel, especially as it relates to the notion of angelic fellowship? (primary)
3.) How do angels associated with Israel contribute to sectarian identity? (primary)
4.) How did the concept of angels associated with Israel develop (secondary)
5.) How do Second Temple Period texts interact with the implication of Deut 32:8-9 that Yahweh is Israel’s guardian? (secondary)

My thesis will therefore be organized as follows: one chapter on the concepts and texts which served as the background of the late Second Temple Period notion of angels associated with Israel; one chapter on the late Second Temple Period compositions found at Qumran that were part of the ancestral patrimony of the sectarians; two chapters on the sectarian texts; and one chapter of conclusions. More specifically, my chapter divisions will look like this:

- Chapter Two will briefly explore the conceptual background of angels associated with Israel in the ANE literature and in pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic passages of the Hebrew Bible.
- Chapter Three will examine angelic guardians and angelic priests associated with Israel in the late Second Temple Period compositions of a non-sectarian provenance.
- Chapter Four will examine angelic guardians associated with Israel in the sectarian texts.
- Chapter Five will examine angelic priests associated with Israel in the sectarian texts.
- Chapter Six will contain the conclusions of my study.

This thesis fits within the history of research surveyed above in that: i.) it will move beyond the descriptive and observational approaches that have characterized many angelological studies; and ii.) it will do so by utilizing the idea of angels associated with Israel to gain a better understanding of how the Yahad adapted shared Jewish traditions to shape its identity vis-à-vis other Jews.
CHAPTER TWO
THE BACKGROUND OF ANGELS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL IN THE ANE LITERATURE AND IN THE PRE-EXILIC, EXILIC, AND EARLY POST-EXILIC PASSAGES OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

2.1: INTRODUCTION

Since my organization of angels associated with Israel includes the categories of angelic guardians and priests, the most important sections of this chapter will highlight the background of these two groups of angels in pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic passages of the Hebrew Bible. That is, these concepts only emerged as part of the angelological interests of the Second Temple Period, and, as such, angelic guardians of Israel are not found in the books of the Hebrew Bible prior to Daniel; the evidence for angelic priests before the late Second Temple Period is even more ambiguous. The conceptual forerunner of these angels, the gods of the nations – or the idea that certain divine beings watch over other nations as Yahweh watches over Israel – is widespread in the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, here I will examine the gods of the nations texts that are foundational for understanding angels associated with Israel and the worldviews within which they were envisioned. But since the concept of gods of the nation is related to the ANE divine council, I will begin with a brief glimpse at this motif in the Canaanite texts.¹

2.2: THE CANAANITE DIVINE ASSEMBLY

Broadly conceived, the ANE divine assembly is the concept that the royal court of the highest god consisted of subordinate beings who had various ranks and roles. Investigation

¹ There are, of course, relevant parallels in other ANE texts, but there is an especially close relationship between the ancient Canaanites and Israelites, who were both West Semitic peoples. For an overview, see the section entitled, “Israel’s ‘Canaanite’ Heritage” in Smith, The Early History of God, 19-31.
of the Canaanite assembly involves a number of complex issues, including how the relationship between the assembly members should be understood and who should be identified as highest god of the pantheon.

2.2.1: Who is the High God of the Canaanite Pantheon?

The only extant indigenous texts for studying the Canaanite divine council are the tablets of the ancient city of Ugarit, found in 1928. Among other myths, these 14th cent. BCE texts contain what has become known as the “Baal Cycle,” which is centered on the battles of the storm god, Baal, to attain kingship of the cosmos. But it is precisely the issue of Baal’s kingship that poses a crux for interpreters. Scholars have understood the prominence of Baal differently, and there are two main conclusions: while some see the kingship of Baal in the Ugaritic texts as parallel yet subordinate to the reign of El, who is considered the highest god, others understand Baal to be the supreme ruler over the gods, El included. The issue is not just that there are those who conclude that Baal became the power broker of the Canaanite pantheon as the status of El diminished over time as some have also made the more drastic claim that Baal’s kingship was established after a conflict between El and Baal from which the latter emerged victorious.


3 While there have been numerous attempts to provide a comprehensive interpretation of the Baal cycle, Smith, *Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1:59ff, notes that, despite the differences in opinion on the specifics there has been a virtual consensus in recognizing the text as a conflict-resolution story which is royal in nature: Baal’s kingship – secured by his victories over Yamm and Mot – represent and are celebrations of life overcoming chaos/destruction and death. In one sense, the exclamation of the goddess, Athirat, in KTU 1.4 IV 43-44 captures well the thrust of the texts: “Our King is Mightiest Baal, Our ruler, with none above him.”

In short, I find neither the external evidence\(^5\) nor the witness of the Canaanite texts themselves supportive of the view that Baal violently usurped El’s sovereignty over the Canaanite pantheon.\(^6\) Moreover, it is likely correct that “El’s battles are not extant in the Ugaritic texts and that his theogonic wars lie in the distant past.”\(^7\) But just because El was not an active participant in the kingship battles of the younger gods does not mean that he was envisioned as weak or otiose at Ugarit,\(^8\) and the bravado of the younger gods has not universally been interpreted as evidence of a low view of El\(^9\) and should not obscure the fact

\(^5\) I.e., comparison of the Ugaritic texts with other ancient documents has been said to support the view that Baal (violently) triumphed over El. For example, Eusebius of Caesarea, in his *Praparatio evangelica* (ca. 315 CE), includes excerpts of the *Phoenician History* by a certain Sanchuniathon, whose work was translated into Greek by Philo of Byblos (ca. 100 CE) (for text and commentary, see Harold W. Attridge and Robert A. Oden, Jr., *Philo of Byblos the Phoenician History: Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes* [CBQMS 9; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981]; Albert I. Baumgartner, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos: A Commentary* [EPRO; Leiden: Brill, 1981]). Though it is clear that i.) Philo used a source which was genuinely familiar with Canaanite thought; and ii.) the *Phoenician History* identifies Kronos as El of the Canaanite pantheon (i.e., Kronos is the father of large family of gods, the names and actions of whom are similar, at times, to the gods of the Ugaritic texts; cf. Eusebius, *Prap. evang.*., 1.10.29; see Mullen, *Assembly of the Gods*, 32 n. 55; Patrick D. Miller, Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* [HSM 5; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973], 9, 62), it is equally clear that Philo describes the Kronos-El figure as a mighty warrior whose kingship is unambiguously connected to his prowess in combat, and the resulting picture is that Kronos-El, no less than other deities, is a warrior who battles against his enemies. Conversely, it is far from evident that El’s primary function is that of a warrior or that his kingly status is attributable to military exploits. This discrepancy has led some scholars to suggest that the Ugaritic texts envision El as a weak, otiose king, whose rule had been, at the very least, seriously undermined by the kingship of Baal by the time the Ugaritic texts were written. That El’s status had in some sense waned by the time of the Ugaritic texts was first proposed by R. G. Raggia, “Alcune osservazioni sul culto di El a Ras-Samra,” *Aevum* 15 (1941): 559-575; cf. Marvin H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (VTSup 2; Leiden: Brill, 1955), 29; Oldenburg, *The Conflict Between El and Baal*, 101-16. It should be noted, however, that the *Phoenician History* states that the kingship of Zeus-Hadad over the gods came about not by the storm god’s violent disposition of his father but rather with Kronos’ permission: “Zeus Demarous who is Hada, king of the gods, reigned over the place with the consent of Kronos” (cf. Eusebius, *Prap. evang.* 1.10.31); see Attridge and Oden, *Philo of Byblos*, 54-55, 91. For detailed analysis and rebuttal of the supposed lowly status of El with additional bibliography, see L’Heureux, *Rank Among the Canaanite Gods*, 3-70; Mullen, *Assembly of the Gods*, 92ff; Smith, *Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1:88ff, 296.


\(^8\) As noted by Mullen, *Assembly of the Gods*, 10, 45.

\(^9\) In reference to the divine council’s response (i.e., lowering their heads) to Yamm’s messengers (*KTU* 1.2 I 23-24), Smith, *Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1:299-300, notes that in other ANE council scenes, raising the head
that Yamm, Baal, and others could not undertake significant action without first securing the permission of El, particularly as it pertained to matters of kingship.\textsuperscript{10} Additionally, though the Ugaritic texts exalt Baal as king of the cosmos, Baal’s exaltation and reign are not portrayed as absolute but limited and fragile,\textsuperscript{11} as the storm god often requires the assistance of the other deities, especially El.\textsuperscript{12} A helpful way to conceptualize the role of El, then, is as high king of the gods and manager of the pantheon, the latter role including the management of the kingships of the younger gods.\textsuperscript{13} In other words, El reigned supreme over the pantheon, but the younger gods – the sons of El – were permitted to vie with each other for rule of the cosmos.\textsuperscript{14} Understanding El as both high king \textit{and} manager of kingships not only accounts for the lofty royal epithets applied to his sons, but it also suggests that the reigns of El and Baal were relatively harmonious, an assertion which finds support in a text explicitly indicating one’s desire or willingness to act; thus, its opposite – lowering – would suggest a desire \textit{not} to act. Therefore, even if El is to be included with those who “lower their heads” at the sight of Yamm’s emissaries, it may not be that El and the council are afraid; it may simply be that the gods are making known their prerogative: that they did \textit{not} wish to act against Yamm’s messengers, who were charged to remove Baal from the assembly.

\textsuperscript{10} E.g., despite their boldness, Yamm’s emissaries could not simply take Baal from the assembly without El’s consent (cf. \textit{KTU} 1.1 11-39); it is only by the decree of El that a palace could be built for Yamm (cf. \textit{KTU} 1.1 IV 17-20) and Baal (cf. \textit{KTU} 1.4 IV 54-V 63 ); see Smith, \textit{Ugaritic Baal Cycle}, 1:105.

\textsuperscript{11} Smith, \textit{Ugaritic Baal Cycle}, 1:96-114, discusses the possibility that Baal’s limited power reflects the political frustrations at Ugarit. The limited and fragile power of Baal stands in contrast to the absolute power of Baal’s Mesopotamian counterpart, Marduk, in the \textit{Enuma Elish}.

\textsuperscript{12} As Smith, \textit{Ugaritic Baal Cycle}, 1:296, observes, “El emerges as a figure more fully invested with power in the Baal Cycle precisely because Baal is not predominant throughout so much of the plot. [In numerous situations, o]nly when El gives his authority for the palace does [El] recede into the background of the plot.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Mullen, \textit{Assembly of the Gods}, 37-38, who refers to El as the “dispenser” of kingships.

\textsuperscript{14} As J. D. Scholen, “The Exile of Disinherited Kin in \textit{KTU} 1.12 and \textit{KTU} 1.23,” \textit{JNES} 52 (1993): 209-220, has observed, the conflict in the Baal cycle seems to be \textit{patrilateral} in nature; i.e., there are indications that Baal was adopted into family of El and that sibling rivalry with Yamm and Mot is the source of the conflict; cf. Smith, \textit{Ugaritic Baal Cycle}, 94.
noting the relationship between El and Baal: “El sat enthroned with Astarte; El judged with Haddu, his shepherd.”

2.2.2: THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DIVINE ASSEMBLY

Given his preeminent status, it comes as no surprise that the Ugaritic texts depict El as the head of the pantheon’s social structure, which is referred to as the council or assembly.

Table #1: The Four Tiers or Levels of the Divine Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier or Level</th>
<th>Gods and Goddesses</th>
<th>Characteristics of Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>El and his consort, Athirat</td>
<td>high kingship, management of pantheon, decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Baal, Yamm, Mot, Anath et al.</td>
<td>kingship, royal children, nature association, combat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Kothar wa-Hasis</td>
<td>service of higher tiers (e.g., craftsmanship, wise counsel, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>minor deities (often unnamed)</td>
<td>messengers, (military) retinues of higher-tier gods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest tier of the assembly is that of El, and his consort, Athirat, who influenced his decisions. That ultimate authority in the pantheon belonged to El has already been highlighted, and one of the ways the Ugaritic texts emphasize El’s supremacy is the non-democratic nature of the council; that is, the decree of El is tantamount to the decree of the council. The gods and goddesses of the second tier are associated with forces of nature:

---


16 So Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism*, 45-46. Cf. Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven*, 169-177, who subscribes to the same tiers but with different nomenclature, devoting a chapter to each: Highest tier = “Authoritative deities”; Second tier = “Active deities”; Third tier = “Artisan deities”; Fourth tier = “Messenger deities.” Despite the fact that Smith views the entire pantheon as coterminus with the assembly and Handy does not, White, *Yahweh’s Council*, 3ff, points out the affinities between their readings. The four tiers are derived from passages such as *KTU* 1.2 I; 1.4 III; 1.15 II.

17 E.g., After Anath’s request that a palace be built for Baal was denied, it was Athirat’s petition that persuaded El (cf. *KTU* 1.4 IV-V); see Smith, *The Origins*, 45; Handy, *Among the Host of Heaven*, 65-95.

18 I.e., even when Baal is presented as one of the assembly, the storm god must act within the strictures of the El’s decree. Smith, *Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1:315-316, suggests that *KTU* 1.2 I is an example of the Baal cycle using yet undermining the ANE type-scene of the council’s selection of hero to fight on its behalf: rather than being the chosen champion of the assembly, Baal does not have the support of the assembly and is declared by El to be Yamm’s vassal. Once again, Baal’s portrayal in the Ugaritic texts stands in sharp contrast with the council-supported hero of Mesopotamian mythology, Markduk.
as noted above, Yamm is the god of the sea, Mot is the god of death, and Baal the god of the
storm/rain. Baal’s victory over Yamm and Mot are, in part, celebrations of life overcoming
chaos and death, but the associations with natural forces complement and emphasize the
combative nature of the deities of this tier. The third tier of the assembly has sparse
representation in the Ugaritic texts, but the fourth and lowest tier of the assembly is well-
represented, even if this level consists of servant gods, who were often non-individuated
members of the ‘ilm, “gods” (cf. KTU 1.2 I 21-35), bn qdsh, “sons of the Holy One/Holiness”
(cf. KTU 1.2 I 21, 38), or pbr bn ‘ilm, “assembly of the sons of El” (cf. KTU 1.4 III 14). Deities of this tier served as messengers and in their superiors’ retinues, military or
otherwise.

In sum, the concept of the divine assembly in the Ugaritic texts appears to have had
at least four distinct tiers, which likely mirrored similar levels of ancient society. As I will
highlight, the Canaanite conception of the divine assembly is relevant to this thesis in

---

19 There is also evidence (iconographical and textual) that the family of El was considered to be astral
in nature; e.g., the parallelism of KTU 1.10 I 35: sons of El/assembly of the stars/circle of those of heaven. For
discussion of the names and characteristics of specific deities, see Smith, The Origins, 61-66.

20 Iconographic and textual evidence suggests that Baal was considered the warrior-patron and
protector of Ugarit and its king, and it has been posited that the rise and struggles of the storm god in the Baal
Cycle were a reflection of the rise and struggles of the Niqumaddu line at Ugarit in the Middle and Late Bronze
Age. For discussion and bibliography, see Smith, Ugaritic Baal Cycle, 1:90, 106-114. As Handy, Among the Host of
Heaven, 102, puts it, “the role of Baal as the patron deity of Ugarit [was] decidedly more political in nature than
merely controlling rain.”

21 Kothar wa-Hasis is the exemplar of this level. In addition to offering his craftsmanship to the gods,
Kothar provides wise counsel; see Smith, The Origins, 46; Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 131-147.

22 Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 177; cf. Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 149ff, who comments, “While
the higher levels of divine personnel were responsible for determining the activities of the universe and for
seeing to it that these activities were carried out, the lowest level of the divine hierarchy was made up of
numerous deities who appear to have had their own names but who acted in a manner that has made it difficult
to distinguish them from one another.”

23 For the translation and interpretation of these terms, cf. Miller, The Divine Warrior, 14-15; Smith,

24 Smith, The Origins, 46; Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 175-201; cf. Handy, Among the Host of Heaven, 157-
159, who emphasizes the designation, ml’k, and, thus, the messenger role of the fourth tier deities.
multiple ways: I will discuss its possible influence on Dan 7 in Chapter Three; but in the next section of this chapter I will point out the El-like manner in which Yahweh is depicted as sitting at the head of the council in Deut 32 and Ps 82.

There is, however, an important difference between these texts and the Canaanite material: a facet of the biblical tradition’s incorporation of the divine assembly not explicitly evident in the Ugaritic texts is the manner in which council members are appointed as Gods of the nations. As Tigay explains,

the idea that God distributed the nations among the [gods] is unique to the bible. Elsewhere we hear of the major gods dividing the regions of the universe among themselves by lot, or of a chief deity distributing cities, lands, and regions to other gods. These myths are concerned with the allotment of residences and cult centers to the gods, not with relationship of the gods to the people of these places. In the bible the motif serves to express God’s relationship to humanity and his election of Israel [emphasis mine].

As I noted above, the concept of national deities anticipates the Second Temple Period notion of nationally associated angels. I will, therefore, begin my examination of the Hebrew Bible by looking at the passages which shed the most light on the later concept of angels associated with Israel and the worldviews associated with these beings, namely the idea that what transpires in heaven is somehow paralleled in the events of the nations of earth.

2.3: THE BIBLICAL BACKGROUND OF ANGELIC GUARDIANS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL

2.3.1: DEUTERONOMY 32:8-9

Part of the so-called “Song of Moses,” Deut 32:8-9 has been referred to as the “standard or
chart for the topic of the deities of the other nations. In addition to its impact on later tradition, a main reason why Deut 32:8-9 is such an important text is that it is the most explicit statement in the Hebrew Bible regarding not only the existence of the gods of the nations but especially the nature of the relationship of these national deities to Yahweh and Israel. The MT of Deut 32:8-9 reads as follows:

8 When the Most High apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, he fixed the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the [lit: sons of Israel].
9 the LORD's own portion was his people, Jacob his allotted share.

The end of v. 8 has well-known textual variants. More specifically, the LXX and the

consequent moral obligation to serve the God of Israel in faithfulness, and while Israel's proper response to the kindness of God is also central to the historical purview of the Book of Deuteronomy, it is important to note that SM and Deuteronomy are not identical in their outlooks. In fact, the archaic poetic features of SM have persuaded many scholars that SM was an originally independent composition that pre-dates the bulk of Deuteronomy, even if there is no consensus on the specifics of date and provenance. For an overview of the issues, see Paul Sanders, The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32 (OSt 37; Leiden: Brill, 1996). Classic studies that date SM to the 11th cent. BCE include Otto Eissfeldt, Das Lied Moses, Deuterononomium 32:1-43 und das Lebendicht Asaphs samt einer Analyse der Umgung des Mose-Liedes (Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, 1958); William F. Albright, “Some Remarks on the Song of Moses,” VT 9 (1959): 339-346. Tigay, Deuteronomy, 512-13, is open to the possibility that SM is as early as the period of the Judges, but he rightly cautions that the inconsistent occurrences of archaic poetic features (e.g., the use of the imperfect without a waw-consecutive to narrate events in the past such as בִּנְיֵיתָם in v. 10) may indicate that the poem was written and/or revised during a period of transition when old and new forms were used interchangeably or perhaps at an later time in conscious but inconsistent imitation of the older tradition. The tentative conclusion of Tigay, Deuteronomy, 513 is instructive and will be accepted here: “that [the SM] is older than Deuteronomy 1-31 and 34, perhaps considerably older, is likely.” For additional discussion and bibliography, see Mark S. Smith, God in Translation: Deities in Cross-Cultural Discourse in the Biblical Word (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 139-141.


Helpful overviews of the textual witnesses are provided by Michael S. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32 and the Sons of God,” BibSac 158 (2001): 52-54; Smith, God in Translation, 139-140.

DSS do not have “the sons of Israel,” a phrase which has perplexed interpreters.

The discovery of the Qumran Cave 4 mss has all but confirmed the long-held scholarly suspicion that the LXX was dependent on a Hebrew Vorlage similar to that of 4QDeut and that this tradition pre-dated the tradition reflected in the MT. The critical consensus on the variants of verse 8, then, is that the MT’s “sons of Israel” – despite its illogic – was a deliberate emendation of בנים יילים by later scribes who were uncomfortable with the polytheistic implications of the verse. The text is thus corrected by critical commentators


34 S. R. Driver, Deuteronomy (3rd ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1973), 355-356, whose commentary was first published in 1895 – well before the discoveries at Qumran – suggests that Deut 32:8-9 is intelligible in light of Gen 10 and 46:27; i.e., so Tg. Ps.-J., Driver argues that “a correspondence was intended between [the 70 nations descended from the sons of Noah] and the 70 souls of Gen 46:27.” Thus, God divided the nations according to the number of Jacob’s sons who went down to Egypt. But as Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32 and the Sons of God,” 53-54, points out, even if one presupposes an intended connection between the separation (דָּרֶכֶם) of the nations in Gen 10-11 and their separation (דָּרֶכֶם) in Deut 32:8-9, “What possible point would there be behind connecting the pagan Gentile nations numerically with the Israelites?” Cf. Tigay, Deuteronomy, 302.

35 Smith, God in Translation, 141; cf. Emmauel Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2012), 269. A. van der Kooij, “Ancient Emendations in MT,” in L’Ecrit et l’Esprit: Études d’histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker (eds., Dieter Böhler, I. Imbaza, P. Hugo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 152-159, has argued that the scribal emendation dates to 2nd cent. BCE priestly circles; see Smith, God in Translation, 201. There is wide-spread agreement that an emendation similar to that of v. 8 was carried out at the end of the Song: while the LXX and DSS mss of Deut 32:43 preserve, respectively, two and four-line imperatives for the heavenly beings to worship Yahweh, the MT has the emended and significantly truncated, ובנֵי יִבְיָלֵים וּבְנֵי שָׁם. On how the LXX and MT readings arose vis-à-vis the DSS reading, see Tigay, Deuteronomy, 516-518; cf. Alexander Rofé, “The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:43),” in Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium (eds., Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieermann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 164-172, who articulates the general scholarly consensus: “theological correction lies at the bottom of the textual manipulations that ensued.”
and some modern translations to reflect the DSS and LXX witnesses,\textsuperscript{36} and the thrust of Deut 32:8-9 is understood as follows: the God of Israel assigned the subordinate beings of his assembly a guardian-like role over the other nations, but such an arrangement was not established for Israel, who is privileged to be ruled directly by Yahweh.\textsuperscript{37}

In a series of related studies,\textsuperscript{38} Smith has championed and developed the view that a fuller understanding of Deut 32:8-9 and related passages is more complex than the brief sketch provided in the preceding paragraph, even if that sketch is ultimately correct. It is unnecessary to provide an exhaustive review of Smith here, but some discussion is necessary. Smith’s work is concerned with the notion of “translatability,” which he defines as “a worldview that could recognize other national gods as valid for Israel’s neighbors just as Yahweh was for Israel.”\textsuperscript{39} Contrary to claims that Israelite religion exhibited a lack of translatability due to its “Mosaic distinction,”\textsuperscript{40} Smith contends that there is, indeed, evidence of translatability in monarchic Israel, and that certain texts “are not nearly as monotheistic as

\textsuperscript{36} E.g., the NRSV translates the end of v. 8 as “gods” (rather than “sons of Israel”).

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Alexander Rofé, Angels in the Bible: Israelite Belief as Evidence by Biblical Traditions (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Carmel, 2012), xii; Peter C. Craigie, Deuteronomy (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 379-380; Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 202-205; Tigay, Deuteronomy, 302-304; Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32 and the Sons of God,” 52-74; Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12, 796. The sentiment that God has allotted divine beings to the other nations is not limited to the Song of Moses, as Deut 4:19-20 and 29:25-26 attest.


\textsuperscript{39} Smith, God in Translation, 10.

\textsuperscript{40} Smith, God in Translation, 1-9, 103, is clear that his research is primarily a critique and development of the work of Jan Assmann and Ronald Hendel. E.g., Assmann, Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), claims that the distinctive feature of Mosaic religion stems from it being “counter religion” because it rejects and repudiates everything that went before and what is outside itself as ‘paganism.’ … Whereas polytheism … rendered different cultures mutually transparent or compatible, the new counter-religion blocked inter-cultural translatability. False gods cannot be translated”; cf. idem, Die Mosaische Unterscheidung: Oder der Preis des Monotheismus (München: C. Hanser, 2003); Hendel, Remembering Abraham: Culture Memory, and the History of the Hebrew Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
they have been interpreted.” While Smith claims that translatability began to wane when the Assyrians and Babylonians rose to power, the notion of a “Mosaic distinction” cannot truly be maintained until the late biblical period and post-biblical reception of the Hebrew Bible. Perhaps the most relevant aspect of Smith’s work for the present study is his proposal that the move from translatability to non-translatability in ancient Israel involved a sophisticated process of development “that retained older formulations of translatability within expressions of non-translatability and monotheism.” According to Smith, Deut 32:8-9 is an example of a text that preserves an older translatable worldview even as it rejects that same worldview. Smith addresses two aspects of the passage: the textual variants of verse 8 (noted above) and “Elyon,” a epithet associated with El (cf. Gen 14:18-22, which reads יְהוָהַיִּתְנַגֶּשׁ). While it has been common for scholars to identify (El) Elyon and Yahweh, Smith is a proponent of the more controversial view that Deut 32:8-9 reveals a past distinction and translatability between El and Yahweh. “[T]he passage says how Jacob (i.e., Israel) became

41 Smith, God in Translation, 129, highlights how texts such as Gen 31:43-53, Num 23:9, Judg 11:24, and 1 Kgs 20:23-28 “reflect various forms of translatability largely involving the recognition of the class of national military gods across cultural boundaries.”

42 Smith, God in Translation, 10.

43 Smith, God in Translation, 10.


45 The view that the Canaanite/early Israelite god, El, and the southern God, Yahweh, were originally distinct is often associated with the well-known article of Otto Eissfeldt, “El and Yahweh,” JJS 1 (1956): 25-37; for discussion and additional bibliography see Smith, God in Translation, 96-98; John Day, Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan (JSOTSup 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 13-17. For a proposal of a
Yahweh’s allotment”; in other words, “Yahweh is one of the gods who receives his
inheritance from (El) Elyon.” Smith is adamant, however, that the translatability of Deut
32:8-9 is vestigial, and that the composer/compiler of Deut 32:1-43 did not intend to
produce a polytheistic picture since the poem’s numerous monoaltrous assertions indicate
that Elyon was understood as a title of Yahweh (cf. Gen 14:19-22).

Smith concedes that a vestigial reading of Deut 32:8-9 cannot be established with
certainty. In fact, whether an eventual equation of Yahweh with (El) Elyon in Israel
effectively collapsed the notion of a Canaanite-like, multi-tiered assembly, or whether (El)
Elyon was always synonymous with Yahweh who was considered to be the unrivaled head of

hypothetical three-stages process by which Yahweh and El came to be identified, see Smith, The Origins, 143-145.

46 Smith, God in Translation, 139, 196. Such a reading has profound implications for understanding the
divine assembly in ancient Israel: if the passage has vestiges of Yahweh’s past subordination to (El) Elyon, it
may suggest that Yahweh was initially envisioned in Israel as belonging to a lower tier of the divine assembly;
that is, Yahweh may not always have been equated with (El) Elyon but rather was a named son of E; see idem, Origins of Biblical Monotheism, 49. A similar reading has been offered by White, Yahweh’s Council, 16, 34ff, who views Deut 32:8-9 as referring to a council “not under the leadership of Yahweh” and prefers the interpretation that “each of the nations of the Earth received their territory and their national god from [ע”חי] and Israel was
given Yahweh.” Note also the comments of Ronnie Goldstein, “A New Look at Deuteronomy 32:8-9 and 43 in
Light of Akkadian Sources,” Tarbiz 79 (2009): 5-21, who proposes that parallels with Akkadian hymnic texts
suggest that the original import of Deut 32:8-9 was to celebrate that Yahweh – likely as one of the sons of El –
had ascended to the position of the main god and that Israel was given to him as part of his new role. Cf. Day,
Yahweh and Gods and Goddesses, 14, who notes that Yahweh has similarities not only with El, who is portrayed as
benevolent, but also the warrior Baal, who is a god of the second tier of the Canaanite assembly and associated
with the storm (e.g., Judg 5:4-5). For detailed discussions of how the language and imagery of both El and Baal
are applied to Yahweh, see Smith, The Early History of God, 32-47; 65-107.

47 Smith, God in Translation, 202; cf. idem, The Origins, 78.

E.g., v. 17: “They sacrificed to demons, not God, to deities they had never known, to new ones
recently arrived, whom your ancestors had not feared”; cf. vv. 21, 39, 43.

49 See Smith, God in Translation, 142.

subordinate to Elyon is questionable.”

51 On the possibility that Israel’s notion of the assembly was initially similar to the Canaanite
conception, Smith, The Origins, 48, suggests that international politics may have played a role: “ … [T]he neo-
Assyrian empire presented a new world order. Only after this alternation of the world scene did Israel require a
different ‘world theology’ that not only advanced Yahweh to the top but eventually eliminated the second tier
altogether insofar as it treated all other gods as either non-entities or expressions of Yahweh’s power.”
an assembly (even in the earliest stages of Israelite religion), the end result is the same: reinforced by their placement in the “Song of Moses” – and, indeed, the rest of the Book of Deuteronomy – verses 8-9 assert that Yahweh’s stature and authority are incomparable, making (El) Elyon an appropriate designation for Yahweh.

But even if the מנהיגים are vastly inferior to Yahweh, an open question concerns their status – ontological and otherwise – in the mind of the composer, and on this issue a few comments are required. First, despite the aforementioned monolatrous assertions of the poem, the concept of the מנהיגים, in and of itself, does not appear to have been problematic for the composer of Deut 32:1-43. That is, even if the composer of the poem inherited a polytheistic trope and effaced this polytheism “by combining it with statements that express divinity in more exclusive terms,” the effacement is implicit not explicit. In fact, Deut 32:8-9 and similar passages from Deuteronomy suggest a measure of translatability

---

52 Smith, *God in Translation*, 211, writes, “What we have in Deut 32:8-9 is a notion of minor divinities, who serve the absolute divine King; these are, relatively speaking, so powerless compared to Yahweh that for the composer, they do not truly constitute gods like Yahweh. They are perhaps like the ’elim of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices, minor ‘divinities,’ actually angels, but hardly gods in the modern conventional sense”; cf. Smith’s excursus, “What is a God?” in *God in Translation*, 11-15.

53 Tigay, *Deuteronomy*, 303, writes, “‘Most High’ is an ideal epithet for God. In [Deut 32:8] it emphasizes His supremacy over the other divine beings, and since it does not have exclusively Israelite associations it suits the context of God’s organizing the human race as a whole”; cf. Craigie, *Deuteronomy*, 379: “The title emphasizes God’s sovereignty and authority over all nations, whereas in relation to his own people he is called Yahweh or Lord (v. 9).”

54 Smith, *God in Translation*, 211.

55 Nor were the מנהיגים a problem for all Second Temple Period Jews, as 4QDeut readily attests.

56 Smith, *God in Translation*, 142, 197, suggests that multiple “sons of god” was likely deemed by the composer to be an inherited trope as per the seventy divine sons of El and Athirat in the Ugaritic texts (cf. KTU 1.4 IV 44-46).

57 I.e., the language of “no gods” in Deut 32:17, 21, 39; see Smith, *God in Translation*, 197.

58 Smith, *God in Translation*, 142.
or “division in religious devotion”.

Yahweh is the god for the Israelites and the בֵּןֵי אֲלָהֵי is the “gods” for the nations, and while it is correct that the בֵּןֵי אֲלָהֵי are not envisioned to be gods in the same sense that Yahweh is, Tigay points out that the expectation that the nations will one day forsake idolatry and devote themselves exclusively to Yahweh is not unambiguously expressed in the Hebrew Bible before the time of the prophets (cf. Jer 50:35-39). Smith suggests, therefore, that Deuteronomy captures a tension between ancient Israel’s assertion of the matchless stature and authority of Yahweh, on the one hand, and the expression of inherited polytheistic motifs and language, on the other hand.

But Smith arguably understates an important component of this tension: the moral character of the בֵּןֵי אֲלָהֵי. If, as he suggests, the composer(s) only implicitly effaced the inherited polytheism in the poem, Smith seems to place a greater emphasis on the effacement of the polytheism and less stress on what the implications of the implicitness of this effacement might be, in particular, the relative moral neutrality with which these beings are portrayed in Deuteronomy.

Smith sets Ps 82 – a text that will be examined more closely in the next section of this chapter – in the same tradition as Deut 32:8-9 in that it, too, has vestiges of an


60 Smith, The Origins, 49.

61 Smith, God in Translation, 204.

62 See Tigay, Deuteronomy, 435, who writes: “In the Torah, the nations are held guilty for what they do in the name of their religion, such as child sacrifice, but not for what they worship.” E.g., Deut 12:29-31; 18:9-12; 20:18. It is, of course, a primary concern of Deuteronomy that Israel’s only option is to love and serve Yahweh (e.g., Deut 6:4-5).

63 The existence of this tension describes, in nuce, Smith’s discussion of Deut 4:19-20 and 29:25 vis-à-vis Deut 32:8-9; see God in Translation, 203-208.

64 See Smith, God in Translation, 197, 203.
older translatable worldview even as it rallies against that same worldview. Smith contends that the psalm may have served to clarify any ambiguity regarding the ontology of figures such as the בֵּן אַלֹהִים of Deut 32:8-9, precisely because the בֵּן אַלֹהִים of Ps 82 will “die like mortals.” But the gods of Ps 82 are also judged for being unjust (vv. 6-7).

Thus, if Smith is right to suggest that Ps 82 “contributes to our understanding of the larger hermeneutical shift that informs the textual censorship operative in Deut 32:8-9,” then it is plausible that Israelite tradition deemed it necessary to make a definite pronouncement not only on the ontology of the gods of the nations but also in reference to their morality.

Indeed, Ps 82 seems to be revoking the “good opinion of the אַלֹהִים so far held,” and given that Deut 32:8-9 “admits” that the God of Israel has assigned the other nations to the בֵּן אַלֹהִים, it is difficult to see how the original composer/hearers of Deut 32:1-43 could

---

66 According to Smith, God in Translation, 211, just as various forms of censorship in Deut 32:8-9 sought to rid the text of any vestiges of translatability (e.g., the identification of Elyon and Yahweh, the later emending “sons of god” to “sons of Israel,” or the less dramatic censorship of most LXX witnesses, which translate בֵּן אַלֹהִים as ἄγγελος θεοῦ; see below), Ps 82 explicitly censors the possibility of equating the divinity of the “gods of the nations” with that Yahweh by declaring the mortality of the former.
67 On the connection between divinity and morality, John E. Goldingay, Psalms: Volume 2: Psalms 42-89 (BCOTWP; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 568, is instructive: “Realizing the morally incompetent way the gods are governing the world has made the suppliant [of the psalm] realize that they cannot be offspring of the Most High, and that in two senses. It cannot be so because surely they would then show more of a family resemblance. God does not tolerate the neglect or oppression of the poor, so how can God’s offspring collude with it? But also it cannot be so because the suppliant knows that God will take the same action against the gods as God takes against human oppressors. God puts them down. They will lose their lives. And if that is a possibility, this too shows they cannot really be God’s offspring. ‘They do not share in God’s eternity’; cf. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, Psalms 2: A Commentary on Psalms 51-100 (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 333: “While in ancient Near Eastern texts the obligation to protect orphans, widows and the dispossessed rested only on individual ‘law deities,’ our psalm makes this obligation of protection the crucial mark of the divinity of all deities, and thus the essential characteristic of divinity pure and simple.”
68 So Hans-Joachim Kraus, Psalms 60-150 (CC; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1993), 157.
69 Rofé, Angels in the Bible, xii.
70 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 435-436, in a short excursus devoted to “The Biblical View of the Origin of Polytheism,” deems the attempts of the LXX and the Rabbis to downplay the other-gods-for-other-nations thrust of Deut 4:19-20 and 32:8-9 “unlikely”; i.e., early in Israel’s history, the conception that Yahweh had granted gods to the Gentiles was acceptable (so long as Israel did not worship these deities).
have concluded that the בַּעַל יִהְיוּדִים to be evil or unjust per se.

Thus, for the purposes of understanding the trajectory of Israelite tradition, the implicit effacement of the ontology of the gods, which is present in the Song of Moses, needs to be clearly differentiated from the explicit ontological and moral judgments of the gods of the nations, which are not present in the Song of Moses but unambiguously articulated in Ps 82. This distinction is important, and I will return to its significance, below.

2.3.2: PSALM 82

The topics discussed in this chapter thus far – Deut 32:8-9 and the divine assembly – are important for understanding Ps 82, which not only refers to the gods of the nations but also makes use of the Canaanite type-scene of the high god El presiding over the assembly.71 Almost every conceivable time period has been proposed for the date of composition, though it seems likely that Ps 82 evokes and is, therefore, later than Deut 32:8-9.72

71 Hossfeld and Zengler, Psalms 2, 329, point out that there are actually three mythological concepts brought together in Psalm 82: i.) the hierarchy of the divine assembly; ii.) the notion of national gods as per Deut 32:8-9; and iii.) the rise to power within the pantheon (cf. Baal’s rise to power in the Canaanite texts and Marduk’s ascension in the Babylonian literature); see also Kraus, Psalm 60-151, 155; Smith, God in Translation, 135.

72 Goldingay, Psalms, 2:560, provides a helpful summary of the options: for a pre/early monarchic period date, see Mitchell J. Dahood, Psalms 2 (AB 17; Garden City: Doubleday, 1964), 269; Samuel Terrien, The Psalms (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 591; for a late monarchic period date, see David Qimchi, Tehillim in Migrant Gedolot (repr., with partial English trans. in A. J. Rosenberg, Psalms [3 vols. New York: Judaica, 1991]); for an exilic period date, see A. Gonzales, “Le Psalme lxxxii,” VT 13 1(1969), 78-80; for an early post-exilic period date, see Zoltan Rokay, “Vom Stadttor zu den Verhöfen,” ZKT 116 (1994): 457-63; Julian Morgenstern, “The Mythological Background of Psalm 82,” HUCA 14 (1939): 119-121; for the development of the psalm over a long period of time, see Oswald Loretz, Psalmstudien (BZAW 309; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 268-273; lastly, the similarities with Daniel (see below) may suggest a very late date. Given that there is a similar lack of agreement on the date of composition of the Song of Moses, caution is warranted (i.e., it is possible that Deut 32:1-43 and Ps 82 are contemporaneous and simply contain competing viewpoints). However, since Ps 82 refers to the gods as “sons of Elyon” (cf. Deut 32:8 where Yahweh is referred to as “Elyon”) and states that all nations “belong” (נְקַנְנֵי) to the God of Israel (cf. Deut 32:9 where Israel alone is Yahweh’s נְקַנְנֵי, the psalm seems to be clarifying, updating, or even criticizing the claims of Deut 32:8-9 in that gods of the nation have been deposed and that the authority and jurisdiction of the God of Israel are unlimited in scope. Thus, Ps 82 may have been a late, direct response to Deut 32:8-9 (so Sanders, The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32, 370-371), though how much later is uncertain.
1 God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment:
2 “How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? Selah
3 Give justice to the weak and the orphan; maintain the right of the lowly and the destitute.
4 Rescue the weak and the needy; deliver them from the hand of the wicked.”
5 They have neither knowledge nor understanding, they walk around in darkness;
6 all the foundations of the earth are shaken.
7 I say, “You are gods, children [Heb.: sons] of the Most High, all of you;
8 nevertheless, you shall die like mortals, and fall like any prince.”
9 Rise up, O God, judge the earth; for all the nations belong to you!

The first occurrence of שׁדֵי אֱלֹהִים in verse 1 refers to Yahweh,73 who stands74 in the “assembly
of El/in the midst of the gods” in order to judge the immorality of the assembly members,
called “gods” and “sons of Elyon” in verse 6. The God of Israel occupies the role of El at
the head of the assembly,75 and since there also seems to be reference to “gods” who (used

73 In the so-called “Elohist Psalter” (Pss 42-83), שְׁדֵי אֱלֹהִים can be read for שְׂדֵי אֱלֹהִים, and doing so helps to
distinguish between the first and second occurrences of שדֵי אֱלֹהִים in Ps 82:1 (i.e., as a proper name and as a
reference to subordinate heavenly beings, respectively); see Goldingay, Psalms, 2561, and Kraus, Psalm 60-150,
154. Commenting on the characteristics of the Elohist Psalter, Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 2, 5, note that
“there is preference for speaking of Elohim when God’s universality is to be underscored,” which is an apt
description of the thrust of Ps 82.

74 For a detailed discussion of the verb בָּשָׁם, see Smith, God in Translation, 133 n. 4. Hossfeld and
Zenger, Psalms 2, 333, observe that בָּשָׁם emphasizes Yahweh’s prosecutorial role. Thus, the Canaanite type-
scene is modified in that Yahweh is not only the assembly’s presider/judge (so Klaus Seybold, Das Gebet des
Kranken im Alten Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits – und Heilungspsalmen
[BWANT 19; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973], 325) but also the prosecutor/accuser; cf. Hans-Jochen Boecker,
Redeformen des Rechtslebens im Alten Testament (2nd ed.; WMANT 14; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,
1970), 85.

75 E.g., KTU 1.2.1. Ps 82:6-7 declares that the “gods” are corrupt, and that these “sons of Elyon” will
die like humans for their injustice. Smith, The Origins, 49, notes that, if the notion of a multi-leveled, Canaanite-
like assembly in which Yahweh was a second-tier deity was ever part of the mythology of ancient Israel, Ps 82 is
even clearer than Deut 32:8-9 in stating that such an understanding of the divine hierarchy had collapsed. Cf.
to) rule the nations as Yahweh rules Israel, Smith contends that the psalm, as noted above, is another example of a text having vestiges of translatability; Ps 82, however, is more explicit than Deut 32:8-9 in its rejection of translatability. Indeed, Yahweh is depicted as having “exclusive divine competency.”

Most relevant to the present study, however, is how Ps 82 declares Yahweh’s universal reign. While some commentators have interpreted the psalm as an indictment of the gods of the nations (the most straightforward option), and others have understood it as a judgment of human rulers who are described in exalted language, a third option – and the view accepted here – is that the first two interpretations are not mutually exclusive, and that

---

76 In fact, Smith God in Translation, 139, claims that Ps 82 is a decisive call to end translatability; cf. Goldingay, Psalm, 2:562 n. 18, who rightly notes that even if, in an earlier stage of the history of the scene/material, El was conceived as the head of the assembly and Yahweh as a (subordinate) assembly member, such a scenario “cannot be the meaning of the psalm,” either in the context of the Psalter, in general, or Psalm 82, in particular. Also see White, Yahweh’s Council, 33, who, in remarks similar to those she makes regarding Deut 32:8-9, proposes that “while Yahweh is a character in this divine council type-scene, he is not the head of it (El is) until possibly the end of the psalm when he takes over the position of the council. So this scene cannot truly be considered a Council of Yahweh type-scene, but it could represent a transition from a more ancient form of type-scene towards the Council of Yahweh type-scene corpus.” For an additional understanding, see Michael Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God’ in 4Q246? An Overlooked Example of Early Biblical Interpretation,” DSD 21 (2014): 295, who, though he views Ps 82 as a “direct development” of Deut 32:8-9, is supportive of what is, in my opinion, the questionable proposal of David Frankel, “El as the Speaking Voice in Ps 82:6-7,” JHS 10 (2010): 1-24, who argues that v. 8 is not a petition penned by the psalmist but rather the words of El directed to his subordinate, Yahweh. Frankel’s reading means that the Canaanite heritage of Ps 82 is still very much in the foreground of the psalm. Segal, in turn, applies Frankel’s interpretation to Dan 7, a reading with which I will interact in the next chapter.

77 Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 2, 328.

78 For a brief summary of the interpretive options, see Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 2, 330-332.

79 See especially Alfons Deissler, Die Psalmen (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1964), 319-320, who highlights that the psalm is similar to prophetic texts in which Yahweh judges Israel’s rulers (cf. Isa 1:17; 3:13-26; Mic 3:9-12). The לֶאְטַם in verse 1, then, refers to the לָאָטַם, לָהַלו, Israel’s general populace (cf. Num 27:17; 31:16; Josh 22:16-17), and לָהַלו is a mytho-poetic way of referring to Israel’s ruling officials. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,” 62, notes that, as early as the 1930s, identifying the “gods” of Ps 82 with rulers was criticized as an attempt to guard the text from polytheism; see Cyrus H. Gordon, “לָהַלו in Its Reputed Meaning of Rulers, Judges,” JBL 54 (1935): 139-144.
Ps 82 posits an analogous relationship between the gods and human beings.\textsuperscript{80} The question of the second verse presupposes the ANE notion that the gods have judicial responsibilities in heaven with real implications on earth.\textsuperscript{81} I have already noted that a hallmark of Ps 82 is the explicit denunciation of the gods in verse 7 for their immorality. But an equally significant conceptual contribution of this psalm is that it posits a connection between the behaviour of the gods and the actions of people on earth. Goldingay summarizes this worldview as follows:

\begin{quote}
[T]he gods are expected to identify with the principles that Yahweh believes in and expect human beings to live by. The presupposition is that the gods share in responsibility for the proper supervision of life in the world, under God but above earthly authorities. … They are to exercise authority for the faithful and elevate them and to see that earthly authorities do so.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

However, the gods have favoured the יָּשָׁכְתִים, and the poor are oppressed as a result.\textsuperscript{83}

An important question concerns the sense in which the gods of Ps 82 were thought to be aiding the wicked and failing to exercise authority for those on the margins of society.\textsuperscript{84}

While it is possible that the psalm is claiming that the poor in Israel suffer because of Israel’s collusion with other nations who are, in turn, inspired by their unjust gods,\textsuperscript{85} in light of

\textsuperscript{80} So Herbert Niehr, “Götter oder Menschen – eine falsche Alternative: Bemerkungen zu Ps 82,” \textit{ZAW} 99 (1987) 94-98. Hossfeld and Zenger, \textit{Psalms} 2, 330-331, agree with Niehr that it is a false dichotomy to choose between humans or gods as the objects of God’s judgment in Ps 82, but rightly emphasize Yahweh’s indictment of the gods, who were the realities behind the unjust systems and rulers on earth. For similar interpretations, see Kraus, \textit{Psalms 60-150}, 153-158; Goldingay, \textit{Psalms}, 2:558-570; Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,” 62; Mullen, \textit{Assembly of the Gods}, 228.

\textsuperscript{81} Cf. Kraus, \textit{Psalms 60-150}, 156; Hossfeld and Zenger, \textit{Psalms} 2, 333.

\textsuperscript{82} Goldingay, \textit{Psalms}, 2:563.

\textsuperscript{83} Kraus, \textit{Psalms 60-150}, 156.

\textsuperscript{84} Goldingay, \textit{Psalms}, 2:565.

\textsuperscript{85} See Goldingay, \textit{Psalms}, 2:565: “The gods do not have responsibility for relationships within the Israelite community; that is Yahweh’s business. But the Israelites were often suffering because of the attacks of other peoples (see Psalm 83), for which these people’s gods could then be held responsible [so Michael D. Goulder, \textit{The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch} (JSOTSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 163-
frequent biblical admonishments of Israel for idolatry, the psalm may also imply the following charge: Israel had made the gods of the nations their *de facto* objects of worship,\(^{86}\) and as per the analogous relationship between heaven and earth presupposed by the psalm, the injustice of Israel’s *de facto* gods was somehow paralleled or mirrored in Israel. The emphasis on the judgment of the gods (rather than the culpability of Israel) may serve, then, not only to assert the authority and stature of Yahweh vis-à-vis the gods of the nations but also to underscore the folly of idolatry by highlighting the corruption and impotence of Israel’s *de facto* gods.

In any case, it would seem that the psalmist considers the injustice of the gods to have such dramatic, earth-impacting consequences\(^{87}\) that any ambiguity regarding the moral and ontological status of the gods of the nations needed to be addressed with an unequivocal statement: their actions and resultant punishment – death – reveal that these אֱלֹהִים are inferior in every way to Yahweh. In verse 8, the God of Israel is, thus, implored to judge the earth, which, in light of the worldview of the psalm, means that “God will act as the one who holds power in the world and can govern it in the way it needs.”\(^{88}\) Hossfeld and Zenger claim that the petition of verse 8 “looks back to Deut 32:8-9” in that it calls on the God of

\(^{164}\) ... Might the psalm be protesting the way the gods collude in or inspire the oppression of the vulnerable within the nations they oversee (cf. the critiques in Amos 1:3-2:3)?  

\(^{86}\) In the preceding psalm (cf. Ps 81:7-16), Israel is rebuked for failing to listen to God’s command not to have “strange” and “foreign” gods among them. The placement/succession of Pss 81-82 may suggest that early readers understood Ps 82 as reinforcing the polemic against idolatry by pointing out the dangerous reality behind idolatry. 

\(^{87}\) Hence, v. 5: “They have neither knowledge nor understanding, they walk around in darkness; all the foundations of the earth are shaken”; cf. Kraus, *Psalm 69-150*, 157, who points out that elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Ps 96:10; Isa 28:16-17) justice is portrayed as foundational to the created order. 

\(^{88}\) Goldingay, *Psalms*, 2:568, follows others in highlighting not only the importance of the verb אֱלֹהִים to the psalm but also its nuances; cf. Kenneth M. Craig, “Psalm 82,” *Int* 49 (1995): 281-284; Smith, *God in Translation*, 134 n. 6: “[אֱלֹהִים] in this psalm does not refer to ruling the divine council itself. In verse 1 it characterizes the divine indictment of the other deities, while in verses 2-3 and [8] it denotes proper rule or adjudication within a god’s divine realm.”
Israel “to become [emphasis retained] the God he, as the God of the exodus, really is.”

However, it may be more accurate to view verse 8 as looking back to Deut 32:8-9 in order to reevaluate its claims, especially in light of verses 6-7, the overarching import of which is clear: optimism or ambivalence concerning the gods of the nations may have been acceptable in the past, but such a nonchalant attitude is dangerous because they have proven themselves unworthy of their delegated responsibilities to the detriment of people on earth.

2.3.3: 2 KINGS 18:32b-35 (//ISA 36:18-20)

A text that presupposes a worldview similar to that of Ps 82, in which an analogous relationship between heaven and earth is posited, is found in 2 Kings, specifically within the account of the Assyrian king Sennacherib’s attack of Jerusalem (ca. 701 BCE). The MT of 2

---

89 Hossfeld and Zenger, Psalms 2, 335, do not elaborate on this comment, but as noted above the use of the title “Elyon” in the context of Deut 32:8-9 conveys the sense of Yahweh’s authority over all people and gods. Whereas in Deut 32:8-9 Yahweh uses his authority to delegate, the psalmist implores the God of Israel to exercise that same authority in a more comprehensive, hands-on manner so the world can be governed as it ought and needs to be governed (see preceding note).

90 Echoing the comments I made above, White, Yahweh’s Council, 38, speaks of the “evolution” of the Hebrew Bible divine council passages, placing Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82 in the first and second positions, respectively.

91 Although discussion has ensued concerning both the identity of the speaker in verses 6-7 (i.e., Yahweh or the psalmist) and the nuance of the antithetical relationship between הַשָּׁם הַמִּקְדָּשׁוֹ and אֱלֹהִים, the denunciation of the gods – despite indications that they were formerly held in higher esteem – is apparent; see especially, Mattithau Tsevat, “God and the Gods in Assembly,” HUCA 40-41 (1969-70): 129-130: “The poem presents two views of the gods, and earlier one and a later one”; cf. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32 and the Sons of God,” 64; Cyrus H. Gordon, “History of Religion in Psalm 82,” in Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor (ed., Gary A. Tuttle; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 129-131; Goldenayg, Psalms, 2:567; Kraus, Psalm 60-150, 157. Contra Frankel, “El as the Speaking Voice,” 1-24, who, as noted above, prefers El as the speaker of vv. 6-8.

Kgs 18:32b-35 reads:

32b Do not listen to Hezekiah when he misleads you by saying, the Lord will deliver us.
33 Has any of the gods of the nations ever delivered its land out of the hand of the king of Assyria?
34 Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivva? Have they delivered Samaria out of my hand?
35 Who among all the gods of the countries have delivered their countries out of my hand, that the Lord should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?

These words, spoken by an unnamed Assyrian official with the title of “the Rabshekeh” (cf. 2 Kgs 18:17, 19, 28), are part of a taunt intended to demoralize the defenders of Jerusalem’s walls. While in an earlier speech (cf. 2 Kgs 18:19-25), the Rabshekeh addresses three Judean officials and attempts to undermine their confidence by challenging the reliability of Hezekiah and Yahweh, in his second speech, the Rabshekeh implores the watchmen of Jerusalem to trust Sennacherib, and then states why Judah should do so: Yahweh is no more capable than the unsuccessful gods of the other nations to deliver his people from the Assyrian onslaught.

93 “The Rabshekeh” (in Hebrew, הָרַבְשֶׁקָה) or “chief cupbearer” was the third-highest position in the Assyrian hierarchy and served as the king’s advisor or diplomat; see Sweeney, 1 & II Kings, 414, and Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 11; New York: Doubleday, 1988), 242.

94 An interesting facet of the Rabshekeh’s first speech is the mention of Hezekiah tearing down the high places (cf. 2 Kgs 18:22). The implication is that Hezekiah’s religious reforms have actually offended Yahweh; thus, the Judeans are foolish to place their trust in a god whom they have insulted and may have even incited against themselves; see Sweeney, I & II Kings, 416. Burke O. Long, 2 Kings (FOTL 10; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 211, notes that trust and confidence—a leitmotif of the reign of Hezekiah (cf. 2 Kgs 18:5)—characterizes the Rabshekeh’s first speech (i.e., trust in Yahweh is misplaced).

95 See the numerous occurrences of the verb בְּשָׂא in our passage. According to Long, 2 Kings, 211, the Rabshekeh’s first and second speeches have the following combined directive: “The people should not be deceived by Hezekiah who makes them ‘trust’ that the Lord will ‘deliver’ them and their city from Sennacherib.”
But, again, it is not just the existence of the gods of the nations that is assumed: the taunt of the Rabshekeh presupposes that the successes and failures of the national deities have consequences for the nations themselves. As with Ps 82, the exact nature of the parallel between the realms is not spelled out; it is clear enough, however, that the Rabshekeh does not place the blame for the inability of the nations to defend themselves on the people or even their kings but rather on the failure of their respective national deities. Thus, the thinly veiled polemic of the Rabshekeh was that the god of the Assyrians was prevailing over the gods of the nations, Yahweh included. This reality was made manifest in the victorious campaign of Sennacherib.

But it is characteristic of every point of his taunt that the Rabshekeh either challenges the expectation that a national god will deliver its people from Sennacherib or implies that such an expectation is misplaced because Sennacherib has (thus far) emerged victorious over the gods of the nations. In other words, the language used by the Rabshekeh indicates that the reality of the analogy between heaven and earth is so basic to the speaker (and hearers) that it can be said that the national gods have not been able, nor will be able, to deliver their devotees from the human king, Sennacherib. Thus, the nation/king and the cosmic power behind them are virtually synonymous.

2.3.4: Isaiah 24:21-23


These verses are situated in the so-called “Apocalypse of Isaiah” (cf. Isa 24-27), which is widely considered to be a post-exilic redactional addition to First Isaiah. On the post-exilic date of Isa 24-27, see
21 On that day the Lord will punish the host of heaven in heaven, and on earth the kings of the earth.
22 They will be gathered together like prisoners in a pit; they will be shut up in a prison, and after many days they will be punished.
23 Then the moon will be abashed, and the sun ashamed; for the Lord of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will manifest his glory.

The most important line for the present study is verse 21, which, in light of the eschatological outlook of the preceding passage, announces what will be included when “that day” of eschatological judgment arrives (cf. 24:16b-20). The parallelism of the bicolon is revealing and will serve as the point of departure for my discussion.

*Table #3: Parallelism of Isa 24:21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>colon 1</th>
<th>colon 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הָקַשֵׁה חַלְּכֵה וּדְבִהְוָה חַלְּכֵה וּדְבִהְוָה</td>
<td>לְעַטְּפָה לְעַטְּפָה לְעַטְּפָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isa 24:21 envisions an eschatological battle in which Yahweh will decisively contend with the forces of evil. But as the poetry suggests, this conflict will not be fought on the earthly battlefield alone but simultaneously “in the heaven/height” against “the host.” Mention of the heavenly battle before its earthy counterpart may not only suggest that a relationship between the realms was envisioned but also that what transpires in the heavenly realm is primary; that is, the decisive battle would occur on the heavenly stage and what happens on


98 As Kaiser, *Isaiah 13-27*, notes, the prophet/redactor “loosely attaches his promise [of vv. 21-23] to the preceding scene of horror.”

the earthly stage corresponds to and is dependent on what happens on the heavenly stage.\footnote{So Wildberger, \textit{Isaiah 13-27}, 506.} Additionally, commentators have wrestled with the identity of “the host of heaven” who correspond to the “kings of the earth.” Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, the host (גבעת) can constitute the army/entourage of Yahweh,\footnote{Cf. \textit{HALOT} s.v. "גבעת" A.4.b; also see Kaiser, \textit{Isaiah 13-39}, 194. Moreover, the God of Israel is frequently described as יבּ (cf. Ps 33.6; Isa 40:26; 45:12; Jer 33:22; Neh 9:6).} but since the passage is clear that the host will face judgment, they cannot be faithful servants of the God of Israel. Given that the host of verse 21 appear to be synonymous with the sun and moon of verse 23, scholars have proposed the following: the gods – identified here as the heavenly bodies\footnote{The Hebrew Bible frequently identifies the gods of the nations with the heavenly bodies; e.g., Deut 4:19; Zeph 1:5; Jer 19:13; 2 Chr 33:5; see also Job 38:7, where the “sons of god” – who (via the parallelism of the poetry) are identified with “the stars” – give praise to God (cf. \textit{CTA} 10 1 3-5); see Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 44.} have rebelled against Yahweh and must be punished for their insubordination.\footnote{See the discussions of Kaiser, \textit{Isaiah 13-39}, 194; Wildberger, \textit{Isaiah 13-27}, 506-507.}

Thus, Isa 24:21-23 seems to present a worldview similar to that found in Ps 82 and 2 Kgs 18/Isa 36 insofar as what happens on earth is a reflection of heavenly realities. Moreover, Isa 24:21-23 leaves no doubt that its post-exilic author considered the gods of the nations and their corresponding human devotees to be hostile to Yahweh both of whom would be punished for their insubordination at the eschaton.

2.3.5: Preliminary Conclusions, Additional Observations, and Looking Ahead

The following points summarize the discussion of the gods of the nations texts examined in this section: 1.) Deut 32:8-9 (cf. 4:19; 29:25-26) portrays the gods of the nations as ontologically distinct from and inferior to Yahweh but in a relatively neutral light, morally speaking; 2.) if there was any ambiguity concerning the ontological or moral status of the
gods of the nations, Ps 82, 2 Kgs 18:32b-35/Isa 36:18-20, and Isa 24:21-23 address this in an explicit manner: here, these gods are portrayed as unjust and insubordinate to Yahweh, and they will be punished for their actions; 3.) in these same passages, the actions of the gods of the nations are said to impact the actions of humans, and the worldview revealed in these texts is one in which what happens on earth mirrors or corresponds to what happens in heaven, though the mechanics of this analogy are not delineated; 4.) most LXX witnesses of Deut 32:8-9 have ἄγγελων θεοῦ for בנים אלהים (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1), a translation that was likely an attempt to explain these heavenly beings according to late Second Temple Period monotheistic sensibilities. Taken together, the four points indicate that the hostile angels we will encounter in the following chapters are conceptually indebted to the gods of the nations as depicted in the Hebrew Bible texts just surveyed. This is particularly obvious as it pertains to the angelic guardians of Greece and Persia in Dan 10,104 but wicked, trans-national, chief

104 That scholars see a development between the gods of the nations and the national angels can be seen in the fact that it is frequently pointed out that the gods of the nations as depicted in Ps 82, 2 Kgs 18/Isa 36, and Isa 24 are both a development of the thought of Deut 32:8-9 and a precursor to national angelic guardians as presented in the Early Jewish literature, especially in the Book of Daniel. For example, in reference to LXX Deut 32:8-9, Smith, God in Translation, 196-197, 201-202, remarks that “‘angels of God’ provided an avenue for conforming the picture in this text to the boundaries of the tradition. It shows how the tradition has moved the line in its understanding or interpretation of ‘elohim, construed here to refer more narrowly to ‘angels’ and not ‘divine beings’ more generally. As with the change to ‘[sons of] Israel,’ the change to ‘angels [of God]’ involves a sort of censorship that is also in effect a matter of interpretation. The notion that the ‘ruler’ of each nation is an angel (and not a god as such) is clear in Daniel 10 (‘Michael, your prince,’ in verse 21).” Goldingay, Daniel, 286, after observing that “there is no Persian equivalent to the idea of heavenly beings identified with particular peoples,” notes that the angelic princes of Persia in Greece in Dan 10-12 are “likely a development of … Deut 32:8-9.” Similarly, Duane L. Christensen, Deuteronomy 21:10-34:12 (WBC 6B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2002), 796, comments that the divine beings of Deut 32:8 “anticipate the later doctrine of guardian angels watching over the nations in Dan 10:13, 20-21, 12:1.” In reference to the words of the Rabshakeh in 2 Kgs 18, Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 110, says the following on the worldview of the passage: “Behind every nation stands a god who does battle on behalf of his people. The [angelic] ‘princes’ of Daniel 10 are clearly an adaptation of this idea.” Similarly, Kaiser, Isaiah 13-39, 194, in his discussion on Isa 24:21-24, says the following about Deut 4:19-20, which, as previously noted, is similar to (and likely dependent on) Deut 32:8-9: “We find the strange conception that Yahweh has allotted the stars to the other nations to worship. From this it was only one further step to seeing in the army of heaven, or of the height [in Isa 24:21-23], the astral angels of other nations which we meet [in Daniel].”
angelic combatants such as Mastema, Belial, and the Prince of Darkness are also reminiscent of the denounced gods of the nations.

Most significant to note for my purposes, however, is that a glaring discrepancy emerges when these gods of the nations texts are compared to the late Second Temple Period texts that I will examine in subsequent chapters: whereas the angels associated with the Gentile nations have been/can be understood as a development of the thought of certain passages of the Hebrew Bible, the existence and function of high-profile angels, who contend on behalf of Israel, seemingly contradicts the idea that Yahweh was Israel’s guardian, a notion found not only in Deut 32:8-9, but also in other passages. As Collins summarizes, “In the Hebrew Bible prior to Daniel, the Lord serves as ruler of Israel, a role given to Michael [in Daniel].” To be sure, Israel is portrayed as the beneficiary of angelic assistance long before the time of the Qumran covenanters and their contemporaries: in addition to the Hebrew Bible’s numerous references to the angel of the Lord (e.g., Gen 22:11ff; Exod 3:2; Num 22:22ff; Judg 13:3; 1 Kgs 1:3ff; Isa 37:36; Zech 3:1ff; Ps 34:7). For a recent discussion on this angel, especially its military role, see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 35-40, who makes the observation that there is a significant evolution in this character from being almost indistinguishable from Yahweh himself (e.g., Judges 6) to being a more independent figure, though still a faithful servant of the God of Israel (e.g., Zech 1:8).

Outside of Daniel, the closest the Hebrew Bible comes to presenting an independent,

105 Cf. Isa 63:9, which may reflect the same sentiment; see below.
106 This observation comes at the end of a comment suggesting that the conceptual foundation for the angelic princes of Greece and Persia are to be found in Deut 32:8-9; see Collins, Daniel, 374-375. Intriguingly, later Rabbinic interpretation included the proposal that, after the Golden calf incident, Israel lost the privilege of being led by Yahweh directly and was subsequently led by an angel; cf. ExodR 32:7; see Hannah, “Guardian Angels and National Angelic Patrons,” 432-433; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 102 n. 23.
107 The “angel of the Lord” appears approximately 50x in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Gen 22:11ff; Exod 3:2; Num 22:22ff; Judg 13:3; 1 Kgs 1:3ff; Isa 37:36; Zech 3:1ff; Ps 34:7). For a recent discussion on this angel, especially its military role, see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 35-40, who makes the observation that there is a significant evolution in this character from being almost indistinguishable from Yahweh himself (e.g., Judges 6) to being a more independent figure, though still a faithful servant of the God of Israel (e.g., Zech 1:8).
108 The imagery is enigmatic, but as Susan Niditch, Judges: A Commentary (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 80, comments, “Human and meta-human adversaries collide and operate, and the primordial Kishon, as personified, alternates with the sound of stampeding horses; the sight and sounds of battle encompass both” (cf. Josh 10:10-12 and Hab 3:3-6, which may also portray the heavenly luminaries as soldiers “under God’s orders”; see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 50; Cross, Canaanite Myth, 70-71).
Michael-like figure, who represents or fights for Israel, is the מֹשֶה of Josh 5:11-13, whom Cross describes as “Joshua’s cosmic counterpart.” Cross, Canaanite Myth, 70. This scene indicates that “Yahweh’s heavenly armies, led by their commander, would assist those of Israel.” Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 43; cf. J. Alberto Soggin, “The Conquest of Jericho through Battle,” EI 16 (1982): 216. But the overwhelming picture of the pre-Danielic books of the Hebrew Bible – and the picture likely operative even in Josh 5:11-13 – is that the God of Israel himself is a warrior, who, as מֹשֶה, has a direct or “hands-on” leadership role in Israel’s conflicts, despite the fact that he does not fight alone (cf. Exod 15:3; Deut 33:2-3; Ps 24:8). Conversely, the overwhelming majority of the DSS reveal that they are witnesses to an important development within the Second Temple Period: now Israel, too, has angelic guardians, who strive against the nation’s enemies, celestial and otherwise. Yet before looking at these texts, we need to review the biblical background of the other group of angels associated with Israel: heaven’s priests.

109 Cross, Canaanite Myth, 70.
111 On the biblical depiction of Yahweh as a warrior, see the classic study of Miller, The Divine Warrior, 64-165; cf. idem, “The Divine Council and the Prophetic Call to War,” VTSJ 18 [1968]: 100-107; Cross, Canaanite Myth, 60-144; Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 189-201; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 13-54.
112 While space prevents a venture into the complex discussions of what prompted the angelological explosion of Early Judaism, in general, or why angels rather than Yahweh were portrayed as fighting for/protecting Israel, more specifically, major factors are often said to be the perceived hiddenness/transcendence of God and reevaluation of the (simplistic) Deuteronomic worldview in the aftermath of the exile, as well as the subsequent rise of apocalypticism; see the comments of D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC-100 AD (OTL; Louisville: Westminster, 1964), 237-240; Cross, Canaanite Myth, 343-346; Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 278; Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 1-42. Note also Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 14, 32, who has recently observed that such reevaluations resulted in the transfer of Yahweh’s martial prerogatives to his angelic retinue. On this point, also see Kevin Brown, “Book Review: Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Period Jewish Literature,” n.p. [cited Nov. 10, 2013]. Online: http://diglotting.com/2013/10/24/book-review-angels-and-warriors-in-late-second-temple-jewish-literature; Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 259-272. But note the comments of Stefan Beyeler, “The ‘God of Heaven’ in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods,” in Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World, 17-36, who argues that the authority and legitimacy emphasized by having God reside in a heavenly temple does not mean he is transcendent or unattainable. As we will see in the following chapters, the question becomes who is able or worthy to approach God in heaven.
2.4: THE BIBLICAL BACKGROUND OF ANGELIC PRIESTS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL

The biblical evidence for the notion of a heavenly temple served by angelic priests who constitute the model for Israel’s priesthood is even more ambiguous than that for the concept of angelic guardians of Israel. My discussion will therefore be brief, and it will be helpful to look at the alleged background of a heavenly temple and angelic priests separately. I will begin with the former.

The late Second Temple Period notion of a heavenly temple served by angelic priests is ultimately indebted to the Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) religious concept of the divine council or court, which, as mentioned above, has clearly left its mark on the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Deut 32:8-9; Ps 82:1-8). The progression from council to temple has been described as follows:

If God dwells in a celestial palace [surrounded by his council], it is only natural that his earthly residence, the temple, should also be conceived as a divine palace. Indeed, in the Hebrew Bible the word לֶחֶם refers not only to the temple but also to the king’s palace.\(^{113}\) However, in the Second Temple Period, there is increasing evidence of the reverse assumption – a shift to a conceptualization of God’s royal court as a celestial temple and his councilors as supernatural priests.\(^{114}\)

But the pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic Hebrew Bible passages often cited as primitive indications of the belief in a heavenly temple and priesthood are debated. On the one hand, there are hints that God was envisioned as enthroned in a heavenly temple (cf. 1 Kgs 22:19-21; Isa 6:1-13; Ezek 1:1-28), which suggests that the ANE concept that a god’s heavenly dwelling was the inspiration for an earthly counterpart\(^{115}\) was an idea that influenced the

---

\(^{113}\) The same point is made by Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 14-20.

\(^{114}\) Angel, *Otherworldly*, 24.

\(^{115}\) E.g., after Baal defeats Yamm, the storm god announces his desire for a palace – the ANE symbol of kingship – in order to legitimize his reign; see Smith and Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle: Volume II*, 282, 324. In
biblical tradition at a relatively early point. On the other hand, there has been much discussion concerning the interpretation of the noun τύπος (cf. Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8; 1 Chr 28:19). Though some scholars argue that the word includes the idea of an archetypal heavenly temple, others stress that it connotes only the divine “plan” or “blueprint” for the earthly sanctuary, a concept which finds its biblical zenith in the eschatological temple of Ezek 40-48. For example, Klawans may be right, in theory, to insist that the notion of a heavenly blueprint for an earthly temple is “vastly different … from the idea that there is ongoing angelic worship of God in a permanent heavenly temple [emphasis retained]” – and thus one should not presume an inherent linkage between the two concepts. But in light of ANE precedent, it may be overly cautious not to give due consideration to the possibility that the Hebrew Bible occurrences of τύπος refer to an archetypal temple in heaven, or that the Babylonian Creation Epic, Marduk has an earthly “counterpart” to his “luxurious” heavenly temple (cf. Enuma Elish V 119ff); see ANET, 501-503.


117 See the overviews of Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven, 118; Attridge, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 222.

118 So, e.g., Carol Meyers, Exodus (NCBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 227; cf. Eliade, The Myth of the Eternal Return, 3-11, who cites Exod 25:9, 40; 1 Chr 28:19, and Ezek 40-48 as support, and then argues for the importance of “archetypes of territories, temples and cities” in the Hebrew Bible, which also reveals Jerusalem as having a “celestial archetype.” Also see L. Goppelt, “τύπος,” TDNT 8:256-257.


120 Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 129.
later, creative reflection on נַבָּעֲדָּה is at least partially responsible for Second Temple Period presentations of heaven as a sanctuary.\footnote{Especially relevant here is Heb 8:1-6, which links the idea of a heavenly temple with the divine blueprint for an earthly one – and quotes Exod 25:40 to do so (cf. Wis 9:8; Acts 7:44). For comment, see Attridge, The Epistle to the Hebrews, 219ff. For detailed depictions of the heavenly temple and an angelic priesthood, see, e.g., 1 En. 14:8-23 and Song of the Sabbath Sacrifice, which will be discussed in Chapters Three and Five, respectively.}

When it comes to the notion of heavenly priests, the Hebrew Bible is similarly ambiguous. Though there are references to celestial beings whose descriptions may be indicative of priestly attire,\footnote{Note the “linen” (דָּשָּׁם) garb of the angels in Ezek 9:2-10:6, which is comparable to the descriptions of priestly vestments elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Exod 39:2ff; Lev 6:10; 16:4ff, et al.); see Angel, Otherworldly, 24.} there is no mention of cultic activity in heaven nor are angels ever specifically called priests (כָּן). A noteworthy verse on this subject is Isa 63:9, with the relevant portion of the MT reading as follows: נַבָּעֲדָּה תִּלֵּךְ וְנַבָּעֲדָּה יָשִּׁיטֶם \text{[Qere: יָשִּׁיטֶם]}. The corresponding words in the LXX are οὐ πρέσβυς οὔδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς, and as VanderKam notes, some modern interpreters have understood the verse as per the LXX (which has seemingly taken כָּן as כָּן, “messenger”),\footnote{James C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” DSD 7 (2000): 383.} resulting in the NRSV’s translation, “It was no messenger or angel but his presence that saved them.” Such a reading complements the preceding verse (63:8), which suggests that God himself was Israel’s guardian (cf. Deut 32:8-9), but this is not the only way Isa 63:9 has been understood. It may have been that the figurative representation of God’s face/presence (cf. Exod 33:14-15; Deut 4:37), in conjunction with the four-faced attendants of God’s throne in Ezekiel’s vision (cf. Ezek 1:6), led to the formulation, נַבָּעֲדָּה וָאֵל, “the angel of his presence.”\footnote{Note the JPS Tanakh translation (“And in all their troubles, he was troubled, and the angel of his presence delivered them”), which instead of rendering כָּן as כָּן, understands the word to be the noun כָּן.}
While it is impossible to know for certain how Isa 63:9 was originally understood, in light of the fact that 1QIsa\(^a\) attests to the sequence of מַלְאָךְ פְּנֵי הָאָדָמִים, these words may have been “quite suggestive to an ancient reader.”\(^{125}\) At the very least, Isa 63:9’s מַלְאָךְ פְּנֵי seems to have been the impetus for the so-named class of angels, who are later depicted as the most privileged priests of the celestial temple and as the heavenly counterparts to Israel (cf. Jub 1:27, 29; 2:1, 2, 18, 30; 6:18; 15:27; 31:14; 1QH\(^a\) 14:16; 1QSb 4:25-26, et al.).

In sum, though it is uncertain as to whether these pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic passages were intended to convey a belief in the existence of an angelic priesthood, it is likely that the phraseology of Isa 63:9 influenced the naming of the priestly “angels of the presence,” who have significant roles in the late Second Temple Period texts to be discussed in subsequent chapters. My investigation of these texts will reveal that priestly angels make vital contributions to the works in which they are found, and that angelic priests, together with angelic guardians, were one of the two groups of angels who had a valued connection to God’s people.

\(^{125}\) See VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 383.
CHAPTER THREE

ANGELIC GUARDIANS AND PRIESTS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL
IN THE LATE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD DSS
OF A NON-SECTARIAN PROVENANCE

3.1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter will examine angelic guardians and priests associated with Israel in the late Second Temple Period compositions found at Qumran of a non-sectarian provenance. Nine diverse texts will form the basis of my discussion. Since Dan 7-12 is the clearest (and paradigmatic) non-sectarian exemplar of Israel having angelic guardians whose struggles in heaven parallel those of the nation on earth, I will open the chapter by looking at these chapters of the Book of Daniel; in this section I will include a brief excursus on the Deut 32:8-9-inspired (and anti-angelic guardian) claim of Sir 17:17, as well as a preview of the similar assertion found in Jub. 15:30-32. Next, I will consider three of the traditions of 1 Enoch: the Book of Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse (from the Book of Dreams), and the Epistle of Enoch; the first of these is especially important as it contains the earliest Jewish presentation of heaven as a temple served by angelic priests. I will then turn my attention to the Aramaic Levi Document and Visions of Amram, texts which may suggest that Israel’s priestly line had a privileged connection to their heavenly counterparts, and that ideal sacerdotal service on earth is informed by the priests’ link with the angelic priesthood. Following this will be treatments of Tobit and Jubilees, which hint that at least some angels were envisioned as both guardians and priests. I will round out the chapter by looking at the variously understood Son of God text, the most recent interpretations of which warrant its inclusion here.
In addition to highlighting the ways in which angelic guardians and priests associated with Israel make important contributions to the works in which they are found, a key component of my discussions of all nine texts will be to note the relationship between these angels and a given work’s understanding of Israel, thereby setting the stage for a comparison with the outlook of the Qumran sectarian texts at the end of this thesis.

3.2: Daniel 7-12

Angelic guardians associated with Israel are central to the worldview of Dan 7-12, as these chapters reveal that the persecutions of the Jews at the hands of Antiochus IV Epiphanes are only part of a larger reality: the evil that is transpiring on earth is parallel to a battle in heaven, with the outcome of the earthly conflict determined by events in the heavenly realm. The severity of the situation is highlighted by descriptions of the oppression of the angelic host, who are defended by their leader, Michael. This section will include a chapter-by-chapter discussion of the Book of Daniel’s presentation of Israel’s angelic guardians, but in order to set the stage for that discussion, I will begin by addressing three contested interpretive issues.

---

1 Contra Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 267ff, who speaks of the “absence of an ‘as in heaven so on earth’” cosmology at Qumran, especially as it pertains to a heavenly sanctuary. However, the depictions and language of a heavenly temple and priesthood in the works under investigation in this chapter suggest that his reading of these and other texts is dubious. I will address the arguments of Fletcher-Louis in more detail when I examine angelic priests associated with Israel in the sectarian texts. Cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 23-82, whose monograph focuses not only on the otherworldly priesthood but also the otherworldly luster with which Israel’s priests were described (cf. Jub. 31:14; Sir 45:6-22; 50:1ff; 4Q418 81; 4Q541 9); i.e., such imagery suggests that the angelic priesthood had more influence than Fletcher-Louis allows.

2 Due to the consensus that the Book of Daniel is a late Second Temple Period composition, I place my treatment of Dan 7-12 here rather than in the previous chapter.

3 While the Book of Daniel focuses primarily on angelic guardians, the linen garb of the angel(s) mentioned in Dan 10:5 and 12:6-7 may be indicative of a priestly status (cf. Ezek 9:2-11; 10:2-7); see Angel, Otherworldly, 24. A priest-like intercessory role is also suggested by the descriptions of the angels in Dan 9:21ff and 10:12; on this point, see Robert E. Moses, “Tangible Prayer in Early Judaism and Christianity,” JSJ 25 (2015): 118-149, esp. 141-143, who points out that Daniel’s prayers were (temporarily) impeded by the angels associated with Greece and Persia.
3.2.1: ISSUE #1: THE ARAMAIC-HEBREW DIVIDE OF DANIEL 7-12

The bilingual composition of Daniel, the different genres of the book, and the various scholarly viewpoints on its redactional history render any division of the book a complicated endeavor. A comprehensive discussion of the issues is not warranted here, but a few comments will serve to highlight the challenges. First, a virtual consensus of modern critical scholarship is that Dan 7 bears the marks of the Maccabean crisis. Second, it is clear that chapters 2-7 have a concentric literary structure, including the corresponding four-kingdom schemas of chapters 2 and 7. Scholars are divided, however, on the provenance of chapter 7. The concentric arrangement of chapters 2-7, as well as the fact that chapter 7, like chapters 2-6, was composed in Aramaic, have led some to conclude that chapters 2-7 once circulated as an independent Aramaic book. Moreover, many consider the court tales of chapters 2-6 to be earlier than the 2nd cent. BCE. Thus, if chapters 2-7 at one time stood independently, and if chapter 7 (in its final form) refers to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabean crisis, it necessarily follows that chapter 7 had a pre-Maccabean core to which the Antiochus references were later added.

---

4 The Aramaic section of Daniel is 2:4b-7:28; the Hebrew sections are 1:1-2:4a and 8:1-12:13.

5 For detailed discussions, see Collins, Daniel, 12-38; 277-280; cf. Rainer Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel” in The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (eds., John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; VTSup 83.1; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 171-204.


7 For a thorough history of scholarship, see Collins, Daniel, 26-38, who points out this view is indebted to the proposals of Johannes Meinhold, Die Composition des Buches Daniel (Greifswald: Abel, 1884); Gustav Hölscher, “Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel,” ThStK 92 (1919): 113-138.


9 I.e., specific verses are deemed to have come from different authorial or redactional hands; this view has been particularly (though not exclusively) championed in German scholarship; cf., e.g., Hölscher, “Die Entstehung des Buches Daniel,” 113-138; Reinhard G. Kratz, Translatio Imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologischgeschichtlichen Umfeld (WMANT 63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag,
But the view that chapter 7 is a redacted work is far from unanimous. Detractors point to the lack of a consensus among proponents as to precisely what verses were part of a pre-Maccabean core;\(^\text{10}\) it has also been countered that the supposed additions to chapter 7—the allusions to Antiochus Epiphanes, the “little horn” (cf. 7:8, 20-21, 24-26) are not peripheral to the vision but integral to it.\(^\text{11}\) Moreover, while it is true that chapter 7 forms a concentric pattern with chapters 2-6, a number of features bind chapter 7 to chapters 8-12, including a first-person perspective, a new chronological sequence, and perhaps most significantly, shared themes within an apocalyptic framework.\(^\text{12}\) It has been proposed, therefore, that chapter 7 was written—as a conclusion to chapters 2-6—early in the Maccabean crisis.\(^\text{13}\) In this scenario, chapters 2-7 could have briefly constituted an independent Aramaic book to which the Hebrew sections of Daniel were subsequently written and appended with chapter 7 in mind.\(^\text{14}\)

---

\(^\text{10}\) Collins, *Daniel*, 278: “[V]irtually every study is distinguished by some original variation”; cf. Klaus Koch, *Das Buch Daniel* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), 70.

\(^\text{11}\) Collins, *Daniel*, 35.


\(^\text{14}\) A recent proposal that attempts to mitigate some of these issues is that of Ralph J. Korner, “The ‘Exilic’ Prophecy of Daniel 7: Does it Reflect Late Pre-Maccabean or Early Hellenistic Historiography?” in *Prophecy, Prophecy, and Ancient Israelite Historiography* (eds., Mark J. Boda and Lissa M. Wray Beal; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 333-353, who argues that the little horn of the fourth beast should be identified, not as the Seleucid ruler, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but as the Ptolemaic ruler, Ptolemy I Soter (ca. 323-282 BCE). If correct, this identification would allow for an earlier date for the final form of chapter 7 and provide more time for chapters 2-7 to have circulated as an independent Aramaic work before the Hebrew sections were added to it in the 160’s BCE. However, given that Korner’s conclusion is the somewhat modest claim that “Daniel 7 correlates as well with the reign of Ptolemy I Soter as it does with Antiochus,” a stronger argument will likely have to be made for Ptolemy I to shift the consensus opinion that the little horn is Antiochus Epiphanes (especially given the strong affinities the little horn has with what is known of the career of Antiochus).
Since my primary concern is the concept of angels associated with Israel in the DSS, the present study will examine Daniel thematically rather than divide it on linguistic grounds. Moreover, there is nothing in the manuscript evidence from Qumran to suggest a division between chapter 7 and chapters 8-12. Thus, Dan 7 should be read as part of a completed work, regardless of what an early form of chapter 7 may have meant or what its content/shape was originally. Indeed, chapters 7-12 as a unit reveal the centrality of angels associated with Israel in the mind of its composer and/or editor:

What we find in the visions [of Dan 7-12] is not just a reaction to the events of the Maccabean period but a way of perceiving those events that is quite different from what we find in the books of Maccabees. … Behind the wars of the Hellenistic princes lies the heavenly combat between the angelic princes. While the language is imaginative and symbolic, it points to a dimension of reality that is crucial for Daniel. The first objective of the book is to persuade its readers of the reality of this supernatural dimension. The struggle is not ultimately between human powers or within human control. … The beast from the sea will be destroyed, and Michael will prevail in the heavenly combat. The very fact that the situation is beyond human control is, in the end, reassuring, for it is in the hand of God, the holy ones, and the angelic prince, Michael.

As will be highlighted below, the themes of chapter 7 complement and are complemented by those of chapters 8-12.

---

15 The eight fragments of Daniel extant among the DSS are designated as 1QDan a-b, 4QDan a-e, and 6QpapDan, and as Peter W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (eds., John J. Collins et al.; VTSup 83.2; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 331, notes, the Daniel scrolls found at Qumran “reveal no major disagreements against the Masoretic text …”; cf. Eugene Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in Daniel: Composition and Reception, 2:573-585.

16 Collins, Daniel, 61.

17 In his comments on the formation of the Book of Daniel, Michael Segal, “Monotheism and Angelology in Daniel,” in One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeology and Biblical Perspectives (eds., Reinhard G. Kratz and Hermann Spieckmann; BZAW 405; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 419, argues that chapter 7 provided the “theological underpinnings of the national [angelic] princes” found in chapters 10 and 12. This is an important observation, as it suggests that Dan 7 was the impetus for the (more explicit) portrayal of Israel’s angelic guardians in chapters 10 and 12.
3.2.2: Issue #2: The Identity of the “One Like a Son of Man” and the Holy Ones of the Most High

Any study of Dan 7 must address the enigmatic “one like a son of man” (cf. Dan 7:13-14), who appears at the climax of Daniel’s vision. The identity of this figure is debated, and only compounding the matter is that its interpretation is tied to another exegetical crux: the identification of the “holy ones (or saints) of the Most High.” The view adopted here is that the “one like a son of man” is a highly exalted heavenly being, the chief angelic guardian of God’s people, likely Michael, and that the “holy ones of the Most High” are best understood as the collective angelic host, whom Michael leads and on whose behalf he strives. These interpretations have been proposed and defended at length elsewhere, but here I will highlight why the angelic interpretations of the “one like a son of man” and the “holy ones of the Most High” are persuasive.

In the last century, the majority of critical scholars have interpreted the “one like a son of man” as Michael, but the view was first put forward by N. Schmidt, “The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel,” JBL 19 (1900): 22-28; cf. John A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” JTS 9 (1958): 225-242; Ulrich B. Müller, Messias und Menscheninh in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes (SNT 6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972), 28; Lacocque, Daniel, 133-134; Rowland, The Open Heaven, 182. Some scholars have supported the angelic interpretation of Dan 7:13-14 but rather than identify the “one like a son of man” as Michael have proposed that the figure is an unnamed angelic leader (e.g., Arthur J. Ferch, The Apocalyptic Son of Man in Daniel 7 [AUSDDS 6; Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1979], 105), or perhaps Gabriel (e.g., Ziony Zevit, “The Structure and Individual elements of Daniel 7,” ZAW 80 [1960]: 394-396; cf. idem, “The Exegetical Implications of Daniel viii 1, ix 21,” VT 28 [1978]: 488-492). If the composer(s) of Dan 8-12 are to be distinguished from the author(s) of chapter 7, it would seem that the former interpreted the “one like a son of man” as Michael, especially given the prominence of angels, in general, and Michael more specifically, in Dan 8-12. As noted above, Segal, “Monotheism and Angelology,” 405-420, has recently argued that that final form of Dan 10-12 is the product of different authors, and that while he considers the references to Michael in chapter 10 and 12 to be secondary, he argues that these additions were actually influenced by Dan 7:13-14. Cf. John Day, God’s Conflict with the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 173: “It is certainly justified to correlate the figure of the one like a son of man of Dan 7 with the angel Michael in Dan 12:1, since, even if these are right who maintain that Dan. 2:4b-7:28 and 8-12 come from different authors, the writer of the latter having drawn on an early Aramaic source containing the former, … and Dan 8-12 forms a kind of midrash on Dan. 7, so that it may be argued that the overall redactor of the book of Daniel wished to equate the one like a son of man with the angel Michael.”

For a survey of scholarship, see Collins, Daniel, 304-311; 313-317; cf. idem, “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 50-68.

18 Collins, Daniel, 318 (cf. idem, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 101-106; “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 50-68) has championed the “one like a son of man” as Michael, but the view was first put forward by N. Schmidt, “The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel,” JBL 19 (1900): 22-28; cf. John A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” JTS 9 (1958): 225-242; Ulrich B. Müller, Messias und Menscheninh in jüdischen Apokalypsen und in der Offenbarung des Johannes (SNT 6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1972), 28; Lacocque, Daniel, 133-134; Rowland, The Open Heaven, 182. Some scholars have supported the angelic interpretation of Dan 7:13-14 but rather than identify the “one like a son of man” as Michael have proposed that the figure is an unnamed angelic leader (e.g., Arthur J. Ferch, The Apocalyptic Son of Man in Daniel 7 [AUSDDS 6; Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1979], 105), or perhaps Gabriel (e.g., Ziony Zevit, “The Structure and Individual elements of Daniel 7,” ZAW 80 [1960]: 394-396; cf. idem, “The Exegetical Implications of Daniel viii 1, ix 21,” VT 28 [1978]: 488-492). If the composer(s) of Dan 8-12 are to be distinguished from the author(s) of chapter 7, it would seem that the former interpreted the “one like a son of man” as Michael, especially given the prominence of angels, in general, and Michael more specifically, in Dan 8-12. As noted above, Segal, “Monotheism and Angelology,” 405-420, has recently argued that that final form of Dan 10-12 is the product of different authors, and that while he considers the references to Michael in chapter 10 and 12 to be secondary, he argues that these additions were actually influenced by Dan 7:13-14. Cf. John Day, God’s Conflict with the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 173: “It is certainly justified to correlate the figure of the one like a son of man of Dan 7 with the angel Michael in Dan 12:1, since, even if these are right who maintain that Dan. 2:4b-7:28 and 8-12 come from different authors, the writer of the latter having drawn on an early Aramaic source containing the former, … and Dan 8-12 forms a kind of midrash on Dan. 7, so that it may be argued that the overall redactor of the book of Daniel wished to equate the one like a son of man with the angel Michael.”

For a survey of scholarship, see Collins, Daniel, 304-311; 313-317; cf. idem, “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 50-68.
son of man” in one of two ways: as either a collective symbol for the Jewish people, or an individual heavenly being closely associated with the Jewish people. Both interpretations are dependent, at least in part, on the structure of chapter 7, which includes Daniel’s vision report (vv. 2b-14), the interpretation of the vision (vv. 15-18), and an additional clarification of the vision (vv. 19-27). As Collins has observed, it is not unreasonable to assume that “because the ‘one like a son of man’ receives dominion after the death of the fourth beast, … he has in some way triumphed over it.” But when Daniel inquires as to the meaning of his vision, the interpretation offered by the angelic attendant is puzzling: “As for these four great beasts, four kings shall arise out of the earth. But the holy ones of the Most High shall receive the kingdom and possess the kingdom forever – forever and ever” (Dan 7:18). The first aspect of the interpretation – the revelation that the four beasts are four kings – is relatively straightforward, but the second is ambiguous, as there is no reference to the “one like a son of man,” who is the recipient of the kingdom according to the initial vision report; instead, the attendant reveals that it is the “holy ones of the Most High,” who will possess the kingdom forever. When Daniel requests further clarification of his vision, he is informed

20 Collins, “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 50. A minority of modern scholars have understood the “one like a son of man” as a messianic figure, but there is nothing in Dan 7 to indicate that a messiah is in view. In the words of Hartman and DiLella, Daniel, 219, “In Daniel 7, the symbolic manlike figure has no messianic meaning except perhaps as connected with messianism in the broad sense, i.e., with God’s plan of salvation for his chosen People.” It seems, however, that a messianic interpretation of Dan 7:13 arose rather quickly in the reception history of the passage; see especially William Horbury, “Messianic Associations of the Son of Man,” JTS 36 (1985): 34-55; cf. Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days” in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7, 13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?” ZNW 86 (1995): 268-276; H. Daniel Zacharias, “Old Greek Daniel 7:13-14 and Matthew’s Son of Man,” BBR 21 (2011): 453-461.

21 The outlines of chapter 7 proposed by scholars may vary in their minutiae, but there seems to be a consensus as to the general structure; the three sections mentioned are preceded by an introduction (vv. 1-2a) and a concluding statement (v. 28).

22 Collins, Daniel, 291; cf. Day, God’s Conflict, 162.
that the fourth beast is a kingdom, and that the horn of the fourth beast represents a particularly violent and arrogant king who will emerge from this kingdom. But despite the brutal reign of this ruler, dominion and kingship will be granted to the “people of the Holy Ones of the Most High” (Dan 7:27). There is, therefore, a degree of correspondence between the “one like a son of man,” the “holy ones of the Most High,” and the “people of the holy ones of the Most High,” all of whom are said to be granted dominion. But the precise nature of this correspondence is the subject of debate.

Since the beasts seem to function as allegorical symbols for kings/kingdoms, many have suggested that the “one like a son of man” should be understood in the same way; in other words, “[the ‘one like a son of man’] is a pure symbol, … not a real being who exists outside Daniel’s dream.” Moreover, given that the “holy ones” and the “people of the holy ones” – without distinction between them – have often been interpreted as references to the

---

23 But as noted, v. 17 states that the four beasts are four kings; there appears, then, to be some fluidity between “king” and “kingdom” in chapter 7, a point which will be addressed, below.


25 Maurice Casey, Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7 (London: SPCK, 1979), 24-25, continues by providing two main reasons for viewing the “one like a son of man” as a collective symbol as opposed to a figure existing outside of the vision: 1.) “In the first place, the author provided an interpretation of the symbolism of this dream, which reaches a climax with the full description of the triumph of the people of the Saints of the Most in v. 27. This triumph was very important to the author, and it corresponds precisely to what is said of the man-like figure in vs. 14, but it does not mention him. If the author had viewed him as a real being who would lead or deliver the Saints, he must have mentioned him here.” 2.) “The second reason is that on this view the basic structure of the symbolism is consistent. The first four kingdoms are presented by beast-like figures, the fifth by a man-like figure. It is not suggested that the beast-like figures really existed somewhere; we only attribute consistency to the symbolism by concluding that the man-like figure was not a real being either.” Cf. Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in the Old Testament and Later Judaism (New York: Abingdon, 1955), 350; Mathias Delcor, Le Livre de Daniel (SB; Paris: Gabalda, 1971), 155; Hartman and DiLeia, Daniel, 91-92; James D. G. Dunn, “‘Son of God’ as ‘Son of Man’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls? A Response to John Collins on 4Q246,” in The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After (eds., Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 198-210. Also see the discussion of Collins, Daniel, 305 n. 253. For responses to symbolic interpretation, see below.
Jewish people,\textsuperscript{26} it is understandable that the antecedent “one like a son of man” has been interpreted as symbolic of Israel, who will be granted dominion and kingship, despite the dire situation caused by an oppressive foreign ruler. But others have countered that while the impulse to connect the “one like a son of man” with the Jewish people is correct as far as it goes, the figure should be viewed as more than a symbolic reference to the people of God.\textsuperscript{27}

A key point in this fuller understanding of the “one like a son of man” stems from the recognition that the initial section of chapter 7, Daniel’s vision report (vv. 2b-14), contains two distinct yet complementary parts: the succession of four increasingly terrifying beasts (vv. 2b-8) and the arrival of the “one like a son of man” before the “Ancient of Days” (vv. 9-14).\textsuperscript{28} The “Ancient of Days” has been described as a representation of a different order than the four beasts, as this figure seems to be a “mythic-realistic symbol for God,”\textsuperscript{29} … who

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 309, writes: “There is no doubt that the exaltation of the “one like a son of man” represents in some way the triumph of the Jewish people. The question is whether the collective interpretation does justice to the fullness of the apocalyptic symbolism with which this triumph is portrayed.”
  \item In contrast to the narrative-like description of the beasts in vv. 2b-8, numerous scholars have noted how vv. 9-10 describe the “Ancient of Days” in a quasi-poetic fashion (BHS marks these lines as poetry); cf. Susan Niditch, \textit{The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition} (HSM 30; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 195-199; James A. Montgomery, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel} (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1927), 296. Also see Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 300, who adds that the recognition that the vision contains two distinct parts does not “undermine the unity of the vision.”
  \item The imagery of thrones being set up, a fiery throne (chariot) with wheels of fire, white hair/clothes, thousands standing before him, the courts convened in his presence, and the open books, make it clear that the Ancient of Days is the God of Israel. In the words of Cross, \textit{Canaanite Myth}, 17: “[T]he identity of the Ancient One is transparent” (cf. Ps 122:5 1 Kgs 22:1; Isa 6:1-5; Ezek 1:1-28). Strikingly similar imagery is found in the 3rd cent. BCE \textit{Book of Watchers} (cf. 1 En. 14:18-23; to be discussed, below) and a scene from the mid-2nd cent. BCE \textit{Book of Giants} (cf. 4Q530), which is a narrative re-telling of 1 En. 6-16 written from the perspective of the offspring of the fallen Watchers. The strong affinities have resulted in numerous proposals regarding the traditions involved and the direction of dependence. A sampling of viewpoints will be sufficient here: Emerton, “The Origin,” 225-242, has argued that Dan 7:9-10 and 1 En. 14:8-23 developed independently of one another and that their similarities can be attributed to biblical passages such as Gen 5:24, 2 Kgs 2:1, and Ezek 8:3. Ryan E. Stokes, “The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 14, the Qumran \textit{Book of Giants} (4Q530): An Analysis of their
is assumed to exist outside of the dream." Moreover, neither the "Ancient of Days" nor the "one like a son of man" are interpreted by the attending angel, and as Rowland comments, "if the Son of Man figure had merely been a symbol of the Saints of the Most High, we might have expected to find the same kind of identification between the Son of Man and the saints which we find in respect of the beasts and the kings in v. 19, but this is lacking." Given that humans frequently represent angels or angel-like beings, both in the Book of Daniel (cf. Dan 3:25; 8:15; 9:21; 10:5; 12:5-7), and in visionary and apocalyptic literature, more broadly (cf. Josh 5:13; Judg 13:6-16; Ezek 8-10; Zech 1:8; 2:5; 1 En. 87:2; 89:1-9, 36; 90:14-22), the interpretation of the "one like a son of man" as an angel has warrant. Furthermore, Early Jewish and Christian interpretations of Dan 7:13 that indicate

Literary Relationship,” DSD 15 (2008): 340-358, has proposed that 1 En. 14:18-23 modified the tradition preserved in Dan 7:9-10 and the Book of Giants in order to assert God’s sovereignty more strongly (e.g., by removing the reference to plural thrones of judgment). Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, 2:382-384, is a proponent of the view that Dan 7:9-10 has abbreviated the more lengthy scene in 1 En. 14:8-23, while the Book of Giants is the most primitive of the three texts because the number of angelic attendants is less (i.e., it is likely the grandeur of the scene was increased by adding to the number of angels). Finally, the position provisionally accepted here is that articulated by 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),” ResQ 25 (2012): 451-466, who posits independent use of a common oral tradition, a view which accounts well for both the similarities and discrepancies between the passages; similarly, Joseph L. Angel, “The Divine Courtroom Scenes of Daniel 7 and the Qumran Book of Giants: A Textual and Contextual Comparison,” in The Divine Courtroom in Comparative Perspective (eds., Ari Mermelstein and Shalom E. Holtz; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 25-48, emphasizes the use of shared divine courtroom traditions but also notes that the discrepancies suggest different social milieus. The affinities these three texts share with another passage, 1 En. 90:20, are noted by Carol A. Newsom with Brennan W. Breed, Daniel: A Commentary (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 227-228, who also argue that since 1 En. 90:20 and the Book of Giants take place on earth, so too must Dan 7:9-10, which specifies that thrones were “set up” (i.e., such “furniture” would already be arranged in heaven). I am not convinced, however, that the other features of the passage – particularly the imagery of the divine council – support an earthly setting, and as Newsom herself concedes, “the details of the scene in Daniel thus combine two traditions about heaven: the myriad attendants represent the worship of God, while the seated court foregrounds the judicial function)” [emphasis mine].

30 Collins, Daniel, 305.
31 Rowland, The Open Heaven, 180. Contra Casey, Son of Man, 25, who, as noted above, has claimed that if the “one like a son of man” was more than a symbol for God’s people, he would have been mentioned later in the chapter. However, Casey does not mention why the “Ancient of Days” is not identified; see Collins, Daniel, 305 n. 254. It should also be noted that the interpretation of the four beasts as four kings/kingdoms likely does not exhaust the meaning of the beasts; see below.
that the “one like a son of man” was understood as an angel-like figure are all the more intelligible if the Danielic “one like a son of man” was originally intended to be viewed as such.32

Additional support for understanding the “one like a son of man” as an angel is related to the observation that a differentiation should be made between the נְבִיִּים הַרְחַבִּים, “holy ones of the Most High” and the נְבִיִּים הַרְחַבִּים מַעֲרָבִים, “people of the holy ones of the Most High.”33 In the Hebrew Bible, virtually every occurrence of the substantive form of נְבִיִּים refers to heavenly beings,34 a usage mirrored elsewhere in Daniel,35 as well as in the ANE literature and the Qumran texts (cf. CTA 2 I 21, 28; 17 I 4; 1QapGen 2:1; 1QM 15:14).36 To be sure, the DSS highlight that the Yahad could refer to themselves – that is, the human sect members – as נְבִיִּים; it is likely, however, that such usage reflects, at least in part, the Yahad’s self-identity as an angel-like community, which included the belief that sect

---

32 Collins, “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 64. Scholars have often noted the influence of Dan 7:13-14 on the latest section of 1 Enoch, the Similitudes (cf. 1 En. 46:1; 48:10; 52:4); see further, below. Angelic interpretations of Dan 7:13-14 are also found in first century CE texts such as 4 Ezra 13:26 and Rev 14:14. Additionally, some NT scholars have (controversially) understood certain references to Dan 7:13-14 in the Gospels as reflecting Jesus’ belief in a heavenly figure other than himself who would have a role at the impending eschaton (cf. Mark 13:26, Matt 24:44 et al.); see Adella Yarbro Collins, “The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament,” in Collins, Daniel, 93.

33 According to this understanding (the virtual consensus), נְבִיִּים is a construct plural form of נְבִיָּה, with נְבִיִּים functioning as a pluralis excellentiae, leading to the translation, “holy ones of the Most High”; Gesenius includes Dan 7:18, 22, and 25 as examples of this use of the plural; see GKC §124. Alternatively, it has been proposed that the phrase is adjectival or epexegetical and should be translated “holy ones on high”; see Goldingay, Daniel, 146 n. 18a; cf. idem, “Holy Ones on High,” JBL 107 (1988): 495-497.

34 נְבִיָּה is the Hebrew equivalent of the Aramaic נְבִיָּה, the construct form of which is found in Daniel 7 (cf., e.g., Ps 89:6-8; Job 5:1; 15:15); passages that may refer to humans are Deut 33:2 and Ps 16:3; see Collins, Daniel, 314 n. 326.

35 Cf. Dan 4:14, where the Aramaic נְבִיָּה refers to heavenly beings.

36 A particularly influential article for understanding the “holy ones” of Dan 7 to be angelic beings (as opposed to humans/Israel) was written by Martin Noth, “The Holy Ones of the Most High,” in idem, The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays (London: Oliver and Boyd; 1966; repr., London: SCM, 1984), 215-228; for a thorough defense with discussion of the pertinent Early Jewish literature, see the excursus, “Holy Ones,” in Collins, Daniel, 313-317.
members enjoyed fellowship in the present with angelic host (cf. 1QH’ 11:19-23; 19:13-17; 1QS 11:5-8.), a phenomenon that is a distinctly post-mortem privilege according to the Book of Daniel (cf. 12:2-3). ³⁷

In light of these points, and in light of the prevalence of angels in Dan 8-12, the evidence suggests that the נלומין יתגלה ידכ of chapter 7 are not people, especially given the qualified phrase of Dan 7:27, יתגלה ידכ נלומין, which is almost certainly a reference to humans. ³⁸ The “holy ones of the Most High,” then, are the angelic host, whereas the “people of the holy ones of the Most High” are the Jewish people, who belong or pertain to the angelic host; ³⁹ in other words, Dan 7 reflects the belief that Israel on earth corresponds to and is represented and protected by angels in heaven. As for the identity of the “one like a son of man,” Collins argues,

The conclusion that the holy ones are angelic beings strongly supports the view that the ‘one like a human being’ should be identified with Michael, the leader of the heavenly host. The specification of an individual angel does justice to the symbolism of the human figure in the vision. That the kingdom is variously given to an individual, to the holy ones, or to the people of the holy ones is analogous to the vacillation that we find between kings and kingdom in the interpretation of the beasts. … [T]he references to the giving of the kingdom are nicely complementary. The first, in v. 13, refers to the leader of the host, the second and third to the host

---

³⁷ I will discuss the Yahad’s practice of referring to sect members using what is normally angelic terminology (and vice-versa) in Chapter Five, below; see also Collins, Daniel, 314; idem, “The Angelic Life,” 291-310; Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99ff.

³⁸ Citing 1QH’ 11:22-23 for support, Noth, “The Holy Ones of the Most High,” 220-224, contended that יתגלה ידכ was a reference to the angelic host. However, numerous commentators have pointed out that in the case of 1QH’, יתגלה ידכ is the preposition יתגלה ידכ and should be translated “with”; cf. Day, God’s Conflict with the Dragon, 170; Hartmut Stegemann, Eileen M. Schuller, and Carol A. Newsom, eds., IQHodayot: With Incorporation of 1QHodayot and 4QHodayot (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 155.

³⁹ A possessive/genitival/tutelary relationship between the angels (holy ones) and Israel (people of the holy ones) is proposed by L. Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” OsIs 18 (1973): 155-156, 179-187 (especially 186); followed by Collins, Daniel, 315-316. Similar language is found in the War Scroll (1QM) and will be discussed in Chapter Four, below.
itself (vv 18, 22), and the final reference to the people on earth.\textsuperscript{40}

Furthermore, given that Dan 10 states that it is Michael who contends against the angelic representatives of Persia and Greece (cf. 10:2-21), and that Dan 12 suggests that it is the rule and superiority of Michael in heaven that “makes possible the dominion of Israel on earth” (cf. 12:1),\textsuperscript{41} the proposal that the “one like a son of man” should be identified as Michael, the leader of the angelic host,\textsuperscript{42} is persuasive.

3.2.3: ISSUE #3: THE CANAANITE IMAGERY OF DANIEL 7: A USEFUL RESPONSE TO DEUT 32:8-9?

A third matter concerns the imagery of chapter 7. The origins of the mythology used in Dan 7 has been a topic of scholarly interest, with Babylonian, Iranian, and Canaanite backgrounds being proposed. However, it is widely held that the imagery has the closest affinities to the Baal cycle,\textsuperscript{43} and as such, my earlier review of the relationship between El and Baal in the

\textsuperscript{40} Collins, Daniel, 318. While Casey, Son of Man, 24, does not accept the angelic interpretation of Dan 7:13, he does makes the following intriguing observation: “The whole of the fourth beast is necessarily destroyed. It should be clear that the destruction of the little horn itself would not have been sufficient, as it would have left the hated Macedonians still in power, and that the destruction of the whole fourth beast necessarily involves the destruction of its little horn.” The principle underlying Casey’s observation is arguably applicable to the angelic interpretation of Dan 7:13: just as it would have been insufficient for only the little horn (i.e., Antiochus = individual) to have been destroyed without the fourth beast (i.e., the Greek/Seleucid/Macedonian kingdom from which the king came) also being destroyed, it would have been similarly unsatisfactory for the “one like a son of man” (i.e., the leader of the host = individual) to be granted dominion without the angelic host and the people (i.e., the groups whom the “one like a son of man” figure represented) being granted dominion, as well.

\textsuperscript{41} Collins, Daniel, 318; cf. idem, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 101-106.

Ugaritic texts will be useful in this brief discussion. I will tentatively suggest here that, in light of the “polemical doctrine” found in roughly contemporaneous texts such as Sir 17:17 and Jub. 15:30-32, the Canaanite imagery of chapter 7 may have been perceived as a useful way of asserting the opposite view: that Israel indeed had a national guardian in the heavenly realm, though subordinate to and ultimately dependent upon Yahweh.

The most significant parallels between the Canaanite literature and Dan 7 concern the protagonists of the vision, the “Ancient of Days” (Yahweh) and the “one like a son of man,” and can be summarized as follows: 1.) both El and the “Ancient of Days” – are described as aged judges; 2.) both El and the “Ancient of Days” are pictured as surrounded by the divine assembly (cf. KTU 1.2 I 21; Dan 7:10b); 3.) the “one like a son of man” is depicted as “coming with the clouds of heaven,” which is reminiscent of Baal’s epithet, “rider of the clouds” (cf. KTU 1.2 IV 29; Dan 7:13); 4.) both Baal and the “one like a son of man” are granted everlasting dominion (cf. KTU 1.2 IV 10; Dan 7:14); 5.) the “one like a son of man” is victorious despite the violent and chaos-wreaking beasts that emerge from the sea, which is analogous to Baal’s victory over the chaotic power of Yamm/Sea and Mot/Death; 6.) as was emphasized above, Baal is El’s powerful yet subordinate co-regent, which approximates the

---

44 So dubbed by Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 242-243.
45 For discussion and bibliography of the following points, see Day, God’s Conflict, 161ff; Collins, Daniel, 290-291; Lacocque, “Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7,” 114-124.
46 There has been much debate regarding the Ugaritic phrase ‘ab shnm, “Father of Years,” and its similarity to ṢYlm Yd, “Ancient of Days.” Regardless, both the Ugaritic texts and Daniel depict El and Yahweh, respectively, as aged judges. While the description of Yahweh as a judge is widespread, as Collins, Daniel, 290, notes, this depiction of God (i.e., with white hair) is unique to Daniel among the books of the Hebrew Bible (cf. KTU 1.1 III 24; 1.4 IV 24; 1.4 V 65-66; 1.6 I 36; Ug. V. 2b-3a; Dan 7:9-10).
relationship between the “one like a son of man” and “Ancient of Days.”

Traditionally, some scholars have been hesitant to embrace the idea that a pious Jewish author would have employed Canaanite imagery in a religious text. In response, it has been pointed out that a recognition of parallels between Dan 7 and ANE mythology is not tantamount to saying that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the texts. For example, the thrust of chapter 7 is not that the “one like a son of man” is Baal, as the use of mythology is clearly not a wholesale representation, adoption, or endorsement of Canaanite figures, concepts, and practices. As Collins has argued, the issue “is not holistic correspondence but that the use of a particular image be rendered intelligible by analogy with the proposed prototype.”

But it is precisely the degree of correspondence between the texts that has prompted Newsom to question the way scholars have used the Canaanite imagery to understand Dan 7. In a recent essay, she cautions against over-interpreting the Canaanite mythological imagery, since the motifs may have been stock imagery with which the author was familiar. In her words, scholars need to “distinguish between mere points of correlation and a truly formational force of a mythic pattern.” After surveying various alleged points of comparison – and stressing that these points are better described as correlations rather than the preservation of a mythic pattern – Newsom then addresses the relationship between the

47 See the overview of Collins, Daniel, 280-281.
48 Collins, Daniel, 281. Contra Markus Zehnder, “Why the Danielic ‘Son of Man’ Is a Divine Being,” BBR 24 (2014): 331-347, who marshals the use of Baal imagery as one of the evidences that the son of man is divine “as opposed to having only symbolic, human, or angelic status.” But this may press the correspondence too far.
49 Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 87, 90, also describes the differentiation for which she is arguing as distinguishing between “historical authorial intertextuality” and “modern, scholarly readers’ intertextuality”; i.e., Newsom is suggesting that critical scholars have equated the former with the latter and the result has been to see the pattern of the Ugaritic material in Dan 7 when there are only similarities.
“Ancient of Days” and the “Son of Man,” which Collins and others have claimed is analogous to the superior-subordinate relationship between El and Baal in the Ugaritic texts.\(^{51}\) While conceding that the similarities are “striking,” Newsom suggests that the author of chapter 7 likely did not intend for the pattern of the El-Baal relationship to inform the relationship between the “Ancient of Days” and the “one like a son of man” and any resemblance is “accidental.”\(^{52}\)

Though Newsom is right that the individual elements of the Canaanite imagery employed in Dan 7 do not preserve the mythic pattern of the Ugaritic texts in an exact or comprehensive fashion, Newsom may be underestimating the thrust of the picture conveyed by the combination of these individual mythological elements in Dan 7. That is, the various elements of Canaanite imagery, taken together – the chaos-wreaking sea, God as an aged judge, a heavenly subordinate who receives dominion – combine to reveal a picture that, even if it is not identical to the mythic pattern of the Ugaritic texts, seems to have been influenced by it. To be sure, there are other elements at work in the chapter 7, even ones more proximate to the 2\(^{nd}\) cent. BCE than the Ugaritic texts;\(^{53}\) it is also true that the precise channels by which the Canaanite material was transmitted down to the Second Temple Period remain unknown.\(^{54}\) In her discussion of the latter point, Newsom reviews a proposal of Mosca, that the Davidic kingship as depicted in Ps 89 may have been one of the channels


\(^{52}\) Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 96.

\(^{53}\) Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 90ff, emphasizes the role of Dan 2 and common traditions reflected in *1 En.* 14:8-23, 90:20, and 4Q520 (see above) in shaping Dan 7.

\(^{54}\) I.e., the author(s) of Daniel obviously did not consult the Ugaritic texts directly as a source since more than a millennium separated them; see the discussion of Collins, *Daniel*, 291-294, who notes the prominence of foreign mythology in works such as *The Phoenician History* of Philo of Byblos (see Chapter Two).
by which the mythic pattern of the Ugaritic texts reached Dan 7.\textsuperscript{55} While Newsom ultimately rejects Mosca’s thesis, she considers the relationship between Yahweh and the Davidic king as described in Psalm 2 to bear “the closest relationship to Dan 7” insofar as “the angelic figure and the Davidic king are both ascribed a role that is passive.”\textsuperscript{56} But precisely because the roles of the Davidic king and the “one like a son of man” are “passive” – and, thus unlike the active role of Baal – Newsom questions the role Davidic kingship could have had in transmitting the Ugaritic pattern.

But do these points rule out the possibility that the pattern of the Ugaritic texts informed the picture of Dan 7? As Hansen has noted, “the apocalyptic literature of the second century and after is the result of a long development reaching back to pre-exilic times and beyond, and not the new baby of second century foreign parents”;\textsuperscript{57} he continues by observing that

the earlier one goes in Israel’s religious history, the more powerful the untranslated visionary element becomes, as illustrated by many of the archaic traditions … (e.g., Exodus 15, Judges 5, Joshua 10). This pattern suggests that Israel did not enter nationhood with a fully developed historiography; for that nation emerged from a mixture of peoples, many embracing worldviews which would not have contrasted sharply with mythopoeic view which can be seen, for example, in the literature of ancient Ugarit. The move toward a more mythopoeic view of reality which is discernable in early apocalyptic is thus not an unexpected adventure into uncharted territory; it is a return to some of Israel’s most ancient roots [emphasis mine].\textsuperscript{58}


\textsuperscript{56} Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 15;


\textsuperscript{58} Hansen, \textit{The Dawn of Apocalyptic}, 17. Cf. John J. Collins, \textit{The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls} (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 193-194, who makes the following observation regarding Daniel 7: “There is no doubt that traditional imagery is used in [the chapter]. I believe that the
Moreover, Newsom acknowledges that moving with the clouds as per Dan 7:13 is a depiction associated with divine beings including Yahweh (cf. Isa 19:1; Deut 33:26; Ps 68:34; 104:3) and Baal (cf. KTU 1.2 IV 8, 29). In the context of Dan 7-12, she refers to this picture as an aspect of “the elohization of the angels, that is the tendency to describe them in terms drawn from descriptions of God.”

There are at least two pertinent observations to be drawn from the concept Newsom dubs elohization. First, elohization supports the interpretation of the “one like a son of man” that understands this figure to be an angel of a high rank and lofty status. Newsom herself states that the “view of reality [found in Dan 7] comports well with the angelology in Dan 10-12, where the ‘princes’ of various nations are angelic powers whose struggles in heaven mirror those on earth. Thus, the argument … that the one ‘like a human’ in Dan 7:13 is to be understood as the archangel Michael seems well grounded.”

If, as Segal has argued, Dan 7 provided the “theological underpinnings” of the Michael passages in Dan 10-12, and given that Michael’s role in Dan 10-12 is far from “passive,” perhaps a more apt description of the role of the “one like a son of man” in

---

59 Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 99; cf. Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 14, who, as mentioned earlier, has noted the Second Temple Period practice of attributing to angels functions that were previously the prerogatives of Yahweh himself.

60 Newsom, “The Reuse of Ugaritic Mythology,” 97.

61 Segal, “Monotheism and Angelology,” 419.
chapter 7 is implicitly active – and thus not as far from the role of Baal as Newsom suggests. Second, the concept of elohization may point to reasons why the Canaanite mythic pattern might have been attractive to the composer(s) of Dan 7. I will offer two reasons why this pattern may have been considered useful.

The first is essentially an addendum to an argument of Collins, who has sought to counter objections that the composer(s) of chapter 7 would not have knowingly employed Canaanite motifs given that the cult introduced by Antiochus Epiphanes involved the worship of Baal.62 The use of the imagery may actually have been to polemicize against Antiochus and his cult,63 but Collins does not provide a detailed explanation as to how the imagery of chapter 7 might have functioned as a polemic.64 One cannot miss, however, the irony in the downfall of the Baal-devotee, Antiochus, being associated with the judgment of the “Ancient of Days” (Yahweh) and dominion of the “one like a son of man” figure, who are respectively depicted with imagery and language akin to that used of El and Baal. But the polemic against Antiochus may be even more pointed than this. As was discussed earlier, the picture that emerges from the Ugaritic texts is that El was envisioned as the high god and ultimate power-broker of the pantheon, and that Baal was portrayed as El's lofty, powerful, yet subordinate co-regent, who actively contended against the forces of chaos as represented by Yamm (Sea) and Mot (Death); and it is precisely the superior-subordinate nature of the

62 E.g., Mosca, “Ugarit and Daniel 7, 496-517, who argues that the Canaanite imagery stems from earlier biblical incorporation of the same; see Collins, Daniel, 292.

63 Moreover, “[w]hether pagan myths constitute the background to Daniel 7 must be judged by the light they throw on the text, not prejudged by modern assumptions about what is permissible for an ancient Jew”; see Collins, Daniel, 282.

64 Collins, Daniel, 292, writes: “An author may borrow symbolism in order to polemicize against its source – Hosea’s use of Canaanite imagery is a well-known case in point. Daniel’s portrayal of Antiochus Epiphanes as (the little horn on the beast of the sea) is all the more scathing if its mythological overtones are fully recognized, in view of the king’s devotion to Baal … .” It should also be noted that the cult of Antiochus seems to have identified Baal with Zeus Olympius; see the discussion of idem, “Stirring Up the Great Sea,” 133.
El-Baal relationship that may have contributed to the polemical import of the vision. If, as noted above, it is reasonable to assume that the rise and dominion of the (elohized) “one like a son of man” means that this figure is, in some way, responsible for the downfall of the little horn of the fourth beast, chapter 7 is effectively claiming that Yahweh’s angelic lieutenant is (relatively) competent to contend with Antiochus, or more likely, Antiochus’ equivalent in the heavenly realm (see below). In other words, if a figure inferior to the God of Israel is in some way responsible for the defeat of Antiochus, it is a disparaging commentary on the power of the Greek-Seleucid ruler and/or the cosmic reality behind him vis-à-vis the power of Yahweh. Thus, the polemic of chapter 7 may lie not only in the derogatory references to Antiochus as the “little horn” and his ultimate defeat, but also in the assertion that the enemy – on earth and in heaven – is not in any sense on par with the God of Israel, as even the subordinate “one like a son of man” will emerge victorious despite the ravages of the horn. Given the celestial context of the El-Baal relationship, it is plausible that this Canaanite pattern could have been deemed helpful by the creative Jew(s) responsible for the final form of Dan 7, especially if a goal of the chapter is to set forth the notion of an angelic kingdom as an element of the sovereignty of the God of Israel, as Newsom points out.65

In addition to contributing to an anti-Antiochus polemic, a second reason why the Canaanite imagery may have been considered useful is related to assertions found in two roughly contemporaneous texts.

**ExCURSUS: SIR 17:17 (AND A PREVIEW OF JUB, 15:30-32)**

Sirach or Ben Sira is an important Second Temple Period work in the wisdom tradition and as such shares similarities with Proverbs and Qohelet. According to Sir 50:27, the author was a certain “Jesus

---

Son of Eleazar son of Sirach of Jerusalem,” who likely wrote his work ca. 200-175 BCE. Though composed in Hebrew (fragments of which were discovered at Qumran and Masada), it was subsequently translated into Greek by the grandson of the book’s namesake. Most relevant here is Sir 17:17, which is an unmistakable echo of Deut 32:8-9: “[God] appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord’s own portion” (cf. Jub. 15:30-32). While it is possible that these “rulers” refer to human sovereigns, the phrase μερὶς κυρίου (literally, “portion of the Lord”) is identical to LXX Deut 32:9. As was pointed out in Chapter Two, the Greek versions of Deut 32:8 (along with the Hebrew text of 4QDeut) support the notion that God has assigned the sons of god/angelic beings to watch over the Gentiles. Thus, it appears that while Sirach sides with numerous Second Temple


68 Sir 17:17 is situated in the midst of a poem extolling God’s creation of humanity and his omniscient and benevolent care of what he has made, and while some commentators see the poem as running from 17:1-24, others consider vv. 15-24 to be a separate poem; see Skehan and DiLella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 281, 283. It should also be noted that Marko Marttila, *Foreign Nations in the Wisdom of Ben Sira: A Jewish Sage between Opposition and Assimilation* (DCLS 13; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 65, has posited that 17:17 is secondary; he does so because he does not see an unambiguous division between Israel and the nations earlier in chapter 17. However, Marttila’s reasoning arguably underestimates the covenant language of chapter 17, especially vv. 11ff.

69 I will discuss *Jubilees* in greater detail later in this chapter, but for now it is sufficient to note that Jub. 15:30-32 stands in a degree of tension with the rest of the book: while *Jubilees*’ author(s) may have considered it theoretically important to uphold Deut 32:8-9, one of the work’s main characters, a Michael-like figure dubbed “the angel of the presence,” suggests that, in practice, *Jubilees* has not strayed very far from the popular Second Temple Period conviction that Yahweh had consigned his guardianship duties to an angel.

70 Noted by Skehan and DiLella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 283. While the word translated “ruler” is a participle of ἡγέομαι – and often used in reference to prominent humans (cf., e.g., Gen 49:10; Luke 22:6) – the same verb is used to describe the angelic leadership of Michael and Raphael in the Greek text of the *Book of Watchers* (cf. 1 En. 21:5; 24:6; see below).

71 Unfortunately, the Hebrew text of Sir 17:17 is not extant.

72 The language and thought of Deut 32:8-9 in Sir 17:17 is part of a larger emphasis Sirach places on Deuteronomy. Of paramount concern for Sirach is the relationship between universal wisdom and the Mosaic Torah, an association that is well articulated in Deut 4:5-8. More specifically, these verses stress that the wisdom inherent in Torah is incomparable, and since Torah has been revealed to Israel, Deut 4:5-8 is an
Period texts in affirming that the Gentiles have angelic guardians, it departs from virtually every text that will be examined in this thesis in upholding the sentiment of Deut 32:8-9, namely, that Israel’s principal guardian is not an angel but Yahweh.

If Sirach and (to a lesser extent) Jubilees are uncomfortable with Israel having a named heavenly guardian other than Yahweh, an important question is this: what options were available to those who wanted to assert the opposite view, namely, that Israel did have angelic guardians who strove on their behalf? While admittedly speculative, I suggest that that the 2nd cent. BCE author(s) of Dan 7 may have recognized a potential ally in appropriating the Canaanite imagery to claim – against the roughly contemporaneous reflections of Deut 32:8-9 found in Sir 17:17 and Jub. 15:30-32 – that Israel, indeed, had an angelic guardian. This is not to say that Dan 7 is a direct response to Sirach or Jubilees. But Segal has recently argued that Dan 7 is the “natural continuation” of Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82. Moreover, in view of

unquestionably positive statement on the identity of God’s people. Moreover, it is Torah and its observance that both distinguish Israel from the nations and elicit their respect. As Timo Veijola, “Law and Wisdom: The Deuteronomistic Heritage in Ben Sira’s Teaching of the Law,” in Leben nach der Weisung: exegetisch-historische Studien zum Alten Testament (eds., Walter Dietrich and Timo Veijola; FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2008), 148-149, observes, these Deuteronomistic sentiments bear a resemblance to the well-known poem of Sirach 24, where wisdom seeks and finds its resting place in Israel out of all the nations of the world. But according to Tzvi Novick, “Wisdom’s Wandering, Wandering: On the Evolution of a Motif,” Hen 30 (2008): 104-118, the association of wisdom and Torah resulted in a tension between universalism and election. This is a keen observation since Novick also notes that the most immediate biblical inspiration for Sir 24:2-8 is Deut 32:8-9: the latter sets apart Israel alone as God’s portion (κληρονομία) and the former (v. 8) asserts that wisdom is to receive its inheritance (κληρονομέω) in Israel. For two other Sirach texts that may allude to Deut 32:8-9, see Sir 44:22-23 and 45:11. However, all of these texts refer to just one facet of the Deut 32:8-9: Israel as God’s possession. The notion of angelic guardians – or more precisely, Israel’s lack thereof – is found only in Sir 17:17.

73 Cf. Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 242-243, who captures well my sentiments: “Undoubtedly, there was a tradition that Michael was the national angel of Israel, although in other texts [i.e., Deut 32:8-9, Jub. 15:30-32, and Sir 17:17] we find a polemical doctrine that God himself was the heavenly representative of the Jewish nation.”

74 Jubilees is often dated to the same time as Daniel: the late 160’s BCE. If Jubilees was written later in 2nd cent. BCE, Jub. 15:30-32 might have had Dan 7-12 in mind.

75 Insofar as the passages “describe a theological-cosmological picture with a leading divine entity and subordinate divine beings” and “the context of each of these passages is the inheritance of the nations and lands by the subordinate divinities”; see Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God’ in 4Q246?” 294ff, who in his own estimation has proposed a “radical” interpretation of Dan 7 that stems from these observations (see following footnote).
what Newsom refers to as the *elohization* of angelology of the Second Temple Period, perhaps the use of imagery originally used to depict the protector-patron god, Baal, who strove against chaos-wreaking cosmic combatants, but, at the same time, was subordinate to the high god, El, was considered an appropriate and relatively familiar way to affirm that God’s people could count on a Michael-like figure, who, while ultimately subordinate to Yahweh and dependent on his intervention, received the kingdom on behalf of the “holy ones” (i.e., the rest of the angelic host) and the “people of the holy one” (i.e., Israel).

Thus, the Canaanite imagery in Dan 7, though it does not convey the mythic pattern of the Ugaritic texts in an exact or wholesale fashion, arguably preserves the pattern to a discernable extent – and in a manner that might be best described as a creative Jewish modification of the ancient Canaanite myth. How this pattern reached the 2nd cent. BCE remains an open question, but given the influence of Canaanite thought on Israelite tradition, that some of the main contours of the Baal Cycle persisted in Early Judaism and were

---

76 One of the issues that has perplexed interpreters of Dan 7 vis-à-vis the biblical tradition has been what Collins, *Daniel*, 292, describes as “the juxtaposition of two apparently divine figures, the one like a son of man and the Ancient of Days.” Note, however, that Collins rejects the relevance of Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82 and their alleged translatability (i.e., Yahweh as subordinate to El) to speak to this issue; that is, even if these passages contain vestiges of a translatable worldview (see Chapter Two), he considers it “unlikely … that such an understanding would have persisted down to the time when Daniel was written.” *Contra* Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God’ in 4Q2462” 295-296, who has recently argued, not only for the translatability of Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82 to the extent that Second Temple Period readers of these texts would have recognized El as granting authority to Yahweh (cf. Frankel, “El as the Speaking Voice,” 1-24), but also that such an interpretation “finds its natural continuation in the apocalypse of Dan 7, in which a senior deity (the Ancient of Days) convicts subordinate divine characters (the four beasts) to death, while granting dominion over all the nations of the world to a divine character of special status, the one like a man.” This prompts Segal to interpret the “one like a son of man” as Yahweh (a view which is quite different than his earlier openness to the interpretation of the “one like a son of man” as Michael; see idem, “Monotheism and Angelology,”418-419, which is cited, above). While Segal offers the caveats that “rather than presenting the religious worldview [of Dan 7’s author], it may be the result of his dependence upon the ancient myths of the division of the world expressed in Deut 32 and Ps 82” and that “the author of Dan 7 intended for his audience to identify and be aware of these earlier sources passages,” his reading presses the persistence and correspondence of the Canaanite imagery to a level that is questionable and unnecessary. I consider it much more likely that the author(s) of Dan 7, in light of the burgeoning apocalypticism and angelology of Early Judaism, found the ancient Canaanite pattern a useful (and even traditional) vehicle to convey that Yahweh (the “Ancient of Days”) had an active and formidable subordinate (the “one like a son of man”), who played an integral role in the struggles of the angelic host and the people of God.
employed by the author(s) of Dan 7 is not that remarkable.

3.2.4: DANIEL 7

The general contours and outlook of Dan 7 were examined in the preceding sections. But it should be noted that the chapter’s angelology and cosmology, which will be highlighted here, are important as they reveal with relative clarity the apocalyptic worldview that is both foundational for the apocalyptic worldview of Dan 8-12 and similar to the worldviews of the texts to be examined in the rest of this thesis.

Reasons for identifying the “one like a son of man” as the leader of the angelic host have already been discussed, and the following observations regarding the beasts of chapter 7 will serve to strengthen the identification of the “one like a son of man” as an angel. It was also noted above that the interpretations of the beasts provided by the angelic attendant are brief: the four beasts represent four kings/kingdoms. But given the internal evidence of chapter 7, as well as the witness of chapters 7-12 as a unit, viewing the beasts as symbols for earthly kings and kingdoms likely does not exhaust their meaning. More specifically, it has been argued that a “beast,” according to chapter 7, functions not only as a symbol but also as a dynamic, multivalent concept. Capturing well the complexity of imagery, Caragounis is worth quoting at length, as he highlights the complexity of the beasts:

[T]he term “beasts” does not stand for any particular king, but for the whole series of kings involved in each kingdom. Moreover – and this is of extreme importance – the beast is not quite identical with this totality of kings. The oscillation between king and kingdom observable in the text, obtains also between the king on the one hand and the entity that is conceived of as being the core in the concept of “Beast” on the other. The recognition of the dynamic nature of the text is of crucial importance for understanding the nature of the concept of ‘Beast.’ … Our author is grappling with his problem on a two dimensional basis. While cogitating on human affairs the author goes beyond what

---

is observable in the empirical realm. He introduces his readers to another plane, the plane of vision, where earthly phenomena are seen to have their invisible counterparts to ‘events’ beyond the world of sense. More than this, there is a causal connection between the invisible and the visible worlds. Earthly events are not simply the result of the whim of earthly potentates; they are to be explained by reference to realities in the invisible world. It is this double dimension in the author’s perspective which renders the concept of ‘Beast’ a complex concept of ambivalent nature. Therefore, in the author’s way of thinking the ‘Beast’s’ essential character is neither the state nor the king. What is perhaps only implicit as yet in chapter 7 become quite explicit in [chapter 10]. Here, two of the beasts/kingdoms, Persia and Greece, are described as having a ‘prince,’ … who tries to thwart God’s purpose by opposing the angelic emissary. That these ‘princes’ cannot possible refer to … human kings is placed beyond reasonable doubt in verse 21 which in identical terms speaks of the angel Michael as the ‘prince’ of the Jews [emphasis mine].

More will be said about this two dimensional worldview, below. For now, it is sufficient to note that if the symbolism of the beasts includes the heavenly or angelic powers that lie behind the respective earthly kings/kingdoms represented by each beast, then the interpretation of the “one like a son of man” as Israel’s angelic guardian constitutes a powerful announcement: that dominion is granted to the leader of the angelic host means that, in the end, the celestial forces behind Antiochus will be defeated. And “to the pious Jews of the Maccabean era, who had a lively belief in supernatural beings, nothing could be more relevant” than that their angelic guardians – and not the heavenly beings that stood behind their enemies – would “receive dominion and glory and kingship” (7:14).

Chapter 7 is clear that the ultimate fortunes of the “one like a son of man” are the same as those of the “holy ones of the Most High,” the angelic host, who will possess the kingdom forever (7:18). But the chapter also mentions the hardships of the “holy ones,” as verse 21 reads: “[the] horn made war with the holy ones and was prevailing over them.”

---


Elaborating upon this statement, verse 25 reveals that the horn is a king who, among other blasphemous acts, “shall speak words against the Most High, [and] attempt to wear out the holy ones of the Most High ... .” There have been questions concerning the precise meaning of the verb הָלָב, “to wear out,” but the sense of the word seems to be the affliction of someone or something over time, with the result that the object is severely strained or taxed. According to verse 22, this affliction is reversed by the judgment of the “Ancient of Days,” a point that serves to reinforce the interconnected fates of the “holy ones of the Most High” and “son of man.”

The Jewish people are only mentioned in verse 27, where it is said that the “people of the holy ones of the Most High” will be given “the kingship and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven.” As noted above, the epithet “people of the holy ones of the Most High” suggests a close association between the Jewish people and their angelic guardians and may even imply that the latter protect the former (or are supposed to do so). Moreover, as with the “one like a son of man” and the “holy ones of the Most High,” the fortunes of the “people of the holy ones” are dependent upon the judgment of

---

81. Noth, “The Holy Ones of the Most High,” 226, who considers the “holy ones” of v. 21 to be the Jewish people – even though he considers the “holy ones of the Most High” to be the angelic host – was uncertain as to whether הָלָב could take a human object, and therefore proposed that the word might be related to the Arabic verb, halla, “to offend.” While Antiochus (the “horn”) certainly offended Jews during the events of the 160s BCE, it has already been discussed why viewing the “holy ones” as the Jewish people is unsatisfactory. It is also doubtful that a human referent exhausts the symbolism of the horn (cf. Caragounis, Son of Man, 59; Collins, Daniel, 320); I will return to the nature of the horn, below.

82. E.g., an article of clothing (cf. Josh 9:13; Neh 9:21); also see הָלָב, HALOT 5:1834, which notes the REB’s translation, “to wear down.”

83. The coming of the “one like a son of man” in the visionary sequence (vv. 13-14) directly follows the judgment scene of the fourth beast and its horn (vv. 11-12) at which the “Ancient of Days” (vv. 9-10) presumably presides.

84. While humans are not specifically mentioned elsewhere in chapter 7, it is obvious that the actions of the beasts impacts earth, even if not exclusively so.

the heavenly court (7:26). As Lacocque observes, “the passage from the ‘son of man’ to his collective dimension, that is to those who, like him, receive ‘the kingship, dominion, and grandeur of all the kingdoms under heaven’ is the dominant theme in this chapter in its present form.”

Chapter 7 portrays the close relationship between heaven and earth in different ways. First, the symbolism of the chapter describes Antiochus afflicting the “holy ones” (7:21, 25). Collins explains the depiction of a human antagonist attacking a cosmic protagonist as follows: “the empirical data lie in the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, but in the apocalyptic imagination of the author these events are understood as an assault on the heavenly host and ultimately on God himself.” More specifically, Kvanvig notes that there are essentially three interpretations of this description: the offensive of Antiochus was envisioned as being against either people on earth, the angels in heaven, or both. While Kvanvig attributes to Collins the view that the actions of Antiochus are against both heaven and earth, this view more accurately describes Kvanvig’s own understanding, which is dependent on the ANE concept of the “rebel king,” who ascends to heaven and provokes God. Collins’ interpretation, while similar to Kvanvig’s insofar as Antiochus’ actions are

---

86 Lacocque, Daniel, 154.
87 Collins, Daniel, 320.
88 Helge S. Kvanvig, Roots of the Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 579.
89 Brekelmans, “The Saints of the Most High,” 305-329. Partially to mitigate the presumed illogic of Antiochus attacking heaven, even some supporters of the angelic interpretation of the “holy ones of the Most High” have opted to view the abbreviated designation of v. 21, “holy ones,” as a reference to the Jewish people, against whom the horn, Antiochus, was waging war; cf. Noth, “The Holy Ones of the Most High,” 226; Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic, 582-583.
90 Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 155-156.
92 Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic, 460-484, 581ff.
understood to have impact in both realms, is different in that Collins does not posit an ascension of Antiochus; instead, he suggests that “the little horn should not be understood purely in human terms,” especially since chapter 10 is explicit in its depiction of earthly struggles being a reflection or an out working of heavenly ones. A second way the chapter accomplishes this concerns the intertwined fortunes of the Jewish people and the angels associated with them. For example, it is without question that the hostility of the “little horn” results in hardship for God’s people on earth, even if, again, the earthly impact of the horn’s actions does not exhaust the symbolism. However, it is interesting that the description of the action of the little horn on earth (7:8) is followed by the judgment of the heavenly court; the horn is also said to be waging war against and wearing out the angelic host (7:9-14, 21-22). It is not until the end of the chapter 7 – that is, after judgment has twice been said to occur from heaven and for heavenly recipients – that the “people of the holy ones of the Most High” explicitly receive the same favorable judgment. Indeed, “the parallelism between the Jewish people and its heavenly counterpart extends to adversity. When things go badly on earth, it is supposedly because they are going badly in the heavenly battle too. When the Ancient of Days arrives in judgment, fortunes are reversed on both levels.”

---

93 Collins, Daniel, 318; cf. Caragounis, Son of Man, 59-60; also noted above.

94 Collins, “Mythology of Holy War,” 598. The interchangeable manner in which reference to both realms is made is reminiscent of the taunt of the Rabshekeh in 2 Kgs 18:33 (cf. Isa 36:18), who boasts that the gods of others nations have not been able to halt the offensive of the human King of Assyria. As noted in the previous chapter, the annals of the king of Assyria attribute Sennacherib’s victory to the nation’s god (i.e., not the ascension of the Assyrian king to the heavenly realm).

95 Collins, Daniel, 320; cf. Kvanvig, Roots of the Apocalyptic, 583, who notes that chapter 7 deliberately portrays “the fate of the terrestrial and the celestial groups in parallel to each other. Both groups suffer under the attack of the demonic king (vv. 21, 25), and both receive justice and the kingdom at the end (vv. 22, 27).”
3.2.5: DANIEL 8

Daniel 8 covers much of the same historical ground as chapter 7, with many scholars suggesting that the former, which marks the book’s transition to Hebrew, is dependent on the latter.\(^96\) The earthly and cosmic impact associated with the persecutions of Antiochus, who is again symbolized by a little horn,\(^97\) are in focus, and the chapter ends with a brief yet hopeful statement indicating that the oppressor will meet his demise through divine intervention.\(^98\) Broadly speaking, chapter 8 has two sections: a vision report (vv. 3-14) and its interpretation (vv. 15-26).

A possible reference to an angelic leader figure occurs at verse 11,\(^99\) where it is said that the little horn acted arrogantly against the אדבכד…ד, “prince of the host.” Given that verse 11 continues by mentioning that the horn “took the regular burnt offering away from him and overthrew the place of his sanctuary” – with the antecedent of the italicized pronouns almost certainly referring to the “prince of the host” – the epithet is often understood as a description of the God of Israel; that the interpretation section seemingly refers to the “prince of the host” as the אדבכדכ, “prince of princes” (8:25) is said to

---

\(^{96}\) Cf. Collins, Daniel, 342; Goldingay, Daniel, 201. On the use of animal metaphors in the two chapters, see Porter, Metaphors and Monsters, 121. On the use of scripture in chapter 8, including Isa 14, see S. Niditch, The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition (HSM 30; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1983), 228.

\(^{97}\) In the words of Hartman and DiLella, Daniel, 235, “the name of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the eighth Seleucid king of Syria, is not mentioned anywhere in this chapter, but there is not the slightest doubt that he is the one meant in the description of the “[little] horn,” whom the angels identifies as a king ‘brazen-faced and skilled in trickery’ (vv. 23-25).”

\(^{98}\) As Goldingay, Daniel, 204, implies, the absence of any mention of divine intervention until the very end of the chapter highlights the severity of persecutions of Antiochus.

\(^{99}\) The angel Gabriel is mentioned in Dan 8:16, but his role there is not as a guardian of God’s people per se but as a revealer/messenger (cf. 9:21).
strengthen the identification.\textsuperscript{100} This conclusion, however, while widespread, has not been the only option proposed. Early 20\textsuperscript{th} century commentators argued that a high priest is in view.\textsuperscript{101} Goldingay has posited that the אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל needs to be understood in light of the phrase אֱלֶה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל, “the host of heaven,” in verse 10; taken together, the verses suggest that the אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל is “the leader of Israel’s celestial equivalents.”\textsuperscript{102} While ultimately rejecting the possibility that this leader is Michael,\textsuperscript{103} Goldingay does not rule out this interpretation entirely, due in part to the similarities between the epithet אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל and that of the enigmatic angelic leader of Josh 5:12, who is called the הָיוֹ עַד הָאֱלֹהִים.\textsuperscript{104} Elsewhere in Daniel, הָיוֹ refers to an angel (cf. 10:13, 20, 21; 12:1);\textsuperscript{105} given that chapter 7 describes the “little horn” as waging war against the angelic host, it is certainly plausible that chapter 8, in

\textsuperscript{100} Cf. Hartman and DiLella, Daniel, 236; Collins, Daniel, 333; Newsom, Daniel, 264. The translators of the NRSV apparently concur with this evaluation as is evidenced by the capitalization of the epithet (i.e., “Prince of princes”); cf. the parallel to Dan 8:11 = 11:36, “The king shall act as he pleases. He shall exalt himself and consider himself greater than any god, and shall speak horrendous things against the God of gods”; see John J. Collins, “יְהוָ֛ה,” DDD, 624ff. If this interpretation is correct, Dan 8 is a rare instance of the use of יְהוָ֛ה as an epithet for the God of Israel, but cf. 1QH 18:10; 4Q417 frg. 2 1:5; 4Q418 frg. 140 4.

\textsuperscript{101} Cf. R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), 204; Martinus A. Beck, Das Danielbuch: Sein Historischer Hintergrund und seine literarische Entwicklung (Leiden: Bringsberg, 1935), 80; proponents of this interpretation note that the word יְהוָ֛ה can be used in priestly contexts (e.g., 1 Chr 16:5; 24:5; Ezra 8:24).

\textsuperscript{102} Goldingay, Daniel, 210.

\textsuperscript{103} Michael was proposed by the medieval commentator, Ibn Ezra.

\textsuperscript{104} Goldingay, Daniel, 210, identifies the אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל as the God of Israel, but the reasons he gives for rejecting the identification of the אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל as a chief guardian may reveal an underestimation of Michael’s nature and role in Daniel. I will return to Goldingay’s assessment, below. Cf. Gillian Bampfylde, “The Prince of the Host in the Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” JSJ 14 [1983]: 129-134, who similarly downplays Michael’s role in Daniel and opts to identify the אֱלֶ֛ה כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל as the (superior) angel mentioned in 10:5-6, 21, and 12:6. But this interpretation overlooks the fact that this angelic figure appears to require the assistance of Michael (10:13) and that it is Michael who “arises” to assist God’s people when circumstances are at their worst (12:1).

\textsuperscript{105} Lacocque, Daniel, 162, is incorrect to state that the Book of Daniel “always” uses יְהוָ֛ה in reference to an angel (cf. 1:7-11, 18; 9:6, 8; 11:5).
the course of emphasizing the hubris of the horn,\textsuperscript{106} would depict the horn as challenging even the leader of the host, which the מֵרָכְבָּה/MyîrDc_rAc would then signify.\textsuperscript{107} In order to make sense of this scene, the important observation made regarding chapter 7 – that the little horn should not be considered solely in human terms – is also appropriate here.

Chapter 8 utilizes the widespread ANE motif that the stars are gods or angelic beings.\textsuperscript{108} As previously discussed, the astral host could be envisioned as either for or against Yahweh, but it is obvious here that the stars are the victims of the horn’s aggression, and are, thus, “good”\textsuperscript{109} angels: “[the horn] threw down to earth some of the host and some of the stars, and trampled on them” (8:10). The angelic “stars” and the trampling they endured from the horn is reminiscent of the war the horn waged against the “holy ones” in Dan 7 and serves to highlight the similarities between the two chapters, and together, they emphasize the cosmic consequences associated with the assaults of Antiochus. That the host is said to be “given over”\textsuperscript{110} to the horn (v. 11) continues the bleak description of the angelic host

\textsuperscript{106} Cf. Dan 8:25: “in his own mind he shall be great.”

\textsuperscript{107} So Lacocque, Daniel, 170-171, who argues that the מֵרָכְבָּה/MyîrDc_rAc is one and the same as the “one like a son of man,” i.e., the “chief of the angels.” A recent suggestion of Segal should also be noted: in his discussion of the redaction-critical history of the book, “Monotheism and Angelology,” 19-20, Segal argues that the language of chapter 8 – specifically, the word מֵרָכְבָּה – influenced the Michael passages in Dan 10 and 12, which he considers to be secondary additions. While Segal interprets the מֵרָכְבָּה/Miyr and מֵרָכְבָּה to be epithets of the God of Israel, he cautiously proposes that the scribe who added the Michael passages in Dan 10 and 12 mistakenly interpreted the designations to be references to a chief angel figure. However, Segal allows for the possibility that מֵרָכְבָּה and מֵרָכְבָּה were originally intended to refer to a chief angel, and that the Michael passages in chapters 10 and 12 therefore correctly reflect the meaning of chapter 8.

\textsuperscript{108} Alternatively, the stars were considered to be manifestations of divine beings, though the distinction is sometimes unclear; see Collins, Daniel, 331; cf. Goldingay, Daniel, 209-210; Mullen, Assembly of the Gods, 194-196; Bietenhard, Die himmlische Welt, 16.

\textsuperscript{109} Collins, Daniel, 332.

\textsuperscript{110} The text is difficult here; see further, below.
under attack.¹¹¹

Daniel 8 emphasizes the correspondence between heaven and earth by alternating references to each realm in a manner similar to that witnessed in Dan 7. This oscillation can occur abruptly: after a rather lengthy description of the power of the goat and its horns (vv. 5-9), which symbolize events on earth (at least primarily), attention is suddenly given to the cosmic disturbances associated with the horn:

The small horn grows south, east, and toward Palestine (v. 9). This aggressive movement then moves onto a different plane, to reach to the celestial army and the commander of that army (vv. 10, 11). Alongside the references here to ישומת (`heaven/the heavens,' vv. 8, 10) appear a number of references to ארץ (`the earth/ground,' vv 5, 7, 10, 12, 18): both are capable of referring both to the this-worldly plane and to movement between earth and heaven [emphasis mine].¹¹²

But chapter 8 also exhibits this oscillation on a smaller scale, that is, within the same line; verse 12 reads as follows: “Because of wickedness, the host was given over to [the horn] together with the regular burnt offering.” Admittedly, the text is problematic and various emendations have been proposed.¹¹³ But if the reading behind the NRSV is to be accepted,¹¹⁴ in the same breath the impact of the horn is said to touch heaven and earth, and “here again, the empirical tribulation of the Jewish people is understood to have its

¹¹¹ The interpretation section of chapter 8 is also plagued by textual problems at v. 24, which may include a reference to the collective angelic host. In short, while the MT/NRSV of the pertinent part of the verse reads, “He shall destroy the powerful and the people of the holy ones” (cf. 7:27), it has been suggested that the original reading was simply “holy ones.” On the one hand, Collins, Daniel, 340-341, suggests that “holy ones” is the preferred reading, in part because it best prepares for the reference to heavenly “prince of princes” in v. 25 and coheres with earlier references to “holy ones” (v. 13) and the “host” (v. 10); on the other, LaCroix, Daniel, 170-171, claims that an elaborate parallelism justifies reading “people of the holy ones” (a reading which would again emphasize the tutelary correspondence between the people and the angels; cf. 7:27). However one deciphers the textual issues, it is once again clear that the severity and scope of the persecutions of Antiochus are being emphasized.

¹¹² Goldingay, Daniel, 205.

¹¹³ For a discussion of the options, see Collins, Daniel, 334-335.

¹¹⁴ i.e., if נביא is retained and not reinterpreted to mean something other than what is usually means.
counterpart in the heavenly battle.”

3.2.6: Daniel 10-12

The final vision of the Book of Daniel encompasses chapters 10-12 and is comprised of an initial vision (10:1-11:1), which serves as an introduction for an angel-mediated audition or discourse containing an *ex eventu* prophecy of the history of the 4th-2nd cent. BCE (11:2-12:4); an epilogue (12:5-13) follows this discourse. The introductory nature of the initial vision does not mean, however, that it is superfluous to the larger vision or that the real importance of Dan 10-12 lies in the historical details of the discourse. To be sure, the “retrospective” of the discourse is meant to convey that history proceeds according to the pre-determined plan of God. But the vision of chapter 10 is foundational for understanding the *ex eventu* prophecies of chapter 11, as the former elucidates the latter by providing a glimpse of “what is really going on”; in other words, what is cryptic in chapters 7-8 is explicit in chapter 10: the struggle of God’s people on earth mirrors the struggle of Israel’s angelic guardians in heaven. Chapters 10-12 are clear, however, that this struggle will end in victory for Michael which means victory for God’s people.

115 Collins, Daniel, 333-335. Lacocque, Daniel, 162, not only supports the interpretation that the “prince of the host” is Michael, but in keeping with the option briefly mentioned above he also sees the epithet as simultaneously referring to the high priest. While this view is quite speculative, it is likely an attempt to underscore what Collins describes as “the synergism between the heavenly and earthly worlds that is pervasive in these chapters.”

116 For detailed outlines of Daniel 10-12, see Goldingay, Daniel, 281-282; Collins, Daniel, 371-372.

117 The designation of Lacocque, Daniel, 214.

118 Collins, Daniel, 61.

119 As previously mentioned, Segal, “Monotheism and Angelology,” 419, has argued that the passages referring to angelic princes in Dan 10 and 12 (10:13, 20-21; 12:1) are secondary, deliberately added to complement the picture of Dan 7 and 8, namely, that “the Lord renders judgment on the nations of the world, including Israel. Each of these nations is depicted by a supernatural being, and in the case of Israel, by a divine entity [i.e., Michael] second in rank only to God himself.” Segal suggests that his analysis helps to make sense of awkward “seams” in the text, e.g., the tribulation and arrival of Michael at 12:1-4 after the demise of Antiochus at the end of chapter 11. But whether original or added later (though it could not have been much
In Dan 10-12, Michael is three times referred to as a רכ, “prince” (cf. 10:13, 21; 12:1), a designation indicating that his role corresponds to that of the רכ, “the prince of Persia” (10:13, 20) and the רכ, “the prince of Greece” (10:21). Once again, the use of the term “prince” here likely stems, in part, from reflection upon the רכ of Josh 5:13-13, and in the context of chapter 10 is likely meant to convey that Israel has an angelic warrior-guardian par excellence.\(^{120}\) But as previously noted, while Goldingay concedes that Michael has a “special relationship with Israel parallel to that of other leaders with Persia or Greece,” he also claims that referring to Michael as the רכ (8:5) or רכ (8:25) would invest him with authority that “goes beyond that of Michael elsewhere: he is only one of the prominent [angelic] leaders (10:13).”\(^{121}\) The witness of Dan 7-12 suggests that Goldingay has underestimated Michael and his role.

First, while it is true that chapter 10 describes Michael as רכ, “one of the chief princes” (v. 13), it is apparent that Michael is exemplary or even extraordinary among the angels. As verse 21 makes clear, the unnamed angel\(^ {122}\) who requires Michael’s assistance in the struggle against the angelic princes of Persia and Greece has only Michael to rely on: “There is no one with me who contends against these princes except

---

\(^{120}\) Hartman and DiLella, Daniel, 282-283; cf. Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 105.


\(^{122}\) Some scholars have identified this unnamed angel as Gabriel, given the similarities between Dan 8:15-17 and 10:5-7. If correct, it would appear that in addition to his (primary?) revelatory/messenger role, Gabriel also has a (secondary?) guardian role. On the militaristic role of Gabriel in Jewish literature, see Michalak, Angels as Warrior, 124-125.
Michael, your prince.” Second, the designation מַלְאָךְ, “your prince,” reveals more than a “special relationship” to Israel; it is evidence of the departure from the thought of Deut 32:8-9 (cf. Sir 17:17; Jub. 15:31-32), and that an angelic being now occupies the prestigious role that was once the prerogative of Yahweh himself: the guardianship of the people of Israel. 

Third, as the historical discourse comes to a close, Michael’s role is affirmed as central to the triumph of Israel in the book’s eschatological scenario: רַמֵּחַ דָּמוֹד מַלְאָךְ לִי, “and at that time Michael, the great prince, the protector of your people, shall arise” (12:1). While the second occurrence of the verb תָּמֹר connotes protection, the meaning of the first occurrence is disputed, with martial and judicial roles being proposed. There is, however, no reason to pit these nuances of תָּמֹר against one another, as both are important to the Book of Daniel: whereas the central scene of chapter 7 (vv. 9-14) involves divine judgment, which includes dominion being granted to the “son of man,” who most likely should be understood as the leader of Israel’s angelic host, chapter 10 (vv. 13, 21) is unambiguous in its description of the martial role of Michael.

While chapter 10 does not explicitly mention the collective angelic host, it is implied:

---

123 Cf. Collins,  Daniel, 374-376, here 376: “The idea that Michael is prince of Israel occurs here for the first time in the Bible, although a slightly earlier occurrence may be found in 1 Es. 20:5. It marks a departure from earlier tradition” (i.e., Deut 32:8-9 and the non-angelic reading of Isa 63:9). Also see Michalak,  Angels as Warriors, 102, who highlights some of the ways the discrepancy between Deut 32:8-9 and Dan 10 was addressed in Patristic and Rabbinic literature.

124 Once again, the “at that time” refers to the tribulation preceding the demise of Antiochus as depicted at the end of chapter 11, with 12:1ff then providing a glimpse of the corresponding scene in the heavenly realm and Michael’s role in it.

125 Followed by the preposition, לִי, the verb תָּמֹר means “to protect” or “to defend” (cf. Esth 8:1; 9:6); see Hartman and DiLella,  Daniel, 273.

126 For detailed discussions of the word, see Collins,  Daniel, 390.

on two occasions that Michael is his only recourse in the fight against the angelic princes of Persia and Greece. The implication, then, is that the other angels are either unwilling to help (unlikely) or outmatched (more likely). Given that chapters 7 and 8 describe the collective angelic host as being oppressed by the little horn, it is plausible that chapter 10 underscores the severity of the persecution by reiterating that even God’s angels – with the exception of the unnamed angel and Michael – are too weak to contend successfully against their cosmic enemies.

Daniel 12 makes two important claims regarding the people of God, which serve as a fitting close not only to the final vision of Daniel but also to the entire book. First, after announcing the role of the angelic protector Michael at the end of the age, verse 1 states that “at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book.” In other words, while the imagery of beasts and animals and the behind-the-scenes glimpses into the heavenly world that dominate Dan 7-12 work together to reveal that history is progressing according to a divinely-ordained plan, 12:1 is clear that the goal of this plan is the eschatological deliverance of God’s people. Second, although Dan 12:2-3 is well-known for being the only explicit reference to resurrection in the Hebrew Bible, for the purposes of this thesis its value is in what it says regarding the resurrected state of at least some of

---


129 Cf. Lacocque, *Daniel*, 213: “Only ‘Michael, your prince’ is faithful, but he will suffice.”


131 Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, 310, stress that not everyone who is resurrected shines like the stars as this is reserved for the wise; cf. Collins, *Daniel*, 392; “Only in the case of the wiseMASKILIM are we given any information about the resurrected state.” *Contra* idem, “Apocalyptic Eschatology as the transcendence of Death,” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 33-35, who in this earlier study did not restrict the privilege.
those who rise to eternal life: “Those who are wise (lit.; מָזוּלִים or Maskilim) shall shine like the brightness of the sky, and those who lead many to righteousness, like the stars forever and ever.” In light of the notion of the astral angelic host, verse 3 is asserting that the wise will become like angels in heaven at the resurrection.\(^{132}\) Goldingay suggests that the significance of this distinction is related to the connection between heaven and earth presupposed throughout Dan 7-12: the Maskilim, who demonstrate their faithfulness through wise teaching and suffering (cf. 11:33),\(^{133}\) will be honoured by being granted the prestige and privileges of heaven and its inhabitants, the angels to whom the Maskilim correspond.\(^{134}\)

Despite their apparent privilege and distinct status, Collins observes that the orientation of the Maskilim – those responsible for the Book of Daniel\(^{135}\) – is “outward” insofar as they continue to function “within the larger community” and are not antagonistic toward broader Judaism.\(^{136}\) Such statements are supported by the solidarity Daniel shows with his fellow

\(^{132}\) Goldingay, Daniel, 308, is right to emphasize the comparative nature of the statement: “‘Like the stars’ then compare the discerning with these, but does not necessarily thereby suggest that they will be located among them, still less will be become stars/angels [emphasis retained].” The picture here is very similar to that of 1 En. 104:2-6, which I will discuss, below.

\(^{133}\) Newsom, Daniel, 352-353, highlights that Dan 12:2-3 (“those who are wise … those who lead many to righteousness”) contains an intertextual allusion to the Suffering Servant song of Isa 52-53 (cf. esp. 52:13 and 53:11-12) – but this does not necessitate an opposition to (the violent ways of) the Maccabees as per Porphory’s interpretation of the “little help” mentioned in Dan 11:34; on this point, see also Collins, Daniel, 386; Goldingay, Daniel, 303.

\(^{134}\) Goldingay, Daniel, 308-309, notes that correspondence between heaven and earth has various manifestations in the Hebrew Bible including the lofty/privileged status of the king (e.g., Num 24:17; 1 Sam 29:9; 2 Sam 14:17, 20; Isa 9:5) and the prophets “who partake of the honour of a place in Yahweh’s council.” Thus, Goldingay seems to be saying that the resurrected state of the Maskilim will include the angel-like privileges that were associated with respected offices of Israel. Cf. Walter Wifall, “The Status of ‘Man’ as Resurrection,” ZAIII 90 (1978): 382-394; Hans Clemons Cesarius Cavallio, Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15, Part 1: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background (ConBNT 7; Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 27; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, 26.

\(^{135}\) As Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 68, puts it, the recipients of the dream visions and revelations in the Book of Daniel (in its final form), as well as its fictional author, are a “stand-in for the real authors,” the Maskilim. Cf. Collins, Daniel, 385: “There can be little doubt that the author of Daniel belonged to his circle and that the instruction they impart corresponds to the apocalyptic wisdom of the book.”

\(^{136}\) Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 112, also points out that even if “[t]he commitment of the masses appears uncertain, … [t]here is no evidence of separate organization, such as we find at Qumran. The
Jews when he says that he was “confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel” (9:20).  

3.2.7: SUMMARY OF DAN 7-12

The authors of Dan 7-12 reveal the conviction that the happenings of the heavenly realm constituted “what was really going on.” And despite the chaotic persecutions that overwhelmed even the angelic host, God had decreed that victory would be granted to the angels and their leader, a verdict which rendered certain the deliverance of earthly Israel and the defeat of Antiochus and his forces. Though Sir 17:17 upholds the sentiment of Deut 32:8-9 insofar as Yahweh alone was Israel’s guardian (cf. Jub. 15:31-32), the outlook of Dan 7-12 represents what seems to have been the majority viewpoint of the Second Temple Period: that Yahweh had an angelic lieutenant (here, “the one like a son of man”/Michael), who could be envisioned as both Israel’s guardian and the leader of the larger angelic host, who collectively constituted heavenly Israel, and whose fates were intimately tied to those of Israel on earth. While Daniel appears to set the Maskilim apart for a privileged, angel-like afterlife, the work as whole is not exclusivist: solidarity with wider Israel is emphasized and thus the hope of angelic guardianship – which is ultimately dependent on God’s decisive interaction – is not just for the Jews responsible for the book.

3.3: 1 ENOCH

An amalgam of five traditions, the work known as 1 Enoch is extant in its entirety only in an Ethiopian (Ge’ez) translation dated between the 4th and 6th cent. CE. However, the temple and central institutions of the religion are evidently not rejected [by the Maskilim], although for the present they are defiled.”

137 Cf. Newsom, Daniel, 287, who observes that chapter 9 “focuses extensively on the relationship between YHWH and Israel – a topic absent from the other chapters.”
discovery among the DSS\textsuperscript{140} of all but one of these traditions has confirmed the long-held assumption that Aramaic was the language of composition of at least four sections of \textit{1 Enoch}.\textsuperscript{141} Of the Enochic traditions found at Qumran, parts of the \textit{Book of Watchers}, the \textit{Book of Dreams}, and the \textit{Epistle of Enoch} are relevant to the present study.

3.3.1: THE BOOK OF WATCHERS (1 ENUCH 1-36)

The tradition with which \textit{1 Enoch} opens, the \textit{Book of Watchers} (henceforth, \textit{BW}) is widely held to have been completed in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} cent. BCE.\textsuperscript{142} The work is clearly enamored with Enoch,\textsuperscript{143} taking as its point of departure the limited and cryptic biblical references to this ante-diluvian

\textsuperscript{138} The traditions are: the \textit{Book of Watchers} (chaps. 1-36); the \textit{Book of Parables or Similitudes} (chaps. 37-71); the \textit{Astronomical Book or Book of the Luminaries} (chaps. 72-82); the \textit{Book of Dreams} (chaps. 83-90); the \textit{Epistle of Enoch} (chaps. 91-108). On the traditions and languages of \textit{1 Enoch}, see Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch}, I, 7ff.

\textsuperscript{139} The Ethiopic translation is dated ca. 4th-6th cent. CE. For the Ethiopic text, see Michael A. Knibb, \textit{The Ethiopian Book of Enoch} (2 vols.; Oxford: Claredon, 1978).

\textsuperscript{140} For the Qumran texts of \textit{1 Enoch}, see Józef T. Milik, \textit{The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); Stephen J. Pfann et al., eds., \textit{Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1: Qumran Cave 4.XXVI} (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000). Also extant are fragments of a Greek translation (likely dating to the late 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. CE), intermediate between the Aramaic original and the Ethiopic translation; for the Greek text, see Matthew Black, \textit{Apocalypsis Henochi Graece} (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

\textsuperscript{141} Only the \textit{Parables} were not found at Qumran, and scholars are thus unsure as to the language of composition of chapters 37-71 – though it is virtually certain that this section had a Semitic original (i.e., Aramaic or Hebrew); see the discussions of R. H. Charles, \textit{The Book of Enoch, or 1 Enoch} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), xi-xvii; Knibb, \textit{The Ethiopian Book of Enoch}, 27; Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} I, 9. Since the Parables were not found among the DSS, they will not be discussed in detail, here; cf., e.g., Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 20, 25-27.

For a detailed discussion of the date of the \textit{Parables}, see George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, \textit{1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82} (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 58ff, who prefer a late 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. BCE/early 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. CE date of composition.

\textsuperscript{142} It is thus one of the earliest extant apocalyptic texts, only the \textit{Book of the Luminaries} likely being older; cf. Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} I, 7, 169-171; James C. VanderKam, \textit{Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition} (CBQMS 16; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 111-114. \textit{BW} is itself an amalgam of traditions; on this issue, see Collins, \textit{The Apocalyptic Imagination}, 47.

\textsuperscript{143} The biblical “career” of Enoch is as mysterious as it is brief. According to Gen 5:24, “Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him.” As Schäfer, \textit{The Origins of Jewish Mysticism}, 54, succinctly puts it, “these few enigmatic sentences in the Hebrew Bible became the springboard for much speculation in the postbiblical and (later) Christian literature.” Moreover, it is clear that Gen 5:24 serves as \textit{BW}’s impetus: “… Enoch was taken; and none of the sons of men knew where he had been taken, or where he was, or what had happened to him. And his works were with the watchers, and with the holy ones were his days” (1 Enoch 1:1-2). It is important to note, however, that whereas Gen 5:24 is a reference to the disappearance of Enoch \textit{at the end of his earthly life}, \textit{BW} seems to interpret Genesis as referring to \textit{a heavenly journey that precedes Enoch’s final removal from earth}; see the comments of VanderKam, \textit{Enoch and the Growth}, 130-131.
patriarch to whom is revealed the divine plan. Numerous angels and their functions are mentioned in BW, including the notion of a guardian tasked with watching over God’s people. This is where I will begin my discussion.

Shortly after outlining how the celestial rebels, Shemihazah and Asael, wrought havoc on the inhabitants of earth (6:3ff), BW has the first of a number of important references to named angelic leaders who have remained faithful to God:

Then Michael and Sariel and Raphael and Gabriel looked down from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth and saw much blood shed upon the earth. All the earth was filled with the godlessness and violence that had befallen it (9:1).

Intriguingly, a list of seven rather than four archangels is found in 20:1-8, and it is here that we are informed of Michael's role as it pertains to the people:

These are the names of the holy angels who watch. ... Michael, one of the holy angels who has been put in charge of the good ones of the people (20:5).

These passages, in conjunction with the significance of his implied functions elsewhere in BW, provide several relevant items of discussion. First, the preface to the list of seven archangels in chapter 20 highlights the angelological terminology of BW. It has been

Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 233; Angel, Otherworldly, 31. The role and significance of Enoch will be addressed, below.

144 Unless otherwise noted, all translations of 1 Enoch are from Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1; idem and J. C. VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2.

145 “Archangel(s)” is the term often used by scholars to describe named heavenly leader figures, and it is the designation used in verse 8b of the Greek translation of the book (i.e., ἀρχαγγέλοι). In an excursus entitled, “The Four – or Seven – Archangels in Jewish and Early Christian Literature,” Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 207, notes that the fact that there are four such beings is likely dependent on the four living creatures of Ezekiel’s vision; on the reception of Ezekiel’s vision, see especially David J. Halperin, The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988). Other texts that have four archangel figures include the Qumran War Scroll (cf. 1QM 9:15-16; see Chapter Four, below), the Testament of Abraham (cf. T. Ab. 12-14), and various Rabbinic texts (cf. Num. Rab. 2:10; Pesiq. R. 44; Pirq R. El. 4). The expansion to seven archangels in 1 Enoch 20-36, and 81 is due, at least in part, to the necessity of there being an angel at each stop of Enoch’s heavenly tour. The Book of Revelation seems to have incorporated both the four and the seven archangel traditions (cf. Rev 1:4; 4:5-8). On this topic, see also Christoph Berner, “The Four (or Seven) Archangels in the First Book of Enoch and Early Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period,” in Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings, 395-409.
proposed that “holy angels who watch” (20:1)\textsuperscript{146} should be understood as a paraphrase of the more common double-designation, יָניָדְיָד רוּאֵנָא, “watchers and holy ones.”\textsuperscript{147} That “holy ones” is a common designation for heavenly beings was discussed earlier in this chapter, but “watchers” is used less frequently in Early Jewish texts (cf. Dan 4:10, 14, 20). The term is often considered to be derived from the root, דֵּרַע, “to be awake/watchful,”\textsuperscript{148} carrying the sense of being alert for various commissioned tasks; in \textit{BW}, angels are tasked with the guardianship of heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{149}

But like other texts, \textit{BW} suggests that Israel has a guardian \textit{par excellence} in Michael, who is singled out among the archangels listed in chapter 20 for being “in charge of the good ones of the people.” Though there is uncertainty on textual grounds as to whether Michael is envisioned here as the angelic protector of the entire nation or a righteous remnant

\textsuperscript{146} So Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 295.

\textsuperscript{147} In his excursus, “The Watchers and Holy Ones,” Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 140-141, draws the following terminological conclusions from what he concedes is fragmentary evidence: 1.) יָניָדְיָד, “watchers,” is the angelological term used frequently in \textit{BW} and can be employed as a general designation (i.e., for faithful or rebel angels); while 2.) the double-designation, יָניָדְיָד רוּאֵנָא, is used for angels faithful to God, 3.) the translators used the Greek equivalent of ἐγρήγοροι, as a special term for the angelic rebels.

\textsuperscript{148} Hence the Greek translation, ἐγρήγορος (cf. LXX Lam 4:14).

\textsuperscript{149} Robert P. R. Murray, “The Origin of the Aramaic \textit{ṣr}, angel,” \textit{Or} 53.2 (1984): 303-317 (cf. Mitchell Dahood, \textit{Psalms 1-50: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} [AB 16; New York: Doubleday, 1966], 55), has argued that the use of יָניָדְיָד in reference to angels is connected to the guardian deities of the Ugaritic pantheon. Whether or not one accepts Murray’s suggestion that this usage of יָניָדְיָד was suppressed in the Hebrew Bible due to its associations with Semitic guardian deities, it is apparent that the faithful angels of \textit{1 Enoch} have been charged with an attentive guardianship of various sorts (e.g., \textit{1 Enoch} 6:7; 14:21-23; 20:1; cf. 39:12-13; 40:2; 61:12; 71:7; see the excursus of Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 140). It is interesting to note that in Deut 32:11 – which immediately follows the statement of Deut 32:8-9 that heavenly beings watch over other nations but that Yahweh himself is Israel’s guardian – the verb יָניָדְיָד contributes to the description of Yahweh’s guardianship of the nation: “as an eagle lifts up (יָניָדְיָד) its nest, and hovers over its young; as it spreads its wings, takes them up, and bears the aloft on it pinions, Yahweh alone guided them …”; see Murray, “The Origin,” 307; Tigay, \textit{Deuteronomy}, 304.
thereof, there is, in my opinion, little rationale for limiting the purview of Michael’s guardianship to those responsible for BW (see below). That BW describes Michael as the protector of the people indicates that his association with a guardianship role pre-dates the Book of Daniel, and at least in his role as guardian of the people, Michael appears to be without angelic peer; BW may even indicate that Michael outranks all other angels, as 24:6-25:7 not only mentions the archangel’s special connection to the people (in that Michael is the interpreter who announces their glorious future) but the passage also makes a statement on angelic hierarchy: “Then Michael answered me, one of the holy angels who was with me and was their leader … [emphasis added]” (24:6). There is ambiguity as to what exactly is being said of Michael’s leadership here, but it is clear that Michael is considered a ranking angel, perhaps the highest. Additionally, 9:1ff states that an important facet of angelic guardianship is an intercessory role: on account of the suffering wrought by the sin of the rebel watchers, Michael and the other angels hear the prayers of the humans suffering.

150 See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 294-296, who notes that while λαός can be a technical term for Israel (cf. H. Strathamann, “λαός,” TDNT 4:34-35), Michael’s special relationship to the “righteous” and “chosen” in 25:4-5 may be a reference to a faithful remnant of the people. I will return to the subject of the identity of the “chosen”/“righteous,” below.

151 Even if the roles of various angels overlap to a certain extent; i.e., BW indicates that other angels have been tasked for roles that benefit the people of God (e.g., just as Michael is not the only angel to intercede on behalf of humanity [cf. 9:1ff; see below]), Raphael’s charge to watch over the wicked souls awaiting eschatological judgment contributes to the future well-being of the faithful, albeit indirectly (cf. 20:3; 22:3, 6).

152 On Michael’s relatively infrequent role as an interpreter in Early Judaism, see the brief discussion of Hannah, Michael and Christ, 47-48. As noted above, the root of the term used for “leader” in the Greek translation, ἡγέομαι, is the same word used in LXX Sir 17:17 to refer to the celestial guardians of the Gentile nations.

153 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 313, points out that it is unclear whether Michael outranks the named archangels or whether he stands at the head of another group of angels under his command (i.e., his personal retinue).

154 In addition to calling Michael “one of the ‘holy’ angels,” some Ethiopic mss of 1 En. 24:6 add “and honoured”; see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 313.

155 On Michael as a heavenly intercessor in Early Judaism, see Moses, “Tangible Prayer,” 140-141; Hannah, Michael and Christ, 42-45; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 208-210.
The priestly connotations of intercession have been noted, and this observation complements another important facet of BW: the depiction of heaven as a temple. In fact, BW is the earliest extant Jewish text to imply that the Jerusalem temple is the terrestrial reflection of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary.

While the text does not explicitly refer to heaven as a temple or angels as priests, both are strongly intimated in chapters 9-16, the centerpiece of which is the account of Enoch’s ascent in 14:8-23. BW’s appropriation of the concept of heaven as a temple is observable in two general categories, the first of which concerns the description of the heavenly realm itself. At numerous points, heaven is referred to as a “sanctuary,” the place from which the faithful archangels look down on humanity; the sanctuary of heaven is also the place which the rebel watchers forsook. The Aramaic phrase used at 9:1 is הַמַּפְתֵּשָּׁה, “the sanctuaries of heaven” (4Q201 frg. 1 4:7), and the Greek phrases in 12:4 and 15:3 are, respectively, τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως τοῦ αἰώνος, “the sanctuary of their eternal station” and τὸν υψηλὸν τὸν ἁγιὸν τοῦ αἰώνος, “the high [place], the eternal

---

156 See, e.g., Angel, Otherworldly, 29 n. 21, who cites Exod 28:29 as a prime example of the intercessory role of priests in the Hebrew Bible: “So Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel on the breastpiece of judgment upon his heart whenever he enters the holy place as a continual memorial before the Lord.”

157 As noted earlier in this chapter, scholars have often observed the striking similarities between and 1 En. 14:8-23, Dan 7:9-14, and a scene from the Book of Giants (4Q530), but there is little consensus on the direction of dependence. Unlike the scene in the Book of Giants, the scenes in Daniel and BW take place in heaven. On the similarities between 1 En. 14 and the heavenly scene found in Isa 6, see Kelley Coblentz Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void, and the Uninhabited Paradise: Otherworldly Sites in the Book of Watchers,” in Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World, 41.

158 As outlined by Angel, Otherworldly, 28-30.

159 Hence the severity of the watchers’ sin (cf. 9:1; 12:4; 15:3). In the words of Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 269, “Sexual intercourse was given by God to the human race to assure the continuity of one’s line. The watchers, being immortal, needed no such instrument. Nonetheless, they have lusted and acted like human beings and have defiled their heavenly and holy status through sexual contact with earthly women . . . . The sin is compounded by the fact that watchers are priests in the heavenly sanctuary. Thus their holiness is not simply a special pure state that has been polluted. It is that state which allows them to draw near to God and minister to him. Since they have contaminated that state and violated God’s order of creation, they are banished from his presence in heaven . . . .”
sanctuary.” The use of this language, in conjunction with the language of the Jerusalem temple employed in the description of Enoch’s ascent to God’s throne, suggests that the archetype of/celestial equivalent to the earthly sanctuary is in view. The second category of priestly themes concerns the terminology used to depict the actions of the angels in the heavenly temple, including the aforementioned στάσις, and the reference to certain angels in 14:23 as οἱ ἔγγίζοντες αὐτῷ, “those who approached him.” Both terms are used in the LXX to describe the service of the priests in the temple.

This depiction of heaven as a temple, along with the Michael’s aforementioned intercessory role, are consistent with the interpretation that his actions, including his binding of the rebel angels in order to cleanse the earth from impurity and wrongdoing, serve to portray Michael as a celestial high priest. More specifically, it has been posited that the role of the Michael-led angels in 10:11-11:2 is an etiological allegory for the Yom Kippur scapegoat ceremony found in Lev 16:1-34: that is, just as the high priest sends the sin-laden goat into

---

160 See Angel, Otherworldly, 28, who summarizes as follows: “[T]he upper realm is described in terms which relate rather precisely to the three major architectural sections of the Jerusalem temple, the ἁγίασμα (1 Kgs 6:3; cf. Ezek 40:48), ἱερόν (1 Kgs 6:17; cf. Ezek 41:1), and ἱππαρχία (1 Kgs 6:5, 16; cf. Ezek 41:4);” cf. Himmelfarb, Ascent to Heaven, 10-11; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 66.

161 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 271, observes that in the LXX, ἅγιασμα is often the translation for ἄλογος, the common word for “sanctuary,” though occasionally ἅγιασμα can translate ἱερόν as it does in Psalm 113:2 (=MT 114:2) and Ezek 45:2. In turn, when ἱερόν means “sanctuary,” it is usually translated by τὸ ἅγιον or τὸ ἅγιον; cf., e.g., Exod 36:1; Lev 10:18.

162 For the priestly use of στάσις in the LXX, see 1 Chr 30:16; 35:10. In the context of 1 En. 12:4, it is likely that στάσις translates ἱππαρχία, which refers to the priestly “station” or “course” (e.g., 1 Chr 23:28); see Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1966), 70-72; cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 28 (I will further discuss ἱππαρχία when I examine the Hodayot and Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, below). Commenting on οἱ ἔγγίζοντες, George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” JBL 100 (1981): 585 n. 37, observes that ἔγγίζω, which often translates ἴππει or ἱππαρχία in the Hebrew Bible, can have “technical cultic connotations” (e.g., Ezek 44:13-16; 45:4); Nickelsburg also points out the priestly sentiment of being in the temple “day and night” (e.g., 1 Chr 23:3; Josephus, Ant. 7.363-367; Luke 2:37).
the wilderness, Michael leads the way in rounding up, binding, and consigning the sinful watchers to their punishment. Therefore, Michael, though he is not specifically named, may be one of the angels permitted to approach God’s throne in 14:23, and, if this interpretation is accepted, Michael’s dual role in BW is that of guardian of God’s people and celestial high priest.

If some angels in BW were envisioned as having a role analogous to the earthly high priest insofar as they were allowed to serve in closest proximity to God, Enoch’s vision of the heavenly temple may suggest that those not permitted to approach God – perhaps most other angels – were thought to be priests of a lower rank, thus explaining their non-access to the innermost part of the heavenly sanctuary. That is, even the language used to describe the angelic multitudes who could not come near to God may still be indicative of cultic activity, as 14:22 reads as follows:

[F]laming fire encircled him, and a great fire stood (παρειστήκει) by him; and none of those about him approached him. Ten thousand times ten thousand stood (ἐστήκασιν) before him; but he needed no counselor … .

The parallelism of verse 22 can be seen in the following table:

| TABLE #4: PARALLELISM OF 1 E.N. 14:22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… fire stood by him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… ten thousands stood before him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

163 For this interpretation, see Paul D. Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11,” JBL 96 (1977): 220-226; Devorah Dimant, “1 Enoch 6-11: A Methodological Perspective,” in SBL Seminar Papers, 1978 (SBLSP 1; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 326-327; Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 463; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 44; Angel, Otherworldly, 29. For later texts that specify a high-priestly role for Michael, see 3 Bar. 11-16; Ar. Mos. 10.2; T. Levi 2-5; T. Dan 6; b. Hag 12b. On Michael’s exceptional priestly prerogatives in 3 Baruch as foreshadowed by BW, see the comment of Moses, “Tangible Prayer,” 140-141.

164 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 265.

165 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 265.

166 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 265, who provides a similar table.
Given that the “fire” is parallel to the “ten thousands times ten thousands,” which is almost certainly a reference to angels, it is plausible that the former is angelic, as well.\textsuperscript{167}

Furthermore, the fire//ten thousands are apparently not in closest proximity to the divine throne, but they are nevertheless said to \textit{stand} before God, with the verbs \textit{ἵστημι} and especially \textit{παρίστημι} being used in the LXX and elsewhere of priests and Levites in the earthly tabernacle/temple\textsuperscript{168} or of angels in heaven\textsuperscript{169} to describe acts of service and worship.\textsuperscript{170} Thus, the angelic priesthood of the heavenly temple as depicted in chapter 14 may be approximating the priesthood of the earthly sanctuary or other depictions of the heavenly sanctuary insofar as priestly leadership is tiered.\textsuperscript{171}

As for why \textit{BW} posits heaven as having angelic guardians and priests, it is commonly asserted that the text addresses events of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} cent. BCE by transposing political and religious concerns to the “mythological plane”\textsuperscript{172} in that the chaos imposed by warring foreign powers – specifically the \textit{Diadochoi}\textsuperscript{173} – and the immorality of (some) of the Jerusalem

---

\textsuperscript{167} It is interesting to note that another Aramaic text, \textit{4QWords of Michael}, refers to the angelic host as \textit{נהרונים}, “troops of fire” (4Q529 2). Alternatively, the description of the fire may be approximating \textit{Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice}’s depiction of the celestial sanctuary, which has been referred to as “animate”; see below.

\textsuperscript{168} E.g., \textit{ἵστημι}: 1 Chr 23:30; 2 Chr 29:11; \textit{παρίστημι}: Deut 10:8, 17:12; Judg 20:28.

\textsuperscript{169} E.g., \textit{ἵστημι}: 2 Chr 18:18; \textit{παρίστημι}: Job 1:6, 2:1; T. Sol. 5:9, 26:9; \textit{Apoc. Ab.} 7:11; Luke 1:19; 1 Clement 34:5. Additionally, Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 265, points out that \textit{παρίστημι} is used in LXX Dan 7:10 (both OG & \textit{Θ}) to describe the angelic myriads who \textit{stand} before the “Ancient of Days.”

\textsuperscript{170} G. Bertram, “\textit{παρίστημι},” \textit{TDNT} 5:838, explains that in the LXX the word often carries the meaning of “respectful standing or service” before kings or superiors (e.g., 1 Kgs 10:8; 2 Kgs 5:25; 1sa 60:10; Prov 22:29 2 Chr 9:7), and that “only with the help of the particular relation of the servant to the king can one understand the religious and cultic use of [the word] … .”

\textsuperscript{171} The Jerusalem temple is served by, in ascending order of authority, Levites, priests, and the high priest. Furthermore, while \textit{BW} is relatively clear that \textit{some} angels served in a priestly capacity, it is like other texts in that it is silent as to what percentage of the entire angelic host were so tasked; see the comments of Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 44, 265.

\textsuperscript{172} Collins, \textit{The Apocalyptic Imagination}, 51-52.

\textsuperscript{173} Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 170, suggests that the fallen watchers represent the \textit{Diadochoi}, the hubristic successors to Alexander the Great: “Such a context may allow a more specific definition of the myth’s message and function. The image of divine begetting is reminiscent of the claims that some of the \textit{Diadochoi} had gods as their fathers. If this similarity is to the point, the myth would be an answer to these claims in the form of a kind
priests are said to be allegorized in BW by the boundary-transgressing watchers, who have forsaken their priest-like duties in heaven. But despite the widespread recognition that BW is concerned with matters of a priestly nature, the extent to which the apocalyptic symbolism of the text can/should be pressed for historical realities is a matter of debate; there is also disagreement as to what specific priestly sins may have provoked the ire of BW’s authors and how strongly BW should be read as a critique of the Jerusalem temple. While the

of parody. The author would be saying, ‘Yes, their fathers were divine; however, they were not gods, but demons – angels who rebelled against the authority of God’; also see idem, “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11,” JBL 96 (1977): 383-405; Rüdiger Barbelms, Heremton in Israel und seiner Umwelt (ATHANT 65; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1979), 180-183.

174 See especially David Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16,” HUCA 50 (1979): 119; also see Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 575-600. There is debate concerning the specifics and extent of the priestly issues reflected in BW, and I will return to these, below.

175 E.g., Annette Yoshiko Reed, Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of the Enochic Literature (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 63, is wary of Nickelsburg’s fallen watchers = Diadochoi interpretation, in large part because she questions the assumption that BW is necessarily representative of a marginalized or oppressed group. She suggests instead that “it may be more heuristic to focus on its continuities with broader trends in postexilic Judaism, viewing its appeal to the fallen angels in terms of the reemergence of ancient, mythic imagery in late biblical prophecy and understanding its interest in the origins of evil in terms of the concern for theodicy in Wisdom books like Job and Qohelet” (cf. Cross, Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic, 343-346). While Reed is right to caution against an overly explicit reading of the text, the possibility that historical referents – e.g., the Diadochoi – were at least partial impetuses for the presentation of the fallen watchers is not mutually exclusive of a reading that has also been shaped by the concerns and motifs operative in contemporaneous Jewish literature. Reed herself is open to the view that priestly concerns inform the myth; see below.

176 Insofar as the actions of the watchers are said to be an allegory for the sins of earthly priests, there is discussion as to what sins are in view. Whereas some have emphasized that the temple-polluting sin in question was that priests were marrying foreign women (e.g., Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests, 21ff), others have suggested that authors were also concerned that the Jerusalem priests had sexual contact with women who were in a state of menstrual impurity (e.g., Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 119; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 271-272).

177 On the one hand, Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 586, considers the tradition found in chapters 12-16 to be a statement that the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood were considered defiled and “therefore under the irrevocable judgment of God”; cf. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 66-67. On the other hand, Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests, 20-21, argues that BW’s criticism of the Jerusalem temple is somewhat muted in comparison to the temple critiques of later texts: “The preference for the heavenly temple over the earthly in 1 Enoch 12-16 suggests that the affairs of the temple were not being conducted in a manner that lived up to the author’s standards. … But chapters 12-16 report that all is not well in the heavenly temple either. Some of the priests of the heavenly temple have abandoned their posts; they have descended to earth, undertaken marriages unsuitable to them, and reveal secrets that should not have been made known, to devastating effect. … But it is important to notice that according to BW many watchers remain in heaven performing their duties. Thus, the criticism of earthly priests that chapters 12-16 read in the story of the descent of the watchers is not directed at all priests, and thus it appears that in the view of the author of these chapters, the earthly temple, despite its problems, remains a viable temple – just like the heavenly temple”; see
Diadochoi and priestly concerns could have been motivating factors for the authors of BW; the non-specificity of the text serves an important purpose; and so long as it is recognized that the heavenly realm was considered the “truer, more real world” – that is, the archetypal significance of the heavenly realm is not unduly minimized by seeing it only in allegorical terms – my own sense is that this transposition (and thereby aggrandizing) of events to the mythical plane would have been effective in reassuring those for whom BW was written. Specifically, the knowledge that Michael is carrying out what would become his traditional role as Israel’s patron – in addition to the fact that other righteous angels were incarcerating the celestial rebels (10:4-15; 21:1-10) and would be part of God’s decisive eschatological arrival (1:1-9) – would have served to lessen the fears wrought by the

also eadem, Ascent to Heaven, 15-22. In a similar vein, Reed, Fallen Angels, 63, is suspicious of an approach that equates the social settings and viewpoints of the various traditions of 1 Enoch; i.e., one should not assume that the nature and severity of the 2nd cent. BCE temple critiques of the Animal Apocalypse in the Book of Dreams or the Apocalypse of Weeks in the Epistle of Enoch (see below) are necessarily the same as those of a 3rd cent. BCE work like BW; cf. Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 128ff, who highlights the scholarly tendency to exaggerate anti-Jerusalem temple sentiments in texts which speak of a heavenly sanctuary, including BW.

Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 51ff, who argues as follows: “The resolution of the ancient conflict generated by the watchers emerges with an inevitability that guarantees a similar resolution of the conflicts of the Hellenistic age. The superhuman status of the actors takes the action out of the sphere of human control and places the immediate situation in a deterministic perspective which also serves to relieve the anxiety. … By telling the story of the watchers rather than of the Diadochoi or the priesthood, 1 En. 1-36 becomes a paradigm which is not restricted to one historical situation but can be applied whenever an analogous situation arises.”

So Alexander, Mystical Texts, 61, whose descriptor I quote here in order to emphasize the primacy of the heavenly realm in the Second Temple Period worldview. Note, for instance, the comment of Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 48, who states that the celestial realm “forms the backdrop of the human action [emphasis mine]” in BW. His statement and the one quoted above are sound provided that they are not taken to mean that BW’s authors considered these angels in the same way modern scholars do. As Collins says elsewhere (Daniel, 318), “For the modern Western critic, only the human people are real. For the Jewish visionary, however, heavenly counterparts were not only real but vital to human destiny.” For additional comments on the reality of the heavenly realm and a call not to minimize its importance or archetypal significance, see Angel, Otherworldly, 101ff.

So Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 295.

On the sufficiency of the revelation that the angelic rebels will be incarcerated until the final judgment, see Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 58-59; cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 321, who points out that the dualism of the Enochic texts should be differentiated from that found in the Qumran sectarian texts insofar as in the latter a prompt incarceration follows the angelic rebellion, whereas in the former the wicked angels remain in a state of rebellion until the eschaton.
watchers’ malevolence. Similarly, if some of the Jerusalem priests had succumbed to various temptations (that may or may not have been related to warring Diadochi and other foreign influences), the revelation of a pure heavenly temple and its priesthood would have served to encourage Jews that the actions of some rebellious priests ultimately do not negate the efficacy of the heavenly temple or its terrestrial counterpart in Jerusalem.

In order to appreciate fully these angelological features of BW, it is necessary to review briefly additional facets of the text. First, whoever the “righteous” and “chosen” are, it is likely that they are the “recipients” of BW’s revelation of the heavenly world. Second, the importance and authority of this revealed knowledge is heightened by a.) the subtle yet noticeable downplaying of the Mosaic Torah vis-à-vis the content of the vision; and b.) the

182 On this point, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The We and the Other in the Worldview of 1 Enoch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Other Early Jewish Texts,” in The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honour of John J. Collins (eds., Daniel C. Harlow et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 264, who remarks that “by attributing this broad spectrum of evils to supernatural intervention, the myth asserts that these evils cannot be reduced to the sinful deeds of the humans who carry them out – generals and their armies, sorcerers and prognosticators, craftsmen, and fornicators. They are the functions of a malevolent demonic realm that is bent on the destruction of God’s creation and created order. In the wake of the wars waged by the Hellenistic kings and the penetration of Hellenistic culture, the poets who created these mythic materials experience reality with an intensity that led them to posit a force qualitatively greater and other than the humans who perpetrated these evils [emphasis mine].”

183 In short, I am sympathetic to readings of BW that do not see the Jerusalem temple as profaned and rejected, at least irrevocably so; cf. Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 131ff, who intimates an interpretation similar to what I am suggesting: “That some of God’s own angels will fall into transgression certainly does not constitute a prediction that all earthly priests will inevitably fall short [emphasis retained].” He also rightly points out that, void of a specific critique of the Jerusalem temple, the notion of an archetypal heavenly sanctuary actually serves to bolster the efficacy (and thus authority) of the earthly one.

184 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 67, conjectures that BW’s writers may have been preeminent among the chosen/righteous but suggests this cautiously: “[W]ho [the authors of BW] were, and to what extent they were in any sense superiors of other colleagues, is a secret that is hidden behind their pseudepigraphic mask.” On the same subject, Reed, Fallen Angels, 61ff, is also cautious. For a developed thesis that those responsible for 1 Enoch were part of a Second Temple Period movement, see the “Enochic Judaism” proposal of Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, passim.

185 An indication that the authors of BW should be differentiated from other Jews is how the Torah is used. On the one hand, the language and imagery of Deut 33 – the so-called “blessing of Moses” – have been detected in the opening lines of BW (cf. 1:1-9); references to the blessings of God’s people and a theophany at Sinai are common to both texts, and the presence of these features has led some scholars to the conclusion that the Sinai-revealed Torah would be the basis for the eschatological judgment described in these verses; cf. James C. VanderKam, “The Theophany of 1 Enoch 1:3b-7, 9,” V/TS 23 (1973): 136-38; Lars Hartman, Asking for a
pseudepigraphic attribution of the vision to the enigmatic Enoch, who is portrayed as an exalted, angel-like priest, and who may, in some sense, represent BW’s authors. Third, despite its focus on authoritative revelation, BW is not rigidly exclusivist. Nickelsburg describes the “righteous”/“chosen” as “true Israel,” but this is too strong a characterization, especially if the same designation is used to refer to the Qumran sectarians. As others have noted, there are no explicit terminological indications that a

---

Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5 (Lund: Gleerup, 1979), 42-44. But it has also been highlighted that the Mosaic covenant does not occupy center stage in BW. For example, whereas God comes from Sinai in Deut 33:2, God descends to Sinai in 1 En. 1:4; as Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 48, points out, “this slight change is significant. Sinai has a place in Enoch’s revelation, but it is not the ultimate source.” Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 52, summarizes this reading as follows: “[The authors] have leapfrogged Moses and identified Enoch as the primordial recipient of all heavenly wisdom. This devaluing of the character of Moses is evident at the very beginning of the corpus (1:1-9), which places in the mouth of Enoch a text that was modeled after the Blessing of Moses (Deut 33). Cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 321.

186 Enoch is assigned two priestly privileges of note: access to the innermost part of the heavenly sanctuary and an intercessory role, which are captured in God’s response to the patriarch in 15:2: “Go and say to the watchers of heaven, who sent you to petition in their behalf, ‘You should petition in behalf of men, and not men in behalf of you.’” VanderKam, Enoch and the Growth, 131, notes that Enoch not only associates with angels in BW, but his actions also imply that there are heavenly beings he outranks. Angel, Otherworldly, 31-32, suggests that Michael’s intercessory role is (at least partially) taken up by Enoch (cf. 12:3-6; 14:4-7; 15:2-16:4) and that Enoch’s access to the divine throne is all the more profound in light of the fact that some (most?) angels were not granted such privileges (see above); cf. Bautch, “The Heavenly Temple, the Prison in the Void, and the Uninhabited Paradise,” 38; Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests, 18; Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 576-587. The conclusion of Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 62, that Enoch’s status is indicative of BW being “anti-angelic,” is an overstatement. On the possibility that Enoch’s scribal activity (cf. 12:4; 13:6; 15:1) served to mitigate the tension that existed in Early Judaism between the hereditary office of the priesthood and the non-hereditary scribal office, see Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests, 30.

187 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 67, states that in the same way the namesake of the Book of Daniel is a stand-in for the Maskilim, Enoch is a stand-in for BW’s authors. Rowland, The Open Heaven, 232-247, goes even further by suggesting that the thermal descriptions in 14:8-23 reflect the physical aspects of the visionary’s ascent experience. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 315, emphasizes the authority carried by the scene, but he does not offer a suggestion as to who might stand behind Enoch. Similarly, Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 64-66, highlights the authority inherent in Enoch’s ascent, the ultimate goal of which is to benefit Israel, but he does not allow that the details of the vision reflect the experience of a visionary. In short, I see no reason to drive a wedge between the authoritative benefit of casting Enoch as the recipient of the vision, and the possibility that Enoch is a stand-in for BW’s authors (who perhaps had visionary experiences of their own), on the other. Given that BW envisions heaven as a temple, the role of Enoch cannot be understated, as the status and privilege accorded the patriarch may be suggestive of the belief that the truly righteous could be granted that which was normally the prerogative of angelic priests. But this is, at best, only implied by the text.

188 So Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 147.

189 I.e., the texts I will examine in Chapters Four and Five are more appropriately characterized as exclusivist or “sectarian,” and I will use the designations true/ideal Israel to refer to how the Yahad understood their reconstitution of Israel’s covenant.
exclusivist identity is at work in BW, and even if the myth of the watchers reflects a priestly dispute among Second Temple Period Jews, it is true that the “party lines are not clearly drawn.”

The epithet “plant of righteous” (10:16c) echoes biblical language for ethnic Israel (cf. Isa 60:21; 61:3), and while it has been proposed that the use of this language was an elitist usurpation by BW’s authors, I see no reason to rule out that this “plant” is wider Israel, who are perhaps stirred by the knowledge and wisdom of the “chosen”/“righteous.” The same verse declares that the plant “will become a blessing” (cf. Gen 12:1-3), which seems to be related to the markedly non-exclusivist statement that “all the sons of men will become righteous” and that “all the people will worship [God]” (10:21). Though in some tension with BW’s judgment of wicked humanity, this verse reveals a strong universalistic leaning. Lastly, Reed has challenged the assumption that the ascent or otherworldly journey apocalypses are necessarily the product of small, isolated, antiestablishment groups, and instead points to an emphasis on “an apocalyptic epistemology that celebrates the didactic dimension of cosmological, geographical, and ouranographical knowledge.”

In light of the fact that the fallen watchers have transgressed the very boundaries of the created order and have thus ignored the ontological distinctions inherent to creation’s proper

190 Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 72; cf. Nickelsburg, “The We and the Other,” 264-265, who, even though elsewhere emphasizes what he considers to be the exclusivist nature of nature of BW (see above), acknowledges that the main antagonists of the text are the “nonhuman Other” (i.e., not other Jews).
191 Cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 444-445.
192 So Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 226.
195 Reed, Fallen Angels, 62. For further on revealed wisdom as a hallmark of 1 Enoch, see especially, Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 52-54; cf. idem, “Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity,” in To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and “Others” in Late Antiquity (eds., Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 74-91; Randal A. Argall, 1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 101-107.
functioning, it is ironic that BW resolves this cataclysm through the supernatural revelation to humanity via “Enoch” that God and his faithful angels exist and act to bring vindication and peace to the entire created order. Yet even the knowledge of these angels and the hope of assistance from them was, on its own, insufficient; not until God arrives with his angelic holy ones (cf. 1:1-9) will BW’s envisioned future come to pass.

In short, these observations suggest that the import of BW’s presentation of angels associated with Israel is found in the revealed knowledge of the existence of these guardians and priests and their leader, Michael, who protected the people and interceded for them, ridded the world of sin and its causes, and served as the model and validation of the earthly priesthood. The actions of Michael and his comrades were for the encouragement and benefit of the “plant of righteous” (i.e., Israel), who, in turn, would becoming a blessing to all of humankind. That this knowledge was revealed to the pious, ante-diluvian hero, Enoch, grants a measure of authority to both the vision itself and those for whom Enoch is a presumably a stand-in, BW’s authors.

3.3.2: THE ANIMAL APOCALYPSE (1 Enoch 85-90)

The section of 1 Enoch known as the Book of Dreams has two major parts, both of which describe Enoch as conveying the content of supernatural revelations to his son, Methusaleh. But rather than depicting Enoch as ascending to the divine throne, BD has the patriarch recounting two dream-visions, the second of which is relevant to this thesis. Known as the

196 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 41.
197 Cf. 83:1: “And now, my son, Methusaleh, I will show you all the visions that I saw; before you I will recount (them). Two visions I saw before I took a wife … .” For a recent examination of the genre of dream-visions in the Qumran Aramaic texts, see Andrew B. Perrin, “Dream-Visions in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls” (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 2013); published as The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelations in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls (JASSup 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).
Animal Apocalypse (henceforth, AA),\textsuperscript{198} this text has been understood to contain references to angels associated with Israel.

AA is a retelling of Israelite/Jewish history in which time is divided into three distinct eras: the “remote past” (85:3-89:9), the “present” (89:9-90:27), and the “ideal future” (90:28-38).\textsuperscript{199} The most distinctive feature of AA, however, is its allegorical representation of humans as animals,\textsuperscript{200} hence the title given to the text by scholars; the allegory also includes the presentation of angels as humans.\textsuperscript{201} In addition to contributing to the generic diversity of 1 Enoch\textsuperscript{202} and giving the work a typical or timeless character,\textsuperscript{203} AA’s allegorical treatment of history allows its author(s) to integrate the various players of Israel’s cosmic drama onto a single stage:

\[AA\] … show[s] history as it really is, a great playing field where God, angels and demons compete for possession of and control over the humans that pass in and out of it. By means of the allegory, the author has been able to level this playing field so that he can imaginatively present the whole hierarchy of God, angels and demons, and humans as acting on the same playing field. The allegory bridges the cosmic dualism between heaven and earth, and the angels are seen as being as much a part of the life of Israel as a shepherd is a part of the life of a sheep.\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{198} AA is found in 85:1-90:42.

\textsuperscript{199} As articulated by Patrick A. Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 3; cf. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 354, who classifies these eras as “creation to the flood,” “the renewal of creation to the great judgment,” and “the second renewal into an open future”; also see Daniel C. Olson, A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: ‘All Nations Shall Be Blessed’ (SVTP 24; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 14, who emphasizes that the hallmark of AA’s envisioned future is the transformation of the nation of Israel, who will be a universal blessing as per Gen 12:1-3; see below.

\textsuperscript{200} It should be noted that Israelites/Jews are presented as kosher or clean animals; Gentiles are presented as unclean animals.

\textsuperscript{201} On angels appearing as men in apocalyptic literature, cf. 1 En. 17:1; Dan 7:13; 8:15; 9:21; 10:5; also see Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse, 245.

\textsuperscript{202} Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 360.

\textsuperscript{203} Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 70; cf. Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse, 27: “[The] allegory serves admirably in any propaganda war since its basic function is to subvert normal language that has been traditionally pressed into service for the dominant party. Agents, objects, and ideals can be caricatured in new ways that may be more natural to the narrative fiction than to the reality it represents.”

\textsuperscript{204} Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse, 27-28.
The angels associated with the Gentile nations are allegorized as seventy malevolent shepherds who have no small role as it relates to the fate of Israel throughout its history. The violence imposed by the seventy shepherds is great, and their rules are divided respectively into four reigns of 12, 23, 23, and 12 shepherds, which correspond approximately to the Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid periods; this violent chaos is thus limited within the strictures of divine order and providence. Moreover, the archangel Michael has been interpreted as having a role in 90:13-14ff (see below), a passage which corresponds to events of the Maccabean revolt; this section is used to date AA to the mid to late 160s BCE, and angelic assistance was therefore part of the “whole hierarchy of God” that brought Israel another step closer to the ideal future anticipated by AA’s authors.

After AA relays its own account of the fall of the angelic rebels (86:1-6), Enoch sees seven, white-clad figures who have the appearance of men (87:1-4). Since men signify angels in AA, it is thus widely accepted that these seven “men” correspond to the seven archangels mentioned elsewhere in 1 Enoch: three of the archangels transport or translate Enoch to an elevated location so he can best view what is going to transpire on Earth, and from this vantage point Enoch witnesses the remaining four archangels act as agents of judgment against the fallen watchers and the giant offspring fathered by them (87:1-88:3).

---

205 On the background of “seventy” as it relates to the shepherds, see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 391-393.
207 For issues in the dating of AA, see Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse, 61-79; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 360-361; Olson, A New Reading, 216-218.
208 These verses describe the fallen watchers as “stars,” a designation that highlights yet again the astral-angelic association in ancient Judaism.
209 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 374 summarizes the matter as follows: “The [archangels] are numbered in two groups. The four, who will be active in 88:1-89:1, correspond to the four in chap. 10 [= Sariel, Raphael, Gabriel, and Michael]. The other three fill the complement of seven mentioned in chap. 20 [= Uriel, Raguel, and Remiel] … .”
While the fact that their raiment is white may suggest that the archangels have a priestly status, there is no imagery or language of a heavenly temple as there is in BW.

Key references to nationally associated angels are found in relation to the dominant concept of the work noted above: that God has utilized seventy “shepherds” to rule successively over the “sheep,” that is, Israel. In the context of the apostasy of the pre-exilic monarchy, God charges the shepherds with the following bleak instructions:

“Every one of you from now on shall pasture the sheep, and everything that I command you, do. I am handing them over to you duly numbered, and I will tell you which of them are to be destroyed. Destroy them.” And [God] handed those sheep over to them (89:59-60).

There are many instances in the Hebrew Bible where God or the leaders of Israel are referred to as shepherds, with Ezek 34 and Zech 11 constituting the most detailed negative examples of the metaphor (cf. Pss 23:1-6; 80:2; 100:3; Isa 40:11). In keeping with AA’s allegorical scheme, the shepherds – a human vocation – should be understood to be angels. While these shepherds have been instructed by God to facilitate the punishment of disobedient Israel (cf. 89:58, 68), it is clear that the shepherds have malevolently overstepped their mandate. Scholars have not missed the affinity these angelic shepherds have with Deut 32:8 and its “sons of god,” whom the God of Israel has appointed to rule over the Gentile nations. But as Nickelsburg rightly points out, the character of AA’s shepherds is more akin

---


211 However, AA does ascribe an intercessory role to the archangels (cf. 89:70-71, 76-77; 90:14, 17), the priest-like connotations of which were noted in my discussion of BW; see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 374.

212 See especially Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 391, who has devoted an excursus to the topic: “The Biblical Sources of the Idea of the Negligent Shepherds.”


214 I will address the mechanics/worldview of this arrangement, below.
to the unjust מנהגו and נברר of Ps 82:6,\textsuperscript{215} for this reason, the shepherds are widely identified as the gods or angels of the nations.\textsuperscript{216}

The divine response to the injustice of the shepherds is unexpected. Instead of intervening himself or sanctioning an immediate angelic counter assault, God instructs a scribe to record the actions of the shepherds; 89:61-64 states that

another he summoned and said to him, “Observe and see everything that the shepherds do against the sheep, for they will destroy more of them than I have commanded them. Every excess and destruction that is done by the shepherds, write down – how many they destroy at my command, and how many they destroy on their own. Every destruction by each individual shepherd, write down against them. And by number read them in my presence – how many they destroy, and how many they hand over to destruction, so that I may have this testimony against them, that I may know every deed of the shepherds, that I may measure them and see what they are doing – whether they are acting according to the command that I gave them, or not. And do not let them know it, and do not show them or rebuke them. But write down every destruction by the shepherds, one by one, in his own time, and bring it all up to me” (cf. 89:70-71, 76-77; 90:14, 17, 22).

The consensus opinion is that this scribe is an angel: not only is the figure referred to as “another” in 89:61 – which should likely not be taken to mean that he is another malevolent shepherd but rather that the scribe is another angel\textsuperscript{217} – AA also later announces that the

\textsuperscript{215} Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 391, 395; Deut 32:8 and Ps 82 were discussed in Chapter Two, above.

\textsuperscript{216} So Charles, \textit{The Book of Enoch}, 200; cf. Black, \textit{The Book of Enoch}, 200; Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 98, 108-109; Collins, \textit{The Apocalyptic Imagination}, 68-69; Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 145. Contra Tiller, \textit{The Animal Apocalypse}, 53-54, who views the shepherds as \textit{Israel}'s angelic patrons, whom God has turned against the nation; cf. Carr, \textit{Angels and Principalities}, 31-32. When the seventy shepherds are introduced in 89:59, it is interesting to note that they are not the only ones addressed by God: “And he said to the shepherds and their subordinates [emphasis added] …” (cf. 89:69). As Tiller, \textit{The Animal Apocalypse}, 325, notes, the Ethiopic word used is the (collective) singular \textit{dammal}, meaning someone who is bound in service to another, thus his translation, “retinue”; in addition to Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 387, who translates the word as “subordinates,” cf. Olson, \textit{A New Reading}, 192, who prefers “associates”; E. Issac, “1 [Ethiopic Apocalypse of] Enoch,” OTP 1:68, who translates it as “colleagues.”

\textsuperscript{217} See Tiller, \textit{The Animal Apocalypse}, 326, who, in addition to noting that the Ethiopic text is problematic at this point, states: “It is not entirely clear who this ‘other’ is. Surely, he is not another shepherd. Apparently the allegory has faded and what is meant is another angel?” cf. Black, \textit{The Book of Enoch}, 271.
scribe is “one of those seven white ones” (90:22) who acts as an agent of judgment against the excessive shepherds.218

But a number of scholars have identified the angelic scribe more specifically as the archangel Michael.219 In addition to the fact that the scribe-as-Michael interpretation is extant in the marginal notes of certain Ethiopic mss,220 it is widely held that AA refers to the events of 1 Macc 4:30-35 and its theological development in 2 Macc 11:6-12 where angelic assistance is highlighted.221 The relevant verse is found at 90:14:

And I looked until that man came who wrote the names of the shepherds and brought (them) before the Lord of the sheep and he helped [that ram] and showed it everything; his help came down to that ram.

That the ram with the large horn – likely a reference to Judas Maccabeus222 – receives assistance from the angel is clear; but since the scribe is not only identified as one of the archangels but also cast as Israel’s guardian and assigned a role in the downfall of the shepherds (90:22ff), commentators have justifiably proposed that the angelic scribe is Michael.223

---

218 This verse refers back to the seven, white-clad archangels first mentioned in AA at 87:2ff. Moreover, the angelic scribe serves as a heavenly witness and intercessor throughout chapters 88-90, roles which are in keeping with BW’s portrayal of the archangels.


221 Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 37. Due to its similarities with the War Scroll, I will briefly discuss 2 Macc 11:8-10 in Chapter Four, below.

222 Most scholars understand the figure of 1 En. 90:10ff to be Judas; cf., e.g., Tiller, *The Animal Apocalypse*, 62-63, 355; Nickelsburg, 1 En 1, 400; Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 146; Olson, *A New Reading*, 213; contra Torrey, “Alexander Jannaeus and the Archangel Michael,” 208-211, who has proposed that the horn was John Hyrcanus.

223 Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 37, summarizes the interpretation as follows: “To begin with, it is more likely that this figure is one of the four named archangels whose missions parallel Michael’s, Gabriel’s,
In order to put *AA*'s envisioned angelic guardianship in perspective, it is important to note that the authors make no attempt to romanticize Israel’s history. The nation or significant portions of it are often said to have “strayed” (89:33, 51) or have been “blinded” (89:41, 74), and the matter becomes acute during the divided monarchy, when *AA* states that the people “went astray in everything” (89:54ff.). The divine response to this apostasy is to “abandon” (89:55) the sheep to various wild beasts, that is, Israel’s enemies. Yet despite Enoch’s protestation to the devastation, God remains silent and actually “rejoices” (89:58) in the Babylonian conquest.

What happens next in the narrative – the commissioning of the seventy angelic shepherds – not only reinforces the bleak perspective of Israel’s history held by *AA*’s authors, but also highlights an important aspect of the worldview operative in the text. In short, God’s abandonment of the flock and the apostasy that prompted it are heightened by the handing over of the sheep to the shepherds: no longer is the Lord of the sheep the subject of verbs of which the sheep are beneficiaries, and God effectively distances himself

---

224 E.g., lions, leopards, wolves, etc.; on the identification of the wild beasts with specific Gentile nations, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 385.

225 Cf. 89:57: “And I began to cry out with all my might and to call to the Lord of the sheep and to show him concerning the sheep, because they were devoured by all the wild beasts.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 385, remarks that “in the Enochic corpus, [Enoch’s plea] functions like angelic intercession”; see the similar sentiments in *BP* (see 13:47; 22:12).

226 On this point, see Tiller, *The Animal Apocalypse*, 322-323, who emphasizes *AA*’s focus on the waywardness of Israel’s past history and God’s righteous prerogative to judge.

227 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 389-390.

228 As is the case numerous times from the Exodus onward; cf. *1 En*. 89:28ff.
from Israel when he hands over the sheep to the shepherds. Not to be missed, however, are the mechanics of this arrangement:

This scene takes place in heaven,\(^{229}\) where the Lord of the sheep summons first the seventy shepherds and then an angelic scribe, who will be responsible to report to God in the heavenly courtroom. … The scenario is that God delivers the sheep to the shepherds and their associates [89:58, 68], and the shepherds hand over the sheep to the wild beasts and birds of prey for destruction. In so doing, however, they deliver for destruction more than they should and thus act as negligent, malevolent, and disobedient shepherds. God is aware of this malfeasance of office before he delivers the sheep to the shepherds, but this foreknowledge is accompanied by God’s determination to hold the shepherds responsible for their actions [emphasis mine].\(^{230}\)

The wild beasts and birds of prey are, of course, Israel’s enemies. Thus, in the commissioning of the angelic shepherds we have another example of earthly realities paralleling those of heaven.

It is interesting, however, that the faithful counterpart to the malevolent shepherds, the angelic scribe, is not depicted as influencing earthly realities, at least in the same way the shepherds do. To be sure, the scribe records, testifies, and intercedes for God’s people,\(^{231}\) yet there is no mention of this figure engaging the shepherds in a heavenly battle with earthly consequences. As discussed above, scholars have suggested that the angelic scribe is Michael; and while it is true that the role of the angelic scribe in 90:13-14ff has affinities with that of Michael as portrayed, for example, in Dan 7-12,\(^{232}\) a distinction needs to be made:

Michael’s role in the Book of Daniel is largely a heavenly one with earthly import whereas the

\(^{229}\) There is debate as to when the heavenly commissioning of the shepherds occurs vis-à-vis events on earth. Most scholars see their malevolent role as beginning during God’s abandonment of the sheep as described in 89:55 (i.e., slightly before the shepherds’ formal introduction in 89:59 = ca. 604-587 BCE), but some view it has beginning as early as the Assyrian conquest of the Northern Kingdom (ca. 722 BCE). See the excursus of Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 39-393, entitled, “The Chronology of the Vision: Seventy Shepherds Ruling for Seventy Weeks of Years”; cf. Olson, *A New Reading*, 191-192.

\(^{230}\) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 390.

\(^{231}\) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 390; see above.

\(^{232}\) As is frequently noted by commentators; cf., e.g., Hannah, “Guardian Angels and National Angelic Patrons,” 421; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 391; Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 146; Olson, *A New Reading*, 218.
angelic scribe’s activities, at least in his role as “Israel martial champion,”\textsuperscript{233} takes place on earth.\textsuperscript{234}

An important observation is that the earthly actions of the angelic scribe are set within the context of what is a notable feature of \textit{AA}’s depiction of Israel: a militant role for the people (cf. 90:6ff). While the rams who rally to fight alongside Judas have traditionally been identified as the \textit{Hasidim} (90:10), recent scholarship has been more cautious on this point.\textsuperscript{235} For the purposes of this study, it is sufficient to note that \textit{AA} is among a group of 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. BCE texts that depict not just Israel’s history, in general, but the post-exilic period, in particular, in an unfavorable light.\textsuperscript{236} This reality is especially evident at two points: 89:73-74, which mentions the blindness of the people and the pollution of the temple,\textsuperscript{237} and 90:6-7, which reports the birth of lambs who “began to open their eyes and to see and to cry out to the flock.” The latter verses refer to the emergence of enlightened reformers who were not content with the religious status quo, and it is possible this group represents the authors’ own.\textsuperscript{238} Whether \textit{AA} and other texts testify to a singular reform movement or a

\textsuperscript{233} Olson, \textit{A New Reading}, 218.

\textsuperscript{234} Even when God instructs the scribe to round up the shepherds for judgment in 90:20-27, this scene takes place on earth; see Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 403. Moreover, the scribe’s role on earth may be to counter what Olson, \textit{A New Reading}, 218, calls the “surprising” mention of the angelic shepherds in the enemy coalition found in 90:13.

\textsuperscript{235} So Olson, \textit{A New Reading}, 214; Tiller, \textit{The Animal Apocalypse}, 109-115, 356; Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 363, 400.

\textsuperscript{236} See the excursus of Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 398-400, entitled, “Traditions about a Religious Awakening in the Hellenistic Period,” which examines the similarities between \textit{AA}, the \textit{Apocalypse of Weeks}, the \textit{Damascus Document}, etc. Common themes include criticism of the temple, cult, and priesthood.

\textsuperscript{237} Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 395: “Employing language possibly taken from Mal 1:7 and 12, the author asserts that from its inception the cult of the Second Temple did not follow correct laws of ritual purity.”

\textsuperscript{238} See the helpful historical summary of Olson, \textit{A New Reading}, 210-211; cf. Tiller, \textit{The Animal Apocalypse}, 101.
series of such movements is uncertain. Nevertheless, it is clear that those responsible for
support the Maccabean uprising as at least part of what would contribute to the
reestablishment of “traditional religious observance”; the requested and received
intervention of Michael in 90:13-14 only lends theological warrant to this militant modus
operandi.

To bring together the various parts of this discussion, two additional points need to
be made. First, angelic assistance on its own is not sufficient to usher in the eschaton as AA
anticipates it: the theophanic scenes of 90:15ff suggest that it will only be God’s direct
intervention and judgment that secures Israel’s future. Second, it is clear that not all Gentiles
and apostate Jews are destroyed in the final judgment since the pure and glorious future
envisioned by AA includes the eradication of the blindness that formerly plagued the sheep,
a new Jerusalem and new temple, the resurrection and conversion of the judged wild beasts
and birds of prey (i.e., Gentiles) that previously ravaged the flock and the total
transformation of humanity to its “primordial righteousness and perfection” (cf. 90:20-36).
The snow-white bull which appears in 90:37-38 has been variously interpreted, but its
introduction immediately prior to the transformation of all creatures to snow-white cows
suggests that this figure, at minimum, is the God-ordained catalyst which stands at the head
of transformed humanity.

239 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 400, characterizes the movement(s) of these texts as having “an
eschatological worldview that was authenticated by claims of revelation.”
242 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 407.
243 E.g., the messiah. For discussion and bibliography, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 406-408, who
points out that the transformation to white cows is a return to the one species from which all species came; cf.
In short, the overall import of *AA* has similarities to what we witnessed with *BW*: the revelation that the angelic scribe/Michael provided intercession for Israel in the midst of chaotic circumstances would have served as an encouragement to those who viewed themselves as faithful to God; that this same angel responded to the prayers of the people by aiding the Maccabean warriors on the battlefield would have been all the more significant for those anticipating God's direct and decisive intervention (90:15-17). But *AA* is also clear that these angelic activities were ultimately part of a plan that was not just for the benefit of the people of Israel but also for humankind more broadly, since the glorious future envisioned by the text is universalistic insofar as a significant number of apostate Jews and sinful Gentiles survive the final judgment to be part of a restored humanity.

3.3.3: THE EPISTLE OF ENOCH (1 Enoch 91-108)

The *Epistle of Enoch* (henceforth, *EE*), is comprised of a number of different traditions that have been brought together within a testament-like framework in which Enoch is presented as imparting revelation and wisdom to his entire family. The most well-known portion of *EE* is the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (henceforth, *AW*), a historical overview that divides history

---

244 On the significance of 90:17, see the comments of Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 361.
245 As is also the case with *BW*; see Nickelsburg, “We and the Other,” 266.
246 *EE* includes the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (93:1-10; 91:11-17; see further below); an *Exhortation* (91:1-10, 18-19); the *Epistle* proper (from which the name of the larger section comes; 92:1-5; 93:11-105:2); the *Birth of Noah* (106:1-107:3); an *Eschatological Admonition* (108:1-15); see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* (CEJL; New York: de Gruyter, 2007), 1. Given that *EE* is this amalgam of traditions, issues of dating and provenance are difficult to determine with certainty; however, a 2nd cent. BCE composition of chapters 91-107 – and their subsequent editing into a collection – is likely. There was no extant evidence of chapter 108 among the Qumran mss of *1 Enoch*, and it has been suggested this chapter was added to the tradition ca. 100 CE; cf. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 217; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 427-428, 554; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 1, 691-694.
247 It should be noted that a Qumran ms of *BD* (cf. 4QEn*ð* = 4Q212) has confirmed what scholars have long suspected regarding *AW*: the Ethiopic tradition has misplaced the conclusion of the apocalypse so that *AW* is actually 93:3-10 + 91:11-17; see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 414-415.
into ten periods or “weeks.” *AW* has numerous affinities with *AA*, including the emergence of enlightened reformers – likely a reference to authors’ own circle – who will take up arms against the wicked; the “chosen” (93:10) therefore have a role in the advent of the righteous eschaton that will arrive in its fullness at the end of *AW*’s tenth and final week (cf. 9:17). *AW* thus connects thematically with the ethical exhortations that precede and follow it (cf. 91:18; 94:1-5); indeed, *EE* is largely paraenetic in nature, encouraging the reader to walk in righteous paths and to avoid paths of violence and wickedness, especially oppression of the poor. Most significant for this thesis is that *EE* refers to the roles angels have in securing not just the punishment of the wicked but also the glorious fate of the righteous.

That being said, angels receive relatively limited attention in *AW*, a facet which may be due to the brevity of the work. The first possible reference to angels associated with Israel occurs during *AW*’s fourth week, with 93:6 stating that

\[
\text{after this will arise a fourth week, and at its conclusion, visions of the holy and righteous will be seen; and a covenant for all generations and a tabernacle will be made in it.}
\]

This verse, the only reference to the Mosaic covenant in *1 Enoch*, describes the events of Sinai. Though the “holy and righteous” may refer to pious Israelites (cf. 100:5), it is better

\[\text{248 Other affinities with } AA \text{ are the depiction of history and its anticipated future, which occur within the strictures of divine order and providence, and a negative view of the post-exilic period and its temple. For a detailed comparison of } AW \text{ and } AA, \text{ see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 398-399, 447.}\]
\[\text{249 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 415, 454-456.}\]
\[\text{250 Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 66.}\]
\[\text{251 Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 123.}\]
\[\text{252 Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 119.}\]
\[\text{253 Cf. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 107; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 446.}\]
\[\text{254 Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 103.}\]
understood as a reference to angels in 93:6, even if the expression is an “unusual” one for angelic beings.\(^{255}\) Specifically, the “holy and righteous” have been understood as the angels involved in the theophany at Sinai; as Stuckenbruck explains, “The claim in Exodus 24:9-11 that Moses, Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders saw ‘the God of Israel’ on the mountain could have been taken as a vision of the heavenly throne room, from which the notion of the presence of an angelic entourage is not remote.”\(^{257}\) When I discussed 1 En. 14, it was observed that only certain angels were permitted to be in closest proximity to God. Thus, if the angelic interpretation of the “righteous and holy” of 93:6 is correct, the angels involved are presumably the angelic priests who have access to the innermost part of the heavenly temple. Moreover, as in BW and AA, angels are charged with the priestly task of intercession, with 99:3 announcing the following:

> Then be prepared, O righteous, and present your petitions as a reminder; offer them as a testimony before the angels, that they may bring in the sins of the unrighteous before the Most High as a reminder.\(^{258}\)

The righteous are thus comforted with the knowledge that prayers offered in the midst of persecution are heard – and that they have heavenly intercessors who will testify on their behalf at the eschatological judgment (cf. 97:6; 99:3; 100:10; 102:3; 104:1-8; 108:3, 7).\(^{259}\)

---

\(^{255}\) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 446.

\(^{256}\) Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 104 n. 212, observes that the angelic interpretation is strengthened by the fact that an Ethiopic ms omits the “righteous”; i.e., the reading is the “holy [ones].”

\(^{257}\) Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, 105; so Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 446: “The author may be alluding to an exposition of Exod 24:9-11 that described a vision of the heavenly court like 1 Enoch 14 or Daniel 7.” As will be examined later in this chapter, *Jubilees* ascribes an important role to angels at Sinai.

\(^{258}\) Likewise, 104:1 states that “the angels in heaven make mention of you for good before the glory of the Great One, and your names are written before the glory of the Great One.”

\(^{259}\)Nickelsburg, “The We and the Other,” 268; cf. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 125-126, who notes that angels are not specifically mentioned as writing records of sins of the unrighteous (against the righteous), but such activity is strongly intimated. Given the role of the angelic scribe/Michael in AA, this is a sound reading.
It was noted above that the “chosen” are likely a reference to the author’s own group (93:10), but it seems that AW’s author holds the post-exilic period in an even lower esteem than the author(s) of AA. This perspective can be seen in the designation, “the chosen will be chosen, as witnesses of righteousness from the eternal plant of righteousness” (93:10), which, again, is at least partially deserved due to their status as the recipients of divine revelation.

While the text therefore gives the impression that the author’s group is the faithful embodiment of Israel (cf. 99:2; 104:12), it is important to note that they are chosen to testify to righteousness. And that they are effective in doing so is evident in 91:14, which exclaims that “all humankind will look to the path of eternal righteousness” (cf. 100:6; 105:1-2).

---

260 Note the comments of Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91-108, 122: “Significantly, there is no mention of any return from exile and, with it, of the Second Temple. Instead, the scattering of Israel in the sixth week is seamlessly followed in the seventh by the rise of ‘wicked generation.’ … The absence of any reference to the people’s return to the land or rebuilding of the Temple is striking. It is in stark contrast with references to making or building of ‘[the tabernacle]’ in the fourth week (93:6) and to building of the ‘house of glory’ in the fifth (v. 7). The author thus leaves the impression, that as far as he and his community are concerned, the Second Temple is of no consequence in relation to God’s plan for Israel. In this respect, he may be as, or even more radical than the Animal Apocalypse, in which the author, despite serious misgiving about the Second Temple, could nevertheless at least give Judas Maccabeus – and, by association, the cult – principled, though temporary, support in the conflict against the Seleucid oppressors.”

261 I.e., the authors viewed themselves as an enlightened entity within Israel. Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91-108, 124ff, discusses the possible nature of the knowledge disclosed to the “chosen” and concludes that “of chief concern … is the righteous community’s identity as the definitive receptacle of divine disclosure.” On the “eternal plant” as a designation for Israel (from which these “chosen” would emerge), see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 444-445; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch 91-108, 124. Cf. 1 En. 10:16, which, as noted, uses the less exclusivist designation “eternal plant.”

262 As such, God would work through them to inaugurate the eschaton, an era that would begin with the violent destruction of the wicked and the construction of a new temple; 91:12-13 states that, “After this will arise an eighth week of righteousness, in which a sword will be given to all the righteous, to execute righteous judgment on all the wicked, and they will be delivered into their hands. And at its conclusion, they will acquire possessions in righteousness; and the temple of the kingdom of the Great One will be built in the greatness of its glory for all the generations of eternity.” The righteous then have a part in removing wickedness from the world, and thereby help to establish the conditions for the piety and righteousness that will characterize the eternal era that follows the tenth week (cf. 91:15-17).

263 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 448: “The elect are chosen, first of all, to be the recipients of wisdom and knowledge. … But the elect are not chosen simply to be the recipients of the salvation granted through this wisdom and knowledge; they are chosen for a mission, viz., to be witnesses of righteousness.”
As with \textit{BW} and \textit{AA}, the references to judgment in \textit{EE} render these universalistic verses almost paradoxical.\footnote{This is a reference to the biblical text.} But the statements highlight the hope with which all three of the Enochic works examined here look toward the eschaton. More specifically, \textit{EE}'s envisioned future for the righteous includes a relationship with the angels whose intercession and assistance has/will help(ed) them. In a passage that contrasts the present persecutions with their glorious future,\footnote{Cf. \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 529.} 104:2, 4, 6 reveals the following:

Take courage then; for formerly you were worn out by evils and tribulations, but now you will shine like the luminaries of heaven; you will shine and appear, and the portals of heaven will be opened for you. … Take courage and do not abandon your hope, for you will have great joy like the angels of heaven. … Fear not, O righteous, when you see the sinners growing strong and prospering, and do not be their companions; but stay far from all their iniquities, for you will be companions of the host of heaven (cf. 92:4).

These verses are making a comparison: upon death the righteous do not become angels; they are like angels.\footnote{Cf., e.g., Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 129; Stuckenbruck, \textit{1 Enoch} 91-108, 573-574.} The simile is akin to that found in Dan 12:3, but there is a clear distinction between the two texts: whereas Dan 12 suggests that only the Maskilim will shine like stars, the present verses seem to affirm that all righteous people will attain an angel-like afterlife.\footnote{Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch} 1, 529.} Also, the exhortation to the righteous not to associate with sinners in the present is made with the eschatological incentive that the righteous will one day not only be like the angels but also have fellowship with the angels.\footnote{Stuckenbruck, \textit{1 Enoch} 91-108, 577, rightly points out, “Being associates with angelic beings is not a claim about what the author’s community already are by virtue of their covenant faithfulness. Rather, the statement is promissorial … and will be achieved [after the final judgment].” Elsewhere Stuckenbruck mentions that \textit{EE}’s author is refuting the mistaken perspective of his readers, namely, that the flourishing of evildoers will continue. Instead, the lots will be reversed and present suffering of the righteous will give way to the post-final.} As such, the faithful need not fear the coming
decisive judgment of God,\textsuperscript{270} not least because he will arrive with an angelic entourage tasked with the in-gathering of human oppressors “in one place” for judgment (100:4); significantly, the very next verse (100:5) announces that God will “set a guard of the holy angel over all the righteous and holy and they will be kept as the apple of the eye, until evil and sin come to an end”; in other words, the spiritual forces of wickedness can do no harm to the souls of the righteous dead, who are protected by their angelic guardians until the final judgment when, as just noted, they will receive angel-like exaltation and guardianship will become fellowship.\textsuperscript{271}

In closing, \emph{EE} portrays angels as having the priestly role of intercession, and while there are no explicit references to heaven as a temple or angels as priests, the “holy and righteous” of 93:6 are plausibly understood to be the angelic priests who serve in closest proximity to God. As with \emph{AA}, the righteous – so deemed at least partially because they are the privileged recipients of divine revelation and knowledge – will take up arms against the wicked (cf. 91:12-13; 98:12-13). But here there is no explicit mention of martial angelic assistance on the battlefield (or in heaven, for that matter); the only angelic guardianship activities are the protection of the righteous dead and the in-gathering of the sinful humanity for judgment, an event which will only occur at God’s decisive eschatological arrival. Of the three Enochic texts examined in this chapter, \emph{EE} may be the most exclusivistic – yet it paradoxically shares the hopeful vision of the future of \emph{BW} and \emph{AA} that somehow has room for humanity’s redemption, the full, eschatological expression of which is characterized by

\footnotesize{judgment reward of angelic fellowship; see idem, “The ‘Otherworld’ and the Epistle of Enoch,” in \textit{Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World}, 90. In the same volume, John J. Collins, “The Otherworld in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 97, observes that the “angelic afterlife” of 1 En. 104 complements the hope of a transformed earth in \emph{AW}.}

\textsuperscript{270} So Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch 1}, 530.

\textsuperscript{271} So Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch 1}, 500-501.
angel-like glory and even fellowship with the angels. Thus, the knowledge that the angelic guardians and priests associated with Israel exist and act for the benefit of humanity, though not occupying pride of place in *EE*, would have served to encourage those Jews responsible for the text that their present oppression did not go unheard and that the eschaton would bring a dramatic reversal of fortunes for themselves and others.

3.4: Aramaic Levi Document

Found on seven fragmentary mss from Qumran as well as being known from previously discovered texts, the *Aramaic Levi Document* (henceforth, *ALD*) was likely composed in the late 3rd or early 2nd cent. BCE. An influential text, *ALD* is thought to have left its mark on *Visions of Amram, Jubilees*, and other texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, but it is best known for its affinities with *BW* and, particularly, the Greek *Testament of Levi* (henceforth, *T. Levi*). The latter text, which dates to the 2nd cent. CE, is either a Christian composition

---

272 The texts of the Qumran mss of *ALD* have been published as follows: 1QLevi [=1Q21]: Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Mišk, eds., *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 87-91; 4QLevi 41 [=4Q213, 213a, 213b, 214, 214a, 214b]: George Brooke et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 1-72. The work is also known from fragments from the Cairo Geniza (designated as Cambridge Columns a-f; Bodleian Columns a-d), as well as a Greek translation interpolated into an 11th cent. text of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* from the Monastery of Koutloumous known as the Athos ms; see Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1-6. For additional commentary, see Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text From Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

273 See discussions and bibliographies provided by Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document, 19ff*; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 63ff. The paleographic dates of the Qumran *ALD* mss have been estimated as ranging from approx. mid 2nd cent. BCE-mid 1st cent. BCE, and this factor, in conjunction with *ALD*’s impact on other texts, suggests a 3rd cent. or early 2nd cent. date of composition.

274 The affinities between *BW* and *T. Levi* (e.g., a patriarch being granted a vision of the celestial realm, and the notions of heaven as a temple and angels as priests, etc.; see Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 132; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1, 76*) have led to proposals that *BW* and *ALD* (which was a source for *T. Levi*, see below) originated in the same circles; cf., e.g., Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 588-590; Michael E. Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins,” *JEx* 19 (1988): 159-170.

275 Greek *T. Levi* is part of a larger work known as the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*; for text, translation and commentary, see Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985); for a more recent treatment, see Robert A. Kugler, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (GAP; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
outright or came to its present form through the influence of Christian interpolators.276 Nevertheless, it widely held that T. Levi is, in some sense, indebted to ALD,277 and I will thus refer to both documents.

T. Levi is concerned with the patriarch Levi and his priesthood, presenting both the person and his office in a lofty manner that far exceeds the biblical depictions.278 Levi’s vision of heaven (cf. T. Levi 2:5ff) functions as his priestly investiture, and the commissioning import of the text is evident in the angel’s opening declaration to the patriarch in T. Levi 2:10:

You will stand (στήσῃ [from ἵστημι]) close (ἐγγὺς) to the Lord, and you will be his servant (λειτουργός), and you will announce his secrets to men.279

This sacerdotal charge is conveyed elsewhere in T. Levi: not only is Levi adorned with priestly vestments (8:2ff) but his call is also confirmed by a vision of his father, Jacob (9:1ff). The clearest statement on the matter, however, is found in T. Levi 4:2-5:2, which has an angel pronounce Levi as

276 See the helpful summary of the options provided by Kugler, The Testaments, 31-38.


278 E.g., the biblical portrait of Levi (as per Enoch) is absent of any kind of visionary or ascent experience. As Angel, Otherworldly, 58, summarizes the matter, ALD “elevates Levi to unprecedented heights, and attributes to his priesthood royal, sapiential, and other accolades.” For a recent discussion of the biblical texts employed in the “exegetical” development of the Levi tradition, see Perrin, “Dream-Visions,” 129-144. Cf. James L. Kugel, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture (eds., Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffmann; Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013), 3:1724, who points out that ALD and T. Levi “harmonize” two priestly traditions: one that posits an unbroken chain of priests from Adam to Levi (via Enoch et al.) and another that understands Levi to be the first of a hereditary line of priests; for further reading on this topic, see idem, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings,” HTR 86 (1993): 1-64.

279 The use of ἵστημι and ἐγγύς (the verbal form of ἑγγὺς) in priestly contexts were noted in my discussion of BW (cf. 1 En. 14:23; LXX 1 Chr 23:30; 2 Chr 18:18; 29:11; Ezek 44:13-16; 45:4; see Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 585 n. 37); λειτουργός also has a priestly usage (cf. LXX Isa 61:6; Ezra 7:24; Neh 10:40; Ps 102:21 [MT 103:21]; Ps 103:4 [MT 104:4]; Sir 7:30; 50:14).
a servant and a minister of his presence (λειτουργὸν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ). You will cause the light of knowledge to shine in Jacob, and you will be like the sun to the whole seed of Israel. ... Therefore wisdom and understanding have been given to you, so that you may instruct your sons ... Then ... [the Most High] said to me: “Levi, I have given you the blessings of the priesthood.”

Levi’s priesthood is thus specified as having a teaching role (cf. Deut 33:10), which, as just mentioned, includes the disclosure of God’s “secrets” (T. Levi 2:10). Levi is shown various tiers or levels of heaven, the highest of which is God’s dwelling place and is referred to as the “holy of holies.” The correspondence between the Jerusalem sanctuary and that of heaven is obvious and is strengthened by a reference to sacrifices – though here described as “reasonable and bloodless” in nature – and the angels who perform them. Significantly, T. Levi 3:7 styles these beings as οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου, “angels of the Lord’s presence” (cf. Isa 63:9), and the fact that Levi is dubbed with a similar title indicates that the priesthood in which he has been installed is modeled on (and thus validated by) the priesthood of heaven. As Klawans points out, T. Levi 14:3 amounts to a statement that “earthly purity [specifically that of the Levites] is in emulation of heavenly purity.”

---

280 Translations of T. Levi are from Kugel, “Testaments of the Twelve.”

281 It is clear that T. Levi’s portrait of heaven is tiered; less certain is whether T. Levi originally envisioned three or seven levels of heaven; due to its fragmentary condition, ALD’s configuration of the celestial realm is also uncertain. For helpful discussions with bibliography, see Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 132-133; Kugler, From Patriarch to Priest, 181 n. 36; Angel, Otherworldly, 48 n. 104; Kugel, “Testaments of the Twelve,” 3:1725.

282 The “sweet savor/aroma” language of the passage (3:6) is an allusion to the earthly cultic sacrifices (cf. Exod 29:18, 25 et al.), but this has been understood in various ways. On “reasonable and bloodless” as a Christian gloss, which makes the notion of sacrifice “safe” for Christians (cf. Rom 12:1), see Hollander and de Jonge, The Testaments, 138; cf. Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 132. It is possible, however, that heavenly sacrifices (even in a Jewish context) may not have been envisioned as involving animals; see Kugel, “Testaments of the Twelve,” 3:1727; also see my discussion of angelic offerings as referenced in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in Chapter Five, below.

283 The verse reads as follows: “For just as the sky is purer than the earth in the Lord’s eyes, so are you [i.e., the Levitical priests] than all the nations.”

While the above references are from Greek *T. Levi*, it seems that its notion of a heaven-earth correspondence was inherited from *ALD*. For example, though references to the angel of the presence and Levi’s analogous description are not extant in the Aramaic text, *ALD* refers to the patriarch as נַבִּיָּיו אֶלֶּה, “a priest to God Most High” (*Bod*. Col. b 5-6; cf. *Bod*. Col. a 20; 4Q213b 6). The designation is the same as that applied to Melchizedek in Gen 14:10 (cf. 1QapGen 22:15), and given that other texts interpret this enigmatic human priest as an angelic warrior-priest, it has been suggested that a Melchizedek connection would have been a way for *ALD* to establish a correspondence between the earthly priesthood of Levi and the angelic priesthood. Corroborating this sentiment—as well the reference to Levi’s rapport with God in *T. Levi* 2:10—is the pronouncement that the patriarch is “close (בִּרְק) to God and close (בִּרְק) to all his holy ones” (cf. *Bod*. Col. b 21-22). Moreover, the reference to God as the “Lord of the heavens” (cf. *Bod*. Col. b 6) likely functioned to undergird the idea that Levi has a “particular


286 On the Melchizedek tradition and proposals for how it came about, and on this figure’s identification with Michael, see my discussion of 11QMelchizedek in Chapter Four. On the possible references to Melchizedek as the ranking angelic priest in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, which may also cast him as a warrior, see Chapter Five. I will make additional comments on Melchizedek as it pertains to *ALD*, below.


288 As mentioned above, the priestly import of *T. Levi* 2:10 includes the description of Levi as standing “close” (ἐγγὺς) to the Lord. It comes as no surprise, then, that the Athos ms renders the Aramaic בִּרְק as ἑγγὺς; cf. MT and LXX Ezek 45:4, which use a similar combination of words to describe the actions of the priests.
relationship with the heavenly realm.” But it may be that Levi’s closeness to the angelic holy ones extends beyond priestly matters. In his prayer (cf. 4Q213a frg. 1 1:1ff + Mt. Athos ms), Levi asks to be “close” to God (4Q213a frg. 1:18); here, the verb used is בָּרָק, understandably prompting Drawnel to conclude that Levi’s request has a “sacerdotal character.” I am not convinced, however, that priestly matters are the only motivation for these words. Earlier in his prayer, Levi petitions God with the imperative: “do not allow any satan (נֶפֶשׂ) to rule over me” (4Q213a frg. 1 17). Thus, Levi is presumably requesting that his connection to holy ones include protection from the hostile spiritual beings of darkness to which he refers (cf. 4Q213 frg. 4 6). The previously noted interpretation of Melchizedek as a warrior-priest would make Melchizedek the ideal “answer” to Levi’s prayer, and his association with Melchizedek may suggest that Levi’s prayer would be (or has been) answered. Also, T. Levi describes those who adorned Levi in his priestly vestments as “seven men in white clothing” (8:1), which is likely indicative of their status as both archangels and priests. If these are the same as the “seven” who depart from Levi in his

289 Drawnel, An Aramaic Wisdom Text, 260.
290 Drawnel, An Aramaic Wisdom Text, 221.
291 As Drawnel, An Aramaic Wisdom Text, 217, 347, notes, 4QVisions of Amram “already has a full-blown division of the spiritual world between two classes of angelic beings represented by Melchizedek and Melchiresha,” and that “[t]his composition … evidently develops the ideas on the nature of the spiritual world already present in [ALD].” I will address 4QVisions of Amram in the following section of this chapter.
292 I.e., seven angels, which is almost certainly an allusion to the Early Jewish tradition that there were seven – rather than four – archangels (cf. 1 En. 20:1-7); on this topic, see my discussion of BW, above.
293 On white (or linen) clothing of angelic figures as suggestive of a priestly vocation, see Ezek 9:2-11; 10:2; Dan 10:5; 12:6-7. It should also be remembered that seven white-clad angelic figures make an appearance in 1 En. 87:1-4, and it has been suggested that, there, these figures are heavenly priests; see Tiller, The Animal Apocalypse, 245. Cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 51, who summarizes as follows: “The garments of the angels in both Ezekiel and T. Levi recall those that the high priest is to wear once a year on the Day of Atonement when he enters the holy of holies (Lev 16:4). Thus, the white clothing of the angels in T. Levi 8 most likely identifies them as priests. Though the clothing of the seven is not describe in the preserved portions of ALD, it is possible that T. Levi followed ALD in this case.”
dream in *ALD* (cf. 4Q213b 2; *Bod. Col.* a 9), it suggests that the Aramaic text had Levi’s earthly priesthood legitimized by no less than the heavenly priesthood itself.\(^{294}\)

The following observations will assist in drawing my discussion of *ALD* to a close. I highlighted above that *T. Levi* posits a teaching role for Levi and his priesthood (cf. 2:10; 4:2-5:2); the didactic import of *ALD* has been similarly emphasized by Drawnel, who argues that the text reflects a family-based, Levitical education, which espoused the view that “the priestly class is to occupy the leading role in Israel – provided that it keeps the tradition of the forefathers and transmits it to the future priestly generations [since n]eglecting sapiential education leads to abandoning the way of truth and justice, and to the dominion of darkness over the sons of Levi.”\(^{295}\) Kugler proposes a more contentious context for the emergence of *ALD* in that he sees the text as stemming from competition-driven priestly disputes.\(^{296}\)

Given both the limited material with which scholars have to work and its fragmentary nature, any proposals for *ALD*’s origins are tentative (though I am inclined to agree with those who

\(^{294}\) As Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 30ff, notes, Levi’s investiture as an earthly priest in *T. Levi* follows his ascent to heaven, which suggests that the latter legitimized the former. Angel, *Otherworldly*, 53, expounds on this idea by proposing that the collectedness exhibited by Levi during his vision of heaven in *T. Levi* 2-5 – in contrast to the dread of Enoch in *BW* (cf. *1 En.* 14:14-15) – is indicative of the patriarch’s elevated status (noted above) as “near to God and near to all his holy ones” (*Bod. Col.* b 21-22; cf. *T. Levi* 2:10), not of a transformed or perhaps diminished significance of the temple for later Christians, as some have argued (e.g., M. de Jonge, “Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in Testament of Levi X, XIV-XV and XVI,” in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge* [NovTSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1991], 180-190). Once again, extant *ALD* does not reveal the patriarch’s composure during his visions of heaven, and as Angel surmises, “it is possible that Levi’s calmness in *T. Levi* reflects an older notion inherited from *ALD* – the notion that the earthly priesthood of Levi is analogous to and somehow participates in the nature of the angelic priesthood serving God in the celestial temple.” It should also be noted that Levi’s murderous vengeance against the Shechemites, which, in the biblical narrative is initially condemned (cf. Gen 34:1-31; 49:7), is elsewhere celebrated or affirmed as the kind of action apropos for those of priestly lineage (cf. Num 25:12-13; Deut 33:8-11). On the subject of Levi’s Shechemite zealotry being affirmed in *ALD/T. Levi*, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 263; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 102; Perrin, “Dream-Visions,” 130; cf. *ALD* 78 (= *Camb. Col.* d 18). I mention this here due to the fact that other Aramaic texts depict sin-purging/binding of perpetrators to be angelic prerogatives (cf. *1 En.* 10:1ff; 90:22ff; 100:4), which may be yet another way Levi is associated with his priestly angelic counterparts.


\(^{296}\) Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 135-137, contends that *ALD* is a polemic against those who have rejected the ideal priesthood of Levi which emphasizes purity, sapiential matters, and education.
What is clear is that the priesthood is a matter of utmost importance for ALD’s author(s), and for my purposes, it is significant that one of the ways the text seems to assert that the priesthood should have “the leading role in Israel” is to connect it to its angelic exemplar and archetype. This impulse reveals not only that the notion of a correspondence between heaven and earth was central but also that it was considered ideal for Israel’s priests to emulate and to learn from Israel’s heavenly priests. Moreover, the juxtaposition of Levi’s closeness to the holy ones and his request to be delivered from the spiritual forces of darkness suggests that ALD’s authors had a confident belief that the priesthood’s connection to the angelic realm extended beyond priestly matters to protection or guardianship (perhaps because the sanctity and importance of their role as priests necessitated such provision).

3.5: Visions of Amram

Seven fragmentary mss from Cave 4 have been dubbed Visions of Amram (henceforth, VA), so named from its incipit found in 4Q543 frg. 1 1-2:

A copy of the document of the Vision of Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi: Everything which he revealed to his sons and which he appointed for them on the day of [his death … .

---


298 As per his statements regarding BW, Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 133, contends that ALD and T. Levi are not inherently anti-temple/anti-priestly, and I would suggest that a connection to the heavenly temple/priesthood supports these observations insofar as the otherworldly connection contributes to the challenge to the human priests to treat their office with utmost sanctity – a charge which presupposes a high view of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.

299 The mss designated *Visions of Amram* (4Q543-549 [=4QVisions of Amram*]) have been published by Emile Puech, ed., *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529-549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Claredon, 2001), 283-405. However, thematic elements and the absence of any overlap with the other mss indicate that 4Q548 and 4Q549 should not be considered as witnesses to VA; see Robert R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram* (4Q543-547) (SBLSBL 135; New York: Peter Lang, 2010), 35-42.

300 Translations of VA are from Duke, *The Social Location*.
As the reference to Levi indicates, VA is concerned with Israel’s priestly line, and, as such, has been classified as being part of a “series” of Aramaic sacerdotal texts. Given VA’s proposed dependence on the oldest text in this series, ALD, it is estimated that VA was composed in the first half of the 2nd cent. BCE or slightly earlier. In brief, it is the two angelic figures of Amram’s vision that have particular relevance for this thesis.

According to 4Q544 frg. 1 11, Amram sees the two figures “judging” (נין) and having a “great quarrel” (בר רג) concerning him. After making an inquiry as to what he has seen, the two declare to the patriarch that they are “ruling (שלים) over all the sons of men.” It seems as though Amram is then asked by the figures something about their rule.

Amran’s response has not been preserved, but he does relay a description of the appearance of the figures in lines 12-14 of the same fragment:

I raised my eyes and saw. And one from them his appearance […] all his clothes are colorful and dark is the darkness of […]. And the other on one I saw and beho[ld …] in his appearance and his face is smiling and he is covered with […] very […] his eyes.

301 As Michael E. Stone, “Amram,” EDS 1:23-24, points out, ALD, VA, and another text, the Testament of Qahat (4Q542), form a “series of priestly instruction”; for a recent treatment that draws out the thematic similarities of these and other Aramaic works, see Perrin, “Dream-Visions,” 142ff, and the literature cited there. For the most recent contribution to this topic, see Hanna Tervanotko, “A Trilogy of Testaments? The Status of the Testament of Qahat Versus Texts Attributed to Levi and Amram,” in Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures (ed., Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; BETL 270; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 41-59. The sacerdotal concerns of 4Q542 do not include the angelic realm, and it will therefore not be discussed.

302 Paleographic analysis suggests a terminus ante quem of 125 BCE (see Puech, DJD 31, 285-287ff), but as noted in the previous section, ALD is dated to the 3rd or early 2nd cent. BCE. Given the likelihood that VA has developed the thought of ALD (see the preceding section of the present chapter, and further, below), a date of composition for VA no later than the first half of the 2nd cent. BCE is realistic.

303 It has been widely accepted/assumed that Amram is here asked to choose the figure with which he will align himself, a notion that stems from what has become the influential reconstruction of Józef T. Milik, “4QVisions d’Amram et une citation d’Origène,” RB 79 (1972): 79-80, who introduced the verb הָנָּב to line 12. For a recent defense of this reading, see Blake A. Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Vision of Amram (4Q543-547),” JSP 24 (2014): 3-42. However, Andrew B. Perrin, “Another Look at Dualism in 4QVisions of Amram,” Hen 36 (2014): 106-117, has challenged Milik’s reconstruction, arguing that it is less certain than it is often assumed to be. I will return to this issue, below.
4Q544 frg. 2 3 states that the figure associated with darkness is named אֵלֶּחֵי רָשִׁים, "Melchiresha," which means "(my) king of wickedness. An angelic identity for Melchiresha is suggested by the fact that elsewhere in the DSS he is portrayed as an evil angel, who is cursed in a manner reminiscent of the imprecations against Belial in the Community Rule (4Q280 1-7; cf. 1QS 2:4-10). The name of the righteous figure who stands opposite to Melchiresha is not extant, but Milik’s proposal of Melchizedek has found widespread acceptance and is only strengthened by the fact that the namesake of 11QMelchizedek is an angelic benefactor who contends against a wicked adversary (see Chapter Four, below); VA also indicates that each angel had “three names” (cf. 4Q544 frg. 3 1-2), with the following pairs among those suggested: Melchiresha and Melchizedek, the Prince of Darkness and Prince of Light, and Belial and Michael.

Two features of this angelic scenario are noteworthy for my purposes. First, the contrast between the menacing description of Melchiresha308 and the reassuring countenance

---

304 For discussion of 4Q280, see Józef T. Milik, “Milki-sedek et Mlíkí-resha’ dans les anciens écarts juifs et chrétiens,” JJS 23 (1972): 126ff; Paul J. Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Society of America, 1981), 38-42. The angelic identity of Melchiresha is further corroborated if the restoration of אֵלֶּחֵי, “watcher,” is accepted in 4Q544 frg. 2 3; so Milik, “4QVisions d’Amram,” 83; cf. Puech, DJD 31, 327. Note, however, the caution of Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 265, who points out that there is scant evidence for this reading.

305 Melchizedek – meaning “[my] king of righteousness” – is, of course, the perfect counter to Melchiresha; see Milik, “4QVisions d’Amram,” 85-86; cf., e.g., Puech, DJD 31, 329; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 266-268; Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 36.

306 The line reads: שִׁמְאֹת דָּבָר שָׁבֶל, “And he (i.e., the righteous angelic protagonist) said to me, ‘Three name[s …’”; see Puech, DJD 31, 328.

307 On the reconstruction of the three pairs of names, see Milik, “4QVisions d’Amram,” 85-86; Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 33-36; John J. Collins, “Powers in Heaven: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds., John J. Collins et al.; SDSSRI; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 18. For further on 11QMelchizedek, and identifying Melchizedek, Michael, and the Prince of Light as same angelic leader figure, see Chapter Four, below.

308 As it pertains to the description of Melchiresha in 4Q544 frg. 1 13, it is virtually certain that the angel’s appearance is labeled as “dreadful” (7yjd); but what follows requires a greater degree of reconstruction, with Milik, “4QVision d’Amram,” 79-80, influentially proposing 7yelb, “that of a snake”; cf.
of his righteous adversary may suggest that Melchizedek was ideally envisioned as providing Amram and his descendents a measure of protection from his wicked counterpart. Whether Amram is prompted to align himself with one of the angels is, as noted above, not as certain as it is commonly assumed to be.\(^{309}\) That being said, if \(VA\) is dependent on \(ALD\),\(^{310}\) the emphasis the latter places on the conditional nature of the priesthood’s leadership\(^ {311}\) may suggest that in the former Amram was asked to choose a side of the dualistic divide.\(^ {312}\)

Regardless, \(VA\) appears to be an early witness to a dualism that has two angels standing at the heads of an opposing dualistic divide (cf. 1QS 3:13-4:26; \(11QMelch\); \(1QM\)).\(^ {313}\) The
implication, therefore, is that Israel's priestly line has (privileged?) angelic guardianship in Melchizedek. The second noteworthy feature of \textit{VA}'s angelic scenario is related to the first: if Israel's priests have a connection to Melchizedek, it would only make sense that, like the possible connection in \textit{ALD}, there is priestly significance to the relationship. In addition to what may be a reference to Aaron as a “holy priest [to God Most High …” (4Q545 frg. 4 16),\footnote{Puech, DJD 31, 343, restores the end of line 16 as follows: … Nwylo lal «awh CYdq N«h«k. He does so due to similar language in \textit{VA} (4Q543 frg. 22 2), \textit{ALD} (Bod. Col. b 5-6), and the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} (1Q20 22:16), and, if accepted, this reading may be functioning in a manner similar to that proposed for \textit{ALD} (see above) insofar as it establishes a correspondence between the earthly priesthood of Aaron and that of Melchizedek, who in other texts is interpreted as an angelic-warrior priest; see Perrin, “Dream-Visions,” 153.} it is significant that in the same line it may be Melchizedek who makes known to Aaron the הַדְּבָרָה, “mystery of his service.” Perrin notes that a revelatory role for Melchizedek would emphasize that a component of this mystery is a “close connection” with the celestial priesthood, which serves to link the earthly priests “into a chain of command that stretches upwards to the heavens.”\footnote{See Perrin, “Dream-Visions,” 154, who provides a helpful discussion of הַדְּבָרָה in the Aramaic DSS.} I would add, however, that what makes a close connection to the sacerdotal command structure so desirable is that the heavenly priesthood was envisioned as the model or archetype for the very office which \textit{VA} is at pains to establish: Israel’s priesthood.

Duke has argued that \textit{VA} is the product of pre-Hasmonean era, disenfranchised priests who were being oppressed by wealthy elites.\footnote{So Duke, \textit{The Social Location}, 7, 110, and passim.} While this is an interesting possibility, my own sense is that the brevity and fragmentary condition of the text mean that specific proposals for the scribal context of the document need to be considered tentatively. What is most significant for my purposes is the possibility that \textit{VA} is concerned with two things: that

Israel’s priestly line has a relationship to their heavenly counterparts, and that if the earthly priests are to serve as they ought, the basis for their actions must stem from the knowledge granted by the priests of heavenly Israel, of whom Melchizedek may have been envisioned as foremost.

3.6: TOBIT

Six mss of the Book of Tobit were found among the DSS – five in Aramaic and one in Hebrew\(^{317}\) – and these discoveries have effectively ended the debate as to whether Tobit was composed in Greek or a Semitic language.\(^{318}\) While there is still some disagreement over Hebrew or Aramaic as the language of composition, the growing consensus that opts for composition in Aramaic will be accepted here.\(^{319}\) Though set in the Assyrian exile, the work was likely written in the 3\(^{rd}\) or 2\(^{nd}\) cent. BCE.\(^{320}\)

Tobit has been called “a delightful story of the afflictions of a pious Israelite and the adventures of his dutiful son, who makes a journey in the company of a disguised angel and returns with a bride and the means to restore the father’s health and wealth”;\(^{321}\) and while it

\(^{317}\) The Qumran mss of Tobit are designated as follows: Aramaic: 4QpapTob\(^{a}\) [=4Q196]; 4QTob\(^{b-d}\) [4Q497-499]; Schoyen Tobit [=4Q196a]; and Hebrew: 4QTob\(^{e}\) [=4Q200]; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “196-200. 4QpapTobit a ar, 4QTobit b-d ar, and 4QTobit e,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (eds., M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 1-76; Michaela Hallermayer, *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit* (DCLS 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008); Torleif Elgvin, ed., *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artifacts from the Schoyen Collection* (LSTS 71; London: Continuum, forthcoming).


may be a stretch to describe the work as an “extended angelology,” it is true that the angel, Raphael, who disguises himself as man until the end of the story, has a significant role in the narrative. Hannah describes Raphael as one of the earliest Jewish examples of the notion that individuals have a personal guardian angel, and to the extent that Raphael assists and protects Tobit and his family members, Hannah’s description is not inaccurate. However, if one approaches the book from a different angle – namely, its overarching purpose – the notion of a personal guardian angel may not sufficiently explain Raphael’s role. To put this in perspective, note the comments of Delcor on the objective of Tobit:

The author is trying to convince his reader that God never abandons a pious man …. Throughout the book the author exhorts his fellow countrymen to obey the law. For even if they live in the Diaspora, God will not fail to protect them, as long as, in spite of the difficulties of their peculiar position, they remain faithful to him.

There is a sense, then, in which Raphael is more than a personal angelic guardian; he is also a national angelic guardian (a role usually reserved for his archangelic compatriot, Michael), and Raphael’s actions serve to emphasize the following: for the faithful and exiled Israelite, even the dispatch of an angel for special protection is not out of the question.


325 Though it is clear that Tobit and his family are portrayed as faithful and exemplary Israelites (cf. 1:15-2:5), it should be noted that scholars have grappled with the question in what sense the book’s author is “in exile”; i.e., the geographical location of Tobit’s author is a highly contested issue, with virtually every conceivable location (either Diasporic or Judaean) being proposed. For discussion, see Perrin, “An Almanac,” 115ff.
Highlighting some of the specifics of this angelic succor will bring it into sharper relief. First, Raphael (which means “God has healed”) binds the demon, Asmodeus (8:3), an act that is reminiscent of those attributed to Raphael and other angels in the Enochic tradition (cf. 1 En. 10:1ff; 90:22ff; 100:4). While Raphael’s binding of the jealous demon who had killed Sarah’s previous husbands is a powerful statement, his earlier intervention (6:16ff) facilitated the endogamous marriage of Tobias and Sarah, which is said to be “in accordance with the decree in the book of Moses” (7:11-13). Thus, the implicit assertion is that angelic assistance is available for those who are concerned for halakhic matters and the correct interpretation of Torah. Third, we are introduced to Raphael because he is “sent to heal” (a play on his name) Tobit and Sarah from blindness and demon possession, respectively (3:17); Raphael’s commissioning is the direct result of the protagonists’ prayers being heard “in the glorious presence of God” (3:16). This sentiment, once again, has parallels in 1 Enoch, which, as we have seen, portrays angels not only as in proximity to God’s throne but also serving in priest-like, intercessory capacities (cf. 1 En. 8:4-10:22; 14:22; 93:6;


327 See Moore, Tobit, 160. I also suggested above that the notion of the Levitical priesthood having a close association with its angelic counterparts may find support in ALD/T. Levi’s affirmation of Levi’s vengeance on the Shechemites precisely because such sin-purging is what angels do in other texts.

328 For discussion of this scene, see Perrin, “Tobit’s Contacts,” 39-40, who observes that Levitical marriage cannot be in view here (contra Robert J. Littman, Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codes Sinaiticus [SCS, 9; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 121) because Tobias is not a brother of Sarah’s previous husbands. Moreover, Shaye J. D. Cohen, “From the Bible to the Talmud: The Prohibition of Intermarriage,” HAR 7 (1983), 23-39, has noted that there is nothing in the Torah specifically prohibiting marriage to Gentiles. Therefore, Perrin suggests that Tobit is referring to a halakhic expansion of the Law of Moses (cf. Ezra 10:3), which is a phenomenon treated by Hindy Najman, Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism [JS]Sup, 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

97:5; 99:3; 104:1). When Raphael finally reveals himself as an angel, he announces the following in 12:12-15:

So now, when you and Sarah prayed, it was I who brought and read the record of your prayer before the glory of the Lord, and likewise whenever you buried the dead. And that time when you did not hesitate to get up and leave your dinner to go and bury the dead, I was sent to you to test you. And at the same time God sent me to heal you and Sarah your daughter-in-law. I am Raphael, one of the seven angels who stand ready and enter before the glory of the Lord.

Though not stated explicitly, it would seem Raphael is envisioned as an angel of the presence. In short, what is implied at the beginning of Tobit is also reiterated near its conclusion (12:15): the assistance available to faithful and exiled Israelites is not from just any celestial being: it is provided by one of the elite angels who stand in closest proximity to God.

3.7: Jubilees

Extant in its entirety only in Ethiopic, Jubilees is a 2nd cent. BCE work and one of the most important exemplars of the genre scholars have dubbed “Rewritten Bible.” Set at Mount

330 So Moore, Tobit, 157.

331 On the Isa 63:9-inspired epithet “the angel of the presence,” see Chapter Two. The priestly connotations of Raphael’s role are emphasized by the verb παρίστημι, which is elsewhere used in sacerdotal contexts, and this is made more explicit in the so-called short version of the Greek text which adds that Raphael is one of the angels “who presents the prayers of the saints.” On Raphael as an angel of the presence, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 195; Beate Ego, “The Figure of the Angel Raphael According to His Farewell Address in Tob 12:6-20,” in Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings, 244. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 55, notes that the language of 12:15 hints at a heavenly temple.

Sinai and taking its cue from Exod 24:12-18, the framework of the book includes an angel dictating to Moses from heavenly tablets; the contents of the tablets cover the events from creation to the building of the sanctuary (Jub. 1:27) and are thus a creative retelling of Genesis and the first half of Exodus.  

The large number of Jubilees mss found among the DSS suggests that this non-sectarian work was held in high esteem at Qumran.  

Two features of Jubilees are particularly relevant to this thesis: 1.) the creation and description of angelic classes that are closely associated with Israel; and 2.) Jubilees’ echo of Deut 32:8-9 that God

---


334 For comment and bibliography on Jubilees as “rewritten Bible/Scripture,” see Michael Segal, The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology ([JS]Sup 177; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 4-5. For a recent discussion of scholarship and terminology of the genre, see Daniel A. Machiela, “Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism – A Review of Recent Developments,” JSJ 51 (2010): 308. It is recognized, however, that Jubilees has elements of other genres including those of apocalyptic literature (not least of which is the revelation of heavenly knowledge to an ancient worthy by an angelic mediator); see Collins, Apocalyptic Imagination, 81, who refers to Jubilees as a “borderline case for the apocalyptic genre.” On Jubilees as a work that “subverts” themes common to apocalyptic literature, see Hanneken, The Subversion; I will interact with aspects of Hanneken’s study, below.

335 So described by James C. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees (GAP; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 11. The recasting of the biblical narrative allows the author of Jubilees, as Himmelfarb, A Kingdom of Priests, 54, states, “to demonstrate that many of the laws of the Torah were observed by the Israelites even before they were revealed at Mount Sinai. This insistence on the eternal status of the laws of the Torah may be a response to a Hellenistic critique of Judaism that admired monotheism but viewed the ritual laws, which they saw as superstitious and misanthropic, as a later addition. The laws in question, according to Jubilees, could be found on heavenly tablets. These heavenly tablets are central to Jubilees’ thought.” Approaching the subject from a different yet complementary angle, Segal, The Book of Jubilees, 7, highlights that the significance of the Jubilees’ heavenly tablets is to stress that God’s covenant with Israel actually has its foundation at creation (rather than Sinai). Thus, Israel’s relationship with God is from the very beginning of time.

336 Fourteen (or possibly fifteen) mss of Jubilees were found at Qumran, which means that only Psalms (36), Deuteronomy (29), Isaiah (21), Exodus (17), and perhaps Genesis (15) were found in greater numbers; see Angel, Otherworld and Eschatological Priesthood, 36. The oldest copy of Jubilees found at Qumran, 4Q216, has been dated on paleographic grounds to the last quarter of the 2nd cent. BCE (see DJD 13, 1-3), and in conjunction with the reference to Jubilees in the Damascus Document (the earliest copy of which, 4Q266, dates to the first half of the first century BCE), indicates a terminus ante quem of 100 BCE for Jubilees. A terminus post quem is more difficult to ascertain, but Jubilees’ reliance upon the story of the Watchers suggests it can’t be earlier than the 3rd cent. BCE, and possible allusions to the Maccabean revolt (cf., e.g., Jub. 37-38; 1 Macc 5) may indicate a date of composition in the late 160s BCE. For discussion, see James C. VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 207-285, Segal, The Book of Jubilees, 35ff and passim.

337 Jubilees’ affinities with themes in the sectarian texts include i) support for a 364-day solar calendar (cf. 4Q252; 11QPsalms scroll) and a date of 15/3 for Shavuot, which serves as a covenant renewal ceremony (cf. 4Q266 11:17-18; 4Q270 7 2:11-12; 1QS 1:16-3:12). These and other similarities suggest that Jubilees was highly valued by the Yabud, even if it is widely considered to have had a non-sectarian provenance; see VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 145-146.
alone is Israel’s celestial guardian, and, in light of this, the book’s seemingly contradictory presentation of a guardian-like figure known as the angel of the presence, which I briefly noted above.337 I will begin my discussion of Jubilees with the first of these features.

3.7.1: ISRAEL’S RELATIONSHIP TO THE ANGELIC PRIESTS

According to the opening chapter of Genesis, the sole action of God on the first day of creation was to bring light, and, thereby, day and night, into existence (Gen 1:3-5). But one of the first examples of Jubilees’ interpretive expansion of its biblical base text is that day one of creation now includes the formation of the angelic world, thereby addressing the silence of Genesis on this matter:338

For on the first day he created the heavens that are above, and the earth, the waters and all the spirits who serve before him, namely: the angels of the presence, and the angels of holiness; …” (2:2).339

The account continues with the creation of other angelic classes, specifically those who oversee various meteorological domains. A number of factors suggest, however, that the author of Jubilees envisioned the “angels of the presence” and the “angels of holiness”340 as not only occupying the highest angelic ranks but also having a special connection to Israel.

---

337 Earlier in this chapter, I briefly referred to Jah. 15:30-32, when I contrasted the statement of Sir 17:17 to an idea central to Dan 7-12 and numerous other Second Temple Period texts extant at Qumran: that Israel has a heavenly guardian other than Yahweh. Here, I will look at Jubilees’ main angelic protagonist (“the angel of the presence”) vis-à-vis 15:30-32.

338 As VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 29, comments: “Within day one the writer has included the contents of the introductory statements in Gen 1:1-2 (the heavens and the earth) and creation of the angels. The latter category solves the problem that Genesis, while it mentions angels several times (see 3:24), does not say when (or whether) they were created.”


340 4Q216 suggests that the Hebrew titles for the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness were, respectively, מַעְלֵי הַשָּׁמֶשׁ and מַעְלֵי הַרְשָׁעִים, with the former sometimes translated as “the angels of sanctification”; see DJD 13, 13. I will return to the designation “the angels of the presence” and its significance, below.
First, *Jubilees* refers to the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness as the “two great kinds” (2:18).\(^{341}\) Second, in the verse just quoted these angels are said to serve/minister before God, a priestly privilege already intimated by the words “presence” and “holiness”\(^{342}\); a sacerdotal function for these two classes is all but confirmed later in *Jubilees*, when Jacob blesses Levi:

> May the Lord give you and your descendents extremely great honor; may he make you and your descendents (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and the holy ones.\(^{343}\) The descendents of your sons will be like them in honour, greatness, and holiness; may he make them great throughout all ages [emphasis added]” (31:14; cf. 30:18).\(^{344}\)

They are also said to keep the Sabbath (2:18, 30) and celebrate *Shavuot* in heaven until the days of Noah (6:18); and they are the only heavenly beings created circumcised (6:18). Such characteristics mark the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness as “partakers of [the divine covenant], and as the heavenly counterparts of earthly Israel.”\(^{345}\) As Scott has observed, the progression from the angelic observance of the Sabbath in *Jub* 2:18 to God’s

---

\(^{341}\) The word “great,” while present in the Ethiopic text, is missing from 4Q216 (see DJD 13, 19-20). Segal, *The Book of Jubilees*, 9 n. 22, rightly points out that even if the adjective was added secondarily due to the influence of the phrase “a great sign” in 6:17, the rest of *Jubilees* is clear that these two classes of angels are extraordinary.

\(^{342}\) While it is not certain that the qualifying phrase “serve/minister before him” in 2:2 should be restricted to the “angels of presence” and the “angels of holiness,” commentators have, for good reason, taken it to mean this, since Early Jewish texts portray the angels of presence in particular as having a privileged status: they are said to serve in God’s presence, whereas other angels must ascend in order to offer their gifts (cf. T. Levi 3:7), and it is implied that these beings are subordinate only to God (cf. T. Judah 25:2). The *Similitudes of Enoch* refer to four “faces/presences” (cf. Ezek 1:6), who are none other than the archangels, Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel (1 En. 40:8); see VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 385. Thus, on the role of the angels of the presence and angels of the holiness in *Jubilees*, Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99, writes, “These angels are clearly distinguished from the ones in charge of other cosmic domains. For them is reserved the task of serving before the Divine Throne in the innermost heavenly sanctuary, … .”

\(^{343}\) Charles, *APOT* 2:60, suggested that the “holy ones” of 31:14 should be identified as the angels of holiness; cf. Angel, *Otherworldly*, 42.

\(^{344}\) As will be discussed below, the celestial being who dictates the heavenly tablets to Moses and serves as the narrator of *Jubilees* is the angel of the presence, a high-ranking figure who apparently stood at the head of the class of angels with the same name; see Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 49 n. 109.

\(^{345}\) Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99.
announcement to the angels that he would separate a people for himself to keep the Sabbath on earth constitutes an *imitatio angelorum* and serves as part of the book’s “on earth as in heaven” motif.\(^\text{346}\) In the context of a discussion of *Jubilees*’ understanding of the Jewish people vis-à-vis the Gentiles, Angel elaborates upon the observation that certain celestial beings correspond to Israel, summarizing the matter as follows:

The [angels] were … created in a tripartite hierarchy, with the angels of presence at the top, followed by the angels of holiness, and finally by the angels of cosmic phenomena. Only the first two groups continue to play a role in the remainder of the book, while the third is not mentioned again. 2:18 reports that the top two tiers of angels are charged to celebrate the Sabbath. Of all the nations of the earth, only Israel is commanded to celebrate the Sabbath along with the angels and God. All the other nations, as well as the angels of cosmic phenomena, presumably continue to work on the seventh day due to their inferior state of holiness (2:19, 31). In this way, *Jubilees*’ picture of earth is modeled on its vision of celestial reality – there is a direct parallelism between the existence and actions of heavenly beings and those of their human counterparts on earth. Written into the very order of creation, Israel corresponds to the angels closest to God, while the Gentiles correlate to those farthest away. … The fact that the angels [of the presence and the angels of holiness] are by nature circumcised seems to imply that by fulfilling the covenant of circumcision, Jews become earthly replicas of God’s celestial inner circle. On the other hand, the Gentiles did not receive such a command, for God “chose them not” (15:30) [emphasis mine].\(^\text{347}\)

Additional aspects of *Jubilees* shed light on its correspondence between Israel and the angelic priests: unlike other non-sectarian texts *Jubilees* does not indicate a special role for its authors nor is it exclusivist in its appraisal of other Jews. *Jubilees* is also clear that non-Jews cannot become part of the people of God (even on limited or strict terms).\(^\text{348}\) Thus, *Jubilees*’

\(^\text{346}\) That the angels celebrate Shavuot and are circumcised contribute to this motif as well; see James M. Scott, *On Earth as It Is in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 1-8. The bulk of Scott’s monograph focuses on how the themes of cultic cycles, chronology, and land are reflected “on earth as in heaven,” but he begins by briefly highlighting instances of *imitatio angelorum*, cf. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens*, 235, who puts the matter succinctly: “Israel hält den Sabbat, weil es en Engels gleichet.”

\(^\text{347}\) Angel, *Otherworldly*, 38.

emphasis is on both Israel in its entirety and Israel exclusively, and it should therefore come as no surprise that the notion of priestly holiness is extended to the nation as a whole. A perhaps obvious corollary of Jubilees’ emphasis on all Israel and its correspondence to the angelic realm is one that should not be overlooked: it is not merely Israel’s priests that are represented by the angels of presence and the angels of holiness; it is the entire nation that corresponds to the angelic priests. To be sure, Levi and his descendants are specifically compared to the angels of presence and the angels of holiness at Jub. 31:14, as quoted above. But as Himmelfarb points out, the comparison between the Levitical line and the angels is part of a larger correlation integral to the outlook of the book:

As the heavenly observance of the Sabbath and the Feast of Weeks indicates, Jubilees understand not only priests but also the entire people of Israel to be the earthly counterparts of the angels; indeed, all Jews are the counterparts of the angels of presence and the holy ones, the very classes of angels to which Levi’s descendants are compared, since these are the angels who observe the Sabbath with God from its creation.

She goes on to suggest that the connection Jubilees posits between the entire nation and the highest-ranking angels should be seen in contrast to the presupposition inherent in the BW that only the extraordinarily righteous – as exemplified in Enoch – could attain an angel-like

349 Hanneken, The Subversion of the Apocalypses, 292, suggests that one of the reasons for this focus on the entire people of God is that Jubilees “presents itself as instruction for Israelites of all times and all classes,” and therefore took issue with more narrowly defined notions of the faithful prevalent in other texts. As Hanneken (97ff) also points out, this does not mean that Jubilees is completely without of language that could be interpreted as elitist (e.g., Michel Testuz, Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés [Geneve: Droz, 1960], 33, proposed that Jub. 1:29, which speaks of “all the elect ones of Israel,” was an early reference to the group that would become the Essenes) nor does it suggest that Jubilees is overly permissive when it comes to defining Israel (e.g., Segal, The Book of Jubilees, 241ff, highlights the strictness with which Jub. 15:26 declares the necessity of circumcision on the eighth day for membership in Israel). However, the overarching emphasis of Jubilees is that the entire nation is elect.

350 See the discussion of Angel, Otherworldly, 38-40, who notes that Jubilees’ accounts of both the rape of Dinah by Shechem (30:1-25; cf. Gen 34:1-31) and the rape of Bilhah by Reuben (33:1-20; cf. Gen 35:21-22) denounce the incidents in sacerdotal terms. Cf. Segal, The Book of Jubilees, 10-11, who discusses the “priestly outlook” of Jubilees as one of the four main ideological and theological emphases of the work (the others being the giving of the laws prior to Sinai, a hepdatic chronological system, and angelology).

status and role. While Himmelfarb’s comparison is questionable insofar as BW describes a revelatory experience whereas Jubilees is referring to a correspondence, her point is valuable in that it highlights the uniqueness of Jubilees among Second Temple period texts in positing that there is a relationship of some kind between all Israel – including non-priests – and the angelic priests of the heavenly sanctuary.

Given both the priestly connotations of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness and what Jubilees has implied about the correspondence these beings have with Israel, perhaps it is only natural that the book portrays the nation as having an individual, angelic leader with sacerdotal prerogatives: a well-known feature of Jubilees is a singular figure known as the angel of the presence. The angel of the presence is not only responsible for serving as Jubilees’ narrator but also presumably stands at the head of the previously mentioned angelic class of the same name. In numerous instances, the angel of the presence includes himself in the actions of the comrades of his class of angels. But quite often this figure singles himself out as having an especially important role in the life of God’s people, not least when he speaks of his standing between the Israelites and the Egyptians at

---

353 And one that is arguably not as exclusivist as she suggests; see my discussion of BW, above.
354 It would be an overstatement, however, to suggest that Jubilees is the only Second Temple Period text to posit an analogous relationship between Israel and the general angelic host, which seems to be the picture operative in Dan 7-12; Himmelfarb, “The Book of Jubilees,” 392, comes close to making such an overstatement.
355 For a detailed study of this figure, see VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 378-393.
356 Hannah, Michael and Christ, 49, n. 109, summarizes the matter as follows: “The author of Jubilees apparently believed in both a class of angels so named (2:2) and the angel of the presence who revealed the contents of Jubilees to Moses.”
357 As denoted by the use of the first-person plural; e.g., Jub. 2:17: “And [God] gave us the Sabbath day as a great sign so that we should perform work for six days and that we should keep Sabbath from all work on the seventh day. He told us – all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness (these two great kinds) – to keep Sabbath with him in heaven and on earth” (cf. Jub. 3:4, 9, 12, 15; 4:6, 23; 14:20; 19:3; 30:18, 41:24; 48:10, et al.).
the Red Sea (48:13),\textsuperscript{358} and his responsibilities in the dictation of the heavenly tablets to Moses (1:27-2:1) and in the writing of the Torah (50:2).\textsuperscript{359} The Ethiopic title, *mal’aka gass*, literally means “the angel of the face,” and a *Jubilees* mss from Qumran (4Q216 5:5) reveals that the Hebrew title included the word *הmaalך*; thus, the complete designation for the angelic class was most likely מלך העונים and מלך העונים for its leader, a title which, as we have seen, appears to have been partially derived from Isa 63:9, a verse situated in a passage referring to Israel’s rescue during its flight from Egypt. In what may be a related interpretive move, the persona of the angel of the presence in *Jubilees*, while in addition to being the product of the author’s exegetical reflection of certain מלך ויהוה מלך אלהים passages (cf. Gen 16:7-11; 21:17; 22:11-15; Exod 3:2),\textsuperscript{361} seems especially indebted to the angel of the Exodus, who assists Israel during their wanderings in the desert (cf. Exod 14:19; 23:20-23; 32:34).\textsuperscript{362} The affinity between the two angels is perhaps most evident in their respective descriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table #5: Comparison of Exod 14:19 and Jub 1:29</strong>\textsuperscript{363}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exod 14:19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jub 1:29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The angel of the presence, who went before the camp of Israel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{358} E.g., before mentioning an instance of the collective work of his class, *Jub.* 48:13 notes these words of the angel of presence: “And I stood between the Egyptians and Israel, and we delivered Israel from his hand and from the hand of his people”; \textit{contra} Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 50, who suggests that the “we” of 48:13 refers to the angel of the presence and God.

\textsuperscript{359} VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 385, puts it succinctly: “The author of *Jubilees* made one of these elite angels the revealer of his annotated history of early biblical times.”

\textsuperscript{360} See DJD 13, 13-15.

\textsuperscript{361} VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 388-390.

\textsuperscript{362} VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 385-388.

\textsuperscript{363} VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 385.
Though the descriptions are not identical, the word מִנְפָּה is used in reference to Israel’s angelic assistant in Exod 14:19 and in the other Exodus passages just referenced. Moreover, the designation מִנְפָּה מֵאלָם indicates that “such beings enter into the very presence of God himself,” and thus the title is eminently appropriate for the head of a class of angels who serve as heavenly priests. Finally, in its presentation of the angel of the presence, Jubilees has borrowed from the biblical texts the concept of a high-ranking angel who speaks with God’s authority.

In light of the authority and stature of the angel of the presence, some commentators have suggested that this figure should be identified as the archangel Michael. In support, Hannah points out the Michael-like role of the angel of the presence in his going before the camp of Israel (1:29) and in delivering the nation from the hand of the wicked angel, Mastema (48:13). Indeed, Mastema has been referred to as the evil counterpart of the

366 A well-known feature of the מֵאלָם מִנְפָּה – especially in early texts (e.g., Judg 6) – is that this figure is virtually indistinguishable from Yahweh; for recent discussion and bibliography on this point, see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 35-36. Similarly, VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence,” 393, describes Jubilees’ מֵאלָם מִנְפָּה as follows: “For the sake of his own book, the writer has established its great and unquestioned authority by tying it directly to the extraordinary angel of the presence. He is the one who dictates all the words of Jub. 2-50 to Moses. Yet, not only is the angel of the presence the authority behind these words; the writer further bolsters the authority of his book by picturing this angel as reading to Moses from the inscribed tablets of heaven and he does all of this by divine command. What could be more authoritative than a book written by Moses, dictated to him by an angel of the very face of God, based on the unimpeachable contents of the heavenly tablets, and mandated by God himself?” As Segal, The Book of Jubilees, 9, summarizes, “In certain instances, an angel or angels in Jubilees come in the place of God in the Pentateuch. The most conspicuous case of the replacement of God by an angel is the narrative frame of the entire book, in which the angel of the presence speaks to Moses at Sinai, and dictates to him from the Heavenly Tablets.”
368 A righteous angel battling with his wicked adversary is reminiscent of Dan 10, where Michael strives against the angelic princes of Greece and Persia; see Hannah, Michael and Christ, 48-49.
angel of the presence (cf. 10:11; 17:15-16; 18:9), even if the dualistic symmetry of Jubilees is not quite as exact as it is in other texts. Intriguingly, a Greek fragment of Jubilees preserved in Syncellus’ Chronographia (ca. late 8th or 9th cent. CE) testifies to a discrepancy when compared to the Ethiopic version: instead of the plurality of angels who assist the descendents of Noah in the midst of their struggles with evil spirits/angels (10:1-14), the corresponding story in Chronographia (49:6-15) has Michael casting the evil spirits into the abyss. VanderKam has argued that there are paraphrastic tendencies at work in Chronographia’s citations of Jubilees and has therefore cautioned that the Michael identification may be the work of Syncellus himself. Nevertheless, Hannah rightly notes the significance of at least one ancient reader equating Jubilees’ narrator with Michael.

3.7.2: THE ANGEL OF THE PRESENCE VIS-À-VIS JUB. 15:30-32

But when it comes to the concept of an angelic leader figure associated with Israel, the evidence of Jubilees is perplexing if not contradictory, since the book appears to exhibit a degree of discomfort with the notion of Israel having a Michael-like celestial guardian. As noted earlier, the clearest statement to this effect is found in 15:30-32, a passage which serves as the pinnacle of a discourse emphasizing God’s election of the nation through Jacob:

For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham’s children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people. He sanctified them and gathered (them) from all mankind. For there are many nations and many people and all belong to him. He made spirits rule over all in the order to lead them astray from following him. But over Israel he made no angel or spirit rule because he alone is their ruler. He will guard them and require them for himself from his angels, his spirits,

371 VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, 8.
372 Hannah, Michael and Christ, 50.
and everyone, and all his powers so that he may guard them and bless them and so that they may be his and he theirs from now and forever [emphasis mine].

Other passages from *Jubilees* are in agreement with the idea that Yahweh watches over Israel directly.\(^\text{373}\) For example, *Jub. 16:17* stresses Israel as God’s possession:

All the descendents of [Isaac’s] sons would become nations and be numbered with the nations. But one of Isaac’s sons would become a holy progeny and would not be numbered among the nations, for he would become the share of the Most High. All his descendents had fallen into that (share) which God owns so that they would become a people whom the Lord possesses out of all the nations; and that they would be become a kingdom, a priesthood, and a holy people.

As part of Abraham’s blessing of Jacob,\(^\text{374}\) *Jub. 19:28-29* warns against the wicked alternative to God’s guardianship of Israel:

May the spirits of Mastema not rule over you and your descendents to remove you from following the Lord who is your God from now and forever. May the Lord God become your father and you his first-born son and people for all time.

Lastly, the pronouncement of eschatological judgment in *Jub. 23:22* makes no mention of a national angel coming to Israel’s rescue or to defeat her enemies:

There will be a great punishment *from the Lord* for the actions of that generation [emphasis mine].\(^\text{375}\)

Even if these texts are not verbatim quotations of Deut 32:8-9, it is clear that *Jubilees* endorses the dual-pronged Deuteronomic sentiment: the nations have been assigned angelic princes, but Israel belongs to God, and he rules his people in an unmediated fashion.\(^\text{376}\) In fact, Segal

---


\(^{374}\) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 54-55, notes that *Jubilees* makes explicit what is implied in the narrative of Genesis: the lives of Abraham and Jacob overlapped, even if only by fifteen years.

\(^{375}\) Cf., e.g., Dan 12:1.

\(^{376}\) Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 70.
suggests that another passage, *Jub.* 1:19-21, which is a prayer of Moses influenced by Deut 9:26-29, has been infused with the import of Deut 32:8-9:

> Then Moses fell prostrate and prayed and said: “O Lord my God, do not allow your people and your heritage to go along in the error of their minds, and do not deliver them into the control of the nations with the result that they rule over them lest they make them sin against you. May your mercy, Lord, be lifted over your people. Create for them a just spirit. May the spirit of Belial not rule over them so as to bring charges against them before you and to trap them away from proper path so that they may be destroyed from your presence. They are your people and your heritage … .”

Unfortunately, the Hebrew text of *Jub.* 1:19-21 is not extant, but the language of “people” and “heritage” are indeed reminiscent of Deut 32:8-9. Hanneken has proposed that unmediated governance ensures that the sovereignty of God is not hindered, either by the wickedness of the Gentiles’ angelic guardians or the limited abilities of Israel’s angelic guardians (were they to have them), as is the case in many apocalyptic texts. This divine “hand’s on” approach is an example of what Hanneken has catalogued as *Jubilees’* tendency to subvert features typical of apocalypses. The direct rule of God, in conjunction with the subversion of the Mastema-led angelic forces of evil, serves to emphasize that nothing can

---


378 See DJD 13, 11.

379 To be sure, apocalyptic texts do not state (or even imply) that God is not in control or the outcome of history is in doubt, but as I mentioned above, Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 68-69, comparatively examines Dan 7-12 and points out the following: “[I]n Daniel, the first part of the issue is the face that the holy ones are left at the mercy of a beast for a certain period (Dan 7:25). The second part is that even the good angels are at the limit of their means to keep evil in check. Again, God’s ultimate victory is certain, but the myriad myriads of God’s power are reserved for the future (Dan 7:10). As of 10:21 the forces of good number two, `there is no one who supports me against them except Michael, your prince’ (cf. Dan 12:1). Regardless of variations in the narrative details, the apocalypses typically convey the idea that God’s sovereignty is temporarily impeded both by the wickedness of some cosmic forces and the inefficiency or inefficacy of the good cosmic forces.” Cf. Moses, “Tangible Prayer,” 141-143, who highlights how Israel’s angels (as well as Daniel’s prayers) are “impeded” by the angelic princes of Greece and Persia.

380 *Jubilees* is clear that i.) Mastema’s forces have been reduced to one-tenth of their original numbers (cf. *Jub* 10:11); ii.) Mastema’s activity is severely limited to carrying out divine “dirty work” (cf. *Jub* 49:2; Exod 11:4); and iii.) evil angelic princes do not play the role of eschatological protagonist (cf. *Jub* 23); see Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 70-88.
thwart the covenant God established with Israel at creation;\textsuperscript{381} it also keeps Israel away from evil spirits, whom van Ruiten describes as a continual “threat” in Jubilees.\textsuperscript{382} Moreover, if the phrase “spirit of Belial” is a reference to the wicked angel, Mastema,\textsuperscript{383} the parallelism of Jub. 1:19-21 (cited above) implies that Israel suffers a two-pronged attack: from the nations on earth and from the accusations of Belial in heaven.\textsuperscript{384} That Belial’s confrontation is with God – and not the angel of the presence – only underscores Jubilee’s Deut 32:8-9-inspired assertion that God alone is Israel’s guardian.

Perhaps a fitting way to conclude this discussion of Jubilees’ contradictory stance on angels associated with Israel is to mention Jub. 35:17, which is a statement on the respective protection offered to Jacob and Esau:

Jacob’s guardian is greater and more powerful, glorious, and praiseworthy than Esau’s guardian.

Summarizing the interpretive options, Hannah states that it is difficult to decide whether this [verse] pertains to Jacob and Esau as individuals, as fathers of nations, or both at once. From the perspective of the Second Temple readers of Jubilees, the second and third options are more probable than the first. It would have been very natural for them to have understood Jacob’s individual guardian as their guardian.\textsuperscript{385} However, … according to Jub. 15:31-32, Israel was not assigned to an angelic guardian, for God kept that privilege for Himself. Either the

\textsuperscript{381} Hanneken, \textit{The Subversion of the Apocalypses}, 117-118.

\textsuperscript{382} Van Ruiten, “Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees,” in \textit{Angels}, 585-609, who highlights that Jubilees is making use of a tradition in which the Deut 32:8-9 echo at 15:30-32 refers to the division of the nations as per Gen 10 and which has demons associated with foreign gods as per Deut 32:16-17 and Ps 106:34-39.

\textsuperscript{383} Segal, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 182; 251-256, points out that in Early Jewish texts \textit{-belial} can refer to either evil/injustice (cf., e.g., Prov 6:12; 1QH 12:11) or an independent evil entity (cf., e.g., 1QS 2:5; 1QM 13:10-12); Segal opts for the latter, here. \textit{Contra} Hanneken, \textit{The Subversion of the Apocalypses}, 73, who sees a parallelism between “spirit of Belial” and “just spirit” and thus understands the phrase to refer to evil/injustice.

\textsuperscript{384} Segal, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 256: “The one difference between the nations and the ‘spirit of Belial’ in vv. 19-20 is the role of this spirit to ‘bring charges against them before’ God. This distinction is the result of the disparity in status between the two – only Belial, who is a member of the heavenly pantheon, can instigate such claims before God.”

\textsuperscript{385} So Charles, \textit{Jubilees}, 209.
author here is making the rather obvious statement that God is greater than the angel he assigned to be over Esau/Edom or he has simply contradicted himself.\textsuperscript{386}

While Hannah himself views 35:17 as referring to the angel God has assigned to Israel and is thus a “slip” vis-à-vis 15:30-32,\textsuperscript{387} Hanneken also appeals to 15:30-32 in drawing the opposite conclusion: “there can be no doubt that ‘Jacob’s guardian’ ... is none other than God.”\textsuperscript{388}

Arguably, the reason such interpretive ambiguity is possible is due to the fact that even though \textit{Jubilees} may “subvert” (to use Hanneken’s term) apocalyptic themes such as the angelic guardianship of Israel, the book appears to have vestiges of the more common late Second Temple Period view that a certain angel – in \textit{Jubilees’} estimation, the angel of the presence – is associated with Israel in the Michael-like role of guardian of the nation. It may also have been that the epithet of the angel of the presence meant that this figure was primarily envisioned as a heavenly priest, a vocation which assuaged the authors’ fears that its angelic protagonist was violating the spirit of Deut 32:8-9.\textsuperscript{389}

In sum, the covenant marks of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness signify that these angelic priests are closely associated with Israel, whose protection and value are underscored by the fact that their heavenly counterparts serve in closest proximity to God. Though \textit{Jubilees} is not unique insofar as it proposes that some angels serve dually as

\textsuperscript{386} Hannah, \textit{Michael and Christ}, 31; cf. idem, “Guardian Angels and National Angelic Patrons,” 419.

\textsuperscript{387} Hannah, \textit{Michael and Christ}, 32.

\textsuperscript{388} Hanneken, \textit{The Subversion of Apocalypses}, 70.

\textsuperscript{389} The discussion of \textit{Jubilees’} angel of the presence vis-à-vis 15:30-32 is made all the more interesting by the possibility that these verses were not original: James L. Kugel, “\textit{Jubilees},” in \textit{Outside the Bible}, 1:278-281, suggests that 15:25-34 is one of approx. 30 interpolations inserted into the text. If correct, it may have been that the interpolator was uncomfortable with the guardianship characteristics of the angel of the presence and, in deference to Deut 32:8-9, added the statement of 15:30-32 – even if it resulted in tension with the text as it stood. However, Kugel states that it was the final form of the text (i.e., post-interpolations) that “went on to have a distinguished career” at Qumran and elsewhere.
guardians and priests, it stands out for simultaneously presenting a Michael-like guardian figure and preserving an echo of Deut 32:8-9.

3.8: SON OF GOD TEXT

The Aramaic Apocalypse or Apocryphon of Daniel – which is commonly known as the Son of God text (henceforth, SGT) – is a single fragmentary ms (4Q246), dated on the basis of paleography to the Herodian period (ca. 25 BCE). The text consists of two columns, the first of which is only partially extant; that there was at least a third column is suggested by the presence of a construct form in the last word of the second column. As for the content of the vision, it appears that a seer is interpreting the vision of a king who is troubled by what he has seen (4Q246 1 1-3), namely the tribulations wrought by foreign oppressors (cf. 1 4-8; 2 2-3, 8-9). The most well-known and debated aspect of the vision is a figure referred to as בֵּית הָדָּר אֱלֹהִים, “son of God” and בֵּית הָדָּר רֵא שֶׁמֶּהוּ, “son of the Most High” (2 1). There has been a host of suggestions as to the identity of this figure and both his relationship to the tribulations witnessed by the king and how he is connected to the rise of the people of God, an event mentioned near the end of the extant text (cf. 2 4-6).  


391 See Puech, DJD 22, 166. The text’s linguistic parallels with Daniel (see below) suggest a terminus post quem of the mid-2nd cent. BCE.

392 See Florentino García Martínez, “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246,” in Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 168, who also notes that there is uncertainty as to the “historical or apocalyptic character of the description of the future evils narrated to the king.”
In general, interpretations of this “son of God” fall into one of two categories: negative or positive. Negative understandings include a pre-Christian antichrist figure or a historical king, with Alexander Balas and Antiochus Epiphanes having been proposed. What these interpretations share in common is that the lofty epithets of divine sonship have been blasphemously usurped, and that rise of the people of God is understood to be indicative of the downfall of this oppressive figure’s kingdom. The text has linguistic affinities with Dan 7, and Dunn has proposed that the “people of God” (4Q246 2:7) are intended to mirror the victorious fate of the Danielic “people of the Holy Ones of the Most High” (Dan 7:27) and the “one like a son of man” (Dan 7:13-14), whom he interprets as a collective symbol. But like the interpretations mentioned above, Dunn understands the “son of God” to be a malevolent figure whose downfall results in the victory of God’s

---

393 García Martínez, “The Eschatological Figure,” 168.
395 For a convenient listing of the linguistic parallels 4Q246 has with the Book of Daniel, see Geza G. Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 86. The affinities between Daniel 7 and 4Q246 are listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE # 6: LINGUISTIC PARALLELS BETWEEN 4Q246 AND DAN 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Q246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:8) אלף אלפים יוסי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2:3) אלף רמלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2:5) הלוחות שלמים דלעם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2:9) שלמים שלמים דלעם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

people. Others, however, have proposed an individualistic interpretation that sees the son of God in a positive light, namely, as the Davidic messiah (cf. 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 4Q174 frg. 1 1:7; Pss. Sol. 17:4, 32-42);\(^{397}\) the strikingly similar language used of Jesus in the Lucan infancy narrative (cf. Luke 1:32-33) is said to lend credence to this interpretation.\(^{398}\) In light of the linguistic parallels with Dan 7, it has also been posited that the son of God figure may be an implicit, messianic reworking of the coming of the “one like a son of man.” \(^{399}\)

Two additional understandings of SGT – one positive and one negative (not unrelated to those surveyed above) – are especially relevant, here. The first belongs to García Martínez, who has argued that the son of God should be identified as a Michael-like angel.\(^{400}\) More recently, García Martínez has developed his interpretation in that he views 4Q246’s son of God as “human and heavenly at the same time.”\(^{401}\) Though he readily acknowledges that “the human character of the mysterious personage of 4Q246 is not


\(^{400}\) García Martínez, “The Eschatological Figure,” 172-179.

\(^{401}\) See Florentino García Martínez, “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” in Qumranica Minora II (STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 20-24, here 23.
emphasized,”*402 García Martínez is essentially a.) combining the aforementioned messianic and collective interpretations of SGT with his own angelic interpretation;*403 and he does so by b.) positing that the “son of God” has an earthly, messianic counterpart. Thus, the relationship between the “the son of God” (2:1) and the rise of the “people of God” (2:7) is seen to be analogous to that of the exaltation of Danielic “one like a son of man” and the reception of the kingdom by the “people of the holy ones of the Most High.” Against this interpretation, it has been pointed out that the “son of God” in the singular is not a title for a principal angel figure in the DSS and that it is strange for a text to make the claim that God is the “strength” of an angel when the norm is for an angel to grant support to Israel.*404 However, no matter their charge or potency, we have seen that angels are never independently sufficient and always require God’s decisive interaction for victory (cf. Dan 7:22), and both the War Scroll and 11QMelchizedek present angels as divinely-commissioned eschatological agents of judgment who usher in reigns of peace for Israel (cf. 11QMelch 13-15; 1QM 17:5-8), making a similar reading of 4Q246’s son of God a strong option.*405

A second interpretation of SGT especially relevant to the present study – and one which is effectively a counter to García Martínez’s reading – has been proposed by Segal,

*402 García Martínez, “Two Messianic Figures,” 23.

*403 Though, strangely, he is reticent to retain the term “angelic” for the “son of God,” which is made all the more surprising since he cites the angelic interpretation of the Danielic “one like a son of man” and similar figure from the Similitudes of Enoch as parallels; see García Martínez, “Two Messianic Figures,” 23-34, who prefers to use the adjective “superhuman.” Though Collins, The Scepter and the Star, 183, prefers the messianic interpretation of 4Q246, he is open to an angelic understanding: “One other text should be considered in support of the angelic interpretation of the ‘Son of God.’ The Similitudes of Enoch are not found at Qumran, and are probably the product of a different sect, although their apocalyptic worldview is similar in many respects to that of the community. A central role in this document is filled by a figure call ‘that Son of Man,’ who is patently meant to recall the ‘one like a son of man’ of Daniel 7.” For an overview of the Enochic “son of man,” see Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 113-120.

*404 So Collins, The Scepter and the Star, 181-183. While the plural “sons of God” and similar appellations are commonly used as angelic designations, to my knowledge there is no Second Temple Period text which refers to a singular angel as “son of god.”

whose “literary-theological connection” between Deut 32, Ps 82, and Dan 7 was discussed in Chapter Two. Given 4Q246’s use of Dan 7, Segal views the son of God as the Ps 82-inspired heavenly (i.e., angelic) counterpart of the fourth beast in Daniel’s vision (cf. Dan 7:7-8), who has been recast in SGT. Segal’s reading primarily stems from two factors: a.) the nomenclature of the son of God, which he argues is ultimately drawn from the unjust and demoted יהוה בני שלם and שלמה בני שלם of Ps 82:6-7, who, in Segal’s evaluation, are cast as beasts in Dan 7; and b.) a linear reading of SGT, which stresses that the son of God emerges in the midst of a period of upheaval and thus contributes to it. In addition to being susceptible to the same critique of a positive angelic interpretation – that the son of God/Most High in the singular is not anywhere a title granted to an angel – the fragmentary condition of 4Q246 means that it questionable whether a linear approach to SGT is correct. Citing the influence of Dan 7 and other apocalyptic texts, Collins has defended an oscillatory understanding of the text that allows for the mention of (a future) positive figure in an otherwise chaotic scene, and he thus does not deem it necessary to view the son of God as malevolent.

Its fragmentary condition and variegated interpretive history render the study of 4Q246 particularly challenging and caution is warranted when drawing conclusions. That being said, I find much to commend in García Martínez’s latest reading of SGT: in keeping

406 See Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God?’” 296ff. While I find Segal’s reading of Dan 7:13-14 questionable (see above), his reading of 4Q246 is more plausible.

407 That the earthly “beasts” of Daniel 7 have celestial counterparts was discussed above.

408 Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God?’” 301-304, outlines SGT as follows: a.) 1:1-8: a negative era of tribulation under the king(s) of Assyria and Egypt; b.) 1:9-2:?: mention of the “son of God/Most High”; c.) 2:2-3: a negative era of international conflict; d.) 2:4-9: a positive era in which the people of God are victorious. In short, because the progression from Segal’s section c.) to d.) is the only “clearly marked” transition from negative to positive, he considers the son of God to be responsible for the unrest in the section in which he appears.

409 Though Collins, “The Background,” 58ff, concedes that the “repetitions in Daniel 7 are occasioned by the process of interpretation, and this is not overtly the case in 4Q246.” For interaction with Collins’ interpretation, see Segal, “Who is the ‘Son of God?’” 304.
with the apparent influence of Dan 7, his emphasis on the relationship between celestial and earthly realities is important. And this is especially true of his interpretation of the son of God/Most High as “both human and heavenly at the same time,” not least because of the messianic and angelic associations of these epithets. Interpreted in this way, 4Q246 is indicative of the belief that the ה¿ה ה¿ג (i.e., Israel) had an angelic guardian whose influence was connected to their eschatological “rise.”

3.9: CONCLUSIONS

This chapter has focused on nine Qumran non-sectarian texts in which angels associated with Israel are prevalent. While angelic guardians are the focus of two texts (Dan 7-12 and SGT, depending on its interpretation), the others either refer to both angelic guardians and priests or suggest that some angels served in a dual capacity. As it pertains to angelic guardians, a few summary observations can be made. First, though Sir 17:17 echoes Deut 32:8-9, this sentiment appears to be an anomaly in light of many of the passages discussed (e.g., Dan 7:13-14; 10:13, 21; 12:1; 1 En. 20:5; 90:14; 4Q544 frg. 1 14; Jub. 1:29; 48:13), and the Michael-like role of the “angel of the presence” indicates that Jubilees’ similar assertion is theoretical in nature; indeed, a priestly epithet/vocation for its chief angelic protagonist may have been one of the ways Jubilees justified the juxtaposition of a celestial guardian figure and the assertion of Jub. 15:30-32. Second, some texts advocate violent resistance (AA; EE) and others suggest that faithfulness is demonstrated through wise teaching, piety, or patient suffering (Dan 7-12; Tobit); in all cases, the knowledge of Israel’s angelic guardianship,

410 Conversely, if one assumes Segal’s reading is correct, it is possible that the non-extant sections of the text referred to a righteous counterpart of the malevolent son of God, since hostile angelic figures akin to what Segal is proposing for 4Q246’s son of God (e.g., Belial, the Prince of Darkness, etc.) often have a righteous angelic equivalent (cf. BW, AA, Jubilees, 1QS 3:13-4:26; 1QM; 11QMelch, et al.).
whether on the earthly battlefield or on a heavenly one (with or without parallel earthly import), would have been a profound encouragement for those to whom it was revealed.\footnote{411 Cf. Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 241, 245, who observes that in the late Second Temple Period literature angels either a.) fight in the heavenly equivalent of an earthly battle; or b.) intervene directly on the battlefield. I will return to this observation in my discussion of the *War Scroll*; see Chapter Four, below.}

It would also have served to remind Israel of its connection to their heavenly counterparts, a bond that in some cases was envisioned as culminating in post-mortem angelic fellowship and angel-like exaltation (e.g., Dan 12:3; *1 En.* 104:2-6). Third, angelic guardians are never sufficient in and of themselves: despite a lofty rank or charge, these beings – and thus the nation – are ultimately dependent on God’s decisive support, intervention, or judgment (e.g., Dan 7:22; *1 En.* 1:9; 90:4; *Bod.* Col. b 21-22),\footnote{412 As I noted in Chapter One, Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 243, points out that even angels of high rank have “no independent power to initiate their own missions.”} and this theocentric conviction may have been another way Second Temple Period Jews justified circumventing Deut 32:8-9.

The existence and actions of angelic priests as depicted in these texts would have similarly encouraged those to whom this knowledge was revealed. In chaotic times, a temple in heaven would have functioned as reassurance that the corruption of some priests – angelic or human – ultimately does not negate the efficacy of the heavenly priesthood or its counterpart in Jerusalem (*BW*). Moreover, the intercession provided by the heavenly priests, as well as their sin-purging incarceration of the angelic rebels (*BW; AA; EE*), were likely no small comforts in the minds of those who composed these texts. As with angelic guardians, a high value is placed on the connection between Israel’s priestly line and their angelic counterparts: some texts suggest that to be the ideal priesthood is to emulate the heavenly one because it is its basis for knowledge and teaching (*ALD; VA*); the culmination of such
thinking is that it is not just Israel’s priests but the entire nation that corresponds to the angelic priests who serve in closest proximity to God (*Jubilees*).

Finally, that action is undertaken and knowledge conveyed by the most elite of angels (e.g., *1 En.* 10:1ff, 24:6ff, 93:6; *Tob* 12:15; *Jub.* 1:27) enhances the authority of what is revealed and the prestige of the protection afforded; revelatory confidence is also heightened by making ancient heroes like Enoch and Levi the “recipients” of this knowledge, which complements (yet sometimes seems to outshine) the Mosaic Torah. What is interesting to note, however, is that even if the patriarchs are stand-ins for a given text’s authors – who are thereby claiming privileged knowledge of the angelic realm – the outlooks of the works discussed in this chapter are not overly exclusivist. While some texts hint at a special role for its authors or evaluate fellow Jews more stringently than others (esp. *EE*), it is noteworthy that in others Israel is generously defined (e.g., *Dan* 7-12; *Jubilees*) and that all three of the Enochic works examined here (*EE* included) have strong universalistic leanings. Thus, angelic guardians and priests associated with Israel in the non-sectarian texts ultimately exist and act for the benefit of most Jews and, in some cases, a significant number of Gentiles.
CHAPTER FOUR
ANGELS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL IN THE SECTARIAN TEXTS PART I:
ANGELIC GUARDIANS

4.1: INTRODUCTION

In previous chapters, I examined angels associated with Israel in the non-sectarian texts, noting how the revealed knowledge of the existence of these angels and the belief of a connection or correspondence with them, as well as the hope of receiving their assistance and the anticipation of post-mortem angelic fellowship, were important facets of the works in which they are found. Turning to texts of a sectarian provenance, I will highlight similar themes, but here my focus will be on the development and expansion of these motifs at Qumran, especially as it is manifested in the Yahad’s well-known notion of angelic fellowship, which is more elaborate than the distinctly post-mortem privilege anticipated in texts like Dan 12 and 1 Enoch 104. Specifically, I will explore the relationship between angelic fellowship and the sect’s claims to be ideal Israel.

Scholars have attempted to categorize the different “forms” of angelic communion,

1 Of the documents examined in the next two chapters, it is only the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice whose sectarian provenance is seriously questioned by scholars, but even with this text there are good reasons for reading it as a sectarian composition; see the following chapter for discussion. Of course, certain elements/sections of various sectarian texts may pre-date the Yahad, and I will comment on these when necessary.

2 Cf. Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99, who captures the unique/provocative nature of the notion of angelic fellowship by referring to it as the “notorious communion of the Qumranites with the angels.”

3 E.g., Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 151-152, who lists four different types of angelic communion: (i) the Hodayot depict the community as intermingling with the angels in heaven as they praise God together (but he allows for the possibility that the sectarians thought the angels were present with them on earth); (ii) the first-person speaker of the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn boasts of his elevation among the angels in heaven and his superiority to any angel or human; (iii) Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice is a different work in that the focus is not on humans but on the angelic priests, whom the sectarians invite to perform their liturgical and sacrificial duties in the heavenly sanctuary; (iv) the War Scroll, in which humans and angels are united on earth for the great eschatological battle. The affinities between Schäfer’s first three categories can be seen in the way other scholars have classified angelic fellowship. Cf. Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 117, who mentions three Vorstellungskreise proposed by Kuhn (Enderwartung, 69): holy war, exclusion of the impure, and priestly communion. These are similar to the categories of angelic fellowship noted by Moshe Weinfeld, Normative and
one of which is the anticipation that the sectarian warriors and their angelic counterparts would fight together as a single army at the eschatological war; thus a significant section of this chapter will be a discussion of the War Scroll. But before doing so, I will examine two other texts – a section of the Community Rule known as the Treatise on the Two Spirits and 11QMelchizedek – as both seem to contain the type of beliefs that could have served as the conceptual foundations for the martial angelic fellowship of the War Scroll.

4.2: FOUNDATIONS FOR MARTIAL ANGELIC FELLOWSHIP

4.2.1: THE TREATISE ON THE TWO SPIRITS (1QS 3:13-4:26)

The lengthy dualistic theological statement known as the Treatise on the Two Spirits (henceforth, TTS) spans the second half of column three and the entirety of column four of the Community Rule from Cave 1 (1QS).4 TTS is important to the present study because its dualism includes the pitting of two angel-led contingents against one another. Due to the fact that 1QS was among the first texts discovered by the Bedouin but also because this early cache of manuscripts included a number of documents universally considered to be of sectarian provenance,5 scholars have often concluded that the dualistic outlook of TTS was a

--

Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period (LSTS 54; London: T & T Clark, 2005), 48: eschatological warfare, common praise, and eternal life. The organization of my discussion roughly corresponds to two of the categories mentioned by Kuhn and Weinfeld: camaraderie during the eschatological war, which I will address later in this chapter; and liturgical communion (with the priestly angels), which I will address in the following chapter.


5 E.g., the Hodayot (1QH) and the War Scroll (1QM).
sеминар компонент цивилизации Yhad’s теологии.\(^6\) В других словах, было предположено, что TTS является секулярным произведением и был неотъемлемой частью Community Rule с его создания.

Но открытие и публикация более коротких редакций Community Rule из Caves 4 — текстов, которые не содержат TTS и другие материалы — сложили вопрос.

Что определено, это то, что TTS “не был неизбежной частью Community Rule.”\(^8\) Вопрос, однако, является, не TTS как формулировка развития Сереха традиции или являются более короткие тексты Caves 4 — текстов, которые не содержат TTS, и они являются адаптацией традиции, сохраненной в 1QС.\(^9\) Я рассмотрю первый взгляд, чтобы предложить наиболее объясняющие силы, и в этом сценарии TTS был


7 E.g., both 4Q5 and 4Q6 begin at what is the equivalent of 1Q4 column 5. For the Cave 4 Serakh texts, see Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4Q Serakh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Claredon, 1998). For a summary of Qumran fragments which share similarities to TTS or may be related to it, see Hempel, “The Treatise on the Two Spirits,” 107-110.

8 Collins, *The Scriptures and Sectarianism*, 188.

9 1Q is dated on basis of paleography to 100-75 BCE. Championing the developmental scenario is Sarianna Metso (*The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [STD 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997]; and more recently, “Phases of Textual Growth,” in eadem, *The Serakh Texts* [LSTS 62; London: T & T Clark, 2007], 15-20), despite the fact that the paleography of the Cave 4 fragments has been judged to be later than that of 1Q. Conversely, Philip S. Alexander (“The Reaction History of the Serakh Ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *ResQ* 17 [1996]: 437-456; cf. idem, “The Recensional History of the Serakh ha-Yahad,” in *DJD 26, 9-12*) has argued that the Cave 4 fragments are an abbreviation of the 1Q tradition. Also see Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*.

10 For a helpful overview of the issues, see Michael Knibb, “The Rule of the Community,” *EDSS* 2:793-797, who summarizes as follows: “Alexander’s stress on the importance of paleographical considerations has to be taken seriously. On the other hand, the view put forward by Metso better takes account of the indication within [1Q] itself that its text is composite, and that it acquired its present form by a process of evolution [e.g., the additions of TTS and quotations of scripture].”
either a.) composed by the sect and added to the *Community Rule* at a later time;\(^{11}\) or b.) a non-sectarian composition subsequently adopted by the sect and added to *Community Rule*,\(^{12}\) perhaps with additions to both texts.\(^{13}\) A second factor prompting scholars to question the provenance of *TTS* is its so-called universalistic perspective,\(^{14}\) which stands in contrast to the *Yahad*’s more exclusive claims.

But regardless of its origins, *TTS* occupies a prominent position in a quintessential sectarian document, and it is therefore not surprising that speculation has arisen as to why *TTS* may have been included.\(^{15}\) I will return to this “why” question in greater detail, below; for now it is sufficient to note that *TTS* uses dualism both to demarcate who is elect and to clarify the place of the elect in God’s plan. While such observations may be “banal,”\(^{16}\) they

---

\(^{11}\) E.g., Collins, *The Scriptures and Sectarianism*, 193.


\(^{13}\) See especially Hempel, “Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History,” 113ff, who proposes how not just *TTS* but also the *Serekh* material that surrounds it may have been modified to facilitate the union of the documents.

\(^{14}\) Universalistic in the sense that there is nothing in *TTS* per se limiting the positive element of dualistic opposites such as יָשָׁרָהּ מְאָרָה (truth and deceit) to the *Yahad*, and that it is only within the context of 1QS that such identifications can/must be made (more on this point, below); so Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer, “Evil, Dualism and Community: Who/What Did the Yahad Not Want to Be?” in *Dualism in Qumran*, 134-136; cf. Hempel, “Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History,” 115; eadem, “Maskil(Im) and Rabbiim: From Daniel to Qumran,” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (eds., Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Leu; JSJSup 111; Lieden: Brill, 2006), 152-154; Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 88.

\(^{15}\) While it is possible that the removal of *TTS* from the tradition was prompted by a change in perspective, an abbreviated recension of the *Serekh* tradition does not demand the conclusion that *TTS* was thereby rejected by the *Yahad* (i.e., it simply may have been that a condensed version of the rules was desired).

\(^{16}\) Leonhardt-Balzer concedes the simplicity and banality of these observations, but she also suggests that *TTS* was important because it helped the *Yahad* decipher who they did *not* want to be: “others”; see eadem, “Evil, Dualism and Community,” 141, 146. Cf. Nickelsburg, “The We and the Other,” 273, who states that...
are important if the goal is to understand the self-identity of the Yahad. In order to comprehend fully the relationship the elect have with the aforementioned angel-led contingents, some comments on both the structure and content of TTS, as well as how TTS functions within 1QS, will be helpful.

Numerous outlines have been proposed for TTS, and my own demarcation of the text is indebted to earlier proposals:\(^{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1QS Column &amp; Line</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>3:13-15a</td>
<td>Admonition for the maskil to teach the treatise and an introductory statement that its contents concern the nature of humanity and, &quot;all their spiritual varieties&quot;(^{18})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of Divine Sovereignty (3:15b-4:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3:15b-17a</td>
<td>Foundational statement on the sovereignty of God and his sustaining power over the created order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3:17b-19</td>
<td>Aspect #1 of God’s Sovereignty: the two inclinational spirits at work within humankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>3:20-4:1</td>
<td>Aspect #2 of God’s Sovereignty: the two angelic spirits influencing humankind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practical Out-Workings of Divine Sovereignty (4:2-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4:2-8 and 4:9-14</td>
<td>The respective paths and eschatological rewards/punishments of those led by the spirit of truth and spirit of deceit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>4:15-26</td>
<td>Mechanics of the division and reiteration of the eschatological fates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A key to understanding TTS is that there is not just one form of dualism at work within it, but that the text simultaneously employs psychological (or inclinational) dualism, cosmic (or angelic) dualism, and ethical (or moral) dualism.\(^{19}\) The recognition that the various dualisms from the perspective of TTS (and its function/placement in 1QS) non-members of the Yahad are the “epitome of the ‘Other’.”


\(^{18}\) As translated by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSYE, 1:75.

complement and interact with each other is particularly important in light of the fact that the word (טָן) תְּנֵי, “spirit(s)” is used somewhat confusingly to refer to both psychological and angelic dualisms. For obvious reasons, it is angelic dualism with which I am most concerned, and since this form of dualism is showcased in what I have demarcated as TTS’s section III (3:20-4:1), my discussion will highlight these lines.

Having already set out that two opposing inclinational spirits are at work within humankind in my section II (3:17b-19), TTS then announces that humankind also has outside influences in the form of two opposing angels:

בּוֺדַר שֶׁהוּא הַמֶּשֶּׁל הַמַּכְלְעָה בּוֺדַר בְּנֵי צֶדֶק הַרְרוּפִּים אוֹר הַחֲלֵלָה בּוֺדַר פָּלְאָה

Having already set out that two opposing inclinational spirits are at work within humankind in my section II (3:17b-19), TTS then announces that humankind also has outside influences in the form of two opposing angels:

20 And in the hand of the Prince of Lights (is) the dominion of all the Sons of Righteousness; in the ways of light they walk. But in the hand of the Angel of

Human Being in Second Temple Judaism: The Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III:13-IV:26) in its Tradition-Historical Context,” in Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World (eds., Armin Lange et al.; JAJSup 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 145-168. Additionally, the various dualisms have been a driving force for speculation on source-critical matters and the history of the formation of TTS itself; cf., e.g., Peter Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial: traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 17-28; Jean Duhaime, “L’Instruction sur les deux esprits et le interpolations dualistes a Qumrân (1QS III,13-IV,26),” CBQ 49 (1987): 40-43. It needs to be said, however, that proposals for how TTS came to attain its present shape and content are at least just as speculative as deciphering TTS’s relationship to 1QS, and for this reason, Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualism,” 290, is right to emphasize the “compositional unity” of the text; cf. Hempel, “The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History,” 113, who comments that while some of the distinctive dualistic elements “may well have originated separately, it seems impossible to try to disentangle their current interconnection.”

20 Contra Preben Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serke 3:13-4:26),” RevQ (1961): 422, who understood (טָן) תְּנֵי only in terms of psychology, mood, disposition, propensity, etc., and thus roughly equivalent to the rabbinic נָפָשׁ distinctions. However, it is unnecessary to pit one form of dualism against another in TTS, and here John J. Collins, Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls (LDSS; New York: Routledge, 1997), 41, is instructive: “[TTS] clearly identifies the two spirits with the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness (3:20-1). The dualism is simultaneously psychological, moral, and cosmic. There is a synergism between the psychological realm and the agency of the supernatural angels or demons [emphasis mine].” On the use of מַרְאָה to refer to demons, see Philip S. Alexander, “The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment (eds., Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 331; cf. Frey, “Different Patterns,” 192ff; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 153-156; Arthur E. Sekki, The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 7-67; Arnold A. Anderson, “The Use of ‘Ruah’ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM,” JSJS 7 (1962): 293-303.
21 Darkness (is) the dominion of the Sons of Deceit; and in the ways of darkness they walk.

One immediately notices the interplay of angelic and ethical dualisms, as well as the relative theological neatness of the statement insofar as there are two distinct angelic leaders, peoples, and paths. However, the second half of line 21 and following makes things far less tidy theologically:

21 ... By the Angel of Darkness [comes] the aberration of
22 all the Sons of Righteousness; all their sins, their iniquities, their guilt, and their iniquitous works are under his dominion

The section continues with the comment that the subordinates of the Angel of Darkness have a hand in making the “sons of light” stumble (3:24a). Therefore, the Angel of Darkness not only has sway over the sons of deceit (= those within whom are the inclinational spirit of deceit), but he and his comrades also negatively impact the sons of justice/sons of light (= those within whom is the inclinational spirit of truth).

If TTS aided in the recognition of who is elect and who is not, the division of humankind into two opposing lots is surely a means to this end, as Leonhardt-Balzer points out. But she also observes that TTS “maintains the awareness that even the sons of

---

21 I.e., the angels are at least partially responsible for influencing the respective moral paths of those in their “hand.”

22 Indeed, angelic subordinates over and through whom the Angel of Darkness rules likely constitute part of his ממלכת השטח mentioned in line 22; cf. 1QM 17:7-8, discussed below. While there is no explicit indication that the Prince of Lights has a retinue, this is certainly possible; see the comments of Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 170; Frey, “Different Patterns,” 292-293; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 156; Anderson, “The Use of Ruach,” 299.

23 As Alexander, Mystical Texts, succinctly puts its, “The Qumran sect believed that the world is the theatre of a cosmic struggle between good and evil, fought out by proxies in both the material and spiritual realms.” Cf. Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 96; “Seeing themselves as part of the hosts of Light, the Qumranites viewed all their political conflicts and theological controversies in terms of [a] metaphysical struggle.”
righteousness are fallible due to the influence of the Angel of Darkness. Thus there is a
certain tension between the predestination of man through God and the influence of the
Angel of Darkness on the Sons of Light. To be sure, the tension is real, and it may be
symptomatic of the more robust tension TTS has with Israelite/Jewish tradition – a tradition
that heavily emphasized the freedom to choose or reject the covenant (e.g., Josh 24:15).

But to dwell on these tensions without due emphasis on the mitigation of the tensions
advocated by TTS itself and its placement in 1QS would be unfortunate.

First, TTS is clear that every human heart is a battleground of sorts for the war
between truth and injustice. 1QS 4:23-24a reads:

23 עַד־הַנֶּה־יִרְאוֹתָה רְחֹמֶת אֲחֶט וּעֲלוֹת בַּלַּכְס בְּנֵר
   יִהוּדֵלֵי בַּמַּכָּהוּ וּא֑וֹלָהוּ
24

23 Until now the spirits of truth and deceit struggle in the hearts of humans,
24 they walk in wisdom or folly …

TTS also suggests that what is determinative for one’s actions and eschatological destiny is
the measure of their inheritance/share in lots of truth or injustice. 1QS 4:24-25 reads:

בַּמַּכָּהוּ אַשְּׁי־בֵּאָמָה יִשְׂרָאֵל וֹּסֶךֶם וֹּסֶךֶם תַּעְלָה בַּמַּכָּהוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל וּרְשֵׁי־בַּמַּכָּה

24

“The idea that the sons of righteousness go astray is … unexpected in a catechesis on the two ways which is
concerned with a clear-cut separation between men according their conduct.”

25 Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 189, summarizes the canonical picture as follows: “The
traditional covenant presupposed a vigorous doctrine of free will, by which the Israelites were to choose to obey
the commandments or not, and were fully responsible for their actions. The suggestion that human beings are
determined by angelic or demonic forces, and that their design is established in advance, departs radically from
this view, and has very little precedent in the Hebrew Bible.” On the Persian background of TTS’s dualism, see
und die iranische Religion,” ZTK 49 (1952): 296-316. Contra Paul Heger, Challenges to Conventional Opinions on
Qumran and Enoch Issues (STDJ 100; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 227-310, who argues that Persian influence on TTS
has been overstated. However, it is widely recognized that the dualism of TTS is not the “absolute” dualism of
Zoroastrianism but more “moderate” in that God’s sovereignty is never in question; on this point, see the
comments of Popovic, “Light and Darkness,” 151. For helpful discussions of the (in)appropriateness of using
the term “dualism” in a Jewish/motheistic context, see Stuckenbruck, “The Interiorization of Dualism,”
24 According to a man’s share in truth shall he be righteous and thus hate deceit, and
according to his inheritance in the lot of deceit he shall be evil through it, and thus
25 loathe truth. For God has sorted them into equal parts\(^26\) until the appointed end and the
making of the new.

The fallibility of the righteous is thereby tempered by the fact that God has the matter sorted
out, with the implication being that time would reveal that those responsible for 1QS are
indeed the “sons of light,” whose inheritance in the truth is greater than their shares in the
lot of injustice.\(^27\)

But a second way the fallibility of the righteous is mitigated is, for the present study,
more important. I just noted the role of the Angel of Darkness and the spirits of his lot; but
the manner by which TTS says this evil is countered is significant:

> נָא יְהוָה יְשַׁרֵאֵל וֹמָלָא עַמָּה יָשַׁר לֹא לְתוֹלֵה

> בִּמְךָ אָדָם

24 But the God of Israel and his Angel of Truth help all
25 the sons of light …

Duhaime is convinced that this line is secondary to TTS (and part of a larger, multi-stage
interpolation that runs from 3:18b-25a);\(^28\) he further posits that the cosmic/angelic dualism

---

\(^{26}\) Qimron translates بد بدر as “set them apart,” which is not as clear as “sorted them into
equal parts”; for the latter translation, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:79.

\(^{27}\) Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 42: “The conflict will be resolved, it is assumed, at the end;
therefore, the tension between the present era and the end is an eschatological dualism [emphasis retained]”; cf.
Charlesworth, *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 76-89; Alexander, “Predestination and Freewill,” 37ff; Collins, *The
Scriptures and Sectarianism*, 189ff. On the possibility of a relationship between TTS and 4Q186, and whether the
latter may have been used to determine one’s inheritance in the truth or injustice, see Popovic, “Light and
Darkness,” 148-165, especially 156ff; cf. idem, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea
Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (STDJ 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

\(^{28}\) Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 38ff (especially 41-42), argues that there are several items
suggesting that 3:18b-25a constitute an addition including 1.) “marginal ticks,” which may indicate scribal
recognition of a new section (e.g., 3:13 & 4:26 = the beginning and end of TTS, respectively; cf. 4:2, 9, 15); 2.)
the “double introduction” of spirits in 18b & 25b-26a; 3.) the observation that 3:13-4:14 is a “coherent
continuity” without 3:18b-25a. Duhaime is expounding upon the arguments that 1QS 3:20-25 (give or take a
of this section was added in order to personalize the inclinational spirits of light and darkness referred to earlier in TTS, as well as to “strengthen the sons of light by spelling out the aggression which they suffer and the help they are given.” Such detailed proposals are certainly possible. But whatever the source-critical history, Duhaime is correct that 3:24b functions as TTS’s response to the disturbing picture of evil announced in the preceding lines.

At the same time, the angelic dualism of 3:20-4:1 serves a much greater purpose than to personalize the inclinational spirits or to spell out the help granted to the sons of light. The statement at 3:24b arguably serves as the climax of both what I have demarcated as section III and the entire first half of TTS (see Table # 7, above). Given the chiastic structure of my section III, “the angel of his truth” is presumably another name for the Prince of Lights. Intriguingly, this section contains the only occurrence of the word “Israel” in TTS; that the sons of light are assisted by “the God of Israel and the angel of his truth” lends further support to the argument that the adoption of TTS’s dualistic thought was not a rejection of the Mosaic covenant: as Collins has argued, the dualism of TTS was at

---

29 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 43.
30 According to my outline, the first major section of TTS (3:13-4:1) is comprised of three sub-sections, the last of which focuses on cosmic/angelic dualism; in turn, this last sub-section can be outlined according to the following chiastic structure:

a.) Prince of Lights rules sons of justice (3:20a)
b.) Angel of Darkness rules sons of deceit (20b-21a)

Rounding out section III is the statement in 3:25b-4:1 that serves as both a fitting summary of the first half of TTS and a bridge to the second (4:2-26), which highlights the respective paths and eschatological fates of the sons of light and the sons of deceit.

32 Even if, as already discussed, the adoption of TTS resulted in some tension with biblical tradition; see Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 193-194.
least partially attractive to the Yahad due to its ability to explain the disobedience of other Jews. Elsewhere, Collins has suggested that TTS was a way for the Yahad to enhance its assertions to be peerless on halakhic matters:

The dualism of light and darkness went hand in hand with the separation of the sect from the rest of Judaism. It is probably fruitless to argue whether the division or the myth came first. If we judge by 4QMMT, the separation of the sect was primarily due to legal disagreement, and so we might suppose that the doctrine of the two spirits was adopted secondarily to provide a theological explanation of the social division.

Moreover, TTS is situated within 1QS between a covenant renewal ceremony (1:13-3:12) and detailed regulations for community life (5:1-7:25; 7:26-10:8), sections which effectively assert the Yahad as Israel “as it ought to be.”

**EXCURSUS: THE YAHAD AS IDEAL ISRAEL**

As a rejoinder to arguments that the Community Rule is not as nationalistic in its focus as the Damascus Document, Collins observes:

1QS 5:8 states that members of the community bind themselves by oath “to return to the Torah of Moses, according to all which he has commanded.” 5:22 speaks of “the multitude of Israel who dedicate themselves to return to his covenant through the community.” The covenant renewal ceremony at the beginning of 1QS is clearly modeled on Deuteronomy, with its curses and blessings. The community is clearly imagined in the context of biblical Israel, and is in effect a re-constitution of Israel as it ought to be. It is in this ideal sense that

---

34 The view that TTS was secondarily adopted to bolster legal arguments is related to/complements the proposal discussed above that 1QS represents an expansion of the serekh tradition.
35 Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 193; cf. Murphy-O’Connor, “La genèse littéraire de la Règle,” 528-549, who suggests that TTS was adopted and included for encouragement in the midst of crises; Hempel, “The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History,” 107. Also see Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 137, who claims that “it is conformity to angelic behaviour that guarantees to the community that their praxis (halakah) is correct.” I will address the Yahad’s attempt live in imitation of the angels when I discuss the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices (see the following chapter).
IQS 2:22 can refer to those who participate in the covenant ceremony as “every man of Israel.”

In the same essay, Collins is quick to point out that the sect hoped that the distinction between Israel and the Sons of Light would eventually collapse, that the separation of the sect from the rest of Judaism was likely envisioned to be temporary, and hopes of a national restoration were never completely abandoned. However, this relative optimism needs to be articulated with caution for one runs the risk of understating the boldness and uniqueness of sectarian claims—and, intriguingly, Collins has, in a more recent discussion, tempered the optimism of his earlier statements:

The Scrolls never deny that the covenant is intended for all Israel, and the authors were well aware that their movement was not identical with all Israel in the present. They hoped it would be so in the eschatological future, but even then the War Scroll acknowledged that “the violators of the covenant” would share the lot of the Kittim. In short, from the perspective of the sect, it is not true that all Israel has a share in the world to come.

These sentiments are echoed by numerous scholars in various ways. For example, Schiffman writes that, “All in all, the authors of the various sectarian texts found at Qumran saw both the people and the Land of Israel in ideal terms. They expected that as the true Israel, separated from both errant Jews and from the non-Jewish world, they could live a life of perfect holiness and sanctity … .”

Moreover, the concept of the covenant is central to the ideal Israel claims of the sect, and as Bautsch notes, “although the covenants described in the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document have affinities with those made in the Hebrew Bible, in the scrolls the covenants do not indicate ‘a relationship between God and ethnic Israel,’ as covenant clearly does in Jubilees, and refer rather to ‘a particularistic covenant relationship.’” For this reason, Talmon stresses the importance of the

---

40 I will address a similar need for caution when examining the outlook of 1QM; see below.
aforementioned covenant renewal ceremony (1QS 1:13-3:12), which itself elucidates the boldness of sectarian nationalistic aspirations:

The thread of Israel’s historical past, which had snapped when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed [in 587 BCE], is retied with the establishment of the Yabud’s “renewed covenant.” The intrinsic community-signification of הַרְכֵּזָה comes to the fore in the induction rite of novices into the Yabud, when also the membership of veterans was presumably reaffirmed. This annually repeated ritual is palpably molded upon the “Blessing and Curse” ceremony, which the Pentateuchal tradition reports to have been enacted by Moses prior to Israel’s enrootment in the land of Canaan (Deut 27-28). … The Yabud members perceived the reenactment of the biblical ceremony in their induction ritual as the confirmation of their community’s claim to be the only legitimate heir to biblical Israel.  

The contribution the dualism of 1QS 3:13-4:26 makes to these claims and themes is that it “absolutizes” them: as Nickelsburg explains, TTS “encompasses all of humanity in its scope,” and from the perspective of the Yabud, “the rest of Israel – to say nothing of humanity – constitutes the Other, as darkness is other than light.” And regardless of its origins, TTS was deliberately situated in 1QS, a document whose writers considered themselves “to be exclusively Israel, the chosen of God.” Thus, TTS’s prominent placement in 1QS affirms the obvious: the sons of light are the Yabud, the ones who constitute ideal Israel.

excluding the rest of Israel.” Also see the comments of Swarup, The Self-Understanding, 72, who examines the biblical “plant” and “house” metaphors used to assert the ideal Israel claims of the Yabud (see my discussion of the Hodayot and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in the following chapter) and whose conclusions are nearly identical to those of Bautch et al.: “The DSS community understood itself to be the ‘elect’ whom God had chosen and to whom he had given an eternal possession. They were now keeping the obligations of the covenant and therefore fulfilling the purpose of the elect. However, the DSS community differed from other Jewish groups in their view of election. The community understood its election as an election of individuals rather than of the nation of Israel, and they perceived themselves to be the restored Israel. This is contrary to Second Temple expectation which hoped for a future re-establishment of Israel in which all Israel would be restored. The participation of other Israelites was only possible if they joined the community as individuals. Further, one could not be born into the sect. Entrants had to take an oath (1QS 5:8).”


45 Nickelsburg, “The We and Others,” 273.

46 Nickelsburg, “The We and Others,” 273.

47 The identification of the sons of light with the Yabud is bolstered by what Hempel, “The Treatise on the Two Spirits,” 113ff, refers to as “thematic links” between TTS and other sections of 1QS: e.g., the opposition of הַרְכֵּזָה and its prominent in both TTS and 1QS 5-9, and the latter instances make explicit what is implied in the former. In Hempel’s own words, “Truth (תְמִית) and injustice (שְׁאָר הַגְּנָב) occur very
Thus, the placement of 1QS 3:24b means that at the heart of TTS is the affirmation that to be counted among the sons of light—that is, to be a member of the Yahad or ideal Israel—is not simply to be on the righteous or winning side of a dualistic divide—it means that one’s help in the midst of the cosmic struggle between good and evil is the God of Israel and the Angel of (his) Truth/the Prince of Light.  

To be sure, the Yahad’s boasts of martial fellowship with the angels (to be discussed later in this chapter) are bolder than the assertion of 1QS 3:24b. But the fact that the Yahad claimed the God of Israel’s Angel of Truth as their help is no small contention because it is the usurpation of the angelic assistance that was normally the hope of the entire nation. In the context of the Community Rule, this contention also seems to be considered an integral component of what it means to be ideal Israel. The presupposition of a uniquely close relationship to an angelic guardian figure is central to another text, 11QMelchizedek.

4.2.2: 11QMelchizedek (11Q13)

The document known as 11QMelchizedek (henceforth, 11QMel) is a fragmentary, thematic pesher which outlines the career of its namesake, a figure of extraordinarily high rank and frequently in the Treatise. This polarity is also a central defining feature of the community in 1QS v-ix//4QS. Thus, according to 1QS v 2 the people of injustice emerge as the nemesis of the community which itself is referred to as a ‘foundation of truth’ (1QS v 5) and ‘house of truth’ (1QS v 6). … A further particularly instructive example is found in 1QS vi 14f … in the context of admission into the community, a process that is described in terms of being permitted by the official at the head of the many to enter ‘the covenant to return to the truth and to turn away from all in justice.’” On the identity of the “people of injustice” see eadem, “The Community and Its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4,” RevQ 81 (2003): 47-81. For additional comments on TTS’s placement within 1QS and the identification of the sons of light with the Yahad, cf. Leonhardt-Balzer, “Evil, Dualism, and Community,” 134; Hans-Walter Huppenbauer, Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten: Der Dualismus der Texte von Qumran (Höhle 1) und der Damaskusfragmente: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Evangeliums (AthANT 32; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959), 22-26.

48 Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 115, 136, perceptively notes the importance of the dualistic divide. Hannah, Michael and Christ, 75, in passing, makes the observation that the sect claimed Israel’s angel succor as their own.

49 While fourteen fragments and two columns of text (with vestiges of another) were discovered, the original length of the document is unknown. It is only the extant second column that is in relatively good
privilege. Melchizedek’s lofty depiction has generated much discussion concerning his precise nature, but the most common identification of this eschatological protagonist – and the view accepted here – is that Melchizedek is an angelic benefactor of God’s people and the leader of the spiritual beings who contend against the wicked angel Belial and his forces.

Recasting the year of jubilee (cf. Lev 25:13) in an eschatological framework, 11QMelch describes the last days as the tenth of ten jubilees (2:7). During the first week of this tenth and final jubilee period, Melchizedek will liberate those who are captive and free them from condition, but even this section requires much restoration. The text has been dated on the basis of paleography to the 1st cent. BCE, but a quotation of Dan 9 suggests it may have been composed as early as the middle of the 2nd cent. BCE. Initially published by Adam S. Van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XL,” Os 14 (1965): 354-373, it has been more recently presented in Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. Van der Woude, eds., Qumran Cave 11.II: 11QS-18, 11Q20-31 (DJD 23; Oxford: Claredon Press, 1998), 221-241, which will serve as the basis for citations here; cf. J. J. M. Roberts, “Melchizedek: 11Q13 = 11QMelchizedek = 11QMelch,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Texts (eds., James H. Charlesworth et al.; PTSDSSP 6B; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 264-273. For additional textual comments, see Emile Puech, “Notes sur le manuscript de 11Qmelkîsédek,” RevQ 12 (1987): 483-513; Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa,” 109-124.

50 In addition to the so-called “continuous” pesharim, which are verse-by-verse interpretations of a particular work (e.g., the well-known commentary on Habakkuk =1QpHab), the Yahad also approached biblical interpretation thematically by using a collection of scriptures to develop an idea. In the case of 11QMelch, a wide-range of passages including Lev 25, Deut 15, Pss 7 and 82, and Isa 52 and 61 are employed to describe an eschatological scenario and its Lev. Both the terms “continuous” (or “running”) pešēr and “thematic” peshar were coined by Jean Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédek,” RevQ 7 (1970): 343-378. On the Qumran pesharim, see Shani Berrin, “Qumran Pesharim,” in Biblical Interpretation at Qumran (ed., Matthias Henze; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 110-133; Timothy H. Lim, “The Genre of Pesher: Definition and Categorization” in idem, Pesharim (CQS 3; London: Sheffield Press, 2002), 44-53.


52 On the Early Jewish tradition of the eschaton as the last jubilee, cf. Dan 9; T. Levi 16-18, 1 En. 91, 93; see Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet, 72.
their iniquities (2:6); at the end of this jubilee will be a day of atonement for God’s people (2:6-7). The reason given for these events is the following:

“For it is the time for the year of the grace of Melchizedek, and of [his] armies, the people of the holy ones of God, of the administration of justice, …” (2:8b-9a).

The statement uses the language of Isa 61:2 – a verse which proclaims the year of Yahweh’s grace/favour – to announce the intervention of Melchizedek. The remarkable replacement of Melchizedek for Yahweh is a hallmark of 11QMelch, and this feature sets Melchizedek apart as one who has been both commissioned to do God’s will and as one who, in doing so, has been accorded privileges and descriptions that are normally the prerogatives of God himself. While another allusion to Isaiah 61 declares that Melchizedek will “carry out the vengeance of God’s judgments” (2:13), it is the text’s use of Psalm 82 that most elucidates the lofty stature and role of Melchizedek.

As discussed at length in Chapter Two, above, Psalm 82 conveys the superiority of the God of Israel over all other celestial beings, some of whom God is asked to judge because of their negligence and malevolence. But whereas the psalm is clear that Yahweh is the אלוהים who “has taken his place in the divine council …,” 11QMelch reinterprets Ps

---

53 DJD 23 has “nation”; for the significance of this phrase, see below.
54 The first part of Isa 61:2 reads לא כתוב על התורה. מלחמה נמחקה.
56 Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 132, entertains the possibility that the אלוהים of Ps 82:1 originally referred to a “principal angel,” which would mean that a “high’ angelology” was a central part of the mainstream cult and thus accepted by the Qumran community. However, she rightly states that there is no
82:1 as a reference to Melchizedek and his role as heavenly judge (2:10). There are a number of examples of figures other than the God of Israel being called אֱלֹהִים in the Hebrew Bible, but the most pertinent for understanding 11QMelch is found in Ps 82:6, where the אֱלֹהִים are rebellious celestial beings. In the context of 11QMelch’s use of Ps 82, these beings are the “spirits of Belial’s lot” whom Melchizedek will judge (2:11-12), and the stage is thus set for a showdown between the אֱלֹהִים. Melchizedek, aided by the righteous celestial beings, will square off against Belial and his forces. Analogous to Ps 82, 11QMelch evidence for such a view and is quick to note the theological ingenuity of the Qumranite interpretation that sees Melchizedek as אֱלֹהִים.

57 That the אֱלֹהִים of the Ps 82:1 quotation refers to Melchizedek is the consensus view, with which I concur; see, e.g., van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt,” 364, 367-368; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11,” JBL 86 (1967): 37; Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 71, 75; Hannah, Michael and Christ, 70 n. 3; Xeravits, King Priest, Prophet, 73; Mason, ‘You Are a Priest Forever,’ 176-183; contra Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisèdek,” 365-367, who opposed this identification on the basis of his conclusion that wylo refers back not to Melchizedek but ןָבִים (cf. DJD 23, 231: “The suffix probably refers to Melchizedek although מָכְסִית could also be the antecedent”). In response to such arguments, Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 59-60, states that “whether the antecedent of ‘lyw is mlky sdq or mspt, ‘judgment,’” in no way affects the interpretation of ‘lwhym [as Melchizedek].”

58 Ps 7:8-9 is quoted in 2:10b-11a to support the contention that it is Melchizedek who has been tasked with divine judgment. In this instance, however, לא substitutes for the psalm’s יWhy. Just as לא introduces the Ps 82:1 quotation at the beginning of line 10, לא functions in the same capacity for the Ps 7 quotation near the end of line, so there is little doubt לא in some way refers to Melchizedek. Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 33, 37, cites the reluctance to write the tetragrammaton at Qumran as the reason for this particular substitution. Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 77, takes it to mean that Melchizedek’s judgments are synonymous with those of לא (i.e., God). In light of this, the proximity to the quotation of Ps 82:1, which locates the judgments of Melchizedek in the לא, 11QMelch’s use of לא in the Ps 7 quotation makes good sense; cf. Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 62; van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt,” 365.

59 Cf. Exod 4:16 (Moses); 1 Sam 28:13 (Samuel’s ghost); 1 Kgs 18:24 (Baal); see Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 60 n. 35.


61 Melchizedek’s support is mentioned in 2:14: מְלַבַּי אֵלַי כִּי זֶה יֹדֵעַ אֵלֶּה אֲנָשֵׁי הָאָדָם וּבְנֵיIGIN ... מְלַבַּי אֵלַי כִּי זֶה יֹדֵעַ אֵלֶּה אֲנָשֵׁי הָאָדָם וּבְנֵי. “And all the gods [of justice] are to his help; [and he] is (the one) who all the sons of God and he will ....” Though the poor condition of this line makes any interpretation of it tentative, most commentators understand the “gods” and “sons of God” to be references to the angelic forces whom Melchizedek leads; see, e.g., Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 54, 71-72; contra Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisèdek,” who objects on the basis that Melchizedek seems to require help.
suggests that the wickedness of the spiritual realm somehow negatively impacts humanity, though the text is fragmentary at key points.\(^{62}\)

It is thus clear that Ps 82 was considered to be a suitable template to describe the career of Melchizedek; and due to his roles as judge in the heavenly court, executor of divine vengeance, chief opponent of the rebellious heavenly beings, eschatological redeemer, and especially the way this is conveyed – through the substitution of the name of Melchizedek for Yahweh in scripture quotations – it is understandable why a majority of commentators have identified Melchizedek as a high-ranking angel.\(^{63}\) However, the latter half of 11QMelch's...
second column refers to an anointed messenger who is said to fulfill Second Isaiah’s prediction of peace-proclaiming herald (2:15ff; cf. Isa 52:7; 61:1; Dan 9:25-26), and there is some ambiguity as to whether this herald and Melchizedek are one and the same figure.

Since the two references to Melchizedek in the Hebrew Bible seem to refer to a priest (cf. Gen 14; Ps 110), it has also been suggested that Melchizedek is a human. But such arguments are ultimately unsatisfactory. Not only would the enigmatic nature of Melchizedek in the Hebrew Bible have likely been ripe for imaginative Second Temple Period interpreters; to understand the figure of 11QMelch as even partially human is to consider a "warrior figure" rather than a priest, there are certainly hints of a priestly role (e.g., mention of the day of atonement). Moreover, we will see below that Melchizedek’s name has been restored in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, where he may have been cast as the ranking angelic high priest. For recent treatments that emphasize the priestly aspects of Melchizedek’s presentation in 11QMelch, see Angel, Otherworldly, 152-165; Alexander, Mystical Texts, 70; Anders Aschim, “Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews,” in The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers From the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (eds., Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis; JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 139-140.

Despite the poor condition of the text, it is virtually certain that Isa 52:7 is quoted in 2:15b-16, and the editors note the strong possibility of part of Dan 9:25 or 26 being quoted in 2:18, especially in light of the reading [לְאִיש] יְהוָה. Isa 61:1, employed earlier in the second column, also refers to an anointed herald of God, and thus may be in view in line 19; see DJD 23, 232.

This was put forward as a possibility by Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 40 (followed by Miller, “The Function of Isaiah 61:1-2,” 467-469), but it has found little support; see below.

Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédék,” 369, has argued that the figure of 11QMelch is a purely human figure; cf. Paul Rainbow, “Melchizedek as Messiah at Qumran,” BBR 7 (1997): 179-194, who claims that Melchizedek is the Davudic Messiah. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 216-221, argues that Melchizedek should not be viewed as “entirely superhuman” (i.e., as an angel) but rather as a “divine human” (i.e., evidence of Fletcher-Louis’ thesis that Early Judaism testifies to angelmorphic anthropology tradition).

As pointed out by Angel, Otherworldly, 151-152, who argues that “the author’s dependence on Scripture clearly did not force him to comply with the ‘literal’ meaning of biblical traditions, especially as modern exegesis might understand it.” Following a suggestion of David Flusser (“Melchizedek and the Son of Man [A Preliminary note on a new fragment from Qumran],” Christian News from Israel [April 1966]: 26-27), Mason, ‘You Are a Priest Forever,’ 171ff, proposes that Ps 110 was read in antiquity in such a way that it was addressed to Melchizedek (in heaven) rather than someone receiving a priesthood like Melchizedek’s. In this reading, the author of 11QMelch may have thought that the Melchizedek of Ps 110 was eternal, and the psalm’s themes of heavenly privilege, dominion over enemies, and rendering judgment became a character sketch for the heavenly Melchizedek. In short, the Melchizedek of 11QMelch was influenced by a particular reading of Ps 110 and less by the human priest of Gen 14. Conversely, Anders Aschim, “Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?” JBLSP 35 (1996): 43-58, proposes that the Melchizedek of Gen 14 may have been understood as Abram’s heavenly patron who contends against the spiritual equivalents of Abram’s enemies in the celestial realm, thus ensuring the patriarch’s victory. But note the caution of Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 79: “We do not have enough of the document left to satisfy our curiosity about how the
ignore the import of the angelic symmetry of the text: Melchizedek is cast as the righteous counterpart of Belial, the name of the leader of the wicked angelic host. Moreover, given both the name מלך יודע – meaning, “my king is righteous(ness)” or “king of righteousness” – and the interpretation of Melchizedek as the בָּלָא of Ps 82:1, the text itself appears to differentiate between the herald and Melchizedek when it is announced (presumably by the herald) that “your God” is Melchizedek (2:24b-25a).

---

68 Contra Cargmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédek,” 369, who arrives at his conclusion that the figure of 11QMelch is human by denying that Melchizedek is the subject of the quotations of Pss 7 and 82. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 216-221, though he identifies Melchizedek as the subject of the psalms quotations, is not only dismissive of the close similarities Melchizedek shares with angels in the Qumran literature, but his contention that Melchizedek is a “divine human” all but ignores Melchizedek’s function as the adversary of the angelic Belial. Fletcher-Louis also cites the ascent of the speaker of the Self-Glorification Hymn’s speaker (see following chapter) – whom he also considers to be “divine human” – as a possible parallel to 11QMelch. There is, however, no evidence of Melchizedek’s ascension in 11QMelch, and Fletcher-Louis’ argument that the language of return (cf. Ps 7:8-9, 11QMelch 2:10-11) functions as a description of how Melchizedek moves into his position of heavenly authority actually suggests the opposite: i.e., to return to a judgment role in the divine court presupposes that such a role has precedent, which would be a strange assertion to make of someone who is human. On the possibility that the verb in question is not בָּחַר but a form of בָּשׂ which may be more intelligible in the context of the psalm, see the comments of Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 37, who notes the similarly problematic spelling of the word in the MT; cf. Dahood, Psalms 1, 44.

69 For the origins of Belial as a chief wicked angel/Satan figure, see S. D. Sperling, “Belial,” DDD 169ff; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 170ff; Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresha, 75-83.

70 It is likely that “Sedeq” was originally a Canaanite theophoric element of the name; see the discussions of Mason, “Melchizedek Traditions,” 344; Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresha, 55-56; Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 42-43.

71 11QMelch 2:23-25 returns to the language of Isa 52:7 (cf. 2:15): “as is written about him (גְּדוֹל): ‘[saying to Zi]on: your God is king’. [Zi]on [its] [the congregation of all the sons of justice, who] establish the covenant, who avoid walking [on the path of the people. And ‘your G[o]od’ (גְּדוֹל) is […] Melchizedek who will free them from the hand of Belial.” While it is true that the interpretation of גְּדוֹל at the end of 2:24 has not been preserved, most commentators consider the גְּדוֹל of 2:23 to refer to Melchizedek rather than the herald of 2:18; it is therefore considered reasonable to expect our protagonist to be mentioned in 2:23ff, hence the restoration of Melchizedek, who is proclaimed by the herald as “your God.” This view is especially persuasive in light of the role ascribed to גְּדוֹל, who rescues those in the clutches of Belial. The herald is thus not Melchizedek but the one who announces Melchizedek’s eschatological career; cf. DJD 23, 233; Mason, “Melchizedek Traditions,” 358; Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresha, 61. Some have observed similarities between this herald and the eschatological prophet of 1QS 9:11 and 4QTestamonia 5-8; see the discussions of Angel, Otherworldly, 150-151; Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 68; van der Woude, “Melchizedek als himmlische
Other objections to an angelic interpretation of the figure of 11QMelch are that Melchizedek would be better understood as a divine hypostasis or perhaps even Yahweh himself.\textsuperscript{72} But as already noted, 11QMelch 2:13 states that it is Melchizedek who carries out the vengeance of God’s judgments, thus making a distinction between Yahweh and his agent;\textsuperscript{73} indeed, that the herald deems it essential to comment on the identity of יַהֲנָא in 2:24 is redundant if “your God” is the God of Israel.\textsuperscript{74} By far the best explanation of Melchizedek’s lofty portrayal in 11QMelch is the Second Temple Period trend of attributing to angels what were previously prerogatives and responsibilities of God.\textsuperscript{75} What is important to note is that this trend results not only in the elevation of the righteous angel(s) in question but also in a leveling of the ontological playing field\textsuperscript{76} and functions as a two-pronged polemic: if angelic beings rather than God himself are the opponents of the wicked angels, such a scenario simultaneously i.) exalts God by the implicit assertion that even the righteous angels (with God’s support, of course) are relatively competent to contend against the angelic


\textsuperscript{73} That Yahweh and Melchizedek are separate beings is the near universal consensus; see, e.g., Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 30.

\textsuperscript{74} So Horton, The Melchizedek Tradition, 75: “The author evidently thinks that the יִהְנָא of Isa 52:7 [2:23] needs to be explained, something which would be unnecessary if יִהְנָא were understood as ‘God’ (יָהָנָא’);” cf. Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 72; Hannah, Michael and Christ, 71.

\textsuperscript{75} So Angel, Otherworldly, 150; cf. Davila, “Michael, Melchizedek, and War in Heaven,” 270. For additional discussion and bibliography, see Chapter Two, above.

\textsuperscript{76} I.e., instead of wicked angels vs. God, it becomes wicked angels vs. righteous angels (with God’s assistance, of course); cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 228.
forces of evil;\textsuperscript{77} and ii.) belittles Belial and the wicked angels, who are not worthy of being God’s direct opponents, and deliverance from whom is the text’s central theme.\textsuperscript{78}

The same trend of attributing to angels what were normally divine prerogatives and responsibilities likely influenced the designations \textit{11QMelch} uses for God’s people. First, \textit{11QMelch} 2:8 says that atonement in the eschatological jubilee will be for

\begin{equation}
\text{מֹלֶלֶךְ מָנוֹן} \text{הָאָדָם} \text{יְאִשָּׁה} \text{נָוִידֵל מִלְי} \text{בּוּדֵךְ}
\end{equation}

8 “all the sons of [light and for] the men of the lot of Mel[ch]izedek ….”

The first lacuna requires the restoration of a key phrase. The line is frequently read with the word \textit{תַּנּ},\textsuperscript{79} and the result is that the eschatological atonement will benefit the “sons of light,” the dualistic designation for members of the \textit{Yabed} in \textit{1QS} and especially \textit{1QM}. Moreover, that the “men of the lot of Melchizedek” is parallel to the “sons of light” suggests that to be a sect member is, by definition, to be able to claim Melchizedek as one’s angelic redeemer. Elsewhere in the DSS, the possession of a \textit{נְוִידֵל} is the exclusive privilege of either God himself or Belial (i.e., never a human prerogative),\textsuperscript{80} an observation that both highlights the preeminence of Melchizedek in the mind of \textit{11QMelch}'s author and underscores the close relationship envisioned between the \textit{Yabed} and their support in the heavenly realm. If the

\textsuperscript{77} Cf. my comments on the Danelic “one like a son of man” vis-à-vis the little horn and the “Ancient of Days” in Chapter Three, above.

\textsuperscript{78} See Lim, “Pesher: Definition and Categorization,” 46.

\textsuperscript{79} Puech, “Notes sur le manuscript de 11Qmelkisèdek,” 483-513, claimed there was a trace of an aleph, but more recently this has been denied; see García Martínez, DJD 23, 227, who nonetheless restores the text with \textit{תַּנּ}; cf., e.g., Roberts, “Melchizedek,” 266; Horton, \textit{The Melchizedek Tradition}, 70; Kobelski, \textit{Melchizedek and Melchiresha}, 15, et al. However, it is also quite common to allow that the text originally read “sons of \textit{תַּנּ};” cf. Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-resa,” 98, who preferred this option. As Hannah, \textit{Michael and Christ}, 70-71, observes, the attractiveness of the latter proposal is that Melchizedek would then be the head of a community comprised of both angels (sons of God) and humans (the lot Melchizedek), which is a key feature of \textit{1QM}.

\textsuperscript{80} So Kobelski, \textit{Melchizedek and Melchiresha}, 60; cf. Horton, \textit{The Melchizedek Tradition}, 78; Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 149.
restoration at 2:9 is correct, an intimate connection with the angels is further emphasized when the beneficiaries of Melchizedek’s assistance are referred to as הֵרִים אֲדֹנָי, “the people of the holy ones of God.” Similar to a phrase found in Dan 7:27, as well as the language of the War Scroll (see below), it was discussed in Chapter Three how this language posits a genitival, possessive or tutelary relationship between heaven and earth, which is an apt description of Melchizedek’s function in 11QMelch.

The transfer of this divine prerogative to an angel and the resultant, tight-knit connection between the Yahad and their angelic succor may help to explain another designation by which God’s people are known in 11QMelch: “the inheritance of Melchizedek” (2:5). The line as a whole is poorly preserved, but it seems that נַחֲלַת מַלְכֵי גּוֹדֶר is a reference to those who will benefit from the eschatological jubilee that has just been announced (2:2-4) and is about to be explained in detail (2:6ff). Various passages from the Hebrew Bible are acknowledged as the background of this expression, all of which assert that Israel is the inheritance of Yahweh (e.g., 1 Sam 10:1; Ps 78:71; Isa 19:25, 47:6, et al.). The most significant of these passages for my purposes is Deut 32:8-9, which was discussed at length in Chapter Two. By claiming that Israel is Melchizedek’s נַחֲלַת, 11QMelch is using the language of Deut 32:9 to assert what is perhaps presupposed by other texts: the sentiment of

---

81 See DJD 23, 227, 229, 231.
82 Cf. Deueker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 155-156, who views the people as those who “belong or pertain to the angels”; Collins, Daniel, 315-316.
83 It is likely this term occurs a second time in line 5, but the reading נַחֲלַת מַלְכֵי גּוֹדֶר has to be restored. For evaluations of the various proposed restorations of 2:4-5 in its entirety, see DJD 23, 230-231.
84 The use of נַחֲלַת to describe something that belongs to Melchizedek is in keeping with boldness of the pesher application of scripture quotations to our protagonist, and the editors grant the expression נַחֲלַת the lengthiest comment of any line in 11QMelch; see DJD 23, 231.
Deut 32:8-9 is in need of qualification to bring it in-line with the Second Temple Period angelological sensibilities. To be sure, the text is not denying that Yahweh reigns supreme over Israel and protects her; but it seems God has delegated Melchizedek and his forces to strive against Belial and his lot so that, practically speaking, Melchizedek is now Israel’s guardian. Such contemporizing of Deut 32:8-9 should not, however, be viewed as mechanical updating. The notion of inheritance in the Hebrew Bible is both familial and characterized by endurance, and that 11QMelch refers to the people as the נחלות מלך ישר is more than a mere assignment for Melchizedek, who has been entrusted with God’s inheritance. Simultaneously, 11QMelch, as a sectarian composition, equates the “men of the lot of Melchizedek” with the sons of light (as is it nearly universally restored in 2:8; see above). It is unlikely then that the inheritance of Melchizedek was thought to be Israel in its fullest sense but rather the sons of light/the Yahad.

In short, our text announces the career of Melchizedek, a figure with whom the authors and readers of 11QMelch claimed an intimate connection. As God’s eschatological agent, Melchizedek is cast as the angelic guardian par excellence of the sons of light. And as with the Prince of Light/Angel of God’s Truth from 1QS 3:24, dependence on Melchizedek’s superior angelic protection was a key privilege of being a member of the Yahad, whose tutelary relationship with the angels is further emphasized (if the

---

85 Israel is often described as a favoured/first born son (cf. Deut 32:6; Exod 4:22ff; Isa 63:13; et al.) not only to whom a נחלות has been given, especially land (cf. 1 Kgs 8:36; Ps 47:5[4]), but who are also themselves Yahweh’s treasured נחלות (see references above), which when used in this figurative way stresses not “the transfer or inheritance of property, but rather the constant, enduring nature of its possession. The notion of permanent possession is in fact intimately associated with the concept of נחלות, which constitutes a family’s ancient property, an indisputable possession that could not be transferred from one clan to another”; see E. Lipinski, “נחלות, נחלות,” TDOT 9:328-331. As noted above, some see a priestly role for Melchizedek in 11QMelch, and the priestly connotations of נחלות have been observed (cf. Num 18:20; Deut 10:9; 18:2; Josh 13:33). But it is normally God who is called the נחלות of the priests; on this see DJD 23, 213.
reconstruction is accepted) by the designation “the people of the holy ones” (cf. Dan 7:27; 8:24). Moreover, the pesher method employed throughout 11QMelch not only results in the replacement of Yahweh with his agent, but also strongly implies that it is the sectarians rather than a generic definition of Israel that constitutes Melchizedek’s inheritance. Thus again, part of the definition of what it means to be a sect member – and therefore a member of ideal Israel – is to be in the lot of the angel to whom the God of Israel has delegated unparalleled power and authority. But as extraordinary as these privileges are, they are modest in comparison to the claims of the War Scroll.

4.3: THE WAR SCROLL AND RELATED TEXTS

Not only has the relatively well-preserved War Scroll (henceforth, WS) from Cave 1 captured the attention of scholars from the initial days of Qumran studies, it has also drawn comparisons to other sectarian documents from Cave 1, particularly because of WS’s use of dualistic language. As is the case with the Community Rule, related manuscripts from Cave 4

---

86 Dated on the basis of paleography to the second half of the 1st cent. BCE, 1QM comprises nineteen columns of extant text. Less than ten years after it was found, 1QM was published by Eleazar L. Sukenik, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University (Jerusalem: Magnes Press/The Hebrew University, 1955), 1-19, pls. 16-34, trans. of אַלּוֹת הַסִּפְרִים הַכְּלָלִים (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik/The Hebrew University, 1954). Unless otherwise stated, I will cite the more recent critical text of Jean Duhaime, “War Scroll,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents (PTSDSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 80-141, whose translation will be the basis for that provided here. It should be noted that it is Duhaime’s practice not to propose reconstructions (and the corresponding translations) where there are lacunae.

87 The longer name by which scholars sometimes refer to 1QM – The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (or something similar; see, e.g., the title of Yigael Yadin’s commentary [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962]) – is characteristic of the dualistic language of some sections of WS. As will be evident throughout my discussion, comparisons are often made between WS and other dualistic texts/passages from Qumran, especially 1QS’s Treatise on the Two Spirits; cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 213; Hannah, Michael and Christ, 62; Duhaime, The War Texts, 95ff.
suggest that WSY was the product of a complex literary development,\(^{88}\) and I will address the relevance of source-critical proposals, below. For now it is sufficient to state that, as it stands, 1QM espouses the common Early Jewish expectation of eschatological angelic assistance for God’s people, and that this hope is combined with sectarian claims of a uniquely close connection with their angelic guardians. The resulting fusion of these convictions amounts to a grandiose statement on the self-identity of the sectarians, who were convinced that they would fight in conjunction with the angels at the eschatological war.

My discussion of WSY will be comprised of three parts. I will first highlight language that presupposes a close relationship between the human combatants and the angels. I will then examine statements that explicitly refer to the mingling of humans and angels as comrades in the eschatological war. Finally, I will look at references to Israel in light of source-critical scholarship on WSY and demonstrate that despite the use of what likely included non-sectarian sources or traditions, the overall assertion of 1QM is that “Israel” is defined according to sectarian ideals.

4.3.1: Passages Presupposing a Close Human-Angel Relationship

A number of WSY passages suggest that a connection between the human warriors and the angelic realm is basic or presupposed. More specifically, I noted earlier the reading that understands Dan 7:27 (cf. Dan and 8:24; 11QMelch 2:9) as positing a genitival, possessive, or tutelary relationship between the angelic holy ones and the people, and how this fits very well

\(^{88}\) For the Cave 4 mss, see Maurice Baillet, ed., *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520) (DJD 7)* (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1982), 12-72; cf. Duhaime, “Cave IV Fragments Related to the War Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 142-203.
with the correspondence between heaven and earth that is made explicit in Dan 10-12. A construction similar to those found in Daniel and 11QMelch occurs in 1QM 10:8ff, which is a prayer that begins by asking:

9 And who is like your people Israel whom you have chosen for yourself among all the peoples of the lands?

Immediately following this line (at the beginning of 10:10) is the phrase קדושים בברית, which is a reference to “your people Israel.” Duhaime translates it as “holy people of the covenant.” He thus understands קדושים as an attributive adjective. But as per Dan 7:27 and 8:24, many scholars read קדושים as a substantive, resulting in the translation, “the people of the holy ones of the covenant.” Given the wide-spread recognition of the influence of Dan 7-8 on this line, that 1QM 10:10 envisions a Daniel-like, tutelary correspondence between

---


90 Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 117; cf. Jean Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres: Texte Restauré, Traduit Commenté (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958), 145, whose translation (“Le peuple des saints de l’Alliance”) is ambiguous but who seemingly understands the word as an attributive: “Ici l’auteur la complete en mettant directement en relation cette ‘sainteté’ avec l’Alliance.” Elisha Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS) 29; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986; repr., Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008, 83 n. 63, cites 1QM 10:10 as one of approximately twenty examples from the DSS of the collective noun, בָּנָי, taking a plural concord. Also note the translation of Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 306, who adds two words (in italics): “a people of men holy through the covenant.” In a section entitled “Angels in Our Midst: Human Angel Communities,” Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 155-161, strangely makes no mention of 10:10 (nor 12:8, 6:1, and 16:1; see below) and one is left to surmise that he takes קדושים as an attributive and thus not an angelic designation. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 283, concedes “people of the holy ones of the covenant” as a viable option, but he prefers “holy people of the covenant” (428-429). But note 1QM 12:1, where the singular קדוש does not (attributively) modifies בנים, which may suggest that an attributive reading of קדוש at 10:10 is incorrect; see below.


92 Even among those who translate קדושים בברית as “holy people of the covenant”; see, e.g., the comment of Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre, 145: “Daniel (7, 27 et 8, 24) a créé l’expression ‘le peuple des
heaven and earth makes good sense. Admittedly, there is no Hebrew Bible precedent for referring to angels as holy ones of the covenant. There are, however, numerous Early Jewish and Christian texts that testify to the belief of angelic mediation at Sinai (cf. Jueb. 1:27-29, 2:1; Josephus, Ant. 15:136; Acts 7:53; Gal 3:19; Heb 2:2). Moreover, the manner by which 1QM 10 explicates נְמָךְ קַרְוֻשֵׁי בָרִית נָגֵד לְפָנֵי אוֹתֵקָר נַחֲיָם נְמָךְ קַרְוֻשֵׁי יִשָּׂרָא אֵלִים נְמָךְ קַרְוֻשֵׁי has a covenantal flavour: the passage continues by stating that the people of Israel were the privileged recipients of the law and angelic revelation.

Similarly ambiguous is the language of another prayer found in 1QM 12:1-9. But like 10:10, the phrase at 12:8 – and, arguably, its tutelary sentiment – are reminiscent of Dan 7:27:

כִּי קַרְוֻשֵׁי אֲדֹなおֹנוֹלִים חַסְמָנִי חַשְׁרוּת הָאָדָם נָגֵד לְפָנֵי אוֹתֵקָר הָאָדוָם קַרְוֻשֵׁי

The first part of the line, “for holy is the Lord and the king of glory is with us,” is clear, but the next phrase, נְמָךְ קַרְוֻשֵׁי, is not. Duhaime translates it as “together with the holy ones,” thus taking נְמָךְ as the preposition. However, for two reasons it is better to read נְמָךְ as נְמָךְ, “people,” and in apposition to נְמָךְ, “with us.” The first reason “people of the holy ones” should be the preferred over “together with the holy ones” is that it avoids the...
grammatically awkward construction of having two prepositions, חָנַן and הבָּי, side by side.\textsuperscript{96}

Second and more significantly, יָעַבּ is immediately followed by three parallel statements which give practical, war-time expression to the presupposition that the people have an intimate connection with the angels (cf. 1QM 12:8-9).\textsuperscript{97}

The likelihood that both 1QM 10:10 and 12:8 should be understood as referring to the “people of the holy ones” is reinforced by two occurrences of what Collins dubs the “reverse”\textsuperscript{98} of the phrase. The first of these is found at 1QM 6:6 and comes at the end of a rule for battalion formation and the descriptions of the inspirational words to be written on the javelins of those assembled for battle. After stating that the warriors will use their weapons to enact the judgment of God on their enemies, the section concludes with this triumphant exclamation:

\begin{quote}
ורומת לְאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה יַזִּיף נַפְרוֹת נֶפֶךְ יַעַבּ
\end{quote}

6 And the kingship shall belong to the God of Israel and among the holy ones of his people he shall do worthily.

The second occurrence of the phrase is similar to the first and is found at 1QM 16:1, functioning as the climax of a hortatory address the high priest is to recite to the warriors:

\begin{quote}
אל יִשְׂרָאֵל קרַם הַרְבָּא עַל כָּל חֹבֶרְיָם יַעַבּוּ נַפְרוֹת נֵבֶרָה
\end{quote}

1 The God of Israel has summoned a sword against all the nations, and among the holy ones of his people he will do mightily.

\textsuperscript{96} So Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 159.

\textsuperscript{97} I will address the content of the statements of 1QM 12:8-9 in section 4.3.2, below.

\textsuperscript{98} Collins, Daniel, 315.
The influence of Num 24:18 – which is quoted directly in 1QM 11:5-7 – is recognized on both 6:6 and 16:1, but the relevance of the parallel has occasionally been misconstrued. For example, since 1QM modifies Num 24:18 by using “holy ones of the people” rather than “Israel,” it does not follow that the “holy ones” are the human warriors nor does it necessitate that the focus of these passages is on the militaristic achievements of the people. In fact, the context of Num 24 is emphatic that any triumph of Israel is God’s doing, a sentiment shared by 1QM 6:6 and 16:1. Moreover, in keeping with the important roles angels have in WȘ, it is entirely appropriate that God is said to secure victory through his angelic holy ones.

At the same time, the role of the human warriors at 6:6 and 16:1 should not be understated and the phrase “holy ones of the people” assists in emphasizing this. While Dequeker contends that “people of the holy ones” and “holy ones of his people,” are two sayings that “must have the same meaning,” I would suggest there is an important nuance. If, as Dequeker (I think, correctly) maintains, “people of the holy ones” is a

99 Num 24:18 (the end of which is relevant here) reads: אֲדוֹּם אֶective וָּרָאָה, “Edom will become a possession, Seir a possession of its enemies, while Israel does valiantly.”

100 So Brekelmans, “The Saints of the Most High,” 325; Sylvester Lamberigts, “Le Sens de qdwym dans les texts de Qumrán,” ETL 46 (1970): 32; cf. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 398, who states that the “holy ones” of 6:1 and 16:1 “must refer to humans” without further argument. But as Collins, Daniel, 315 n. 351, rightly notes, “1QM differs from the Numbers text precisely by the mention of holy ones, so the meaning of this phrase cannot be determined by the parallel.” I discussed “holy ones” as an angelic designation in Chapter Two; on the term as a designation for angels specifically in WȘ, see, e.g., Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 231; Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 153-159; and especially Collins, Daniel, 315-316.

101 Note the summary statement of Num 24:23: אֲדוֹּם אֹלֵחַ וָּרָאָה, “Alas, who can live when God does this?”

102 So Collins, Daniel, 315.

103 As I will highlight below, a similar theme of God achieving victory through his angels is operative in 1QM 17; see Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 51.

104 Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 155; cf. Collins, Daniel, 315-316, who seems to follow Dequeker’s assumption that the phrases have the same meaning yet, as already noted, he simultaneously refers to “holy ones of the people” as the reverse of the Danielic phrase “people of the holy ones.”
possessive/tutelary genitive meaning something akin to “the people who belong to the holy ones,” surely its reverse does not mean exactly the same thing: that is, holy ones of the people suggests that the holy ones belong to the people or that the people can lay claim to the holy ones in some way. Given the grand and cosmic scale upon which the war is envisioned in 1QM, it is conceivable that this phrase contributed to the rallying cry of the document and to the formation of WS’s readers, the prospective human combatants. As Newsom has argued, even non-polemical sectarian texts that share affinities with other late Second Temple Period texts were intended to be formative and can be polemical for the simple reason that “every act of formation is also an act of estrangement. Every act of discourse is also an act of counter-discourse. … [Other language] can appear faulty and defective or shallow and superficial.” How much more would the formational import be, then, when language from the influential Book of Daniel is reversed and employed in an overtly polemical text like WS? The bold assertion that the angels in some way belong to the people functions well as a rationale for the presumptuous notion that I will examine shortly: that the human warriors expected the angels to be their war-time comrades.

Another WS passage that seems to presuppose a close relationship between angels and humans is found is the opening lines of column 12:

105 Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 156.
106 The sons of light saw themselves as God’s decisive counterstrike against wickedness; see, e.g., Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre, 92, who in reference to 1QM 6:6, comments: “L’auteur concoit la guerre des Fils de Lumière comme une juste punition qui rendra aux impies la rançon du mal qu’ils ont fait à Dieu et à son peuple … .”
107 Admittedly, these words of Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 269, are written in reference to the Hodayot’s function in shaping sectarian identity, but the principle is relevant, here.
1 For there is a multitude of holy ones in the heavens, and the hosts of angels (are) in your holy habitation to praise your [truth]. The elect ones of the holy people, you have set for yourself [...]. The names of all their hosts (are) with you in your holy dwelling; your [...] ym in your glorious habitation.

3 The mercies of [your] blessing[s] and the covenant of your peace, you have engraved for them with a stylus of life, to reign [...] in all the appointed times forever, ...

In line 1, “holy ones” is synonymous with “hosts of angels,” thus referencing celestial beings who are on God’s side. The “elect ones of the holy people” are most often considered to be the earthly complement of the holy ones/host of angels, namely the human warriors.

Not only does this view accord well with the use of חֵלֶר elsewhere in the DSS, where it carries the sense of righteous remnant of Israel; it also anticipates the focus on the combined human-angel army later in column 12 and, indeed, throughout WS. The implication that the angels, as well as the people, are part of God’s covenant (line 3)

109 While it is sometimes allowed that the קדושת refers to humans here, the consensus view is that the “holy ones” of 12:1 are angels because of their location (heaven) and the fact that they are parallel to the “host of angels,” whose location is also in heaven (lit.: holy habitation); see, e.g., Bastiaan Jongeling, Le Rouleau de la Guerre des Manuscrits de Qumran (SSN 4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962), 274; Dequeker, “The Saints of the Most High,” 158; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 230. Objecting to this reading is Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 398, 423ff, who claims that the holy ones/host of angels is a reference to “the Israelites in their angelomorphic mode” (425). But as Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 121-122, rightly observes, Fletcher-Louis’ angelmorphic reading (here and elsewhere) “squeeze[s] out the angels almost entirely” and does so by violating “the obvious sense of the text”; cf. Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 163-164.

110 Note that in the phrase, “elect ones of the holy people,” קדושת is in the singular; it is thus attributively modifying נוּן; cf. 1QM 10:10; 12:8, discussed in section 5.4.1, above.

111 See Philip R. Davies, IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), 100-101, who notes this “well-defined meaning” of יָדִיב in other Qumran texts; cf., e.g., CD 4:3ff; 1QpHab 9:12; 10:13; 4Q171 (=4QpPs) 4:13-15. I will address the identity of “Israel” in WS in section 4.3.3, below.
underscores this relationship. Alternatively, it has been suggested that the “elect ones of the holy people” are not humans on earth but the souls of dead humans in heaven, who work in conjunction with the מַלְאָכָּה וּמַרְאֵֽה and קְרֹשֶׁ֖ם. Given the Early Jewish anticipation of an angel-like afterlife for the righteous (e.g., Dan 12:3; 1 En. 104:2-6; cf. 1QS 4:6-8), understanding מַרְאֵֽה as the souls of deceased humans who have received the reward of becoming associates of the angels merits serious consideration. The likelihood of this view may be enhanced by lines 4-5:

4 וְלַאֲמֶ֫רֶת צֹ֖עַר. מַלְאָכָּ֗ה וּמַרְאֵֽה יֵ֖דֶעֶת גְּדוֹל֔וֹת הָֽאָדָ֥אנִים וּדְֽרָכִ֖ים וּפִֽ֖תַּהֲנָֽה

5 מַלְאָכָּ֖ה (לָֽאָדָ֥אנִים) יֵ֖דֶעֶת וּדְֽ֖רָכִ֣ים וּפִֽ֖תַּהֲנָֽה

4 and to muster ... yrykb according to their thousands and their myriads, together with your holy ones ... your angels, so that they have a mighty hand

5 in the battle ... the rebels of the earth in the strife of your judgments, and the people of the elect ones of the heavens shall be victorious ...

In line 4, it is common to restore בָּכְאָמָ֖ה as the first word of the initial lacuna, with בָּכְאָמָ֖ה often proposed as the second. The resulting phrase is thus “the host of your

---

112 Cf. Jubilees, which speaks of the Angels of (the) Presence and the Angels of Holiness of whom Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99, writes, “they alone were created circumcised (15:27-28). A sign of the divine covenant, it marks them as partakers of this covenant, and as heavenly counterparts of earthly Israel.” Jubilees is treated in Chapter Three, above.

113 So Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre, 170, 172; cf. Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 242. Davies, IQM, the War Scroll, 101 n. 30, is overstating when he says that Carmignac and Yadin understand the “chosen ones” as a class of angels (along with the מַלְאָכָּה and קְרֹשֶׁם).

114 On this topic, see Collins, “The Angelic Life,” 291-295; and most recently, idem, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 195-211.

115 Though caution is necessary because it seems that the rewards of angelic fellowship and angel-like honour envisioned in Dan 12 and 1 En. 104 occur at the resurrection/post-eschatological judgment.

116 Cf., e.g., Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 315; Carmignac, La Règle de la Guerre, 175; van der Ploeg, Le Rouleau, 144; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE, 1:132. Contra André Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la Guerre des Filis de Lumière: traduction et notes,” RHR 148.2 (1955): 162, who proposes רָֽאֵ֖שׁ, “adversaries,” a reading which is dependent upon understanding the verb פִּקַּֽשׁ to mean “chastise” (see HALOT s.v. פִּקַּֽשׁ qal – 5). However, that פִּקַּֽשׁ is followed by דִּֽרשָֽה “to authorize/direct” (cf. the noun, דִּֽרשָֽה).
elect ones.” As per line 1, the elect ones are mentioned “together with”\(^{118}\) “your holy ones” and “your angels”;\(^{119}\) this observation, in conjunction with the language used to describe the elect ones – namely, “thousands” and “myriads” – only strengthens the understanding of this group as righteous human souls who are now associates of the angelic throng.\(^{120}\) Moreover, line 5 refers to the victory of “the people of the elect ones of the heavens,”\(^{121}\) a designation that not only specifies the celestial habitation of the elect ones but also differentiates them from the people. In the same way that the phrase “people of the holy ones” may indicate a tutelary relationship between the angels and the people, “the people of the elect ones of the heavens” may suggest that the souls of the righteous, as part of the heavenly contingent and members of the covenant, have an intimate connection with the people that will factor immensely in the upcoming eschatological war.

4.3.2: HUMANS & ANGELS: COMRADES IN THE ESCHATOLOGICAL WAR

While the statements from \(\text{WS}'s\) just surveyed suggest a close relationship between angels and humans, these statements are general in nature or merely hint at how this relationship will manifest itself during the eschatological war. In addition to mentioning that the names of the

\[\text{“authorization/empowerment”}, \text{ suggests that } ḫayl ṣafā is better translated as “muster/command” (see \text{HALOT s.v. ḫayl qal – 3. & – 4}).\]

\(^{117}\) Since ḫayl ṣafā is found in lines 1 and 5, the near universal restoration of the legible ḫayl ṣafā to ḫayl ṣafā is sound; contra Carmignac, \text{La Règle de la Guerre}, 175, who opts for ḫayl ṣafā.

\(^{118}\) ḫayl ṣafā is preceded by the adverb, ḫayl, “together.” The correct reading therefore is “together with (ḇaṣṭē) your holy ones,” not “the people (ḇaṣṭē) of your holy ones” as per 10:10 and 12:8.

\(^{119}\) Each of these three groups have the 2nd person plural suffix, ḫayl, suggesting that they are, in some sense, to be taken together (i.e., on the same side).

\(^{120}\) For the use of ḫayl ṣafā and ḫayl ṣafā to describe the angelic host quantitatively, see, e.g., Num 10:36; 1 Kgs 22:19; Pss 68:17; 89:7; Zech 14:5; Dan 7:10.

\(^{121}\) Once again, while ḫayl could be taken as the preposition ḫayl (so, e.g., van der Ploeg, \text{La Rouleau}, 47), a majority of scholars prefer to read ḫayl.
archangels were to be placed on their shields (9:14-16), a practice which seems to have served as a claim that the warriors identified with and had the leadership of these angels, other assertions are more specific and reveal the presumptuous belief that the human warriors would uniquely fight in conjunction with the angels during the war at the end of days. This conviction is reiterated a number of times and in different ways throughout WŚ.

The first statement in this category occurs in WŚ’s opening column and serves to set the tone for the rest of the document. After predicting the ultimate victory of the forces of the God of Israel in what is billed as the long-awaited and divinely-ordained eschatological battle, 1QM 1:10ff describes the respective combatants:

10 On this (day) they shall clash in great carnage; the congregation of divine beings and the assembly of
11 men, the Sons of Light and the lot of darkness, shall fight each other to (disclose?) the might of God, with the uproar of a large multitude and the war cry of divine beings and men, on the day of calamity.

Here, we are informed of a key facet of the designation “sons of light” as well as of their opponents, the “lot/sons of darkness”: these groups are comprised of both men and angels. In every sense, then, the war is cosmic in scope, an all-encompassing confrontation

---

122 Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 227, comments that “the use of the archangels’ name presumably expresses the sect’s sense of identification with these angelic champions who are God’s four leading attendants and Angels of the Presence. The names would serve as a reminder to all the troops that the holy angels were with them as mighty warriors”; cf. Yadin, *Scroll of the War*, 237. Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 158ff, tentatively suggests an angelic understanding of the inscriptions on the trumpets (2:15-3:11).

123 A detail not explicitly conveyed (though not excluded) by the use of the same terms in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* and *11QMelchizedek*; cf. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 214, 216, 229. Just as the war cry of the angels likely encouraged the soldiers (so Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 87), Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 157, rightly stresses that the belief in the angelic presence in and of itself would have served the same function.
between good and evil.  

Underscoring that the righteous warriors belong to the “sons of light” – and that membership in this group includes a powerful human-angelic union – are the words of a blessing to be recited by the priests found in 1QM 13:9ff:

רֹבֵנוּלָּה אָדָר הָפָלְתְּנָה   9
כְּעֵדָו רֹהיִים
[ ] לֵאמֹותְךָ רִשּׁוּ 10
אָמֲתָם בֵּיתָם קָלָם

9 … You have cast us in the lot of light
10 according to your truth. The Prince of Light, long ago, you entrusted to our rescue \( wb \) [...] you, all the spirits of truth are under his dominion.

The “Prince of Light” has an analogous role in the Treatise of the Two Spirits, and I have already noted that many have identified this figure with Michael who is mentioned elsewhere in \( WS \) (cf. 1QM 9:15-16; 17:7-8). This is important because according to the Book of Daniel, Michael is the leader of the angelic holy ones who constitute the celestial counterparts of Israel (cf. Dan 7:13-14, 18, 21-22, 25; 10:13, 21; 12:3). Moreover, the reference to the Prince of Light is surrounded by comments on the role and ultimate downfall of the Prince of Light’s wicked counterpart, Belial (see 13:2, 4, 11; cf. 1:1, 3, 5, 13, 15; 4:2; 11:8; 14:9; 15:3, 17; 16:11; 17:15; 18:1, 3; 18:16). As Collins notes,

---

124 Cf. Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 55. On Belial’s leadership of the sons of darkness, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 217ff; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 180.

125 Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 123, uses the less frequent translation of “commander” for \( לַמַּשַּׁלְתָּה \).

126 On the widely held view that Michael, the Prince of Light, the Angel of God’s truth, and Melchizedek represent different names for the same principal angel, see section 5.2.2, above; in addition to the references listed there, see Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 235-236; Carmignac, La Règle, 114 n. 8. Contra Bampfylde, “The Prince of the Host,” 129-134, who considers Michael to be a subordinate of the Prince of Light, who in turn is “equitable” with the \( אָדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְדָּבְd \) from Dan 8:11. However, Bampfylde’s non-identification of Michael and the Prince of Light stems from an objectionable downplaying of the stature of Michael in the Book of Daniel (see Chapter Three, above). On the Prince of Light as a divine warrior, which seems to be his function here, see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 165-166. The proposal of Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 410ff, that Michael is “not simply Israel’s principal guardian angel, but is her secret name, carrying in himself her vocation and privileged God-like-ness,” is dubious given that it so often minimizes the role and significance of angels; I will return to Fletcher-Louis’ interpretation of Michael when I examine 1QM 17:4-9, below.
the identification with Michael is significant. It shows that the War Scroll is adapting the tradition of Daniel and attempting to correlate the dualism of the ‘Treatise on the Two Spirits’ with established Jewish traditions. The main difference over against Daniel is that Michael is now paired with Belial, the Prince of Darkness, rather than with the angelic princes of specific nations. It is also apparent that these angelic figures can each be known by more than one name.\(^{127}\)

The pitting of the Prince of Light/Michael against the chief wicked angel, Belial – as opposed to various national angels – further emphasizes the all-encompassing scope of the war and the mixed (i.e., angel-human) composition of the two camps. The latter point is perhaps best known from WS’s assertion that the presence of the angels necessitated a heightened state of ceremonial purity and cleanliness; 1QM 7:4ff says:

3 נוכל נער וענשא ואשה לא יבואו למלתיהם באתם
4 נינורשלאך להלחםו יד שבעה יביו פסח וא ידע או ידע או איש אשד
5 כושר כל אלה לאו לא 됐 הלוחםו פוגל היה איש נגרת
6 מלוחמה והмиיוו צור בושר ושגרים ללא נ Gdk וכול

כימ בן ערפי קודות טמואות ווד

3 No young boy or woman shall enter their camps when they leave
4 Jerusalem to go to battle until their return. Neither lame, nor blind, nor crippled, nor a man in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish, nor a man stricken by some uncleanness 5 in his flesh, none of them shall go to the battle with them. They shall all be volunteers for war, perfect ones spirit and flesh, and ready for the Day of Vengeance. Any 6 man who is not purified from a (bodily) discharge on the day of the battle shall not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their armies [emphasis mine].\(^{128}\)

To be sure, the presence of the angels is the reason given for purity in the camp, but WS seems to temper and even overshadow this humility by emphasizing that the human warriors


\(^{128}\) Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 111, renders מלקראם as “their ‘host,’” which obscures the fact that the word refers to the human “armies,” which is a more appropriate translation. Inexplicably, Davies, 1QM, the War Scroll, 42, denies that WS speaks of angelic assistance on the battlefield. But see the critique of Jean Carmignac, “On Philip R. Davies, 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran,” RevQ 9 (1978): 599-603; cf. Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 157.
have the angels as their “brothers in arms.”\textsuperscript{129} The presence of the angels is reiterated in the High Priest’s pre-battle speech in column 15: after the exhortation in lines 6ff for the (human) troops not to fear the enemy, line 14 states that the “h]eroes of the gods” and the “holy ones” – both angelic designations – arc, respectively, “girding themselves for war” and “mustered for battle,” descriptions which function to explain how God’s hand is against “all the wicked spirits.”\textsuperscript{130} Similarly, 1QM 12:8-9 stresses the closeness\textsuperscript{131} of the angels via three parallel statements (indicated by the preposition ב or עב and the first-person plural suffix י at the end of each line and italicized in translation):

\textit{ן}גמ
\textit{8}ןבמה מלאמות מצפורות
\textit{9}ותמרדה הходят[לות] בצרדות

\textit{ם}גמ
8 gem [...]\textsuperscript{132} the host of angels (is) among our numbered men,
9 and the mighty one of war is in our congregation,
and the host of his spirits is with our foot-soldiers …

Though the “mighty one of war” may refer to God himself (cf. Ps 24:8; Exod 15:3),\textsuperscript{133} if one

\textsuperscript{129} Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 152, captures this well by noting in three successive comments that 1.) the angels are “brothers in arms” with the human warriors; 2.) the presence of angels required ritual purity; and 3.) the people are those who “see the angels” (cf. 1QM 10:11). Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 231, notes the influence of Deut 23:14 insofar as purity was demanded in the camp. But whereas the Deuteronomistic passage mentions Yabawb’s presence, Davidson rightly notes that the focus of 1QM 7:3ff is on the presence of the angels. The Deuternomistic sentiment has thus been updated to reflect sectarian/Second Temple Period angelological sensibilities. Cf. Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 164. That being said, even divinely commissioned angelic support never removes the need for God to intervene or secure victory (more on this below).

\textsuperscript{130} Cf. 1QM 15:6ff. While not well-preserved, the end of column 15 stresses the angelic dimension of the war, including Belial’s eventual destruction.

\textsuperscript{131} Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 230, describes 1QM 12:6-8 as having “the angels actually involved with the sectarian army.”

\textsuperscript{132} Duhaime, “War Scroll,” 121, does not attempt to restore/translate the small tear between ו in and

\textsuperscript{133} If correct, this reading forms an alternating emphasis in 12:8-9 between the presence of the angels and God himself, a point that complements the idea that even the divinely commissioned and relatively competent angels are dependent on God to win the battle; see Carmignac, \textit{La Règle de la Guerre}, 179: “Pour
takes into consideration the lofty descriptions and roles leader-angels are granted in the sectarian texts including \textit{WS} (cf. 1QM 9:15-16; 13:10; 17:6-7; 11\textit{QMeq} 2:9-13; 1QS 3:20-25), the Prince of Light/Michael may be in view. Regardless, that the angels are \textit{with} the human warriors is an unmistakable conviction of \textit{WS}.

Yet important questions remain unanswered: if the sons of light are a human-angel coterie, \textit{in what sense} are the Prince of Light/Michael-led angels with the human warriors, and does the concept of “with” envisioned here differ from that found in the scenarios of other texts? To address these questions, a few observations are required. First, in an effort to better understand \textit{WS}, Davidson has noted that angelic “participation”\textsuperscript{134} in Israel’s battles has biblical precedent. Such language, however, is plagued by the same lack of specificity that prompts my question in the first place in that it fails to describe \textit{how} the angels participate.\textsuperscript{135} Though not specifically responding to Davidson, Michalak has recently defined angelic participation or assistance in the late Second Temple Period literature as follows: angels either a.) fight in the heavenly/angelic equivalent of earthly conflicts (e.g., Dan 7-12), or b.) intervene directly in human history/conflicts and their intervention provides a significant psychological or morale boost for the earthly beneficiaries (e.g., 1 \textit{En}. 1:9; 90:14ff; cf. 2 Maccabees).\textsuperscript{136} While helpful to a degree, some texts straddle both of

\textsuperscript{134} See Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 230, who rightly points out that the eschatological scenario of \textit{WS} and its angelic assistance is grander than the situations of “more limited significance” envisioned in the Hebrew Bible; cf. Miller, \textit{The Divine Warrior}, 143; Hannah, \textit{Michael and Christ}, 60; Sullivan, \textit{Wrestling with Angels}, 157; Duhaime, \textit{The War Texts}, 103-116. Also see Chapter Two, above.

\textsuperscript{135} A point implicitly conceded by Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 230ff.

\textsuperscript{136} Michalak, \textit{Angels as Warriors}, 241, 245. Cf. Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 49, who suggests that the angelic presence “toughens those standing on the ‘firing line’ by stressing that the group is living on the very

\textsuperscript{137} obtenir une phrase bien cadencée, l'auteur, qui vient de mettre en scène Dieu, puis les anges, puis Dieu, se doit de revenir aux anges, et de fait il construit un nouveau membre bien parallèle: ‘les puissances de l'armée des anges sont dans nos enrôlés ... l'armée de ses esprits est avec nos fantassins et nos cavaliers’; cf. Yadin, \textit{The Scroll of the War}, 317; Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 230; Steudel, “The Eternal Reign,” 523.
Michalak’s categories, and this is certainly true when it comes to WS. For instance, although WS never provides detailed descriptions of angel-to-angel combat and the focus is on the earthly battle, it seems clear enough that the text presupposes a dualistic picture akin to the angelic struggle between Michael and his wicked counterparts in Dan 7-12; after all, are we to assume that despite the many references to righteous angels throughout WS, they are not the ones who directly strive against the wicked Belial and the spirits of his lot?

Additionally, knowledge of this angelic struggle could not help but be of significant psychological import to those involved in the earthly conflict, and an angel-versus-angel component of the war by no means precludes the direct intervention of angels in human day that God has chosen to humble the empire of ungodliness and to provide his lot with personified heavenly help, peace, blessing, and even dominion over the nations as well as the gods. One could say: The more severe the struggle, the closer the salvation and the greater the reward.”

137 Prime examples being the texts examined earlier in this chapter, the Treatise on the Two Spirits and 11QMelchizedek, as there is nothing about the angelic assistance described in TTS or 11QMelch precluding it from either of Michalak’s categories; cf. John J. Collins, “Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran,” in Traditions in Transformation: Turning Points in Biblical Faith (eds., Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981), 353, who highlights the problems of trying to fit WS into the categories of Mowinickel (He That Cometh [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954], 281) namely this-worldly or other-worldly; as noted by Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 214.

138 So Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 397ff, who presses this point too far in the service of his angelomorphic humanity thesis with the result that the critique of Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 121-122, is again apropos: angels are being unjustifiably “squeezed out” at the expense of the plain meaning of the text.

139 Using terms that will be familiar from my discussion of dualism in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 231-232, writes, “It is clear that dualistic concepts are essential to an understanding of the nature of the eschatological war. Cosmic dualism is important in that two camps of angelic beings are involved, with God also on the side of Michael. There is spatial dualism too, in that there are two worlds, the heavenly and the earthly. Our author does not actually discuss the conflict between the angels directly, for his concern is focused on the war on earth. But war between the angels is presupposed by the exaltation of Michael among the angels [cf. 1QM 17:6-8], by the fact that God defeats Belial and his spirits, and by the involvement of both people and angels in the battle (1QM 1:9-11). Although we do not find a description like that of the confrontation between Michael and the Prince of Persia, as described in Dan 10:13, 20-21, or the heavenly war of Rev 12:7-9, with Michael and his angels opposing the dragon, the conceptual framework in nevertheless similar. 1QM 12:1-2 involves the same idea.” Cf. John G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature,” JBL 93 (1974): 356-359, who suggests that the heaven/earth relationship – or “spatial dualism” – reaches “its apogee” in WS; more specifically, the correspondence between the realms constitutes an “analogical dualism”; as referenced in Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 34, 48, who thus uses the term “analogical spatial dualism” to describe the worldview of WS.

140 As per its function in Dan 7-12; cf., e.g., Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 111.
skirmishes on the battlefield. Thus, to inquire about the sense in which the Prince of Light/Michael-led angels are with the human warriors is, at the same time, to consider the uniqueness of WS's picture of angelic assistance. While difficult to describe with precision, I would suggest there are two main differences: 1.) the attitude/posture of the human warriors anticipating angelic assistance; which is connected to 2.) the role the warriors have in relation to the angels.

I have already highlighted how WS presupposes a close relationship between the people and angels, and that this relationship is conveyed not only through the notion that the human warriors are “the people of the holy ones” but also through this expression’s reverse, “the holy ones of the people.” The idea arguably inherent in the latter expression – that the angels somehow belong to the people – reveals a presumptuous posture that exceeds the confident but comparatively modest sentiments of other texts, particularly non-sectarian texts. Furthermore, the employment of both of these expressions means that angels and humans belong to each other, thereby underscoring the angel-human composition of the

---

141 On the direct intervention of the angels in WS, see the comments of Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 155-157; Davidson, Angels at Qumran 220; Oster-Sacken, Gott und Belial, 221.
142 See the complementary observations of Richard Bauckham, The Climax of Prophecy (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 210-227 (= repr. of “The Book of Revelation as a Christian War Scroll,” Neot 22 [1988]: 17-40), who notes two Holy War traditions: one in which God (and his angels) act without human contribution (e.g., Exod 14:13-14; 2 Kgs 19:32-35) and another in which humans take on a more active role (e.g., 1 En. 90:19); in Bauckham’s estimation, a distinctive aspect of WS is the extent of the human contribution (cf. Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 157; Rowland, The Open Heaven, 42). According to Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, passim, WS presents humans as angelmorphically transcending human ontology. However, I agree with Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 159, 228, that human transformation is not a distinctive element of WS; as he notes in reference to column 7, if the Qumranite “did not maintain a heightened level of purity, then angels could not be present in the community. This suggests that there was a qualitative difference between humans and angels” [emphasis mine]; cf. O'Neill, “Review of Fletcher-Louis, Luke-Acts, 225-230, who similarly concludes, “claims to ontological identity are simply a misunderstanding of the Jewish evidence [as] there is a clear and consistently maintained difference in kind between God and angels and human beings”; also see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 151, 156.
143 E.g., the reference to Michael as “your prince” (Dan 12:1) and the implied correspondence between the people and the covenant-marked “angels of the presence” (Jub. 2:2, 18, 30; 6:18; 31:14).
144 As well as “the elect ones of the holy people” (12:1) and “the people of the elect ones” (12:5).
“sons of light.” Simultaneously, this bold stance sheds further light on the uniqueness of the angelic presence envisioned in WS: if, to use Michalak’s distinctions (and some help from English prepositions), angels who fight in the heavenly equivalent of the earthly conflict can be described as for humans, whereas angels who intervene directly in human conflicts can be described as both for and with humans, the impression given by WS is that its angelic assistance is exceptional insofar as the angels fight both for and in conjunction with humans.¹⁴⁵

Said a different way, the anticipation of, knowledge of, and/or first-hand experience of angelic assistance as depicted in other texts is modest in comparison to WS,¹⁴⁶ where it is

¹⁴⁵ It is an overstatement, however, to suggest that the “idea of communion with angels is frequently expressed” in WS by the combination of the adverb מתאריה and the preposition מ (so Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 154; following Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, 223), as this pairing only occurs at 1QM 7:6 and 12:4 (cf. 11Q14 frg. 1 2:14-15: “For God is with you [מַעַשׂ מַעַשׂ] and [his holy] angels [מַעַשׂ מַעַשׂ] in your congregation [מַעַשׂ מַעַשׂ]; see DJD 23, 248). Again, I am using the English prepositions “for” and “in conjunction with” in order to highlight the sense conveyed by various passages, and my use of these words does not necessarily indicate a מַעַשׂ/מַעַשׂ combination.

¹⁴⁶ Even in comparison with 2 Maccabees. While the Maccabean texts were not found among the DSS and therefore have not been treated in detail in this thesis, the close affinities 2 Maccabees has with WS when it comes to the depiction of angelic assistance (cf. 2 Macc 3:22-26; 5:2-4; 10:29-30 11:6-12; 15:22-24 = 1 Macc 7:41) are often noted (cf., e.g., Yadin, The Scroll of the War, 237; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 225 n. 5). There are, however, notable differences. First and foremost, the presumptuous posture of WS is absent from 2 Maccabees: whereas those responsible for WS confidently anticipated or “could count on celestial help” (so Hannah, Michael and Christ, 59), almost all of the Maccabean passages listed above state that the soldiers engaged in ad hoc petitionary prayer in order to solicit angelic succor. Moreover, there are indications that Judah and his comrades were not always certain – at least during the battle – as to whether their prayers for help had been answered. For example, 2 Macc 10:29 reads: “When [the battle against Timothy] became fierce, there appeared to the enemy from heaven five resplendent men on horses with golden bridles, and they were leading the Jews [emphasis mine].” On this point, Jonathan A. Goldstein, II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 398, observes that “the author here […] says only that the apparitions, leaving it open as to whether they were visible to the Jews, too … .”; Goldstein (210-213) makes similar comments regarding 3:22-26, but note the contrast with 1QM 10:10-11, which describes the warriors of WS as “seers of the holy angels.” It should be noted that even when it is clear that the soldiers saw the angels (2 Macc 5:2-4), there was, in one instance, uncertainty as to how the vision should be understood: 2 Macc 5:4 says that, “Everyone prayed that the apparition might prove to have been a good omen”; as Robert Doran, 2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 126, writes: “What is interesting in this case is that the meaning of the portents is unclear. … The author of 2 Maccabees treats the portent like an oracle whose meaning has to be deciphered.” Doran continues by suggesting that this may be a literary device to heighten “interest in what the outcome will be,” but it also underscores that the Maccabees’ hopes for angelic assistance were more modest/less confident than those found in WS. Finally, the passage that may come closest to WS is 2 Macc 11:8-10, which states that during the fight against Lysias, “a horse appeared at [the army’s] head, clothed in white and brandishing weapons of gold.
implied not only that the angels fight for humans but also that the angels will fight in conjunction with humans. Thus, as it pertains to WS, Michalak’s categories of either a) angelic/heavenly battle; or b) angelic intervention on earth, not only introduce a false dichotomy (as they may in other texts), but also are unable to articulate fully the distinctiveness of WS:

**Table #8: The Uniqueness of the War Scroll’s Angelic Succor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description: Angels fight _____ humans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelic equivalent of earthly battle</td>
<td>for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelic intervention on earth</td>
<td>for and with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM</td>
<td>for and in conjunction with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though the anticipation of the presence of the angels prompted a heightened attention to ritual purity, the sensitivities of a text like Josh 5:13-15 have all but disappeared in that WS depicts the righteous human warriors and God’s angels as comrades; in fact, this comradeship and the presumptuous posture underlying it may suggest that those responsible for WS saw themselves as functionally equal with the angels. In this sense, angelic “assistance,” though not incorrect, is descriptively deficient, and scholars rightly cite WS as an eschatological/martial example of the well-known sectarian concept of angelic fellowship.

And together they all praised the merciful God, and were strengthened in heart, ready to assail not only humans but the wildest animals or wall of iron. They advanced in battle order, having their heavenly ally, for the Lord had mercy on them.” It is, however, one thing to say that the Maccabean army was led by an angel (2 Macc 11:8) or to claim a “heavenly ally” (11:10); it is quite another to suggest, as WS does, that the human warriors and the angels together constitute the “sons of light” (1QM 1:10-11) or belong to the same “lot” (1QM 17:6-9). In short, I am not convinced that even the 2 Maccabees angelic assistance passages have the “for” and “in conjunction with” senses conveyed by WS.

147 In Chapter Two, above, I briefly discussed Josh 5:13-15, a passage which is clear that the Israelites are the subordinate beneficiaries of the angelic army. Intriguingly, Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 217-218, mentions this passage to explain 2 Macc 11:6-12: “Just as before the battle against Jericho Joshua had met the commander of the Lord’s army … , so now an angel leads Judas and his men into battle”; i.e., the Maccabean army is wholly dependent on the angelic leadership and noticeably absent are any WS-like sentiments that Judas and his soldiers are comrades with the angels.

148 Cf., e.g., the following comments on the interaction of angels and humans in WS: Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 151-152, who uses the term “fellowship” with the angels; Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 119, who refers to “communion” with the angels; Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 59, who speaks of the soldiers’ “companionship” with the angels; Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 152, dubs the humans and angels as
4.3.3: **The Sons of Light and Israel: the Identity of the Human Warriors**

Thus far in my discussion of *WS* I have commented little on the specific identity of those portrayed as having fellowship with the angels: the human warriors. While the presence of dualistic terminology (e.g., “the sons of light” or “Prince of Light”) has traditionally led to the conclusion that the warriors are sect members, source-critical scholarship on *WS* and the ways in which the text refers to “Israel” complicate this identification.

The majority view, based on external and internal evidence, is that *WS* is a composite text. As briefly noted above, the Cave 4 discoveries (the external evidence) support the view that 1QM was the product of complex literary development, with some fragments deemed to be copies, others recensions, and still others considered to be evidence of different compositions on a related subject. But even before the Cave 4 material was published, scholars recognized that different traditions have been brought together in *WS* (the internal evidence). The general consensus is that *WS* preserves two major traditions: a day-long, “best of seven” war against the “Kittim” and their allies referenced in columns 1 and 15-19; and a forty-year conflict – the so-called “war of divisions” – against a broad range of international enemies found in columns 2-9; it is also common to view the priest-led prayers found in columns 10-14 as a collection that was added to give *WS* a liturgical

“brothers in arms”; Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels*, 156 n. 44, contends that “the term ‘utopian’ might be appropriate . . . , insomuch as *WS* seems to describe a synergy between humans and angels as the ‘Sons of Light.’”

Notable (early) exceptions were Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 3, 6, 14-17, 243; and especially Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*, xi-iv.

E.g., Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* (STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 391, classifies the mss as follows: 4Q492, 4Q494, and 4Q495 are copies of 1QM; 4Q471, 4Q491, 4Q493, and 4Q496 are recensions of 1QM; and 4Q285 and 11Q14 are different compositions with similar (martial) subject matter. Also see Duhaime, *War Texts*, 50-53.

Hence what Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 214, refers to as the “difficulties in ascertaining the actual course of the war”; see below.
dimension. While some scholars consider the first column of 1QM and its dualistic language to be the earliest or among the earliest part(s) of the document,\textsuperscript{152} others have argued that the traditions preserved in columns 2-9 – which have been said to be void of the dualism of column 1 – should be considered the oldest sections of WS, and that the dualistic language and sentiments were added later.\textsuperscript{153} The question as to whether the dualism of 1QM is early or late is, of course, reminiscent of scholarly discussions of the Treatise on the Two Spirits and its place in 1QS, and while I concur with Sullivan that “there does not seem to be any specific set of angel beliefs related to any one level of [proposed] redactional activity,”\textsuperscript{154} each view has implications for identifying the human warriors and thus their relationship to the angels.

The most recent and detailed argument for the priority of column 1 is that of Schultz, who, in keeping with the consensus view that a source-critical distinction can be made between columns 1 and 2, reads the redacted 1QM as outlining a two-stage war: the seven-stage battle against the Kittim in column 1 (which he considers the inspiration for columns 15-19), followed by the decades-long, international conflict in column 2-9. In support of this reading, he notes the precedence for two-stage conflicts in a variety of texts (cf. Mic 5:4-5; 1

\textsuperscript{152} For a helpful overview, see Duhaime, War Texts, 44ff, who highlights the various articulations of this understanding: e.g., André Dupont-Somer, The Essene Writings from Qumran (trans. Geza Vermes; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), 166, viewed columns 15-19 as an annex to columns 1 and 2-14; Van der Ploeg, Le Rouleau de la Guerre, 7-22, considered column 1 and 15-19 as the earliest sections, noting the war therein is different from the decades-long conflict envisioned in column 2-6; Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, 29-115, emphasized the influence of biblical passages and themes – especially Dan 11:40-45 – on column 1, with the dualistic tone and language of 1:11-15 serving as the framework for columns 15-19, and the war tradition of columns 2-6 subsequently added to this foundation; also see Schultz, Conquering the World, 86-169, 391ff, who emphasizes the priority of the dualistic column 1 and with whom I will interact, below.

\textsuperscript{153} Cf. Davies, IQM, the War Scroll, 123; idem, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” in Dualism in Qumran, 8-19; Jean Duhaime, “La redaction de 1QM XIII et l’évolution du dualisme à Qumrân,” RB 84 (1977): 210-238; idem, “Dualistic Reworking,” 43-51.

\textsuperscript{154} Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 156.
Schultz then draws the following conclusion: whereas the protagonists of the initial battle are primarily sect members, a national restoration before the second stage means that Israel *en masse* will fight in the international campaign. A discrepancy between columns 1 and 2 serves as a main impetus for his reading: in column 1, the “sons of light” are identified as “the sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin” (1:1-4), indicating that the three southern tribes are the sectarians and their allies, who will fight against not only the Kittim but also apostate Jews dubbed “violators of the covenant” (1:2); in contrast, column 2 involves “all the tribes of Israel” (2:7); hence the need for some kind of national restoration between the two stages of the war.

While Schultz’s reading of *WS* is well-argued, I am convinced that the way some of his conclusions are stated can be nuanced. For example, he argues that the “sons of light”

---

155 An important (and welcomed) aspect of how Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 237-238, reads the text is his attempt to decipher the logic of 1QM as it stands (i.e., despite the various sources): “the focus on source and redaction criticisms has resulted in a lack of effort to seek out the text’s inherent coherence, with the result that M has been labeled as being more disunified than it really is”; cf. Martin G. Abegg, Jr., Review of Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, *BBR* 22 (2012): 589: “[Schultz] treads a careful line between the ‘clumpers’ who would find cohesiveness in the face of clear inconsistencies, and the ‘splitters,’ who would assign half lines to disparate traditions and sources. In so doing, he brings a welcome sense of unity to the message of the text while at the same time allowing the inconsistencies a voice that sheds important light on the evolution and context of the work’s creation.”

156 Note the parallels terms in 1:1-4: “The first attack of the *Sons of Light* shall be launched against the lot of the *Sons of Darkness*, … // The *Sons of Levi*, the *sons of Judah*, and the *sons of Benjamin*, the *exiles of the wilderness* shall wage war against them … // when the *exiles*, the *Sons of Light*, return from the wilderness of the peoples/nations ….” But this grouping of tribes is somewhat unusual (see Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll*, 114 n. 7, who observes that “Judah and Levi” are the norm), prompting Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 103ff, to provide a detailed discussion of the background of the designation. The only occurrence of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin together in the DSS is found in the non-sectarian text 4Q372 frg 1:14 (see Eileen M. Schuller, “4Q372 I: A Prayer About Joseph,” *ResQ* 14 (1990): 349-376), where these three tribes have returned from exile but are still in conflict. Since the sectarians viewed themselves as in the midst of strife and separated from other Jews despite being in the land, Schultz suggests the use of this grouping of tribes may have been considered an appropriate self-designation (*contra* Hannan Eshel, “אֶשֶר חָסְרָה: מִסְפַּר הַמִּשְׁכָּה וַהַמִּשְׁכָּה מַעֲשֵׂה יִרְבּוּ,” *Zion* 56 (1991): 125-136, who considers the reference to these tribes to be unfavourable in both 4Q372 and 1QM 1 and thus not a sectarian self-reference at all; but see the response of Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 112ff, who addresses Eshel’s objections).
are comprised of not “just the sectarians,”\textsuperscript{157} and that generic terms such as הַנְּדוּד הָאָדָם, “the people of God” (cf. 1QM 1:5; 3:13) support this contention.\textsuperscript{158} Similarly, though Schultz notes instances in the DSS when יָהָד, “congregation,” is employed as a sectarian self-designation or part thereof in non-eschatological contexts, he suggests that the \textit{Yahad} preferred to use this word in reference to a national restoration that would characterize the messianic age, particularly as delineated in the \textit{Rule of the Congregation} (cf. 1QSa 1:1-6ff).\textsuperscript{159} However, Schultz relegates to a footnote the following vital insight that should be granted much greater prominence in the articulation of his argument: “the messianic age [is the period] during which \textit{all Israel will have joined the sectarians} [emphasis mine].”\textsuperscript{160} The reason this qualification is so crucial is that, if not granted its proper weight, both the uniqueness of the sectarian convictions and the confidence with which they were held are essentially undermined. In other words, to speak of a restoration of Israel in \textit{WS} without due

\textsuperscript{157} Schultz, \textit{Conquering the World}, 123ff.

\textsuperscript{158} In reference to the term הַנְּדוּד הָאָדָם, Schultz, \textit{Conquering the World}, 125, states that “in the entire Qumran corpus, it is used only in M” (cf. 1QM 1:5; 3:13; 4Q496 frg. 10:4; but he seems to have missed [the Aramaic] 4Q246 2:4). Schultz further suggests that the usage of this phrase may stem from an early point in the history of the sect when members “would have allowed for the existence of others who, although not part of their movement, sought to remain faithful to God in contrast to those who were ‘violators of the covenant.’” I will return to matters of dating as it relates to the identity of the human warriors, below; for now it is sufficient to note that the use of a “generic” phrase in a sectarian document may not be indicative of openness to outsiders as per Schultz but rather sectarian appropriation/reduction of a broadly nationalistic source.

\textsuperscript{159} Note the words of 1QSa 1:1: יָהָד הָעַדָּה לֶךְ לֵאמֶר יָהָדוּד וּמַלְאֵיהוּ הָעוֹד, “And this is the rule for the entire congregation of Israel in the last days.” But especially in its absolute form (i.e., יָהָדָה), Schultz, \textit{Conquering the World}, 353-365, claims that the use of יָהָדָה in the sectarian scrolls often envisioned a unified Israel of the messianic age. In support, he observes that 1QS never uses “the congregation” to refer to the \textit{Yahad} (362) and all occurrences of the expression in 1QM are found in cols. 2-5, a section which he considers to be part of the post-restoration stage of the eschatological war (363). But even if correct in his observation that the absolute use of יָהָדָה has a special eschatological connotation, “the congregation” may simply refer to the coming together of various \textit{sectarian} communities at the end of days, a point with which Schultz briefly interacts but implicitly dismisses in favour of emphasizing a national restoration scenario (362-363). More importantly, the manner in which Schultz speaks of a national restoration has potential to detract from the stridency of the sectarian outlook; see below for further.

\textsuperscript{160} Schultz, \textit{Conquering the World}, 357 n. 93.
significance granted to the fact that WS either labels other Jews as “violators of the covenant” (1:2) or shares the dualistic language of other sectarian texts – texts that effectively envision and prescribe the reconstitution of Israel (e.g., 1QS) or claim for the sect the privileged angelic assistance that was previously a prerogative of the entire Jewish people (e.g., Treatise on the Two Spirits and 11QMelchizedek) – may unintentionally suggest that a national restoration would come at the expense of conversion\textsuperscript{161} to the ways and outlook of the Yahad.\textsuperscript{162} In this sense, the comment of Sanders (quoted by Schultz) has the potential to be misleading: “the sect did not, at least very often, think of itself as ‘Israel’ during the time of its historical existence [emphasis retained].”\textsuperscript{163} Said less ambiguously, the sect may not have ever claimed that in the present they were the sum total of Israel, and the specific instances of the Yahad referring to itself as “the congregation” may be primarily reserved for eschatological contexts; but these observations should not detract from the point that the sect envisioned itself as true Israel\textsuperscript{164} to which apostate Jews must join if they wanted to be considered part of

\textsuperscript{161} I use the “conversion” cautiously, cognizant of the fact that it is a problematic modern concept.

\textsuperscript{162} The language of “restoration” is, in my opinion, more appropriately applied to the scenario envisioned near the conclusion of the Animal Apocalypse (cf. 1 En. 90:32-35); see Chapter Three, above.

\textsuperscript{163} E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 254; as cited in Schultz, Conquering the World, 365, who on the same page (n. 120) quotes the relatively optimistic conclusions of Collins, “The Construction of Israel,” 34, 38. However, as I noted in my excursus (see section 4.2.1), Collins’ more recent comments on the same subject (see The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 181-182) rightly emphasize the stringent demands of the sectarian covenant and specifically cite 1QM 1:3 to make the point that Yahad did not anticipate all Israel as having a place in the world to come. Cf. Martin G. Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians,” in The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple (eds., Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. de Roo; JSJSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97, who also quotes Sanders and refers to the writer of 1QSa as presaging “a time when the need would no longer be only for a Rule of the Community …, but rather for a Rule of the Congregation of Israel [emphasis retained]. … At the end of the age, Israel would finally become coincident with the sectarian community.” While Abegg’s last statement, that Israel would “become coincident” with the Yahad, is less ambiguous than the language of “national restoration,” he does not explicitly mention a conversion of ethnic Israel to the ways of the sect.

\textsuperscript{164} On the Yahad as “ideal Israel,” see my excursus in section 5.2.1, above. Cf. Philip R. Davies, “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism,” in Pursuing the Texts: Studies in Honour of Ben Zion Wacholder (eds., John C. Reeves and John Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 75-77, whose comments admittedly pertain to a different text (Damascus Document), but nonetheless articulate well how the sectarians viewed themselves vis-à-vis the rest of “Israel”/other Jews: “Did the sect regard itself as true Israel? The answer is clearly ‘yes’, though the
God’s people, and that “violators of the covenant,” who have rejected the sectarian ways, must accept its covenantal ideal to be truly part of the twelve tribes. Indeed, Schultz himself points out that there are instances elsewhere in the DSS when “all Israel” is used as “an apologetic that God’s covenant for the sect is intended for the entire nation” (cf. CD 15:5; 16:1). As Bautch comments, the Yahad does not envision a special destiny for the nation of Israel because it understands the future apocalyptically in terms of the group’s own vindication and exaltation; events in the final age will bring the group itself to assume the role of Israel. One clear example of this is found in 1QSa, which begins with the sect referring to itself as the “congregation of Israel in the final days” (דובת ישראל באת ・תまと חנה). In short, the sectarian nature of the Jewish group responsible for the Dead Sea Scrolls shapes and colours its understanding of Israel and of covenant. … [T]he “emphasis is on a covenantal obedience and a status of perfection rather than membership by birth.”

Thus, rather than saying that the “sons of light” of the WSS are not just the sectarian, a more accurate way of summarizing the matter is to say that the “sons of light” would eventually encompass not just those who were presently sectarian and that any hoped for eschatological restoration would come via conversion.

---

165 Cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 216: “The ‘offenders against the covenant’ – the phrase is found in Dan 11:32 – are apostate Jews, meaning those Jews not belonging to the sect.”

166 For an excellent discussion of this point and the role of 1QSa in articulating the relationship between the sect and ethnic Israel at the eschaton, see Bautch, Glory and Power, 139ff.

167 While Schultz, Conquering the World, 364, mentions that most uses of “all Israel” occur in an eschatological context (i.e., his national restoration scenario at the eschaton), he makes no comment on how an apologetic use of the phrase might be related to the eschatological occurrences he references.

168 Bautch, Glory and Power, 139-140, who incorporates a quotation of Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 117. I will reference similar readings, below.

169 As Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 254, states: “The [sectarian] community believed that eschatological Israel would be formed by the conversion of the rest of Israel to the way of the sect.”
Not surprisingly, the discrepancy between WS’s opening two columns has also been addressed by those who support the priority of column 2. Davies, for example, argues that the tradition of the twelve tribes fighting against their enemies (2:10) “has not been obliterated” in column 1 but has undergone a dualistic revision.\footnote{Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” 13, who further notes that this “dualistic revision of the entire scheme of the war in col. i, however dramatic its effect, does not therefore seek to obliterate the already existing non-dualistic scheme, but as far as possible to accommodate it. Obviously, only in this way was it feasible to reuse so much of the material already in existence.”} According to his reading, the aforementioned reference to Levi, Judah, and Benjamin (1:2) is a vestige of the “pan-Israelite” tradition of column 2.\footnote{Davies, \textit{IQM, the War Scroll}, 114-115.} But rather than viewing the use of the three tribes as a way of distinguishing the sect from other Jews, Davies claims that it is an intra-sect distinction: the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, who are dubbed in 1:2 נלוחה חמר הב.weapon, “the exiles of the wilderness/desert,”\footnote{Presumably, the desert/wilderness of Jerusalem (1:3), which is to be differentiated from the desert/wilderness of the peoples/nations; see below.} will later be joined by other sectarian, fellow “sons of light” who are similarly dubbed exiles – but exiles from “the wilderness of the peoples/nations” (1:3). In Davies’ own words:

\begin{quote}
It seems that by the three tribes mentioned, something less than the whole of Judean community is meant; only the “exiles of the wilderness” are to be understood. These await the return of others of their number from exile in the “wilderness of the nations.” Since 1QM was discovered amongst the Qumran caves, and since other Qumran texts refer to “sons of light,” we can fairly safely equate the “sons of light” with the Qumran sect. These men were not only from the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, but were also “exiles of the wilderness” inasmuch as they lived by the shore of the Dead Sea. Apparently, these men were awaiting the return of others of their number from the “wilderness of the nations.”\footnote{Davies, \textit{IQM, the War Scroll}, 115.}
\end{quote}

In sum, despite utilizing a source (column 2-9) that originally espoused a pan-Israelite ideal, Davies argues that 1QM as it now stands is the product of a dualistic revision that restricts
the earlier, nation-wide tradition to the sectarians. Correspondingly, Duhaime contends that even if the sources were non-sectarian, the redacted product contributed to the sectarian identity in that it consolidated a break with a perverted environment.

Both of the views just surveyed have strengths and weaknesses. Although Schultz’ emphasis on a large-scale national restoration (i.e., conversion) helps to mitigate the problem of a small sect engaging in an international military campaign, he favours an early date (mid 2nd cent. BCE) for at least column 1, a view that stands in tension with the recent trend in

---

174 According to his reading of the text, Davies, *Dualism and the Qumran War Texts*, 19, explains that the editor of 1QM “did not clearly separate his own conception from that of the existing tradition” (e.g., Israel becomes the “sons of light” and non-sectarian Jews and the nations become the “sons of darkness”); cf. idem, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 115. See also Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 215: “Even the people of Israel, as ‘offenders against the covenant’ (1QM 1:3) are included in the catalogue of the sect’s enemies”; Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 75: “[The sectarians define ‘Israel’ … narrowly”; Collins, *The Scriptures and Sectarianism*, 192: “[The sectarians] rejected the notion that all Israel has a share in the world to come, even if they still tended to equate the Sons of Light with Israel in texts like the War Scroll that referred to the eschatological time. The division between the Sons of Light and Sons of Darkness was not universalistic – Gentiles were assumed to belong to the Sons of Darkness except for the poorly attested case of proselytes. But the eschatonantal community was no longer equated with ethnic Israel”; Newsom, “Constructing ‘We, You, and Others,’” 13, highlights how the use of language is important: “[W]e’ and ‘others’ is most clearly marked in polemical formulations that distinguish between ‘children of light’ and ‘children of darkness.’”

175 Jean Duhaime, “La règle de la guerre (1QM) et la construction de l’identité sectaire,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen* (eds., Florentino García Martínez et al.; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 145: “Il ne fait cependant aucun doute que sa rédaction finale s’est faite dans un groupe à tendance sectaire forte et qu’elle a servi ses intérêts à l’époque tourmentée ou l’occupation romaine de la Palestine divisait la communauté juive.”

176 On this point, see Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 158-159 n. 247.

177 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 158-159, considers col. 1 to have been composed before 63 BCE. He gives three reasons, the second and third of which are closely related: 1.) The clear allusions to Dan 11:40-45 in col. 1 (on this, see Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, 28-62; Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 222, 232) were likely attempts to address the fact that both the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (=king of the north in Dan 11:40) and the redemption that was supposed to follow Antiochus’ death (Dan 12:1-3) did not happen as per Daniel. In the words of Schultz: “The fact that M’s ‘king of the Kittim’ is standing in for Daniel’s ‘king of the north’ and that the Qumranites never called the Roman leaders ‘kings’ supports the Seleucid identification of M’s ‘kittim of Assyria,’ and confirms that at least col. 1 of M was composed prior to Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem”; 2.) Schultz is sympathetic to the view that the Teacher of Righteousness was the High Priest during the so-called intersacerdotium (159-153 BCE). Thus, after the Teacher’s priestly tenure, the sectarians would have been unsatisfied with the temple establishment and conceivably would have desired a war against such “violators of the covenant.” That 1 Macc 9:23 speaks of “transgressors of the law” and “doers of unrighteousness” may lend credence to the possibility that the sectarians would have found other Jews who shared their displeasure with the Jerusalem priesthood; 3.) If 4QMMT was written to Jonathan before he became High Priest (so Hanan Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* [eds., John Kampen and Moshe Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 62-63), it
Qumran scholarship that sees the dualism of the sectarian texts as secondarily adopted and thus later.\(^{178}\) At the same time, caution is warranted if the presence or absence of dualism is pressed too hard in the service of determining the date of a given section of WS. As noted above, Davies considers columns 2-9 to be the earliest tradition in WS, in part because of the lack of “dualistic language,”\(^{179}\) and to be sure, the language of light and darkness is largely absent\(^{180}\) from these columns. But dualistic thought can be expressed beyond this characteristic terminology. Indeed, the dualism of WS – unlike that of 1QS’s Treatise – is not predominately confined to an easily distinguished block of material, as the notion of a battle between opposing angelic forces permeates all sections of WS.\(^{181}\) Thus, it may or may not be the case that certain sections of the text are the product of redaction. For instance, it has

---

\(^{178}\) Precisely how much later, of course, depends on one’s conclusions regarding the priority of the various sources/traditions included in WS and when it is determined these traditions were brought together as found in 1QM. While there is little agreement on these issues, scholars are relatively sure of the limits of WS: the references to Dan 11-12 indicate a terminus a quo of 164 BCE, and paleographical analysis of 1QM suggests a terminus ad quem of the mid-1\(^{st}\) cent. BCE; for a thorough treatment of the dating of the M tradition, see Duhaime, The War Texts, 65-101. Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” 12, allows that WS may represent the earliest form of Qumran dualism, but he rejects the notion that WS is grounded in dualism, as we have seen. I have also mentioned (see preceding footnote) that Schultz, Conquering the World, 158 n. 247, is sympathetic to a mid-2\(^{nd}\) cent. BCE dating of the dualistic col. 1, and that he considers the hopeful tone of the contemporaneous 4QMMT to be indicative of an optimism that manifested itself in the outlook that there were still non-sectarian Jews who had not yet disqualified themselves from being part of the people of God. Such optimism, as discussed, coheres with what Schultz posits as a national restoration in the midst of WS’s two-stage eschatological war. Intriguingly, Collins, Scriptures and Sectarianism, 194, employs 4QMMT to draw quite a different conclusion: MMT indicates that the sect’s split with other Jews was primarily for legal reasons and therefore dualism was likely “adopted secondarily to provide a theological explanation of the social division.” Collins’ comments are made specifically in regard to the Treatise on the Two Spirits (see the fuller discussion in section 5.2.1), but they highlight the trend that sees dualism as a product of later redaction; cf. Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 35-36.

\(^{179}\) Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” 13: “No dualistic language has been introduced into columns ii-ix, where various collections of date about the war are gathered.”

\(^{180}\) But not entirely: sons of darkness” is found at 1QM 3:6, 9; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 225.

\(^{181}\) As I have already highlighted; cf. Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 168, who makes this observation explicitly. It is, therefore, inaccurate for Davies, “Dualism in the Qumran War Texts,” 16-17, to describe the dualistic portrait of WS as “rather slight.”
been argued that the angelic Prince of Light and the dualistic thrust of 1QM 13:9b-12 were secondarily added: Duhaime contends that because 13:1-6 pits God himself against Belial and because 13:13b-14\(^\text{182}\) is a clear statement that God’s strength is greater than that of any angel, an earlier version of column 13 – perhaps in deference to Deut 32:8-9 – did not have lines 9b-12a.\(^\text{183}\) But given the prominence of angelic dualism throughout WS, such proposals must not be too hastily accepted,\(^\text{184}\) not least because even a sentiment like that of 13:13b-14, as we have seen, is quite at home in Second Temple Period angelological texts insofar as angelic protagonists, no matter their charge or potency, are ultimately subordinate to/dependent on God for victory (cf. Dan 7:21-22; 1 En. 1:9; 90:15ff; 1QS 3:24).\(^\text{185}\) Therefore, the presence of angelic dualism does not necessitate a given passage is the product of redaction.

Given the difficulty surrounding WS’s source-critical history and date of composition or compiling,\(^\text{186}\) it is fortunate that sorting out all the particulars is not demanded for the purposes of this thesis. I am most concerned with the final form of the document, and what

\(^{182}\) “Who is like you in strength, God of Israel, whose mighty had is with the poor? And which angel or prince is an aid like [you?].”


\(^{184}\) As per Collins, “Powers in Heaven,” 17: “We may detect [at 1QM 13:13b-14] some ambivalence about the status of the Prince of Light. The author or compiler of the *War Scroll* wanted to be sure that the uniqueness of God was not compromised. There is no reason, however, to regard the angelic Prince of Light as a secondary insertion here. The role of the principal angel is again affirmed in column 17 of the *War Scroll.*”

\(^{185}\) While Persian influence may help to explain WS’s somewhat unusual (from a Jewish perspective) portrait of two supernatural equals, Michael and Belial, fighting against one another (see Collins, “The Mythology of Holy War,” 607; cf. Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 181-191), the sovereignty of the God of Israel is never in doubt; on this point, see Hannah, *Michael and Christ*, 63, who speaks of the “limited dualism” of the sect and (cf. 1QS 3:25; 1QH\(^a\) 9:9ff, 5:8) and God’s superiority to all angels (cf. 1QM 13:13f; 1QH\(^a\) 15:28ff, 18:8); cf. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 221-224; Steudel, “The Eternal Reign,” 523; and my discussion of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, above.

\(^{186}\) Cf. Duhaime, “War Texts,” 100-101: “All things considered, the date of the composition of 1QM as we have it remains quite elusive. Many indications point to the Hellenistic period ... . In this hypothesis, 1QM 1 would have been written very early after Daniel 11-12 and the Kittim would be the Greeks; the weaponry and strategy would have been assembled within a very short period of time. But no argument for this dating seems really compelling, either; and the texts could be a late composition or reworking from the Roman period. In this case, the vision of Daniel 11-12 would have been reinterpreted to fit the expectations of a group under occupation by the Romans, the Kittim of the time, whose weapons and tactics could be observed almost on a daily basis. The document would have eventually incorporated early material and slightly updated it.”
my discussion has highlighted is that when it comes to the identity of the human warriors, diverse appraisals of the source-critical history of WS arrive at roughly the same conclusion: whether through what Schultz refers to as a large-scale national, eschatological restoration (I argued that conversion is a more appropriate term) or via the restriction or appropriation of pan-Israelite tradition, those who fight in conjunction with the angels in WS represent the true, reconstituted Israel, namely, the sectarians. This conclusion is keeping with the angelological convictions of 11QMelchizedek and the Treatise on the Two Spirits insofar as it is the unique privilege of the sectarians to benefit from what was traditionally the angelic assistance offered to the entire nation. Even more than that, it seems that an integral component of what it meant to be sectarian-defined Israel was to have access to this succor.

But as I have shown, WS speaks of the relationship between the humans and angels in an even loftier manner than the Treatise and 11QMelchizedek: a presumptuous mutuality is envisioned between the angels and the sectarian warriors, who together comprise the sons of light; both this mutuality and the notion that privileged angelic succor is an integral component of what it means to be true Israel are best seen in an important passage near the end of the extant document. 1QM 17:6-9 reads as follows:

5 (This is) the day he has set to humiliate and to bring low the prince of the dominion of wickedness. He has sent an everlasting help to the lot whom he has [re]deemed through
the might of the majestic angel. (He will set) the authority of Michael in everlasting light. 
7 He will cause the covenant of Israel to shine in joy! Peace and blessing to the lot of God! 
He will exalt over the divine beings the authority of Michael and the dominion of 
8 Israel over all flesh. Righteousness shall rejoice in the heights and all his Sons of Truth 
shall be glad in everlasting knowledge. As for you, sons of his covenant, 
9 strengthen yourselves in the midst of God’s crucible until he waves his hand and fills up his 
crucibles (according to) his mysteries so that you may stand.

It is helpful to view the beginning of this passage as a statement answering a series of implied 
questions. How will God win the war and defeat the angelic leader of wickedness and his 
forces? By sending help to his redeemed lot. What is the means by which God will help? 
Via his sending of the “majestic angel,” who is likely to be identified with Michael/the Prince 
of Light. The answer to the next implied question – who are the beneficiaries of this 
angelic help? – complements the close relationship between angels and humans in \(\text{WS}\) 
discussed thus far, serving as the climactic statement on this topic. Figure 1 highlights how 
the structure of lines 6b-8a function as a response to the question.\(^{188}\)

\(^{187}\) Contra Johannes P. Rohland, Der Erzengel Michael (BZRGG 19; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 16, who 
considers Michael to be the Angel of Yahweh, whose jurisdiction is earth, while the majestic angel is Israel’s 
advocate (Anwaltes Israels) in the heavenly realm (cf. Helmer Ringrenn, The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead 
Sea Scrolls [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963], 82-83). There is, however, nothing in column 17 indicating that this is 
the case, and it seems natural to view the majestic angel as a designation for the Prince of Light/Michael, the 
leader of the righteous angelic host, who are referred to in line 6 as the “authority of Michael” (see below). See 
also Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 469, who (implausibly) suggests, as he does with Michael, that the majestic 
angel may be a designation for the people of Israel in their angelmorphic state.

\(^{188}\) Cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 227, who provides a diagram complementary to my own, outlining 
the respective sides of the eschatological war:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>God’s Lot</th>
<th>Belial’s lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael = Prince of Light</td>
<td>Belial (not equal to God)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angels of Michael’s dominion</td>
<td>Angels of Belial’s lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sect</td>
<td>People of Belial’s lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= people of the covenant</td>
<td>= all outside of sect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= sons of light</td>
<td>= sons of darkness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, Davidson’s accompanying comment that “the Prince of Light and the angels of his dominion are 
ever actually said to belong to God’s lot” is only true in the most literal sense: my diagram highlights that the 
parallelism of the passage suggests that the “lot of God” is comprised of those angels under Michael’s authority.

**Figure #1: Parallelism of 1QM 17:6-8**

He will cause the covenant of Israel to shine in joy

(He will set) the authority of Michael in everlasting light

Peace and blessing to the lot of God

and the dominion of Israel over all flesh

He will exalt over the divine beings the authority of Michael

A number of items require comment. First, that there is an intimate connection between heaven and earth is indicated by two statements that parallel Michael and Israel,\(^{189}\) the first of which uses light/illumination (אור) imagery. Second, הַרְוַיִּשְׁרָאֵל is a clear reference to the people,\(^{190}\) but more curious is מֵשָׁרָאֵל, which is obviously angelic, but in what sense?

While it may be that מֵשָׁרָאֵל refers to the archangel’s “authority”\(^ {191}\) in a literal sense, it more

---

\(^{189}\) Again, contra Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 472, who does not see an analogical spatial dualism (i.e., a correspondence between heaven and earth) but rather a way of emphasizing an angelmorphic understanding of Israel. See Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 169, who rightly objects: “[Fletcher-Louis’] interpretation seems to ignore the parallelism between the ‘dominion of Michael’ and ‘the rule of Israel among all flesh.’”

\(^{190}\) Specifically, those who accept the sectarian covenant/reconstitution of Israel. On this point, see my discussion above; cf., e.g., Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 226, who in reference to 1QM 17:7-8 states that “Israel (the sect) will gain dominance over all flesh”; Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 81, also specifies “true Israel.” This identification is confirmed by the presence of dualistic terminology familiar from 1QS throughout the passage; see below.

\(^{191}\) Most scholars read מֵשָׁרָאֵל as the construct form of the noun מִשָּׁרָאֵל (cf. Isa 9:5-6, where the NRSV translates מִשָּׁרָאֵל as “authority”). Contra Dupont-Sommer, “Règlement de la Guerre,” 175, who considers the word to be a participle of מִשָּׁרָאֵל (a reading followed by Anges Caquot, “Les Service des Anges,” *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 425-429; allowed by Duhaime, “War Texts,” 133 n. 76), with the result that Israel is being referred to as the “servant of Michael.” If Dupont-Sommer is correct, 1QM 17:6-8 is stating that Israel, as the servant of Michael, is exalted over the divine beings (i.e., outranks the angels), and given the lofty claims of WS, it would be tempting to draw this conclusion (for the notion that the sectarians outrank the angels, see my discussion of the Self-Glorification Hymn in the following chapter). But note the critique of Carmignac, *La Règle*, 239, who rightly argues that reading מֵשָׁרָאֵל as a construct form of מִשָּׁרָאֵל (rather than a participle of מִשָּׁרָאֵל) is to be preferred, as מֵשָׁרָאֵל better complements מִשָּׁרָאֵל which is parallel to it in lines 7-8. Also see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 458ff, who opts for “service of Michael” (in the cultic sense of service) and, as already noted, interprets this phrase as a reference to angelmorphic Israel.
likely includes a collective character: that is, נסחאת מֶלֶךְ is a reference to the righteous angels Michael assists and those over and through whom he has sway. The advantage of the latter understanding is that it better complements the collectivity of not only המֶלֶךְ but also מֶלֶךְ in the first parallel but also מֶלֶךְ in the second. Thus, we have in this passage the leader of the angelic host (= the majestic angel, who is Michael/the Prince of Light), the collective angelic host (= the authority of Michael), and the people (= the covenant/dominion of Israel). Moreover, the connection between the Michael-led angelic forces and Israel on earth suggests that: a.) the former represent the guardians of heavenly Israel in a manner reminiscent of Dan 7-12; and b.) the amalgam of the heavenly Israel and earthly Israel into one eschatological army is a sectarian usurpation and widening of the apocalyptic notion that “earthly realities reflect and mirror heavenly ones.” With these things in mind, the mention of Michael, Israel’s angelic prince and guardian par excellence, is no

Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 227; cf. Cargmignac, Le Règle, 238.

While המֶלֶךְ means “realm” or “dominion” in Dan 11:5, the collective sense is present in 1QS 3:20ff, which speaks of the dominion of the Prince of Light “over all the sons of righteousness.” Also see 2 Chr 32:9, where המֶלֶךְ refers to Sennacherib’s “military forces.” As mentioned above, Davies, QM, the War Scroll, 81, suggests that the המֶלֶךְ of 1QM 17:8 is that of the “true Israel,” a statement followed by parenthetical references to Dan 7:22, 27. Davies offers no commentary on the Danelic references, but these verses pertain to the possession of the kingdom by the “holy ones” (7:22) and “the people of the holy ones” (7:27), thus suggesting that he reads המֶלֶךְ collectively.

Cf. Collins, Daniel, 318, who observes the same three-fold distinction in Dan 7 (i.e., “one like a son of man”; holy ones; and people of the holy ones).

As noted throughout this section, the Book of Daniel has greatly influenced WS’s authors/compilers. On col. 17 as similar to Dan 7, see Collins, Daniel, 319 (idem, “The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High,” 64): “In 1QM 17:7-8, God raises up ‘among the angels the authority of Michael and the dominion of Israel among all flesh.’ It is precisely such a two-tiered understanding of the eschatological struggle that underlies the vision of the ‘one like a human being’ and its relation to the people of the holy ones.” Also see Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 51, who observes that “the victory in col. 17 is that of [God’s] appointed angel. One of the results of this victory is the exaltation of Michael over all gods, perhaps in the manner of the exaltation of the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7”; cf. Miller, Messias und Menschensohn, 28; Rowland, The Open Heaven, 181. On the subject of the Michael-led angels as heavenly Israel, see Collins, Daniel, 318ff, who speaks of the “synergism between the faithful Israelites on earth and their angelic counterparts in heaven”; for further, see Chapter Three, above.

Hannah “Guardian Angels,” 420.
accident (cf. Dan 7:13-14; 10:21, 23; 12:3). Third, in the midst of the two lines that mention Michael and Israel, a blessing is pronounced on the מַעְלַךְ. At first glance, this phrase might seem awkward or extraneous, but its placement serves to underscore $WS$’s focus on the human-angel composition of the sons of light. In short, heavenly Israel and the true earthly Israel, as a unit, constitute the “lot of God” – a fact immediately reinforced by the second Michael-Israel parallel. Fourth, various dualistic terms appear in the passage, including מַעְלַךְ (cf. 1QM 1:5, 11, 13-14; 1QS 3:24; 11QMelch 2:8, 12) and מַמְשָׁלָה (cf. 1QM 1:6, 15; 1QS 3:20ff; 11QMelch 2:9), as well as מַרְדֹּקְא (cf. 1QS 4:5, 6) and מַדָּע (cf. 1QM 1:12). Again, while it is possible that these terms are evidence of a dualistic redaction, more certain is that their presence reiterates that the sectarians were claiming the sway of Michael – that is, Israel’s angelic succor – for themselves. Indeed, the angelology of $WS$ performs an “apologetic function, justifying the secession from mainstream Judaism” insofar as “those who do not stand with the right leaders and the cosmic powers behind them will suffer destruction by the wrath of God.”

197 Technically, Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 224-227, is correct to point out that $WS$ considers the sectarians as belonging to the “lot of God” rather than to the lot of an angel (contra 11QMelch, where sect members are said to be part of “Melchizedek’s lot/inheritance”). But the significance of this observation could easily be overstated since here the chosen leader of God’s lot is the majestic angel/Michael.

198 Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 80-81.

199 Duhaime, “Dualistic Reworking,” 46-51, suggests that 1QM has taken what was originally a God vs. Belial scenario in 4QM (=4Q491) frg. 11 2:13b-18 and turned it into a (God-ordained) Michael vs. Belial scenario; cf. Davies, *IQM, the War Scroll*, 81. Also see Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 228: “It is noteworthy that the opposition does not lie between God and Belial directly, but instead between Michael and Belial. There is a sense in which God himself stands outside of the conflict.” Cf. my comments on 11QMelch, above.

200 So Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 117 – though if it is correct that the initial impetus for secession was *halakhic* matters, then the angelological claims were likely used to bolster the *halakhic* ones which would have been seen as the primary motivation for secession; cf. Collins, *The Scriptures and Sectarianism*, 193-194.

4.4: CONCLUSIONS

As the “people of the holy ones” (cf. 1QM 10:10; 12:8), the sectarians were convinced that they had a special connection to the angelic succor that was previously available to the entire nation, and this assertion is made in different ways, not only in WS but also in the Treatise on the Two Spirits and 11QMelchizedek. Moreover, all three texts suggest that this close relationship to their celestial guardians was an integral component of what it meant to be ideal Israel. However, the sectarians also presumptuously referred to these same guardians as the “holy ones of the people” (cf. 1QM 6:6; 16:1), which, as I argued, points to the belief that they somehow laid claim to the angels. The eschatological war-time expression of this lofty conviction was not simply that the angels would be for and/or with them: the unique picture of WS is that the angels of heavenly Israel would fight in conjunction with the warriors of true earthly Israel, namely, the sectarian soldiers, who together constitute “God’s lot.”

As numerous commentators have observed, the redactional history of WS is complex. But even if it is likely that earlier, pan-Israel sources have been employed in WS, it does not negate the fact that the redacted document brilliantly conveys that a sectarian-defined Israel would emerge victorious at the eschaton. Finally and most significantly, for a group that considered itself to be Israel “as it ought to be,” there is arguably no better claim than to boast that adherence to the sectarian covenant included martial fellowship with the army of heavenly Israel led by the nation’s angelic guardian par excellence, Michael.202

202 It is important to note that 4Q491 frg. 11 col. i has been controversially associated with the War Scroll, including lines which have been dubbed “the hymn of Michael.” Since scholars have also considered frg. 11 col. i to be a recension of the Self-Glorification Hymn, I will examine 4Q491 in my discussion of the Self-Glorification Hymn in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE
ANGELS ASSOCIATED WITH ISRAEL IN THE SECTARIAN TEXTS PART II:
ANGELIC PRIESTS

5.1: INTRODUCTION

To be sure, 1QM’s notion of a sectarian-angel eschatological army is grandiose. But other
texts reveal something loftier in that Qumranites apparently did not consider fellowship with
the angels as an experience that would have to wait for the eschatological war; a feature of a
number of statements in the Hodayot, for example, is that at least some measure of angelic
fellowship was envisioned as a present reality.¹ More specifically, the texts I will discuss in this
chapter juxtapose the sectarian notion of angelic fellowship and the aforementioned Second
Temple Period belief that heaven includes a sanctuary served by an angelic priesthood. The
synthesis of these convictions resulted in claims that the Yahad enjoyed present liturgical
communion with the priestly angels associated with Israel.² As I will demonstrate, boasts of liturgical
fellowship with the angelic priests were closely connected to and enhanced the sect’s identity
as ideal Israel.

The chapter will be organized as follows. I will first examine the boasts of angelic
fellowship in the Hodayot and in the hymn found at the end of 1QS. Next, I will examine the
Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,³ a document which is often viewed as one of the ritual
mechanisms for achieving liturgical communion with the angels at Qumran. I will then turn

¹ See, e.g., Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 124, 151-152, who differentiates between the future
angelic fellowship of the War Scroll and the present angelic fellowship of the Hodayot. This distinction is a
somewhat controversial point among scholars, and I will return to it, below.
² Cf. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 151-152; Weinfeld, Normative and Sectarian Judaism, 48, who
both list common praise with the angels as a form of angelic fellowship.
³ Again, the provenance of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice is disputed, and I will address this issue in my
treatment of the text.
to brief statements regarding fellowship with the angelic priests in 4Q181, Songs of the Sage, and the *Rule of Blessings*. Lastly, I will discuss the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, whose angelic fellowship sentiments are the loftiest among the DSS and will thus serve as an appropriate way to conclude the chapter.

5.2: THE HODAYOT AND RELATED TEXTS

My discussion of the *Hodayot* will be comprised of two parts. I will first highlight the pertinent angelic fellowship passages, noting the nature and function of angelic communion in the text. I will then explore how angelic fellowship in *Hodayot* – as well as analogous sentiments in 1QS 11:7-8⁴ – contributed to sectarian claims to be the true or ideal Israel. I have addressed the sectarian provenance of 1QS above; the *Hodayot* have also been considered sectarian texts from the time of their discovery.⁵ While at least one so-called

---

⁴ Given the *Hodayot*-like qualities of 1QS 11, it has been proposed that the *Hodayot* existed at least as early as 1QS, which is dated on the basis of paleography to the early first century BCE (a suggestion supported by at least one of the Cave 4 *Hodayot* mss); see Emile Puech, “*Hodayot,*” *EDSS* 1:366; cf. Devorah Dimant, “The Composite Character of Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in eadem, *History, Ideology, and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (FAT 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 178.

⁵ Terminological and thematic affinities with other sectarian texts (e.g., reference to the “Maskil,” dualistic elements, angelic fellowship, etc.) have led to the conclusion that the *Hodayot* were composed, edited, and/or compiled by the *Yahad*; on this issue, see the essays of Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance” and “The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in eadem, *History, Ideology, and Bible Interpretation, 27-56, 57-100;* on the possibility that some of the hymns pre-date the *Yahad*, see Angela Kim Harkins, “A New Proposal for Thinking About 1QH*’* Sixty Years After Its Discovery,” 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., Darrell K. Falk and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 102-134; cf. eadem, “The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation,” *DSD* 15 (2008) 121-154; eadem, “Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns from 1QH*’* and 4QH*’* (1Q427),” *DSD* 12 (2005): 233-256. Like the sectarian S and M traditions, *Hodayot* mss were found in Cave 1 (1QH*’* and 1QH*’’) and Cave 4 (4QH*’* and 4QH*’*p) [= 4Q427-432]). Dated paleographically to the early Herodian period, 1QH*’* is the latest extant witness to the H tradition; the sequence and earlier paleography of the Cave 4 mss may suggest that the sequence of psalms in 1QH*’* was initiated at an early point in the tradition (even if certain witnesses may have only contained specific blocks of psalms; see further below). Earlier work on the *Hodayot* followed the column and line numbering of Eleazar Sukenik, *Ozzer ha-Megillat ha-Benajot* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1954); cf. idem, *The Dead Sea Scroll of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955). However, subsequent material and paleographic analysis of the scroll led Hartmut Stegemann, “Rekonstruktion der Hodayot: Ursprüngliche Gestalt und kritisch bearbeiteter Text der Hymnenrolle aus Höhle 1 von Qumran” (Ph.D. diss.;
recension of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* is related to the *Hodayot*, its content, proposed use, and possible relationship to other texts warrant a separate discussion later in the present chapter.

5.2.1: *ANGELIC FELLOWSHIP IN THE HODAYOT: PRESENT AND LITURGICAL*

In various places, the *Hodayot* specify the honour God has bestowed upon the speaker(s) or the security in which God has enabled him/them to walk (cf. 1QH*ª* 4:26-27; 7:29-30; 15:27; 20:1). But these passages are modest in comparison with the extraordinary privileges boasted

---

6 Traditionally, the voice of individual psalms has been attributed to either the Teacher of Righteousness (i.e., the so-called “Teacher Hymns,” variously delineated as running from 1QH*ª* cols. 9 or 10-19) or the larger sectarian community (i.e., the so-called “Community Hymns,” which are found in 1QH*ª* cols. 1-8 or 9 and 19-28); the block of Teacher Hymns (TH) is thus flanked by two blocks of Community Hymns (CH 1 and CH 2). On the history of these distinctions and the burgeoning interest in their (re)definition, see Schuller, “Recent Scholarship,” 122, 137-146. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 196ff, 287-292, points out that current discussions have largely abandoned seeing a definitive connection between the historical Teacher of Righteousness and the Teacher Hymns, with Newsom herself being a prominent advocate for the view that the Teacher Hymns reflect the leadership of the sect more broadly; she also contends that even a leadership inspired-*hodayah* does not mean that it is void of significance for the “ordinary” sectarian insofar as these psalms may have promoted “ideal” sectarian ways. While Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 121-122, 133-134, has argued that angelic fellowship in the *Hodayot* is limited to TH and CH 2, as we will see below, there are (admittedly fragmentary) references in column 7 and 8; also see column 3, which seems to refer to angelic fellowship in line 32, but the poor condition of the rest of the column means the context of the line is virtually impossible to decipher. As Esther G. Chazon, “Liturgical Function in the Cave 1 Hodayot Collection,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*, 137, 149, observes, angelic fellowship is not limited to any one section of the *Hodayot*, and these important claims may even have been a unifying editorial feature; cf. Emile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en al vie future: Immoralité, resurrection, vie éternelle? Historie d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 417, who similarly does not detect any difference between the “eschatology” (the category in which Puech places angelic fellowship) of the Teacher Hymns and the Community Hymns.
about elsewhere in the *Hodayot*. Two examples are frequently cited, the first of which is from column 11:7

20 I thank you, Lord, that you have redeemed my life form the pit, and that from Sheol-
21 Abaddon
22 you have lifted me up to an eternal height, so that I walk about on a limitless plain. I
23 know that there is hope for one whom
24 you have formed from the dust for an eternal council. And a perverted spirit you have
purified from great sin that it might take its place with
25 the host of the holy ones and enter into community with the congregation of the children
of heaven. And you cast for the man an eternal lot with the spirits
26 of knowledge, that he might praise your name in a common rejoicing and recount your
27 wonderful acts before all your works.

Frequently noted for correspondences with 11:20-24, the second well-known angelic
fellowship passage is found in 19:13-17:8

---

7 These lines are part of a psalm that extends from 11:20-37; see DJD 40, 146. Since communal praise is a feature of the Community Hymns, this psalm has not infrequently been considered as such, despite its placement in the Teacher Hymn block: cf., e.g., Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 70; Michael C. Douglas, “Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1-18:14” (Ph.D. diss.; University of Chicago, 1998), 245, 254. Conversely, Sara J. Tanzer, “The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the ‘Hodayot,’” (Ph.D. Diss.; Harvard University, 1986), 106ff, discusses why she considers this psalm a Teacher Hymn (though a “hybrid” of sorts), including a close connection between it and the immediately preceding Teacher Hymn (11:6-19). On the relationship between this psalm and 11:6-19, see Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 229, who considers the categories of Teacher Hymn and Community Hymn “inadequate” for 11:20-37; cf. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 256ff. Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 138-140, observes the use of two characteristics of the Teacher Hymns in 11:20-37: the use of the "רני אדביה" incipit and rescue from the “pit.” Moreover, in keeping with Newsom’s comments mentioned in the preceding footnote, Chazon suggests that “although the author of the Teacher Hymn in 1QH11:20-37 writes from an individual perspective, the terms he employs for the shared station and joint praise with the angels and the similar usage of these terms in the Community Hymns strongly suggest that he also has his elect community in view – the earthly counterpart to the ‘congregation of the sons of heaven.’”

8 These lines are from a psalm that begins at 19:6 and possibly ends at 20:6, though some consider line 18 as commencing an entirely new psalm (i.e., not just a new section); for the various proposals, see DJD 40, 242. On this psalm as a Community Hymn with strong wisdom elements, see Tanzer, “The Sages at Qumran,” 23-24, 37-42. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 226, conveniently highlights the parallels between 11:20-24 and 19:13-
For the sake of your glory you have purified a mortal from sin so that he may sanctify himself.

for you from all impure abominations and from faithless guilt, so that he might be united with the children of your truth and in the lot with

your holy ones, so that a corpse infesting maggot might be raised up from the dust to the council of [your] truth, and from a spirit of perversion to the understanding which comes from you,

and so that he may take (his) place before you with the everlasting host and the [eternal] spirit[s], and so that he may be renewed together with all that [is]

and will be and with those who have knowledge in a common rejoicing.

That the psalmists can celebrate being exalted by God to commune with the angels\(^9\) is

\(^9\) A number of angelic designations are used in these passages, and as Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 205, explains: “[T]he author(s) did not tire of rearranging the various epithets applying to angels, producing many combinations. This, of course, is consistent with the use of poetic form, but nevertheless does highlight the interest of the writer(s) in angels.” For the use of “sons of heaven” as a designation for angels, see 1 En. 6:2; 13:8; for the use of “host of heaven” (or similar constructions), see 1 Kgs 22:19; 2 Macc 10:29-30; 1QM 12:1-8.

Though רוחות טהָרִים and נאמָנִים may occasionally refer to sect members and inclinational spirits, respectively, the context and parallel constructions confirm that the “host of holy ones” and “sons of heaven” in 11:23-24 as well as “eternal host” and “eternal spirits” in 19:16 refer to angelic beings. These statements are thus indicative of angelic communion; see Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms at Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 68; Menahem Monsoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction (STD)* 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 117; Puech, *La Croyance*, 370; Bjorn Frennesson, “*In a Common Rejoicing*”: Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran (SSU 14; Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 1999), 49 n. 33; Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels*, 162. However, scholars have rightly noted the הילדו of 19:14-15 is more difficult to interpret, in large part because it is parallel with נאמָנִים, a phrase which seems more naturally to be a reference to sect members; see, e.g., the discussion of Mathias Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Hodayot: texte hébreu, introduction, traduction, commentaire (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962), 236-237, who highlights the ambiguity. If the “holy ones”/“sons of your truth” are sect members (i.e., synonymous parallelism), the sense would seem to be that the sectarian are, in turn, those who are raised to stand in the presence of the (angelic) eternal host/everlasting spirits as per line 16; so Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 187; Kuhn, *Enderwartung*, 82-83; Stephen F. Noll, “Angelology in the Qumran Texts,” (Ph.D. diss; University of Manchester, 1979), 92; Tanzer, “Sages at Qumran,” 37. Alternatively, the parallelism may not be synonymous but complementary: i.e., sons of your truth = sectarian, whereas the holy ones = angels; so Theodor Herzl Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (rev. ed.; Garden City: Anchor Books, 1964), 178; Puech, *La Croyance*, 378; Frennesson, “*In a Common Rejoicing*,” 53 n. 73. While I am inclined to accept the former interpretation, it is clear that angelic fellowship is not ruled out even by the latter because of the statement of 19:16. I will address the possibility of word play in these lines, below.
somewhat paradoxical, given that another prominent feature of the Hodayot is their vigorous declarations of human depravity (cf. 1QH 5:31-35; 9:23-29; 11:24-26; 19:22-25; 1QS 11:9-10). However, these so-called *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* by no means cancel the exuberance of the claims of angelic fellowship but rather serve as a rhetorical foil to emphasize that divine grace and election have more than countered the lowliness of those so chosen by God. In fact, the extravagance of the God’s favour can be seen in different ways, not least of which

---


11 A few observations are pertinent. First, Angela Kim Harkins, “Reading the Qumran Hodayot in Light of the Traditions Associated with Enoch” *Her 32* (2010): 400 (cf. eadem, “Elements of the Fallen Angels Traditions in the Qumran Hodayot,” in *The Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Period Developments and Reception History* [eds., Kelley Cobentz Bauch, and John C. Endres; CBQMS 53; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 2014], 8-24), is right to point out that the “awareness of wretchedness of the human condition emerges only after the human speaker is positioned in a heavenly congregation. … With the proximity of the human to the heavenly, the experience of unworthiness is intensified.” That being said, the understanding of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* as a “foil” is helpful (see Kyle B. Wells, *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart* [NovTSup 157; Leiden: Brill, 2015], 124), because the Hodayot to do not seem to “land” on the sentiments of the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*: i.e., precisely because lowliness is not the dominant impression conveyed by the Hodayot, Carol A. Newsom, “Religious Experience in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Two Case Studies,” *Experientia, Volume 2: Linking Text and Experience* (eds., Colleen Shantz and Rodney Werline; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 212, 215, suggests that the expression *Niedrigkeitsdoxologie* “puts the emphasis in the wrong place,” opting for the designation, “masochistic sublime,” since the experience of exalted and profound knowledge and moral capacity is intensified precisely by a repeated encounter with the nothingness that is the human on its own. … The pleasure of seeing oneself constituted and destined for heavenly reward by means of the overwhelming power and mercy of God is experienced and even intensified by simultaneously expressing and experiencing one’s natural human sinfulness and loathsomeness.”

12 Scholars have investigated the Hodayot’s perplexing juxtaposition of penitential/self-deprecatory sentiments alongside determinist theology. E.g., Eileen M. Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Two Case Studies* (eds., John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; SDSSR; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 38, observes that the *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien* “function to introduce praise of God’s justice and mercy to such a wretched creation, and never as a petition for a change in the human condition.” Similarly, Esther Chazon, “Low to Lofty: The Hodayot’s Use of Liturgical Tradition to Shape Sectarian Identity,” *RelQ* 101 (2013): 5-9, notes that “given its deterministic worldview and firm belief in its members’ predestined election by grace, one would not expect the Qumran community to resort to petitionary prayer of any kind let alone for forgiveness of sin. … [But h]ere it is important to distinguish between penitential prayers proper and generically different texts that avail themselves of penitential motifs for their own purposes. The hodayot fall into the latter category … . The hodayot’s formulation *per se* is then quite standard, the sectarian adaptation lying in the recontextualization into the context of thanksgiving for election by grace.”

13 E.g., repentance and knowledge – two things which, in theory, could be attributed to human effort or piety – are viewed by the *Hodayot* author(s) as gifts of God; see Newsom, “Religious Experience,” 212.
is the nature of angelic communion itself. We have seen that Dan 12:3 and 1 En. 104:2-6 anticipate an angel-like afterlife for the righteous, and that the unique vision of the War Scroll is that the angels and sectarians would serve as comrades during the great eschatological conflict; but the perfect verbs of the 1QH* 11:20-24 and 19:13-17 have been widely understood to mean that these lines speak of angelic fellowship as “a present reality,” though this by no means rules out future implications.

While Kuhn is well-known for advocating the present significance of these verbs, and Puech the future or eschatological (he considers them examples of the “parfait prophétique”), both of their views as well as those of most who weigh-in on this subject are nuanced, and it is not so much that scholars accept in toto one connotation rather than another as that it is a matter of emphasis. While I accept the majority opinion that these Hodayot passages claim a robust measure of angelic fellowship as a present reality for the sect, the language used in attempting to strike a balance between this present reality and its future consummation has sometimes been problematic. For instance, context indeed

---

14 Specifically, both of the passages just cited display a series parallel lines consisting of perfect verbs followed by infinitives of purpose or result; e.g., 1QH* 11:22-23: “a perverted spirit you have purified (הַרְפָּא) from great sin that it might take (נָלַחְתָּה) its place with the host of the holy ones and enter (נָעַב) into community with the congregation of the children of heaven …”; see Bonnie P. Kittel, The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary (SBLDS 50; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 60, 62-63 (col. 11), 116 (col. 19); on infinitives of purpose/result, see Jouon § 124 f.

15 See Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 199-200, who in reference to 1QH* 11:20-24 and 19:13-17 says that “in these and other passages the fellowship with the angels promised to the righteous after death in the Epistle of Enoch and Daniel is claimed for members of the sectarian community” even if “it is certainly true that the Scrolls do not envision a world fully redeemed.”

16 Kuhn, Enderwartung, 44-112.

17 Puech, La Croyance 369ff.


19 Cf., e.g., the similar (though certainly not identical) views of Nickelsburg, Resurrection, 153-55; Rowland, The Open Heaven, 117-118; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 193; Chazon, “Human and Angelic Prayer,” 42ff; Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 93-103; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 54; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 123, 198; Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 163; Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 228ff.
suggests that the “eternal height” of 11:20 “represents the new life in the sectarian covenant, characterized by מזרחי and מלחים, in contrast to life outside the covenant, which is Sheol and Abbaddon,” but it is surely an exaggeration to say that 1QH 11: 20-24 “does not seem to concern the future life,” especially given the eschatological focus of 11:20-37 as a whole. Conversely, it may not give due credit to the present implications of angelic fellowship to refer to these claims as a “foretaste” of the eschaton. I would suggest, however, that Tuschling’s helpful articulation comes close to striking the proper balance: “Present transcendence and eschatological fulfillment are not the same, although one leads to the other.”

20 See Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 66, 68, 187, who makes similar comments regarding 19:16-17: just because the “probable thought here is of angels before the throne of God,” and that “membership of the community is identical to fellowship with God,” does not mean the passage is void of future eschatological significance. Cf. Delcor, Les Hymnes, 127, who calls attention to “une véritable communion mystique entre la communauté terrestre et la cour angélique céleste et point n’est besoin de comprendre tout notre texte au futur.” But it is likely overstating the matter to suggest that the community is “vit déjà ici-bas comme si elle était dans l’au-delà.”

21 On the eschatology of the end of the psalm, see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 176ff. On how the present deliverance of the first part of the psalm and the eschatological deliverance of the end of the psalm work together, see Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 228ff.

22 So Alexander, Mystical Texts, 72.

23 Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 118. That present transcendence leads to eschatological fulfillment is perhaps well-illustrated by the word לברגה, which, as we have seen, occurs with some frequency in the sectarian texts (cf. 1QS 3:24; 4:24, 26; 11:7; 11QMelch 2:8, 12, 13; 1QM 1:1-15; 13:5-12; 1QH 11:23; 14:16; 19:14 et al.; on לברגה specifically in the Hodayot, see Holm-Nielsen, Psalms at Qumran, 68; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 124-125). Though Puech, La Croyance, 370-371, has argued that לברגה has only future implications in 1QH 11:23 and 19:14, it is questionable whether לברגה ever has such a strict definition. The word occurs 77x in the Hebrew Bible, and even when it includes the figurative sense of “destiny,” there are real implications for the present (cf., e.g., Ps 16:5-6; Jer 13:25). Moreover, the Treatise on the Two Spirits is clear that to be part of a “lot” is to have very present angelic succor that carries inherent eschatological relevance. Even in the future-oriented 11QMelchizedek and War Scroll, there are no indications that being part of a “lot” is anything less than the eschatological outworking of present realities. Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 49-50 (cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 93 n. 45), has suggested that the parallelism of 1QH 11:22-23 supports the identification of membership in an angelic קדוש with being stationed with the “host of the holy ones”/entering into community with the “congregation of the sons of heaven,” since this identification conveys the idea of a “present reality and not just something that is ‘vécu dans la foi et l'espoir’” (as per Puech, La Croyance, 372). In addition to the present force of the verbs, the analysis of Kittel, The Hymns of Qumran, 62-63, supports
But more can be said regarding the nature of angelic fellowship in the *Hodayot*. A number of psalms refer to angels as נקבה “warriors” or “mighty ones” (cf. 11:36; 13:23; 16:12; 18:36), yet it is clear that in at least two such instances the focus is not primarily eschatological or martial. In column 7 we read:

17 And as for us, in the community of those gathered and with those who have knowledge we are instructed by you and we cry [out in the abundance of]
your compassion [ ] with your warriors. And when (you) act wondrously we will recount (it) together in the knowledge of God ] and until [ ]

Frennesson’s assertion. As briefly mentioned above, 11:22-24 exhibits a pattern of perfect verbs followed by infinitives of purpose/result. The following is a more detailed presentation of Kittel’s analysis:

Kittel highlights, “the first line states the action of God (the cleansing of man’s spirit); the two infinitives phrases attached to this clause indicate the purpose or result of this action. It is done so that (לד) man can take his place in the assembly of the [angels]. The second independent clause of the stanza begins with a restatement of that result – God places man with the [angels] – and a new set of purposive or result clauses are attached to this statement. The whole stanza, then, is arranged not only with some attention to parallelism, but in an interlocking fashion.” In light of this – and to further Frennesson’s point – it is not just that a למד with the angels is parallel to similar sentiments; it is that this claim was apparently deemed worthy of more forceful restatement via a perfect verb in its own independent clause.

24 נבורה is often used in the Hebrew Bible to refer to human warriors (e.g., Josh 1:14; Judg 6:12; Ps 33:16; 2 Chr 14:7), a usage echoed in the *Hodayot* (e.g., 1QH II 11:40; 14:33; 36; 18:26). The word, however, is not infrequently employed as designation for supernatural beings including the Nephilim (cf. Gen 6:4; see P. W. Coxon, “Gibborim,” *DDD*, 345-346), righteous angels (e.g., Ps 103:20; 1QM 15:14), and the God of Israel (e.g., Isa 42:13; Jer 20:11; Ps 24:8); as noted above, it is uncertain whether the “mighty one of war” נבורה at 1QM 12:9 refers to an angel or God. For further discussion and references, see Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 197-198; Michalak, *Angels as Warriors*, 27, 89-90.

25 In addition to its location in the CH 1 block, the first person plural pronoun suggests that this is a community hymn; see Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 57; cf. Tanzer, “Sages at Qumran,” 82. Column 7 is poorly preserved, but by taking the Cave 4 mss evidence into consideration, Schuller has suggested that 7:17-19 is part of a relatively short psalm that runs from 7:12-20; for comments on the psalm and the reconstruction of the text, see DJD 40, 37 (4.5.2.2), 99-100.
19 in the assembly of [ ]h and our offspring [you] have caused to understand together with the children of men in the midst of [ the children of ] Adam [ ]

Analogous sentiments are found in column 8:

\[\text{Alakhor roaring to the Lord, the Lord's} \]
\[\text{also to God, the Lord's allies,} \]
\[\text{with God's warriors,} \]
\[\text{and with the host of eternal warriors.} \]

14 … A source of light you have opened [ ] and for your council you have called me 15 to praise your holiness by the mouth of all your creatures, for you have don[e] to be united with the host of 16 the eternal [wa]rriors …

Certainty is ruled out by their fragmentary condition, but 7:17-19 and 8:14-16, like 11:20-24 and 19:14-16, would appear to be examples of present angelic communion, since the people are said to be “with those who have knowledge” (7:17), “with [God’s] warriors” (7:18), and “united with the host of eternal warriors” (8:15-16). Also like 11:20-24 and 19:14-17, the angelic fellowship in columns 7 and 8 is marked by the praise of God: מַעֲשֵׂה and מַעְלָל are widespread in liturgical passages of the Hebrew Bible (cf., e.g., Deut 32:43; Isa 16:10; Pss 5:12; 95:1), with the piel of כָּרָא not infrequently employed in similar settings; all three verbs

26 This psalm likely begins at 7:21 and ends at 8:40-41; see DJD 40, 110-11; Tanzer, “Sages at Qumran,” 88, describes this psalm as a Community Hymn in which angelic fellowship is specified as a reward for the righteous.

27 For “those with knowledge” as an angelic designation, see Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 48 n. 27, 54 n. 79, 57; cf. Carol A. Newsom, The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (HSM 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 23-29, who notes that knowledge is characteristic of angels in the Širîm. Also see Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 269, who proposes “people of your warriors” as a translation for הַמָּקוֹז (cf. Dan 7:27; 1QM 10:10; 12:8; 1IQMelb 2:9; and my discussion in section 4.3.1).

28 I.e., there are no indications of this being a future-oriented togetherness. Moreover, 7:17 has a niphal participle of מָרַע, which in the Hebrew Bible frequently expresses the very present activities of God meeting Israel at the sanctuary before the mercy seat (cf. Exod 25:22; 29:43ff; 30:6, 36) and his assembling of the congregation for worship (cf. Num 10:3; 1 Kgs 8:5; 2 Chr 5:6); see J. P. Lewis, TWOT s.v. “תָּמר.” As I will highlight, a purpose of the sect’s fellowship with the angels in the Hodayot is worship.

29 Cf. J. Kühlwein, TLOT s.v. כָּרָא: “In the piel meaning (to narrate), כָּרָא has a specifically theological setting in the Psalms: in the vow of praise and in reports that people communicate God’s mighty acts that they have experienced or heard of to others. … Objects of the narration are Yahweh’s name (Pss
or their cognates appear in the *Hodayot* passages listed above (cf. 7:17; 8:15-16, 18; 11:24; 19:17). The ritual purity requisite for the proper praise of God in a cultic context may have driven the choice of the word הָוֶּם in 11:21: Fletcher-Louis rightly notes that in a psalm that praises God for his forgiveness and purification, הָוֶּם, which is universally translated “hope,” is likely functioning as a double entendre, meaning both “hope” and “ritual bath.”

Indeed, numerous commentators have noticed that a main purpose of fellowship with the angels is worship, which is succinctly summarized in the phrase בְּיָדָהוּ נַחֲנָה, “in a common rejoicing” (cf. 1QHא 11:24; 19:17).

The notion that the sectarians have somehow united with the angels in heaven for liturgical purposes is only enhanced by use of the nouns דָּוָס and הָדוֹ. Both words are biblical designations for the divine assembly (cf. Jer 23:18-22; Pss 82:1; 89:6-9), and though they can refer to human assemblies (cf. Exod 16:1; Lev 8:4; Ps 83:4; Prov 11:13), the angelic

---

30 Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 108-112; cf. Harkins, “Reading the Qumran Hodayot,” 38. For additional examples of double entendres in the *Hodayot*, see section 5.2.2, below. On ritual bathing in the DSS, see, e.g., CD 10:11-12; 1QS 3:4-6.

31 On “common rejoicing” as a purpose of angelic fellowship, see especially Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 137ff; Frenneson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 57 (who appropriately used the phrase as the title for his monograph); Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 192; cf. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 124-125, who comments on how these passages use the language of Job 38:7, but whereas the Joban line refers to angels joining together to praise God, the *Hodayot* speak of the liturgical communion of angels and humans. That human-angel worship is a purpose of angelic fellowship is emphasized by the fact that both occurrences of בְּיָדָהוּ נַחֲנָה are found in the infinitive lines of the aforementioned perfect verb/infinitive of purpose constructions; see Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran*, 58, 60, 62, 111, 116. Earlier *Hodayot* scholarship proposed that 1QHא 19:28-29 also referred to the joining together of humans and angels for worship (in part because the words ןַחֲנָה and בְּיָדָהוּ occur in close proximity to each other). But as Schuller has pointed out, the Cave 4 mss help restore the more general picture of all creation joining together to praise God; see DJD 40, 246-247; cf. Frenneson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 55.

32 For the use of דָּוָס in the Hebrew Bible, see White, *Yahweh’s Council*, 56-57.

33 I discussed additional sectarian usage of הָדוֹ in section 5.3.3, above.
terminology combined with the language of being lifted up or exalted\textsuperscript{34} by God strongly suggest that דָּוָּד and הָדוֹד refer to the divine assembly in 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 7:19\textsuperscript{35} and 11:22-23 (cf. 25:26, 32),\textsuperscript{36} an assembly to which the sectarian worshipers have been granted access. This is further emphasized by the use of בֵּית הָדוֹד, “station” (cf. 11:22; 19:16): the word is used in the Hebrew Bible to refer to priestly service in the Jerusalem temple (cf. 1 Chr 23:28; 2 Chr

\textsuperscript{34} Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 214, points out the “geographical” extremes (i.e., Sheol vs. Heaven) of the opening lines. Cf. Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 256f: “Significant verbal links between the conclusion of the preceding todayah and the beginning of this one [1QH\textsuperscript{a} 11:19-37] point to the symbolic nexus on which this anxiety is focused—the claim of Sheol. Where the woman pregnant with a viper/nothingness was consigned to the Pit and Sheol at the conclusion of the earlier text, this prayer opens with thanks that ‘you have redeemed my life from the Pit, and that from Sheol-Abaddon you have brought me up to an eternal height’ (lines 19-20). Various polar terms are used to mark the transformation of the speaker’s situation: low/high; dust/eternal council; perverted spirit/holy ones; and so forth (lines 19-23). The prayer would initially appear to build on the externalizing of the negative in the previous composition in order to consolidate a sense of the distinction between self and other, good and evil, saved and damned, and in so doing reinforce a relatively unified subjectivity.” Such comments, however, do not definitively address the nature or sense of these extremes or poles. Though some scholars see the angelic fellowship of the Hodayot as envisioning angelic descent or a heaven-on-earth experience (cf., e.g., Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 11ff, 50; Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 119), others view it as human ascent to heaven (cf., e.g., Chazon, “Human & Angelic Prayer,” 43ff; Schäfer, The Origin of Jewish Mysticism, 151-152; Angel, Otherworldly, 84). While I think the latter interpretation best accounts for the Hodayot’s exaltation language (see further, below), an important observation is made by Alexander, The Mystical Texts, 118-119, who is sympathetic to the human ascent understanding: “The lack of explicit reference [to the actual ascent as per, e.g., Enoch] raises another intriguing possibility, namely that the Qumranites’ view of heaven was more sophisticated than we might suppose. Heaven was not really ‘up there’: such spatial language is only symbolic and metaphorical. Rather the spiritual, heavenly world constitutes a parallel universe, another dimension. … [T]his opens up the possibility of seeing the yihud with the angels in more psychological terms, as a more internal process than we might at first suppose.”

\textsuperscript{35} Whereas in 11:23 God has enabled the psalmist to be part of the בֵּית הָדוֹד, the construct chain of 7:19 is broken. Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 114, proposes that the references to “children of men” and “children of Adam” later in line 19 point to a human congregation. However, Schuller has proposed that 7:19 be restored to מִדְרֵשָׁה קְדֻשָּׁה בֵּית הָדוֹד, which is likely a reference to a heavenly congregation, especially if מִדְרֵשָׁה is corrected to מִדְרֵשָׁה בֵּית הָדוֹד as per 4QHa frg. 8 1:10; see DJD 40, 102, 106.

\textsuperscript{36} Commenting on 11:20-24, Delcor, Des Hymnes, 126, notes the similarities between it and Ps 89:6-7, verses which speak of the divine assembly; cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 167 n. 3; Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 221; contra Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 67, who states that “man’s expectation of heavenly glory is realized in the existence of the community,” and as such considers מִדְרֵשָׁה בֵּית הָדוֹד to be “a fixed term for the community.” I will address the perhaps deliberate ambiguity of מִדְרֵשָׁה (as well as קְדֻשָּׁה) in 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 19:15, below.
35:15), but it also likely lies behind the word used in the Similitudes to describe the standing of the angelic throng in the throne room of the heavenly temple (cf. 1 En. 60:2).

This observation complements the angelic fellowship claim of column 14, which I have not yet discussed:

15 Thus all the nations will acknowledge your truth and all the peoples your glory, for you have brought [ ] your secret counsel
16 to all the people of your council, and in a common lot with the angels of presence, without an intermediary between them ly[ ...]

The fragmentary state of the text is again unfortunate, but it seems that line 16 is making a vital assertion about angelic fellowship. Again, the psalmist claims to be in a נרדל with the angels, and that this human-angel lot denotes communion – as opposed to a pedestrian claim that both contingents happen to be on the same (righteous) side of the dualistic divide – is suggested by the clarificatory statement that there is “no intermediary” between the

---


38 These lines are part of a relatively long teacher hymn that runs from 13:22-15:8; see DJD 40, 184. On the contribution 14:15-16 make to the psalm, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 194, who notes that while the psalmist’s opponents are characterized by unfaithfulness to the covenant, the righteous have communion with the angels as their reward. I will return to these themes, below.

39 As Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 163, notes, the text’s condition is “frustrating,” but the notion of fellowship between angels and people is clear.

40 On the nuances of הנבון, which can mean “mediator,” “translator,” or “interpreter,” cf. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 114; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 52 n. 56; DJD 40, 187.
sects and the angels. But this time, the angels with whom the sectarians are grouped are the מָלָאךְיְךָ פָּנִים, a statement entirely appropriate in a document emphasizing liturgical fellowship with the angels: as discussed in Chapter Three, Jubilees and other texts depict these “angels of (the) presence” as an elite class of celestial beings who serve before God as the priests of the heavenly sanctuary and as the heavenly archetypes who correspond to Israel and its priesthood on earth (cf. Jub. 2:2, 18, 30; 6:18; 31:14; also see 1 En. 40:1-9; Tob 12:15; T. Levi 3:7; T. Judah 25:2; Matt 18:11). Moreover, fellowship between the sectarians and the angels is here stated “in the boldest way possible,” as it is a claim that being a member of

41 The last two letters before the vacat in line 16 are ql, with Schuller proposing that מִקְוָה be restored, resulting in the following sense: “and there is no need (or: there is no longer need) of an interpreter acting between both of them (הַקָּדוֹשִׁים; for your holy ones (the angels) do make answer according to the spirit’; that is, there is a [direct] relationship between men and angels in cultic language, so that the utterances of these human beings can be understood in the heavens without further help of angelic mediation”; see DJD 40, 187.

42 On the ministering/priestly function of the angels of the presence in Second Temple Period texts, see Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 114; Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 137 n. 5; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 65, 83. Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 117, understands communion with angels of the presence as stemming from the priestly character of the sect, which in turn is indebted to the Jubilees. Given the Yabad’s apparent affinity for Jubilees – a work which says more about the angel(s) of presence than any other extant text – Tuschling’s observation should be taken seriously; cf. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 125-126.

43 To reiterate, that these angels are understood to be archetypal can be seen in the ways scholars refer to them and/or their relationship with Israel/the sect: cf., e.g., Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 99, 101, who speaks of the angels of presence as the “heavenly counterparts of earthly Israel,” and the Yabad as those who “aimed at creating on earth a replica of the heavenly world”; Angel, Otherworldly, 38: “there is a direct parallel between the existence and action of [the angels of presence] and those of their human counterparts on earth”; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 66: the sectarians “worshipped God in accordance with the heavenly model [provided by the angels].”

44 Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 52 (cf. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Monotheism, 125-126), who notes that a relationship to the elite angels of presence means that the sectarians viewed themselves “as close to God as possible.” This observation coheres with a proposal of Harkins, “Reading the Qumran Hodayot,” 39, who suggests that as the reader moves along the individual psalms of 1QH, the speaker’s proximity to God increases: whereas in 11:20 the speaker (merely) joins the angels, 19:16 specifies that the speaker can join the angels in standing before (לְפָנֶיךָ) God. Admittedly, the sentiment of 19:16 may be implicit in 11:20. But if Harkins is correct in seeing a progression of sorts, 14:15-16 fits into this progression quite nicely: 1.) 11:20: with the angels = bold; 2.) 14:15-16: with the angels of presence = bolder; 3.) 19:16: before God with the angels = bolder still. Moreover, Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 117, and Noll, “Angelology in the Qumran Texts,” 93 (cf. “Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 54 n. 76), have proposed, respectively, that the occurrences of לְפָנֶיךָ, “before you” in 15:34 and 19:16 contribute to the notion of fellowship with the angels; i.e., just as the
the *Yahad* entailed fellowship with the highest-ranking angels and heaven’s priests. Given the boldness of the claims, it is important to investigate how liturgical fellowship with these angels may have contributed to the identity of the *Yahad*.

5.2.2: Present Liturgical Fellowship as a Defining Sectarian Characteristic

I noted above that two passages from the *Hodayot* are particularly well-known when it comes to angelic fellowship. A third passage, often cited alongside 1QH 11:20-24 and 19:13-17, is found in the psalm that concludes 1QS. The similarities these lines share with the *Hodayot* angelic fellowship passages will make their relevance readily apparent. 1QS 11:7-9 reads as follows:

45 The psalm, a first-person hymn of the *Maskil*/Instructor, is found in 1QS 10:9-11:22. As is the case with the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, not all extant S mss preserve the psalm; scholars similarly disagree as to which tradition is earlier: the one containing the psalm (1QS and most 4QS witnesses) or 4QSe, which ends with a calendrical (Otot) document. On the redaction of the psalm and the source-critical history of 1QS, see the works cited in section 4.2.1, above; also see Murphy-O’Connor, “La genèse littéraire,” 529-532. On the role of the hymn in 1QS, see especially Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 165-167, who argues that the “rhetorical shaping of the document, however is quite different, depending on whether it concludes with the Otot or with the first-person hymn of the *Maskil*. With Otot, the focus on the figure of the *Maskil* is quickly subordinated to the content of his teaching. His presence in the document is no more vivid than that of the members described in the accounts of community procedure. The inclusion of the *Maskil’s* first-person hymn, however, not only gives the *Maskil* a voice and presence but also provided the *Serek ha-Yahad* a much more forceful rhetorical structure and even something like a genuine conclusion. … Although the *Maskil’s* hymn deals with certain aspects of the responsibilities addressed in the instructions, much of its content does not have to do with those things that distinguish him from other members of the *Yahad*. In this regard the self-presentation of the *Maskil* provides a model of the ideal sectarian self. If one is properly shaped by the teaching and disciplines of the community, as they have been described in the *Serek ha-Yahad*, then this is the kind of voice with which one will speak.” These comments are similar, of course, to those Newsom has made regarding the *Hodayot* Teacher Hymns (see above). On the affinities between 1QS 10-11 and the *Hodayot*, see Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 64; Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 426.

46 On the function of these lines in the larger psalm, see Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 169, who points out the *Hodayot*-like contrast between human sinfulness and God’s gracious rescue of humans from their humble state – a rescue that includes angelic fellowship.
7 Those whom God has chosen he has set as an eternal possession. He has allowed them to inherit the lot of the holy ones. With the sons of heaven he has joined together their assembly for the council of the community. (Their) assembly (is) a house of Holiness for the eternal plant during every time to come. …

Again, we are told that the sectarian assembly in a נטילה with the angels, and once more this is qualified beyond the vague notion that they are on the same team: God has actually joined “their assembly” – that is, the sectarian assembly\(^{47}\) – with the angelic “sons of heaven” (cf. 1QH\(^a\) 11:23). Most telling is the purpose of this union, articulated here as לשתת יד, “for the council of the community,” the technical term for the sectarians in the Community Rule (cf. 1QS 3:2; 5:7; 6:3, 10, 14, 16; 7:2, 22, 24; 8:1, 5, 22).\(^{48}\) As I have highlighted already, 1QS effectively reconstitutes the sect and its covenant as ideal Israel,\(^{49}\) and the implication of juxtaposing this reconstitution with the notion of angelic fellowship is monumental: just as having the angelic guardians of heavenly Israel as comrades at the eschatological war seems to have been part of the definition of being true Israel, so also was the notion of present liturgical fellowship with the nation’s archetypal priests. There are numerous indications in both 1QS 11 and the Hodayot that this was the case.

---

\(^{47}\) The word for “assembly” used here is נטילה, and in this instance an earthly “assembly” is in view, the relevance of which I will discuss, below; see Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 65-66, who points out the present implications of this angelic fellowship.

\(^{48}\) Cf. Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 200; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 169. Contra Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 66 n. 22, who prefers to read לשתת יד as an adverb, though he acknowledges the possibility of the technical designation. For examples of the adverbial use of לשתת יד, see below.

\(^{49}\) See my excursus in section 4.2.1, above.
First, it is almost certain that the meaning of the term for “community,” *Yahad* (יָּהָד) – “union” (or adverbially, “together”) – is related to the conviction that “togetherness with the angels [was] constitutive of the covenant community on earth.”

Evidence for this can be seen especially in 1QS 11:8 and 1QH* 7:17 and 11:23, as in each of these lines the appearance of *יָּהָד* as a reference to the community is immediately or closely followed by mention of angelic fellowship. Moreover, the meaning of *יָּהָד* may assist in explaining the otherwise perplexing choice of a non-biblical self-designation for a group that prided itself on being biblical interpreters *par excellence*: if “the *Yahad*” encapsulated what was deemed to be a central aspect of the sectarian worldview – namely, togetherness or union with the angels – the selection is eminently appropriate.

Second, there are instances when *יָּהָד* seems to be part of a double entendre or word play, which may have served to remind the reader/worshipper of the nature of the sectarian community. The phrase *vetica יָּהָד* (cf. 1QH* 11:24; 19:17), mentioned above, is a case in

---


51 Cf. Holm-Neilson, *Hodayot*, 68 n. 11: “to be taken into the community is the same as to be in fellowship with God, and therefore his hosts.”

52 So Douglas, “Power and Praise,” 181 n. 94; cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 90. Also note the comments of Elior, *The Three Temples*, 171: “This at once visible and invisible [angelic] world was for them a divine source of authority, an eternal testimony, a cultic inspiration, a historical pledge; they sensed its presence as something palpable, a decisive mystical pattern endowed with divine meaning. Many of the works composed by the secessionist priests express this relationship between the community (or Council) of ‘togetherness’ (Heb. *yahad*) and the holy creatures in heaven. This was in fact the source of the name by which … the members of the Community referred to themselves – the *yahad* – reflecting the assumed ‘togetherness’ of priests and angels. This is the clear import of [various passages in] the *Thanksgiving Hymns*.”


54 On word plays as a frequently used rhetorical device in the *Hodayot*, see DJD 40, 156; cf. Harkins “Reading the Qumran Hodayot,” 14, who focuses on the numerous word plays in 1QH* 11:6-19, but as it pertains to 11:20-37 notes only the previously mentioned word play of *vetica יָּהָד* in line 21.
point. Newsom translates it “a common rejoicing,” which in context is a statement on the joint (i.e., angel-human) nature of sectarian life. Given that “the Yabat” was the sectarians’ preferred self-designation, if it is correct to read יָד as an adverb in 11:24 and 19:17, the choice can hardly be an accident. In a similar fashion, we have seen that 1QH 14:16 states that the sectarians are יָד, “in a common lot with the angels of presence.” What is intriguing about this example is that יָד, which is clearly functioning as an adverb, is grammatically extraneous. It is, however, the ideal word to emphasize the unmediated togetherness the sectarians share with God’s angelic priests. Other word plays or double entendres involve the noun וָכָר. I noted above that וָכָר can refer to heavenly or earthly assemblies; in 1QS 11:8 the latter meaning is the primary meaning for both occurrences of the word. However, in light of biblical and sectarian precedent for using וָכָר to refer to the divine assembly, as well as the fact that the sectarian וָכָר is here being joined together with the angels, the word is likely functioning as a double entendre of sorts, calling further attention to the conviction that to be part of the sectarian וָכָר is to join the divine

55 See DJD 40, 155, 248 (as per the translation of Vermes, CDSSIE, 267, 294); cf. Wise, Abegg, and Cook, DSSANT, 182, 196: “together with shouts of joy.”

56 The fact that יָד in 1QH 11:24 and 19:17 can be/sometimes is translated as a noun (i.e., a reference to the community) highlights the ambiguity that makes the word play possible: e.g., García Martínez and Tijnkelaar, DSSSE, 1:167, 189: “in the community of jubilation”; cf. Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 215: “in a community of rejoicing”; Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 64, 185: “in the choir of rejoicing.”

57 Cf. 1QH 19:14-15, which has a similar construction and meaning yet lacks יָד (or any other adverb): יַהֲלָם וְדָעַת, “in the lot with your holy ones.” However, the omission of יָד may be due to the fact this phrase is part of an ellipsis, whose verb is יָד, “to unite,” which itself may be a sectarian word play, given the subject matter of the lines (also see 23:30).
A similar word play may be at work in 1QH a 19:14-16: in these lines, the angelic designation, קדושין, “holy ones,” is parallel to “children of your truth.” Since the latter is likely a reference to sect members, the same would be true of the “holy ones,”59 and to refer to the sectarians as “holy ones” is, in and of itself, a double entendre or perhaps more accurately, an example of deliberate terminological ambiguity.60 But the children of your truth/holy ones are also said to be raised up from the dust “to the council of your truth” לוכד אלהים, which is likely a reference to the Yahad. In light of the fact that סד is used elsewhere as a designation for the divine assembly as well as the clear reference to angelic fellowship in 19:16, it would seem that another double entendre is intended here: to be part of the reconstituted Israel is to commune in an earthly סד with fellow sectarian “holy ones,” who together commune with the angelic “holy ones” in a heavenly סד. Lastly, a double entendre may help explain the use of חומץ: given that it is a word that describes

58 Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 66 n. 23, agrees that the human/earthly connotation is primary, but he rightly notes another possible meaning of סד: “foundation.” This meaning complements the reference to the Yahad as a “house of holiness,” a designation upon which I will comment, below. Cf. Patrick A. Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” DJD 4 (1997): 329 n. 43, who recognizes the sentiment without specifying that it is a word play.

59 Cf. additional comments in section 5.2.1.

60 I will further address the notion of deliberate terminological ambiguity in my discussion of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice in section 5.3. Cf. Collins, Daniel, 314, 316, whose comments more or less confirm what we have seen thus far. Despite some “inherent ambiguity in the use of the term at Qumran [e.g., 1QH a 19:16] … the holy ones in the sectarian literature of Qumran are normally angels or heavenly beings. Confusion arises because the human community is believed to mingle with the heavenly host in the eschatological war … and in the community itself, and it can be called the people of the holy ones. There is no undisputed case in this literature, where the expression ‘holy ones’ in itself refers to human beings.”

61 On the restoration of יהודים, see DJD 40, 245.
the organization of the sectarian reconstitution of Israel (cf. 1QS 2:22-23; 6:12), it is fitting that it is used as part of the claim that the sectarians have a station with the angels in heaven.62

For a third indication that present liturgical fellowship with the angels was part of the sectarian definition of being the reconstituted people of God, I turn again to 1QS 11:7-9. If, according to these lines, a purpose of God joining together the angels with the sectarian assembly (דַּי) was “for the council of the community,” the passage continues with a brief statement that further expounds this purpose: מִמַּה לְמַעְלָה עָלֵם עֵלֶם לַכֶּל, “(Their) assembly (is) a house of holiness for the eternal plant during every time to come.” Swarup’s detailed study examines the metaphors “house of holiness” and “eternal plant(ing),” concluding that these biblical epithets were appropriated by the Qumran sectarians to assert their “all encompassing role as ‘a kingdom of priests and a holy nation’” as per Exod 19:5-6.63 The sectarians could thus assert themselves as both the nation’s righteous remnant and its undefiled priests. In other words, these terms constituted a powerful, two-pronged claim to be “true Israel.” While Swarup rightly concludes that the sectarian use of these metaphors is thereby distinguished from their more generous application to ethnic Israel in the Hebrew Bible, 1 Enoch, and Jubilees,64 I would suggest that he has understated the contribution angelic fellowship makes to the sectarian claims to be true Israel. For example, the import of 1QS 11:8 is surely more nuanced than the

62 Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 49, notes the dual use of the word, but does not refer to it as a word play.
63 Cf. Swarup, The Self-Understanding, 193ff, who builds on the earlier study of Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting,’” 268-294. The sect as “true Israel” is widely noted in discussions of the “house” and “plant” metaphors; cf., e.g., Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline, 13-14; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 166 n. 4; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 65.
64 On this point, see my discussions of 1 Enoch and Jubilees in Chapter Three, above; also see Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting,’’ 329; cf. Bautch, Glory and Power, 139ff, who provides an excellent discussion of the sectarian texts vis-à-vis the non-sectarian nature of Jubilees.
observation that “as much as the angels were in the presence of God, [the sectarians] too were now in the presence of God.” That is, if “house of holiness” and “eternal plant” are indicative of being Israel’s truly righteous remnant and its undefiled priests (cf. 1QS 8:5ff), perhaps there is good reason why 1QS 11 prefaces this assertion with a boast of angelic fellowship. I would suggest that 1QH a 14:16 provides us with such a reason in that there would be no better way to enhance the sect’s identity as ideal Israel than to claim to have fellowship with the angels of the presence, the very archetypes of the nation’s priesthood. That 1QS 11:7-9 envisions a connection with the heavenly priesthood – and thus Israel’s archetypal priests – finds support in the use of הַנוֹבֶם, a word which in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice refers to the animate structures of the heavenly sanctuary (cf. 4Q403 frg. 1 1:41, 44; 4Q405 frg. 14-15 1:6; 11Q17 frgs. 2-1-9 line 7). More importantly, one of the two Hodayot passages examined by Swarup, 1QH a 14:17-21, is immediately preceded by the claim of fellowship with the angels of the presence.

65 Seeking to situate 1QS 11:7b-9a in the context of the broader Community Rule, Swarup, The Self-Understanding, 72, rightly emphasizes the nationalism and exclusiveness of these lines, but he does not comment directly on the contribution angelic fellowship makes to these claims. Cf. Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Plant,’” 329, who writes that “assimilation to the angels is connected with the ‘eternal planting,’” but does not elaborate as to the significance of this connection in 1QS 11:7-9 other than noting that “a particular historical group of people within Israel are designated as the eternal planting because they also participate in the eschatological blessing of participation in heavenly activities with the angels” [emphasis mine]. This is important, but Tiller does not explain why participation with the angels allows the sect to be designated as the eternal planting (see below). Angel, Otherworldly, 77, observes the combination of the “plant” metaphor with angelic fellowship in 1QS 11:7-9 (and 1QH a 14:15-18; see below), but he does not comment on it. He does suggest, however, that a possible background to these sentiments is found in 4QInstruction [=4Q418] frg. 81, though he rightly notes that the sectarian texts go far beyond 4QInstruction insofar as the latter does not specifically refer to angelic priests and is better interpreted as anticipating future/eschatological rewards (cf. Dan 12:3; 1 En. 104:2-6). On Angel’s last point, see John J. Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scroll: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 May 2001 (eds., idem, Gregory E. Sterling, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 57-58.

66 I.e., this may constitute another word play/double entendre alluding to the relationship between the sectarian “house” and the heavenly location of its angelic fellowship; see below.

67 These lines are textually problematic. In addition to the discussion of Swarup, The Self-Understanding, 16-34 (who follows Sukenik’s line numbering), see the detailed comments and bibliography provided by Schuller, DJD 40, 187ff.
in 14:16, which was just discussed. Beginning at the end of line 17, the psalmist says of the sect\footnote{1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:17 refers to the sectarians as נַעֲרֵי, “your princes.” Frennesson, “In Common Rejoicing,” 52, notes that this term is used of angels as well as high-ranking humans, concluding that the sense here is that an angelic designation is being used to state that “the lot and privileges ascribed to the community members are on a level with those of the angels”; cf. Holm-Nielsen, \textit{Hodayot}, 115. Contra Fletcher-Louis, \textit{All the Glory}, 106, who views it as an indication of angelmorphic anthropology.} that

\begin{quote}
their [shoot] opens as a flower [blooms, for] everlasting fragrance, making a sprout grow into the branches of an eternal planting. And it will cast shade over all the world, and its [branches] will reach to the clouds, and its roots as far as the deep.
\end{quote}

Swarup points out that the plant metaphors – the original referents of which were the entire nation of Israel (cf. Isa 27:6; 37:31-32; 60:21; 61:1ff) – have been reworked, actualized, and applied by the \textit{Yahad} to themselves: they are the righteous remnant.\footnote{Swarup, \textit{The Self-Understanding}, 23, 30-34. Cf. Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in \textit{Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period} (ed., Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 539. Abegg, “The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians,” 97, observes that the remnant sentiment also occurs earlier in column 14, remarking that although the \textit{Yahad} was confident that the eschaton would mean that other Jews would accept the sectarian reconstitution of Israel, “in the evil meantime, the community saw themselves as the guardians of God’s covenant until the time that all Israel would return. In the words of the sectarian hymnist [from 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:11-12], ‘… You will raise up survivors among Your people and a remnant among Your inheritance. You will refine them so that they may be cleansed from guilt. For all their works are in Your truth, and in Your mercies You will judge them with abundant compassion and bountiful forgiveness; teaching them according to Your word.’” Moreover, that the \textit{Yahad} claims to be the shoot/sprout that \textit{grows into} an eternal plant may reveal confidence in the longevity, influence, and growth of the sect and/or conversion to sectarian ways (cf. Ezek 17:22-24; 31:2-14; Dan 4:9-12; Mark 4:32 and parallels) but most certainly does not imply quasi-universalism or the more generous definitions of Israel implied in \textit{1 Enoch} and \textit{Jubilees}; on this point, see my excursus in section 4.2.1. Also see Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting,’” 329-331.} And while there is admittedly no mention of being a priestly “house of holiness” as there is in 1QS 11:7-9,\footnote{But notice that the sect is described as the “way of holiness” in 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:20-21 and as a “strong building” in 14:29.} such a boast would likely be redundant next to a claim specifically stating that the sectarians enjoy an unmediated relationship with the priestly angels of the presence. Thus, Tiller’s assertion that the sectarians designated themselves as the eternal planting merely because they experienced the eschatological blessings of angelic fellowship in the here and now is
insufficient: the Yahad could claim (and simultaneously enhanced their claims) to be true Israel in part because they had fellowship with the priestly angels associated with Israel.

In short, if the sect was trying to convince its own members and/or outsiders that it truly was the ideal Israel, what better way for a group with priestly concerns to do so than to announce that being members of the covenant community entailed joint worship with the angels who were the heavenly ideal or archetype of the nation’s priesthood? Significantly, it

---

71 Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting,’” 329-330, also understates the interplay of angelic fellowship and the nationalist sentiments of the plant imagery when he says that the expansion of the sectarian shoot/plant “corresponds to” fellowship with the angels of the presence insofar as the growth of the Yahad even reaches up to heaven. But angelic fellowship is more than a matter of growth/influence – it is a matter of identity, especially given that an unmediated relationship with the angels of the presence is specified.

72 The comments of Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 343-344 (cf. eadem, “Kenneth Burke Meets the Teacher of Righteousness: Rhetorical Strategies in the Hodayot and the Serek Ha-Yahad,” in Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins: Presented John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday [eds., John J. Collins, Harold W. Attridge, and Thomas H. Tobin; New York: University Press of America, 1990], 125ff) assist in bringing the angelic fellowship claims of 1QH 14:15-16 into sharper focus. She highlights that a concern of the large psalm in which these lines are found (13:22-15:8) is to address the defection, inner-community discord, and anti-leadership grumblings (cf. 1QH 13:24-25) that may have been inevitable aspects of the intense accountability and confrontational nature of community life (cf. 1QS 5:24-6:1). Later in the hymn, the image of a fortified city is employed, likely to depict the covenanted community alone as a place of security and blessing (14:29-38). Accordingly, Michael O. Wise, “The Concept of a New Covenant in the Teacher Hymns from Qumran (1QH 1XVII)” in The Concept of Covenant, 126, argues that “entering and leaving the New Covenant of the Teacher of Righteousness were matters of eternal consequence. Utter destruction was the price one paid for making the wrong decision.” While many no longer share Wise’s confidence in seeing the Teacher Hymns as reflecting the voice of the historical Yahad, it is difficult to object to his conclusion that the sectarian reconstitution of Israel’s covenant was taken with utmost severity by the sect and its leadership. However, as much as angelic fellowship is set forth as both a benefit/reward for fidelity to the sectarian covenant and something covenant rejecters would fail to experience (cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 194; Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 343; Michael O. Wise, The First Messiah: Investigating the Messiah before Jesus [San Francisco: Harper, 1999], 179; Hultgren, From the Damascus Covenant, 418-419), it is more than that: unmediated communion with the angels of the presence – the very beings who keep and bear the marks of the covenant in heaven (Jub. 2:18, 30; 6:18) – would not only have served to legitimate the Teacher/sect as the correct interpreters and adherents to Israel’s covenant; it would also have heightened the plausibility of the consequences for covenant rejection. Intriguingly, it has been suggested that one of the uses of the Hodayot (and 1QS 11) in sectarian life was their recitation in the well-known covenant renewal ceremony (cf. 1QS 1:16-3:12); on the possibility that the hodayot examined throughout this section were used for this purpose, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 188; Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 227; Hultgren, From the Damascus Covenant, 429-431; Angela Kim Harkins, “The Performative Reading of the Hodayot: The Arousal of Emotions and the Exegetical Generation of Texts,” JSP 21 (2011): 61; Newsom, The Self as Symbolic Space, 167; eadem, “Religious Experience,” 207ff; Judith H. Newman, “Covenant Renewal and Transformational Scripts in the Performance of the Hodayot and 2 Corinthians,” in Jews, Paulus und die Texte von Qumran (eds., Jörg Frey and Enno Edzard Popkes; WUNT 2 390; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 300ff.
is the archetypal temple and its angelic priesthood that is the focus of the text to which I will now turn, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

### 5.3: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice

Whereas the passages from the *Hodayot* (and 1QS 11) just examined may recount or boast of common worship with the angels, scholars have generally not considered these texts to have been used to achieve this experience.\(^{73}\) The same cannot be said of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (henceforth, *SSS*). While certainly not the only proposed function of this work, here I accept readings of *SSS* that understand them as “one of the ritual mechanisms by which the Qumran community’s belief in communion with the angels was actually experienced.”\(^{74}\)

My discussion of *SSS* will be comprised of two parts. I will first provide a brief overview of the contents of the document, highlighting its fascination with the heavenly temple and the angelic priests who minister in it. I will then examine the significance of *SSS* as it pertains to the *Yahad*’s angelic fellowship claims, noting how the work’s focus on the celestial sanctuary and the scholarly estimations of its function are eminently appropriate for a group that not only claimed fellowship with the angels but was also convinced that it was ideal Israel. Although the provenance of *SSS* is debated, I will provisionally proceed under the assumption that it is a sectarian text.\(^{75}\)

---

\(^{73}\) But see the recent work of Angela Kim Harkins, *Reading with an “I” to the Heavens: Looking at the Qumran Hodayot through the Lens of Visionary Traditions* (New York: de Gruyter, 2012), 267, who has proposed that the *Hodayot* “were read and experienced by the ancient community of covenancers within an on-going practice of performative prayer in which a reader sought to *reenact the affective experiences that are described in them* [emphasis mine]”; cf. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 151-152.

\(^{74}\) Newsom, “Religious Experience,” 216. I will elaborate on the proposed uses of *SSS* and related issues, below.

\(^{75}\) Nine fragmentary copies of *SSS* were found at Qumran (4Q400-407 [= 4QShirot\^1\*\*\*\] and 11Q17 [11QShirot]) and one at Masada (Mas1k), with paleographic estimations of the various mss ranging from the late Hasmonean period to the late Herodian period. Treatments of the texts are found in the following: Cave 4
5.3.1: The Heavenly Temple and Angelic Priesthood of \(\text{SSS}\)

Even a cursory reading of \(\text{SSS}\) reveals that it is dominated by the heavenly temple and its angelic priesthood.\(^{76}\) In fact, the work has been called “the most detailed and explicit portrait

---

\(^{76}\) Cf. Klawans, \textit{Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple}, 135: “The extant portions of the \textit{Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice} seem to do little else but describe the celestial worship of God as carried out by the angels.” The most
of the angelic priesthood and the celestial temple not only at Qumran, but in all of Second Temple Jewish literature. The content of SSS is intimately related to its thirteen-song structure, which can be outlined as follows: Songs 1-5 describe the establishment, arrangement, and responsibilities of the angelic priesthood, an initial account of the celestial temple, and fragmentary references to celestial warfare; Songs 6-8 speak of the praises of the seven chief angelic princes and their deputies as well as the animate temple itself; and Songs 9-13 provide a systematic description of the Ezek 40-48-inspired celestial temple as well as

vocal objection to these kind of statements has been that of Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 252-394, who, as I have mentioned in the course of discussing other texts, understands angels not to be angels at all but the sectarians/Israel in their angelmorphic mode. For a persuasive critique of Fletcher-Louis' reading specifically as it pertains to SSS, see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 45ff, whose five main points of rebuttal echo objections to the application of Fletcher-Louis' angelmorphic anthropology thesis to the War Scroll and Hodayot (see above).

First, the thesis is counter-intuitive: it strains plausibility to argue to the extent that Fletcher-Louis does that references normally thought to refer to angels or heaven are actually references to humans and earth. Second, his reading does not sufficiently pay attention to the dualism of the text. Third, the notion of angelmorphism itself is far from clear, especially when the text's dualism is not appreciated: i.e., if figures traditionally understood to be angels are actually humans, it is difficult to understand what angelmorphism means. Fourth, the text is treated in an overly literal fashion insofar as it misconstrues the use of anthropomorphism as applied to angels. Fifth, the reading overemphasizes the realized aspects of the sect's eschatology. For a more recent proposal that is similar in some respects to that of Fletcher-Louis, see Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 31 n. 8, 44 n. 33, who does not consider SSS to be portraying a heavenly temple indwelt by angels but instead sees the heavenly temple and the angels as a figurative way of referring to the spirit-indwelt “material temple of men,” who are “nearly angelic.”

Angel, Otherworldly, 84; cf. Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 112: a “well-developed angelology … is an absolute prerequisite for the notion of a heavenly temple.”

The introduction to each song is clear that the thirteen songs were used for at least the first thirteen Sabbaths of the year. Scholars disagree, however, as to whether the songs were only used for the opening quarter of the assumed 364-day calendar (so, e.g., Newsom, “He Has Established, 114) or whether the cycle of songs was repeated in the second, third, and fourth quarters (so, e.g., Alexander, Mystical Texts, 52). While this issue is not particularly relevant to my discussion, there may be symbolic significance to the fact that in the first quarter of the year Songs 12 and 13 would have occurred after Shavuot; see below.

As per Newsom, “He Has Established,” 103ff, whose brief overview is followed by a song-by-song commentary; more detailed treatments are provided by Alexander, Mystical Texts, 15ff; James R. Davila, Liturgical Works (ECDSS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 97ff. For a convenient reconstructed presentation of SSS according to song, see Carol A. Newsom, “Angelic Liturgy: The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice” (4Q400-407, 11Q17, Mas1k), in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations (PTSDSSP 4B; ed., James H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 1-189. I will return to the question of structure, below, when I briefly address where the climax of the text is to be located.
references to the throne chariot/merkavah, heavenly sacrifices, and the regalia of the angelic high priests.  

In addition to using common terms for angels such as “divine beings” (ךָלְכֶל), “gods” (ךֵלֵכֶל), “holy ones” (גֵדוֹל), “spirits” (רָדָח), and numerous constructs based on these words, a few other designations employed by SSS are noteworthy. As we have seen, the language of Jubilees, the Hodayot, and other texts suggests that certain angels had sacerdotal roles, and similar designations are employed here. For example, Song 1:4 (= 4Q400 frg. 1 1:4) refers to the מְשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ (דָּבָר) mentioned in Jub. 2:2, 18; 1QH 14:16; et al. Moreover, SSS is

---

80 Cf. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 17, who notes that the rather brief description of the temple in Song 1 anticipates the more detailed accounts found in the later songs.

81 It is a stretch to say with Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 133, that some of the angelic designations (especially those that have a variation of מָשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ as part of their name) blur the division between angels and God. While it is correct that SSS refers to certain angels as honoured by lesser angels and humans (cf. Song 2:20 [= 4Q401 frg. 14 1:5]), it is clearly because of these angels’ exemplary worship of God that they are so honoured. If Song 11 depicts the angels as “recoiling” (ךָרָא) from God’s voice, their subordinate status is further emphasized. Thus, even the most elite of the angelic priests are “firmly on the creaturely side of the great ontological divide,” existing solely to do the divine will and to reveal the knowledge they have received from God. On these points, see Stuckenbruck, Angel Veneration, 157-164; Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 130; Alexander, Mystical Texts, 19, 21, 29, 39. On the subordinate status of the angels, see especially Song 5:17-18 [= 4Q403 frg. 1 1:35-36]). For similar comments, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 240, 245, who stresses angelic obedience; cf. Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 124, who mentions the “derivative holiness” of the angels.

82 E.g., מְשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ, “divine beings of knowledge.” For a thorough discussion of angelic terminology and references, see Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 23-38; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 236-237, 247ff, 338ff, who notes that this “rich inventory” of terminology may account for SSS’s relatively infrequent use of מְשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ, which perhaps was considered too mundane.

83 Song 1:4 designates the fourth line of the first song; all such references, text, and translation of SSS are as per Newsom, “Angelic Liturgy.”

84 While the terms are obviously different – and thus the influence of Jubilees and its priestly angels of the presence cannot be proven (so, e.g., Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 125; Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 36) – in light of Ps 103:21, which uses יִדְרָא as an angelic designation, there is no reason to think that the מְשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ and מְשַׁלְתִּים מֵאֶת חַנָּנָא יֶהוֹ are not synonymous; so Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 238-239, 249.
the earliest extent Jewish text to employ the word *priest* in reference to an angel.\(^{85}\) מַדְגָּנָה, “priests of the inner sanctum,”\(^{86}\) is a designation seemingly in apposition to not only מָרָא אֶכֶל פִּי, “Most Holy Ones” (cf. Song 1:10 et al.),\(^{87}\) and likely refers to the most elite/privileged of angelic priests. It would also seem that the seven נַעַמְאָא מַדְגָּנָה, “chief princes,”\(^{88}\) and נַעַמְאָא נַעַמְאָא מַדְגָּנָה, “deputy princes,”\(^{89}\) who are respectively summoned to praise in Song 6 and Song 8, are alternative epithets for the angelic high priests and their most senior assistants. It may be that these seven chief princes correspond to the Early Jewish tradition that envisioned seven (rather than four) archangels (cf. 1 En. 20:1-8),\(^{90}\) though this is far from certain as there are factors that complicate decipherment of the work’s angelic hierarchy. One such factor is that the notion of “seven” is a prominent

\(^{85}\) Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 26: “To the best of my knowledge the term מַדְגָּנָה, or its equivalent in Greek, Ethiopic, etc., is not explicitly used of angels in other Qumran texts, in apocryphal compositions, or in rabbinic literature, even though the conception of angelic priests is common in these texts”; cf. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 248; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 136; Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy*, 124.

\(^{86}\) The word בֵּרוֹן is often translated as “inner sanctum” (lit.: “nearness”) and is thus read as an example of a noun which in Biblical Hebrew would follow the qatil or qiil pattern but in the DSS follows a qiutl pattern; for discussion, see Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 65; Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 36-37; Swarup, *The Self-Understanding*, 135. Contra Noam Mizrahi, “Aspects of Poetic Stylization,” 155-156, who argues that בֵּרוֹן is not a noun that **SSS** uses interchangeably with בֵּרוֹנָה, and therefore describes the actions of the priest as those who approach or draw near to God (cf. Song 1:20 [= 4Q400 frg. 1 1:20]; Ezek 40:46; 42:13; 43:16; 44:15; 45:4). Either way, the sense is the same: these angelic מַדְגָּנָה have been accorded the highest of sacerdotal privileges in the celestial temple.

\(^{87}\) Or “Holiest of Holy Ones,” a designation which is an obvious allusion to the “Most Holy Place/Holiest of Holies” of the temple in which these angels are said to serve; see Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 132. I will return to the architecture of the heavenly temple, below. On the apposition of these designations in Song 1, see Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 239.

\(^{88}\) As Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 27, points out, the word translated prince is not the common angelic epithet נַעַמְאָא but מַדְגָּנָה, which is only elsewhere used as an angelic designation in *Sefer Ha-Razim* (ca. 4th cent. CE). Regardless, the notion of angelic “princes” is entirely appropriate given that God is frequently referred to as “king” in **SSS**, so Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 37.

\(^{89}\) On the notion of deputy chief priests, see Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 33-34; cf. 2 Kgs 23:4; 25:18; 1QM 2:1. For examples in the Rabbinic Literature, see *m. Tamid* 7:3; *m. Yoma* 4:1; *b. Yoma* 39a.

\(^{90}\) See, e.g., Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 249-251.
feature of SSS; another complicating factor is the possible references to Melchizedek, which Newsom locates somewhere between Songs 3-5 and restores as follows: מֶלְךְ הָאֱלֹהִים מִשָּׁר הָאֱלֹהִים, “Melchizedek, priest in the assembly of God” (cf. 4Q401 frg. 11 3); Newsom also proposes that 4Q401 frg. 22 3 be restored to מֶלְךְ הָאֱלֹהִים, which is immediately preceded by reference to the priestly-consecratory idiom מִלְתּוּת מִילָה יְרֵד מְאֹד, “filling of hands” (cf. Exod 29:9, 33, 35), even if she readily acknowledges that there are other possibilities (e.g., חָוָה יְרֵד מְאֹד). Although Tuschling is right to point out that “the conjectured mentions of Melchizedek […] do not fit well with known schemes of archangels,” her objection that there is nothing in SSS that suggests “a single chief angel over the seven chief princes” is not entirely accurate. To be sure, the fragmentary nature of SSS means all proposals are tentative. But Newsom and Alexander have both argued that SSS’s rare singular מִלְתּוּת in 4Q401 frg. 11 (cf. 4Q403 frg. 1 2:24) may imply that Melchizedek is envisioned as the ranking high priest. Elaborating on this interpretation, as well as the observation that fragment 11 has strong

---

91 If there were just seven priests (i.e., chief priest, deputy chief priest, and five others), interpretation would be relatively simple as each priest would be responsible for the seven psalms mentioned in Song 8; see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 33. However, the celestial temple itself also appears to be sevenfold, which complicates the matter. I will discuss this in greater detail, below.

92 Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 134, 143-144; see also Alexander, Mystical Texts, 22ff, who discusses Melchizedek and the theme of cosmic warfare in Songs 3-5.

93 As Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 125, observes, “It is tempting to equate the two highest ranks [i.e., the chief princes and their deputies] with the angels of the presence of the angels of sanctification in Jub 2 […] . It is also tempting to equate the chief priests with the archangels, since this term is not used in the Songs, and in some traditions at least there are seven archangels (e.g., T. Levi 8). On the other hand, […] . In 11Q13 (11QMelch), Melchizedek is a single chief angel, comparable to Michael.” Cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 253-254, who refers to the difficulty of finding a “single leading angel” in SSS and urges caution in the acceptance of the Melchizedek reading.

94 Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 134, 241; eadem, “He Has Established,” 108. cf. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 22 (quotation), 33ff: “[מִלְתּוּת] here, without qualification, almost certainly means ‘high priest,’ as commonly in biblical Hebrew (1 Sam 23:9; 30:7; 2 Sam 15:27, 1 Kgs 1:8; 1 Chron 16:39).” Also see 1QM 2:1, which seemingly differentiates between human chief priests and the High Priest.
affinities with 11QMelch 2:10, Davila has noted that 4Q402 frg. 4 7-10, which he places in the vicinity of Song 5, mentions the “war of God” (cf. 1QM 15:12) and the “war of heavenly clouds” (cf. Rev 12:7); what he considers a related fragment, 4Q402 frg. 2 4, refers to the inner-most part of the heavenly temple, the place where only the most privileged of angels would be permitted to serve. Davila thus infers that Song 5 (and perhaps the songs that precede it) depict Melchizedek as “the high-priestly, eschatological [angelic] redeemer, much the same as in 11QMelchizedek.” As previously noted, the name Melchizedek has found considerable support as a designation for Michael.

While the “connection between priestly ordination in the celestial temple and the final battle is not intuitively obvious,” a number of observations assist in explaining this curious juxtaposition. First, though it is clear that not all angels are priests, it would appear

---

95 Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 134.
96 Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 288, highlights the similarities with 1QH 11:35-36. Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 263, additionally notes that 4Q402 frgs. 3-4 refers to the (presumably angelic) designation נֵדְרֵבָּם and eschatological judgment. On heaven rather than earth as the location of the war, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 246-247.
97 The extant phrase is %#לֹאַרְבַּת, “in the inner room of the king,” the significance of which I will address, below; see Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 151.
98 I.e., Songs 3 and 4; cf. Newsom, “He Has Established,” 106, who similarly groups Songs 3-5 together.
99 Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 263; cf. idem, Liturgical Works, 164-167; Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 131-132; Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 186ff; Mason, “Melchizedek Traditions,” 354-355. Whereas extant 11QMelch emphasizes Melchizedek’s role as eschatological redeemer/warrior figure and only implicitly mentions his priestly status (so Kobelski, Melchizedek and Melchiresa, 64-71; see Chapter Four, above), perhaps a complete copy of SSS would reveal that it is the mirror image/complement of 11QMelch insofar as Melchizedek’s priestly prerogatives are in the foreground but not completely to the exclusion of his eschatological redeemer/warrior status. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 24-25, makes the astute observation that the fragmentary state of SSS makes it difficult to determine whether the cosmic warfare is eschatological or already playing out.
100 For Melchizedek as a name for Michael in discussions of SSS, cf. Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 264; Alexander, Mystical Texts, 56.
101 So Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 263.
102 On this point, see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 15-19, 46, who notes that Song 2:19-20 mentions the priestly “Most Holy Ones,” who are said to be honoured by – and thus differentiated from – the regular angels,
that at least some angels tasked with priestly roles also have a martial role, namely
Melchizedek/Michael and perhaps others.\footnote{103} Thus, the human boundary familiar from the
War Scroll – that priests bless and prepare the soldiers for battle but do not take part in the
fighting – has apparent exceptions in the angelic realm, a notion which we have seen at work
in other texts.\footnote{104} Second, establishing the proper credentials – and thereby guaranteeing (or
at least emphasizing) the requisite purity – is a matter of obvious importance when it comes
to both priestly concerns and preparedness for battle, and it is therefore not surprising that
angels would be depicted as appropriately qualified.\footnote{105} A third connection between priestly
and martial tasks of the angels can be seen in SSS’s framework, which has been described as
built on the “praise of God.”\footnote{106} This is witnessed not only in the sacrifices and many
blessings the angels are said to offer to God but also in the architecture of the heavenly
temple, which is clearly not a physical building but an animate and mysterious spiritual house
of worship which joins with the angels in their praise of God.\footnote{107} Contributing to the

---

\footnote{103}{In his discussion of Songs 12 and 13, Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 139-140, posits that the
angels who serve God as priests and the angels who come and go from heaven in order to execute God’s
judgment and assist the righteous (cf. 4Q405 frg. 23:1-14) are one and the same.}

\footnote{104}{As I noted in my discussion of non-sectarian texts, both Michael in 1 Enoch and the Angel of the
Presence in Jubilees have been interpreted as combining the roles of chief warrior-guardian and high priest (cf.
At. Mar 10:2, where Michael is arguably presented in a similar dual fashion; contra Angel, Otherworldly, 95 n. 60,
who only sees a priestly role). On the possible martial connotations of some of the priestly angelic designations
in SSS (e.g., מַלְאָךְ and מַלְאָךְ מִשְׁכָּב), see Michalak, Angels as Warriors, 186-187.}

\footnote{105}{Cf. 1QM 7:3ff, which is clear that the soldiers must maintain a heightened level of purity and
cleanliness because the angels were in their midst, a conviction presupposing the belief that the angelic warriors
were pure; see Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 264; cf. Newsom, “He Has Established,” 1-6,
who specifically mentions that Song 5’s concern for purity among the angelic camps is reminiscent of the
War Scroll.}

\footnote{106}{I.e., carried out in the strength of the Creator, the priestly and martial duties of the angels are acts
of worship bringing praise to the one who so commissioned them; see Newsom, “Religious Experience,” 217.}

\footnote{107}{On the living and non-material nature of the temple, see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 30-34, who
argues that the animation should not be taken as a figure of speech as it perhaps should in Ps 24:7-9. A case in
point is the phrase מַגְרוֹ דְּלָה, which refers to the merkabah, with Alexander translating it as “a structure of

---
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grandeur of the temple is the manner in which it is described. The temple is, on the one hand, relatively straightforward as it is said to comprise just two main sections: an outer nave called the מֵלֶת, which corresponds to the holy place of the Jerusalem temple, and an inner room called the דַּבְּרֵי, which corresponds to the holy of holies. But on the other hand, SSS’s fondness for the number seven complicates interpretation, as the temple itself is said to be sevenfold and is thus spatially ambiguous. This of course meshes with the sevenfold priesthood mentioned above. But the most difficult aspect of SSS’s spatiality is that there are

eholim” (i.e., a structure composed of elohim = angels). Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 229, renders the phrase “a divine structure,” thus understanding מַלְכִּי adjectivally. Both translations are possible, but the benefit of Alexander’s is that it overcomes the problem of material furnishings in a heavenly/spiritual temple. Ra’anan (Abusch) Boustan, “Sevenfold Hymns in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Hekhalot Literature,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to the Post Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 (ed., James R. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 227, refers to the phenomenon of angelic décor as the “angelification of temple architecture.”

For helpful overviews of the structure of SSS’s heavenly temple, see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 34-35, 52-55; Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 202; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 136. Noam Mizrahi, “The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Biblical Priestly Literature: A Linguistic Reconsideration” HTR 104 (2011): 35-41, 56-57, points out that the word דַּבְּרֵי does not occur in the so-called priestly material of the Hebrew Bible (i.e., the P-source of the Pentateuch and Ezekiel) but is found in non-priestly sources in reference to the holy of holies in Solomon’s temple (see 1 Kgs 6:31; 1 Kgs 8:6 // 2 Chr 5:7 [cf. 1 Kgs 6:16; 7:50]; Ps 28:2) – observations which are problematic for the oft-repeated assumption that SSS was the product of the priestly tradition. Mizrahi thus concludes that “the author of the Songs had no special relation to the priestly literature because no such literature – as a distinct and recognizable body of texts – was ever available to him. He was influenced by the biblical literature, and this influence extends to various strata and sections of the Hebrew Bible.” On the differences between the heavenly and earthly temples, see the concise remarks of Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 136, who notes that the main differences between the two lie in the celestial temple’s animate and sevenfold natures; cf. Newsom, “He Has Established,” 110, who sees the engraved cherubim of Solomon’s temple (1 Kgs 6; cf. Ezek 40-48) as the counterparts of the animate “engravings” on the vestibules of the heavenly temple mentioned in Song 9. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 135, specifically highlights the influence of Ezek 41:18 and 25 on Song 9, and he suggests that “the angels (paradoxically called elohim hayyim) turn into decorations of the heavenly Temple and, in order to become part of the praise of the Temple’s architecture, are ‘reanimated’ again.” For further on the décor of the animate temple, see the preceding footnote.

Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 202, summarizes the matter well: “The heavenly temple is evidently imagined by analogy with the earthly temple, except that no attention is paid to any outer courts. The holy place is an nāam, while the holy of holies is the debir, which contains the merkabah throne. Everything is sevenfold, so there are apparently seven temples. It is not clear how they relate to each other. The text gives no indication of their spatial relationship, and there is no reason to correlate them with 7 heavens. The motif of 7 heavens only becomes common after the turn of the era.” Cf. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 30-31, who notes the “impressionistic, mazy vision” of the temple that has been influenced by Dan 7, Isa 6, and especially Ezek 1 and 10. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 238, points out that in contrast to the much later 3 Enoch, the seven sanctuaries of SSS do not come with a spatial blueprint.
seven תכשיח דבירים. While it is possible that the multiple sanctuaries are meant to be understood concentrically or superimposed on each other, this does not really solve the problem of having seven holy of holies housing seven throne-chariots. In light of this quandary, I find the heaven-as-indescribable explanation compelling:

The lack in [SSS] of a detailed cosmology that can be clearly imagined is almost certainly deliberate. Our author(s) would have completely agreed with the later Merkabah mystics that heaven is bewildering, awesome world, intrinsically unlike anything we know on earth, a place where terrestrial natural laws do not apply. The sevenfoldness may, therefore, be symbolic, and not meant to be taken literally. It is essentially a rhetorical device, which expresses the transcendent perfection and holiness of the celestial temple.

Indeed, SSS’s description of the heavenly temple and its angelic celebrants is an “experiential tour de force,” and it is therefore not surprising that scholars have considered both its use and significance to be matters of no small importance in the life of the Yabadd.

5.3.2: THE USE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF SSS: AN IDEAL TEXT FOR IDEAL ISRAEL

Newsom highlights the various proposals for the use of SSS at Qumran including the text as i.) a substitute for the sacrifices the sectarians could not make in Jerusalem due to their dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem priests; ii.) an apocalyptic or apocalyptic-like text meant to convey detailed information of the heavens; or iii.) an instrument of ascent or mystical praxis. As relevant as these proposals are, they do not exhaust the text’s meaning or

---

110 So Alexander, Mystical Texts, 53. Even if, as Newsom, “He Has Established,” 109, 111, points out, each individual temple differentiates between multiple merkarot and the merkabah (i.e., that belonging to God), the seven-fold nature of the temple still presents an interpretive dilemma; see below.

111 Alexander, Mystical Texts, 28-32, 53-54, here 57, who also explains that a figurative interpretation would mean that the seven chief princes and their deputies should not be taken literally either. These observations explain why there is not an exact correspondence between the celestial and terrestrial sanctuaries, even if a parallel relationship is assumed.


113 Newsom, “He Has Established,” 114.
significance, and I concur with Newsom and others that the best way of viewing the contribution of SSS made to sectarian life is to consider it a document that enhanced priestly self-understanding – but also a liturgical text, the numinous and highly repetitive language of which contributed to a meditative experience of worship. But an immediate objection to SSS as liturgy is that nowhere is the content of the angelic praises specified – it is simply said that the angels praise God. Yet this objection misfires insofar as SSS frequently invites the angels to praise, an undertaking which arguably constitutes an act of worship and facilitates a worship experience (cf. Ps 148). Moreover, it has been observed that the absence of the content of the praise of the angels seems to have been a deliberate move which draws attention to the primary focus of SSS: the angelic priests themselves. SSS’s near obsession with the angelic priests is of course a main reason why scholars consider the document to have contributed to the Yahad’s priestly self-understanding – but how the text made this

---

114 Newsom, “He Has Established,” 114, acknowledges that her priestly self-understanding viewpoint has been influenced by Maier, Von Kultus, 133-135. For further comments on the priestly import of SSS, see Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 202.


116 I.e., if there is no liturgy to recite or emulate, how then is the document liturgical? Chazon, “Human & Angelic Prayer,” 41ff; eadem, “Liturgical Communion,” 98ff, suggests that the ontological-qualitative divide between angels and humans is one reason why the actual content of the angelic praise is omitted from SSS. But this, in my opinion, may place too much emphasis on the humility of Song 2; see below.

117 Cf. Newsom, “Religious Experience,” 217: “The recitation of a liturgical text that summons to praise is by definition a worship experience”; contra Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 131, who specifically dubs SSS a “liturgical invitation” rather than liturgy proper. Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 150, makes the important point that the liturgical nature of the text may be one reason why not all angelological questions are answered.

118 The result is indeed bold, but that may be the point: if the content of the angels’ praise was included, the focus would be on God rather than the angels; so Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 16; cf. Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 125: “Omitting the actual words of the angelic praise is a means by which attention is turned to the angels rather than God.”
contribution is not explicitly articulated anywhere in *SSS*. In what follows I will interact with some of the scholarly proposals as to how *SSS* enhanced sectarian priestly identity, and I will then offer my own suggestions as to how *SSS* contributed not only to the sect’s priestly identity but also to its claims to be ideal Israel.

*SSS*’s clearest reference to human worshippers is Song 2:17-26 (= 4Q401 frg. 14 1:5-8; 4Q400 frg. 2 1-8), a section in which the first person plural speakers\(^\text{119}\) compare their priesthood with that of heaven:

\[
\text{17 [...] For you are honored among [...] the most godlike divine beings } lr [...] \\
\text{18 to the chiefs of the dominions [...] the heavens of your glorious realm} \\
\text{19 to praise your glory wondrously with the divine beings of knowledge and the laud of your} \\
\text{kingship among the Most Holy Ones.} \\
\text{20 They are honored among all the camps of godlike beings and revered by human} \\
\text{assemblies. More wondrously} \\
\text{21 than godlike or human beings they declare the majesty of his kingship according to their} \\
\text{knowledge and they exalt [...] } \\
\text{22 the heavens of his realm. And in all the highest heights wondrous psalms according to all} \\
\text{ [...] } \\
\text{23 glory of the king of godlike beings they declare in the dwellings (where they have) their} \\
\text{stations. But [...]}
\]

\(^{119}\) Note the numerous first person plurals in Song 2; see Newsom, “Angelic Liturgy,” 144-147. Virtually all commentators understand these first person speakers as referring to human worshippers, though Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 136, mentions the unlikely possibility that it is lesser angels who are voicing their unworthiness (vis-à-vis elite angels).
24 how shall we be accounted [among] them? And how shall our priesthood (be accounted) in their dwellings? And [our] holiness ...
25 their holiness? What (is) the offering of our tongue of dust (compared) with the knowledge of divine beings? ...
26 [...] for our exultation, let us exult the God of knowledge [...]

This passage opens with references to the elite standing and peerless worship offered by the “Most Holy Ones,” those angels which Song 1 also labels the “ministers of the presence” and the “priests of the inner sanctum” (discussed above). To be sure, part of the speakers’ response to this angelic prowess is humility. But in a Hodayot-like fashion, these humble protestations are far from the final word on the matter, as the last extant statement of these human priests is a resolute call to worship: “Let us exult the God of knowledge” (2:26).

Collins has argued that SSS is “the main evidence that fellowship with the angels is focused on the heavenly temple,” and with his comment in mind it is important to note that SSS—especially Song 2— is not only reminiscent of the Hodayot but is also best read as complementing one of its most significant angelological claims: that the sectarians enjoyed liturgical fellowship with the angelic priests who served in closest proximity to God.

How SSS may have facilitated this communion is spelled out by Alexander:

We are explicitly told that the Songs are to be recited by the Maskil. However, they imply that the Maskil does not recite them on his own, but in the presence of others.

---

120 On the similarities between the humility of Song 2 and the Niedrigkeitsdoxologien of the Hodayot, see the comments of Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 46; Angel, Otherworldly, 96ff.

121 SSS also is filled with imperative summons to worship (ostensibly, recited by the Maskil and other sectarians) to the angels; see below.


123 On the quietness, stillness, silence, etc., of the angels’ worship in SSS (particularly in Song 11) and the influence of 1 Kgs 19:12, cf. Dale C. Allison, “The Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” ResQ 13 (1988): 189-197; Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 127; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 138; Newsom, “Religious Experience,” 219. Also see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 39, who notes the contradiction this silence introduces given the implied exuberance of SSS’s other descriptions of angelic worship. But this is likely another effectively employed example of the heaven-as-indescribable motif. As Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 63, points out, the reference to the Elijah narrative also heightens the Sinai and prophetic (i.e., SSS as revelation) motifs at work in the text; see further, below.
These are the “we” referred to in Song 2, whose priesthood is compared with the priesthood of the angels in heaven. These are also presumably the human community who are the recipients of angelic blessings in Songs 6 and 8. In other words, we have here a public liturgy, in which a prayer-leader leads a congregation, who may join him in reciting in whole or in part the words of the hymns. That congregation exhorts the angels in heaven to perform their priestly duties in the celestial temple, and somehow through this liturgical act it feels drawn into union with the angels in worshipping God. … The worshippers’ consciousness that they were surrounded by hostile, evil forces would have been psychologically important for their act of worship, reinforcing their sense of unity, and heightening their feeling of reassurance and privilege at having access to such august celestial beings. The whole liturgy turns on a dualism between earth and heaven, between the worshipping congregation below and the worshipping congregation above, and on the attempts of the earthly congregation to overcome this dichotomy.124

As we have seen, one of the ways the Hodayot and 1QS 11 express the notion of angelic fellowship is to say that the sectarian had been joined together with the divine; it is thus noteworthy that SSS refers to the heavenly location where the sectarians have “access to such august celestial beings” (to use Alexander’s turn of phrase) as a , which is where God has , “established,” for himself an angelic priesthood (cf. Song 1:11, 30; 7:35).125

Other examples of terminological affinity with previously discussed sectarian texts include and . SSS employs to refer to the “stations” of the magnificently garbed

---
124 Alexander, Mystical Texts, 44-47, is, generally speaking, following the interpretation of Newsom, “He Has Established,” 106, 113-118 (cf. eadem, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 71-72; “Religious Experience,” 221), who emphasizes the importance of Song 2 when it comes to understanding the purpose/function of the text. See also Collins, The Scriptures and Sectarianism, 202, who supports the interpretation of Newsom and Alexander. Cf. Hannah, Michael and Christ, 60, who notes the “implicit confirmation” of angelic fellowship provided by Song 2. While Schafer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 144, does not see in the Songs “the idea of a liturgical communion of angels and humans that is so dominant in the unquestionably Qumranic texts,” he concedes that they could have been read in the context of worship in order for the Yahad to participate with the angels in their liturgy.

125 Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 44-45, highlights the use of Hebrew roots in individual songs or clusters thereof, observing the “ambiguity attached to the precise meaning of the word, which may have more than one referential value.” In comments that are analogous to those I made in reference to the Hodayot, Newman intriguingly points out that one of these roots is (from which the noun is derived). Describing the use of this word in Song 1, Newman writes that indicates “the establishment of the priesthood [in heaven] but suggestive already of another foundation, the groundwork that is laid for the construction of the animate temple to come in the seventh song, building up from the who constitute the Yahad or some segment of it” (cf. 1QS 3:26; 4:6; 8:4b-13; 4Q164; CD 10:6; 19:4).
priestly angels who serve before God (cf. Song 13:18-24 [= 4Q405 frg. 23 2:7-12]), a use which complements the heavenly “station” the sectarians have with the angels according to the Hodayot (cf. 1QH 11:22).126 Whereas SSS uses נימַי to refer to the animate heavenly temple (cf. Song 7:12, 15 [= 4Q403 frg. 1 1:41, 44; 4Q405 frg. 14-15 1:6; Song 13:32 [= 11Q17 frgs. 2-1-9 7]), the Community Rule employs this word as a sectarian self-designation (cf. 1QS 11:8; see also 1QS 7:5-10; 4Q174 frgs. 1-3 1:6-7) and may hint at the relationship between the sectarian priestly “house” and the location of its privileged fellowship with heaven’s angelic priests.127

Comparison of SSS with other sectarian texts has uncovered additional fascinating similarities – similarities that indicate that the Yahad’s angelic fellowship experiences may have prompted them to strive to make sectarian community life as angel-like as possible. Dimant has highlighted the “striking resemblances” between angelic activities (as outlined in SSS) and sectarian activities (as outlined in the Community Rule, Hodayot, Habakkuk Pesher, and Damascus Document) including:128 the formation of a special community (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:2-6; 1QS 1:1-15; 8:5-16), a covenant with God (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:2-7; 1QM 12:3; 1QS 1:8, 16-2:25; 3:11-12; 4:22; 5:8-9; CD 20:10-12), the reception of special laws (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:15; 126 Cf. Newsom, “He Has Established,” 117-118, who cites 1QH* 11:22-24, noting that “whether or not the author the Hodayot was referring specifically to his experience in the liturgy of the Sabbath Shirō, the spirituality is much the same”; Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 70, similarly suggests that this Hodayot passage “encapsulates in brief the liturgical movement of the Songs.”

127 On this reading, see Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 168; Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 128; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 66; Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 302; Torleif Elgvin, “Priests on Earth as in Heaven: Jewish Light on the Book of Revelation,” in Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 268-269; Angel, Otherworldly, 90. On the use of נימַי in the SSS, see Newsom, The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 213, 284, 377. Also see 4Q286 (=4QBlessings*) frg. 1 2:7, which uses the related word, נימַי, in reference to the heavenly temple (cf. Ezek 40:2, which uses נימַי to refer to the eschatological Jerusalem/temple).

4Q405 frg. 23 1:10-12; 1QS 5:11; 8:11; CD 3:14; 6:2-11), bloodless sacrifices (cf. 11Q17 1-3; 1QS 8:9-10; 9:4-5) and expiation (cf. 4Q401 frg. 17 4; 4Q402 frg. 4 2; 4Q403 frg. 1 1:36, 39), purity (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:14-15; 1QS 3:4-10), the absence of evil/sin in their midst (cf. 4Q511 frg. 1 6; 1QS 1:16-28; CD 16:7; 20:30-32), the praise of God (cf. 1QM 12:1-2; 4Q511 frg. 35; 1QS 1:21-22; 11:15; 1QH 9:28-32; 11:24; 4Q504 frg. 1-2 7:1-13), the possession of divine wisdom (cf. 4Q401 frg. 17 4; 4Q402 frg. 4 2; 4Q403 frg. 1 1:36, 39; 1QpHab 2:7-10; 1QH 9:21; 1QS 4:22; 11:3), and a teaching role (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:17; 1QS 3:13). I will address the significance of these activities later in the chapter. But for now it is sufficient to note that the sectarians were engaging in *imitatio angelorum*, thereby portraying themselves as the faithful counterparts and fellow worshippers with the ideal priests of heavenly Israel.\(^{129}\)

Taking these insights into consideration, Dimant keenly observes that while *Jubilees* draws a parallel between the angels closest to God and all Israel, the witness of *SSS* and other sectarian texts is that the *Yahad* has appropriated the nation’s prerogative for itself\(^{31}\) – so much so that they were convinced they should imitate the priestly angels with whom they claimed to have fellowship.\(^{132}\) Scholars have not given full consideration to Dimant’s observation, and this can be demonstrated by looking at the significance attributed to *SSS*.

---

\(^{129}\) Song 1:16 states that the priestly angels atone for the repentant; cf. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 240-241; Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 104-105; also see below.

\(^{130}\) On the concept of *imitatio angelorum* generally, Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 113, explains that “priestly concerns with ritual purity are often explicitly understood as efforts to imitate the nature of the angels.” On angelic imitation as a key to understanding *SSS*, see Newsom, “He Has Established,” 115, who states that the text “invites an analogy between the angelic and human priests”; cf. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 15-16, who writes that “the economy of heaven mirrors the economy of earth, a theme that runs like a purple thread through the whole of the Sabbath songs.”

\(^{131}\) Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 101: “The analogy between men and angels is already present in Jubilees. But here it is drawn between the angels and Israel. In the sectarian writings this parallel is applied to the community itself.”

\(^{132}\) As I will discuss in greater detail, below, Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 101, understands the imitation of analogy with the angels to constitute fellowship with the angels.
While proposals stressing that SSS would have facilitated an “experiential validation” of the Yahad’s claims to be the true priesthood are persuasive and undoubtedly part of the picture, they do not sufficiently address the archetypal import of the text. Others have rightly emphasized the “priority of heaven” and that the Yahad “drew its vitality precisely from the envisioning of the community as a model of the imaginal temple.” But these important observations still fall short of specifying a simple yet profound facet of this vitality, thereby ignoring the nationalistic implications of Dimant’s observation: in short, to claim fellowship with and to imitate the archetypes of Israel’s priesthood would have been a powerful way for the Yahad to enhance its claims to be ideal Israel. Indeed, Newman is right to stress that any reading of SSS should do justice to the “zealous, ascetic sectarians whose writings and practices reflect a vivid concern for political and material matters in the here and now.”

More specifically, if one of the purposes of the heavenly sanctuary and its angelic celebrants

---

133 While Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 71-72, also refers to SSS as the “model and image of the Qumran priesthood,” she does not elaborate on nationalistic implications and emphasizes the experiential import of the text; cf. eadem, “Sectually Explicit,” 180; Swarup, The Self-Understanding, 133; Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 96.

134 So Alexander, Mystical Texts, 42, 61, who in addition to speaking of the “almost platonic” and “more real world” of heaven envisioned in SSS, notes that “The Sabbath Songs project onto heaven the polity and practices of earthly Israel in order to reflect this image back to earth to validate what is happening here. This is probably not very consciously done: it is an outsider’s view of the process. The author(s) of the Songs would have believed unquestioningly in the priority of the celestial priesthood, and seen the earthly priesthood as engaged in imitation of it.”

135 So Angel, Otherworldly, 101ff (quotation, 105), 298, who makes an excellent case for the archetypal significance of the text. Particularly influenced by the work of Henry Corbin (Temple and Contemplation [London: KPI, 1986], 267-303) and Elliot R. Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/Soterism Recovered,” in The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel [eds., Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 177-213), Angel warns against reductionism and understatement, emphasizing that the celestial temple was not imaginary/fictional in the minds of SSS’s author(s) but envisioned as real and paradigmatic and the basis for liturgical fellowship with the angels (cf. 1QH 11:22-24, which Angel cites to bolster his point).

136 Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 30, makes this statement in reference to readings of SSS that focus primarily on its experiential or mystical significance, thereby hoping to broaden the scope of what was considered to be its envisioned relevance, use, etc.
was to safeguard the human priesthood as “Israel’s God-appointed spiritual leaders,”137 there would have been no better way for the sectarians — a group whose priestly preoccupations are showcased in lofty self-designations such as a “a holy house for Israel, and a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron” (1QS 8:5-6) — to underscore that their reconstitution of Israel’s covenant was correct than to claim fellowship with and to emulate meticulously those angels whose priesthood was considered to be the very model for that of the nation of Israel.138 Moreover, SSS’s conclusion, which provides a detailed description of the angelic high priests and their regalia,139 is an apt exclamation point not just to the rest of SSS but also to the *Hodayot’s* claim that the sect enjoyed fellowship with the angelic priests (cf. 1QH* 14:16). Song 13:18-23 [= 4Q405 frg. 23 2:7-12] states that:


138 This is especially true if the celestial temple-as-archetype was as important as Angel, *Otherworldly*, 298, suggests it was (see footnote 134, above). On the connection between elitist/ideal sentiments and reciting the angelic liturgy of SSS, cf. Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 57; Steven Fraade, “Ascetical Aspects of Ancient Judaism,” in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible to the Middle Ages* (ed., Arthur Green; New York: Crossroad, 1986), 269.

18 In their wondrous station (are) spirits of mingled colors like woven work, engraved with images of splendor.  
19 In the midst of the glorious appearance of scarlet are (garments) dyed with a light of a spirit of holiest holiness, those who stand fast (in) their holy station before 20 (the) [k]ing, spirits of [brightly] dyed stuffs in the midst of the appearance of whiteness. And the likeness of (the) glorious spirit (is) like fine gold work, shedding 21 [light]. And all their decoration is brightly blended, an artistry like woven works. These are the chiefs of those wondrously arrayed for service, 22 the chiefs of the kingdoms of kingdoms, Holy Ones of the king of holiness in all the heights of the sanctuaries of his glorious realm. In the chiefs of offerings (are) tongues of knowledge [and] they bless the God of knowledge (together) with all his glorious works.

In concert with the focus $SSS$ has on the angels themselves rather than the content of their praises and other areas of interest, this picture of the high priestly angels vividly accentuates the conviction of the Yahad that they communed with the highest ranking priestly angels, here dubbed “the chiefs of those wondrously arrayed for service.” An important reason why this connection with the angelic priests would have muted the anxiety of the sect’s lack of clout in Jerusalem$^{140}$ was that it constituted communion with Israel’s archetypal high priesthood, enabling the sectarians to persuade themselves that their present rejection of the human temple authorities did not mean that they were cut off from the nation’s God-ordained celebrant(s)-in-chief, and their common rejoicing with the ranking priests of the “more real world of heaven”$^{141}$ would thus have made a forceful contribution to the assertion that the sect was Israel as it ought to be.

That there was a relationship between high priestly fellowship and the Yahad’s nationalistic aspirations may be indicated not just by Song 13’s content but also by its placement in the cycle: the thirteenth song arguably functions as one of the climaxes of the

---

$^{140}$ So Newsom, “He Has Established,” 115-117, who also mentions the muting of the more general anxiety inherent in the comparison of the human priesthood with the angelic.

$^{141}$ Alexander, Mystical Texts, 61.
and it is also one of the two songs following the festival of *Shavuot*, which would have occurred on the day after the eleventh Sabbath Song.\(^{143}\) *Shavuot* is associated with one of Israel’s foundational religious events: the revelation of God’s presence and Torah at Sinai; this remembrance was also the occasion of the *Yabadd’s* annual covenant renewal ceremony, an event that seems to have included the evaluation of current sect members and the initiation of new ones (cf. 1QS 1:16-3:12),\(^{144}\) and the symbolic significance of this progression text,\(^{142}\) and it is also one of the two songs following the festival of *Shavuot*, which would have occurred on the day after the eleventh Sabbath Song.\(^{143}\) *Shavuot* is associated with one of Israel’s foundational religious events: the revelation of God’s presence and Torah at Sinai; this remembrance was also the occasion of the *Yabadd*’s annual covenant renewal ceremony, an event that seems to have included the evaluation of current sect members and the initiation of new ones (cf. 1QS 1:16-3:12),\(^{144}\) and the symbolic significance of this progression

\(^{142}\) The question of where the climax of *S.SS* should be located has perplexed scholars and has generated some debate. For a review of the options, see Angel, *Otherworldly*, 97 n. 70. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 13-21, views the 13-song text as exhibiting a pyramidal structure, with the central seventh song’s angel and animate temple praise constituting the apex. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, sees the *merkhahab* vision of Song 12 as the climax but then is puzzled as to why (what he considers to be the anti-climactic) Song 13 should serve as the conclusion. An alternative reading has been advocated by Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, “The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources,” *SBL Seminar Papers, 1998* (SBLSP 37; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 400-431, who views Song 12 as the true climax, dubbing Song 7 a sort of “secondary [or perhaps better: preliminary] crescendo.” However, Song 13 at least one of the high points should not be too hastily dismissed. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, 142, sees the angelic sacrifices as being offered on behalf of true/faithful Israel and thus it would be “somewhat rash” not to consider Song 12 or 13 as *S.SS*’s “dramatic peak.” But as Newsom, “He Has Established,” 113, has argued, the sacrifices offered by the angels only receive limited attention before the focus is, once again, on the angels, especially the vivid depiction of the high priestly vestments: “That the thirteenth and final Sabbath song should contain such encomium of the angelic high priests is really not surprising. From the first Sabbath song, with its account of the establishment of the angelic priesthood, through the central songs with their formulaic accounts of the praises of these seven priestly councils, to the final thirteenth song, the subject of chief interest in the *Sabbath Shirot* is the angelic priesthood itself.” Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 386-387, who considers Song 13 to be the climax of *S.SS* (because it showcases what he deems to be the zenith of priestly angelmorphism).

\(^{143}\) Since *S.SS* states that its cycle begins on the first Sabbath of the year (cf. Song 1:1), *Shavuot*, which is observed on the fifteenth day of the third month, would have fallen on the day after the eleventh Sabbath (as per the 364-day solar year assumed by the text); cf. Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 61.

\(^{144}\) On the requirements for new members in 1QS, see Metso, *The Serekh Texts*, 8-10, 28-30. On the importance of *Shavuot* at Qumran, see Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 61-62ff, who highlights that initiates of the sectarian covenant were required to study the Torah of Moses “according to everything which has been revealed from it” (cf. 1QS 5:8-9). This is suggestive to Newman of “an esoteric dimension of instruction, or at least a knowledge of Mosaic torah with a sectarian inflection”: at Qumran, *Shavuot* was therefore a celebration of divine revelation, appropriately anticipated by Songs 11, 12, and 13, due not only to their emphasis on the *debir* and *merkhahab* (i.e., where God resides, thus the source of revelation) but also because of their numerous allusions to Sinai (e.g., נשמת הר השם, “salted incense”; cf. Exod 30:35; 4Q405 frg. 23:2:10) and Ezekiel and other influences from the prophetic tradition (e.g., נשמת הר השם, “still voice”; cf. 1 Kgs 19:12 [which is set at Sinai]; 4Q405 frg. 19:7). A collection of fragmentary sectarian texts that shares similarities with *S.SS* and which has also been associated with the covenant renewal ceremony is *Berakhot*(4Q286-290), the mss of which are dated paleographically to the early 1st cent. CE; for text and translation, see Bilhah Nitzan, “286. 4QBerakot,” through “290. 4QBerakot,” in *Qumran Cave 4: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 11; eds., Esther Eshel et al.; Oxford: Claredon Press, 1997), 7-74. On the significance of *Berakhot* for the covenant renewal ceremony,
should not be overlooked: it would only be after recommitment or initial admittance to the sectarian reconstitution of Israel that the attentions of the members of the Yahad would be turned to SSS’s most detailed depictions of the attendant angels of the debir/merkavah (Song 12) and its most extravagant presentation of the angelic high priests and their regalia (Song 13). It is also important to mention that, according to Song 1, the priestly angels atone for הבל שם פשע, “all those who repent of transgression” (Song 1:16; cf. T. Levi 3:5). In other

---

145 Cf. Davila, Liturgical Texts, 90; Alexander, Mystical Texts, 49, 63 who stress the importance of the merkabah visions of Songs 11 and 12 flanking Shavuot. But in typical 3.3 fashion, Song 12 and Song 13 which follow Shavuot ultimately devote more attention to the priestly angels than to the subject matter with which each song begins: the merkabah and heavenly sacrifices, respectively. As Newsom, “He Has Established,” 112, points out, “While the [throne chariot in Song 12] is obviously of great significance in the cycle of the Sabbath Shirah, one must note that it does not appear, in and of itself, to constitute the goal of the experience provided by this work. The description of the merkabah does not occur in the final song but at the beginning of the penultimate song. It forms part of a large descriptive complex, encompassing both the twelfth and thirteenth Sabbath songs. Its function in the Sabbath Shirah may be clarified by looking at the material that follows,” which is a description of angelic worship in the ideal temple. Contra Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 144-145, who considers the most valuable aspect of the text not to be the angels or liturgical communion with them but SSS’s depiction of the angelic sacrifices: “The sacrifice on earth has become corrupt, and it is only the angels in heaven who are still able to perform this ritual so crucial to the existence and well-being of the earthly community (until it becomes fully united with the angels).” But the manner in which the focus reverts to the angels themselves in Song 13 does not support Schafer’s reading.

146 The comment of Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 127, that the sacrifices of Song 13 may be interpreted as either the counterpart of the earthly sacrifices or allegorical highlights the difficulty in determining the precise nature of these angelic offerings. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 236 n. 8, summarizes the opinion of many in viewing the offerings as “sacrifices of praise,” and thus “at least by analogy with the earthly system, the angels were thought to offer sacrifices, even though no particular sacrifice as practiced in Judaism might have been in the author’s mind”; cf. Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 102. For a discussion of the language used in Song 12 (= 4Q405 frg. 23 1:5) and Song 13 (= 11Q17 9:4-5) to describe the angelic sacrifices and its parallels with earthly sacrifices, see Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 140. On the notion of praise as a substitute for offerings at Qumran, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy,” in The Synagogue in Late Antiquity (ed., Lee I. Levine; Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 33-48; Angel, Otherworldly, 241; cf. 1QS 9:3-6; 4Q174 frg. 1-2 1:6-7; see also Heb 13:15; Rev 5:8. Contra Falk, Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayer, 136, who argues for a literal heavenly sacrifice, citing T. Levi 3:5-6, Rev. 6:9 and 8:3-5 as suggestive of heaven having animal sacrifices (following Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, 159, who contends that the altar depicted in T. Levi, 3:5-6 “corresponds to the altar of burnt-offering, not to the golden altar or altar of incense in the earthly temple”). However, the propitiatory sacrifices of heaven in T. Levi 3:56 are “rational and bloodless,” as Falk himself concedes; cf. Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 100 n. 32, who specifically cites T. Levi 3:5-6 in arguing that SSS implies bloodless angelic sacrifices. Davidson, Angels at
sectarian texts, this phrase serves as a quasi-technical term for the community (cf. 1QH 10:11-12; 14:9; 1QS 10:20; CD 2:5), and its use in SSS suggests that the Yahad viewed themselves as uniquely benefiting from the angelic sacrifice and the atonement it provided – benefits which included God’s goodwill/favour (ךֵּד). If the angelic sacrifices should be understood as an offering of praise, atonement and/or its benefits may include the revelation of what constitutes the ideal worship of God. That the angels are revealers of the things of heaven is undoubtedly related to designations that highlight them as possessing לְשׁוֹנָה, which is likely also connected to their teaching role. Those who כָּלִיתוֹנִים נְשָׁרָהוֹת, “make known hidden things” (Song 2:40 [= 4Q401 frg. 14 2:7]) are presumably the priestly angels because their nearness to God has equipped them to reveal such heavenly mysteries and knowledge to humanity, though it may be that lesser angels (or both angels and humans)

---

Qumran 245, highlights that “chiefs of the realm of the holy ones” in Song 13:22-23 (= 4Q405 frg. 23 2:11-12) are the chiefs of “the praise offering (להמון)”; cf. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 339.

147 In addition to my brief comments above, see Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 240-241; and especially Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 104-105; cf. Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 44-45.

148 Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 42-43, expresses complementary sentiments when he writes, “How [the] Sabbath Songs conceives of the relationship between the celestial and terrestrial cults is an important question. There can be little doubt that in its view it is the heavenly offerings that are ultimately efficacious: heaven is the place of ‘knowledge’ and perfection; earth the place of ignorance, deficiency and sin. But what then is the purpose of the earthly cult? It is a sacramental re-enactment of the heavenly cult, which atones only insofar as it follows the true celestial pattern? Might the apparent emphasis on the ‘odour’ (רָקִיע) of the sacrifices at 11Q17 21-22 4-5 be significant? Is the thought that the angelic praises are the ‘odour’ of the earthly sacrifices? If the earthly cult is in tune with the heavenly, then the earthly sacrifices get caught up and presented to God in the praise of the angels.”

149 E.g., לְשׁוֹנָה. Cf. Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 19: “For our author, true worship has to be founded on knowledge, and the greater the knowledge the truer the worship.” This echoes almost exactly the comment of Newsom, “He Has Established,” 116: “adequate praise can only be expressed by those who have knowledge of the wonderful mysteries of God.” On the influence of the revelatory role of Jubilees’ angels of the presence, cf. Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 102; Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 62; see further, below.

150 On the subject of knowledge, it should be noted that Song 1:6 (= 4Q400 frg. 1 1:6) has the problematic phrase יִדְעָה לְשׁוֹנָה, “the people [who possess] his glorious insight.” Though a plain reading would suggest this refers to humans (cf. Isa 27:11; CD 5:16; 1QH 10:19), the context is strongly indicative of this being an angelic epithet, as it seems to be in apposition to the many other angelic designations in the first song. There are, however, no extant examples of לְשׁוֹנָה as a reference to the angels themselves (*contra* Newsom,
are the envisioned recipients. But given that the sectarian priests are said to have a teaching/revelatory role (cf. 1QS 6:3-8; 1QM 10-12; CD 13:2-7), readings of the text that understand the priestly angels as serving as the model for the teaching role of the Yahad’s priesthood make good sense. Moreover, Deut 29:28 specifically contrasts the Torah of God with the Torah that had been revealed to all of Israel. The “hidden things” revealed by the priestly angels to the sectarians therefore seem to serve as statement marking the distinction between the privileged members of the Yahad, who form a coterie with the priestly angels, and obstinate Jews, who do not share this privilege. The use of תורשים in CD 3:10-16 would indicate this reading is correct.

Finally, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice hints at the posture with which angelic fellowship was experienced and emulation of the angels was undertaken. In my discussion of the War Scroll (see previous chapter), I highlighted the document’s boldness insofar as it envisions a presumptuous mutuality between the sectarians and angelic warriors; Songs similarly hints at a self-assured

---

151 So Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 99, who cites 1QM 12:8 as the lone example; but as I argued in the preceding chapter, the of 1QM 12:8 likely refers to the people who have a relationship to the angelic holy ones; cf. Dan 7:27; 1QM 10:10). For further discussion, see Davila, Liturgical Works, 102. On the possibility that the designation is deliberately ambiguous (which in my opinion is correct), see Angel, Otherworldly, 95. For more examples of terminological ambiguity in Songs, see below. Alternatively, may be the preposition.


153 So Tuschling, Angels and Orthodoxy, 124ff; Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 139, who further suggest that the “hidden things” may be priestly/cultic/legal matters. Cf. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 21, who comments as follows on the influence of Deut 29:29: “In light of [CD 3:10-16], it is reasonable to take the Qumran community as the recipients of the revelation of secrets mentioned at 4Q401 frg. 14 2:7. If the priestly angels, as is likely, are the subject of (‘they have made known’), then the thought would be just as the first Torah was given at the hand of angels, so also was the new Torah. This may explain the community’s confidence in offering up to God its terrestrial liturgy, despite its deep sense of unworthiness, when compared with the glorious angels. The terrestrial liturgy is based on revelation. The new utterance of God’s mouth, conveyed first to the priestly angels, and then by them to the community, has embraced heaven and earth, and realigned the earthly and heavenly liturgies. It is this that gives the community confidence to approach God. It is surely no accident that it is liturgical matters that head the list of the content of ‘hidden things’ in CD 3:14.”
reciprocity between the sectarian worshippers and angelic priests. While it is true that Song 2 emphasizes that part of the emotional response of the first person plural speakers is humility, the question of how the heavenly and angelic priesthoods can be reckoned together is, as we have seen, not met with despair or even silence but a resolute cohortative: “Let us exult the God of knowledge” (Song 2:26). In Newsom’s words, the second song conveys “a tone of wonder and humility, but also a sense of analogy with the angelic priesthood.” That a sense of analogy (rather than only humble awe) is at work can be seen in the formulaic introduction to the thirteen songs, each of which includes an imperative summons to praise, ostensibly recited by the Maskil and other sectarian worshippers. A prime example is the relatively well-preserved Song 7:

1 For the Master [lit: Maskil]. Song of the sacrifice of the seventh Sabbath on the sixteenth of the <second> month. Praise the God of the exalted heights, O exalted ones among all the divine beings of knowledge. Let the Holy Ones of the godlike beings magnify the king of glory who sanctifies by his holiness all his holy ones. O chiefs of the lauding of

154 Newsom, “He Has Established,” 115 (cf. eadem, “Religious Experience,” 216); “[In the second Sabbath song], the human community briefly contemplates its inadequacy in comparison with the angelic worshippers, but then proceeds to offer its praise”; Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 245: “The sectarian community praises God in association with the angels (4Q400 frg. 2 1-8), even though their praise is impoverished by comparison (4Q400 frg. 2 6-7)”; Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 49: “the repetition of the angelic ‘tongues’ in the sixth and eighth songs picks up the theme introduced in the [second] song in which the human participants ask how the offering of their tongues of dust might be compared with those of the angels. The implied answer is that the human offering should somehow rival that of the angels … .” Contra Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 132, who speaks of the inferiority of humans vis-à-vis angels and reads the humility of Song 2 as a statement that the human priesthood is “nothing compared to the angelic priesthood in heaven”; cf. Chazon, “Human & Angelic Prayer,” 41ff; eadem, “Liturgical Communion,” 98ff.

155 On the office of the Maskil as worship/prayer leader, the community’s senior (high) priest, and possible successor to the Teacher of Righteousness, see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 49; cf. Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 150.
all the godlike beings, laud the majestically [l]audworthy Go[d] …

The summons to worship God is addressed to the angels, who are referred to using a variety of designations, but Song 7 extends this call beyond the post-introduction familiar from the others songs, as imperatives and jussives are frequent throughout lines 2-12.

Another instance of envisioning a self-assured relationship with the angels may be present in Songs 6 and 8. As briefly noted above, these songs mention the blessings offered by the angelic chief princes and their deputies, but the language used to describe the recipients of these blessings is ambiguous and may not refer to the exemplary priestly angels but to the human community that worships with them:

The phrases which allude to the moral qualities of those blessed (e.g., ) certainly need not be taken as referring to human worshippers. The Sabbath Shirot refers to statutes promulgated for the angels through which they attain to purity and holiness (4Q400 frg. 1 1:5, 15) and describes the angels as obedient (4Q405 frg. 23 1:10-11). It is possible, however, that just as the human community joins with the angels in the praise of God (4Q400 2:6-8) they are also considered to be recipients of the blessings of the chief princes, along with the angelic worshippers.156

Though the designations used throughout the songs (e.g., ) may indicate that angels rather than humans are the recipients of these blessings, alternatively, the very cooperation between heaven and earth under discussion could either mean that references to humans and angels are interspersed or a deliberate terminological ambiguity akin to what we witnessed in the Hodayot has been employed.157 If this interpretation is correct, it is further confirmation

156 Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 196; cf. Alexander, Mystical Texts, 44: “[The ‘we’ of Song 2] are presumably the humanity community who are the recipients of the angelic blessings in Songs 6 and 8.”

157 In my examination of the Hodayot, I highlighted the possibility that not only but also was used to refer to the sectarian worshippers; i.e., in an effort to emphasize that the sectarians were honoured members of a human-angel coterie,  has similarly referred to humans using nomenclature commonly employed for angels; so Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 243-244; see also Alexander, Mystical Texts, 15-17, who sees such terminological ambiguity as indicative of “the parallelism between Israel on earth and the angels in
of the presumptuous posture with which the Yabah approached its relationship with the
golden priests, as they viewed themselves as worthy of being blessed by the angels whom

heaven” (cf. Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 58). For an instructive discussion, see Angel, Otherworldly, 93ff, who notes the ease with which many of the epithets can be read as references to angels but at the same time recognizes that not entertaining a human reading of some of the designations may sometimes undermine the intended complexity of the document. On the difficulty terminological ambiguity introduces to making a distinction between angels and humans, see Sullivan, Wrestling with Angels, 152ff. (n.b.: SSSS also applies
designations to angels that are more frequently associated with humans; e.g., נְמוֹש, cf. Swarup, The Self-
Understanding, 142; Angel, Otherworldly, 95; Davila, Liturgical Works, 104).

However, the notion that members of the Yabah could occasionally be described with angelic
designations (or vice versa) in order to emphasize their privileged lot needs to be sharply differentiated from
Fletcher-Louis’ thesis that angels are actually angelomorphic humans, and this observation is part of the larger
debate of whether SSS and other texts envision humans as undergoing some kind of ontological
transformation. For a concise overview, see Zilm, “Multi-Coloured,” 338ff, who articulates two scholarly poles:
1.) interpretations which blur the ontological lines between angels and humans (cf., e.g., Tushling, Angels and
Orthodoxy, 118; Newman, “Priestly Prophets,” 31 n. 8; and of course Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, passim); and
2.) more “conservative” approaches which maintain an ontological distinction between human and angels (cf.,
e.g., Boustan, “Sevenfold Hymns,” 246; Klawans, Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, 136; Chazon, “Human &
Angelic,” 41ff; Dimant, “Men as Angels,” 101; Angel, Otherworldly, 96, 105). Zilm herself claims to take a
middle-ground approach, postulating that the human worshippers became progressively “angel-like” as the
cycle moves from the humility of Song 2 to its climax in Song 13 (on this point, cf. Newman, “Priestly
Prophets,” 71). On the key distinction between ontological transformation to an angel as opposed to
101, 105. While I am decidedly in the camp that sees an ontological distinction between humans and angels, I
would suggest that fellow “conservative” (to use Zilm’s descriptor) readers may, on occasion, unnecessarily
restrict the notion of angelic fellowship. For instance, in the articles just cited, Chazon places SSS in her second
category of religious experience, “two choirs: praying like the angels” rather than her third, “one congregation:
joining the angels,” and Dimant understands angelic fellowship as analogical rather than actual. Both
viewpoints do not allow for the possibility that the question of the sectarian priests in Song 2:24 – “how shall
our priesthood (be accounted) in their dwellings?” – expects and, indeed, has a positive and resolute outcome
just two lines later. Moreover, in light of SSS’s detailed descriptions of the heavenly temple, I do not think that
praying “like” the angels or an analogical understanding of angelic fellowship grants sufficient consideration to
the imperative call to worship of each song as constituting a worship experience that was boldly conceived of
as occurring with the angelic priests. For these reasons, I find compelling the reading of Alexander, Mystical Texts,
44-46, who in my opinion rightly reads SSS as advocating an ontological distinction between humans and angels
– but at the same time upholds the idea that SSS testifies to actual fellowship with the angels. Cf. Newsom,
Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, 71-72, whose well-known quotation begins by stating that SSS facilitated “a mystical
communion with the angels. The priests of the Qumran community understood themselves as alone
representing the true and faithful priesthood, נְמוֹש יִדְיוֹת יִדְיוֹת and משְׁרָב יִדְיוֹת. Yet physical realities seemed to
contradict their claim. They did not have authority in the temple; they could not conduct its sacrificial service;
they possessed neither the sacred vestments nor utensils. The danger in the situation was not that outsiders
would discount their claims but that their claims to represent the true priesthood would cease to remain
plausible to the members themselves, especially those who were not of the founding generation … What was
specifically needed at Qumran, however, were not merely arguments couched in visionary form to demonstrate
the authenticity of the claims of the group but rather some form of experiential validation of their claims. I
would suggest that the cycle of songs in the Sabbath Shirot was developed precisely to meet this need of
experiential validation. … That the Sabbath songs functioned primarily to form the identity and confirm the
legitimacy of the priestly community is also reflected in the fact that the work does not find its climax in the
description of the divine merkahab but rather in the glorious appearance of the celestial high priests in their
ceremonial vestments, [the] model and image of the Qumran priesthood.”
they could exhort to praise God. Thus, the sectarian boasts were not only that they enjoyed fellowship with and meticulously emulated those angels whose priesthood was considered to be the very model for that of the nation of Israel; they also confidently considered their community to have, in some sense, equal standing with these heavenly priests.

5.4: BRIEF EXAMPLES IN OTHER TEXTS & THE SELF-GLORIFICATION HYMN

A number of sectarian documents contain brief yet similar examples to the texts discussed above, and in this section I will present a collection of such works. Lastly, I will examine the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn which in many respects surpasses the loftiness of all other sectarian texts and will thus serve as an appropriate way to conclude both the chapter and the main body of this thesis.

5.4.1: PESHER ON THE PERIODS B/AGES OF CREATION B

4Q181\(^{158}\) states that the benefits of angelic fellowship belong to God’s elect, with a portion of the second column of fragment 1 reading as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{דַּהַג לַחַדָּא תַּעַמל תַּנָּא} \quad \text{vacat} \quad \ldots \quad 3 \\
\text{לְאָלָּא הָיָה} \quad \text{כּוֹרַּשׁ מַעַּלָּהָל קַוָּתי} \quad \text{כּוֹרַּתְיָא} \quad \ldots \quad 4
\end{array}
\]

---

\(^{158}\) For the editio princeps, see John M. Allegro, ed., Qumran Cave 4.1 (4Q158-4Q186) (DJD 5; Oxford: Claredon, 1968), 79, who published his text without commentary. Initially 4Q181 – dated on the basis of paleography to the Herodian period – was grouped with 4Q180 and together were dubbed the Pesher on the Periods (or Ages of Creation) A and B, due to both the genre/content of 4Q180 and the similarities 4Q180 shares with 4Q181 frg. 2; see Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milkiresa,” 112-124. However, there is some discussion as to the relationship between the texts: Devorah Dimant, “The ‘Pesher on the Periods’ (4Q180) and 4Q181,” IOF 9 (1979): 77-102, has argued that these are two different compositions; alternatively, C. Ariel, A. E. Yuditsky, and Elisha Qimron, “The Pesher on the Periods A-B (4Q180-4Q181): Editing, Language, and Interpretation,” Meghillot 11 (2014): 3-40, have proposed that 4Q180 and 4Q181 are two versions of the same work, the longer of which is preserved in 4Q181. For a recent overview of the documents, see Andrew D. Gross, “Ages of Creation,” in Outside the Bible, 2:216-220; for a more detailed treatment of the text with translation, commentary and bibliography, see Devorah Dimant, “On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered,” in Manières de penser dans l’Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale: Mélanges offerts à François Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis (eds., Christophe Batsch and Madalina Vartejanu-Joubert; JSJSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2009): 61-85. Restorations and translations of 4Q181 cited here are based on those of Dimant.
he brought near some of the sons of the world  \textit{rectat} to be reckoned with him in a congregation of the gods, for a holy congregation in the station of everlasting life and in the lot with his holy ones.\textsuperscript{159} The language is similar to that of the Hodayot, 1QS, and SSS\textsuperscript{160} and \textit{דומדומ} suggests that the angelic fellowship envisioned here was with the angelic priests.\textsuperscript{161} It would seem that there is a present sense to this station with the angels,\textsuperscript{162} although 4Q181 is the clearest instance in the sectarian texts of the Early Jewish belief that angelic fellowship will be a hallmark of “eternal life” (cf. Dan 12:3; 1 En. 104:2-6).\textsuperscript{163} Moreover, while the text mentions “Israel” (cf.

\begin{itemize}
  \item In addition to the passage making better sense if \textit{נֵבֶי מַלְאָכִים} is translated as “\textit{with his holy ones}” rather than “\textit{the people of his holy ones}” (cf. Dan 7:28; 8:24; 1QI 10:10; 12:8; 11QMelch 2:9), that the former is the better translation is highlighted by looking at the parallelism. Specifically, the placement of the prepositions (in bold) indicates that \textit{נֵבֶי} is not the noun:

\begin{align*}
  \text{כָּבָּד} & \text{שָׁלֹא} \text{מַלְאָכִים} \\
  \text{בְּנֵי} & \text{מַלְאָכִים} \text{לָדֵי} \\
  \text{בְּנֵי} & \text{מַלְאָכִים} \text{לָדֵי}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{160} Terminology employed in other angelic fellowship passages includes \textit{דומדומ}, \textit{בְּנֵי שָׁלֹא מַלְאָכִים}, \textit{בְּנֵי שָׁלֹא מַלְאָכִים} \textit{דומדומ}, \textit{בְּנֵי שָׁלֹא מַלְאָכִים} \textit{דומדומ} (cf. 1QH1 11:23; 1QS 11:8; SSS 1:10 [= 4Q400 frg. 1 1:10]); \textit{קריסים} (cf. 1QH1 7:19; 11:22-23); \textit{קריסים} (cf. 1QH1 11:23; 1QS 11:8; SSS 2:17 [= 4Q401 frg. 14 1:5]); \textit{קריסים} (cf. 1QH1 11:23; 14:16; 19:14; 16; 1QS 11:7; 1QI 17:7). Two additional facets of the language of 4Q181 should be noted. First, a comparison of 1QS 11:8 and 4Q181 frg. 1 2:2 reveals that while the former is a positive reference to the \textit{ yabhad} ("with the sons of heaven he has joined together their assembly for the Council of the Community"), the latter uses strikingly similar language to describe the \textit{ yabhad}'s wicked counterparts ("in the council of the sons of heaven and earth to a community of wickedness"). Second, the exact phrase \textit{בראשׁיו} is found in Recension B of Self-Glorification Hymn (cf. 4Q491 frg. 11 1:12; for a similar construction \textit{בראשׁי}, see 4Q427 frg. 7 2-9, which is part of the call to worship that follows this fragment’s witness to Recension A of the Self-Glorification Hymn). On the first point, see Ariel, Yuditsky, and Qimron, “The Pesher on the Periods, 3-40; on both points, see Dimant, “On Righteous and Sinner,” 79. I will discuss the Self-Glorification Hymn in greater detail, below.

\textsuperscript{161} I discussed the priestly sense of \textit{בראשׁי}, above (cf. 1 Chr 23:28; 2 Chr 35:15; 1QH1 11:22-23; 19:16; SSS 13:18-24 [= 4Q405 frg. 23 2:7-12]).

\textsuperscript{162} The perfect verb that governs the statement \textit{(hphil of בְּנֵי)} suggests that the communion envisioned is not only for the future; cf. Davidson, \textit{Angels at Qumran}, 275, who claims that the passage “mentions the present experience of the Qumran community as being one of sharing fellowship with the angels.”

\textsuperscript{163} Dimant, “On Righteous and Sinner,” 79.
frg. 2.3), the dualistic tone of the document suggests that Israel is a sectarian appropriation, and thus 4Q181 makes a clear distinction between the members of the Yahad and everyone else, here dubbed “the sons of the world.”164 But the text has also been rightly described as encapsulating a fundamental conviction of the Yahad in that adherence to the reconstituted covenant of Israel meant being in a “single assembly with the angels, thus earning eternal life.”165 4Q181 therefore corroborates what we have witnessed in the sectarian texts thus far: having a station before God with heaven’s priests is intimately connected to the sect being ideal Israel.

5.4.2: SONGS OF THE SAGE

The Songs of the Sage (henceforth, SSage) are hymns, to be led by the Maskil, sung to protect the sectarians from the influence of evil spirits.166 In addition to mentioning the establishment of the angelic priesthood (cf. 4Q511 frg. 2-3), SSage reinforces the notion that there is a union between the angelic priests and the Yahad (cf. 4Q511 frg. 2:7-10), and

---

164 In addition to using הַנְּעָה in a dualistic/predeterministic sense in lines 4-5 (cf. 1QS 3:24; 4:24-26; 1QM 17:7) and contrasting the impurities of the wicked with the mercy bestowed upon the elect (cf. 4Q181 frg. 1:2-3; 1QS 4:2-14), the partitive prefixing of מָּכָל in line 4 conveys the sense of the Yahad as elect and thus true Israel; see Dimant, “On Righteous and Sinners,” 77-78; cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 272-273.


166 As indicated by numerous occurrences of ליַּאֵה, from which the English translation “Sage” stems. For text as well as notes on the affinities SSage has with other sectarian texts, see Baillet, DJD 7, 215-262, who dated the mss on the basis of paleography to the last quarter of the 1st cent. BCE. Translations cited here are based on García Martínez and Tigarhalaar, DSSSE. For important discussions of SSage, including the ליַּאֵה heading and the text’s sectarian provenance, see Baillet, DJD 7, 215fff; Newsom, “Sectually Explicit,” 183-184; Bilhah Nitzan, “Hymns from Qumran,” The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research (eds., Devorah Dimant, Uriel Rappaport, and Yad Yitshak Ben-Tsvi; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 53-63; eadem, Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 227-272; Angel, Otherworldly, 92, 124ff; idem “Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience in the Songs of the Sage (4Q510-511),” DSD 19 (2012): 1-27. For a recent attempt to reorganize the numerous fragments of 4Q511 into a more coherent order, see idem, “The Material Reconstruction of 4QSongs of the Sage” (4Q511),” RevQ 27 (2015): 25-82.

167 In this respect, SSage are reminiscent of SS1 (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1:1-20); see Alexander, Mystical Texts, 69.
it does this primarily in two ways. First, the text states outright that God has brought both angels and the sectarians – who, significantly, are designated as “Israel” – into one lot.

4Q511 frg. 2 1:7-10 exclaims that:

7 By [God’s perceptive knowledge] he placed [Israel] in twelve camps of his holy ones in order to walk 168
8 and to enter the lot of God with the angels of his glorious luminaries. On his name the praise of
9 their […] be instituted according to the feasts of the year, [and] the dominion of the Yahad,
10 so that they would walk [in] the lot of

The War Scroll also describes the sectarian-angel union as the “lot of God,” 169 but here an additional designation gives the angelic fellowship 170 a decidedly sectarian flavour with the term מושלת יורד, “dominion of the Yahad.” 171 Though line 9 is fragmentary, the sense

---

168 For the translations of the italicized words at the end of line 7/beginning of line 8 and the reconstructions on which they are based (including קדושתי, see Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 260-261; Angel, Otherworldly, 126-127.

169 Cf. 1QM 17:7, which has the phrase כי לא עשה.

170 The reference to the divine throne (קדם) in line 10 is further indication that the angels with whom the sectarians have fellowship are the (priestly) angels closest to God. Note, however, that Elisha Qimran has suggested that the word is קדושים rather than קדושלא, a reading which has obvious angelic associations; see idem, The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings, Volume 2 (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2013), 318; I am grateful to Professor Joseph Angel for making me aware of Qimron’s reading.

171 For translations that read יורד as the community’s self-designation (rather than adjectivally), see, e.g., Baillet, DJD 7, 221-222; Wise, Abegg, and Cook, DSS:ANT, 528; cf. Newsom, “Sectually Explicit,” 184 n. 11, who lists numerous examples of when יורד does not have the definite article yet is used to refer to the sectarian community (cf. 1QS 3:2, 12; 9:6; 11:8; 1QSa 1:26; 1QSb 4:26). Even if the intended sense is “communal dominion” (e.g., Garcia Martinez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE, 2:1031), יורד is likely meant to evoke the Yahad via double entendre. It should be noted that מושלח is applied to Israel in 1QM 17:7 which is a passage that also emphasizes the sectarian-angel composition of God’s lot (see preceding footnote); cf. Ps 114:2, where the idea of a priestly kingdom is conveyed: “Judah became God’s sanctuary (קדש), Israel his dominion.
seems to be that sectarian feast-commemoration was so that the sectarians could be part of the angel-human lot of God/dominion of the Yahad.\textsuperscript{172}

The second way the sectarian-angel lot is emphasized finds parallels in the Hodayot and SSS, which, as argued above, employ deliberate terminological ambiguity by referring to humans with designations usually reserved for angels and vice versa. This can be seen not only at the end of the passage just cited in the phrase בְּנֵוֶרֶת תֶּם כְּפָאֵר, “in the lot of the people of his throne” (4Q511 frg. 2 1:10), but also in 4Q511 frg. 35 3-4 which refers to the heavenly priesthood using the following string of designations: לְפָ檢ֶתֶר תֶּם צָרֵךְ תֶּם כְּפָאֵר וּמֵשֶׁרֶהֲמֶים, הָאָמָר וּמֵלֵאךְ כְּפָרְדֶה, “priests, his righteous people, his army and servants, the angels of his glory.”

While any use of the word כְּפָרְדֶה in reference to angels is puzzling at first glance,\textsuperscript{173} we encountered this phenomena in SSS (cf. Song 1:6 [= 4Q400 frg. 1 1:6]), and a “solution” similar to what was offered there is offered again here: the ambiguity of using כְּפָרְדֶה to refer to angels in what is already a “list of intentionally inclusive epithets [is] meant to underscore the

\textsuperscript{172} So Alexander, Mystical Texts, 69. If this interpretation is correct, it complements what I suggested was a symbolic significance of Sabbath Songs 12 and 13 occurring post-Shavuoth/covenant renewal ceremony: it was only after first-time admittance or recommitment to the reconstituted covenant of Israel that the attentions of the members of the Yahad are turned to SSS’s most detailed depictions of the attendant angels of the debir/merkavah (Song 12) and its most extravagant presentation of the angelic high priests and their regalia (Song 13).

\textsuperscript{173} Cf. Baillet, DJD 7, 237, who rather than viewing the five designations in apposition to one another, saw four because he read מֵשֶׁרֶהֲמֶים as a construct, resulting in the translation “ministres des anges de Sa gloire.” But as Angel, Otherworldly, 129, notes, if the goal of Baillet’s reading was to mitigate “an unsettling description of human priests as the angels of God’s glory,” it does not work for at least two reasons: 1.) מֵשֶׁרֶהֲמֶים is not a construct form; 2.) even if one were to disregard מֵשֶׁרֶהֲמֶים, the word מֵשֶׁרֶהֲמֶים is more naturally read as an angelic epithet in this context. For further discussion on translational and interpretive issues of this passage, cf. Davidson, Angels at Qumran, 283-284; Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 164-165.
unity of the heavenly and earthly groups in a single community. Angel has also cautiously proposed that frg. 35, which includes the first-person boasts/qualifications of the Maskil (lines 7ff), originally preceded frg. 18, a portion of text that contains similar statements. If correct, this placement effectively connects the “intentionally inclusive epithets” of frg. 35 lines 3-4 with the confident assertions of the Maskil; in other words, the Yahad’s station with the angels is related to the benefits of the piety of the sectarian leadership. 

Lastly, a hint at the posture with which the author(s) of SSage approached the relationship between the sectarians and the angelic priests may be revealed in a poorly preserved section of 4Q511 frg. 2. In line 5, God’s lot is variously referred to as “Jacob’s best,” his “inheritance,” and “Israel”; line 6 then dubs the people:

\[
\text{שומם} \text{ורכז אלוהים ומשלח} \text{ודש לחרושי עמו}
\]

6 those who [kee]p the way of God and his [h]oly path for the holy ones of his people.

Two words from this line, דרכ ומשלח, occur in 1QS 8:14, which is a quotation of Isa 40:3 used exclaim the Yahad’s Torah-centric raison d’être (1QS 8:14); earlier in the same column the verb שמר is employed to stress the faithful “keeping” of the Law that was to characterize sectarian life (8:3). To be sure, the implication that the members of the Yahad alone are the ones who keep God’s way and his holy path is bold in and of itself. But perhaps bolder still is the end of the line that specifies that this endeavor is לחרושי עמו.

---

174 See Angel, Otherworldly, 131, whose larger discussion references additional examples of this deliberate terminological ambiguity.

175 Angel, “The Material Reconstruction,” 64-66, notes that the “content [of frgs. 18 and 35] appears to flow very well,” though he does not specifically mention a correlation between the credentials of the Maskil and angelic fellowship.

176 On SSage as a sectarian document despite the use of Elohim as a name for God, see Newsom, “Sectually’ Explicit,” 183-184.
Admittedly, the meaning of the expression is difficult to ascertain. I commented on the significance of nearly identical phrases in my discussion of the War Scroll (cf. 1QM 6:6; 16:1), where I argued for a possessive or tutelary sense; if a similar meaning is accepted here, the implication is that the sectarians keep God’s ways/path, which are also those of the angelic holy ones, *who in some sense belong or pertain to God’s people, the members of the Yahad.* In the context of a passage that describes the sectarians in exalted terms (see line 5, cited above) and a document that is focused on presenting the sectarians and angels as God’s united lot, reading line 6 this way is appropriate.

Thus, the impression given by *SSage* is that even if the *Yahad* needed prayers to protect them from malevolent spiritual forces, there was a sense that they, as the true Israel, could also presume a fellowship and mutuality with the priests of heavenly Israel, which, in turn, would have enhanced their identity as the ideal people of Israel.

5.4.3: THE RULE OF BLESSINGS

*The Rule of Blessings* (1QSb) is a collection of benedictions to be pronounced by the *Maskil* over various leaders of the *Yahad.* Space precludes a full treatment of the many possible topics, including the time period for which these benedictions were composed: the

---

177 Cf., e.g., Angel, “Maskil, Community, and Religious Experience,” 19ff, who cites the phrase as another example of deliberate terminological ambiguity in order “to engender the image of a liturgical community, including people and angels.” While it is possible that this is the case (i.e., the usual angelic “holy ones” refers to people in this instance [cf. 1QH 19:14-15]), I am not convinced this is the best interpretation; see below.

178 Cf. Baillet, DJD 7, 222, who cites 1QM 6:6 and 16:1 as parallels.


180 1QSb is the second of two appendices (the first being *The Rule of the Congregation* [=1QSa]) to 1QS and written in the same early 1st cent. BCE hand. The *editio princeps* was published by Józef T. Milik, “Recueil des Bénédictions (1QSb),” in *Qumran Cave 1* (eds., idem and D. Barthélemy; DJD 1; Oxford: Claredon
The view supported here is that the text looks forward toward the eschaton but that its proleptic significance should not be overlooked. I will highlight two relevant passages, the first of which is found in column 3:

22 Words of blessing for the M[askil to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests whom
23 God chose to restore his covenant [...] own all his precepts in the midst of his people, and
to instruct them
24 as he commanded. And they rose up in truth [...] and with righteousness watched over
all his statutes and walked according as
25 he chose. May the Lord bless you from his [holy] abode. May he set you as a perfected
ornament in the midst of the holy ones, and may he renew for you the covenant of the [eternal]
priesthood, and may he give you [...] your place in the

181 For an overview of the text and some of the interpretive issues with bibliography, see
Charlesworth, “Blessings,” 119-121; Angel, Otherworldly, 107-123.

182 On the various ways the text has been divided according to the intended recipients of the various
beneficences, see the helpful summary of Wayne Baxter, “IQSb: Old Divisions Made New,” ResQ 21 (2004):
615-629. On the future-eschatological significance of IQSb, see Lawrence H. Schiffmann, The Eschatological
Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989),
72-76. For readings that understand the text’s references to the “last days” as the present time, see Hartmut
Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb, and to Qumran Messianism,” ResQ 17 (1996): 479-505; Annette
Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa,” DSD 2 (1996): 253-269, esp. 255. For proleptic readings of the text, see
Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, “Rule of the Community,” 2 n. 9; Johannes Zimmermann, Messianische Texte
aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriften von Qumran (WUNT 2;
Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 284; Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “1QSb and the Elusive High Priest,” in Emmanuel:
Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emmanuel Tov (eds., Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup
94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 3-16.

183 The reconstruction is that of Milik, DJD 1, 124; the space is left blank by Charlesworth and
Stuckenbruck. The same expression occurs in 1QSb 4:25, cited below.
27 holy [abode]

Significantly, the priests\textsuperscript{184} of the \textit{Yahad} – here referred to as the Sons of Zadok,\textsuperscript{185} and thus portrayed as Israel’s true priesthood – are honoured because they have faithfully instructed the people in the precepts of the reconstituted covenant. But more important is where this honour occurs: in the presence of the angelic holy ones who presumably reside with God in his \textit{מִדֶּשׁ קְדָשִׁים}, which elsewhere is a celestial reference (cf. Deut 26:15; Jer 25:30; 2 Chr 30:27). Angelic fellowship is thus the focus, with the exaltation of the sectarian priests seemingly on par or perhaps even greater than that of the holy ones with whom they commune.

The honorific benedictions continue in column 4, but the fragmentary nature of the text has led to disagreement as to who receives this blessing: Baxter opts for the Zadokite priests in their entirety (including the high priest),\textsuperscript{186} but others have argued that here the high priest alone is envisioned.\textsuperscript{187} I prefer the latter view, which means that the high priest is the subject of a \textit{Jubilees}-like comparison:\textsuperscript{188}

\footnotesize{... 24}

\textsuperscript{184} It is obvious that the recipients of the blessings in 3:22-27ff are the Zadokite priests; cf., e.g., Milik, “28b. Recueil des Bénédictions,” 118-130; Jacob Licht, \textit{The Rule Scroll} (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 277-289; Abegg, “1QSB and the Elusive High Priest,” 3-16. However, whereas Licht and Abegg suggest that the high priest receives a separate blessing beginning at 4:22ff, Baxter, “1QSB: Old Divisions,” 618ff, argues that the high priest(s) should be included with the Zadokites and that these blessings conclude at 5:19, just before the blessing of the royal messiah in 5:20ff.

\textsuperscript{185} On the “exclusive grasp” that the Sons of Zadok came to have on Israel’s priesthood (cf. 1 Kgs 4:1-2; 1 Chr 29:22; Ezek 40:46), see Baxter, “1QSB: Old Divisions,” 624-625, who suggests that this privilege continued into the Second Temple Period; cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, \textit{The Halakah at Qumran} (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 75.

\textsuperscript{186} Baxter, “1QSB: Old Divisions,” 624ff.

\textsuperscript{187} E.g., Abegg, “1QSB and the Elusive High Priest,” 3-16, esp. 10ff, who argues that the presence of singular verbs and pronouns suggest that an individual recipient is intended; cf. Licht, \textit{The Rule Scroll}, 277-289.

\textsuperscript{188} We witnessed in \textit{Jub}, 31:14 that Jacob’s blessing of Levi included the prayer that his son would serve God in the Jerusalem temple “like the angels of the presence and the holy ones”; in a sense, 1QSB 4:24-26 is a sectarian appropriation of this prayer/sentiment.
24 ... And (may) you (be) like an angel of the presence in the abode of holiness, for the glory of the God of [H]ost[s ... May] you be round about serving in the temple of 26 the kingdom and may you cast lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community[... for] eternal time, and for all glorious endtime. ...

While it is noteworthy that the sectarian high priest is likened\textsuperscript{189} to the priestly angels who serve in closest proximity to God, it is significant that this honour is once again bestowed in the celestial sanctuary, which is indicated by the designations מַחְיָלָאָיִן and לָכְתַּל.\textsuperscript{190} The statement that the high priest “casts the lot” (i.e., determines fate)\textsuperscript{191} with both the angels of the presence and the “council of the Yahad” (نة הירד)\textsuperscript{192} clarifies that the high priest’s association with the angels is reserved not for him alone but also for the

\textsuperscript{189} Contra Fletcher-Louis, \textit{All the Glory}, 152ff, whose angelmorphic anthropology thesis over-interprets the comparative sense of the ב by arguing that the priest \textit{is} an angel of the presence. Cf. Sullivan, \textit{Wrestling with Angels}, 165, puts it succinctly: “[The ב] makes a comparison (like or as), not an equation.”

\textsuperscript{190} The biblical references to כֵּדַשׁ מַלְכוּת as God’s celestial abode are cited above; the parallel term, קַמִּים מַלְכוֹת, though similar to the description of the Jerusalem temple in Sir 50:7 (לֵוָלָא מַלְכוֹת), has analogous designations in \textit{SSS} where it clearly refers to the celestial sanctuary (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:13, which has מַכְרֵשׁ מַלְכוּת; 4Q405 frg. 23 2:11, which has מַכְרֵשׁ מַלְכוֹת). For discussion of this and other similarities to \textit{SSS}, see Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 117ff, who especially stresses the teaching and knowledge of the priesthood; cf. Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 83-87.

\textsuperscript{191} The exact sense of מַלְכוֹת הָאֵל is uncertain, but commentators have taken it as a reference to the divine prerogative to determine destiny/fate (cf. 1QS 4:26), which is here granted to the high priest. For a discussion of the use of this language in other DSS texts, see Armin Lange, “Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot,” in \textit{Sapiental, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo, 1988: Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet} (eds., Darrell K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 39-43. For a translation that reflects this, see Wise, Abegg, and Cook, \textit{DSS-ANT}, 143: “ordering destiny with the angels of presence ….” Cf. Frennesson, “In a Common Rejoicing,” 87; Schäfer, \textit{The Origins of Jewish Mysticism}, 129, who propose that the expression may include an eschatological judging role for the sectarian-angel lot.

\textsuperscript{192} The more common spelling is בַּנָּת הירד; for instances of the phrase as community reference yet without the definite article, cf. 1QS 3:2; 11:8; 1QSa 1:26; 4Q511 frg. 2 1:9; see Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 118 n. 46.
Additionally, the fact that the high priest casts the lot with (מִכְּפָר) the angels of the presence and the community may suggest that they, too, have a destiny-determining role.

5.4.4: SELF-GLORIFICATION HYMN

The so-called Self-Glorification Hymn (henceforth, SGH) has a first-person speaker boasting that he has been exalted above even the angels, which is followed by an imperatival summons (to the community) to praise God. There are multiple textual witnesses to SGH, and the general consensus is that there are two extant recensions: the unquestionably Hodayot-related “Recension A” (cf. 1QH 25:34-27:3; 4Q427 [=4QH'] frg. 7; 4Q471b frgs. 1a-d [=4Q431 or 4QH']) and “Recension B” (cf. 4Q491 frg. 11 1:8-18 [=4Q491c]), which has been controversially associated with the War Scroll.

So Angel, Otherworldly, 118. This may corroborate the fragmentary 1QSb 1:5, which hints that יִתְנָהוּ (מִכְּפָר) “those who fear God” (i.e., the wider community) are blessed in “the congregation of the holy ones” (מֵעָנָה דִּודֶהוֹת), which is surely a celestial reference. The general consensus is that 1QSb 1:5 is part of a section (1:1ff) that refers to the general membership of the sectarian community; see, e.g., Schiffmann, The Eschatological Community, 72; Baxter, “1QSb: Old Divisions,” 616. For another passage that claims that fellowship with the angels of the presence is for all sectarians (not just the priests), see 1QH 14:16 (discussed above); cf. Schäfer, The Origins of Jewish Mysticism, 129.


4Q491 in its entirety was originally considered to be part of the Cave 4 War Scroll fragments published by Baillet, DJD 7, 12ff. But the relationship between the M tradition and 4Q491 was challenged by Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 61-73 (cf. idem, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” in Pursuing the Text, 137), who, on the basis of physical manuscript discrepancies, as well as paleographic, orthographic, and literary differences, divided 4Q491 into three separate “manuscripts.” In his estimation, only two of these manuscripts are related to the War Scroll, while the first (= 4Q491a) shares common text with various material in 1QM, and the second (= 4Q491b) has echoes of 1QM, the third section (= 4Q491c) he deemed to have no
term “recension” is the obvious thematic and linguistic similarities among the extant witnesses, there have been some recent objections to this classification, as scholars have noted that the discrepancies are sufficient to question the term’s appropriateness.\textsuperscript{196} Complicating the issue is that the different literary settings have resulted in different attributions of identity for the “I” voice: a human voice as per those of the other \textit{Hodayot} for Recension A\textsuperscript{197} and the voice of an angel prompted by the \textit{War Scroll’s} reference to Michael (cf. 1QM 17:6-7) for Recension B.\textsuperscript{198} An exhaustive treatment of these text-critical and interpretive issues is well beyond the parameters of the present study, but some brief comments are necessary. First, a \textit{War Scroll} setting for this text does not demand that the “I” voice be angelic.\textsuperscript{199} In fact, most scholars are convinced that the first-person speaker of

---

\textsuperscript{196} So García Martínez, “Old Texts,” 115-116, who contends that “an analysis of the common elements – the shared phraseology and related expressions in both compositions – but also of their obvious differences, does not allow us to conclude that we are dealing with two genetically related compositions. Neither can be explained by the other. Nor can either be explained by an assumed common ancestor. The ‘recension’ idea cannot be applied in this case, at least not if we give it the meaning the word carries in the disciplines of textual and literary criticism where it originated.” Cf. Schuller, DJD 40, 301 n. 10. It should be noted that if the recension terminology is retained, it is still problematic to speak of a \textit{singular} SGH.

\textsuperscript{197} For specific reasons why most scholars have concluded the “I” voice of both recensions is human, see below.

\textsuperscript{198} As discussed in the previous chapter, the general consensus is that 1QM incorporated pre-existent prayer/hymnic material. Given Baillet’s assumptions that 4Q491 frg. 11 1:8-18 was both hymnic and related to the \textit{War Scroll}, he dubbed it “cantique de Michel” due to the reference to the archangel in 1QM 17. I will return to the interpretation of the “I” voice, below.

\textsuperscript{199} Although Collins, \textit{The Scepter and the Star}, 151, rightly allows that “even a different recension may have had a different literary setting and be understood in a different way,” his reading 4Q491c’s “I” voice as human demonstrates that different settings do not demand different understandings of the same referent.
4Q491c is human\textsuperscript{200} (the view accepted here) and, as such, the claims of both 4Q491c and the \textit{SGH} texts more confidently associated with the \textit{Hodayot} are the loftiest angelic fellowship statements in all of the DSS. Thus, any understanding of angelic fellowship and the contribution it made to sectarian identity would be incomplete without taking \textit{SGH} into consideration. I will now highlight the most important boasts of the texts.

As the longest \textit{SGH} witness, 4Q491 frg. 11 1:8-18 contains the greatest number of relevant statements. The extant first person singulars commence at the end of line 12, and the passage combines grandiose exclamations with rhetorical questions expecting a negative answer, which together function to assert the speaker’s perseverance and resolve in the face of persecution (lines 15-16), as well as his matchless eloquence, teaching, and judgments (lines 16-17). Moreover, claims of angelic fellowship are on display in lines 14 and 18.\textsuperscript{201}

\textsuperscript{200} Few scholars have supported Baillet’s interpretation; for discussion and bibliography, see Angel, \textit{Otherworldly}, 137-138 (who also provides a convenient list of arguments for a human interpretation). For the most recent defense of the Michael interpretation, see García Martínez, “Old Texts,” 122ff. The objection to the speaker as Michael is due in large part to the influential observations made by M. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM:” in \textit{Archaeology and History}, 181-188 (cf. idem, “Two Ascended to Heaven,” in \textit{Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls} [ed., James H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1990], 290-301), who argued that someone of the archangel’s stature would hardly have needed to boast of his exalted position, nor would he have compared himself to earthly kings or have to be “reckoned” (נפקא) with the gods (i.e., no angel would ever imply that he was not “originally at home in the heavens”). The same word in the niphal plays a role in describing the (very human) contempt that the speaker has had to endure (4Q491 frg. 11 1:15; cf. 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 12:23; Isa 53:3). On the language associated with the speaker’s teaching role as being more appropriate for a human than an angel, see Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison,” 161, who points out that נפקא, “flow of my lips” (4Q491 frg. 11 1:17) is used elsewhere in the sectarian texts as an expression for human praise/instruction (cf. 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 19:5; 1QSb 3:27; 4QS11 frgs. 63-64, 24). Another phrase that has been judged to be strange were it to stem from angelic lips is בושח תני, “[My desire is not of the flesh” (4Q491 frg. 11 1:14), as the speaker seems to be emphasizing his “inability to be tempted like ordinary mortals”; see Eshel, DJD 29, 423 n. 12; cf. eadem, “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’ of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” in \textit{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), 626. These and others arguments have prompted the vast majority of scholars to read the “I” voice as human, even in 4Q491c. However, it would be misleading to refer to this as the human interpretation since there is no consensus on the specific identity of the human speaker; see below.

\textsuperscript{201} Text and translation of 4Q491 are based on those of Wise, “מיprises אלבלאש,” 182, with line numbers corresponding to those of Baillet, DJD 7, 26-27.
14 I am reckoned with the gods, my habitation is in the holy council.

18 For I am reckoned with the gods, and my glory is with the sons of the king.

It is possible that the reference to a throne in the middle of line 12 is further indication of the speaker’s exaltation, but perhaps the most lofty claims are found at the end of line 12 and continue into line 13:

12 … No one can compare
13 [to] my glory, none have been exalted save myself, and none can oppose me …

These kind of sentiments (cf. line 15) are not limited to 4Q491c; the Hodayot-associated witnesses make analogous and perhaps the best-known claims of the SGH texts. Here, I cite 4Q427 frg. 7 1:8, 10-11:203

203 While the fragmentary state of the text precludes definitive identification of the speaker as the occupier of the throne, both the proximity of this reference to the “I” voice and the fact that the speaker says that “I sit in […] heaven” (line 13) alleviates some of the doubt that the throne belongs to him – but admittedly, could mean “dwell” and a restoration is required to read “heaven.” For discussion, see Joseph L. Angel, “The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” ReQ 96 (2010): 591 n. 29; Wise, “No one can compare” (line 12) to my glory, none have been exalted save myself, and none can oppose me …
8 [and who will compare to me] among the heavenly beings?
10 [beloved of the king, a companion to the holy ones, and it will not come]
11 [and to] my [glory] it will not be comparable; a[s f]or me, [my] station is with the
heavenly beings …

An intriguing possibility with all of these quotations is not just that angelic communion is in
view: what is remarkable about both so-called recensions of $SGH$ is that the speaker may
be exalting himself above the angels with whom he is claiming fellowship. Admittedly, there is
some uncertainty as to whether the speaker includes angels in his boasts of an incomparable
status, especially in Recension B. But less ambiguous is Recension A, which, as we just
saw, has the bold rhetorical question, “who is like me] among the heavenly beings?” (cf. 4Q427
frg. 7 1:8; 4Q431 frg. 1 1:4).

As mentioned above, my reading of the texts is line with the majority view insofar as
the nature of the references to the speaker’s teaching, his hardships, and his opposition are
strongly indicative of a human “I” voice for Recensions A and B. But precisely which human
may be claiming that he has been exalted above the angels is, as I also mentioned, another

---

203 Text, restoration, and translation of 4Q427 frg. 7 are based on those of Schuller, DJD 29, 96ff.
204 Restored as such on the basis of 4Q431 frg. 1: [א[כ] |א| ] (line 3); see Schuller, DJD 29, 203.
205 Restored as such on the basis of 4Q431 frg. 1: [א[כ] |א| ] (line 6); see Schuller, DJD 29, 203.
206 On $SGH$ as an example of angelic fellowship akin to that discussed earlier in this chapter, see the
comments of Schuller, DJD 29, 100-102; Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 145; Alexander, Mystical Texts, 86.
Note especially the terminological affinities between $SGH$ and other angelic fellowship passages, including:
the notion of being בְּהֵם, “with,” the angels (cf. 1QH א 17-18; 11:22; 19:16-17); מְשָׁרֶה (cf. 1QH י 11:22; 19:16; SSS
13:18-24 [=4Q405 frg. 23 2:7-12]; 4Q181 frg. 1 4); יָדָה (cf. 1QH ג 7:19; 11:22-23; 4Q181 frg. 1 3-4); קַרְפֵּשׁ (cf. 1QH א 11:23; 1QS 11:8; SSS 1:10 [=4Q400 frg. 1 1:10]; 4Q181 frg. 1 4); קַרְפֵּשׁ (cf. SSS 2:17 [=4Q401 frg. 14 1:5]; 4Q181 frg. 1 4).
207 E.g., does “none can compare” (cf. 4Q491 frg. 11 1:12-13) refer to other humans and angels or only
other humans?
debated point. Specific proposals as to the identity of the human speaker include an ancient biblical hero, the Teacher of Righteousness, the current leader or Maskil of the Yahad, or the eschatological high priest. I support the view that even if SGH was penned or inspired by the historical Teacher, these texts had a significant and ongoing role for the priestly and liturgical leadership of the Yahad. But it would be a mistake to conclude that SGH is only concerned with leadership, as various factors seem to indicate a deliberate connection between the “I” voice of the leader figure and the wider community. With these things in mind, I will comment on each recension individually.

When it comes to Recension B, even if one accepts the recent objections to the division of 4Q491c from the War Scroll-related 4Q491b, and it is therefore tentatively allowed

---

208 For helpful summaries, cf. Schuller, DJD 29, 102 n. 37; Puech, La Croyance, 2: 494; Angel, Otherworldly, 138; Collins, The Scepter and the Star, 155-160.

209 E.g., Eric Miller, “The Self-Glorification Hymn Reexamined,” Hen 31 (2009): 307-324, who emphasizes the importance of the Enoch tradition at Qumran, and thus surmises that SGH is the kind of composition that the Yahad would have penned upon reflection of their ante-diluvian hero.

210 E.g., Abegg, “Who Has ASCended?” 72-73, who notes that “it is also possible that such a claim was made on behalf of the Teacher of Righteousness by the author(s) of the [SGH] texts … [emphasis retained].”

211 E.g., Alexander, Mystical Texts, 89, who ties the origins of SGH to the Teacher of Righteousness but sees an ongoing leadership appropriation of the text: “If we assume that the original Self-Glorification Hymn was composed by the Teacher of Righteousness, who, in the manner of his ancestor Levi, established his priestly and prophetic credentials within the community by ascent to heaven, then it would make sense to see each successive Maskil as reaffirming the Teacher’s experience, and as demonstrating in his own right his fitness to lead the community.”

212 E.g., Eshel, DJD 29, 422-427; eadem, “4Q471b,” 201-202, who emphasizes the similarities between the speaker and the eschatological priestly figure of 1QSb. Cf. Angel, “The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest,” 591ff; idem, Otherworldly, 141ff, who provides a helpful list of the speaker’s priestly characteristics (e.g., “separation from flesh” [i.e., special distinction], a teaching role, glory, and a standing among the angels), but he stresses the present involvement of this figure in the life of the Yahad: “In my opinion, the speaker should be understood as a member of the Qumran community who should be considered ‘eschatological’ only inasmuch as the liturgical experience allowed him to repeatedly escape linear historical time and be together with the angels.” Also see Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory, 204-216, who interprets the speaker as a present “exalted priestly figure” – but one who has undergone angelomorphic transformation.

213 Cf., e.g., Eshel, DJD 29, 426, who, while ultimately preferring the eschatological high priest interpretation (see preceding footnote), writes the following: “There is no doubt that the Teacher of Righteousness played a major role in the life of the Qumran sect, and his death was a tragic event in their eyes. One may assume that a scribe, coping with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, composed the Self-Glorification Hymn thinking of the Teacher of Righteousness while describing the eschatological high priests.”
that there was once a connection between SGH and the War Scroll,\(^{214}\) Schultz has demonstrated that this connection would have been short-lived.\(^ {215}\) However, it is an overstatement to say that the contents of SGH “are out of character with the rest of the extant M material.”\(^ {216}\) That the War Scroll stresses a non-combatant yet prominent role for priests – in both battle formation and the pre-battle exhortation and prayers (cf., e.g., 1QM 7:9ff; 10:2ff) – is clear. And on the subject of the high priest’s role in 1QM, Smith (inadvertently) makes an observation that may assist us in making sense of a War Scroll setting for SGH:

> Just after the wicked have gained their one permitted victory, the Head Priest, trying to cheer up the righteous, promises that [God] will send Michael to help Israel (17:6f). A worse place for a victory hymn could not be found in the text. … Michael never appears in person, so 1QM provides no occasion for attributing to him the speech we have here.\(^ {217}\)

The point, of course, is that Smith does not consider it a viable option to interpret Michael as the “I” voice of 4Q491c. But to use Smith’s own words, a human priest trying to “cheer up” the troops by boasting of his fellowship with (or exaltation above) the angels is a suitable complement not only to 1QM 17 but also to what I argued was a key facet of the War Scroll’s

---

\(^{214}\) For a counter to the arguments for dividing 4Q491c from the War Scroll-related 4Q491b on material grounds, see García-Martínez, “Old Texts,” 111-114; Davis, “There and Back Again,” 128-137; cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 136 n. 111, who, as noted above, mentions Abegg’s recent uncertainty regarding his earlier conclusions as published in “Who Ascended to Heaven?”

\(^{215}\) As Schultz, Conquering the World, 30 n. 67, contends, “García-Martínez, who rejects the suggestion that 4Q491c is a different composition than 4Q491b, consequently believes that both 4Q471b and 4Q491b do in fact relate to M. … Yet even he concedes that the Hymn in question does not attribute to its protagonist any ‘military function’ … , and that it was ‘inserted into the context of materials related to the eschatological war.’ … Should García-Martínez’s assumption be correct, it must also be pointed out that the Hymn was then duly removed from such a war context very soon thereafter. It is nowhere to be found in M’s extant text, nor is it likely that it was once part of the end which has been lost. … Thus, while García-Martínez may well be right in that this Self-Glorification Hymn … is not related to H as is currently thought, its relationship to M, if there ever was any, would have been short lived.” Cf. Angel, Otherworldly, 136 n. 111, who cites Schultz.


\(^{217}\) Smith, “Ascent to Heaven,” 185.
worldview: the bold and unique mutuality with which the human members of the *Yahad* envisioned their relationship with the angels of heavenly Israel. Indeed, the type of claims made in *SGH* are far from out of place in a document that not only boasts that the sectarians would fight in conjunction with the angels but also presumptuously refers to these angels as the “holy ones of the people” (cf. 1QM 6:6; 16:1). A *War Scroll* setting for *SGH* would have permitted the priest to bolster the confidence and presumption of the army by reminding them of his own exalted status “in the glory of the holy dwelling” (cf. lines 14-15). 218

Moreover, scholars have noted a “special affinity”219 between the speaker and the recipients of the second person plural imperatives in lines 20-23, which Baillet dubbed “cantique des justes” on the basis of the opening vocative (דורי).220 Those addressed by the speaker are ostensibly the community at large – or in the context of the *War Scroll*, the sectarian soldiers – who are exhorted to praise God “in the holy dwelling” (line 20). The language thus

---

218 What I am proposing as a possible function for *SGH* in a *War Scroll* setting has similarities with a comment found in the first edition of John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 148-149: “Baillet placed 4Q491 11 in the War Rule, before the account of the battle corresponding to 1QM 16-17. It should be noted that 1QM 15 contains an exhortation to be spoken by the High Priest, and the end of column 16 contains the introduction to another exhortation on his part. The High Priest of the War Scroll is *de facto* the eschatological High Priest or Messiah of Aaron. While our canticle was not necessarily composed for this context, this placement is highly compatible with the view that the implied speaker is the eschatological priest/teacher. The claim that he has a throne in heaven is a validation of his authority, and serves the purpose of exhortation in the face of tribulation of the eschatological battle.” For a complementary viewpoint, see the recent comments of Davis, “There and Back Again,” 137-146, here 144ff, who notes that 4Q491c and the priest-led statements of 1QM 16-17 share important commonalities: “The two hymns of 4Q491 frg. 11 i extol the speaker and the recipients as members of the divine council amid a period of adversity. The combination forms a declaration of divinely wrought victory and celebration in times of naturally manifest human distress. … Baillet made the mistake of aligning frg. 11 with the mention of Michael in 1QM 17 and on the posited connection this formed with the self-glorification hymns in the preceding column. It is important to note that there is no mention of Michael at any point in 4Q491, and no reason to expect his appearance in any of the lacunae between either column. Baillet’s title, *cantique du Michel*, was at best anachronistic, nevertheless it was partially correct by way of this allusion: the hymns of adversity and exultation in frg. 11 i quite nicely complement the description of military struggle and victory in [1QM 2, which served as the inspiration for 1QM 14-19], and both are comparatively constructed around the theme of cooperation between mortal pietists and the heavenly hosts.”


220 Baillet, DJD 7, 26-27. This section is marked off by a large *lamed* (סנד).
matches that used to describe the speaker's exaltation, and as Alexander notes, "There is a large correspondence between the hymn of boasting and the exhortation: the speaker exhorts his audience to replicate to some degree his own experience and to join with the angels in heaven in worshipping God." What is interesting about a possible SGH-War Scroll connection is that it may imply that the speaker and, by extension, the rest of the sectarian troops do not simply have the angelic guardians of heavenly Israel as comrades but that they outrank them in some way as well. If there ever was a connection between the texts, why SGH was ultimately not incorporated into 1QM remains uncertain; perhaps it was judged that the first-person mode of address was incongruent with the rest of the document.

Regardless, if a decision not to include SGH in 1QM was made at some point, I am not convinced that it was because the sentiments of SGH were considered too bold or inappropriate.

Turning to Recension A, a similar boldness is present, but here we have more to work with when discussing the literary setting, the identity of the speaker, and the significance of the boasts. Two observations are key. First, SGH's location among the Community Hymns of 1QH needs to be taken seriously. As Schuller has argued, "Whoever the referent may in the 4Q491 11 i, in the recension of this psalm that is found in the Hodayot manuscripts, the 'I' is to be understood in relationship to the 'I' voice we hear speaking in the

---

221 Alexander, Mystical Texts, 86; cf. Angel, “The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest,” 597, who highlights the affinities between the speaker and the community in the Recension A texts, as well; see below.

222 Outranking of the angels has been observed as a feature of the Recension A texts; see below.

223 Since the fragmentary remains of SGH are located between 1QH 25:34 and 27:3, this situates the text at the end of second block of Community Hymns (CH2) = cols. 19-28.
other psalms, particularly the other Hymns of the Community.”

Again, while it is possible or even likely that the claims and/or experience of a priestly leader figure such as the Teacher of Righteousness lie behind SGH, its placement in 1QHa suggests that the speaker’s elevated status is something available to the community at large, perhaps even normative. As with Recension B, the communal import of Recension A is further indicated by the affinities between the speaker and the references to the community in the surrounding material. In addition to the speaker referring to both himself and the community as “beloved” (cf. 4Q427 frg. 7 1:10, 13), and an implied teaching-learning relationship (cf. 4Q471b frgs. 1a–d 3-4;

224 Schuller, DJD 29, 102. Contra Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 154ff, who on the basis of its lofty content simultaneously object to the classification of SGH as a Community Hymn and argue that it surpasses anything in the Teacher Hymns. While SGH does indeed stand out among the Hodayot, there are affinities with the TH: e.g., angelic fellowship, acknowledgement of God’s salvation, and the weakness of the human condition (see Schuller, DJD 29, 100). Moreover, appeals to SGH’s uniqueness ultimately do not alter the fact that it is situated in the CH2 block, and as mentioned above, Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 196ff, 287-292, has made a strong case for viewing the Teacher Hymns as not being void of significance for the “ordinary” sectarian insofar as these psalms promoted “ideal” sectarian ways. Such reasoning may account for SGH’s placement among CH2. For more on the significance of SGH’s location in 1QHa, see below.

225 This has been proposed in various ways by a number of scholars. E.g., Chazon, “Angelic & Human Prayer,” 45: “It is not impossible that the speaker, whether the Teacher of Righteousness or a similarly exalted leader of the Yahad, projected his own spiritual, perhaps even mystical, experience onto all member of his community or conversely, that the Yahad projected onto itself the Teacher’s achievements and experiences” (cf. eadem, “Liturgical Function,” 148, who stresses the liturgical – and thus communal – nature of SGH’s setting in 1QHa; more on this aspect of the text, below). Alexander, Mystical Texts, 86: “There is a strong correspondence between the hymn of boasting and the exhortation: the speaker exhorts his audience to replicate to some degree his own experience and to join with the angels in heaven in worshipping God” (cf. idem, “Qumran and the Genealogy,” 227, who makes the plausible suggestion that SGH “may have served as a sort of introit to the Sabbath Songs. In this scenario, the Maskil, having recited his credentials to lead the congregation [by identifying with the lofty claims of the first-person speaker of SGH], then exhorts them to follow his example of uniting with the angels in their worship of God”). Wise, “כַּפּוֹלָה בִּבְלִית,” 218: “On the one level, by inserting the [SGH] into the 1QHa form of the Hodayot, the redactor meant for the reader, listener, user to think of the Teacher. The Canticle’s assertions were literally true of the teacher in a way they could not be for anyone else. But on another level, each individual believer could make them true for himself or herself by partaking in the charisma of the Teacher. That happened partially through recitation. In a sense, the group [led by the current Maskil] became what their charismatic founder had been.”

226 As Wise, “כַּפּוֹלָה בִּבְלִית,” 218, states, “This is no mere coincidence. The repetition of the term is an intentional element of the melding process that was the Hodayot redaction. makes no appearance in the 4Q491c parallel, where the term is (4Q491c 13).” Schuller, DJD 29, 103, who allows for the possibility that is an angelic designation but concludes that “here it is probably all the members of the Yahad who are summoned to give praise . . . .” Also note the comments of Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 145:
the “I” voice claims to have a station “with the gods” (cf. 4Q427 frg. 7 1:11, cited above), which is very similar to the language used to describe the lot of the community, here called “the poor” (cf. 4Q427 frg. 7 2:8-9). Moreover, the speaker-community relationship is integral to the liturgical focus of the surrounding text, as can be seen in the use of the second person plural imperatives (e.g., נָאם, מָרָא, etc.) issued by the speaker to the community (cf. 4Q427 frg. 7 1:13ff). As Chazon notes, the speaker’s fellowship with the angels, as well as the implication that he joins the angels in praising God, suggests that his exhortation to the “beloved ones” to offer praise means that he is “making a similar claim [of angelic fellowship and exaltation] for all members of his community.”

And this brings me to the second key observation for Recension A: the boasts of SGH should be considered in light of the other angelic fellowship claims of the Hodayot, especially that of 1QH a14:16, which specifies that the sectarians enjoyed unmediated communion with the priestly angels of the presence. *Taken together, the two observations suggest that the community thought of themselves not only as having liturgical fellowship with Israel’s archetypal priests but that they may also have been convinced that there was a sense in which they outranked these angels.*

---

“An analogy between these ‘beloved ones’ … and the ‘beloved of the king’ … in the Self-Glorification Hymn is drawn by the very juxtaposition of these two passages and their use of the same nomenclature.” *Contra* Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 117, who prefers the angelic interpretation of the “beloved ones.”


228 Cf. Schuller, DJD 29, 107; Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 146; Angel, “The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest,” 597. Note also the affinities in language and sentiment 4Q427 frg. 7 2:9 has with previously examined Hodayot passages: יָדָה נִשְׁמֶה אֵלֶּה (לָהֶם שָׁלוֹם) יְהֹוהֵל שְׁלֹשָׁה חִכָּהוֹן; יִתְנָה שְׁלֹשָׁה מָצָה; יְהֹוהֵל שְׁלֹשָׁה יְבוּשָׁה. “And he lifts up the poor from the dust to the eternal height, and to the clouds he magnifies him in stature, and (he is) with the heavenly beings in the assembly of the community …” (cf. 1QH a 11:20-24; 19:13-17; 1QS 11:7-9).

There is, however, a curious reticence among scholars to grant the full force of the speaker-community affinity to the community, even from those who have highlighted the importance of this relationship. But in light of what scholars have referred to as $SGH$’s affinity, correspondence, analogy, etc., between the speaker and the rest of the community, I do not see why the speaker’s status as exceeding the angels would not also be true for other members of the $Yahad$. Instructive on this point is Alexander, who, after entertaining the possibility that the speaker alone outranks the angels, concludes that his exaltation belongs to the community as well:

The speaker implies that in some way or other he is elevated even above the angels. … The strong individuality of this voice is unmistakable: the “I” here, surely, is not, as elsewhere, a generic “I”. The ascension of the speaker is cited to underscore his authority within the earthly community (the “beloved” whom he proceeds to address), and this only works if this experience is unusual or unique. If it is shared by all, then all can claim equal authority. This is astonishing and deeply puzzling. However, in the last analysis, it is unlikely that the destiny of this individual could be qualitatively different from that of the other members of his community [emphasis mine].

Furthermore, recent scholarship has greatly contributed to our understanding of the $Hodayot$ tradition’s development by noting the liturgical nature of various $Hodayot$ manuscripts, as well as the pride of place $1QH^3$ gives to the $Community Hymns$. That $SGH$ is located near the

---

$230$ E.g., Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 148, who, while stating without reservation that the “analogy [between the speaker and the community] could be taken as … a promise of the most exalted state to which an individual might aspire,” comments as follows regarding the speaker: “[T]he bold claims of the self-glorified speaker are unique. He alone claims to be a companion to the angels … and even the highest among them in that famous line, ‘Who is like me among the heavenly beings?’ ….” Note, too, the remarks of Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 118, 132, who says that the speaker “has exceeded his angelic counterparts,” and that $SGH$’s “extraordinary claims serve as a powerful culmination of the human and angelic prayers throughout the TH and CH II material” – yet she makes no comment on the relationship between the community and her own observation that the speaker exceeds the angels.

$231$ Alexander, Mystical Texts, 90, 109.

$232$ On the liturgical orientation of $4Q427$ and the possibility that this ms only contained $Community Hymns$, see Schuller, DJD 29, 86-87. For a discussion of the liturgical nature of $1QH^3$, see Chazon, “Liturgical Function,” 135-149. For a proposal that $4Q428$ included TH and CH2 and served as a foundation for what would later become the collection of hymns in $1QH^3$, see Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 101-134.
end of the second block of *Community Hymns* (and thus 1QH = as a whole) and integrated with liturgical exhortations are reasons why *SGH* can rightly be described as a the “crescendo” or “powerful culmination”\(^{233}\) of the *Hodayot*, and it stresses all the more the correspondence between the speaker and those he is exhorting – a correspondence which, in my opinion, was intended to imply a rank above the angels for the community.

5.5: Conclusions

The texts discussed in this chapter indicate that angelic fellowship was a cherished facet of sectarian life. While 4Q181 and 1QSb emphasize fellowship with the angels as a hallmark of the impending eschatological age, the *Hodayot*, *SSS*, and *SSage*, as well as 4Q181 (and 1QSb, if read proleptically), are understood by scholars as advocating a robust measure of liturgical fellowship with the angels as a present benefit of membership in the *Yahad*. But the key observation for my purposes is that this form of fellowship is specified as being with the angelic priests, which means that the envisioned communion was with the very archetypes of the nation’s priesthood. And for a group that considered itself to be Israel as it ought to be – its righteous remnant and undefiled priesthood – this privileged relationship with the God-ordained celebrants-in-chief would have been a powerful claim. The passages that most explicitly juxtapose nationalist sentiments with liturgical angelic fellowship are 1QH = 14 and 1QS 11; but it is interesting that in 4Q181, 4Q511, 1QSb 3-4, and throughout the *Hodayot*, angelic communion is mentioned in close proximity to statements that point to the *Yahad* as God’s people or “Israel.” Thus, what I highlighted as a feature of martial angelic fellowship

\(^{233}\) Harkins, “A New Proposal,” 132, 134 n. 63; cf. eadem, “Reading the Qumran Hodayot,” 39, who suggests (as noted above) that as one progresses through the individual psalms of 1QH =, the speaker increases his standing before God. It should be noted, however, that the *SGH* witnesses are found in various places in other mss: cols. 3-4 of 4Q427 and in col. 1 of 4Q431; see Schuller, DJD 29, 86, 96, 202-203.
is also on display in this chapter: present liturgical fellowship with the angelic priests was an integral component of what it meant to be ideal Israel.

With these things in mind, one can understand why it is apposite to describe SSS as an ideal text at Qumran: first, for its tour de force treatment of the heavenly temple, and, second, because of its proposed function (as a liturgical text) in facilitating common worship with the angelic priests. SSS therefore helped to compensate for the Yabat's separation from Jerusalem by providing access to a pure temple and priesthood. Yet it would be a mistake to think that the significance of this access is exhausted simply by the fact that the sectarians could worship in a functioning and undefiled sanctuary: access to the celestial temple meant that the sectarian priesthood could indeed be reckoned with the model priesthood of heavenly Israel (cf. SSS 2:24-26).

But whereas the Hodayot, SSS, and other texts suggest that the sectarians considered themselves to be equal in rank to the angels, laid claim to the angels, and/or occasionally hinted that they surpassed the angels in some sense, at least one recension of the SGH seems to take these lofty estimations a presumptuous step further in that a priest – and by extension, his fellow sectarians – boasts that his/their glory, knowledge, teaching, and rank surpass that of any angel. For those who believed themselves to be ideal Israel, there is perhaps only one claim that would have been more identity-shaping and identity-asserting than to claim fellowship with the Israel's archetypal priests, and the implied answer to the rhetorical question, מילה ים, ימי ואלפים, contains this very boast: that membership in the Yabat's reconstitution of the covenant of Israel resulted in a glory and rank that surpassed all the divine beings. Indeed, what better way for the sectarians to promote themselves as ideal Israel than to suggest that they exceed the angels of archetypal, heavenly Israel?
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSIONS

6.1: OVERVIEW

I began this thesis by noting the late Second Temple Period conviction that certain angels were closely associated with Israel, and I placed these angels in one of two categories – guardians and priests – though in some cases angels served in a dual capacity. Chapter One continued with a history of research, which included numerous observations scholars have made about angels in the DSS and sectarian identity at Qumran as well as suggestions as to how scholarship might be advanced; from that survey, three observations and two suggestions emerged as especially pertinent to my investigation: 1.) the importance of ancient apocalyptic worldviews, which envisioned a correspondence, connection, or parallel between Israel and the angels; 2.) the priority of the heavenly realm, which constituted the archetypal or “more real” world; 3.) the fact that the Yahad considered itself to be the true or ideal Israel of God; 4.) the call for a more thorough study of the intersection of angelology and sectarian identity; and 5.) the proposal that a comparison of the sectarian angelic fellowship passages might reveal what they share in common. Bringing these points together, I have endeavored to show that the sectarian notion of angelic fellowship went beyond the relatively widespread idea that God’s people correspond to the angels or had some kind of connection with them. More specifically, I have argued that since the angelic guardians and priests with whom the sectarians were claiming fellowship were viewed as heavenly or archetypal Israel, boasts of angelic fellowship would have enhanced the Yahad’s estimation of itself as true Israel. Indeed, a commonality among the angelic fellowship texts is that they make important contributions to the Yahad’s identity as Israel as it ought to be.
6.2: ANE AND HEBREW BIBLE BACKGROUNDS OF ANGELIC GUARDIANS AND PRIESTS

In order to understand and discuss angels associated with Israel in as comprehensive a manner as possible, Chapter Two was devoted to an examination of the conceptual backgrounds of angelic guardians and priests in the ANE literature and in pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic passages of the Hebrew Bible. Though the ANE texts can portray the terrestrial temple as the counterpart of a god’s heavenly abode, the Hebrew Bible does not explicitly depict the wilderness tabernacle or the Jerusalem sanctuary as a mirror of Yahweh’s heavenly dwelling, though there are instances of enthronement language and temple imagery in a celestial context (cf. 1 Kgs 22:19-21; Isa 6:1-13; Ezek 1:1-28), and some scholars have allowed that מִזְרָח (cf. Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8; 1 Chr 28:19) refers to a heavenly “archetype” and not simply a “blueprint.” Similarly, there are only hints of the existence of the beings who might officiate in a heavenly temple, namely, the priest-like garb of the angels in Ezek 9:2-10:6 (cf. Exod 39:2ff; Lev 6:10) and the phraseology of Isa 63:9, which was likely the inspiration for the late Second Temple Period priestly angelic class known as the “angels of the presence.”

While there is more material to consider when it comes to deciphering the background of angelic guardians, again only an outline of their development is possible. I highlighted both the Canaanite conception of the divine council, which depicts the high god, El, presiding over the assembly, and how this Canaanite type-scene has influenced Deut 32:8-9 and Ps 82. Moreover, I underscored the importance of Deut 32:8-9, which portrays the gods of the nations as ontologically distinct from and inferior to Yahweh but in a morally-neutral light. Conversely, Ps 82, 2 Kgs 18:32b-35 (cf. Isa 36:18-20), and Isa 24:21-23 depict the gods of the nations as unjust, insubordinate, and hostile to Yahweh; these gods also
impact the actions of humans, thus revealing the belief that what happens in heaven is somehow connected to what happens on earth. This, in conjunction with the fact that most LXX witnesses of Deut 32:8-9 translate בֵּין אָנָלֵגְיֵנִים as ἀγγέλων θεοῦ (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1), suggests that the angels associated with the Gentile nations as depicted in late Second Temple Period compositions (e.g., Dan 10) – as well as hostile trans-national, angelic combatants like the Angel of Darkness or Belial (e.g., 1QM) – are likely indebted conceptually to the gods of the nations.

6.3: The Emergence of Angels Associated with Israel

But even a cursory comparison of pre-exilic, exilic, and early post-exilic texts with the late Second Temple Period compositions found among the DSS reveals that a significant development had transpired: the latter texts are suggestive of the belief that Yahweh had largely consigned his guardianship prerogatives to angels, a notion which seemingly contradicts Deut 32:8-9. A few texts demonstrate that the older, Deuteronomistic conviction was either upheld (cf. Sir 17:17) or exhibit a robust angelology and thus stand in a degree of logical tension when they appear to be sympathetic to Deut 32:8-9 (cf. Jub. 15:30-32; 1QM 13:9-14). In the case of Jubilees, it may have been that a priestly epithet (and vocation) for the “angel of the presence” was thought to justify the juxtaposition of this figure’s guardian-like characteristics with the echo of Deut 32:8-9 in Jub. 15:30-32; more broadly, it may have been that the existence of angelic guardians was not deemed to be in defiance of Deut 32:8-9 for the simple reason that angels are never portrayed as completely self-sufficient and that victory is always dependent on the decisive support, intervention, or judgment of God, who was likely still considered to be Israel’s guardian in an ultimate sense (cf. Dan 7:22; 1 En. 1:9;
90:15-17; 100:4; *Bod.* Col. b 21-22; 1QS 3:24; 1QM 12:8; 1QH* h* 11:35). I also pointed out that a benefit of angels (rather than God himself) being cast as the direct adversaries of the wicked angels is that such a scenario simultaneously exalts the God of Israel (i.e., even his righteous angelic forces are relatively competent to contend against the angelic forces of evil) and belittles the wicked angelic opponents, who are not worthy of confronting Yahweh directly. Regardless, the overarching picture of the late Second Temple Period compositions found among the DSS is one that is comfortable with the notion of Israel having a high-profile heavenly guardian other than Yahweh; I even tentatively suggested that the Canaanite imagery of Dan 7 – specifically, the superior-subordinate pattern of the El-Baal relationship – may have been perceived as a useful way to counter the roughly contemporaneous echoes of Deut 32:8-9 in Sir 17:17 and *Jub.* 15:30-32. Additionally, that the late Second Temple Period texts found at Qumran can contain detailed descriptions of a celestial sanctuary served by angelic priests suggests an increasing comfort with/interest in this concept, as well.

6.4: Affinities Between Non-Sectarian and Sectarian Texts

In light of the fact that the non-sectarian texts constituted part of the ancestral patrimony of the *Yahad*, it is hardly surprising that there are a number of affinities between the late Second Temple Period texts of a non-sectarian provenance (Chapter Three) and the sectarian texts (Chapters Four and Five). First, virtually all of the texts discussed in these chapters point to the belief that there was some sort of connection between Israel and its angelic guardians, and that a hallmark of this relationship was protection: I noted that an envisioned tutelary correspondence between Israel and the angels may be responsible for the genitival construction “people of the holy ones” (cf. Dan 7:27; 8:24; 1QM 6:6; 16:1); other texts are
clear that the nation’s angelic succor is ready, willing, and able to protect the people of God when they are confronted by hostile angelic forces, and that it is implied that this angelic succor was a reward for those who take seriously *halakhic* matters and devotion to Torah (cf. Tob 5:4ff; 1QS 3:20-25). An important practical outworking of this protection was the conviction that angels aid Israel by intervening in both terrestrial battles (e.g., *1 En.* 90:14; cf. 2 Macc 11:6-12) and heavenly wars which may parallel strife on earth (e.g., Dan 7-12; *1 En.* 10:1ff; 4Q402 frg. 4 7-10); it was also anticipated that angels would have a significant role in God’s definitive eschatological judgment (e.g., *1 En.* 1:9; *11QMelch*; 1QM). Unquestionably, the revealed knowledge that Israel had such angelic guardianship would have served as a profound encouragement to Jews struggling on earth.

Another commonality non-sectarian and sectarian texts have is that it is not only Israel’s angelic guardians who were thought to have a connection to the people: the angelic priests of the celestial sanctuary were also thought to have a special relationship with Israel. Despite the corruption of some angelic or human priests, the revelation of a glorious and functioning heavenly temple would have confirmed its own efficacy and undergirded (at least in theory) the Jerusalem temple and priesthood (e.g., *1 En.* 14:8-23; SSS). The knowledge of the angelic priests’ intercessory role (e.g., *1 En.* 8:4-10:22; 90:14; 99:3; 104:1) would have been an additional source of encouragement, and suggestions of a connection Israel’s priests shared with heaven’s priests implies that sacerdotal practice on earth was both ideally informed and enhanced by the revealed mysteries of its heavenly archetype (cf. *Bod.* Col. b 21-22; 4Q545 frg. 4 16; 4Q401 frg. 14 2:7). Thus, the highest aspiration and loftiest prayer that could be offered for Israel’s priests and their leadership was that they would be like the priestly “angels of the presence,” who serve in closest proximity to God (cf. *Jub.* 31:14; 1QSb
Lastly, numerous non-sectarian and sectarian passages suggest that the longed-for culmination of a relationship with the angels was post-mortem angelic fellowship and angel-like glorification (cf. Dan 12:3; 1 En. 104:2-6; 4Q181 frg. 1 2:3-4; 1QSb 1:5; 3:22-27; 4:24-26).

6.5: The Uniqueness of the Sectarian Perspective

However, the commonalities between non-sectarian and sectarian texts examined in this thesis are overshadowed by crucial differences. First, whereas non-sectarian texts imply definitions of Israel that are either quite generous (e.g., Dan 7-12; Jubilees) or more stringent but (paradoxically) tempered by universalistic sentiments (e.g., 1 En. 10:21; 90:36; 91:14), we have seen that sectarian texts assert the Yabud as the true or ideal Israel of God (cf. 1QS 1:16-3:12; 5:20-22), and that this is emphasized via the appropriation of biblical epithets for Israel such as “house of holiness” and “eternal planting” (cf. 1QS 11:7-9; 1QH* 14:17) and dualistic self-designations such as the “sons of light” (cf. 1QS 3:13-4:26; 11QMe 2:8-9; 1QM 1:1ff; 17:7). Tellingly, even other Jews who reject the sectarian reconstitution of Israel are dubbed “violators of the covenant” (cf. 1QM 2:1). A second difference – and what might be viewed as an angelological implication of the first – is that sectarian texts evince the belief that Israel’s angelic guardians had a unique connection to the Yabud, who had effectively usurped for themselves the privileges that were formerly those of the entire nation. That an exclusive relationship with the angels was an integral component of what it meant to be ideal Israel can be seen in both the Community Rule’s placement of the Treatise in the Two Spirits, which itself gives pride of place to the theme of angelic guardianship (cf. 1QS 3:20-25), and the way the sectarians refer to themselves as the “inheritance” (יִדְוָה) of Melchizedek” (cf. 11QMelch 2:5) – a designation which elsewhere refers to the entirety of Israel as Yahweh’s “inheritance” (cf.
Deut 32:8-9). But the most profound difference between the non-sectarian and sectarian texts is this: whereas the former texts are relatively confident that angelic guardians and priests had important roles to play in the life of God’s people, the latter texts boast of fellowship with these angels prior to death.

I highlighted the *War Scroll’s* claims that the great eschatological war would be characterized by the sectarians fighting side-by-side with the angels (cf. 1QM 7:6; 12:8-9), arguing that the outlook of the text is not simply that the angels will be *for* and *with* the soldiers as they are in other texts: the distinctive picture of the *War Scroll* is that the angels, led by Michael – who was likely known by various names including Melchizedek, the Angel of (God’s) Truth, and the Prince of Light – would fight *in conjunction with* the warriors of true, earthly Israel, the sectarian soldiers, who are together referred to as “God’s lot” (cf. 1QM 17:8). A connection between the Michael-led angels and sectarian-defined Israel suggests that the former constitute heavenly Israel as per Dan 7-12, and the amalgam of heavenly Israel and earthly Israel into one eschatological army suggests that the sectarians had widened the apocalyptic notion that what happens on earth is a reflection of heavenly realities. Thus, the *War Scroll* resembles yet exceeds the *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and *11QMelchizedek* in that the Yahad’s unique relationship with their angelic guardians was thought to be an integral component of what it meant to be ideal Israel. The *War Scroll* is therefore also expressing more than angelic “assistance” and is rightly described as containing a martial and eschatological example of angelic fellowship. That a presumptuous, angel-human mutuality was the foundation for these convictions is suggested by the following observation: the *War Scroll* not only echoes the Book of Daniel and *11QMelchizedek* in that it uses the genitival construction the “people of the holy ones” (cf. 1QM 10:10; 12:8; Dan 7:27; 8:24; *11QMelch*
2:9), it also employs the reverse phrase, the “holy ones of the people” (cf. 1QM 6:6; 16:1; also see 4Q511 frg. 2 6), which implies that the sectarians somehow laid claim to their heavenly comrades. This presumption is enhanced by the possibility that the War Scroll was once connected to Recension B of the Self-Glorification Hymn, since the boasts of the priestly “I” voice suggest that the speaker and, by extension, the sectarian troops he is presumably exhorting, are “reckoned with the gods” and that (at least) no other human “can compare” to him/them (cf. 4Q491 frg. 11 8, 14).

My examination of the Hodayot’s angelic fellowship passages highlighted boasts of liturgical fellowship as a present benefit of membership in the covenant community (cf. 1QH* 7:17-19; 8:14-16; 11:20-24; 19:13-17), and that the fellowship so envisioned is with the priestly “angels of the presence” (cf. 1QH* 14:16). This picture of present liturgical fellowship is corroborated by passages in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (passim), the Community Rule (cf. 1QS 11:7-9), the Pesher on the Periods B (cf. 4Q181 frg. 1 2:3-4), Songs of the Sage (cf. 4Q511 frg. 2 1:7-10; frg. 35 3-4), the Self-Glorification Hymn (cf. 4Q491 frg. 11 1:14, 18; 4Q427 frg. 7 1:10-11), and (if read proleptically) the Rule of Blessings (cf. 1QSb 3-4).

Double entendres serve to emphasize that to have a נפש with the angels in a heavenly נפש (cf. 1QH* 11:22; 19:16; 1QS 2:22-23; 6:12; 11:8); that the Yahad (םיה) articulates a main purpose of angelic fellowship as the praise of God “in a common rejoicing” (םיחה מיח) is perhaps the most identity-defining example (cf. 1QH* 11:24; 19:17) of this kind of word-play. Similarly, the use of deliberate terminological ambiguity, which applies angelic designations (e.g., קדוש, שֵׁם) to the sectarians (cf. 1QH* 14:17; 19:14-16) or human designations (e.g., נפש) to angels (cf. 4Q400 frg. 1 1:6;
4Q511 frg. 2 1:10; frg. 35 3-4) underscores the extent to which angelic fellowship was considered a hallmark of sectarian life.

More importantly, the significance of the fact that angelic fellowship is specified as occurring with the priests of the heavenly temple is that the sectarians are thereby boasting of a unique relationship with the very archetypes of Israel’s priesthood. Given that the Yahad asserted itself as true Israel, fellowship with the God-ordained celebrants-in-chief of the heavenly sanctuary would have made a powerful contribution to their claims to be Israel as it ought to be. The juxtaposition of angelic fellowship claims and the use of the epithets “eternal plant(ing)” and “house of holiness” (cf. 1QH 14:16-21; 1QS 11:7-9), as well as the use of תֵּיבָנִים to refer to both the sectarian “house” and the heavenly temple (cf. 1QS 11:8; 4Q403 frg. 1 1:41, 44; 4Q405 frg. 14-15 1:6; 11Q17 frgs. 2-1-9 line 7), suggest that the sect saw a correlation between angelic fellowship and its assertions to be true Israel. Additional support for this correlation is found in the proposals that angelic fellowship texts were recited as part of the Yahad’s annual covenant renewal ceremony on Shavuot; especially noteworthy in this regard are the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, as the arrangement of this text indicates that it would have been post-Shavuot – that is, only after initial admittance or recommitment to the sectarian reconstitution of Israel – that the attentions of the sect members would have been turned to the most detailed depictions of attendant angels of the debir/merkavah (Song 12) and the angelic high priests and their regalia (Song 13). While it is common to view the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice as one of the ritual mechanisms that afforded the Yahad access to a functioning and undefiled sanctuary, the significance of this access was not just that it compensated for their separation from Jerusalem: access to the celestial temple meant that the priestly sectarians could indeed be reckoned with Israel’s archetypal
priests (cf. 4Q400 frg. 2 6), whom the Yabod also strove to emulate. As with the War Scroll, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice reveal that the posture adopted by the sectarians was presumptuous insofar as they respond to their own brief expressions of unworthiness vis-à-vis the angels with a resolute cohortative of praise (cf. 4Q400 frg. 2 6-8); the sectarians also address the angels with numerous imperatival calls to worship, and the Yabod may even have been convinced that, due to their exemplary worship of God, they were the recipients of the blessings of the angelic high priests (Songs 6 and 8). Thus, life in the sectarian covenant not only included angelic fellowship but also seems to have promoted the grandiose self-estimation that the members of the Yabod were, in some sense, equal to the angels associated with Israel. But as lofty as these claims are, at least one recension of the Self-Glorification Hymn testifies to a much loftier boast, when the speaker of Recension A asks: “Who is like me among the heavenly beings?” (cf. 4Q427 frg. 7 1:8; 4Q431 frg. 1 1:4). The implied answer, of course, is “no one,” indicating that the speaker and his fellow sectarians are peerless, even among the angels – presumably including the angels associated with Israel.

We are now in a better position to see the uniqueness of the sectarian texts vis-à-vis the non-sectarian texts. To be sure, the idea encountered in some non-sectarian texts – that authority is drawn from the pseudepigraphical attribution to an ancient hero, who has been granted a privileged, revelatory experience, and who is likely a stand-in for a given work’s author(s) – is bold. However, this is rather unexceptional in comparison to the Yabod and its leadership openly claiming that they have fellowship with the angels and are either a.) equal to the angels in some sense; or b.) have attained a rank and glory higher than the angels. To reiterate Newsom’s point cited earlier, all claims made at Qumran were, in part, counter
claims to those made by other Second Temple Period Jews.\(^1\) And for those who were convinced that the sectarian reconstitution of Israel’s covenant was the nation as it ought to be, there would have been no better way to promote the *Yahad* as such than to boast that the sect members were equal to – and even outranked – the guardians and priests of heavenly, archetypal Israel. While scholars have sometimes disagreed as to the precise meaning of angelic fellowship claims,\(^2\) this thesis has demonstrated that at least part of the meaning is to be found in the contribution these claims make to the identity of the sect as the true or ideal Israel of God.

---

1 Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 3; see p. 26, above.
2 As noted by Schuller, “Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot,” 151; see p. 29, above.
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