

PRIESTHOOD, CULT, AND TEMPLE IN THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS

PRIESTHOOD, CULT, AND TEMPLE IN THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS FROM QUMRAN

By ROBERT E. JONES III, B.A., M.Div.

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

McMaster University © Copyright by Robert E. Jones III, June 2020

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2020) Hamilton, Ontario (Religious Studies)

TITLE: Priesthood, Cult, and Temple in the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran

AUTHOR: Robert E. Jones III, B.A. (Eastern University), M.Div. (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Daniel A. Machiela

NUMBER OF PAGES: xiv + 321

ABSTRACT

My dissertation analyzes the passages related to the priesthood, cult, and temple in the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran. The Aramaic Scrolls comprise roughly 15% of the manuscripts found in the Qumran caves, and testify to the presence of a flourishing Jewish Aramaic literary tradition dating to the early Hellenistic period (ca. late fourth to early second century BCE). Scholarship since the mid-2000s has increasingly understood these writings as a corpus of related literature on both literary and socio-historical grounds, and has emphasized their shared features, genres, and theological outlook. Roughly half of the Aramaic Scrolls display a strong interest in Israel's priestly institutions: the priesthood, cult, and temple. That many of these compositions display such an interest has not gone unnoticed. To date, however, few scholars have analyzed the priestly passages in any given composition in light of the broader corpus, and no scholars have undertaken a comprehensive treatment of the priestly passages in the Aramaic Scrolls. My dissertation fills these lacunae.

After a brief introduction to the dissertation in Chapter 1, Chapter 2 gives an overview and assessment of earlier treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls. Chapters 3 through 5 offer analyses of the passages related to the priesthood, cult, and temple found in fourteen of the approximately thirty Aramaic Scrolls, dealing with each composition in turn. In Chapter 6, I synthesize the material in the previous three chapters, and show that the Aramaic Scrolls reflect a remarkably consistent conception of Israel's priestly institutions. By way of conclusion in Chapter 7, I situate the Aramaic Scrolls in the context of broader scholarly proposals concerning the history of the Second Temple Jewish priesthood, and demonstrate how this corpus can shed new light on an otherwise poorly documented period in Jewish history, namely, the pre-Hasmonean, Hellenistic period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since I began my time at McMaster six years ago, Daniel Machiela has been a mentor, teacher, and friend. I could not have asked for a more erudite, attentive, and encouraging supervisor. I am grateful for his critical eye and his unwavering support. I am also deeply indebted to the rest of my supervisory committee. I have learned so much from Eileen Schuller over the past few years. She possesses an encyclopedic knowledge of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in addition to being a dedicated teacher and a model for careful, rigorous scholarship. Hanna Tervanotko was a late, but welcomed, addition to the committee. I had already benefited immensely from her published work prior to her arrival at McMaster, and I was thrilled to have her on board when she joined our Department in 2017. All three members of my supervisory committee are not only respected scholars in the fields of Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism, but they also routinely demonstrate their selfless commitment to their students. I am thankful for their expertise, insight, and time. I am also thankful to the entire Department of Religious Studies at McMaster University. It has been a great honor and a great joy to study and teach alongside such an impressive and collegial group of professors and graduate students.

A significant portion of Chapters 3 and 5 were written at the Qumran Institute at the University of Groningen during my time as a Dirk Smilde Scholar in the spring of 2018. I must extend my sincerest thanks and appreciation to the Dirk Smilde family, the Ubbo Emmius Fonds, Mladen Popović, and the entire Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Groningen. I would also like to express my gratitude to George Brooke, who read and commented on a draft of Chapter 2 while I was in Groningen, and to Gareth Wearne, my fellow Dirk Smilde Scholar, with whom I had the pleasure of discussing our research projects over pints of Belgian beer. After three trips to Groningen while pursuing my Ph.D., it has become something of an

academic home away from home, and I am thankful for all of my friends and colleagues there who have welcomed me into their rich and vibrant scholarly community.

I would also be remiss if I did not offer a word of thanks to the professors at Eastern University, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, and the University of Pittsburgh who took an interest in my work, especially Carl Mosser, Raymond Van Leeuwen, Kenton Sparks, Edith Humphrey, and Jason van Ehrenkrook. Without them, I would have had neither the skills nor the confidence to pursue further graduate study. I am grateful for their continued friendship and support.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my family. Their unfailing love has sustained me through this long and often arduous process. I could not have done it without them. My parents-in-law, Jay and Lori, welcomed me wholeheartedly into the Sofianek family almost seven years ago. One of the true joys of studying in Hamilton was being able to make so many trips to their house in Rochester, NY. Throughout the Ph.D. process, their home became a place for much needed rest, laughter, and conversation (not to mention good food and drink). I am very thankful for their love and support, and I am proud to call them Mom and Dad. My own parents, Bob and Debbie, have always been a source of inspiration for me. They taught me the value of hard work and the importance of a good education from a very young age. They made countless sacrifices for me and my sister, Rebecca, over the years. I would not be who or where I am without their love, wisdom, kindness, patience, persistence, and support. I am deeply grateful for them. Finally, I must acknowledge my sincere gratitude for Kyle, my wife, partner, and best friend. She has been my companion for over a decade, and no words could ever express how thankful I am for her. I could not have accomplished this goal without her constant love and selfless support. We have called many places “home” since we first met. But no matter where we have been or where we go next, home will always be where you are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....1

1.1 Introducing the Dissertation.....1

1.2 Introducing the Material.....4

1.3 Overview of the Dissertation.....5

CHAPTER 2: THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS IN SCHOLARLY CONTEXT.....8

2.1 Introduction.....8

2.2 Earlier Treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls.....10

2.3 Classifying the Aramaic Scrolls.....14

2.4 The Aramaic Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptures.....20

2.5 The Aramaic Scrolls and Apocalyptic Literature/Apocalypticism.....24

2.6 The Aramaic Scrolls and Foreign Culture.....30

2.7 The Aramaic Scrolls and the Qumran Sectarian Writings.....35

2.8 Conclusion.....37

CHAPTER 3: FROM ENOCH TO ABRAHAM.....40

3.1 Introduction.....40

3.2 The Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36).....41

3.2.1 The Priestly Qualities of Enoch and the Angelic Host.....42

3.2.2 Exogamy as a Violation of Priestly Prohibitions.....45

3.2.3 The Earthly Temple, Jerusalem, and the Eschaton.....47

3.2.4 The Heavenly Realm as a Temple.....48

3.2.5 Conclusion.....54

Excursus: Criticism of the Jerusalem Priesthood in the Book of Watchers?

1 Introduction.....55

2 Suter, Nickelsburg, and the Foundations of a Consensus.....56

3 Critical Responses to Suter and Nickelsburg.....60

4 Condemning the Contemporary Jerusalem Priesthood?.....60

5 Polemicizing against Menstrual Impurity?.....62

6	A Problematic Methodology?.....	64
7	Conclusion.....	66
3.3	The Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90).....	67
3.4	The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17).....	75
3.5	The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20).....	78
3.5.1	Noah’s Atoning Sacrifice.....	79
3.5.2	Abraham’s Cultic Activity.....	86
3.5.3	Conclusion.....	88
CHAPTER 4: FROM JACOB TO AARON.....		89
4.1	Introduction.....	89
4.2	Testament of Jacob? (4Q537).....	89
4.2.1	A Vision of the Temple Cult.....	91
4.2.2	The Temple and Its Environs.....	92
4.2.3	Priests, Sacrificial Procedure, and Consumption.....	95
4.2.4	Conclusion.....	96
4.3	New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554–555, 5Q15, 11Q18).....	96
4.3.1	Gates, Boulevards, and the Location of the Temple.....	99
4.3.2	The Architecture of the Temple.....	106
4.3.3	The Priesthood and Its Rituals.....	110
4.3.3.1	Priestly Organization.....	111
4.3.3.2	High Priestly Vestments.....	115
4.3.3.3	Showbread Ritual.....	117
4.3.3.4	Sacrifice.....	121
4.3.4	Conclusion.....	124
4.4	Aramaic Levi Document (1Q21; 4Q213–214b).....	125
4.4.1	The Elevation of Levi.....	126
4.4.2	The Foundations of Levi’s Priesthood.....	127
4.4.3	The Eternal Duration of Levi’s Priesthood.....	134
4.4.4	The Character of Levi’s Priesthood.....	136
4.4.4.1	Cultic.....	137

4.4.4.2	Scribal-Sapiential.....	139
4.4.4.3	Royal.....	144
4.4.4.4	Judicial.....	146
4.4.5	Summary.....	149
4.4.6	Socio-Historical Context.....	150
4.4.7	Conclusion.....	160
4.5	Apocryphon of Levi ^{b?} (4Q541).....	161
4.5.1	An Eschatological Priest.....	164
4.5.2	An Interpretative Background.....	168
4.5.3	Noah and the Eschatological Priest.....	170
4.5.4	Conclusion.....	173
4.6	The Testament of Qahat (4Q542).....	174
4.6.1	Inheritance and the Priesthood.....	174
4.6.2	Priestly Language.....	179
4.6.3	The Elevation of Qahat.....	181
4.6.4	Conclusion.....	182
4.7	Visions of Amram (4Q543–547).....	183
4.7.1	Priestly Material in Amram’s Dream-Vision.....	185
4.7.2	Aaron’s Priesthood.....	187
4.7.3	The Priestly Genealogy.....	189
4.7.4	Cultic Activity.....	190
4.7.5	Conclusion.....	192
CHAPTER 5: MISCELLANEOUS COMPOSITIONS.....		194
5.1	Introduction.....	194
5.2	Tobit (4Q196–199).....	194
5.2.1	Tobit’s Jerusalem-centric Piety.....	195
5.2.2	The Historic and Future Role of Jerusalem and Its Temple.....	200
5.2.2.1	Jerusalem and the Temple in Tobit’s Zion Song.....	201
5.2.2.2	Jerusalem and the Temple in Tobit’s Prophecy.....	205
5.2.3	Conclusion.....	209

5.3	Pseudo-Daniel ^c (4Q245).....	210
5.4	Unidentified Text A (4Q562).....	214
5.5	Biblical Chronology (4Q559).....	218
CHAPTER 6: SYNTHESIS.....		220
6.1	Introduction.....	220
6.2	The Priesthood.....	220
6.2.1	Cultic Obligations.....	221
6.2.2	Scribal-Sapiential Qualities and Activities.....	223
6.2.3	Judicial Responsibilities.....	226
6.2.4	A Royal Priesthood.....	227
6.2.5	Miscellaneous.....	228
6.2.6	The Levitical-Priestly Genealogy.....	232
6.2.7	The Priesthood and the Patriarchs of Israel.....	235
6.2.8	The Priesthood and the Prediluvian Age.....	236
6.2.9	The Perpetual Endurance of the Priesthood.....	237
6.2.10	The Organization of the Priesthood.....	240
6.3	The Cult.....	243
6.3.1	Sacrificial Procedure.....	244
6.3.2	Scriptural Engagement.....	246
6.3.3	A Cultic Worldview.....	248
6.4	Jerusalem and the Temple(s).....	250
6.4.1	Descriptions of the City and Temple.....	251
6.4.2	The City and Temple in Israel's History and Future.....	255
6.4.3	A Cult Outside of Jerusalem?.....	258
6.5	Conclusion.....	259
CHAPTER 7: SITUATING THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS: A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL.....		263
7.1	The Aramaic Scrolls in Context.....	263
7.2	Levites, Aaronides, and Zadokites.....	266
7.2.1	A Zadokite Priesthood?.....	270

7.2.2	A Bipartite Division of the Priesthood: Priests and Levites.....	273
7.3	Priests and Scribes.....	276
7.3.1	“The Scribes”.....	279
7.3.2	Scribalism and Priestly Authority.....	281
7.3.3	Socio-Historical Reality.....	285
7.3.3.1	The Religio-Political Status of the Temple.....	286
7.3.3.2	Temple Scribes.....	286
7.3.3.3	Priests as the Educated Class.....	287
7.3.4	Recent Work on Priests and Scribes.....	287
7.3.5	Summary.....	293
7.4	Conclusion.....	293
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	297

LIST OF TABLES

Table I: Gates of the New Jerusalem.....101
Table II: A Comparison of Lev 21:14–15 and ALD 6:4.....157
Table III: Tobit’s Use of Deuteronomy 33.....208
Table IV: A Comparison of Cultic Language.....245

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of primary sources follow those in the SBL Handbook of Style, 2d ed. For all other abbreviations, see below:

AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
ANESSup	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv Orientali</i>
AS	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
ATTM	Beyer, Klaus. <i>Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus des Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Band 1</i> . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
ATTM 2	Beyer, Klaus. <i>Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus des Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Band 2</i> . Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DQA	Cook, Edward M. <i>Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic</i> . Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
<i>EDEJ</i>	<i>The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism</i>
EJIL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>

<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>JAAJ</i>	<i>Judaïsme Ancien – Ancient Judaism</i>
<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JAJSup	Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBT</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal of the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSSSup	Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigraph: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
OTS	Old Testament Studies
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i>
RI	Recherches Intertestamentaires
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses</i>

SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBM	Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien
SCS	Septuagint Commentary Series
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TSJTSA	Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WAC	Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation</i> . Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperOne, 2005.
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introducing the Dissertation

The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls bear witness to the presence of a flourishing Jewish Aramaic literary tradition in Palestine during the Hellenistic period. The official publication of most of the Aramaic Scrolls by Émile Puech in DJD in 2001 and 2009 has prompted various attempts to delineate how they relate to the rest of the Qumran finds, especially the so-called sectarian writings. Scholars have, in general, dated the original composition of the vast majority of the Aramaic Scrolls to the late Persian or early Hellenistic periods; this makes them, for the most part, not only pre-sectarian, but pre-Hasmonean as well. The Aramaic Scrolls thus provide us with a window into a poorly attested, and therefore poorly understood, era of ancient Jewish history. A few of the Aramaic compositions discovered at Qumran were already known to scholars in some form or another, and have long histories of interpretation (i.e., Tobit; Dan 2–7; 1 Enoch; the Aramaic Levi Document). The rest of the roughly thirty distinct compositions were previously unknown, and still have yet to be fully integrated into our research paradigms.

Several initial treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls have begun to demonstrate that a significant swath of them share a striking number of traits in common, such that it has become typical to refer to these compositions collectively as a corpus, and to analyze them in light of one another. However, systematic analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus is still in its infancy, and there is still much ambiguity with regard to exactly what is implied by the term corpus. There is a growing recognition, though, that these compositions share a literary and socio-historical context, and that approaching them as a corpus might help to clarify their relationship to one another. One of the traits that unites the Aramaic Scrolls is their overwhelming interest in matters related to the

priesthood, cult, and temple: priests and priest-like protagonists, the priestly genealogy, the minutiae of sacrificial procedure, and the Jerusalem temple all occupy a prominent place in the religious vision of a high percentage of these compositions. That these compositions display an interest in the priesthood, cult, and temple has not gone unnoticed. A number of scholars have pointed out the priestly themes on evidence in the Aramaic Scrolls, but their discussions of those themes have been largely confined to passing remarks or to studies of one, or small clusters, of compositions (e.g., the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram). Rarely have scholars analyzed the priestly material in any given composition in light of the broader corpus, nor has a comprehensive treatment of the priestly material in the Aramaic Scrolls been attempted. It is my contention that focusing on this aspect of the Aramaic Scrolls will go a long way toward giving us a better understanding of them as a corpus, from both literary and socio-historical perspectives.

The Aramaic Scrolls provide a remarkably consistent conception of the priesthood, priestly service, the sacrificial cult, and the Jerusalem temple. Where we can compare priestly material within the corpus, we see clear similarities. The Aramaic Scrolls trace the origins of the priesthood and its sacrificial prescriptions back to Israel's prediluvian and patriarchal past; identify Levi and Aaron as prototypical priests and progenitors of an eternal priesthood; and depict priests and priest-like protagonists not only as cultic functionaries, but as learned scribes, judges, teachers, and visionaries. They give a great deal of attention to the proper stewardship of the sacrificial cult, and go to great lengths to enumerate the details of cultic procedure, without fundamentally contradicting either each other or earlier Pentateuchal legislation. They situate the Jerusalem temple at the center of religious life, unrivaled by any other native religious, cultural, or political institution, and present a religious vision involving a heavenly and eschatological temple, without

explicitly casting aspersions on the contemporary temple, except in two very specific cases (i.e., the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks). Beyond these broad thematic and conceptual affinities, moreover, there are a striking number of parallels in phraseology, which reflect a shared way of speaking about the priesthood, temple, and cult throughout the Aramaic Scrolls. Many of these similarities and parallels are inextricably connected to other traits that scholars have previously identified as uniting the Aramaic Scrolls, e.g., their shared approach to the Hebrew scriptures and their apocalyptic outlook. Focusing on the priestly and cultic aspects of the Aramaic Scrolls thus reinforces the basic contours of what several scholars have already argued in respect to the coherence of these compositions. It can also clarify and develop what it might mean to consider these compositions as a corpus.

At the end of my dissertation, I will draw upon my analysis of the priestly passages in the Aramaic Scrolls in order to offer a preliminary attempt at situating these writings in their broader socio-historical context. I will argue that most of the Aramaic Scrolls were likely the products of a class of Jewish intellectuals who shared a very specific social location and sense of identity. I will argue that a significant swath of the Aramaic Scrolls were most plausibly written by learned priests (and, possibly, Levites) who were affiliated with the Jerusalem temple, and who wrote in part to articulate a theological vision of Jewish society and, in so doing, to highlight their own central place in it. As I set out to show, reading the corpus in this manner can help us to understand better the Aramaic Scrolls themselves, but it can also illuminate an otherwise poorly documented period in the history of the Jewish priesthood, namely, the early Hellenistic period: more specifically, the roughly one hundred fifty years spanning from the writing of Chronicles to the rise of Antiochus IV.

1.2 Introducing the Material¹

The Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran were among the last to be published, and have garnered far less scholarly attention than their biblical and sectarian counterparts. Recently, however, they have generated an increasing amount of attention from Qumran specialists who are working to integrate them more fully into their understanding not only of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but of Second Temple literature and history more broadly.² Since this research is still in its early stages, it is worth briefly highlighting the shape and character of the corpus at the outset of this dissertation. The Aramaic manuscripts make up roughly 15% of the Qumran finds, or about 130 out of 904 identifiable scrolls. They represent approximately 30 distinct compositions, only a handful of which were previously known to scholars prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Aramaic manuscripts were discovered in seven of the eleven Qumran caves, with Caves 1, 3, and 4 containing the highest percentage of them. A number of the Aramaic compositions were preserved in several copies (e.g., the Visions of Amram: between 5 and 7), and a few of them were found in multiple caves (e.g., New Jerusalem in Caves 1, 2, 4, 5, and 11), attesting to the popularity of at least some of them.³

The vast majority of the extant Aramaic Scrolls are narrative texts involving pious protagonists from either pre-Mosaic or exilic times. Many of them display an apocalyptic outlook,

¹ With the exception of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, and Tobit, all of my transcriptions are based on the Aramaic Qumran manuscripts as found in their DJD editions, with translations being based on those found in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, rev. ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2013 (some slight adjustments made where necessary). For information concerning manuscripts, transcriptions, and translations for 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, and Tobit, see the footnotes in sections 3.2, 3.5, 4.4, and 5.2, respectively.

² Evidence of the burgeoning interest in the Aramaic Scrolls as a discrete corpus within the Qumran finds is reflected in the fact that there have recently been two major conferences dedicated to them in Aix-en-Provence (2008) and Copenhagen (2017). A third was scheduled to take place at Trinity Western University in Langley, BC (Canada), but has been cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The proceedings from the first two are currently available, and represent a significant contribution to the fields of Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism more broadly.

³ The statistics from this paragraph come from Daniel A. Machiela, “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Coherence and Context in the Library of Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen, STDJ 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 243–57, esp. 244–7.

which is most evident in their frequent use of dream-visions and angelic mediators as modes of divine revelation, but is also reflected in their dualistic and, at times, eschatological orientation. Other common features of the Aramaic Scrolls include: the passing on of knowledge from father to son, an interest in scribes and book lore, the regular use of wisdom terminology, and a deep concern with endogamy. The Aramaic Scrolls also reflect an impressive familiarity not only with Israel's scriptural heritage, but with the cultural traditions of foreign peoples (e.g., Gilgamesh, Ahikar, Nabonidus) and with scientific and other forms of technical knowledge, (e.g., astronomical, geographical, physiognomic, and metro-arithmetical). The Aramaic Scrolls are thus firmly rooted in the traditions of ancient Israel, but they also have a cosmopolitan flavor, and a relatively open, if cautious, attitude toward foreigners and the imperial powers. Finally, the Aramaic Scrolls display a thoroughgoing interest in the priesthood, cult, and Jerusalem temple, but, as we will see throughout this dissertation, the priestly aspects of these compositions are intertwined with their other distinctive traits and features: e.g., protagonists have both sacerdotal and scribal attributes, and are stewards of book lore; information about the priesthood, cult, and temple is revealed via dream-visions; the proper operation of the sacrificial cult requires knowledge of Babylonian-style metro-arithmetical calculation; and the Jerusalem temple plays a central role at the time of the eschaton.

1.3 Overview of the Dissertation

This dissertation accomplishes several related tasks: it gives an overview and assessment of earlier treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus (Chapter 2); it collects and analyzes all the material in the Aramaic Scrolls related to the priesthood, cult, or temple (Chapters 3 through 5); and it offers a synthesis of all the priestly material in the corpus (Chapter 6). I will also show how

my analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls in Chapters 3 through 6 can contribute to broader scholarly research on the ancient Jewish priesthood (Chapter 7).

After this present introductory chapter, I open with an overview and assessment of the history of scholarship on the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus. To my mind, there have been two major phrases in the study of these writings. Before 2007, there were certainly scholars who noticed some important commonalities amongst the Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran, with J. T. Milik and Ben-Zion Wacholder being two important examples, but a seminal article by Devorah Dimant published in 2007 initiated a period of more sustained, systematic analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus within the Qumran finds. Prior to her work, there had been no concerted effort to synthesize these compositions, draw conclusions about their relationship to one another, or situate them vis-à-vis the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since Dimant's initial article on the subject, a number of other scholars have taken up her observations, and have pushed the conversation in new, compelling directions, including Eibert Tigchelaar, Florentino García Martínez, John Collins, Daniel Machiela, and, most recently, Andrew Perrin.

The core of my dissertation is a literary analysis of the passages related to the priesthood, cult, and temple found in fourteen different compositions. This portion of the study takes up by far the most space, and is divided into three separate chapters. Chapter 3 deals with compositions whose protagonists range from the period of Enoch to that of Abraham. Chapter 4 includes the compositions that recount the exploits of Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Amram. Chapter 5 treats compositions that do not neatly fit into any particular category. It primarily involves my treatment of the Book of Tobit, but it also includes several fragmentary works. In these three chapters, each composition is considered on its own terms. Only in the sixth chapter do I attempt a broader comparative analysis in earnest.

In Chapter 6, I provide a synthesis of the material highlighted in Chapters 3 through 5, exploring whether or not the Aramaic Scrolls provide us with a consistent conception of the priesthood, cult, and temple. I answer this question in the affirmative, although I do address both continuities and discontinuities within the corpus, along with their implications. Chapter 7 brings my dissertation to a close by offering a preliminary attempt to situate my analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls within broader scholarly discussions of the history of the Second Temple Jewish priesthood, and to demonstrate how this corpus can shed new light on an otherwise poorly documented period in Jewish history, the pre-Hasmonean, Hellenistic period.

CHAPTER 2: THE ARAMAIC DEAD SCROLLS IN SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

Dimant attempted the first systematic treatment of the Aramaic literary compositions from Qumran in a landmark 2007 study, in which she sought to classify each of them according to their thematic content.⁴ In this study, Dimant also made a proposal about the relationship of the Aramaic Scrolls to the rest of the Qumran finds, particularly the so-called sectarian compositions.⁵ Much of the subsequent discussion in the secondary literature has built upon, augmented, and critiqued certain aspects of Dimant's initial study. Dimant's proposed classification, though modified by subsequent scholars, served to highlight several of the most significant common features that both unite the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus and distinguish them from the rest of the Qumran finds. Dimant observed that the Aramaic Scrolls share 1) a common approach to the Hebrew scriptures,⁶ 2) an interest in matters related to apocalypticism,⁷ and 3) an awareness of foreign, especially Mesopotamian and Iranian, traditions.⁸ Dimant has also observed that 4) the Aramaic Scrolls lack the distinct sectarian terminology shared by a number of the Qumran writings, an observation

⁴ Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. A. Hilhorst et al., JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–205.

⁵ As García Martínez acknowledges, "Dimant's is the first essay ever to attempt a thematic classification of the corpus of Aramaic writings found at Qumran." Florentino García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica apocalyptica?" in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 435–50, 435. Some of Dimant's earlier works included preliminary analyses of the Aramaic material from Qumran. However, the 2007 article was her first systematic discussion of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus that was solely dedicated to addressing both its inner-coherence and its unique place within the larger Qumran corpus. Cf. Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Content and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness, Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*, ed. D. Dimant and L. Schiffman, STDJ 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 23–58; eadem, "The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. J.H. Charlesworth, 3 vols. (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2.447–67.

⁶ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts," 202–3.

⁷ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts," 204.

⁸ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts," 204–5. Later scholars have noticed Greek and Egyptian elements as well. See section 2.6 below.

which led her to conclude that the Aramaic compositions are, on the whole, non-sectarian.⁹ This initial study set the agenda for the next several years of research on the Aramaic Scrolls, such that each of these four observations has been taken up, and discussed in further detail, by scholars like Tigchelaar, García Martínez, Collins, Machiela, and others.¹⁰

The core of this chapter will involve a treatment of the most significant studies on the Aramaic Scrolls, since and including Dimant's initial article, but it will begin with a brief assessment of the history of research in the years prior, focusing on the work of two scholars in particular: J. T. Milik and Ben Zion Wacholder. Several of these earlier studies laid the groundwork for most subsequent treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls,¹¹ and are sometimes

⁹ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts," 198–9.

¹⁰ Some of the most important treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls to date are as follows: Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts"; eadem, "Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 15–43; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*," in *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. A. Hilhorst et al., JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 257–70; idem, "Forms of Pseudepigraphy in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*, ed. J. Frey et al., WUNT 246 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 85–101; idem, "Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. M. Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010); 155–71; John J. Collins, "The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 547–64; García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica"; idem, "Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran," in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremer*, ed. J. Dijkstra et al., SHR 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 329–41; idem, "Les rapports avec l'Écriture des textes araméens trouvés à Qumrân," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. E. J. C. Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 19–40; Daniel A. Machiela, "The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Coherence and Context in the Library of Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen, STDJ 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 243–56.

¹¹ Some of which include: J. T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957); idem, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, trans. J. Strugnell (London: SCM, 1959); Stanislav Segert, "Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft," in *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. Bis 14. Oktober 1961*, ed. H. Bardtke (Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1963), 315–39; idem, "Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen aramäischen Texten von Qumrân," *ArOr* 33 (1965): 190–206; J. T. Milik, "Écrits préesseniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram," in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor (Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978), 91–106; Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus des Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Band 1* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988); Ben Zion Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. L. Schiffman (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 257–81.

overlooked in more recent scholarship.¹² After that, I will discuss the most significant studies on the Aramaic Scrolls since 2007, specifically those that analyze the Aramaic Scrolls as a distinct corpus within the Qumran finds. My treatment of this scholarship will be organized thematically as opposed to being structured as a traditional, chronological literature review. This thematic structure has the advantage of highlighting very clearly various aspects of the distinct literary and conceptual profile of the corpus. My thematic discussion will be centered around Dimant's four aforementioned observations about the Aramaic Scrolls, and will follow a section on the various attempts to classify the Aramaic Scrolls.

2.2 Earlier Treatments of the Aramaic Scrolls

As early as 1957, J. T. Milik recognized a number of the distinguishing features of the Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran that would eventually attract the attention of Dimant and others.¹³ For one, Milik suggested that these Aramaic compositions were likely written before the establishment of the sectarian settlement at Qumran.¹⁴ He later reiterated this point in an article appropriately entitled “Écrits Préesseniens de Qumrân,” in which he described the Aramaic Scrolls as part and parcel of what he categorized as “une riche littérature juive, véhiculée par la *lingua franca* des empires successifs” that began to be composed at least “à l'époque perse, et probablement bien avant.”¹⁵ Rather than being the sole possession of the Essenes, Milik suggested

¹² In a 2010 article on the Aramaic Scrolls, García Martínez noted that Wacholder's treatment of the Aramaic material from Qumran is the only article prior to those of Dimant and Tigchelaar to “focus on the specificity of the Aramaic texts as a group within the [Qumran] collection, and [to] have tried to discover different clusters of compositions among them.” García Martínez, “Scribal Practices,” 331. García Martínez also laments here that Wacholder's article has “remained largely ignored.” García Martínez, “Scribal Practices,” 331 n. 9. However, both Perrin and Machiela have in the years since 2010 included substantive discussions of the significance of Wacholder and other earlier scholars in their discussions of the history of scholarship on the Aramaic Scrolls.

¹³ Milik, *Ten Years*.

¹⁴ Milik, *Ten Years*, 139.

¹⁵ Milik, “Écrits Préesseniens,” 106.

that these texts instead “circulaient librement” across the vast reaches of imperial territory throughout the Second Temple period and even after.¹⁶ Milik also thought that the language of composition itself, as well as the subsequent translation of a number of these writings from Aramaic into Hebrew, reflected larger socio-linguistic trends during the Second Temple period, namely, “the general Jewish renaissance which started in Maccabean times.”¹⁷ Aramaic itself, he suggested, may be one possible indicator of the pre-Maccabean (and thus pre-Essene and/or pre-Qumranic) provenance of these compositions.¹⁸ On this particular point, I find myself in agreement with Milik, though we do have a small number of Aramaic writings from Qumran whose original composition date to the Maccabean period or slightly later (e.g., 4Q245).

Milik also commented briefly on a few of the defining features that these Aramaic writings share in common, specifically noting their pseudepigraphic character and their interest in priestly

¹⁶ Milik, “Écrits Préesseniens,” 106.

¹⁷ Milik, “Écrits Préesseniens,” 130.

¹⁸ The suggestion that there was a nationalistic resurgence behind the re-emergence of Hebrew as a Jewish literary language during the Maccabean revolt can be traced back to at least R. H. Charles in 1912. Charles’s argument was that, since chapters 6 through 36 of 1 Enoch were written in Aramaic, these chapters were likely to have been composed prior to the Maccabean revolt, because “once a nation recovers, or is trying to recover, its independence, we know from history that it seeks to revive its national language.” R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 170. The notion of a “Jewish renaissance” under the Hasmoneans that involved the ascendancy of Jewish Hebrew literature and the gradual decline of Jewish Aramaic literature has since become somewhat of a truism in the study of Second Temple Judaism, being oft-repeated without much sustained argumentation, see e.g. James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner’s Son, 1927), 91; H. L. Ginsberg, *Studies in Koheleth*, TSJTSA XVII (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 45; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Language of Palestine in the First Century A.D.” *CBQ* 32 (1970): 501–31, esp. 502–3; John J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 24; Michael O. Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*, JSPSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 117 n. 45. However, in recent years, a number of scholars have pointed to specific primary sources from the mid-second century BCE (i.e., Jubilees, 4Q464, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Daniel 8–12, Tobit, the Qumran sectarian literature) in order to demonstrate the explanatory value of this theory, namely, that there was a wide-spread revival of Hebrew literature in Palestine, possibly associated with the nascent nationalism of the Maccabean revolt and/or scripturalization of a body of Hebrew literature by the Hasmoneans and/or the gradual sacralization of the Hebrew language itself, see esp. Wacholder, “Judaico-Aramaic Literature,” 273–4; Seth Schwartz, “Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine,” *Past and Present* 148 (1995): 3–47, esp. 26; Milka Rubin, “The Language of Creation or the Primordial Language: A Case of Cultural Polemics in Antiquity,” *JSJ* 49 (1998): 306–33, esp. 312–3; Steve Weitzman, “Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?” *JAOS* 119 (1999): 35–45, esp. 36; David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 155–85; Andrew B. Perrin, “From *lingua franca* to *lingua sacra*: The Scripturalization of Tobit in 4QTob^e,” *VT* 66 (2016): 117–32.

matters.¹⁹ However, Milik did not comment on whether, or to what extent, these observations characterized the Qumran Aramaic corpus as a whole. These preliminary observations were explored in somewhat greater detail in Milik's 1978 article, which was a text-by-text analysis of the Aramaic compositions related to the Israelite heroes spanning from Enoch to Amram—a tacit recognition of the pre-Mosaic focus of a significant segment of the Aramaic Scrolls.²⁰ Most of the discussion in his article centered on individual compositions, but Milik did make a few general observations concerning the features that they shared in common. In particular, he noted the apocalyptic, testamentary, and pseudepigraphic character of most of them.²¹ Milik also commented on the importance of Levi and his line, and noted the significance of Levi as "l'ancêtre de la classe sacerdotale," which reinforced his earlier comments about the priestly nature of at least some of the Aramaic Scrolls.²²

Another foundational study was that of Ben Zion Wacholder (1990), who understood the Aramaic writings from Qumran to be a part of a broader "Judaean-Aramaic tradition" that spanned from roughly 500 BCE to 165 BCE. For Wacholder, this tradition included all of the Aramaic portions of the Hebrew Bible (i.e., Jer 10:10; Ezra 4:8–6:18; 7:12–26; Dan 2–7), the Aramaic compositions from Qumran, the literary materials from Elephantine, and some other miscellaneous writings.²³ Like Milik, Wacholder discussed the significance of the status of Aramaic as a language of composition for Jewish literature in the context of socio-linguistic trends sparked by the

¹⁹ Milik, *Ten Years*, 139.

²⁰ On this aspect of the Aramaic Scrolls, see section 2.3 below.

²¹ Milik, "Écrits Préesseniens," 103, 105; Although Milik was describing only a portion of the Qumran Aramaic collection, a very similar tripartite generic classification of the Aramaic texts from Qumran has been offered by both Dimant and Tigchelaar. Dimant argued that the Aramaic Scrolls were comprised "almost exclusively of visionary-pseudepigraphic compositions, testaments and narrative-aggadic works." Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 35. Tigchelaar likewise described the generic make-up of the Aramaic Scroll as "apocalyptic, aggadic, and testamentary" Tigchelaar, "Aramaic Texts," 157.

²² Milik, "Écrits Préesseniens," 103.

²³ Wacholder, "Judaean-Aramaic Literature," 259–60.

Maccabean revolt and the subsequent Hasmonean dynasty. While Jewish Aramaic literature flourished in the periods leading up to the Maccabean conflict, Wacholder argued that this literary tradition began to decline around the time of the revolt, only to be replaced by a burgeoning Hebrew literary tradition that included 1 Maccabees, Dan 8–12, Jubilees, and the Qumran sectarian compositions.²⁴ This phenomenon, Wacholder argued, was not accidental, rather it was part of a general “national awakening following the Maccabean victory.”²⁵ As Hebrew began to acquire a new level of ideological significance in the wake of the Maccabean revolt, the status of Aramaic was simultaneously devalued as a Jewish literary language.²⁶ Thus, as for Milik, Wacholder understood the Aramaic language itself to be a piece of evidence that points to the pre-Hasmonean, and therefore pre-sectarian, provenance of the Aramaic compositions from Qumran.²⁷

Wacholder was also instrumental in urging scholars “to approach these texts in terms of their interrelationship, as opposed to previous patterns of studying these documents as discrete, self-contained entities.”²⁸ Wacholder noted several “generic and topical distinctions” that were shared by a number, though not all, of the Jewish Aramaic writings from this period.²⁹ These “distinctions” included: 1) a “heptadal” and “duodecimal numerology”³⁰ 2) dream interpretation

²⁴ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 274.

²⁵ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273.

²⁶ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273.

²⁷ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273. Wacholder did, however, argue that “these works anticipated in some way the formation of the sect and its doctrine.”

²⁸ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273. This appeal would be echoed by Dimant almost two decades later in her criticism of the tendency of scholars to study texts like Tobit and *1 Enoch* in isolation, rather than interpreting them in the context of the richer Qumran Aramaic tradition of which they are a part. As Dimant has suggested specifically regarding the Qumran Aramaic writings, “As a distinct entity within the Qumran library then, the Aramaic texts should be examined separately. Only in this way do individual Aramaic compositions acquire their proper significance, and their origin and background may be investigated.” Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 199.

²⁹ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 269.

³⁰ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 270–1.

as a mode of revelation,³¹ 3) a “didactic flavor,”³² and 4) an *Urzeit und Endzeit* eschatology.³³ Finally, Wacholder noted that a significant number of the Aramaic writings from Qumran are dependent on the Hebrew scriptures.³⁴

The preliminary studies on the Aramaic Scrolls, especially those of Milik and Wacholder, were foundational for the work of later scholars. Many of the observations made by these earlier scholars continue to be discussed and debated in more recent studies on the Aramaic Scrolls. In what follows, I provide a thematic overview of the more recent scholarship on the Aramaic Scrolls as a discrete corpus within the Qumran finds, beginning in each case with the work of Dimant in 2007.

2.3 Classifying the Aramaic Scrolls

One of Dimant’s most important contributions was her six-part classification of the Aramaic Scrolls, which was the first attempt at such a systematic classification of these materials. The value of this particular taxonomy is somewhat limited as a way of organizing them, but her system of classification nevertheless led her to make a number of significant and lasting observations about the Aramaic Scrolls corpus. Dimant classified these compositions according to six broad categories: (1) Works about the Period of the Flood, (2) Works dealing with the History of the Patriarchs, (3) Visionary Compositions, (4) Legendary Narratives and Court-Tales, (5) Astronomy and Magic, and (6) Varia.³⁵

³¹ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 271–2; This particular aspect of the Aramaic Scrolls was analyzed in great detail by Andrew B. Perrin in his recent monograph *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*, JAJSup 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

³² Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 272.

³³ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 272–3.

³⁴ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 266.

³⁵ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 200–1.

García Martínez and Jonathan Ben-Dov were the first to offer a critique of this six-part classification.³⁶ As they noted, its most significant shortcoming is that the categories are not “mutually exclusive.”³⁷ Thus, as Ben-Dov correctly characterized the problem, “While some of the categories pertain to genre...others pertain to the purported historical setting of the composition.”³⁸ This discrepancy has created a scenario in which some compositions fit equally well in multiple categories, leading to the impression that the assignment of any given composition to a specific category is somewhat arbitrary (e.g., is the Book of Watchers a ‘Visionary Composition’ or a ‘Work about the Period of the Flood’?). García Martínez also pointed out that Dimant’s classification forced the Genesis Apocryphon to be split in two, with columns 0–19.13 being placed in category (1) and columns 19.14–22.34 in category (2).³⁹

In response, García Martínez proposed an alternative, somewhat simpler bipartite schema in an attempt to rectify the problems inherent in Dimant’s classification. His schema drew upon observations made by both Tigchelaar and Dimant regarding the periods of history during which the narratives of the Aramaic Scrolls are set. He pointed out that “the Aramaic literature found at Qumran is characterized by a predominant interest in ‘pre-mosaic’ protagonists or by a setting in the Diaspora.”⁴⁰ This bipartite classification has received general acceptance, as can be seen in a recent article by Machiela in which he noted, “A very large percentage of the texts are cast as narrative stories associated with either the pre-Sinai patriarchal period or the Babylonian-Persian

³⁶ García Martínez, “Scribal Practices” 332; idem, “Aramaica qumranica,” 435–6; So too Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew at Qumran: Translation and Concealment,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 379–402, esp. 379–80.

³⁷ Ben-Dov, “Scientific Writings,” 379.

³⁸ Ben-Dov, “Scientific Writings,” 379.

³⁹ García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 435–436; idem, “Scribal Practices,” 332.

⁴⁰ García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 437; idem, “Scribal Practices,” 333.

exile.”⁴¹ There is a general recognition, however, that not all of the Aramaic Scrolls fit neatly into one of these two categories. García Martínez, for example, posits that, while not every Aramaic composition from Qumran can be organized according to his bipartite classification, it is nonetheless “useful for dealing with the Aramaic corpus.”⁴² Machiela, on the other hand, uses the language of “core cluster” to differentiate the compositions that can be categorized in terms of García Martínez’s bipartite classification from those which cannot. The term “core cluster” refers to those narrative compositions that are set in either the pre-Mosaic or exilic periods. Yet, as Machiela argues:

The cluster does not include all of the Aramaic texts, some distancing themselves quite naturally from the main group; examples of such outliers are the Job translations, the documentary texts from Cave 4, the magical, physiognomic, and zodiacal texts (4Q560, 4Q561, 4Q318), the List of False Prophets (4Q339), and perhaps some very fragmentary poetic or sapiential texts (4Q563, 4Q569).⁴³

The compositions that fall outside of Machiela’s “core cluster” of Aramaic Scrolls correspond to those that comprise categories (5) and (6) in Dimant’s initial classification, that is, the categories of ‘Astronomy and Magic’ and ‘Varia,’ respectively. These works, as Dimant suggests, are “at the fringes of the Aramaic corpus” due to the fact that they “are represented only by one or two manuscripts”⁴⁴ as opposed to the compositions in categories (1), (2), (3), and (4), which correspond to the texts in Machiela’s “core cluster,” and comprise the bulk of the Aramaic writings from Qumran.

Dimant, Tigchelaar, García Martínez, and Machiela all have noted that there is a certain level of coherence among the texts that comprise the “core cluster” or bipartite schema, with

⁴¹ Machiela, “Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” 250.

⁴² García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 436; idem, “Scribal Practices,” 333.

⁴³ Machiela, “Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” 249.

⁴⁴ Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 42.

respect to their generic, thematic, and linguistic features.⁴⁵ However, García Martínez has taken this observation a step further, arguing that there is a *particular* coherence among the texts in the first category of his bipartite schema, while also suggesting that the same level of coherence cannot be applied to the second category. As García Martínez has articulated it, the compositions in the pre-Mosaic group “est le plus homogène et le mieux défini,”⁴⁶ whereas the texts in the Eastern Diaspora group “est plus diversifié (et conservé d’une manière encore plus fragmentaire).”⁴⁷

Machiela, however, has framed the relationship between the texts in these two categories—pre-Mosaic figures and Eastern Diaspora setting—somewhat differently. While not disputing the distinctive character of each category (or even the diversity of texts within each category), Machiela has attempted to discern a common thread that ties the two categories together in terms of both theme and function. Specifically, as Machiela has observed, the compositions in both categories are set during periods of history in which Israel’s “ancestors had to endure an exilic existence, without an autonomously-ruled homeland.”⁴⁸ The authors of the Aramaic Scrolls were thus, in his view, attempting to draw a parallel between the anxieties, pressures, and instability experienced by the protagonists of these stories as a result of their “exilic existence” and those experienced by their Jewish compatriots in the Hellenistic Diaspora (and, to some extent, in Hellenistic Palestine).

⁴⁵ As García Martínez has suggested concerning the profile of the corpus of Aramaic texts from Qumran, “En conséquence je crois que nous devons nous contenter de classer les textes araméens dans les deux grands groupes décelés dans l’analyse thématique, deux groupes qui, en gros, montrent des caractéristique stylistiques et formelles compatibles.” García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 21.

⁴⁶ So also Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. J.J. Collins and D. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 163–80, 170.

⁴⁷ García Martínez “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 22.

⁴⁸ Daniel A. Machiela, “Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Setting,” in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism: Engaging with John Collins’ The Apocalyptic Imagination*, ed. Cecilia Wassen and Sidnie White Crawford, JSJSup 182 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 88–109, 93. Liora Goldman has made a similar point when considering the commonalities between the Visions of Amram and Tobit. Liora Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers in the *Visions of Amram* from Qumran,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 231–50, 242.

These two approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Machiela, for example, argues that all of the Aramaic Scrolls in the core cluster “repeatedly make the same essential points,” but qualifies this statement by noting that that is nevertheless an “oversimplification of a diverse assortment of texts, each of which must be assessed and appreciated in its own right.”⁴⁹ And García Martínez recognizes that the compositions that comprise both categories, despite their diversity, “montrent des caractéristique stylistiques et formelles compatibles.”⁵⁰ Much can be attributed to the perspective of the interpreter. It is possible to focus primarily on the common features that unify the Qumran Aramaic collection, as Dimant and Machiela typically do. It is also possible to focus on the relative diversity among the collection and to highlight the ways in which the two categories can be distinguished from one another, as Tigchelaar and García Martínez have done. The Aramaic Scrolls are not entirely homogeneous. Any treatment of them must not obscure their diversity.⁵¹ However, as the rest of this chapter will demonstrate, Dimant’s initial call to study the Aramaic Scrolls as “a distinct group” among the Qumran finds on the basis of “their particular language, style, and content” has proven to be a fruitful enterprise.⁵²

One final word must be said about the bipartite classification of the “core cluster” of Qumran Aramaic compositions. We should be careful not to be too simplistic about how we characterize the distribution of the generic, literary, and thematic features shared by the compositions within each category and across the collection. Not every feature shared by one or

⁴⁹ Machiela, “Situating the Aramaic Texts” 96.

⁵⁰ García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 21.

⁵¹ One possible reason for the diversity of the collection may in fact be due to level of diachronic development within the collection itself, a possibility that Machiela raises in “Situating the Aramaic Texts,” 92. Such attempts to discern diachronic development within the corpus, however, are admittedly rather speculative, and must remain tentative.

⁵² Dimant, “Aramaic Texts,” 198; The closest thing to a comprehensive list of the “particular language, style, and content” that the Aramaic Scrolls share in common can be found on pp. 250–3 of Machiela’s “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” though even this list is not exhaustive. Machiela divides his treatment of these common features into three basic categories: 1) basic literary approach or generic character, 2) distinctive configuration of themes and concerns, and 3) language. See also Andrew B. Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts in the Qumran Aramaic Anthology,” *JSP* 25 (2015): 23–51 for a treatment of several features that are shared by a significant segment of the Aramaic Scrolls.

more composition in a given category will be shared by every composition in that category. In fact, some will share features with one or more in the other category that they do not share in common with others in their own. On this point, Machiela has recommended thinking in terms of a “configuration of themes and concerns” that “creates differing patterns of association between two or more texts.”⁵³ These patterns of association often connect compositions within the same category (e.g., Aramaic Levi Document and the Genesis Apocryphon;⁵⁴ 1 Enoch and Aramaic Levi Document;⁵⁵ Book of Giants and the Genesis Apocryphon⁵⁶); however, some of these connections transcend the categorical boundaries established by García Martínez (e.g., Tobit and 1 Enoch;⁵⁷ Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon;⁵⁸ Tobit and Visions of Amram;⁵⁹ Book of Giants and Daniel 7⁶⁰). We must be careful not to adhere so rigidly to the bipartite classification in our analyses of the Aramaic Scrolls that we fail to notice the ways in which different combinations of common features create clusters or constellation of compositions in the corpus, both *within* and *across* the two categories that comprise the “core cluster” of Aramaic texts.

⁵³ Machiela, “Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” 251.

⁵⁴ Dorothy M. Peters, “The Recombination and Evolution of Noah Traditions as Found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*: The DNA of Fraternal Twins,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*, D. K. Falk, S. Metso, D. W. Parry, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 223–32; cf. also eadem, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquities*, EJIL 26 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

⁵⁵ Henryk Drawnel, “Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*Visions of Levi*) and *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q208–211),” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 547–74; idem, “Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts from Qumran and Late Mesopotamian Culture,” *RevQ* 26 (2013): 145–67; see also the studies referenced in n. 11.

⁵⁶ Daniel A. Machiela and Andrew B. Perrin, “‘That You May Know Everything from Him with Certainty’: A New Reading in 4QEnGiants^b ar (4Q530) and a Literary Connection between the *Book of Giants* and *Genesis Apocryphon*,” *RevQ* 25 (2011): 113–25.

⁵⁷ George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Tobit and 1 Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance,” in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, vol. 1, ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 217–39.

⁵⁸ Daniel A. Machiela and Andrew B. Perrin, “Tobit and the *Genesis Apocryphon*: Toward a Family Portrait,” *JBL* 133 (2014): 111–32.

⁵⁹ Goldman, “Burial of the Fathers.” See also Perrin, “Tobit’s Contexts and Contacts.”

⁶⁰ Joseph L. Angel, “Reading the *Book of Giants* in Literary and Historical Context,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 313–46.

2.4 The Aramaic Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptures

In her 2007 article, Dimant noted that a significant number of the Aramaic Scrolls share a way of relating to the Hebrew scriptures, one which distinguishes them from the rest of the Qumran finds. In particular, she noted that several of the Aramaic writings from Qumran are examples of “the systematic reworking of narratives dealing with pre-Sinaitic times,” an approach to the Hebrew scriptures “shared only by the Qumran Aramaic corpus and the [Hebrew] parabiblical non-sectarian texts.”⁶¹ Dimant draws a sharp contrast, though, between these two corpora in regards to their way of engaging with the Genesis narratives. The so-called Hebrew para-biblical writings, as she has suggested, “rework more or less closely the Biblical Hebrew text and elaborate or comment on it.”⁶² On the other hand, the Aramaic Scrolls “treat biblical materials more freely,” arguing that for them “the biblical version is just a peg on which large chunks of aggadic non-biblical expansions are hung.”⁶³ Dimant understood the Genesis Apocryphon to be an exception to this general principle. By arguing that it adhered closely to the base-text of the Hebrew Genesis account, Dimant suggested that Genesis Apocryphon more closely resembled the so-called Hebrew para-biblical literature than its Aramaic counterparts such as 1 Enoch or the Aramaic Levi Document.⁶⁴ In several subsequent studies, Tigchelaar and García Martínez gave more detailed

⁶¹ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 202.

⁶² Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 202.

⁶³ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 202.

⁶⁴ This characterization, as Moshe J. Bernstein has shown, is only partially accurate. Of the extant and partially extant columns of the Genesis Apocryphon, only the sections dealing with Abram (i.e., cols. 19–22) can be said to adhere closely to the base text of Genesis. Moshe J. Bernstein, “The Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 317–43, esp. 333–4. Bernstein rightly notes that the vast majority of the Genesis Apocryphon (cols. 0–18) is closer to that of a ‘parabiblical’ text (as defined by White Crawford) in its treatment of the Genesis narrative, whereas only the Abram sections can be properly classified as ‘rewritten Bible/Scripture.’ Bernstein, “Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” 337. The importance of this observation for our discussion is simply to point out that the Genesis Apocryphon is much closer to the rest of the Aramaic Scrolls in its relation to the Hebrew scriptures than Dimant initially suggested, with the noteworthy exception of cols. 19–22.

accounts of how many of the Aramaic writings from Qumran relate to the Hebrew scriptures. Their conclusions, though basically consistent with Dimant's, attempt a greater level of specificity.

Tigchelaar approached this issue in the context of his discussion of the relationship between pseudepigraphy and the so-called para-biblical literature at Qumran, in which he distinguishes between two basic approaches, i.e., one which could be classified as “extending scripture by interpretative rewriting” and another which could be classified as “expanding scriptures by ascribing traditions to scriptural figures.”⁶⁵ The examples of the first type are predominately Hebrew, mostly notably Jubilees and the Temple Scroll, though he included the Genesis Apocryphon among the members of this category. The scrolls in this category generally adhere fairly closely to a scriptural base-text. They may add some new and innovative material along the way, but most of their creative work consists of rewriting “a text very similar to the Torah.”⁶⁶ The primary function of these compositions, Tigchelaar suggests, is interpretation of their base-text.

The compositions in the second of Tigchelaar's two categories, on the other hand, do not adhere closely to a base-text. Those in this category, as Tigchelaar notes, “do not primarily interpret or rewrite scripture, but present new compositions.”⁶⁷ They primarily comprise new and innovative traditions, but he nevertheless considers them para-biblical insofar as they attribute their new material to “biblical” figures. Both Hebrew and Aramaic compositions can be found among the writings in this category, although the Aramaic materials from Qumran make up a substantial portion. One of the significant differences between the Hebrew and Aramaic compositions in this group is that the Aramaic ones use the first-person narrative voice, whereas the Hebrew ones are generally written in the third-person.⁶⁸ Another is that the Aramaic

⁶⁵ Tigchelaar, “Forms of Pseudepigraphy,” 91, 93.

⁶⁶ Tigchelaar, “Forms of Pseudepigraphy,” 92.

⁶⁷ Tigchelaar, “Forms of Pseudepigraphy,” 93.

⁶⁸ Tigchelaar, “Forms of Pseudepigraphy,” 93.

compositions deal almost exclusively with the pre-Mosaic period, while the Hebrew ones contain material related to figures like Moses, David, and Jeremiah.⁶⁹

Tigchelaar's study has led to a number of important observations about the extent to which the Aramaic Scrolls should be understood as para-biblical literature. First, the label 'para-biblical literature,' if it is to be used at all, only applies to the Aramaic compositions in the first category of García Martínez's bipartite schema, that is, the pre-Mosaic narratives. Second, the so-called Aramaic para-biblical writings are primarily written in the first-person narrative voice, which both distinguishes them from their Hebrew counterparts and connects them to a wider segment of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus, in which the first-person narrative voice also predominates (e.g., Tobit, Dan 7, Four Kingdoms, Prayer of Nabonidus).⁷⁰ Third, most of the Aramaic para-biblical writings do not follow a Hebrew base-text, with the exception of the Abraham portions of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 19–22). However, Tigchelaar still considers them to be para-biblical due to the fact that they attribute their new material to figures known from the Hebrew scriptures. Finally, Tigchelaar suggests that at least some of the so-called Aramaic para-biblical compositions may function to authorize some of their purported authors, especially the less well-known ones, e.g., Qahat or Amram.

García Martínez similarly focuses his discussion on the pre-Mosaic narratives in Aramaic Scrolls, which he contends "ont un rapport clair à l'Écriture, d'où proviennent les protagonistes

⁶⁹ Tigchelaar, "Forms of Pseudepigraphy," 93, 96; cf. idem, "Imaginal Context," 261.

⁷⁰ On the use of the first-person narrative voice in the Aramaic Scrolls, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the *Yahad*," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. A. D. Roitman, L. H. Schiffman, and S. Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 295–326; Andrew B. Perrin, "Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 20 (2013): 98–123. For a discussion of importance of the Aramaic Scrolls for understanding the origin of Jewish testamentary literature, see Jörg Frey, "On the Origins of the Genre of the 'Literary Testament': Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre," in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 345–77.

des récits araméens et ils s’inspirent des récits de la Genèse.”⁷¹ Beyond this observation, however, García Martínez attempts to bring an additional level of specificity and nuance to the discussion of how the various pre-Mosaic compositions relate to the Book of Genesis, suggesting that we think about their relationship in terms of three basic categories. First, he argues, some of the Aramaic texts “*dépendent directement du texte de la Genèse connu.*”⁷² Second, others of them “*dépendent de la trame narrative du texte de l’Écriture qu’ils suivent dans les compositions nouvelles.*”⁷³ Finally, many texts “*s’approprient des personnages connus par les récits bibliques, pour en faire des protagonistes de nouveaux récits.*”⁷⁴ In some ways, García Martínez’s analysis is quite similar to that of Tigchelaar, especially his concluding summary about what might be able to be said about the authority of the Hebrew scriptures for the authors of the pre-Mosaic Aramaic Scrolls:

Toutes ces compositions connaissent les récits de l’Écriture desquels elles prennent leurs protagonistes, et suivent même la trame narrative de l’Écriture dans plusieurs cas, en témoignant ainsi de l’autorité qu’ils octroient à ces récits. Mais ces compositions nous montrent aussi clairement que les récits de la Genèse ne sont pas les seuls écrits ayant autorité pour ses auteurs/rédacteurs.⁷⁵

Dimant, Tigchelaar, and García Martínez all point out something fundamental about how the Aramaic Scrolls, or at least a sizable segment thereof, relate to the Hebrew scriptures, and in

⁷¹ García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 22.

⁷² García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 24. Emphasis original.

⁷³ García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 24. Emphasis original.

⁷⁴ García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 24. Emphasis original.

⁷⁵ García Martínez, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture,” 29. Compare Tigchelaar’s discussion of the same issue: “The references to heavenly tablets and to writing in texts like the *Books of Enoch* and *ALD* certainly function as a fictional device, but also demonstrate an appreciation of ‘writtenness.’ The writings with pre-Mosaic fictional authors maintain the literary fiction and therefore cannot quote Hebrew Scriptures that are attributed to later authors. At the same time, parts of *1 Enoch* clearly use literary forms and motifs, and even the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. The manner in which one refers to earlier literature depends not only on the degree of authoritativeness of that literature, but also on the literary forms, genre, and subject matter of the texts, rather than the presence or absence of quotations, as an indirect indication of their authors’ view on the authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures. The choice of scriptural pre-Mosaic figures as fictional authors of the parabiblical Aramaic texts we now have, affirms the cultural authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures, or, put more minimally, of the traditions incorporated in those Scriptures. But it also challenges the view that those Hebrew Scriptures were the only authoritative traditions.” Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts,” 171.

particular, to the Book of Genesis. The Aramaic narratives involving pre-Mosaic protagonists (e.g., the Book of Watchers or Aramaic Levi Document) presuppose an awareness and an embrace of the Genesis base-text without adhering too closely to it. Most often, the Genesis base-text provides the plot, setting, or even just the character(s) for what can be more accurately described as an entirely new composition, as opposed to a re-telling of an old one. In many ways, the pre-Mosaic narratives depend on a prior knowledge of Genesis, but they frequently follow their source material only very loosely, if at all. Genesis is thus implicitly acknowledged as authoritative, but it is also the case, as Tigchelaar and García Martínez have argued, that the authors of these Aramaic Scrolls are using Genesis in order, at least in part, to authorize their new, innovative traditions.

2.5 The Aramaic Scrolls and Apocalyptic Literature/Apocalypticism

Dimant's initial, but brief, comments on the apocalyptic character of the corpus in 2007 centered specifically on the compositions that she labeled "Aramaic visionary apocalyptic tales."⁷⁶ These compositions correspond to her third category, i.e., "Visionary Compositions," and, notably, do not include such compositions as 1 Enoch and the Visions of Amram. Dimant highlighted the importance of "visionary scenes," especially ones which involve "figures and events of the eschaton," as the defining feature of the compositions that comprise this category.⁷⁷ She also drew

⁷⁶ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic," 200, 203–4. According to Dimant's count, the texts in this category include twenty manuscripts (seven different compositions): New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18), Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553), the so-called Apocryphon of Daniel (4Q246), Words of Michael (4Q529), Birth of Noah (4Q534–536), Apocryphon of Levi (4Q540–541), and Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243–245). The number of compositions increases to nine if we consider, as I do, 4Q540 and 4Q541 as well as 4Q243–244 and 4Q245 to represent separate compositions.

⁷⁷ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic," 203. In Dimant's 2010 follow-up article, she expands her discussion of the "predictive dream-vision." Here, she notes that the "predictive dream-vision" is also one of the salient features of the pre-Mosaic (prediluvian and patriarchal) texts, i.e. 1 Enoch, Book of Giants, Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram, and Genesis Apocryphon. However, Dimant does not take this opportunity to expound upon the relatively terse comments that she made in her 2007 article about the importance of the Aramaic Scrolls for tracing the origins of apocalypticism and apocalyptic literature. See Dimant, "Themes and Genres," 36.

attention to the Diaspora setting of many of these visionary works, and noted the relation of some of them to the figure of Daniel.⁷⁸ These observations led her to suggest that configuring the relationship between these Danielic works could prove foundational for determining the “origins and background of Jewish apocalyptic literature.”⁷⁹

García Martínez attempted both to build upon and further develop some of Dimant’s initial observations. Starting with the salient features of the texts in Dimant’s third category, i.e., a prevalence of “visionary scenes, often dealing with figures and events of the eschaton,” García Martínez argues that this description characterizes a number of other texts from among the Aramaic Scrolls beyond those that comprise Dimant’s third category. These texts include some works that are (and/or could be) classified as representatives of the genre ‘apocalypse’ as defined by *Semeia* 14, but he also noted that several others display an “apocalyptic outlook” without being formal representatives of the genre.⁸⁰ By looking beyond Dimant’s category “Visionary Compositions” to compositions such as 1 Enoch, Book of Giants, and Visions of Amram, García Martínez was able to demonstrate that “a disproportionately large amount of these Aramaic compositions show an apocalyptic outlook.”⁸¹ Moreover, while not every composition in the Aramaic corpus can be so characterized, there is, as he suggested, a “*predominant* interest in apocalypticism” throughout the collection as a whole.⁸²

Collins, responding to the claim that the Aramaic Scrolls display an “apocalyptic outlook,” attempted to problematize the decision to separate apocalypticism (the worldview) from apocalypse (the genre):

⁷⁸ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 204.

⁷⁹ Dimant, “Aramaic Texts,” 204.

⁸⁰ “I am not claiming for any of those Aramaic compositions from Qumran that they are Apocalypses according to the definition of *Semeia* 14, although several of them definitely are. But the apocalyptic outlook of all these compositions seems to be to be clear.” García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 438; cf. idem, “Scribal Practices,” 335.

⁸¹ García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 438; cf. idem, “Scribal Practices,” 335.

⁸² García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 438; cf. idem, “Scribal Practices,” 335.

As Klaus Koch argued almost forty years ago, the literary genre apocalypse provides the only control on the use of such terms as apocalyptic or apocalypticism. Literature is apocalyptic insofar as it resembles what we typically find in apocalypses. Apocalypticism, or German *Apokalyptik*, is the worldview of movements that share the conceptual framework of the apocalypses. This may seem tautologous, but to use the word without reference to apocalypses is only to breed confusion. To put the matter another way, if a movement or group of texts does *not* share the conceptual framework of the apocalypses, it is better to call it something else, other than ‘apocalyptic.’⁸³

In particular, Collins emphasizes the importance of divine revelation, angelic (or superhuman) mediators, and eschatological concerns for any discussion of the apocalyptic genre or apocalypticism as an outlook or “conceptual framework.”⁸⁴ Works that do not contain these features, Collins suggests, cannot be accurately characterized as apocalypses or as having an apocalyptic outlook, including texts that share other features in common with the apocalyptic genre, e.g., “speculation about Noah and other primeval figures.”⁸⁵ Some of these features were simply appropriated by later apocalyptic authors, and thus the features themselves need not be seen as inherently ‘apocalyptic’ in nature.⁸⁶ That is not to say, however, that such texts cannot contribute to our understanding of the development of the apocalyptic genre or worldview. On the contrary, many of the Aramaic Scrolls, while not being apocalyptic according to Collins’ understanding of the term, nevertheless shed light on the “the kind of milieu in which the earliest apocalyptic writings developed.”⁸⁷ Collins points to three key features of this milieu, which were highlighted at the Aix-en-Provence conference on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls in 2008: 1) “the prominence

⁸³ Collins, “Conclusions,” 555–6.

⁸⁴ Collins, “Conclusions,” 556. Such a definition excludes Daniel 2 (but not Daniel 7). See Daniel A. Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts,” *JAAJ* 2 (2014): 113–34 on this point.

⁸⁵ “Not every motif that appears in an apocalypse, however, necessarily qualifies other texts in which it appears as apocalyptic. The question here is whether the fragmentary Aramaic works share the same conceptual structure as the apocalypses.” Collins, “Conclusions,” 557. He continues, “Speculation about the birth of Noah is a good example of material that could be incorporated into an apocalypse, and adapted for apocalyptic ends, without being inherently apocalyptic itself.” Collins, “Conclusions,” 558.

⁸⁶ Collins, “Conclusions,” 557–8.

⁸⁷ Collins, “Conclusions,” 558.

of quasi-scientific writings;”⁸⁸ 2) “the importance of secrecy and esotericism;”⁸⁹ and 3) “Mesopotamian motifs and traditions...[as well as] Persian traditions.”⁹⁰ Thus, for Collins, while the Aramaic Scrolls should *not* be understood as an apocalyptic corpus, they are nonetheless significant for understanding the intellectual and literary matrix out of which the Jewish apocalypses and apocalypticism emerged.

More recently, Machiela has written a pair of articles that discuss the “apocalyptic character” of the Aramaic Scrolls in some detail. In the introduction to the first of these two articles, Machiela addresses the concern raised by Collins regarding the use of the terms “apocalyptic” and “apocalypticism,” namely, that these terms “must be controlled by a defined group of texts that are widely agreed to be apocalypses, since without this limitation a tangle of terminological confusion ensues.”⁹¹ Without claiming to resolve this difficulty entirely, Machiela raises three issues in response to Collins’ critique. First, Machiela points to the work of Collins, Carmignac, and Sacchi in order to demonstrate that there are divergent views even among specialists as to precise characterization of ‘apocalypse’ as a genre.⁹² Second, he argues that we cannot avoid this dilemma by focusing only on works that explicitly identify themselves as an ‘apocalypse’ (e.g., Revelation) as this would exclude key examples of the genre such as Dan 7 and would privilege later, more developed iterations of the genre.⁹³ Finally, and most importantly, he

⁸⁸ Collins, “Conclusions,” 558. Cf. Ben-Dov, “Scientific Writings”; idem, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran and in their Ancient Context*, STDJ 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁸⁹ Collins, “Conclusions,” 558. Cf. Samuel I. Thomas, “Esoteric Knowledge in Qumran Aramaic Texts,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 403–32; idem, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, EJIL 25 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

⁹⁰ Collins, “Conclusions,” 558–9. Cf. André Lemaire, “Nabonid et Gilgamesh: L’araméen en Mésopotamie et à Qoumrân,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 125–44. Collins and Lemaire disagree as to whether the Mesopotamian influences bespeak a Mesopotamian provenance for these Aramaic texts. See the fuller discussion regarding the Mesopotamian influences in the Aramaic Scrolls below.

⁹¹ Machiela, “Aramaic Writings,” 116.

⁹² Machiela, “Aramaic Writings,” 116; cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 239 n. 23 on this point.

⁹³ Machiela, “Aramaic Writings,” 116.

suggests that if we adhere too rigidly to any established definition of apocalypse in our analyses of new material then we will neglect the opportunity to reconfigure old definitions on the basis of new evidence.⁹⁴

Machiela's first essay moves text-by-text through the Aramaic Scrolls corpus, highlighting compositions (and portions of them) that would be classified as apocalypses according to *Semeia* 14, as well as ones that, though not necessarily apocalypses by genre, nevertheless contain "notable apocalyptic features or motifs."⁹⁵ Machiela notes that the Aramaic Scrolls contain a high volume of compositions, or portions of them, that could be characterized as formal apocalypses on the basis of the *Semeia* 14 definition—some of which had previously been recognized as apocalypses prior to the publication of the Aramaic Scrolls (i.e., the Enochic material); some of which have been newly recognized as apocalypses by several Qumran scholars (e.g., Pseudo-Daniel, Four Kingdoms, New Jerusalem); and some of which remain largely unrecognized as apocalypses, though they conform to the definition as articulated by *Semeia* 14 (e.g., portions of the Genesis Apocryphon). He also contends that there are a number of Aramaic Scrolls that, though not formally apocalypses themselves, are nevertheless related to or dependent on the apocalyptic genre. These observations have led Machiela to conclude that the Aramaic Scrolls represent "an important, early stage in the development of both the apocalyptic worldview and the literary genre 'apocalypse'"⁹⁶ since this collection contains both the earliest extant examples of the genre and a number of compositions that combine apocalyptic features with other forms of literary expression. This phenomenon may reflect a stage in the development of the genre prior to the point when these features began to "crystallize into the later, more 'pure' examples of the genre apocalypse."⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Machiela, "Aramaic Writings," 116.

⁹⁵ Machiela, "Aramaic Writings," 116.

⁹⁶ Machiela, "Aramaic Writings," 115.

⁹⁷ Machiela, "Aramaic Writings," 134.

Machiela's second article on this topic is much broader in scope, seeking to make some more general observations about the apocalyptic character of the corpus, which he delineates as follows: First, the total number of extant apocalypses or "apocalyptically oriented compositions" has greatly increased as a result of the discovery of the Aramaic Scrolls, between fourteen and twenty new compositions by his count.⁹⁸ Second, the Aramaic language appears to have been the language of choice for Jewish authors when composing apocalypses in the Hellenistic age, though this changed as Hebrew began to supplant Aramaic as a Jewish literary language in Palestine and its environs.⁹⁹ Third, a general scholarly consensus, based mostly on analyses of individual texts in the collection, has dated the vast majority of Aramaic Jewish apocalypses and "apocalyptically oriented compositions" to the Ptolemaic period (with some possibly originating as early as the late Persian period).¹⁰⁰ Finally, many of the apocalyptic compositions among the Aramaic Scrolls feature a number of human figures who function as mediators and/or interpreters of divine revelation—a role that is more typically carried out by an angelic figure in Jewish apocalypses, at least according to the *Semeia* 14 definition.¹⁰¹

There is a significant amount of ambiguity and debate surrounding the use of terminology, but, as we have seen here, all of these scholars agree that 1) the Aramaic Scrolls contain the oldest Jewish examples of the genre apocalypse; 2) the Aramaic Scrolls have added a number of

⁹⁸ Daniel A. Machiela, "The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," in *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview*, ed. L. Grabbe, G. Boccaccini, and J. Zurawski (London: T&T Clark, 2016), 147–58, 148. Both Machiela and now Perrin provide tables that outline the Aramaic texts from Qumran that various scholars consider to be apocalypses or apocalyptically oriented. See Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 240–3). As these tables demonstrate, there is considerable variation among scholars as to precisely which texts should be included. Perrin explains this variation as follows: "Looming behind these variations are different conceptions—stated or implied—of what boundaries are drawn around the apocalypse as a literary genre and/or what constitutes an apocalyptic worldview." Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 238.

⁹⁹ Machiela, "Historical Development," 148–50.

¹⁰⁰ Machiela, "Historical Development," 150.

¹⁰¹ Machiela, "Historical Development," 150–2.

previously unknown compositions to our repertoire of apocalyptic literature; and 3) the Aramaic Scrolls are invaluable for understanding the origins of apocalyptic literature and its associated worldview. Some scholars, such as Machiela, have taken these conclusions a step further, and have argued that the very definition of apocalypse should be reconfigured on the basis of this new evidence.¹⁰²

2.6 The Aramaic Scrolls and Foreign Culture

Dimant devoted a portion of her 2007 article to a discussion of the foreign elements on display in the Aramaic Scrolls. Specifically, she suggested that “Babylonian elements are clustered in writings related to the Flood on the one hand, and both Babylonian and Iranian elements are found in non-biblical court-tales and visionary narratives on the other.”¹⁰³ That there would be Babylonian elements found in the Flood-related narratives, Dimant argued, is no real surprise, and in fact scholars have long noted that the Enochic corpus in particular displays an awareness of Babylonian concepts and culture.¹⁰⁴ For example, proposals regarding the Babylonian background both of Enoch himself¹⁰⁵ and of his astronomical knowledge¹⁰⁶ have a long history in scholarship

¹⁰² “[O]nce a new text (e.g., *Visions of Amram*) is adopted as an apocalypse, it may potentially bring with it new associations, thereby re-jigging the base definition of our constructed genre.” Machiela, “Aramaic Writings,” 116.

¹⁰³ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 204–5.

¹⁰⁴ Much of this discussion, though not all of it, has centered on the question of apocalyptic origins, and the cultural and intellectual matrix out of which apocalypticism emerged. See e.g. Pierre Grelot, “La géographie mythique d’Hénoch et ses sources orientales,” *RB* 65 (1958): 33–69; David S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC–AD 100* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964); J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQ Monograph Series 16 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); Helge S. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, WMANT 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2d ed (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1998).

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 45–46; Mladen Popović, “The Emergence of Aramaic and Hebrew Scholarly Texts: Transmission and Translation of Alien Wisdom,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. S. Metso, H. Najman, and E. Schuller, *STDJ* 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 81–114, 89–90.

¹⁰⁶ E.g., Otto Neugebauer, “The ‘Astronomical’ Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72-82): With Additional Notes on the Aramaic Fragments by Matthew Black,” in *The Books of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with*

on Jewish antiquity. More surprising, in Dimant's view, was "the prominence of the Iranian elements in the visionary court-tales."¹⁰⁷ Her discussion of the foreign elements on evidence in the Aramaic Scrolls is somewhat more robust in her 2010 treatment of the corpus' themes and genres. First, Dimant acknowledges the fact that "Babylonian and Iranian influence on the Qumran texts, both Hebrew and Aramaic, has been noted since the early days of Qumran research," citing the work of Grelot, Kvanvig, Drawnel, and Ben-Dov, on the one hand, and that of Winston and Shaked, on the other.¹⁰⁸ Second, she cites Drawnel's work on the Aramaic Levi Document approvingly, which seems to represent her tacit recognition of the fact that the Babylonian elements in the corpus extend beyond the Flood-related narratives.¹⁰⁹ Finally, she also resists the temptation to argue in favor of a diasporic provenance for the Aramaic Scrolls simply on the basis of these foreign elements, as some have done, arguing correctly that "in the centuries under the Persian and Hellenistic rules Eretz-Israel was a focus of various cultural influences, so the appropriation of external motifs by Jewish Aramaic works does not necessarily mean that they were authored abroad."¹¹⁰ Collins, in reflecting on Dimant's contribution, expressed agreement with her basic conclusions, noting that "the Mesopotamian/Iranian background of this material is certainly significant."¹¹¹ To her list of Aramaic Scrolls reflecting Iranian influence, he added the Visions of Amram, citing its "dualism of light and darkness."¹¹² Collins also attempted to

Commentary and Textual Notes, ed. M. Black, SVTP (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 386–419, esp., 394; VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, see esp. 89–106; Henryk Drawnel, "Moon Computation in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book*," *RevQ* 23 (2007): 3–41; idem, "Some Notes," 146–51; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*; Popović, "Emergence," 85.

¹⁰⁷ Dimant, "Qumran Aramaic Texts," 205. The only "Iranian" element that Dimant cites in this article is "the Persian background portrayed by 4Q550."

¹⁰⁸ See the studies listed in n. 6 in Dimant, "Themes and Genres," 17–18.

¹⁰⁹ Dimant, "Themes and Genres," 17 n. 6.

¹¹⁰ Dimant, "Themes and Genres," 17.

¹¹¹ Collins, "Conclusions," 559.

¹¹² Collins, "Conclusions," 559. Collins acknowledges the objections of Frey, but offers a rebuttal: "While I agree with Jörg Frey that it is possible to reconstruct a trajectory in early wisdom literature that culminates in the Instruction of the Two Spirits, neither the conception of the Spirits nor the dualism of light and darkness is derived from the wisdom tradition. The Zoroastrian parallels are too striking to ignore." There is a long scholarly tradition of understanding early apocalyptic dualism against a Zoroastrian backdrop. See Geo Widengren, "Leitende Ideen und

complicate any straightforward association of the Aramaic Scrolls with the diaspora on the basis of their foreign elements.¹¹³

It is worth noting that a number of other important studies, both before and after 2007, on individual Aramaic compositions from Qumran have also made significant contributions to our understanding of the foreign elements in the corpus. These studies can fill out some of what Dimant and Collins have posited in the articles cited above. Most notably, recent work has only reinforced the impression that the authors of the many of the Aramaic Scrolls were heavily dependent on certain aspects of Babylonian culture. This point has been made forcefully by Drawnel,¹¹⁴ but has also been made by Ben-Dov,¹¹⁵ Lemaire,¹¹⁶ and Popović.¹¹⁷ Several of the Aramaic Scrolls, including compositions like the Book of Giants,¹¹⁸ the Prayer of Nabonidus,¹¹⁹ and the Aramaic Levi Document,¹²⁰ display an awareness of specific Mesopotamian personages, on the hand, and

Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*, ed. D. Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 77–162; Shaul Shaked, “Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 1, ed. W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 308–25; Marc Philonenko, “La Doctrine Qoumrâniennes des deux Esprits: Ses origines iraniennes et ses prolongements dans le judaïsme essénien et le christianisme antique,” in *Apocalyptique Iranienne et Dualisme Qoumrânién*, ed. Geo Widengren, Anders Hultgård, and Marc Philonenko, RI 2 (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1995), 163–211; Andres Hultgård, “Persian Apocalypticism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. J.J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 2000), 39–83.

¹¹³ Collins, “Conclusions,” 559.

¹¹⁴ Drawnel, “Some Notes.”

¹¹⁵ Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*.

¹¹⁶ Lemaire, “Nabonid et Gilgamesh.”

¹¹⁷ Popović, “Emergence.”

¹¹⁸ John C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaeism: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*, MHUC 14 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992); Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*, TSAJ 63 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Ida Fröhlich, “Enmeduranki and Gilgamesh: Mesopotamian Figures in Aramaic Enoch Traditions,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, vol. 2, ed. E. Mason et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 637–53; Matthew Goff, “Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants’ Appropriation of Gilgamesh Motifs,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 221–53.

¹¹⁹ Carol A. Newsom, “Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, The Hebrew Bible, and Neo-Babylonian Sources,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. S. Metso, H. Najman, and E. Schuller, STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 57–80. Cf. John J. Collins, “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, ed. J. VanderKam et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 83–93, esp. 85–87.

¹²⁰ Drawnel, “Some Notes,” 146. Cf. idem, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*, JSJSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 269–93.

an indebtedness to Mesopotamian science, on the other. Moreover, some recent studies have highlighted other foreign-influenced features in the corpus beyond those of Mesopotamian origin, including some from Persian, Greek, and Egyptian milieux.¹²¹

It would be a mistake, therefore, to associate the Aramaic Scrolls corpus with one particular cultural or geographic milieu, Mesopotamian or otherwise. Nor is there any *a priori* reason for suggesting that any of the foreign elements in the Aramaic Scrolls must have entered the stream of Jewish tradition *in* the diaspora. The Aramaic language itself served as a particularly effective conduit through which the traditions of various cultures could travel across the far-reaches of the imperial territory.¹²² We cannot insist with absolute certainty on the Palestinian provenance of any specific Jewish Aramaic compositions, but it is worth noting that Judea, and particularly its elite and sub-elite representatives, were not so isolated so as to be unaware of traditions and concepts

¹²¹ Persian: Widengren, “Leitende Ideen und Quellen”; Shaked, “Iranian Influence”; Philonenko, “La Doctrine Qoumrâniennes des deux Espirts”; Hultgård, “Persian Apocalypticism.” Greek: On the four-kingdoms schema in Dan 2 and 7, Four Kingdoms, and New Jerusalem, see John J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam, with the assistance of A.E. Alvarez (Brill: Leiden, 1999), 403–30; Peter W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*, vol. 2, ed. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps, VTSup 83/FIOTL 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 329–67; Lorenzo DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts*, TSAJ 110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Albert L. A. Hogeterp, “Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle: Observations on 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} (4Q552–553),” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. M. Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 173–92; Bennie H. Reynolds III, *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolism and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses, 333–63 B.C.E.*, JAJSup 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011). On the Ionia world map in the Genesis Apocryphon, see Esther Eshel, “The *Imago Mundi* of the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111–31; Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87–94. On Greek medical practices in the Genesis Apocryphon, see Ida Fröhlich, “Medicine and Magic in Genesis Apocryphon: Ideas on Human Conception and Its Hindrances,” *RevQ* 25 (2011): 177–98; Dorothy M. Peters, “Noah Traditions within the Cultural Mosaic at Qumran: Multilingual Conversations and Controversies,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*, ed. P.W. Flint, J. Duhaime, and K. S. Bael, EJIL 30 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 431–46, esp. 440–1. Egyptian: Daniel A. Machiela, “Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?” *AS* 8 (2010): 47–69; Tawny L. Holm, *Of Courtiers and Kings: The Biblical Daniel Narrative and Ancient Story-Collections* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2013).

¹²² So Schwartz, “Language, Power and Identity,” 20–21. Cf. also Bickerman, *Jews in the Greek Age*, 51. For a more recent account of the role of Aramaic in the Hellenistic world, see Holger Gzella, *A Cultural History of Aramaic: From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

from a diverse range of cultural milieux. Judean authors could have encountered foreign traditions on their journeys abroad, or travelers (Jewish or otherwise) could have brought foreign traditions with them to Judea from elsewhere.

This is not to say, however, that some of the earliest Jewish Aramaic compositions (or at least some of the traditions that lie behind them) could not have originated during, say, the Babylonian exile or in the Babylonian diaspora. On the whole, however, the Aramaic Scrolls should instead be understood as reflecting the situation of cultural contact and interchange that obtained throughout the Hellenistic world, including Judea.¹²³ The Aramaic Scrolls can thus be considered “Hellenistic” literature. I do not mean “Hellenistic” here in the sense of “Greek-influenced,” as it was often used in older scholarship. Rather, as scholars are increasingly recognizing, the Hellenistic era was one of intense cultural “interpenetration” during which “motifs from various traditions circulated freely.”¹²⁴ Another way of saying this is that the Aramaic Scrolls should be understood as international literature,¹²⁵ and do not necessarily reflect one specific cultural milieu, but participate in a broader Aramaic scribal culture that transcends the geographical boundaries of any one locale.

¹²³ “In the broadest sense the matrix of the Jewish apocalypses is not any single tradition but the Hellenistic milieu, where motifs from various traditions circulated freely.” Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 34.

¹²⁴ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 33, 34. For some examples of the new models for understanding the nature of cultural interaction and cultural exchange in the Hellenistic world, see the summary in Annette Yoshiko Reed, Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Writing Jewish Astronomy in the Early Hellenistic Age: The Enochic *Astronomical Book* as Aramaic Wisdom and Archival Impulse,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 1–37, 2 n. 2. For specific treatments related to the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms respectively, see Ian S. Moyer, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Paul Kosmin, *Land of the Elephant Kings* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2014).

¹²⁵ Bickerman, *Greek Age*, 51. Cf. Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273.

2.7 The Aramaic Scrolls and the Qumran Sectarian Writings

In her initial 2007 article, Dimant briefly commented on the relationship between the Aramaic Scrolls and the so-called sectarian compositions found at Qumran.¹²⁶ Dimant argued that the Aramaic materials “contain nothing of the specifically sectarian terminology or ideology and therefore do not belong with the sectarian literature.”¹²⁷ She goes on to argue that correspondences between any of the Aramaic Scrolls and the Qumran sectarian compositions simply demonstrate that certain themes and ideas found in these Aramaic writings were part and parcel of the religious landscape during the Second Temple period. Taking the Visions of Amram as an example, she noted that this compositions’s use of the terms “the sons of light and the sons of darkness” (בני נהורא ובני חשוכא), coupled with its “peculiar demonology,” “do not make it a sectarian composition,” but instead “attest to the wide dissemination of [this type of] dualistic thought.”¹²⁸

García Martínez took issue with Dimant’s characterization of the Aramaic Scrolls corpus as being wholly non-sectarian in provenance. His primary complaint was against using Aramaic as an *a priori* criterion in determining whether a composition was non-sectarian.¹²⁹ The seemingly multilingual nature of the group(s) that wrote, collected, and copied Qumran scrolls, as his argument goes, should caution scholars against too hastily ruling out any compositions’s possible sectarian provenance simply on the basis of its being composed in Aramaic.¹³⁰ García Martínez also questioned whether Dimant’s conclusion follows from her premise, namely, that a lack of

¹²⁶ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 198–9.

¹²⁷ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 198–9. Cf. eadem, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 34.

¹²⁸ Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” 199.

¹²⁹ García Martínez, “Scribal Practices,” 336; idem, “Aramaica qumranica,” 435, 439; However, see the discussion above of both Milik and Wacholder (and the associated footnotes) for an argument that the Aramaic language itself may serve as (at least partial) evidence of the Aramaic Scrolls being composed prior to the Maccabean revolt. Cf. Machiela, “Historical Development,” 148–50.

¹³⁰ García Martínez, “Scribal Practices,” 336; idem, “Aramaica qumranica,” 439.

sectarian vocabulary is sufficient grounds for concluding that a writing is of a non-sectarian provenance.¹³¹ Nevertheless, he does not make any suggestions about the sectarian, or possible sectarian, provenance of any specific composition from among the corpus, and seems to assume that most of the Aramaic Scrolls are non-sectarian in origin when discussing their influence on the sectarian movement and its literature.¹³²

Collins also devotes some space to the question of whether or not the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus can be characterized as non-sectarian.¹³³ Collins expresses some basic agreement with García Martínez's principle regarding the need to determine the sectarian or non-sectarian provenance of each Aramaic composition on a case-by-case basis.¹³⁴ However, Collins can think of no "clear cut" examples of sectarian writings from among Aramaic Scrolls, though he considers 4Q339 and 4Q541 as possible candidates.¹³⁵ Moreover, Collins has also noted that, with a few noteworthy exceptions (esp., 4Q245), the Aramaic Scrolls are largely pre-Maccabean, which would obviously rule out the possibility of sectarian origins for any compositions with such an early date.¹³⁶ Rather, as Collins has suggested, the Aramaic Scrolls represent "a segment of popular Jewish literature in the Hellenistic period."¹³⁷

¹³¹ "Even if its first part proves to be true (no sectarian terminology or ideology in the Aramaic texts), the conclusion ("therefore") does not necessarily follow." García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica," 435.

¹³² "[T]he group to which we owe the collection appropriated the contents of these Aramaic compositions in a fashion similar to the way they appropriated the contents of all the other religious literature they preserved... These Aramaic compositions were part and parcel of the religious literature of the time. Their presence in the collection from Qumran shows us that this religious literature deeply influenced the thinking of the group." García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica," García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica," 447.

¹³³ Collins, "Conclusions," 552–5.

¹³⁴ Collins, "Conclusions," 554.

¹³⁵ Collins, "Conclusions," 554. See Collins' treatment of 4Q541 in *Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 107, 127 as well as his comments on his earlier treatment of 4Q541 in "Conclusions," 554–5.

¹³⁶ Collins, "Conclusions," 561–2.

¹³⁷ Collins, "Conclusions," 561. "The relative scarcity of messianic expectations in the Aramaic corpus, and the absence of any reference to the distinctively sectarian expectation of two messiahs lend support to the view that most, if not all, of this literature was not sectarian in origin, and that much of it is older than the distinctively sectarian literature associated with the new covenant or with the *yahad*." Collins, "Conclusions," 561.

While several scholars have attempted to be more specific about how, and to what extent, the Aramaic Scrolls influenced the sectarian movement and its writings,¹³⁸ the most important conclusion for our purposes is the general consensus concerning the pre-sectarian, and in fact pre-Maccabean, nature of the vast majority of the writings in this corpus.¹³⁹ The Aramaic Scrolls were copied and valued by the members of the *yahad* movement, but they should not be viewed as originating in sectarian or proto-sectarian circles. We must therefore look elsewhere and earlier in order to find the socio-historical location of the Aramaic compositions from Qumran.

2.8 Conclusion

The careful and foundational work of scholars like Milik, Wacholder, Dimant, Tigchelaar, García Martínez, Collins, and Machiela has provided the fields of Qumran and Second Temple studies with a new lens through which to view the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. Dimant and Machiela in particular have continued up to the present to refine their paradigms for thinking about the distinctive character and context of these compositions.¹⁴⁰ However, there is still much work to be

¹³⁸ See esp. Machiela, “Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” 253–7. Cf. also García Martínez, “Aramaica qumranica,” 446–8; idem, “Scribal Practices,” 339–41.

¹³⁹ “Most of the Aramaic Scrolls are very difficult to date on literary grounds, but a general consensus has emerged among experts that the earlier Aramaic works, such as parts of 1 Enoch (the *Book of Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book*), the court tales of Daniel, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, Tobit, the *Visions of Amram*, and perhaps the *Book of Giants* were composed in the third or early second centuries BCE. I would also place the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Four Kingdoms*, *Test. Jacob*, *Test. Qahat*, and *Words of Michael* within this time frame. Our latest text with a relatively certain historical referent is *Pseudo-Daniel B* (4Q245), which mentions Simon the Hasmonean (reigned 142–35 BCE) at the end of a list of high priests, and should therefore probably be dated to the 130s in its current form (recognizing that names could have been added to lists in earlier works as they were copied).” Machiela, “Historical Development,” 150.

¹⁴⁰ Devorah Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Aramaic Texts,” in *Is There a Text in this Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, eds. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 385–406; Daniel A. Machiela, “Situating the Aramaic Texts”; idem, “‘Wisdom Motifs’ in the Compositional Strategy of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Ha-ish Moshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, ed. Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal and George J. Brooke, STDJ 122 (Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2018), 223–47; idem, “The Compositional Setting and Implied Audience of Some Aramaic Texts from Qumran: A Working Hypothesis,” in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the*

done on a number of important questions, for example: Just what is meant by the word “corpus”? How should we account for possible diachronic development within the corpus? To what extent can we speak about the shared socio-historical context of those who authored at least the “core cluster” of these compositions?¹⁴¹ I will propose tentative answers to some of these questions toward the end of the dissertation, but even if the others must remain unanswered for the time being the research highlighted through this chapter has shown that Dimant was right to consider the Aramaic Scrolls as a “distinct group” with a “particular language, style, and content” within the Qumran finds,¹⁴² and that Wacholder was right, almost two decades before that, to urge scholars “to approach these texts in terms of their interrelationship, as opposed to previous patterns of studying these documents as discrete, self-contained entities.”¹⁴³

This way of approaching the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls has already borne fruit. Both Joseph Angel and Annette Yoshiko Reed, for instance, have recently grounded their analyses of specific compositions (the Book of Giants and the Astronomical Book, respectively) in their broader Qumran Aramaic context, drawing explicitly on some of the work highlighted in this chapter.¹⁴⁴ Andrew Perrin’s analysis of the dream-vision motif in the Aramaic Scrolls is also indebted to, though it certainly builds upon, the work of Wacholder, Dimant, García Martínez, and Machiela.¹⁴⁵ My own dissertation is similarly rooted in this way of approaching the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus. In what follows, I will work toward advancing the conversation regarding the character and context of the Aramaic Scrolls, or what I have called earlier in this chapter their distinct literary and conceptual profile. In particular, I will demonstrate that the priesthood, cult,

Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017, ed. Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegismund, STDJ 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 168–202.

¹⁴¹ Machiela’s recent essay, “Situating the Aramaic Texts,” touches on all three of these questions.

¹⁴² Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 198.

¹⁴³ Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 273.

¹⁴⁴ Angel, “Book of Giants,” 316–7; Reed, “Writing Jewish Astronomy,” 7–8.

¹⁴⁵ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 30–36.

and temple appear as major themes throughout the “core cluster” of Aramaic Scrolls. These priestly themes are most dominant in the compositions related to Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Amram, but they also appear prominently in other compositions representing both categories of García Martínez’s bipartite schema, including the Enochic writings, the Genesis Apocryphon, Tobit, Pseudo-Daniel^c, and some other miscellaneous compositions. As we will see, the priestly aspects of the Aramaic Scrolls are closely intertwined with the other distinctive features of the corpus, some of which I have outlined in this chapter. For example, so-called para-biblical compositions, such as the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram, emphasize priestly themes and protagonists. Priestly and apocalyptic themes are commingled in the Testament of Jacob^a, New Jerusalem, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Apocryphon of Levi^b, and the Visions of Amram. Priestly lore is depicted in terms of Babylonian science in the Aramaic Levi Document. The priestly material in the Aramaic Scrolls is also coordinated with other prominent themes in the corpus that we have not had the opportunity to discuss in this chapter, such as the scribal-sapiential qualities and interests that pervade much of these writings. In many ways, my analysis confirms the thesis of Dimant and others regarding the extent to which a “core cluster” of the Aramaic Scrolls should be viewed as a corpus on the basis of their shared themes and genres. My dissertation goes further, however, inasmuch as I show in Chapter 6, in view of my findings in Chapters 3 through 5, that the Aramaic Scrolls, at least those comprising Machiela’s “core cluster,” should be understood as a priestly corpus, and as having a consistent conception of the Jewish priesthood and its associated institutions. I will also argue in Chapter 7 that this corpus may help to shed light on the nature, social context, and theologies of the Hellenistic-era Jewish priesthood.

CHAPTER 3: FROM ENOCH TO ABRAHAM

3.1 Introduction

The following two chapters make a somewhat artificial distinction between those compositions dealing with the heroes of the prediluvian period (plus Abraham) and those of the period of early Israelite history (beginning with Jacob). This division is not without problems, since the authors of the Qumran Aramaic writings often do not neatly distinguish between the so-called primeval and patriarchal periods. For example, the Genesis Apocryphon includes an Abraham cycle alongside of its account of the lives of Enoch and Noah, and the Aramaic Levi Document traces its priestly lore back to Abraham via “The Book of Noah concerning the blood.”¹⁴⁶ This division is nevertheless useful, especially for the present investigation into the ways in which the priesthood, temple, and cult are treated in the Aramaic literature from Qumran. Most notably, explicit references to priests and the priesthood are generally confined to those compositions set during the patriarchal period.¹⁴⁷

The present chapter highlights passages related to the priesthood, temple, and cult found in the compositions set during the prediluvian period. Most of the chapter is concerned with my analysis of the Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36), the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) and the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17), the latter two being recognized as distinct literary units within their respective compositions (the Dream Visions and the Epistle of Enoch). My discussion treats each of these three compositions as discrete works, and does not assume *a priori* that they share a conception of or attitude toward the priesthood or temple cult. In so doing,

¹⁴⁶ See also Abraham’s possession of ‘The Book of the Words of Enoch’ in 1Q20 XIX 25 and a broken reference to Noah in one manuscript fragment from the Visions of Amram (4Q547 5 3).

¹⁴⁷ The implications of this and others differences between the two groupings will concern us in greater detail in chapter 6.

I hope to highlight the subtle differences in how they approach these topics. After my discussion of the relevant early Enoch writings, the rest of the chapter deals with the Genesis Apocryphon, focusing in particular on the cultic duties of Noah and Abraham.

3.2 The Book of Watchers¹⁴⁸

Any discussion on the role of the priesthood, temple, and cult in the Book of Watchers should begin with a quote from one of the scholars who has written most prolifically in this area, Martha Himmelfarb.¹⁴⁹ Speaking about the recent history of scholarship on the early Enochic literature, Himmelfarb provides an initial word of caution: “[T]he Book of the Watchers [never] mentions the Jerusalem priesthood. It is worth reminding ourselves, before we offer our ingenious theories about the relationship of [this work] to the contemporary priesthood, just how opaque these texts are.”¹⁵⁰ Even David Suter, one of the strongest proponents of seeing priestly concerns in these texts, admits: “At first glance the topics of temple, priesthood, and cult do not seem to be an intuitive set of categories to choose for a systematic examination of the early Enoch tradition.”¹⁵¹ These observations notwithstanding, the vast majority of critics, including

¹⁴⁸ 1 Enoch has only been preserved in its entirety in Ethiopic. It is widely acknowledged that the Ethiopic version represents a translation of a Greek *Vorlage*, which itself represents a translation of a Semitic, likely Aramaic, original. Where available, I depend on the Aramaic 1 Enoch manuscripts from Qumran as transcribed and translated in J. T. Milik, ed., with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1976). Where the Aramaic is unavailable, I have consulted the Greek Gizeh text of 1 Enoch, accessed via The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha (www.pseudepigrapha.org). Where only the Ethiopic has been preserved, I have relied on Nickelsburg and VanderKam’s English translation of 1 Enoch. I have also made liberal use of the textual notes in George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g. Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 9–28; eadem, “The Book of Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem,” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 131–5; eadem, “Temple and the Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 219–36.

¹⁵⁰ Himmelfarb, “Book of the Watchers,” 131.

¹⁵¹ David W. Suter, “Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch Tradition: Memory, Vision, and Expectation,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 195–218.

Himmelfarb and Suter, continue to interpret the cosmic struggle narrated in the Book of Watchers through the lens of the author’s purported polemic against the behavior of members of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem. I will address these scholarly theories in an excursus below. In the main part of this chapter, however, I intend only to analyze those passages that allude to the priesthood, cult, and temple in the Book of Watchers. Through my analysis of this material, I will show that many of the standard conclusions do not account for the full complexity of the textual evidence. The Book of Watchers is in fact shot through with priestly language and concepts, but the notion that its tradents intended to criticize the impropriety of the contemporary priesthood and reject the authority of the Jerusalem temple cannot withstand close scrutiny. The Book of Watchers brings a decidedly priestly worldview to its interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 and its conception of the cosmos and the eschaton, without offering a clear polemic. The only passage that seems to mention the temple, Jerusalem, and its environs envisions them as integral to God’s eschatological future (see 1 En. 24–27). As Pierluigi Piovanelli has suggested, “Reading the whole text as a coherent narrative, and not as a collage of heterogeneous literary units, we find, at this level, no trace of any criticism or opposition to the Jerusalem priesthood, quite the contrary.” He goes on to add, rightly, that “nothing in the text notifies the reader that [the] present conditions [of Jerusalem and its temple] are either endangered or corrupt.”¹⁵²

3.2.1 The Priestly Qualities of Enoch and the Angelic Host

Nowhere does the Book of Watchers explicitly refer to priests, the priesthood, or any type of sacrificial activity, yet Enoch and various angelic beings at times take on priestly or priest-like

¹⁵² Pierluigi Piovanelli, “‘Sitting by the Waters of Dan,’ or the ‘Tricky Business’ of Tracing the Social Profile of the Communities that Produced the Earliest Enochic Texts,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSup 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 257–81, 278 and 279 n. 69.

attributes. Chapters 9–10, for example, recount the intercessory activity of the four archangels—Michael, Sariel, Raphael, and Gabriel.¹⁵³ Here, we read that these four angels beheld the bloodshed, godlessness, and violence on the earth from their place in “the sanctuary of heaven (τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)” (1 En. 9:1) and offered an intercessory prayer before God on behalf of humanity (1 En. 9:2–11).¹⁵⁴ A few chapters later, the theme of angelic intercession occurs again. This time, though, the fallen watchers are chastised by God for failing to perform this duty on behalf of humankind (1 En. 15:2). Nickelsburg has argued that highlighting “the angel’s intercessory function here may relate to their status as priests in the heavenly temple.”¹⁵⁵ Suter is even more forthright: “The cosmic function of the angels as intercessors...parallels the religious function of the priesthood.”¹⁵⁶ It may be going too far to identify the angelic host as priests outright, but their role as intercessors certainly evokes priestly service, especially when we consider how the heavenly realm in the Book of Watchers is conceived of as a cosmic temple, as we will see in section 3.2.4 below. In fact, the fallen watchers are accursed in part for abandoning their proper domain, which is described in the Book of Watchers as “the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary (τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ αἰῶνος)” (1 En. 15:3).

The Book of Watchers also highlights the special priestly duties of one angel in particular, namely, the archangel Michael. In ch. 10, Michael appears to have been given “high priestly functions” insofar as he is entrusted with the task of eradicating “not only sin and evil, but also

¹⁵³ Nickelsburg refers to their intercession as “an extension and explication of the cry of humanity.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 205. For the other references to humanity’s appeal for divine assistance in the Book of Watchers, see 1 En. 7:6 and 8:4.

¹⁵⁴ Nickelsburg points out that the angels’ words in 1 En. 9:11 indicate that they “are less mediators than they are intercessors, calling God’s attention to what he already knows and has heard—including the prayer of humanity.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 206.

¹⁵⁵ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 271.

¹⁵⁶ David W. Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–35, 123.

their defiling consequences.”¹⁵⁷ 1 Enoch 10:20–22 depicts the earth as having been polluted, in response to which God commands Michael: “Cleanse the earth from all impurity and from all wrong and from all lawlessness and from all sin; and godlessness and impurities that have come upon the earth, remove.” As Nickelsburg argues, this passage likely alludes “to the bloodshed described in chap. 7,” namely, “the violent deeds of the giants and their results.”¹⁵⁸ The term *ἀκαθαρσία* occurs twice in these few short lines, and is consistent with the broader concern with impurity in chaps. 6–16. 1 Enoch 10:20–22 thus understands the earth as having been polluted by blood and in need of “cultic purification.”¹⁵⁹ Michael’s response to the defiling of the earth is most plausibly understood as an act of atonement, comparable to Noah’s act of atonement on behalf of the earth in the Genesis Apocryphon (see section 3.5.1 below).¹⁶⁰

Finally, it is worth considering whether Enoch is presented as a priestly or priest-like figure in the Book of Watchers, as scholars like Himmelfarb have suggested.¹⁶¹ The most compelling argument in favor of Enoch’s priestly identity is that his actions mirror those of the angelic host. Not only does Enoch have access to the heavenly temple, even being led to the threshold of the divine throne room (1 En. 14:25), but he also intercedes on behalf of the fallen watchers, which 1 En. 15:2 identifies as an ironic role reversal: “You should petition on behalf of humans, and not humans on behalf of you.” As Collins argued, “Enoch undertakes the role that should normally be filled by priest-angels.”¹⁶² However, Enoch is identified in the Book of Watchers as a scribe, not a priest (e.g., 1 En. 12:4; 15:1; cf. 1 En. 92:1; 4Q203 8.4), and his competence as a writer in

¹⁵⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 228.

¹⁵⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 227 and 184.

¹⁵⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 227.

¹⁶⁰ The Greek verb used to characterize Michael’s activity in the extant manuscripts (*καθαρίζω*) is not typically chosen to translate כפר in the LXX, but Nickelsburg contends that “the occurrence of טהר/καθαρίζω in Lev 16:30 as a synonym for ‘atone’ suggests some such connotation here.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 228.

¹⁶¹ Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 25.

¹⁶² Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 54.

passages like 1 En. 12:6 has led Collins to suggest that Enoch is better understood as scribal figure, as opposed to a priestly one.¹⁶³ I would argue that this is a false choice. As I will show in section 6.2.2, the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus attest to the convergence of priestly and scribal identities, a trend which occurs across a wide swath of Second Temple Jewish literature. Scribal and priestly identities are far from mutually exclusive.

3.2.2 Exogamy as a Violation of Priestly Prohibitions

The marriages between watchers and human women are sharply condemned in the Book of Watchers, in part by appealing to language of impurity. The very act of sexual contact between the watchers and human women is said to defile the watchers. As 1 En. 9:8 states, “They have gone into the daughters of the men of earth, and they have lain with them, and have defiled themselves with the women.”¹⁶⁴ This verse, however, does not spell out *why* the sexual encounter between watchers and human women was defiling. Many scholars claim that 1 En. 10:11 and 15:4 allude to menstrual impurity, contracted by the watchers by having sex with their wives during their period, but this view is highly unlikely.¹⁶⁵ A more likely explanation can be found in the set of binary oppositions in 1 En. 12:4 and 15:3–7.¹⁶⁶ 1 Enoch 15:4 explains the problem with the watchers’ marriages by noting that in taking wives they, “holy ones and spirits, living forever,” have acted like humans, “flesh and blood, who die and perish.” The watchers have abandoned “the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary (τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ αἰῶνος)” and have consorted “with the daughters

¹⁶³ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 54.

¹⁶⁴ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 271–72.

¹⁶⁵ See the excursus below.

¹⁶⁶ As Tigchelaar notes, “The description of the sins of the Watchers in Enoch’s report, or rather the narrative as a whole, is structured according to a series of oppositions, the most basic of which are heaven vs. earth, and Watchers vs. men.” Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*, OTS 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 195–203, 193. Cf. idem, “Some Remarks on the Book of Watchers, the Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208,” *Henocho* 24 (2002): 143–5.

of men” and thus have “done as the sons of the earth” (1 En. 15:3; cf. 12:4). The watchers are criticized for betraying their heavenly and eternal nature by leaving their heavenly abode, having sexual relations with flesh and blood, and acting like men rather than heavenly beings. As Nickelsburg has summarized, “In short, the watchers have violated the created order, transgressing the boundary between the spheres of heaven and earth, spirit and flesh, and in so doing they have defiled their holy state.”¹⁶⁷ What makes this type of marriage defiling has to do with the fact that it “represents an illegitimate degree of relationship.”¹⁶⁸ There is an “incongruity” inherent in these marriages.¹⁶⁹

The offspring of these sexual unions are also depicted in terms of “incongruity.” They are described using language that reinforces the author’s concern with illegitimate sexual partnerships, and with illicit mixing in particular. Chapters 6–16 of the Book of Watchers describe these gigantic offspring with the phrases *μαζηρέοι* and *κίβδηλα*. The former appears in rabbinic tradition (*μαζηρέοι* = *ממזריא*) as a way of referring to “the offspring of a union forbidden in the law.”¹⁷⁰ The latter connects the giants to earlier, Pentateuchal prohibitions against mixing unlike substances, as it is one of the words that the LXX of Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11 uses to render the word *גְּזֵזֶת*, which “describes a cloth woven from two different kinds of thread.”¹⁷¹ Here, the priestly legislation pertaining to the improper mixing of fabrics is being appropriated by the Book of Watchers to

¹⁶⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 272.

¹⁶⁸ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119.

¹⁶⁹ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119. See also Loader, who suggests, “[The watchers’] choice to have sexual intercourse with human women is now also a corruption and abandonment of their order of being. It is a forbidden mixing of kinds (cf. Deut 22:9–11; Lev 18:22–23.” William Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees: Attitudes Toward Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 9–10.

¹⁷⁰ For more on the use of this term to describe the offspring of the fallen watchers, see Ida Fröhlich, “‘Mamzer’ in Qumran Texts – The Problem of Mixed Marriages from Ezra’s Time: Law, Literature and Practice,” *Transeuphratène* 29 (2005): 103–15. Cf. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 22.

¹⁷¹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 213. He also points to “the transferal of Heb *גְּזֵזֶת* to refer to mixed marriages of priests and Levites” in 4QMMT.

characterize and condemn the offspring of the watchers and human women. What this language suggests is that the author views these angelic beings as engaging in acts of improper mixing, resulting in the production of offspring who are denigrated as “hybrids” possessing “mixed ancestry.”¹⁷² Interestingly, language from the law against illicit mixing in Lev 19:19 is also deployed in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat to describe the children of mixed marriages. Both of them use an Aramaic form of the Hebrew word כְּלָאִים (“two kinds”) as a derogatory term for the child of an exogamous marriage.¹⁷³

3.2.3 The Earthly Temple, Jerusalem, and the Eschaton

The only possible allusion to an earthly temple occurs briefly during Enoch’s guided journey through the cosmos. On this journey, he encounters seven mountains, all of which were “precious and glorious and beautiful” (ἐντιμα και ἔνδοξα και εὐειδῆ) and had “stones [that] were precious in beauty” (οἱ λίθοι ἐντιμοι τῆ καλλονῆ) (1 En. 24:2).¹⁷⁴ Of the seventh mountain, Enoch reports, “[It was] in the midst of these (other mountains), and it rose above them in height, like the seat of a throne.” Two chapters later, we read that this mountain is “a holy mountain” (ὄρος ἅγιον) (1 En. 26:2), which is located at “the center of the earth” (τὸ μέσον τῆς γῆς) (1 En. 26:1). Enoch’s tour guide, the archangel Michael, compares the seventh mountain to “the throne of God” (θρόνου θεοῦ), and identifies it as “the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in goodness” (1 En. 25:3).

¹⁷² Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119.

¹⁷³ This term also appears in 4QMMT to refer to mixed marriages.

¹⁷⁴ Compare this passage with account of the seven mountains in 1 En. 18:6–9, which differs from chs. 24–25 in several respects, but nevertheless refers to “seven mountains of precious stones” (τὰ ἑπτὰ ὄρη ἀπὸ λίθων πολυτελεῶν)—with the seventh resembling “the throne of God” (θρόνος θεοῦ). On the differences between 1 En. 18:6–9 and 1 En. 24:2–25:7, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 313.

The seventh mountain is not explicitly identified with Jerusalem or Mt Zion, but such a conclusion can be drawn on the basis of the consistency with which the phrase “holy mountain” is used throughout the Hebrew Bible. For example, Isa 27:13 foretells of a day in which the exiled Israelites “will come and worship the Lord on the holy mountain at Jerusalem,” and Joel 3:17 proclaims that “you shall know that I, the Lord your God, dwell in Zion, my holy mountain.”¹⁷⁵ Moreover, the idea that the seventh mountain stands at the center of the earth also reinforces its connection to Jewish traditions about Jerusalem. As Nickelsburg has pointed out, “Jerusalem is described as the center of the earth already in Ezek 5:5 and 38:12 (there טבור, lit. ‘navel’), and the idea is explicit in *Jub.* 8:12, 19.”¹⁷⁶ We can thus see that Jerusalem and its temple play a central role in Michael’s description of the eschatological future. Jerusalem is the place to which God’s throne will descend at the end of days, and the temple (τὸ ἄγιον) is the place where God’s chosen will congregate.¹⁷⁷

3.2.4 The Heavenly Realm as a Temple

A majority of scholars subscribe to the view that the Book of Watchers envisions the heavenly realm as a temple, partly on the basis of the ἄγι- nouns used to describe it on several

¹⁷⁵ Other references include: Ps 48:1; 99:1; Isa 11:9; 56:7, 13; 65:11, 25; 66:20; Ezek 20:40; 28:14; Dan 9:16, 20; 11:45; Joel 2:1; 3:7; Obad 16; Zeph 3:11; Zech 8:3.

¹⁷⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 318. Interestingly, both Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon appropriate the Ionian world map, but, while Jubilees adapts it so as to place Jerusalem at the center of the earth, the Genesis Apocryphon does not. So Eshel: “Thus, as opposed to *Jubilees*, which converts the Ionian map to a Jewish perspective, placing Jerusalem at the center of the world, the *Genesis Apocryphon* retains the focus of the original Ionian map.” Esther Eshel, “The *Imago Mundi* of the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111–31, 123. For a reconstruction and detailed discussion of the relevant columns of 1Q20, see Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹⁷⁷ The Book of Watchers, like Ezekiel, also uses Edenic language in its descriptions of the new, eschatological Jerusalem. See, i.e., the centrality of the tree of life in Michael’s account of the seventh mountain and the eschaton.

occasions in chs. 6–16: τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “the sanctuary of heaven” (9:1), τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλὸν τὸ ἁγίασμα τῆς στάσεως τοῦ αἰῶνος “the high heaven, the sanctuary of the[ir] eternal station” (14:2), and τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸν ὑψηλὸν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ αἰῶνος “the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary” (15:3). Of all of these references, the underlying Aramaic phrase is partially preserved only in 1 En. 9:1. According to the relevant Qumran fragment, τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ appears to be a translation of קדשׁ שׁמיה.¹⁷⁸ The Qumran fragments do not preserve the Aramaic of either 1 En. 12:4 or 15:3, but the translation of 1 En. 9:1 is consistent with the general tendency of the LXX to translate the Hebrew words for sanctuary (קֹדֶשׁ; מִקְדָּשׁ) with the Greek words ἁγίασμα and ἅγιον.¹⁷⁹

In addition to these few scattered references, a more detailed description of the heavenly realm appears in 1 En. 14:9–23 in the context of Enoch’s ascent vision in chs. 14–16. Several scholars have argued that the architecture described in this vision resembles that of the Jerusalem temple. As a result, they have concluded that the heavenly realm was intentionally depicted “in terms derived from architectural traditions associated with Solomon’s temple”¹⁸⁰ so as to draw a comparison between the heavenly and earthly temple. This view is almost certainly correct.

Upon reaching heaven, Enoch begins a journey inward, encountering three physical structures of increasing splendor and grandeur along the way: “a wall” or “wall of a building” (τείχους οἰκοδομῆς);¹⁸¹ “a great house” (בֵּית רַב; οἶκον μέγαν); and “a house greater than the former

¹⁷⁸ Milik transcribes and reconstructs the relevant portion of 4Q201 as קדשׁ שׁמיה (1iv.7).

¹⁷⁹ For example, the LXX of Exod 25:8 renders קֹדֶשׁ as ἁγίασμα, the LXX of Exod 26:33 translates מִקְדָּשׁ with ἅγιον, and the LXX of Ezek 45:2–4 uses ἁγίασμα for both קֹדֶשׁ and מִקְדָּשׁ. The Greek text of 1 Maccabees also uses ἁγίασμα for ‘sanctuary’ (1:21), though the underlying Hebrew text is not extant.

¹⁸⁰ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 198.

¹⁸¹ Nickelsburg proposes that οἰκοδομῆς should be understood “as a corrupt abbreviation for οἰκοδομημένου,” thus rendering the English as “a wall built of (ἐν) hailstones,” rather than “the wall of a building (built) of (ἐν) hailstones.”

one” (ὁ οἶκος μείζων τούτων). The greater of the two houses contains a “lofty throne” (θρόνον ὑψηλόν) upon which sits “the Great Glory” (ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη).¹⁸² This tripartite architectural structure mirrors that of the Jerusalem temple as described in various Jewish sources, though it does not correspond perfectly to any single, known description of the temple. Instead, 1 En. 14 appears to draw upon multiple traditions at once. The wall in 1 En. 14:9 is sometimes taken as reflecting either the wall of the vestibule¹⁸³ or, more likely, as that which “encloses the temenos of the heavenly temple,” much like the wall described at the beginning of Ezekiel’s vision of the new Jerusalem (cf. 40:5).¹⁸⁴ The two houses in 1 En. 14:10 and 15 are also very often associated with the sanctuary and holy of holies, respectively.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, both the heavenly realm in 1 En. 14 and the temple in the Hebrew scriptures contain a special room within the larger architectural

Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 258. This reading is line with the Ethiopic (the underlying Aramaic is not preserved). Suter agrees that “the Ethiopic is to be preferred at this point.” Suter, “Temples and the Temple, 202, arguing, “Τεῖχος, as well as the equivalent Ethiopic, indicates a city wall, not the wall of a house, so that it seems more likely that the Greek has misplaced a passive participle with a noun. The instrumental use of the preposition ἐν with a dative likewise seems to call of a passive participle.” Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 202–3. Suter also points to the “parallel construction” in 14:10 (οικοδομημέν ἐν λίθοις χαλάζης).

¹⁸² This phrase is reminiscent of the one used to describe God’s throne in Isa 6 (סִפְּשֹׁנִי דָּךְ סִפְּשֹׁנִי). The LXX translation reads θρόνου ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου.

¹⁸³ Himmelfarb does not emend the Greek text, retaining the reading τεῖχος οἰκοδομῆς “wall of a building” of v. 10. For her, it is significant that “the Greek uses *oikodomē*, building, for the first structure but *oikos*, house, for the other two,” which might “point to the difference between the two inner chambers, where cultic activity takes place, and the vestibule, which serves to separate the sanctuary proper from the area outside and which is not the scene of such activity.” Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 119–20 n. 29. However, the use of the word *oikodomē* in v. 10 does not necessarily support Himmelfarb’s theory about this structure being identified with the חֲלוֹא. Nor does it undermine Nickelsburg’s view that this structure actually refers to the wall surrounding the entire temple complex. In fact, Nickelsburg’s view remains preferable, especially if בניא is the Aramaic word underlying the Greek οἰκοδομή, as Milik suggested in his edition of the Aramaic Enoch manuscripts from Qumran. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 194. The phrase “wall of the building” (קִיר הַבְּנִינָה) occurs in the description of the temple complex in Ezek 40–48, and the Hebrew equivalent of the word בניא (‘building, structure’) is used to describe the wall surrounding the temple complex in Ezek 40:5, a verse which evinces a clear parallel with 1 En. 14:9. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 254, 262. When the vestibule is referred to in the LXX of Ezekiel, the Greek term that translates חֲלוֹא is τὸ αἶλαμ (Ezek 40:48; so also LXX 1 Kgs 6:3).

¹⁸⁴ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 262. So also Suter, who agrees with Nickelsburg that “[i]t is more likely that the construction that Enoch first encounters is a wall marking off a court or *temenos* containing the celestial temple.” Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 203.

¹⁸⁵ See, e.g., Johann Maier, “Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und ‘Gnosis,’” *Kairos* 5 (1963): 18–40; Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, HSS (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 60; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 14; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 263.

complex that contains God’s chariot throne, a room which is off limits to all but a very select group of individuals.¹⁸⁶ The heavenly structure in 1 En. 14 is also depicted as having an upper chamber (τὸ ἀνώτερον; 1 En. 14:17), which is characteristic of the temple as depicted in Chronicles, the Mishnah, and Josephus, though not Kings or Ezekiel.¹⁸⁷ Enoch’s movement through these heavenly structures may have been influenced by the account of Ezekiel’s tour through the restored temple (chs. 40–44).¹⁸⁸

The visually stunning character of the heavenly architecture in 1 En. 14 also connects it to descriptions of the Jerusalem temple. The wall and the first house are constructed of, paradoxically, both fire and water, with the house being described as “hot as fire and cold as snow” (1 En. 14:13).¹⁸⁹ The second house, on the other hand, “is constructed entirely of fiery material. The hailstones and snow of the first house have been replaced by fire.”¹⁹⁰ Many of the materials used in the construction of these architectural elements are described as, or compared with, different types of “meteorological phenomena,” e.g., flashes of lightning, shooting stars, snow, and the shining sun. The inclusion of such building materials may serve a variety of functions, but one of

¹⁸⁶ See, e.g., 1 Chr 28:18.

¹⁸⁷ The first extant references in Jewish literature to the temple having multiple stories come from two passages in the Chronicler’s work, which mention the temple’s “upper chambers” (עליון) (1 Chr 28:11; 2 Chr 3:9). So Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Construction of the Temple According to the ‘Temple Scroll,’” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 555–71, see 568; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 264. The Mishnah uses the singular *יהלע* to describe an “upper chamber” above the temple, which likely “covered both the sanctuary and the holy of holies,” the purpose of which was to allow access to “the holy of holies from above for repairs.” Schiffman, “Construction of the Temple,” 568. Cf. Nickelsburg, who notes the appearance of an “upper chamber” (ὑπερῶον) that “stood over the main room and holy of holies” in Josephus’ description of Herod’s temple in *War*. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 264.

¹⁸⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 254 n. 6 credits Michael Stone with this suggestion. See the table in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 254 and 256.

¹⁸⁹ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 15. Nickelsburg also highlights the paradoxical character of the building materials in this description, characterizing this phenomenon as the “coexistence of mutually exclusive opposites.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 262. The wall is made of “hailstones” (λίθοις χαλάζης) surrounded by tongues of fire (γῶν [γῶν; γλώσσης πυρός). The first house is built using hailstones as well, but also contains a floor of snow (ἐδάφη χιονικά), a ceiling like shooting stars and lightning flashes (ὡς διαδρομαὶ ἀστέρων καὶ ἀσταρπαί), walls surrounded by flaming fire (πῦρ φλεγόμενον), doors blazing with fire (πυρὶ καιόμεναι), and fiery cherubim (αὐτῶν χερουβὶν πύρινα) amidst a watery heaven (οὐρανὸς αὐτῶν ὕδωρ) (1 En. 14:10–14).

¹⁹⁰ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 264. He points out that “here the point of comparison is not cold and heat, but brilliance.”

their effects is to highlight the visually stunning character of God’s celestial abode. Suter proposes understanding this description against the backdrop of a larger collection of writings from Second Temple Judaism, namely, those which use gems and other precious materials “in the description of utopian and eschatological temples and cities in Second Temple literature.”¹⁹¹ Such writings include Tobit (13:16), New Jerusalem (4Q554 2ii.15; 5Q15 1i.6-7), Peshier Isaiah (4Q164 1.1-4), and Revelation (21:10-21),¹⁹² and may reflect “a tradition about the creation of visual impact in the depiction of an ideal state of affairs.”¹⁹³ More concretely, Suter has also pointed to “the use of fire as a structural element in the depiction of the celestial temple in *1 Enoch*” as a point of comparison with “the description of the new Jerusalem in Zech 2,” which includes “a wall of fire” surrounding the city (vv. 3–5).¹⁹⁴ Similarly, Himmelfarb points to a passage from Josephus’ *Jewish War* in which the Jerusalem temple is said to give off “a fiery flash” but also resembles “a snow-clad mountain” to show that 1 En. 14 may depend on traditions related to the temple.¹⁹⁵ The sheer amount of focus in 1 En. 14 on the fact that the heavenly realm is unsurpassed in glory, majesty, and greatness (ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλωσύνῃ) may also function to solidify the correspondence between it and the Jerusalem temple, especially when compared to the description of the eschatological temple in the Apocalypse of Weeks, which is referred to as being built “in the greatness of its splendor” (ברבות זוה) (1 En. 91:13 // 4Q212 1iv.18).

¹⁹¹ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 205.

¹⁹² In my section on the Book of Tobit, I point out that this motif likely derives from the description of the restored Jerusalem in Isa 54. Interestingly, however, the description of the new city in Tobit and New Jerusalem at times agree with one another over and against Isa 54. On this point, see Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 42 and my discussion in Chapter 6.

¹⁹³ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 205. Suter acknowledges that “the hailstones, or ice crystals, and tongues of fire of 1 En. 14 are not exactly precious stones,” but nonetheless argues that “they possess the same impact.” Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 205–6.

¹⁹⁴ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 206. Suter argues here that “[f]ire seems to be a universal symbol of the divine presence, as is apparent from the description of the investment of the tabernacle with the glory of Yahweh in Exod 40:34–38.”

¹⁹⁵ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 15.

Suter reiterates what I have shown in this discussion of 1 En. 14, namely, the heavenly temple in the Book of Watchers is depicted “in terms derived from architectural traditions associated with Solomon’s temple.”¹⁹⁶ This observation led him to conclude correctly that “the description of the celestial temple in 1 En. 14 is very much a constituent part of a rich body of literature related to the temple.”¹⁹⁷ However, Himmelfarb is right to acknowledge that, “[w]hile it is clear that the heavenly temple of 1 Enoch 14 corresponds to the earthly temple, it does not seem to correspond in detail to any particular temple described in the Hebrew Bible,”¹⁹⁸ nor does it contain much “technical terminology” related to the temple or its cult.¹⁹⁹ It is also worth noting that the splendor and glory of the heavenly temple would have certainly been understood by the author of the Book of Watchers to far exceed that of the one in Jerusalem, either the original Solomonic temple or the one built after the return from exile. No earthly temple could possibly have matched the stunning visual impact of a temple constructed of “tongues of fire” and “hailstone” (1 En. 14:9). Even if the heavenly temple resembled the Jerusalem temple, or vice versa, the Jerusalem temple could only ever have paled in comparison to God’s celestial abode. Such a view need not reflect a polemical attitude toward the past or contemporary Jerusalem temple on the part of the author of the Book of Watchers. It would have been uncontroversial for any pious Jew of the Second Temple period to hold that opinion.

¹⁹⁶ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 198.

¹⁹⁷ Suter, “Temples and the Temple,” 204. Suter makes this claim despite arguing that the author of this text is attempting to disassociate the heaven temple from the contemporary earthly temple by locating the point of access to it in Dan rather than Jerusalem.

¹⁹⁸ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 15. The lack of precise correspondences may in part reflect the composite character of 1 En. 14’s description of the heavenly architecture, which drew on a wide variety of sources (e.g., Isa 6 and Ezek 1).

¹⁹⁹ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 15.

3.2.5 Conclusion

Most of the priestly material in the Book of Watchers comes from chs. 6–16, the portion of the narrative that recounts the sins of the fallen watchers and Enoch’s intercession on their behalf. This fact has led many scholars to conclude that the author intended to condemn the contemporary Jerusalem priests on the basis of their errant sexual practices. While it is true that the fallen watchers are depicted as possessing priestly attributes and as failing to fulfill priestly responsibilities, it is worth noting that the Book of Watchers ascribes priestly characteristics to both positive and negative characters. Enoch, Michael, and the other archangels are also reminiscent of priests and carry out priestly duties, and ch. 14 reports that an unspecified number of angels continue to fulfill their duties in the heavenly temple, the defection of their colleagues notwithstanding.²⁰⁰ It is more helpful to understand the Book of Watchers as a work of priestly exegesis. When considering Gen 6:1–4, it would not necessarily have been that far of a leap for an exegete to interpret the sexual activity of the watchers through the lens of the legislation against illicit mixing, especially if that exegete were a member of, or connected to, the priesthood. Genesis 6:1–4 would have been understood by such a priestly exegete as describing a fundamental transgression of the cosmic order and violation of purity regulations—including not only the illicit sexual mixing, but the subsequent defilement of the land through bloodshed. Nothing mandates viewing it as a rhetorical attack on the sexual behavior of specific opponents.

Finally, it should be reiterated that the only possible reference to Jerusalem and its temple in the Book of Watchers is overwhelmingly positive. It is true that the account of the seventh mountain in 1 En. 25:5–6 gives no indication of its attitude toward the contemporary Jerusalem

²⁰⁰ This point is made by Himmelfarb in “Temple and Priests,” 228.

temple, and rather concerns the role of the temple at the time of the eschaton.²⁰¹ However, there is no good reason to assume that the underlying attitude toward the contemporary temple, either here or anywhere else in the Book of Watchers, is one of hostility. Assumptions that the Book of Watchers is critical of the contemporary Jerusalem temple are predicated on a problematic reading of two passages from chs. 6–16 (i.e., 10:11 and 15:4), as well as the unflattering image of the Second Temple in the Animal Apocalypse and its complete absence in the Apocalypse of Weeks. These two compositions will be treated below, but nothing in the Book of Watchers itself indicates that it views the Second Temple as defunct or under divine judgment.

Excursus: Criticism of the Jerusalem Priesthood in the Book of Watchers?

1 Introduction

Over the past few decades, the contours of a consensus have emerged regarding the Book of Watchers and its underlying attitude(s) toward the Jerusalem priesthood and temple. It has been argued that this composition functions as a critique, if not an outright condemnation, of the Jerusalem cultus, and reflects a social movement of dissenters that is actively opposed to the official representatives of the temple establishment. Various scholars articulate their positions differently and even disagree on many of the details, but this basic position has received widespread acceptance, and the Book of Watchers is generally viewed as one of several Second Temple sources that evince a critical posture toward the Jerusalem priesthood and temple.

²⁰¹ 1 Enoch 25:5–6 does not, in fact, refer clearly to the appearance or re-appearance of the temple at the time of the final judgment; its presence seems simply to be assumed, though God's throne descends from heaven. At best, it is unclear whether or not the Book of Watchers assumes the presence of the temple before the eschaton.

However, the arguments on which this consensus rest have not persuaded everyone. Some have objected on exegetical grounds to the notion that the Book of Watchers reflects antipathy toward the Jerusalem cultus, while others have leveled more fundamental, methodological objections. This excursus will outline some of the most influential aspects of the consensus view, focusing on the work of George Nickelsburg and David Suter. I will also highlight the some of the most important critical voices, especially those of Eibert Tigchelaar, Martha Himmelfarb, William Loader, and Philip Esler.

2 Suter, Nickelsburg, and the Foundations of a Consensus

Suter and Nickelsburg published articles in close succession (1979, 1981) in which they argued that the sexual misdeeds of the watchers in the Book of Watchers functioned as a thinly-veiled criticism of specific marriage practices of the priests in Jerusalem.²⁰² Suter and Nickelsburg arrived at their conclusions independently, but many of their assumptions and arguments overlap, such that the two articles are often discussed together. In fact, Suter and Nickelsburg have come back to this topic on several occasions, each using the work of the other to reinforce and nuance his original positions. Many subsequent scholars have either taken the articles of Suter and Nickelsburg as their starting point or incorporated their conclusions in their own theories about the social location of the Book of Watchers.²⁰³ As Crispin Fletcher-Louis noted in 2002, “Since the work of David Suter and George Nickelsburg the *Fall of the Watchers* cycle has been widely interpreted as a typological reference to the exogamy of priests who, like the watchers in heaven,

²⁰² George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600; Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 115–35.

²⁰³ One important example can be found in the work of Benjamin Wright, who uses the claims of Suter and Nickelsburg as the foundation of his theory regarding the relationship between the Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, and Ben Sira. Benjamin G. Wright III, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood,” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*, BZAW 255 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 189–222, see 192–6.

have left their domain of cultic and racial purity by marrying non-Israelite women of the land.”²⁰⁴

As recently as 2017, Philip F. Esler was able to cite this very quote from Fletcher-Louis as being representative of the current state of affairs.²⁰⁵

The foundation of Suter and Nickelsburg’s argument is a proposed correlation in the Book of Watchers between the heavenly realm and the Jerusalem temple, between the fallen watchers and the Jerusalem priests. Both scholars also describe the sexual misdeeds of the watchers as alluding to specific *halakhic* infractions related to sexual impurity.²⁰⁶ Suter and Nickelsburg use their reading of the Book of Watchers as evidence of the author’s implicit criticism of the marital practices of the contemporary Jerusalemite priests, which they argued were viewed by the author as being both exogamous and in violation of specific purity regulations. For Suter, the preoccupation with endogamy and purity in the Book of Watchers reflects “a halakhic interest” and indicates that “the myth needs to be examined in light of the rules concerning family purity in Second Temple Judaism.”²⁰⁷ Suter’s analysis of Second Temple literature dealing with the issue of “family purity” leads him to conclude that it is primarily a priestly matter, and that there was in the Second Temple period “a tendency toward priestly marriage within a relatively closed circle in order to maintain the purity of the priesthood.”²⁰⁸ Suter then argues that the concern for endogamy on evidence in 1 En. 6–16 runs parallel to this “tendency toward endogamy in priestly

²⁰⁴ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 22. It should be noted that Suter posits, as we will see, that the Book of Watchers criticizes not marriages between priests and non-Israelites, but between priests and Israelites from non-priestly families (so also Himmelfarb). Nickelsburg is less explicit on what type of marriages the author has in mind, while still contending that the Book of Watchers is condemning priestly exogamy of some sort.

²⁰⁵ Philip F. Esler, *God’s Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-Interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017), 80.

²⁰⁶ For a fuller discussion of the extent to which the heavenly realm and angelic host are patterned after the Jerusalem temple and its priests, see above. There, I also discuss the priestly language and concepts used to describe the sexual misdeeds and offspring of the fallen watchers. However, arguments about whether or not the Book of Watchers also counts menstrual impurity through sexual contact and a resulting defilement of the temple among the watcher’s transgressions are considered later in this excursus.

²⁰⁷ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119.

²⁰⁸ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 121.

marriages,”²⁰⁹ and thus suggests that the Book of Watchers takes aim at the priests in Jerusalem for failing to live up to these standards. To drive this point further, Suter discusses several other compositions, in particular the Testament of Levi and the Damascus Document, as examples of writings that both criticize the priests in Jerusalem and display an awareness of the myth of the watchers. These compositions accuse the priests of specific infractions, including illicit marriage, misappropriation of temple funds, defiling the temple, and teaching what is contrary to the commandments of God, which, Suter contends, parallel the activity of the watchers in chaps. 6–16 of 1 Enoch. Nickelsburg also proposes several Second Temple period parallels in order to connect the sexual activity of the watchers with that of the Jerusalemite priests. In particular, he argues that the criticism of the priests in the Damascus Document, the Psalms of Solomon, and the last chapters of Ezra closely resembled the particular accusations leveled against the watchers in 1 En. 12:4 and 15:3–4.²¹⁰

For Nickelsburg, as for Suter, the “cultic language” of passages like 1 En. 15:3–4 suggest that the author of the Book of Watchers intended to challenge what he took to be the illicit sexual activity of the Jerusalemite priests of his own day, especially when interpreted in light the close correspondences that they share with some of the “explicit polemics against the priesthood” in roughly contemporaneous texts.²¹¹ For Suter, the illicit sexual activity being criticized in the Book of Watchers included priests marrying women who were Israelites, but who did not belong to a priestly family, which effectively defiled the priesthood.²¹² For both, it also included priests being in sexual contact with women during their menstrual period, which resulted not only in the

²⁰⁹ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 121.

²¹⁰ Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 585.

²¹¹ Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 584.

²¹² Nickelsburg is less than clear on what specific types of marriages are being condemned by the Book of Watchers, i.e., priest and Israelite from non-priestly family (so Suter) or priest and non-Israelite.

defilement of the priesthood, but of the temple itself. For example, Suter posited that, “while the implication seems to be that the contact with the women is defiling *per se* since it represents an illegitimate degree of relationship, 1 En. 10:11 suggests that contamination through contact with menstrual blood may also be implied,”²¹³ given that it accuses the watchers of being defiled by human women “in their uncleanness” (ἐν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ αὐτῶν). Nickelsburg shares this basic approach to 1 En. 10:11, and calls attention to the LXX of 2 Sam 11:4, which uses the term ἀκαθαρσία to describe menstruation.²¹⁴ Nickelsburg also points to 1 En. 15:4, which denounces the watchers for defiling themselves “with the blood of women” (ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν γυναικῶν), as an additional reference to menstrual impurity, which led to the fallen watchers into “a graver state of uncleanness” in accordance with the legal prescriptions of Lev 15:19–24.

By associating the behavior of the watchers with menstrual impurity, Nickelsburg could conclude that 1 En. 12–16 emanated from circles “concerned about the pollution of the temple and/or the priesthood.”²¹⁵ In fact, he goes so far as to describe the tradents of 1 En. 12–16 as a group that “viewed the Jerusalem priesthood as defiled and therefore under the irrevocable judgment of God.”²¹⁶ When hypothesizing about the geographical and social location of such a group, Suter and Nickelsburg both point to Upper Galilee, since various Northern locales play a prominent role in the composition.²¹⁷ For Suter and Nickelsburg, these geographical details serve as evidence of the fact that the Book of Watchers was the product of a scribal community that was

²¹³ Suter, “Fallen Angel,” 119.

²¹⁴ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 225.

²¹⁵ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 231.

²¹⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 231.

²¹⁷ On the problems associated with moving from northern geographical references to an argument about the composition’s provenance, see Esther Eshel and Hanan Eshel, “Toponymic Midrash in *1 Enoch* and in Other Second Temple Jewish Literature,” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 115–30. Taking one relevant example, Eshel and Eshel argue that “the use of geographical Hermon traditions in Psalms and in the Song of Songs demonstrates familiarity with these tradition in Jerusalem.” This means that “anyone conversant with these works was therefore aware of the sanctity ascribed to the Hermon, even if he never left Jerusalem.” Eshel and Eshel, “Toponymic Midrash,” 120.

organized around a revelatory site in the vicinity of Dan. For both scholars, these chapters were thought to have been composed by a group of dissident figures, operating outside of Jerusalem and contesting the authority of the Jerusalemite priests on the grounds that they had defiled themselves and the temple by means of illicit sexual activity.

3 Critical Responses to Suter and Nickelsburg

Several scholars have offered critiques of or alternatives to various aspects of the proposals outlined above, such that the hypotheses of Suter and Nickelsburg about the function and social location of the Book of Watchers should not be used uncritically to construct larger theories about the history of the Second Temple Jewish priesthood. Critical assessments of the work of Suter and Nickelsburg have raised the following questions, all of which are relevant for evaluating their reading of the Book of Watchers: Which priests, if any, are being condemned? Is menstrual impurity actually being addressed? How much should we rely on later Second Temple texts when interpreting this one? My summary of these critical reflections will highlight each of these questions, discussing how different scholars have approached them, thereby complicating the proposals of Suter and Nickelsburg.

4 Condemning the Contemporary Jerusalem Priesthood?

Tigheelaar agrees with Suter and Nickelsburg that the Book of Watchers functions as an implicit criticism of priestly behavior, but takes issue with the notion that it addresses the behavior of the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. His skepticism on this point comes from his observation that the watchers were accused of having “forsaken the high heaven, the eternal sanctuary” (1 En. 15:3). This means that the Book of Watchers may be best understood not as

speaking about priests currently serving in Jerusalem illegitimately, but rather about those who actually forsook their duties in the temple in their pursuit of exogamous relationships. In order to identify these apostate priests, Tigchelaar points to several correspondences between 1 En. 12–16 and the events that preceded the founding of the Samaritan temple on Mt Gerizim, as reported by Josephus in *Ant.* XI, 306-312.²¹⁸ He acknowledges that the correspondences between these two narratives are not enough to prove definitively that the Book of Watchers is alluding to these events, but argues that there is “some circumstantial evidence which corroborates this particular interpretation,”²¹⁹ namely, that 1 En. 12–16 is directed against those who defected from Jerusalem and its temple to Samaria and Mt Gerizim. Tigchelaar’s view thus represents the precise opposite view of Suter and Nickelsburg: “If one adopts my view, according to which not the Jerusalemite priests as such, but those who left Jerusalem are criticized, one cannot right away argue in favour of a sectarian setting. The most one can say on this specific issue is that the opposition against mixed marriages represents an orthodox view.”²²⁰

Himmelfarb was rather dismissive of Tigchelaar’s theory regarding the socio-historical background of the Book of Watchers, though she is also critical of the attempts of Suter and Nickelsburg to demonstrate that the author of this text expresses a wholesale condemnation of the entire contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. The Book of Watchers, Himmelfarb observes, does not accuse all of the watchers as having abandoned their heavenly station in order to pursue illicit relations with human women. While some have proven themselves unfaithful, Himmelfarb points out that the Book of Watchers “pictures some of the watchers continuing their loyal service in the

²¹⁸ This account tells of Manasseh, brother of the high priest Jaddua, and his decision to abandon the Jerusalem temple. Manasseh had married Nikaso, daughter of Sanballat, governor of the Samaria. As result, leading figures in Jerusalem forced him to decide between divorcing his foreign wife or giving up his role as priest. In response, Sanballat offered to build a temple on Mt Gerizim, installing Manasseh as high priest. Manasseh took this offer, being joined by many other Jerusalemite priests and other Judeans.

²¹⁹ Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 199.

²²⁰ Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 203.

heavenly temple, thus suggesting that some of the priests on earth have not defiled themselves.”²²¹ In fact, she continues, “one might argue that the Book of Watchers’ picture of the failings of the heavenly priests actually serves to defend the earthly temple against those who saw it as hopelessly compromised, by showing that even the heavenly temple, of which the sanctity could hardly be doubted, was experiencing problems with its priests.”²²² For Himmelfarb, the Book of Watchers directs its ire at some, but not all, of the priests serving in Jerusalem, and it does not therefore reject the priesthood as an institution, even in its current form.

5 Polemicizing Against Menstrual Impurity?

Loader rejects Nickelsburg’s interpretation of ἀκαθαρσία in 1 En. 10:11, arguing that this phrase should instead be seen as referring “to the nature of women as unclean in relation to the Watchers. In other words, it expressed the understanding that all human women were unclean for the Watchers as sexual partners at all times because they were of a different kind.”²²³ Himmelfarb is also critical of Nickelsburg’s understanding of the phrase “with the blood of women” (ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν γυναικῶν) in 1 En. 15:4 on similar grounds. As Himmelfarb argues, this phrase is not best interpreted as describing menstruation, a point that she makes by analyzing it in the context of the whole verse: “You were holy ones and spirits, living forever. With the blood of women, you have defiled yourselves, and with the blood of flesh you have begotten; and with the blood of men you have lusted, and you have done as they do—flesh and blood, who die and perish.” Himmelfarb argues that this reference to women’s blood must be understood in light of the three other occurrences of the word “blood” that appear here in close succession, i.e., “the blood of flesh,”

²²¹ Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 228.

²²² Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 228.

²²³ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 15 (cf. pp. 23 and 29).

“the blood of men,” and “flesh and blood.”²²⁴ As she correctly point out regarding the former two phrases, neither appears to be describing literal blood. In fact, they both seem to be functioning in the same way as the expression “flesh and blood,” that is, as a reference to the mortality of the human women.²²⁵ There is no reason, then, to assume that the phrase “the blood of women” was intended to function any differently. Each reference to “blood” in this verse serves as a way of drawing a sharp contrast between the watchers (“holy ones and spirits, living forever”) and their human sexual partners (“flesh and blood”) so as to reinforce the transgressive nature of the marriages themselves.²²⁶ What is being condemned as defiling is not contact with menstrual blood, but “the defilement Leviticus 18 and 20 attribute to forbidden sexual relations.”²²⁷ Loader’s understanding of this passage is consistent with that of Himmelfarb. All four references to blood in 1 En. 15:4, he proposes, are best taken “as a broad allusion to mixing with human flesh and blood.”²²⁸ For him, 1 En. 15:4 is thus concerned not with impurity contracted through contact with menstrual blood, but rather with impurity resulting from “illicit mixing in intercourse with human flesh and blood.”²²⁹

It is worth noting that the question of menstrual impurity is not a trivial matter for the interpretation of the Book of Watchers. Himmelfarb rightly recognizes that “failure to obey the laws of menstrual impurity properly would put people in a state of impurity so that they could then defile the temple by entering it.”²³⁰ If we assume that the Book of Watchers intends to criticize even some of the contemporary Jerusalemite priests on these grounds, then the implication would be that the temple itself has become polluted. However, Himmelfarb and Loader have raised

²²⁴ Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 228.

²²⁵ Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 228.

²²⁶ Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 228.

²²⁷ Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 228.

²²⁸ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 15.

²²⁹ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 30.

²³⁰ Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 227.

serious doubts as to the plausibility of this proposal. Not only are the interpretations of 1 En. 10:11 and 15:4 offered by Suter and Nickelsburg open to question, but, as Loader points out, nowhere else does the Book of Watchers accuse the fallen watchers of anything resembling the violation of the laws prohibiting sexual contact during menstruation.²³¹ This has led Himmelfarb to conclude rightly, “there is no reason to claim that the Book of the Watchers saw the Second Temple as defiled.”²³²

6 A Problematic Methodology?

Esler has offered a more fundamental critique of the approach to the Book of Watchers underlying the hypotheses of Suter, Nickelsburg, and Himmelfarb.²³³ Esler begins by suggesting that the Book of Watchers does not condemn the fallen watchers for the *type* of marriage or sexual relations in which they engage, but rather for engaging in marriage or sexual relations *at all*.²³⁴ He notes that Himmelfarb also makes this point, but suggests that her theory does not follow the implications of this observation to their logical conclusion, and functions essentially as a modification of Suter’s proposal.²³⁵ Esler argues that the defilement resulting from their sexual relations does not *prima facie* have anything to do with the earthly priests and their partners. It need not reflect an underlying criticism of infractions carried out by members of the contemporary

²³¹ For a similar view, see Tigchelaar, “Some Remarks.” Tigchelaar restricts his comments to 1 En. 12–16, but they are still worth citing: “[I]t does not say that the Watchers desired the women. And it certainly does not say that they committed adultery by taking married women. Neither does the text refer in any way to ‘defilement by menstrual blood’. Likewise, the 1 Enoch 12–16 narrative or exposition does not deal with other inappropriate degrees of marriage, violence or misappropriation of temple offerings, or the defilement of the temple. The text has only one major theological point to make: the Watchers, as eternal holy beings have no need of progeny, in contrast to mortal humans who need wives to produce children. The text discusses the absolute difference between the priestly angels and the children of men, or children of the earth. The basic accusation is that the watchers have disregarded their natural order and place. They have left heaven, defiled themselves with women, done like the children of earth do, in order to beget sons.”

²³² Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 228.

²³³ I assume Esler would take issue with Tigchelaar’s theory as well, though he does not mention it.

²³⁴ So also Tigchelaar, “Some Remarks.”

²³⁵ Esler, *God’s Court*, 86

Jerusalem priesthood. As he contends, “Merely stating that the angels had defiled themselves by marrying human women cannot itself raise a connection to the priesthood.”²³⁶ In the case of the fallen watchers, their impurity stems simply from “the grievous boundary transgression involved in spirits having sex with flesh and blood.”²³⁷ At issue is the crossing of boundaries (i.e., heavenly/earthly, immortal/mortal). Moving from this observation to an implicit critique of the practices of earthly priests is, for Esler, unwarranted.

In defending this position, Esler questions several exegetical strategies of Suter, Nickelsburg, and Himmelfarb, but his basic and strongest critique is methodological. For example, summarizing Himmelfarb’s suggestion that the Book of Watchers intends to criticize marriages between priests and Israelites from non-priestly families, Esler notes that “the only positive evidence she proceeds to cite for her view comes not from 1 Enoch 1–36 but from two Qumran texts,” i.e., the Aramaic Levi Document and 4QMMT.²³⁸ In response, he correctly notes, “It is axiomatic that one cannot simply impute to one text (here 1 Enoch 1–36) a view alleged to be found in others (*Aramaic Levi* and 4QMMT) simply because they have a high view of that text or its purported author or because they are roughly contemporaneous with it.”²³⁹ Suter and Nickelsburg are open to the very same critique. For example, Nickelsburg interprets 1 En. 15:3–4 as reflecting an anti-priestly polemic by pointing out that its “strong language of indictment parallel polemics against the priesthood in the Damascus Document (CD 5:6–7) and the *Psalms of Solomon* (8:12 [13]).”²⁴⁰ In fact, Tigchelaar leveled a similar criticism, specifically, against Suter’s proposal over two decades before Esler when he argued, “There is, however, one major problem

²³⁶ Esler, *God’s Court*, 82.

²³⁷ Esler, *God’s Court*, 82.

²³⁸ Esler, *God’s Court*, 82. For Himmelfarb’s discussion, see “Temple and Priests,” 226.

²³⁹ Esler, *God’s Court*, 87.

²⁴⁰ Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 585.

concerning Suter’s approach: his interpretation of the ‘problem of family purity’ in 1 En. 6–16 is based to a large extent on the study of this phenomenon in Second Temple Judaism, and not primarily on the data given by the text.”²⁴¹ We should, in Tigchelaar’s view, be wary of the problems associated with “the wholesale reading of a concept derived from other sources into the text one is dealing with.”²⁴² When these criticisms of both the details and the basic approach of Suter and Nickelsburg are added together, we should at least proceed with caution when building our theories about the socio-historical context of the Book of Watchers and other Enochic writings on them.

7 Conclusion

The Book of Watchers certainly reflects priestly concerns. It uses the language of “mixing” to condemn the marriage practices of the watchers in an allusion to legal traditions drawn from Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Other priestly writings, Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat, use similar language in their condemnations of mixed marriages. The Book of Watchers also use priestly language and concepts to describe Michael, Enoch, the angels, and God’s heavenly abode, and it places Jerusalem and its temple at the center of its conception of both space and time. However, there is no solid evidence to warrant the claim that the author of the Book of Watchers intended to condemn the marriage practices of the contemporary priests in Jerusalem, or any priests for that matter. In my view, the Book of Watchers is best understood not as polemic, but as priestly exegesis. It is a creative reading of Gen 6:1–4, informed by a priestly worldview.

²⁴¹ Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 197.

²⁴² Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 198 n. 62.

3.3 The Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90)

The early Enochic literature’s clearest references to the Israelite cult occur in the Animal Apocalypse’s description of the Solomonic and second temples (1 En. 89:50ff., 72b–73). These two institutions are depicted in sharply contrasting terms, with the former being presented positively and the latter negatively. The building of the first temple is narrated immediately after a reference to Solomon, “a little sheep [who] became a ram,” and his ascension to the role of “ruler and leader” of the sheep, i.e. Israel (1 En. 89:48b). This brief allusion to Solomon is followed by a thinly coded allusion to the expansion of Jerusalem, the construction of the temple, and the establishment of the cult: “And that house became large and broad. And a large and high tower was built upon that house for the Lord of the sheep. That house was low, but the tower was raised up and was high. And the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower, and they spread a full table before him” (1 En. 89:50). Here, it is evident that the house and the tower refer to Jerusalem and the temple, respectively. Dimant points to the ways in which this description parallels the accounts of Solomon’s building activity in the Hebrew scriptures (cf. 1 Kgs 3:1; 6–8; 2 Chr 2:1–7:11).²⁴³ However, the Animal Apocalypse does not explicitly credit Solomon with these construction projects, as do the authors of the Books of Kings and Chronicles. Instead, it uses the passive voice in its account of these events, possibly to downplay the role of the monarch.²⁴⁴

²⁴³ Devorah Dimant, “Jerusalem and the Temple in the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90) in Light of the Qumran Community Worldview,” in *From Enoch to Tobit: Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature*, FAT 114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 119–38, 121. This article was originally published in Hebrew in 1983.

²⁴⁴ Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: ‘All Nations Shall be Blessed,’* SVTP 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 180. Contrast the description of the Solomonic Temple in 1 Enoch 89:50 with that of 1 Kgs 6:2, in which it is referred to as *הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה לַיהוָה* ‘the house that King Solomon built for the Lord.’ Cf. the earlier accounts of Noah and Moses, both of whom are transformed from animals into human beings in order to carry out specific construction projects (1 En. 89:1, 36). See Devorah Dimant, “Ideology and History in the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90),” in *Light of the Qumran Community Worldview*,” in *From Enoch to Tobit: Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature*, FAT 114 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 91–118, 96. This article was originally published in Hebrew in 1982. Olson argues that “by disassociating Solomon from the Temple and its cult”

The temple cult is described in unambiguously positive terms in this passage, a point which is only reinforced when compared with its unambiguously negative portrait of the second temple. The second temple is here associated with the activity of “three of those sheep [who] returned and came and entered and began to build all that had fallen down” (1 En. 89:72b). These sheep clearly represent some combination of Israel’s post-exilic leaders.²⁴⁵ Interestingly, the rebuilding of the house and tower in this passage are described using active verbs, in contrast to the account of their original construction in 1 En. 89:50. The second temple itself is also characterized in other ways that clearly seem to invite a contrast with the original.²⁴⁶ First, the new temple “is not said *to be* high (v 50) but to have been ‘*called* the high tower.’”²⁴⁷ Second, while the Animal Apocalypse uses the language of a “table” to allude to the sacrificial cult of both temples (1 En. 89:50, 73), the bread laid out on the second temple’s table is “polluted and not pure” (1 En. 89:73).²⁴⁸ Just as important is what is not said of the second temple. When describing the Solomonic temple, the Animal Apocalypse reports that “the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower” (1 En. 89:50), thus indicating God’s presence. However, prior to the destruction of the temple during the Babylonian conquest, the Lord “abandoned that house of theirs and their tower” in response to the sheep having

the author of the Animal Apocalypse intends “to show that the Davidic throne is not the proper center of Jewish identity and hope.” Olson, *New Reading*, 181.

²⁴⁵ Nickelsburg, however, argues that “[t]he identity of the ‘three’ who return is doubtful since the written sources give differing accounts and we do not know the shape of oral history regarding this period,” though he tentatively proposes Zerubbabel, Joshua, and Sheshbazzar as viable options. He also considers Haggai and/or Zechariah as possibilities. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 394.

²⁴⁶ “The passage balances v 50, but two interesting contrasts with the construction of Solomon’s temple are evident.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 394. On the contrasting positive and negative depictions of the two temples in the Animal Apocalypse, see Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*, EJIL 4 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 39. Tiller cites Dimant, who observes the same points of contrast as Nickelsburg. Tiller also notes that “Reese extends this comparison to a comparison of the time of Solomon and the time of the Persian period.” Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 39. See Günter Reese, “Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums. Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumpto Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches,” (PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität, 1967), 46.

²⁴⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 394.

²⁴⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 394–5.

“abandoned the house of the Lord and his tower” (1 En. 89:54). Significantly, the Lord is not said to return to the house or to the tower at any point during the Second Temple period.

It is not entirely clear why the second temple was viewed so negatively, though it likely relates in some way to the behavior of Israel and to the general character of the epoch in which it was constructed. Immediately after highlighting the polluted character of the cult, the Animal Apocalypse reports that the eyes of both the sheep and their shepherds, i.e., the angelic figures entrusted by God with Israel’s custodial care, are blind (1 En. 89:73).²⁴⁹ The contrasting images of blindness and sight are major themes throughout the Animal Apocalypse, often having cultic implications.²⁵⁰ For example, while Moses is away on Mt Sinai (“the summit of a high rock”), we learn that “the sheep began to be blinded and to stray from the path that [Moses] had shown them” (1 En. 89:29, 32). This passage is clearly an allusion to the idolatrous sacrifice to the Golden Calf in Exod 32. This account is the first of several passages in the Animal Apocalypse in which the coordinated metaphors of ‘blindness’ and ‘straying’ are used to describe cultic transgressions of various kinds (1 En. 89:54; 74).²⁵¹ For example, the cultic indiscretions of the Judah are characterized as an abandonment, bringing together these two metaphors: “I saw when they abandoned the house of the Lord and his tower, they went astray in everything, and their eyes were

²⁴⁹ “[T]he symbol of the seventy shepherds, who appear to be angels and who rule and punish the flock Israel, dominates the text from the point at which it is introduced (89:59) until the judgment when the shepherds are among the preeminently evil ones whose punishment is explicitly noted.” James C. VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90),” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman JSJSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 279–92.

²⁵⁰ In addition to the VanderKam article cited above, see Reese, “Geschichte Israels,” 34–36; Beate Ego, “Vergangenheit im Horizont eschatologischer Hoffnung: Die Tiervision (1 Hen 85-90) als Beispiel apokalyptischer Geschichtskonzeption,” in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. Eve-Marie Becker (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 171–95; Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 292–3; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 379–81; Anthea E. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 363–8.

²⁵¹ “The building and worship of the golden calf are the first in a series of numerous incidents of cultic apostasy.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 380. Nickelsburg also points out that “[i]n the Vision ‘straying’ denotes sins related to the cult, and such sins are singled out for attention, even in cases where this verb ‘to stray’ does not occur (89:32–35, 41, 44–45, 51, 54, 73–74).” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 380.

blinded” (1 En. 89:54). This particular instance of cultic maleficence provokes the Lord to abandon the temple, and to “abandon them into the hands of all the beasts as fodder” (1 En. 89:58), an allusion to the Babylonian conquest and exile. Nickelsburg observes that this event marks a turning point in the Animal Apocalypse’s conception of Israelite history.²⁵² Israel’s past had been characterized up to this point by both blindness and sight. After the period of the divided kingdom, however, we enter a period of absolute blindness from then until the time when a group of lambs start “to open their eyes and to see” during the Seleucid period (1 En. 90:6).²⁵³ These lambs started “to cry out to the sheep” who nevertheless remain “extremely and excessively blinded” (1 En. 90:7).

Crucially, the second temple is constructed during this period of complete blindness, and the blindness of the sheep leads them to commit cultic malpractice(s) of some kind or another. Cultic malpractice, moreover, is not an isolated incident in the history of Israel. In fact, Israel’s transgressions most often relate to the cultic sphere, e.g., idolatry (1 En. 89:32) and apostasy (1 En. 89:54). Can we be more specific about the particular cultic transgression(s) associated with the Second Temple? Scholars have proposed a range of possibilities, though their suggestions are generally more indebted to criticisms of the priesthood and temple cult found elsewhere in Second Temple literature than to the Animal Apocalypse itself.²⁵⁴ For example, Tiller points to the Damascus Document, 4QMMT, Jubilees, the Astronomical Book, and “other Qumran texts” in order to provide a list of possible offenses, which include: sexual misconduct, improper marital practices, an incorrect calendar, and/or other issues related to erroneous ritual practice and cultic

²⁵² Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 384.

²⁵³ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 350–1; Olson, *New Reading*, 210–1.

²⁵⁴ See, e.g., the earlier proposals of August Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch: Uebersetzt und erklärt* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1853), 270 and Gustav Volkmar, *Eine Neu-Testamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung, oder die Geschichts-Vision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang* (Zurich: Riesling, 1862), 12. Neither of these proposals have any textual support.

impurity.²⁵⁵ Tiller nevertheless acknowledges that “[t]hese parallels serve only to provide a range of possibilities. It is not clear whether any or all of these issues were relevant for the author of the *An. Apoc.*, who seems not to be especially interested in legal interpretation.”²⁵⁶ Most scholars have seen in 1 En. 89:73 an allusion to the Book of Malachi, especially Mal 1:7 and 1:12, which accuses the priests of offering polluted animals at the altar.²⁵⁷ However, it is unclear with this allusion whether the author of the Animal Apocalypse intended to accuse the priests of defiling the altar in this particular way or if the condemnatory language of Malachi was simply applied to the author’s particular grievance(s).²⁵⁸ We simply cannot speak with more precision as to the specific issue the author intended to address. It is interesting, moreover, that nowhere does the Animal Apocalypse single out the priests for special criticism. In fact, priests are not explicitly distinguished from the rest of Israel at any point in this composition. Instead, the author chooses to emphasize the shortcomings of the entire nation.²⁵⁹ In fact, Aaron, though he is mentioned on occasion, does not

²⁵⁵ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 39–40.

²⁵⁶ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 40. Nowadays, several scholars acknowledge the difficulty of discerning a particular cultic blunder being alluded to in the actual text of the Animal Apocalypse. Cf. Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 231–33; Olson, *New Reading*, 199. E.g. In response to Nickelburg’s assertion that the Animal Apocalypse reflects an underlying dispute with the temple establishment regarding purity laws, Himmelfarb argues, “[N]owhere does [the Animal Apocalypse] suggest that the sacrifices of the Second Temple were polluted because of improper observance of purity laws or other mistaken practices.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 233.

²⁵⁷ E.g. Michael A. Knibb, “Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings from before the Common Era,” in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*, SVTP 22 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 367–87, 375. Tiller is skeptical of the Malachi allusion, arguing that the term ‘polluted’ “could have been used independently by several writers who thought that the offerings were ritually impure.” Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 340. Olson, however, notes that Tiller “is virtually alone in his skepticism about the Malachi allusion.” Olson, *New Reading*, 199. Olson points out that the use of the term ‘polluted’ is not the only correspondence between the Animal Apocalypse and Malachi, but that “[b]oth texts also describe the altar as a ‘table’ with ‘bread’ upon it.” Olson, *New Reading*, 199.

²⁵⁸ Olson raises the possibility that the Animal Apocalypse “may have left the reasons ambiguous in order to allow Jews with a variety of complaints about the Second Temple to own the present narrative.” Olson, *New Reading*, 199–200.

²⁵⁹ Consider, e.g., Himmelfarb’s contention that the sins of Israel in a variety of domains have functionally polluted the cult, regardless of any specific purity violation related to the Temple itself. As she argues, “The Animal Apocalypse’s critique of the Second Temple is more like the prophetic critique of the cult: even the sacrifices offered properly are repulsive to God when the people offering them continue to sin.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 233. For Himmelfarb, the condemnation of the Temple has more to do with the generally wicked behavior of the population at large

figure at all in a cultic capacity, even in its retelling of Exod 32.²⁶⁰ It is merely reported that “the sheep began to be blinded and to stray from the path that [Moses] had shown them” (1 En. 89:32; cf. Exod 32:1–6). Even when the text re-narrates the slaughter of the errant Israelites who worshipped the Golden Calf, it does not indicate that those who carry out this violent action are either Levites, or otherwise qualitatively distinct from the rest of Israel in any way except with respect to their conduct (1 En. 89:35; cf. Exod 32:26–29).²⁶¹ This observation has led Himmelfarb to conclude that “the absence of priests suggests that the Animal Apocalypse is not particularly interested in them because it does not see their behavior as having special significance for the fate of Israel. Indeed, it nowhere singles out Israel’s leaders for blame; all the sheep are blind and go astray.”²⁶² At the very least, it is striking that the Animal Apocalypse pays such little attention to priests (or Levites), especially given their prominence and significance in many of the other Qumran Aramaic writings (e.g., Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram, Tobit).²⁶³

Equally noteworthy is the fact that neither the tabernacle nor the eschatological temple is explicitly mentioned in the Animal Apocalypse, and it is unclear what type of role—if any—these institutions play in the author’s conception of the period of the wilderness or that of the eschaton. Unlike the accounts of the First and Second Temple periods, which refer to both the ‘house’ and

²⁶⁰ Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 232.

²⁶¹ “And that sheep [i.e. Moses] took other sheep with it and went against those sheep that had strayed and began to slaughter them” (1 Enoch 89:35). On the basis of this passage, Nickelsburg wonders whether the author might have been a Levite. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 362. However, as Himmelfarb observes, “While the Animal Apocalypse notes the role in this incident of the Levites, the sheep who help Moses to slaughter the sheep guilty of straying from the proper path (1 Enoch 89:35), it never discusses their cultic responsibilities.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 232.

²⁶² Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 232. Himmelfarb admits that “the constraints of animal symbolism present certain challenges for the depiction of priests,” but suggests that “that alone cannot explain their absence, for the Animal Apocalypse regularly represents the leaders of the people of Israel as rams, and it surely could have found an appropriate way to mark some of the sheep as priests.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 232.

²⁶³ Though, Himmelfarb notes that “priests are absent also from the Apocalypse of Weeks...Nor do they appear in Daniel.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 232.

the ‘tower’ (1 En. 89:50, 56, 66, 72b–73), both the wilderness and eschatological periods refer only to the ‘house’ (1 En. 89:36; 90:28–29, 33–36). In the wilderness period, the house is described as follows: “That sheep [i.e. Moses] became a man and built a house for the Lord of the sheep and made all the sheep stand in that house” (1 En. 89:36). Earlier scholars tended to identify this wilderness house with the tabernacle.²⁶⁴ A straightforward identification of the house with the tabernacle, however, is problematic. Tiller points out that “it is not the owner of the sheep who inhabits the house but the sheep.”²⁶⁵ Moreover, none of the language used to describe the sacrificial cult in the passages dealing with the tower is to be found in the account of Israel’s wilderness house. Tiller thus posits that the house in 89:36 instead allegorically represents the desert camp, and concludes, “The tabernacle, if present at all, is only to be thought of as the center of the camp and therefore part of the house.”²⁶⁶ Whether or not the author envisioned a place for the tabernacle within the camp, however, is almost beside the point.²⁶⁷ It is striking enough that sacrificial (or any other type of cultic) activity goes unmentioned in the author’s account of the wilderness sojourn, despite figuring in descriptions of both the First and Second Temple periods.

The situation in the wilderness is similar to the time of eschatological renewal, about which we read: “the Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than the first one, and he erected it on the site of the first one that had been rolled up” (1 En. 90:29). Significantly, the Animal Apocalypse does not depict the presence of a tower or a table, that is, the symbols associated with the temple and the sacrificial cult, which has led some scholars to conclude that

²⁶⁴ Cf. Dillman, *Das Buch Henoch*, 261; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 193.

²⁶⁵ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 42. “It is tempting to identify this house as the tabernacle, the temporary dwelling of God, but the last words of verse 36 make that interpretation unlikely. Here all of the sheep are in that house; this would not have been true of the tabernacle, where only priestly individuals served.” James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, S.C.: The University of South Carolina Press, 2008), 80.

²⁶⁶ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 43.

²⁶⁷ At best, the Animal Apocalypse “is interested in the camp to the practical exclusion of the tabernacle.” Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 46.

“there is no temple in the New Jerusalem.”²⁶⁸ Others, meanwhile, contend that “the absence of a tower in the eschatological Jerusalem signals not the absence of a temple, but rather that the whole city has become sacred.”²⁶⁹ In fact, Himmelfarb points to several aspects of its description in order to argue, “The pillars, beams, and ornaments of the eschatological house suggest a temple rather than a city.”²⁷⁰ Himmelfarb even seems to suggest that there is no reason to assume that the Animal Apocalypse envisioned the cessation of the sacrificial cult in the eschatological age.²⁷¹ Tiller convincingly argues, however, that throughout the composition the Animal Apocalypse “has given consistent and clear attention to the temple and it seems inconceivable that it is here merely assumed.”²⁷² Assuming the presence of a temple and/or sacrificial cult does not seem warranted, given that there are such clear cut references to these institutions elsewhere in the Animal Apocalypse. The omission appears deliberate. Temple or no temple, though, it is noteworthy that the Animal Apocalypse does not explicitly articulate a positive, future function for either the temple or its cult in the age to come. Contrast this conception of the eschaton, for example, with that of New Jerusalem (esp. 2Q24; 11Q18), in which the restored city contains an idealized temple, priesthood, and sacrificial cult, or Tobit (chs. 13–14), which includes a temple in its vision of the eschatological city, even though it does not address matters related to the priesthood or sacrifice in its description (cf. the Apocalypse of Weeks).

²⁶⁸ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 46; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 84; Olson, *New Reading*, 60. Some are more cautious, suggesting that it is uncertain whether or not the author implicitly assumed the presence of a temple or if God’s presence in the new city rendered a new temple unnecessary. Cf. Knibb, “Temple and Cult,” 376.

²⁶⁹ Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 230. Both Dillman, *Das Buch Henoch*, 284 and Matthew Black in consultation with James C. VanderKam, with an appendix on the ‘Astronomical’ chapters (72-82) by Otto Neugebauer, *The Book of Enoch, or, 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 278 assume the presence of a temple in the eschatological city.

²⁷⁰ Himmelfarb, “Temple and the Priests,” 230.

²⁷¹ Nickelsburg argues that the Animal Apocalypse imagines the abolition of the “traditional cult...because of God’s presence and because the human race has been fully and permanently purified of sin.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 405. In response, Himmelfarb points out that “God’s presence in the First Temple [does not] preclude a sacrificial cult there...Further, even the elimination of sin would not dispense with the necessity of the daily, sabbath, and festival sacrifices ordained by the Torah.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 231.

²⁷² Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 46.

It is noteworthy that the eschatological future in this composition shares more in common with the wilderness period than it does with either the First or Second Temple periods. In fact, the description of the eschatological Jerusalem closely parallels that of the wilderness camp. On the other hand, the depictions of Jerusalem in the First and Second Temple periods serve as mirror images of one another in ways that differentiate them from the eschatological Jerusalem. These aspects of the Animal Apocalypse prompt Tiller to propose that “the ideal situation to be restored is represented not by the Solomonic Temple, but by the camp of Israel in the desert.”²⁷³ This, of course, does not imply that the Animal Apocalypse views the Solomonic temple negatively, quite the contrary. However, it may be that for the Animal Apocalypse “the temple, while holy and proper, marks an inferior stage in the relationship of God with Israel.”²⁷⁴

3.4 The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17)

The Apocalypse of Weeks is much shorter than the Animal Apocalypse, though it also contains a divinely revealed narration of Israelite history from creation to eschaton. The Apocalypse of Weeks, as its title suggests, organizes Israelite history according to a ten-week schema. The temple plays a prominent role in this composition, which is noteworthy given its overall brevity.²⁷⁵ In some ways, the Apocalypse of Weeks parallels the Animal Apocalypse in its discussion of the temple. It is striking, though, that it is in several important respects closer to Tobit and even New Jerusalem than it is to the Animal Apocalypse, especially with regard to the status

²⁷³ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 49.

²⁷⁴ Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 49.

²⁷⁵ As Himmelfarb contends, “The Apocalypse of Weeks is so brief that the very fact that it mentions the tabernacle, the First Temple, and the eschatological temple indicate their importance.” Himmelfarb, “Temple and Priests,” 234.

of the temple and its role in the eschatological future.²⁷⁶ An analysis of the points of convergence and divergence in these three compositions must wait for my comparative analysis in section 6.4.2.

References to the temple occur in weeks five (1 En. 93:7), six (1 En. 93:8), and eight (1 En. 91:12-13) of the Apocalypse of Weeks, with the tabernacle making a possible, brief appearance in the fourth week (1 En. 93:6).²⁷⁷ Week five contains the period of history spanning from the conquest of Canaan to the construction of the temple. However, only the latter event is described, in keeping with this composition's tendency to narrate only the conclusion of certain weeks (cf. three, four, and five; the descriptions of subsequent weeks are more detailed). As Nickelsburg suggests, "That this is the only event mentioned in this very brief description of the week indicates...the author's great interest in the sanctuary."²⁷⁸ In this passage, we read: "A house of glory and royalty will be built unto eternity" (1 En. 93:7; cf. Tob 1:7; 13:11).²⁷⁹ Missing is any reference to Solomon, the city, the priesthood, or the cult. Instead, the focus is on glory, kingship, and eternity, all of which are themes that find parallel in the account of the eschatological temple in the eighth week. It is unclear how the eternity of the Solomonic temple should be understood here, especially in light of its destruction only one verse later, although it is possible that "the

²⁷⁶ The most important comparison of the eschatology of the Apocalypse of Weeks to that of Tobit was done by Nickelsburg, who posits that the commonalities "are sufficiently close in content, sequence, and at times wording to suggest that the two texts reflect common tradition." Nickelsburg, "Tobit and 1 Enoch," 227. This proposal, however, does not preclude him from highlighting the important differences in how each text articulates its assessment of Israel's past and vision of its future.

²⁷⁷ The term that Nickelsburg renders 'Tabernacle' ('*aṣad*) is rendered more neutrally by Stuckenbruck as 'enclosure.' Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 102. That this enclosure refers to the Tabernacle is assumed by some recent commentators, e.g., Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 446; Himmelfarb, "Temple and the Priests," 234; Suter, "Temples and the Temple," 209. Stuckenbruck understands this enclosure to refer to the ark of the covenant, though he lists three possible ways of interpreting it, i.e., the Torah itself, the Promised Land, or the cult. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 107–8.

²⁷⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 446.

²⁷⁹ This translation is Stuckenbruck's, and is a more faithful rendering of the Ethiopic than Nickelsburg's (this verse is not extant in Aramaic). Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 108–10. Nickelsburg does note that the Ethiopic text reads "the house of glory and kingdom," but he amends the text to "the temple of the glorious kingdom" so as to more closely reflect the Aramaic of 91:13 הַבַּיִת [מ] הַגָּדוֹל (4Q212 1iv.18), which describes the eschatological temple of week eight and which Cook translates "the royal palace" (DQA, 64). For Nickelsburg's decision, see *1 Enoch 1*, 434, 436–7.

author is thinking here of the temple as an institution,” rather than simply a physical structure.²⁸⁰

In any case, the language of eternity implicitly functions as a way of strengthening the continuity between its descriptions of the Solomonic and eschatological temple.

The sixth week picks up after the building of Solomonic temple, and describes only the wickedness of the people, the destruction of the temple, and the exile. This period of Israelite history is characterized by the dual motifs of ‘blindness’ and ‘straying’ (1 En. 93:8), something it shares in common with the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 89:32–33, 54). The Apocalypse of Weeks, however, provides no details about the sins that led to the destruction of the temple, though the author may have some sort of cultic malfeasance in mind.²⁸¹ It also provides no details about the temple or cult, saying only that “the temple of the kingdom will be burned with fire” (1 En. 93:8).

The final reference to the temple occurs at the end of the eighth week. This week culminates with the construction of the eschatological temple: “and the temple of the kingdom of the Great One shall be built in the greatness of its splendor for all the generations of eternity (ויתבנא היכל)” (4Q212 1iv.18 // 1 En. 91:13).²⁸² Although we do not have any Aramaic witnesses to the description of the Solomonic temple in the Apocalypse of Weeks, it is clear that “[t]he eschatological temple picks up key features of Solomon’s temple, indicating that Solomon’s temple foreshadowed the eschatological temple.”²⁸³ These shared

²⁸⁰ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 447. Stuckenbruck proposes an alternative, namely, that the theme of eternity here “may have to do with an interpretation of ‘royalty’ in terms of monarchy rather than as divine kingship. According to 1 Samuel 7:13, the establishment of the Temple as ‘a house for my name’ is bound up with the institution of the monarchy: ‘I will establish his throne forever’, reflecting a situation that not even iniquities of the monarch can undo (1 Sam. 7:14-16).” Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 110.

²⁸¹ Even this proposal must remain tentative, however, given the elusive nature of the accusation in the Apocalypse of Weeks.

²⁸² Milik notes that the Ethiopic text abbreviates the longer ‘in the greatness of its splendor for all the generations to eternity’ to the much shorter ‘in splendor until eternity.’ Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 268. Cf. the textual notes in Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 131–3.

²⁸³ Philip Church, “The Temple in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in Hebrews,” *TynBul* 64 (2013): 109–28, 112.

features include the language of kingship, splendor, and eternity. Many of these features find parallel in Tobit and New Jerusalem, and serve to distinguish the Apocalypse of Weeks from the Animal Apocalypse, whose vision of the future age does not include a description of the temple.

References to the priesthood and the sacrificial cult are entirely absent from the Apocalypse of Weeks, despite its intense interest in the temple.²⁸⁴ There is also a complete absence of the Second temple, which is striking in light of the thoroughgoing interest in the temple elsewhere in the composition. This omission has generally been interpreted, probably accurately, as an implicit denunciation of the contemporary temple.²⁸⁵ However, we must be cautious. The most we can say with complete certainty is that the second temple did not figure prominently enough in the author's conception of Israelite history to warrant mention. Even if we can be somewhat confident that the Apocalypse of Weeks has rejected the contemporary temple, we cannot say why. In fact, we can say even less about the Apocalypse of Weeks on this point than we can about the Animal Apocalypse, where we at least read something about polluted food.

3.5 Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20)

The only extant copy of the Genesis Apocryphon is a single Cave 1 manuscript.²⁸⁶ It was among the first seven Qumran scrolls to be discovered. The quality of the manuscript is superb, and it was clearly produced with great care and at great expense, but many of its twenty-three extant columns are quite badly damaged.²⁸⁷ In what has been preserved, the Genesis Apocryphon

²⁸⁴ Himmelfarb, "Temple and the Priests," 234.

²⁸⁵ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 447; idem, "Tobit and 1 Enoch," 228; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 137–8; Suter, "Temples and the Temple," 209; Himmelfarb, "Temple and the Priests," 234; Church, "Temple in the Apocalypse," 113.

²⁸⁶ For my transcriptions and translations of passages from the Genesis Apocryphon see Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

²⁸⁷ On the complicated publication history of 1Q20, see Machiela, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 21–26.

recounts a series of narratives involving Enoch, Lamech, Noah, and Abraham. Only the Abraham cycle adheres closely to the text of the Hebrew Genesis. The columns involving Enoch and Lamech bear a closer resemblance to the Book of Watchers and the Book of Giants. For our purposes, it is worth noting that the priestly material in this composition is confined to a handful of passages involving Noah and Abraham. These passages take the cultic activity of Noah and Abraham in Genesis as their starting point, and function as exegetical expansions of specific portions of Genesis: Noah's sacrifice after the flood and Abraham's altar-building during his time of sojourn. However, these passages do not just function exegetically, but they also highlight the proto-priestly status of Noah and Abraham.

3.5.1 Noah's Atoning Sacrifice

Noah's cultic responsibilities are enumerated in col. 10 of the Genesis Apocryphon (ll. 13–17) in a passage that functions as an exegetical expansion of Gen 8:20–21, which narrates Noah's sacrificial activity after the Flood.²⁸⁸ This passage is closely paralleled by another account of Noah's sacrifice in Jubilees (6:1–4).²⁸⁹ These two accounts are similar enough to raise questions about their potential literary relationship.²⁹⁰ The Genesis base-text is quite short, providing few details about the sacrifice or its function. In part, the Genesis Apocryphon's much more expansive

²⁸⁸ For a discussion of this passage as exegesis of Genesis, see esp. Moshe J. Bernstein, "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Traditions 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*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 58 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 39–64, esp. 57–61.

²⁸⁹ As VanderKam notes, the account of Noah's sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon "is fragmentary, but it contains most of the elements in Jubilees' description and presents them in the same order." James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees Chapters 1–21*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018), 304.

²⁹⁰ For a comparative reading of these two accounts, see Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LSTS 63 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 69–71. Falk suggests that the Genesis Apocryphon is dependent on Jubilees. This question, however, is far from settled.

account is responding to several perceived gaps in the earlier account,²⁹¹ but it also serves as a means of presenting Noah as a proto-priestly figure, an image of Noah which also appears in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Visions of Amram.²⁹²

Noah's sacrifice is introduced explicitly in the Genesis Apocryphon as an act of atonement (כפר) (1Q20 10.13).²⁹³ This interpretation of the function of Noah's cultic activity is shared by Jubilees (cf. 6:2).²⁹⁴ VanderKam notes that the association of Noah's sacrifice with atonement is "an unusual theme in ancient treatments of the Genesis flood story."²⁹⁵ The extant text of the Genesis Apocryphon does not explain its decision to depict this sacrifice as one of atonement, though Jubilees reports that Noah's cultic activity was done "for all the sins of the earth" (Jub. 6:2).²⁹⁶ Following the earlier suggestion of Charles, VanderKam argued that we should understand

²⁹¹ Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 69.

²⁹² On the significance of Noah's proto-priestly status, see Chapter 6.

²⁹³ Line 12 contains an elusive reference to נור עולם "the eternal fire." The broken context in which this term appears makes its interpretation difficult, but Fitzmyer's suggestion seems plausible: "This probably refers to the fire on the altar that Noah built on that mountain (see *Jub.* 6:1)." Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3d rev ed., *Biblica et Orientalia* 18B (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004), 153.

²⁹⁴ The Ethiopic MS tradition of Jubilees actually preserves the reading: "he appeared on the earth." Werman accepts this reading as original, arguing that this understanding of Noah's sacrifice "can be understood as a replacement for the atonement idea given by the Apocryphon." Cana Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–81, 177. However, as VanderKam argues in the same volume, "The clause 'he appeared on the earth', while it is the better reading in the Ethiopic manuscript tradition, is probably not original. Earlier editors had already noticed that two Ethiopic verbs, which resemble each other in appearance, probably underlie the mistake: 'He appeared' is 'astar'aya, while 'he atoned' would be 'astasraya. Hence, the original reading was 'he atoned for the earth.'" James C. VanderKam, "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 151–70, 164. Bernstein concurs with VanderKam's proposal. Bernstein, "Watchers to the Flood," 58 n. 46.

²⁹⁵ VanderKam, "Angel Story," 164–5. VanderKam points out that Genesis Rabbah does not mention atonement, instead noting that "the issue debated there is whether Noah's sacrifice was a burnt offering or a peace offering." VanderKam, "Angel Story," 165. Moreover, van Ruiten observes that both Philo, *Quest. Gen.* and Pikre de R. Eliezer "interpret the offer of Noah after the Flood as an offer of gratitude." Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 225 n. 13.

²⁹⁶ As VanderKam argues concerning Jubilees, "[T]he earth had been defiled in such a way that atonement was required for it." VanderKam, "Angel Story," 165.

the atoning function of Noah's activity in both Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon against the backdrop of two biblical passages, i.e., Lev 18:26–28 and Num 35:33–34.²⁹⁷ The former refers to abominations (including sexual misconduct) that defile the land, whereas the latter describes the land as being defiled through the shedding of blood. The connection between Noah's atoning sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon and Num 35:33–34 in particular may find confirmation in the earlier reference to אֲשֶׁרוֹ נִפְלִיאָא “the blood that the Nephilin had poured out” (1Q20 6.19).²⁹⁸

Interestingly, the same verb (אָשַׁד) is used when Noah pours out the blood of the sacrifices at the base of the altar (1Q20 10.15). The Numbers passage, however, presents a potential exegetical problem, since, as Num 35:33 reads, “Blood pollutes the land, and no expiation (יְכַפֵּר) can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it” (cf. Jub. 6:8; 7:33). Jubilees solves this dilemma by having Noah sacrifice a goat before the rest of the burnt offerings (Jub. 6:2). In so doing, VanderKam argues that the author of Jubilees intended to evoke the scapegoat ritual associated with the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev 16:7–10),²⁹⁹ and it is likely, though not certain, that the Genesis Apocryphon adopts a similar exegetical strategy.³⁰⁰ In any

²⁹⁷ VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 165–7. Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis: Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: A & C. Black, 1902), 49. Van Ruiten considers VanderKam's proposal and concludes that the Numbers passage is a much more likely candidate than that of Lev 18:26–28. He notes that “there are no verbatim parallels between Lev 18:26–28 and Jub 6:2 of more than one word. Moreover, Leviticus 18 does not talk about the sin of the land (earth), and the atonement for it. Finally, Jub 6:2 does not talk explicitly about the ‘defilement’ of the earth (land).” van Ruiten, *Primaeval History*, 226. He continues, “The affinity of Jub 6:2 with Num 35:33–34 is stronger. In the context of murder and the avenging of blood, Numbers speaks about the pollution of the land by ‘the blood that is shed in it’ (Num 35:33).” van Ruiten, *Primaeval History*, 226.

²⁹⁸ Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 71.

²⁹⁹ VanderKam points to 4Q180 1.7–8 and 4Q203 7i.6 as evidence of traditions from Qumran that “identify the puzzling creature of Leviticus with the archfiend of the angel story” (i.e., Asael from the Book of Watchers), which “raises interesting possibilities for explaining the introduction of the notion of atonement into Jubilees' recension of the tale.” VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 168. Cf. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History*, 226, who simply states, “Immediately after the Flood the blood of the murderers is not available. They have all been destroyed before or in the Flood. In Jub 6:2, Noah therefore presents the blood of a kid as a substitution.”

³⁰⁰ Scholars generally agree that שְׁעִירָה ‘the he-goat’ can be reconstructed at 1Q20 10.14 because of this passage's clear similarities to Jub. 6:2. Both of the two most recent treatments of the text of the *Genesis Apocryphon* restore

case, the Genesis Apocryphon depicts Noah's sacrifice as an act of atonement, which it likely understands as a cultic remedy for the problem of the land's defilement through bloodshed. Notably, as we have seen in section 3.2.1, the Book of Watchers also views the earth as standing in need of cultic intervention as a result of having been defiled by the violence of the Nephilin, and presents Michael as an atoning high priestly figure.

After describing the function of Noah's sacrifice in l. 13, the details of it are recounted in ll. 14–17. The sacrifice is presented schematically in three distinct stages, which are labeled “first” (לקדמין), “second” (תניאנא), and “third” (תלית).³⁰¹ The lines containing the first and second stages are badly damaged, but some observations are still possible. Stage one involves the offering of an animal, likely a goat, and concludes with the phrase: *וּתְרַבָּה עַל נוֹרָא אֶקְטַרְתָּ* “and I burnt the fat upon the altar” (1Q20 10.14).³⁰² Stage two appears to recount the offering of several additional animals, given the use of the plural pronoun in l. 15.³⁰³ The names of the specific animals are not preserved, but the parallel passage in Jubilees lists them as “a bull, a ram, a sheep, goats, salt, a turtledove, and a dove” (Jub. 6:3). The Genesis Apocryphon ends this stage of the sacrifice with the phrases: *כֹּלָה דְמַהוֹן לְאִיסוּד מִדְּבַחָא וְאַשְׁדָּת* “all of their blood to the base of the altar and [I]

א/שעירה here. See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 82; Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 52. Fitzmyer thus concludes that the reference to the atoning qualities of Noah's sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon also “may be a reflection of Lev 16:9, the ritual for the Day of Atonement.” Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 154.

³⁰¹ The account of the ritual in Jub. 6:2–3 does not use numbers to distinguish each stage of the sacrifice. It appears as though the Genesis Apocryphon intends to be “more deliberate about the order of the procedure.” Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 70.

³⁰² See the early discussion in John C. Reeves, “What Does Noah Offer in 1QapGen X, 15?” *RevQ* 12 (1986): 415–9. Bernstein notes, “Reeves' insight, 417–418, made without the benefit of the ‘new’ textual material, that the verb *אֶקְטַרְתָּ* in 10:15 refers to the offering of fat and not incense, was confirmed by the reading *וּתְרַבָּה עַל נוֹרָא אֶקְטַרְתָּ*, ‘I burned the fat on the fire.’” Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 57 n. 44. However, as Machiela's new edition shows, the reference to burning fat occurs in 1Q20 10.14, not 10:15. 1Q20 10.15 describes ‘all their flesh’ being burned. See Machiela, *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 52.

³⁰³ As VanderKam notes, “Though the part of line 14 where the animals might have been listed is lost, the plural suffix indicates that more than one animal was involved.” VanderKam, *Jubilees 1*, 304 n. 9.

poured (it) out” and *קטרת אקטרת על מדבחה* “and all their flesh I burnt upon the altar” (1Q20 10.15). The most complete portion of Noah’s ritual is the third stage, which preserves the following: *לבני שפנינא ע[מ]הון על מדבחה קרבת דמהון וכולהון עלוה[י]* “I offered the young turtledoves wi[th] them upon the altar; their blood and all (of the rest) of them upon it” (ll.15-16). This offering is followed by a “meal offering” (*מנחה*) in l. 16, which consists of *סולת נשיפא פילא* “fine wheat flour, mixed together with oil containing incense.” After a small gap in the readable portion of the manuscript, Noah’s account of his sacrifice concludes by reporting that he said a blessing, put salt on “all of them” (*כולהון*), and that the scent of his offering *ל[ש]מיא* “rose up to the heavens” (l. 17).

The animals and sacrificial procedure described here represent an exegetical expansion of the phrase *מכל הבהמה הטהורה ומכל העוף הטהור* “from all the clean animals and from all the clean birds” (Gen 8:20), and the specific details of this expansion reflect engagement with Pentateuchal legislation concerning sacrifice. One of the most salient examples of this engagement comes at the end of the sacrifice where we read that Noah put *עם כולהון מלחא* “salt with all of them” (l. 17). This regulation is not mentioned at all in the Genesis passage, while the parallel passage in Jubilees simply includes salt in a list of items that were to be included in the burnt offering. Jubilees also does not contain a phrase corresponding to *עם כולהון* in 1Q20 10.17. The Genesis Apocryphon, on the other hand, mentions salt at the very end of the passage so as to emphasize that all of the

aforementioned items were seasoned.³⁰⁴ Bernstein has rightly observed that the Genesis Apocryphon’s concern to demonstrate that the entire offering was salted derives from Lev 2:13, which appends the clause *על כל־קרבנך תקריב מלח* “upon all your offerings you shall offer salt” in a passage that deals with the salting of the grain offerings.³⁰⁵ Salt is not mentioned in any of the sacrificial prescriptions elsewhere in Leviticus, but it does occur in the description of the burnt offering in Ezek 43:24, and Perrin has demonstrated that this “specific sacerdotal halakhah enjoyed wide approval among Second Temple period authors, including Josephus and those of *ALD*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *GenAp*.”³⁰⁶ Bernstein has also argued that the final phrase in the Genesis Apocryphon’s account of Noah’s sacrifice, *ורח מקטורת־י לשמיא סלק* “and the scent of my offering rose to the heavens,” functions as an interpretation of Gen 8:21 that seeks to avoid “the overt anthropomorphism found in the biblical text” (i.e., “and the Lord smelled the pleasing odor”).³⁰⁷

It is more difficult to discern the exegetical dynamics at work in the procedural details described in stages one and two of Noah’s sacrificial ritual. One of the main challenges simply has to do with the fact that much of this section is not preserved and there is a question as to how much of the missing portions of 1Q20 10.13–17 can be reconstructed on the basis of its parallel in Jub. 6:2–3.³⁰⁸ Genesis describes Noah’s sacrifices after the Flood as being burnt offerings (*עלות*), whereas in Jub. 6:2–3 the sacrificed goats is described as a *הטאת* “sin offering” in v. 2 and the

³⁰⁴ James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of and the World of its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 58 n. 115. Cf. Falk, who notes that “The *Genesis Apocryphon* is more careful to reflect the scriptural precedents by...mentioning salt added to all the offerings, not just sacrifices from the herd.” Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 70.

³⁰⁵ Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 154; Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58; Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 70; Berthelot, “References to Biblical Texts,” 192.

³⁰⁶ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172–3.

³⁰⁷ Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 168–9.

³⁰⁸ See e.g. Falk, who argues that “we can reconstruct from partial parallels in *Jubilees*, Noah’s procedure in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.” Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 70.

animals in v. 3 are described as עלות “burnt offerings.” Some scholars have interpreted 1Q20 10.13–17 in light of Jub. 6:2–3, and have thus concluded that the Genesis Apocryphon agrees with both Jubilees and the Temple Scroll in placing “the preparation of the sin-offering or חטאת prior to the עולה.”³⁰⁹ Yet caution requires noting that there are some important differences even between the preserved portions of 1Q20 10.13–17 and Jub. 6:2–3. Like Jubilees, the first stage of Noah’s sacrificial ritual in the Genesis Apocryphon describes fat being burnt upon the altar, “which is not the custom for a burnt offering, all of which is immolated.”³¹⁰ However, unlike Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon depicts the second stage of the ritual as involving the pouring out of blood at the base of the altar “as prescribed by Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, and 34, all passages dealing with חטאת, sin-offering.”³¹¹ If these allusions to Leviticus are any indication, the Genesis Apocryphon may disagree with Jubilees by depicting all its sacrificed animals as sins offerings.³¹² At the very least, these fragmentary sections of the Genesis Apocryphon are ambiguous. It is unclear whether or not we can use Jubilees to fill in all of the gaps in the first two stages of Noah’s sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon.

³⁰⁹ Reeves, “What Did Noah Offer,” 418. Cf. Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 69–70.

³¹⁰ Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58.

³¹¹ Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58. In contrast, Bernstein notes, “[T]he blood of burnt offerings is only sprinkled and not subsequently spilled out, according to Lev 1:5 and 11.” Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58.

³¹² Werman nevertheless maintains that the sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon is properly understood as a burnt offering, even while acknowledging that “blood of a burnt-offering is to be sprinkled on the altar itself, and not to be poured on its base.” She explains this difficulty by suggesting, “It is likely that the deviation from the Bible in the Genesis Apocryphon is the result of the propinquity of the burnt-offering to the sin-offering in this passage.” Werman, *Qumran and the Book of Noah*, 175 n. 8. Bernstein also appears to leave open the possibility that Noah’s second sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon is a burnt offering, suggesting that “[i]t is very possible that the assimilation of the handling of blood of the burnt offering to that of the sin offering is due to an inclination to include the burnt offering in the atonement process, or, as Werman suggests...merely to the proximity of the two offerings in this passage.” Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58 n. 45.

3.5.2 Abraham's Cultic Activity

The Genesis Apocryphon also expands Abraham's cultic role by developing specific aspects of the Abraham cycle in Genesis. Genesis 12 and 13 four times make references to Abraham's altar building activities, yet not one actually depicts the occurrence of a sacrifice. This portion of Genesis is significantly expanded by the Genesis Apocryphon. Of the relevant overlapping material, that which corresponds to Gen 12:5–9 (1Q20 19.7–10), is the most badly damaged. Neither of the references to Abram's altar building in Gen 12:5–9 appear in the extant manuscript of the Genesis Apocryphon, though the phrase [א]ל[הא] "and I called there on the na[me of G]o[d]" corresponds to the note in Genesis, which stated that Abram invoked the name of the Lord after constructing an altar between Bethel and Ai (Gen 12:8). Unlike the Genesis account, the Genesis Apocryphon records the words that Abram addressed to God as well as the words that God spoke to Abram in response, though both are very poorly preserved (1Q20 19.17–18). God's speech ends with the enigmatic phrase: לא דבקתה לטורא קדישא "until now you have not reached the holy mountain" (1Q20 19.8).³¹³ It is not altogether clear to what the "holy mountain" refers, though Jerusalem is a plausible option.³¹⁴ It is even less clear what function this phrase is playing in the larger context of the narrative. Falk has suggested that the phrase may be offering an explanation as to why Abram did not sacrifice at this site, despite building an altar there. He proposes that the author may be "paying deference to Jerusalem in some way" since

³¹³ See the discussion in Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 180. There has been some debate as to whether the verb in this phrase is best taken as a first-person singular (thus, the words of Abram) or a second-person singular (thus, the words of God). Fitzmyer takes the verb as a first-person, arguing that "[n]either in Genesis or in any of the intertestamental literature is there any mention of God speaking to Abram at Bethel." Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 180. However, Machiela edition preserves the phrase [א]ל[הא] "and he spoke with me in the night" earlier in 1Q20 19.8. Machiela, *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 69.

³¹⁴ This theory is far from universally accepted. As Fitzmyer suggests, "Just what spot is meant by this phrase is not easily determined." Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 180). See *ibid*, 180 for several of the varying opinions.

“[o]nly after returning from Egypt – implicitly having passed through Jerusalem – does Abram rebuild the altar at Bethel and for the first time offer sacrifices.”³¹⁵ This proposal is intriguing, though it must remain tentative.

The next reference to Abram’s cultic activity occurs in 1Q20 21.1–4, a passage that overlaps with material in Gen 13:3–4. Both passages follow the sojourn of Abram and Sarai in Egypt, narrating their return to Canaan after escaping a precarious situation in Pharaoh’s court. The passage in the Genesis Apocryphon adapts its Genesis base-text in a number of significant ways. First, the Genesis Apocryphon simply describes the site of Abram’s former encampment as Bethel as opposed to a place between Bethel and Ai (1Q20 21.1; cf. Gen 12:8; 13:4). Second, whereas Genesis merely recalls that this site is the place where Abram had previously built an altar, the Genesis Apocryphon adds: ובניתה תניאני “and I built it a second time” (1Q20 21.1). Third, while Genesis never explicitly mentions Abram offering a sacrifice on this altar, the Genesis Apocryphon records עליון ומנחה לאל עליון “and I offered upon it burnt offerings and a meal offering to the Most High God.”

A more limited exegetical expansion appears a few lines later in 1Q20 21.20–21, which parallels another brief reference to Abram’s cultic activity in Gen 13:8. Genesis 13:8 contains another short mention of Abram’s altar building activity. This time Abram reportedly constructs an altar by the oaks of Mamre immediately after being commanded by God to walk the length and width of the land in order to survey what God is preparing to give to him. We are told nothing more. Like 1Q20 21.2, the Genesis Apocryphon expands the Genesis account here by noting that Abram offered עליון ומנחה לאל עליון “a burnt offering and a meal offering to the Most High God”

³¹⁵ Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 91.

(1Q20 21.20). However, unlike both Genesis and 1Q20 21.1–4, this passage continues by having Abram throw a sacrificial banquet for everyone in his household as well as for his three Amorite friends.

3.5.3 Conclusion

It is important to note that Noah and Abraham's proto-priestly status is just one aspect of their portrayal in the Genesis Apocryphon. Both are also associated with wisdom and with revelatory dream-visions, and Abraham, in particular, is portrayed as a teacher and as an exorcist. In fact, their cultic activity is a relatively minor component of their portrayal in this composition. Much more space is devoted to other aspects of their identity. However, that Noah and Abraham function as forerunners of the Israelite priesthood and cult is a theme that we see throughout the Aramaic Scrolls, especially in compositions like the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram. The Genesis Apocryphon is participating in a broader exegetical and theological tradition, which locates the origins of the Israelite priesthood and cult in the prediluvian and patriarchal past, as we will see in more detail in sections 6.2.7 and 6.2.8.

CHAPTER 4: FROM JACOB TO AARON

4.1 Introduction

This chapter continues my discussion of the Aramaic Scrolls set during pre-Mosaic times, focusing on those related to Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Amram. The first two compositions treated here, the Testament of Jacob^a and New Jerusalem, recount the dream-visions of unnamed protagonists, though in both cases the seer should likely be identified as Jacob. The third, the Aramaic Levi Document, recounts the life and times of Levi and, along with New Jerusalem, provides us with some of the most detailed information about the priesthood and cult in the entire Qumran Aramaic corpus. The next composition, the Apocryphon of Levi^b?, is highly fragmentary, but contains clear priestly themes. As indicated by the question marks in its title, however, its connection to Levi is tenuous at best. The final two compositions deal primarily with two of Levi's descendants: Qahat and Amram, respectively. The latter composition contains a few references to Aaron.

4.2 Testament of Jacob^a (4Q537)

This Cave Four manuscript is the lone representative of a composition that is often referred to as the Testament of Jacob^a?, but that title is somewhat misleading. The extant fragments do not contain any of the defining features of the testamentary genre³¹⁶ nor do they preserve any

³¹⁶ Dimant has noted that the extant portions of 4Q537 lack the distinctive feature of testamentary genre, which include “the gathering of descendants and pietistic exhortation.” Devorah Dimant, review of Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie 4Q529-549*, DJD XXXI, DSD 10 (2003): 292–304. Cf. Esther Eshel, “Jubilees 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature,” in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*, eds. Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements, JSJSup 89 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21–36.

references to Jacob.³¹⁷ A number of scholars, however, have provided several persuasive reasons to associate the first-person narrator of 4Q537 with Jacob.³¹⁸ It is also true that 4Q537 bears some striking correspondences to the other patriarchal narratives found among the Aramaic Scrolls, whose features are reminiscent of the later, more fully developed examples of the literary testament.³¹⁹ 4Q537 contains at least three visions, all of which appear to involve angelic mediators (frags. 1–3; 12; 24). In the first vision (frag. 1–3), a first-person narrator, presumably Jacob, has information about the future mediated to him by means of heavenly tablets, given to him by an

³¹⁷ Dimant attempts to challenge the common assumption that 4Q537 involves Jacob by suggesting that Puech has relied too heavily on a perceived parallel between 4Q537 1–3.3–5 and Jub. 32:21–26 in his reconstruction of these fragments. Dimant, however, underestimates the strength of the parallel, reducing the connection between 4Q537 1–3.3–5 and Jub. 32:21–26 to the presence of לוֹחַיִּים “tablets” and then arguing that “the identification of the figure in 4Q537 with Jacob cannot be established on the basis of the mention of tablets alone. Other candidates, such as Enoch, are equally fitting for the role of tablet readers, since the Enochic traditions repeatedly relate how Enoch read the heavenly tablets.” Dimant, review of Puech, 299. While Dimant is certainly correct to highlight the “conjectural” nature of Puech’s reconstruction in some places (especially his hypothetical ll. 01-02), the connection between 4Q537 and Jub. 32 has been observed by scholars as early as Milik, “Écrits Préesséniens,” 104–5 and depends on more than the presence of לוֹחַיִּים “tablets”/לוֹחַיִּים “tablet” in ll. 3–5. See Eshel, “*Jubilees 32*,” 34–36 for a discussion of the relationship between 4Q537 and Jub. 32.

³¹⁸ The primary reason that scholars identify 4Q537 with Jacob is the perceived relationship between 4Q537 and Jub. 32. Eshel has presented compelling textual evidence for identifying 4Q537 as at least one of the sources of Jub. 32. Eshel, “*Jubilees 32*.” Tigchelaar has also convincingly argued that 4Q537 participates in a literary tradition in which Jacob is shown a vision of the future temple, a tradition that can be found in a number of Second Temple sources Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*,” in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. T. Nicklas, J. Verheyden, and E. Eynikel, JSJSup 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 117–32, esp. 118–9. Additionally, Frey points to the various toponyms that are referenced in frags. 14 and 24 as evidence “that a link with Jacob is quite probable.” Frey, “On the Origins,” 354. Finally, Puech associates the phrase “all my tribulation” (1–3.4) with the words of Jacob in Gen 47:28. DJD XXXI, 172, 176. Dimant is thus too quick to dismiss the importance of Jub. 32 for understanding the literary context of 4Q537, including the identity of the visionary in frags. 1–3. One final point on the identity of the visionary: if the visionary’s age at the time of his death does in fact end in 7, as is suggested by Puech (see DJD XXXI, 176; Stuckenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy,” 312), then it would seem to rule out Dimant’s suggestion of Enoch as a viable candidate. In a later article, moreover, Dimant appears to accept Jacob as the likely protagonist, at least in frags. 1–3 and 12, citing Puech’s observation concerning the connection between 4Q537 1–3.4 and Gen 47:28 as evidence. Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 33–34.

³¹⁹ Some scholars have referred to 4Q537 and other compositions from the Qumran Aramaic corpus as “testament-like.” Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26; Wayne Baxter, “Noachic Traditions and the *Book of Noah*,” *JSP* 15 (2006): 179–94. This designation emphasizes both the similarities and the important differences between many writings in the Qumran Aramaic corpus and the later, more fully developed examples of the literary genre of “testament.” See Frey, “Origins of the Genre” for an argument about the role of the Qumran Aramaic writings in the development of the testamentary genre.

angelic being.³²⁰ The second vision (frag. 12) contains what remains of the priestly material in 4Q537, and involves a description of the inner workings of the future temple. The final vision (frag. 24) involves a visionary journey, and includes reference to a number of Palestinian toponyms.³²¹

4.2.1 A Vision of the Temple Cult

One of the better-preserved fragments (frag. 12) contains a description of the temple cult revealed in the context of a dream-vision:

1. And how [the] structure shall be built[... and how] their [priest]s shall be dressed and purify
2. their hands. And how they shall] offer the sacrifices upon the altar. And h[ow each da]y[they shall in al] the [ear]th eat from a portion their sacrifices.
3. [...] that shall go out from the city and from under its walls. And where shall *ms*[
4.] *vacat* [
5.] before me a land of two squares and [a] l[and

³²⁰ It is worth mentioning that, even if Jacob is identified as the vision in frags. 1–3, we can still not be certain as to whether he should be identified as the visionary and narrator throughout the entire composition. This possibility is raised by Legrand: “Il est impossible également d’affirmer avec certitude que l’ensemble de cette œuvre était centré sur la personne de Jacob; d’autres patriarches y figureraient peut-être, dans des mises en scène qu’il nous reste à imaginer...” (“4Q537,” 404). Stuckenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy,” 313 also raised this possibility. See also Beyer, *ATTM*, 186–8, who suggested that 4Q537 represents a narrative cycle that belongs to the Genesis Apocryphon, and Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 173, who wonders if 4Q537 belongs to the same composition as 4Q540 and 4Q541. My assumption is that frag. 1–3 and 12 likely envision Jacob as the protagonist, in light of the cumulative nature of the evidence cited above. It also seems likely that frags. 5–9 contain another of Jacob’s discourses to his children (or, a continuation of the discourse that begins in frags. 1–3), though this cannot be proven. We must proceed with caution in identifying Jacob as the protagonist in other, less complete, fragments.

³²¹ The first indicator that this passage recounts a dream-vision is its use of the phrase: “כל דנה אתרא אחזיני” “all of this place he showed me...” (l. 3). The phrase “and he showed me” is frequently used in the Aramaic dream-vision literature wherein one of the pre-Mosaic patriarchs is taken on a journey by a heavenly figure, and shown either cosmic or terrestrial geography. This phrase appears in such contexts with relative frequency in the Book of Watchers, the Astronomical Book, and New Jerusalem. More specifically, this fragment bears a number of striking resemblances to the narrative in the Genesis Apocryphon wherein God appears to Abraham at night, instructing him to ascend Ramat-Hazor in order to survey all the land that he is being given according to the promise (1Q20 21.8–10). Both passages use a form of verb חזי, feature the toponym Ramat-Hazor (which is exclusive to 4Q537 and 1Q20), and include an account of the narrator surveying the land at the behest of a heavenly figure (כל דנה אתרא in 4Q537; כל ארעא דא in 1Q20). Although the fragmentary nature of frag. 24 prevents any definitive conclusions, the cumulative evidence seems to suggest that 4Q537 participates in a common theme in the Aramaic Scrolls, that is, a first-person narrator being taken on a journey and shown either cosmic or terrestrial geography by a heavenly tour guide, often in the context of a dream-vision. The reference to Ramat-Hazor, and the similarities of 4Q537 24 to 1Q20 21.8–10, may also indicate that the narrator’s tour involves the patrimonial land of Israel.

1. א[והיך להוא בנינ[א] והיך כהנ[יהוון להוון לבשין וטהירן
2. [ידיהוון והיך להוון] מסקין דבחיא למדבחא וְה[יך כל יו]ם[להוון בכ]ל[אר]עא אכלין מן קצת דבחיהוון
3. [והיך להוון שתין מיא] דְי[להוון נפקין מן קריתא ומן תחות שוריהא ואן להוון מש]תפכין מין שגיאין
4.] *vacat* [
5. [קדמי ארע רבעין תרין וא]רע

The repeated syntactic pattern of this passage appears to be: והיך “and how” + periphrastic construction (i.e., a finite form of הוי + participle), with the subject either preceding or following the verbal unit.³²² The periphrastic construction, it should be noted, also occurs in very similar descriptions of the sacrificial cult in both New Jerusalem and the Aramaic Levi Document. In fact, there are striking similarities in how the cult is described in all three of these compositions, which we will outline in greater detail in section 6.3.1. In what follows, I will discuss the content of frag. 12, focusing first on its description of the temple and then on its account of the priesthood and cultic procedure.

4.2.2 The Temple and Its Environs

Very few details about the temple’s physical structure or contents are preserved in the extant manuscript. Line 1 refers to the Temple as a “building” (בנינ[א]), but nothing about its size,

³²² Periphrastic constructions of this sort are well-attested in the Qumran Aramaic collection, and are often used for “injunctions of permanent validity.” Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*, ANESSup 38 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 178. Cf. Jonas C. Greenfield, “The ‘Periphrastic Imperative’ in Aramaic and Hebrew,” *IEJ* 19 (1969): 199–210; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 185. This syntactical pattern may also appear in frag. 11, though this fragment is very poorly preserved. See DJD XXXI, 181.

shape, materials, furniture, vessels, or utensils is extant. It is possible that 4Q537 (or at least frag. 12) never contained a very detailed description of the physical temple, but we cannot know for sure whether this was the case. We do, however, find the terms “building” (בנין), “city” (קריה), and “wall” (שור), all three of which also appear in the account of the temple found in New Jerusalem.³²³

The term בנין is particularly significant because, although this Aramaic word can generally refer to any type of building, both it and its Hebrew equivalent are used only in relation to the temple compound in the Hebrew scriptures and the extant portions of New Jerusalem (cf. Ezek 40:5; 41:12, 15; 42:1, 5, 10; Ezra 5:4; 11Q18 9.4–5).³²⁴ Context suggests that the temple in this vision is located within a walled city as l. 3 refers to a water system that originates within the temple compound and runs out of the city by traveling underneath its walls.³²⁵ The name of the city is not mentioned in 4Q537, but most scholars assume that this fragment refers to Jerusalem, an assumption that is almost certainly warranted.³²⁶ It is unclear whether 4Q537 intends to describe the Solomonic, second, or eschatological temple, all of which would be ‘future’ temples from the fictive perspective of the narrator, likely Jacob. Water systems of this sort are associated with the Jerusalem temple in several Jewish sources (e.g., Ezek 37:1–12; Let. Aris. 88–91).

It is significant that this visionary narrative contains a *vacat* in l. 4 between the description of this aqueduct that flows out of the city from the temple and an account of the narrator standing “before a land” קדמי ארע. This *vacat* likely marks the beginning of a new section that is now

³²³ Tigchelaar, “Imaginal Context,” 264. See Chapter 6 for a comparative analysis.

³²⁴ This observation is made by Tigchelaar in “Imaginal Context,” 263.

³²⁵ Puech suggests the following in trying to identify this water system: “La ligne semble faire allusion aux eaux de Gihon qui coulent sous le rempart de la ville jébuséenne.” DJD XXXI, 182. So also Frey, “On the Origins,” 354.

³²⁶ Lorenzo DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts*, TSAJ 110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 165; Frey, “On the Origins,” 354; Stuckenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy,” 313.

almost all but entirely lost.³²⁷ Despite the context being quite broken, it appears as though the narrator has moved from the temple precincts and the city into the surrounding area outside of the city walls.³²⁸ The last remaining line of this fragment seems to indicate that this land is in some way divided—all that is preserved is]ארע רבעין תרין וא]. Significantly, this sequence is closely paralleled by the transition from Ezek 37:1–12 to 37:13–23. Ezekiel 37:1–12, as noted above, involves a description of the water system that flows outward from the temple. Ezekiel 37:13–23 describes the land beyond the city walls and its northern, eastern, southern, and western borders, and notes that it should be divided among the twelve tribes of Israel. It is unclear to whom the land in 4Q537 12.5 is allotted, given the fragmentary state of the manuscript. Puech has suggested that l. 5 may refer to “la tribu de Lévi et à sa part dans le pays comme tribu consacrée au culte divin au sanctuaire central de Jérusalem.”³²⁹ This proposal is certainly plausible, but it is just as possible that the “land” described in l. 5 should be understood as referring to territory that is divided up equally amongst the twelve tribes of Israel, as the parallel with Ezek 37:1–23 may suggest. In either case, a determination of the function of the “land” in l. 5 should not be made simply on the basis of a vague appeal to the “priestly context” of either frag. 12 or 4Q537 as a whole, since Testament of Jacob? is not only concerned with priests and priestly matters, but also evinces a

³²⁷ So Legrand: “Cette ligne vierge marque probablement le début d’un nouveau paragraphe.” Legrand, “4Q537,” 411 n. 5.

³²⁸ DiTommaso suggests that l. 5 refers to either “a feature of the city” or “the territory immediately outside the pale.” DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem*, 165. I am suggesting that it likely refers to the land “immediately outside the pale.” The combination of 1) the use of the word ‘land,’ 2) the *vacat* (which likely begins a new section), and 3) the fact that this line follows a reference to water that flows outside of the city walls strengthens the likelihood of the conclusion that the ‘land’ being described in l. 5 lies outside of the city’s walls.

³²⁹ DJD XXXI, 182; Perrin accepts this suggestion, adding: “If this is the case, then this section should be interpreted in light of Num 35:1–5, Deut 12:12 and Joshua 21, which prescribe that the tribes of Israel must reserve some towns and their rural environs for the Levites’ use. This suggests that *T. Jacob*’s priestly outlook included a visionary affirmation of the earthly priests’ provision through the sacerdotal system and territorial allotment of suburban pasture lands.” Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 184.

broader concern with the sons of Jacob (frags. 1–3 and probably 5–9) and the land of Israel as a whole (frags. 14; 24).

4.2.3 Priests, Sacrificial Procedure, and Consumption

After a broken reference to the temple, 4Q537 frag. 12 describes the following activities as being carried out by the priests: donning of garments (להוון לבשין), ritual purification of the hands (טהירן [ידיהון]),³³⁰ offering of sacrifices upon the altar (מסקין דבחיא למדבחא), and consumption of a portion of the sacrifices (אכלין מן קצת דבחיהון). The progression follows a logical order, and is very similar to that of the Aramaic Levi Document, with some noteworthy differences in language, level of detail, and which rites are included. Notably, though, both compositions actually depict the process of sacrifice, beginning with entry and ending with consumption, rather than simply engaging in a topical discussion of the various components of the cultic ritual. It is also worth highlighting the fact that almost all of the cultic material in 4Q537 is paralleled by similar material in New Jerusalem, i.e., priestly garments, sacrifice, and consumption; both compositions frame their cultic material as being revealed in the context of a revelatory dream-vision; and both appear to present Jacob as the recipient of this divine revelation concerning the future cult.³³¹ More precise points of continuity and discontinuity in the accounts of cultic procedure in all three of these compositions will be discussed in detail in section 6.3.1.

³³⁰ The word “hands” is reconstructed by Puech, who notes: “Le fém. plur. וטהירן suppose la restitution de [ידיהון], probablement sans רגליהון pour l’alignement avec la ligne suivante.” DJD XXXI, 182.

³³¹ The identity of the unnamed seer in New Jerusalem has been discussed by Tigchelaar in both “Imaginal Context” and “Character of the City.” See the section on *New Jerusalem* in this chapter for a fuller discussion of Tigchelaar’s proposal.

4.2.4 Conclusion

There is not enough material preserved in frag. 12 to suggest that 4Q537 is endorsing a particular system of sacrificial legislation over and against a rival system. In fact, nothing that has been preserved in this composition suggests that the purpose or function of it is to lay out the minutiae of ritual procedure. It is impossible to rule out the possibility that there is a more detailed account of ritual practice elsewhere in 4Q537, but the extant material in frag. 12 provides only a very general depiction of the cult with minimal details. This depiction seems to represent only a sketch or outline of priestly practice, beginning with entry and ending with consumption. It is difficult to tell what role the vision of the temple cult plays within the composition as a whole, or how exactly it relates to the other two visions (frags. 1–3 and 24), but interest in the priesthood, cult, and temple fits well within the composition's broader concern for the patrimonial land of Israel and the future of Jacob's descendants.

4.3 New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554–555, 5Q15, 11Q18)

Seven copies of an otherwise unattested composition known as New Jerusalem were found scattered among five of the eleven Qumran caves (1, 2, 4, 5, and 11).³³² Both the number of preserved manuscripts and their distribution across nearly half of the caves speaks to the popularity of this composition at Qumran. As it has survived, New Jerusalem is comprised of three basic components: 1) the architectural features of a city, almost certainly an idealized Jerusalem (4Q554, 4Q554a, 5Q15); 2) a description of the city's temple as well as its priesthood and cultic rituals

³³² As DiTommaso notes, the publication of the various copies of *New Jerusalem* was a “relatively uneven process.” Lorenzo DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 4. His observation is borne out simply by looking at the wide-ranging dates of New Jerusalem's *editiones principes*, the first of which appeared in 1955 and the last of which was not published until 2009: DJD I, 134–5, pl. XXXI; DJD III, 84–89, pl. XVI; DJD III 184–93, pls. XL–XLI; DJD XXIII 305–55, pls. XXXV–XL; DJD XXXVII, 91–154, pl. V–VII.

(2Q24; 11Q18); and 3) an eschatological scene involving the Israelites (i.e., זרעך) and several of their traditional enemies (4Q554 13). The entire composition is framed as a tour in which a heavenly figure leads an unnamed seer through the city and the temple, measuring and describing various features along the way (cf. 2Q24 8.7; 4Q554 1ii.14; 1iii.20; 5Q15 1ii.6; 11Q18 15.4; 18.5).³³³ Linguistic and structural parallels have led most scholars to conclude that New Jerusalem is modeled after Ezekiel’s tour of the new Jerusalem in Ezek 40–48.³³⁴ Nevertheless, certain aspects of Ezek 40–48 have been adapted to accord better with the author’s particular literary and theological proclivities.³³⁵ New Jerusalem’s unnamed seer need not be identified as Ezekiel. In fact, if Tigchelaar is correct, this composition may reflect a tradition in which Jacob receives a vision at Bethel that includes details about the future of his children and information concerning the future temple at Jerusalem (so also 4Q537, see above).³³⁶

³³³ See DiTommaso’s comments: “The *NJ* itself is almost certainly an apocalypse. This is indicated by the presence of such elements as a mediating figure and the repeated use of visionary terminology, including instances where the seer reports what this figure does, says, or demonstrates, including the actual measuring of the dimensions of the New Jerusalem.” DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 110. Cf. Florentino García Martínez, “The «New Jerusalem» and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*, STDJ 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 180–213, esp. 193–4; H. Reichelt, “Die Qumran-Fragmente vom Himmelschen Jerusalem,” *Angelus interpretis - Texte in der Johannes-Apokalypse: Strukturen, Aussagen und Hintergründe*, Europäische Hochschulschriften 23 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1994), 203–6; DJD XXIII, 308.

³³⁴ Shozo Fujita, “The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries B.C.” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1970), 306–15; Bastiaan Jongeling, “Publication Provisoire d’un Fragment Provenant de la Grotte 11 de Qumrân (11Q Jér Nouv ar),” *JSJ* 1 (1970): 58–64, esp. 59; Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 264; García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 193; DJD XXIII, 308; DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 107–8; Tigchelaar, “Imaginal Context,” 257; idem, “The Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*,” in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. T. Nicklas, J. Verheyden, and E. Eynikel, JSJSup 143 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 117–32, esp. 117.

³³⁵ See, e.g. Wacholder’s analysis of the difference between the angelic tour guide’s measuring rod in Ezekiel and *New Jerusalem*: “Ezekiel introduces the septimal principle, yet Ezekiel’s measuring rod (*qaneh*) is clearly stated to have been ‘six cubits’ (40.5). The author of Heavenly Jerusalem alters this length to seven cubits. This is a radical alteration carried out on strictly theological principles.” Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 270. Another important difference is the arrangement of the named gates in both writings, the significance of which will be explored below. See DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 108 for these and other differences between the architecture of Ezek 40–48 and that of New Jerusalem.

³³⁶ Tigchelaar, “Imaginal Context,” 260–70. Cf. idem, “Character of the City,” 118–20.

The basic structure of the tour proceeds from the outside moving inward, beginning with the city walls, proceeding into the city, and ending with the temple and the cult.³³⁷ However, the fragmentary nature of the manuscript tradition does not allow for any definitive conclusions to be made concerning the precise order of the extant material. One of the main questions related to the basic structure of the composition has to do with the placement of the fragment that contains the eschatological scenario (4Q554 13). Does this scene occur between the tour of the city and the tour of the temple?³³⁸ Or, does the eschatological material follow the description of both the city and the temple?³³⁹ DiTommaso's textual arguments for situating the eschatological material between the tour of the city and the tour of the temple are compelling. Such a reading would make the description of the temple "the climax of the *NJ* both spatially, as the destination of the outside-in tour of the city, and thematically, if we understand the Temple and its sacrificial cult in the new age to be the heart of the city and the focus of the members of the New Israel."³⁴⁰ Tigchelaar comes to a similar conclusion regarding the basic significance of the temple relative to that of the city:

³³⁷ "The major internal clue is the long, fragmentary section which extends from 4Q554 1 i–iii to 4Q554a (with partial parallels at 2Q24 1 and 5Q15 1 i–ii). As this section is a reconstruction from the fragments, it begins with the report of the city walls and its twelve named gates, and then describes several aspects of the residential area of the city, including finer details about the streets and the houses." DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 96. Cf. Florentino García Martínez, "More Fragments of 11QNJ," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations. New Texts and Reformulated Issues*, ed. W. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 188–9; Jörg Frey, "The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 800–16, 805; Tigchelaar, "Character of the City," 121; Hugo Antonissen, "The Visionary Architecture of New Jerusalem in Qumran," in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*, ed. Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen, and Nadine Kessler, WUNT 278 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 439–80, 443–4. Tigchelaar suggests that the tour of the temple in 11Q18 proceeds from the outside-in as well. Tigchelaar, "Character of the City," 121.

³³⁸ So DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 62–63, 100–1. 4Q554 is labeled 4Q554 2 iii in DiTommaso's edition of the Cave 4 New Jerusalem manuscripts. Tigchelaar's brief discussion of DiTommaso's arrangement can be found in Tigchelaar, "Character of the City," 122–4.

³³⁹ So Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qurman, RevQ* 18 (1998): 453–7, 454. See DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 62–63, 100–101 for a critique of Tigchelaar's placement of the fragment containing the eschatological scene.

³⁴⁰ DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 103.

“Even though the composition has been labeled New Jerusalem, the real focus on the text is on the new temple.”³⁴¹

Yet, the vast majority of studies on the New Jerusalem focus almost entirely on the description of the city, especially its architectural features, layout, and function.³⁴² The only comprehensive treatment of the cultic material in New Jerusalem can be found in Michael Chyutin’s 1997 monograph.³⁴³ Hugo Antonissen includes a fairly substantial section on the architecture of the temple in his 2011 study on New Jerusalem, though he does not comment on the aspects of the composition that deal with the temple’s priests or cultic rituals.³⁴⁴ Some brief discussions of various aspects of New Jerusalem’s cultic material can also be found in studies by Bastiaan Jongeling,³⁴⁵ Menaham Kister,³⁴⁶ Michael Wise,³⁴⁷ García Martínez,³⁴⁸ and Perrin,³⁴⁹ but a synthesis of all the cultic material in New Jerusalem remains a *desideratum*.

4.3.1 Gates, Boulevards, and the Location of the Temple

The scope of my dissertation does not allow for a detailed discussion of all the architectural features of the city. However, two of the city’s architectural features are directly related to the

³⁴¹ Tigchelaar, “Character of the City,” 131.

³⁴² The focus on the city at the expense of the temple and cult may be due in part to the order in which the manuscripts were published. From 1962 to 1998, only the material from Caves 1, 2, and 5 had been published in DJD. Most of the studies on New Jerusalem during that period were based on that material, the best-preserved portions of which dealt with the layout of the city and its gates (i.e., 5Q15). Most of the material dealing with the temple and cult is found in 11Q18, though 2Q24 does contain some important cult-related passages.

³⁴³ Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*, JSPSup 25 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997). The myriad problems with Chyutin’s study are widely acknowledged. So Tigchelaar: “Chyutin’s book can only be used with the utmost caution.” Tigchelaar, “Character of the City,” 126 n. 33. Cf. idem, review of Chyutin, 453–57; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran*, *JTS* 50 (1999): 658–64.

³⁴⁴ Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 465–9, 475–8.

³⁴⁵ Jongeling, “Publication Provisoire,” 58–64.

³⁴⁶ Menahem Kister, “Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran,” *JSJ* 44 (1993): 280–90.

³⁴⁷ Michael Owen Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, SAOC 49 (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990), 64–86.

³⁴⁸ García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 200–2.

³⁴⁹ Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 171–7.

cultic or priestly perspective of New Jerusalem: 1) the names of the city gates and 2) the arrangement of the city's main boulevards with respect to the temple. First, the author of New Jerusalem follows Ezek 40–48 insofar as each of the twelve city gates are associated with one of the twelve sons of Jacob. This tradition can also be found in the Temple Scroll and Reworked Pentateuch (4Q365a), although these two compositions do not associate the sons of Jacob with the gates of the city, but rather with the gates of the temple courts. Examining how each of these compositions has arranged the sons of Jacob around the perimeter of the wall can give some possible indications as to their particular theological or ideological perspectives, inasmuch as specific sons of Jacob are promoted or demoted by various authors. Second, New Jerusalem uses the city's boulevards as a frame of reference when noting the location of the Temple. Using these boulevards in order to locate the temple in relation to the city also has the potential to highlight something of New Jerusalem's distinctive outlook, especially when compared with the location of the temple in Ezek 40–48.

The extant portion of New Jerusalem begins with a clockwise tour around the gigantic walls of the city (4Q554 1i.11–ii.10).³⁵⁰ The tour begins at the northeast corner of the wall (1i.11), with the tour guide using the twelve city gates as reference points—listing the name of and distance between each gate as the tour proceeds (e.g., 1i.13). The wall is constructed as an enormous rectangle, measuring 140 x 100 stadia with the northern and southern sections being the longest.³⁵¹ There are three gates on each of the four walls, with a distance of 35 stadia between

³⁵⁰ DiTommaso notes that this represents either “the beginning or a section close to the beginning of *NJ*.” DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 96.

³⁵¹ García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 194; Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 446. Note that the city's rectangular shape in New Jerusalem differs from the square layout of Ezekiel's city. DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 108. Ezekiel's square city is more in line with the architectural preferences evinced in Jewish literature, biblical and otherwise, as DiTommaso further observes: “*Cf.* the square Levitical towns of Num 35:4-5; the three square courts of the New Temple of the Temple Scroll (11Q19 xxxvi 3-7, xxxviii 12-13, and xl 8); the square New Jerusalem of Revelation (21:16); and the square New Jerusalem of *Lamentations Rabbah* 1.2.” DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 108 n. 63.

each gate on the eastern and western portions of the wall and 25 stadia between those on the northern and southern portions.³⁵² This highly symmetrical arrangement depicts the gates of the city as being equidistant from one another, and thus the gates on the eastern wall are presented as being directly across from those on the western wall and those on the northern wall as being directly across from those to the south.³⁵³

Although it is obvious that each gate bears the name of one of Jacob’s sons, only five of the twelve names have been preserved (i.e., Simeon, Joseph, Reuben, Naphtali, Asher).³⁵⁴ However, it is possible to reconstruct the names and locations of each of the twelve gates on the basis of comparative data found in the Temple Scroll and Reworked Pentateuch, as Puech has demonstrated.³⁵⁵

	Ezek 48:31–34	4Q554 1i–ii	11Q19 xxxix	11Q19 xl/xli	4Q365a 2ii
East North	Joseph	Simeon	Simeon	Simeon	?
East Centre	Benjamin	[Levi]	Levi	Levi	?
East South	Dan	[Judah]	Judah	Judah	?
South East	Simeon	Joseph	Reuben	[Reuben]	?
South Centre	Issachar	[Benjamin]	Joseph	[Joseph]	?
South West	Zebulon	Reuben	Benjamin	Benjamin	?
West South	Gad	[Issachar]	Issachar	Issachar	[Issachar]
West Centre	Asher	[Zebulon]	Zebulon	Zebulon	Zebulon
West North	Naphtali	[Gad]	Gad	Gad	Gad
North West	Reuben	[D]an	Dan	Dan	Dan
North Centre	Judah	Naphtali	Naphtali	Naphtali	Naphtali
North East	Levi	Asher	Asher	Asher	Asher

Gates of the New Jerusalem: Based on the table found on pp. 27–28 of DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem*.

³⁵² García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 194; Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 446.

³⁵³ Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 451.

³⁵⁴ DiTommaso argues, “The trace of the *nun* allows for the reconstruction of the phrase ׀[תרעא ד]” in 4Q554 1ii.6. Though, see Puech, who suggests that “it is impossible to read the name of the gate of Dan in 4Q554 1 ii.” Émile Puech, “The Names of the Gates of the *New Jerusalem* (4Q554),” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, and W. W. Fields (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 379–92. Contrary to the claims of Beyer, *ATTM*, 96, 129.

³⁵⁵ Puech, “Gates,” 383–91. Cf. DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 27–28.

There is a close, though not exact, correspondence between the preserved gates in New Jerusalem, the Temple Scroll, and Reworked Pentateuch.³⁵⁶ This close correspondence among the lists has been used to reconstruct the missing names in both New Jerusalem and Reworked Pentateuch. Most importantly for our purposes, every scholar who has commented on the gates in New Jerusalem has reconstructed the name Levi (לוי) as occupying the central position on the eastern wall. One of the reasons for this reconstruction is textual. The highly formulaic nature of the description of the gates, and of the distance between each of them, in this section of the manuscript has allowed scholars to make an educated guess as to the size of the name that originally occupied this space. As DiTommaso has observed, “It is clear that the application of the distance formulae to reconstruct line 15 leaves room for only a very short name. If this is correct, the only options are the short names ‘Levi’ or ‘Gad.’”³⁵⁷ The close correspondence between the extant gates of New Jerusalem, the Temple Scroll, and Reworked Pentateuch tilts the scales in favor of Levi as opposed to Gad as the most likely reconstruction.

For the purposes of my dissertation, the most important feature of New Jerusalem’s unique arrangement of the sons of Jacob relates to the respective positions of Levi and Judah, especially when compared to their positions in Ezek 48:31–34. Ezekiel places Judah’s gate in the position of greatest privilege. This decision seems to cohere with the place of privilege given to the נשיא “prince” over and above even that of the sons of Zadok (44:3; 45:7; 46:1–18), and the absence of

³⁵⁶ Both DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 28 and Puech, “Gates,” 384–5 have noted that some scholars are too quick to assert that the lists in New Jerusalem, the Temple Scroll, and Reworked Pentateuch are identical, i.e., Wise, *Critical Study*, 78–79; García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 185; Magen Broshi, “Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*, ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman, STDJ 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 9–22, 11; Frey, “New Jerusalem Text,” 806–7, 815. It should be noted, though, that both Wise, “New Jerusalem Text,” DNTB 741–5 and García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” EDSS 2:606–10 have revised their earlier positions, and now recognize that these lists, though similar, are not identical.

³⁵⁷ DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 29. Cf. Puech, “Gates,” 388.

any figure corresponding to the high priest, in the Book of Ezekiel. Nevertheless, Levi retains a privileged position in Ezekiel's scheme insofar as his gate is located next to Judah's. By contrast, Levi's gate retains its proximity to Judah's in New Jerusalem, but it is his, not Judah's, that is given pride of place. This arrangement is paralleled in the Temple Scroll and, possibly, Reworked Pentateuch, and may reflect the gradual ascendance of the priesthood, and especially the high priest, in Jewish society over the course of the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods.³⁵⁸

It is possible that New Jerusalem's placement of the gates named after Simeon and Reuben also reflects something of the author's outlook.³⁵⁹ Simeon occupies a prominent place next to Levi and Judah in New Jerusalem, which is paralleled in the Temple Scroll even as it diverges from Ezekiel's schema, according to which Reuben is situated next to Levi and Judah. Is it possible that Simeon's place in New Jerusalem has something to do with his role in the slaughter of the Shechemites?³⁶⁰ The incident at Shechem was not viewed favorably in the Hebrew Book of Genesis (Gen 34:30), and both Levi and Simeon are cursed by their father Jacob as a result of their violent behavior (Gen 49:5–7). However, scholars have long noted that the figure of Levi is rehabilitated in Second Temple tradition, and the slaughter of the Shechemites comes to be viewed favorably in several texts as a zealous act of piety in defense of sexual purity.³⁶¹ Concern with sexual purity may have also led to the demotion of Reuben in New Jerusalem. Neither New Jerusalem nor the Temple Scroll place Reuben next to Levi and Judah as does Ezekiel, but New Jerusalem is unique in demoting Reuben to the sixth position on the wall.³⁶² It is possible that

³⁵⁸ Significantly, the high priest plays a prominent role in New Jerusalem, whereas no figure corresponding to that of Ezekiel's *גִּבּוֹר* appears in the extant fragments.

³⁵⁹ My interpretation of place of Simeon and Reuben on the city gates in New Jerusalem relies heavily on the comments of Puech in "Gates," 390–1.

³⁶⁰ Puech, "Gates," 391.

³⁶¹ For one of first and most thorough treatments of the rehabilitation and evolution of the figure of Levi in Second Temple literature, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*.

³⁶² Puech, "Gates," 390.

Reuben's demotion has to do with his incestuous rape of Bilhah (Gen 35:22; 49:4).³⁶³ Since, in contrast to Simeon and Levi, whose violent behavior was eventually viewed as a zealous defense of sexual purity in Second Temple tradition, Reuben's behavior is harshly condemned as an example of sexual impurity, especially in Jubilees wherein the rape of Bilhah becomes the basis for articulating of the laws of incest (Jub. 33:1–20).

Finally, a few words must be said about the location of the temple relative to the city gates and the main boulevards of the city. There is some debate as to the precise location of the temple vis-à-vis the city in New Jerusalem. Two basic positions predominate. On the one hand, several scholars argue that the temple and the residential portion of the city occupy two distinct zones within the city walls.³⁶⁴ On the other hand, Puech, García Martínez, and Antonissen have suggested that the temple is situated right in the midst of the city in New Jerusalem.³⁶⁵ It is this second position that best accounts for the textual data.

New Jerusalem uses one of the main boulevards of the city as a reference point when describing the location of the temple. The tour guide describes six major boulevards, three of which run from east to west (4Q554 1ii.15–18) and three of which run from south to north (4Q554 1ii.18–21). Both sets of three boulevards have two that are of equal measure and one that is wider than the rest (4Q554 1ii.17–18; 1ii.19–21). At least in the case of the south-north set of boulevards, the widest one is that which runs through the center of the city (4Q554 1ii.20–21). There is no reason to doubt that this pattern obtains in the case of the east-west boulevards as well. That is, the central

³⁶³ Puech, "Gates," 390, 391.

³⁶⁴ DJD III, 185; Jacob Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran – The Description of the New Jerusalem," *IEJ* 29 (1979): 45–59; Broshi, "Visionary Architecture," 15; Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 85–88; James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper, 2002), 371. Each of these scholars appears to have been influenced by the concept of the *teruma* in Ezek 45:1–6, according to which the section of the city containing the Temple was distinct from rest of the city both spatially and sacrally.

³⁶⁵ García Martínez, "New Jerusalem," 186–8; Puech, "Gates," 390; Antonissen, "Visionary Architecture," 451–3.

east-west boulevard is also likely the widest of the three east-west boulevards.³⁶⁶ This conclusion is based in part on New Jerusalem's penchant for highly patterned, symmetrical descriptions of the city's architectural lay out. If this is correct, the tour guide is describing a grid-like city with six main boulevards, with the boulevards that intersect in the middle of the city being wider than the rest.

These six boulevards connect the gates of the eastern wall to those on the western wall and the gates of the southern wall to those on the northern wall, which creates a city that comprises sixteen similarly-sized rectangular blocks (פרזיא).³⁶⁷ There is no indication in the text that these sixteen blocks have been apportioned to any specific group or for any specific purpose. The location of the temple is somewhat harder to discern, even if it does not appear to be located in an area that is separate from the rest of the city. 4Q554 1ii.17 observes that the central east-west boulevard runs either to the left or the north of the temple (על ש[מא]ל מקדשא), but the extant text does not locate the temple vis-à-vis one of the south-north boulevards. Both Puech and Antonissen have made a reasonable case for locating the temple at the intersection of the widest of the east-west and south-north boulevards, and thus in the centre of the city, but we cannot know with certainty if this proposal is correct. Nevertheless, if the temple is to be found in the midst of the city and if the city is not divided into particular zones akin to Ezekiel's *teruma*, the most likely location for the temple would be the nexus of the city, the intersection of the two largest boulevards.

³⁶⁶ “The author does not specify the location of the widest of the east-west boulevards in relation to the two other parallel boulevards. In accordance with the location of the widest of the boulevards on the south-north axis, one can accept that it is in the middle of the three east-west axes although the text does not entirely exclude the location north or south in relation to the two other boulevards.” Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 452.

³⁶⁷ García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 188; Antonissen, “Visionary Architecture,” 452.

The architecture of the city reflects the centrality of the priesthood and the cult in the outlook of New Jerusalem. Levi has supplanted Judah in New Jerusalem's arrangement of the sons of Jacob, with the gate that bears his name occupying the most privileged position on the city wall. The unique arrangement of the rest of the sons of Jacob may also have been intended to highlight certain attitudes that were of interest to the priesthood. It is also possible, if not probable, that the temple should be understood as being situated at the center of the city itself. In any case, it is clear that New Jerusalem diverges from Ezek 40–48 insofar as it does not divide the city in terms of zones of relative holiness, with the priests and the temple occupying one space, the Levites occupying another, and the rest of Israel occupying yet another.

4.3.2 The Architecture of the Temple

Material concerning the temple itself can be found in 2Q24 and 11Q18, in addition to some fragmentary material in 4Q555 and (possibly) 1Q32. Of these manuscripts, 11Q18 contains the vast majority of the temple-related material, but it is unfortunately notorious for its poor state of preservation.³⁶⁸ Its editors have argued that the manuscript generally proceeds from outside-in on the basis of a possible reference to the outer court in frag. 6 and a possible reference to throne (כורסי]א) of the *debir* in frag. 31ii (cf. 32.1).³⁶⁹ Beyond this basic inward progression, however, “it is difficult to determine the direction of the ‘tour’ through the Temple.”³⁷⁰ It is also often

³⁶⁸ “Apparently 11Q18 was a completely or partially complete, petrified scroll-mass at its time of discovery, but efforts to preserve it intact failed and now it exists solely as a collection of scroll pieces.” DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 4. Cf. DJD XIII, 305–6; Florentino García Martínez, “The Last Surviving Columns of 11QNJ,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne, VTSup 49 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 178–92, pls. 3-9; idem, “More Fragments of 11QNJ,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovation, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 186–98.

³⁶⁹ DJD XXIII, 308. Cf. Tigchelaar, “Character of the City,” 121.

³⁷⁰ DJD XXIII, 308. The editors write, “The exact order of the fragments as they were unrolled from the scroll has unfortunately not been reported.” DJD XXIII, 307.

difficult to determine the precise literary relationship between the descriptions of physical objects and the cultic rituals. What does seem clear is that the portion of New Jerusalem that describes the physical features of the temple is very similar to the better-preserved portion of the composition that deals with the layout of the city. The seer is clearly being led by the same heavenly tour guide, a figure who at one point reads to him from a כתב “writing” (11Q18 19.5–6). This portion of the composition also includes myriad broken references to directional markers,³⁷¹ units of measurement,³⁷² dimensions,³⁷³ and numerical figures.³⁷⁴ A significant amount of attention is paid to the temple’s physical features and materials, physical spaces and objects, though it is often impossible to determine which features, rooms, utensils, or furniture are being described. These fragments include broken references to doors,³⁷⁵ walls,³⁷⁶ stairs,³⁷⁷ columns,³⁷⁸ panels,³⁷⁹ stones,³⁸⁰ foundation,³⁸¹ and living water.³⁸² We also find references to two distinct spaces within the temple complex—עליהא “upper room” (11Q18 9.1; 21.3) and עזרה “temple courtyard” (2Q24 8.7)—as well as references to various ritual objects and furniture, such as sieves,³⁸³ the altar,³⁸⁴ cups,³⁸⁵ bowls,³⁸⁶ and cauldrons.³⁸⁷

³⁷¹ 11Q18 6.3; 12i.5, 8; 12ii.7

³⁷² 11Q18 6.1; 8.2; 9.2, 3; 11.1, 3; 17ii.2, 5; 21.4; 32.4

³⁷³ 11Q18 8.2, 4; 9.3; 11.3; 17ii.2, 4

³⁷⁴ 11Q18 6.1; 8.1; 9.2, 3; 11.1, 3; 17ii.1, 2, 3, 4, 5; 18.1, 2; 21.1, 2, 3, 4; 32.5, 8

³⁷⁵ 11Q18 8.4; 17ii.2, 3; 19.1; 21.2

³⁷⁶ 2Q24 3.4; 8.3; 11Q18 6.2; 11.2, 7; 12i.6

³⁷⁷ 11Q18 21.6

³⁷⁸ 11Q18 9.2; 11.6

³⁷⁹ 11Q18 11.8

³⁸⁰ 11Q18 10i.5; 18.2; 32.6a

³⁸¹ 11Q18 32.9

³⁸² 11Q18 10i.1

³⁸³ 11Q18 12i.1

³⁸⁴ 11Q18 13.4; 22.1, 5; 29.1

³⁸⁵ 11Q18 18.1

³⁸⁶ 11Q18 18.1

³⁸⁷ 11Q18 18.2

A great deal of attention is paid to precious materials in the description of the temple's features and objects. The phrase דהב טב "pure gold" occurs with relative frequency throughout these fragments (cf. 11Q18 8.1; 10i.2; 11.4). There is also an allusion to an object being "overlaid with gold" (חפא דהב; 11Q18 10i.6). These references bring the description of the temple in New Jerusalem into closer continuity with those of the tabernacle (esp. Exod 25–37) and the Solomonic temple (esp. 1 Kgs 6–7; 2 Chr 3–4) as opposed to the temple in Ezek 40–48, which contains no mention of gold. Consider also [תּרע ספּי]רא "the sapphi[re] gate" from 2Q24 3.2. García Martínez has suggested, "Since the other gates mentioned are made of stone, one may reckon that this sapphire gate does not belong, like the others, to the city but to the temple."³⁸⁸ If this is the case, New Jerusalem can again be distinguished from Ezek 40–48 insofar as Ezekiel's description of the temple does not mention that substance. New Jerusalem also diverges from the Pentateuchal account of the tabernacle at this point, which recounts the presence of sapphire only as a component of the priestly vestments (cf. Exod 28:18; 39:11). However, there is a broader tradition that can be traced back to the post-exilic period in which sapphire and other precious materials are used in the construction of the restored Jerusalem, though none of these texts explicitly associate sapphire with the architectural features of the temple complex (cf. Isa 54:11; Tob 13:16; Rev 21:19). Of the compositions that participate in this broader tradition, however, there are some striking connections between the descriptions of the holy city in New Jerusalem and Tobit, as we will explore in detail in section 6.4.1.

³⁸⁸ García Martínez, "New Jerusalem," 200. Cf. Antonissen seconds this proposal, adding that "[t]his point of view can be reinforced by the conclusion that precious materials, such as sapphire, refer to the presence of God in any capacity." Antonissen, "Visionary Architecture," 467.

New Jerusalem uses two different terms in connection with the temple complex, i.e., מקדש (4Q554 1ii.17; 11Q18 9.6) and היכל (2Q24 4.3; 11Q18 19.1, 3; 20.2; 31ii.6; 32.3, 6). The editors render both as “temple,” though this decision may obscure the fact that מקדש and היכל do not appear to simply function as synonyms in New Jerusalem. Context suggests that היכל is better translated as “sanctuary,”³⁸⁹ while מקדש is best rendered “temple” or “temple complex.”

The extant references to היכל in New Jerusalem all seem to describe the location of specific rituals that are performed within the sanctuary (e.g., the showbread ritual; 2Q24 4.3; 11Q18 20.2), involve furniture found within the sanctuary (e.g., 11Q18 31ii.2; 32.1), or are associated with holiness and/or the divine glory (11Q18 19.3; 31ii.7). On the other hand, the few extant references to מקדש occur in less explicitly sacral contexts. The first occurrence of this term appears in the description of the city’s six main boulevards in 4Q554. In this passage, the narrator simply describes the location of one of these boulevards as על ש[מא]ל מקדשא (1ii.17). The only other reference to the מקדש shows up in a very fragmentary context that involves a description of an upper room (11Q18 9.1–6). The extant evidence seems to suggest that מקדש is a more general term used when referring to temple’s exterior or the temple compound as a whole, whereas היכל refers to the temple’s sanctuary, a place of increased holiness in which the divine glory resides.

³⁸⁹ This understanding of היכל was proposed by Kister, who suggested that this term “should perhaps be interpreted as referring to the inner part of the sanctuary (this term is frequently used in this sense in rabbinic literature).” Kister, “Some New Texts,” 285. Wise also translates היכל as “sanctuary” in his treatment of New Jerusalem. Wise, *Critical Study*, 73. Cf. Chyutin, who also distinguishes between מקדש and היכל in his edition, translating the former as “temple” and the latter as “Great Hall.” Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 22, 26.

This conclusion may also be supported by the fact that the reference to the *מקדש* appears in the earlier portion of 11Q18, whereas the references to the *היכל* occur later, thus being consistent with the basic inward movement of the tour.

4.3.3 The Priesthood and Its Rituals

The tour of the temple complex is not merely concerned with its architectural features, references to the priesthood and cult appear throughout the extant fragments. There are myriad allusions to scenes involving the high priest and other high-ranking members of the priesthood,³⁹⁰ the priestly courses,³⁹¹ sacrifices and other cultic rituals,³⁹² priestly vestments,³⁹³ and festival celebrations.³⁹⁴ Unfortunately, the vast majority of them are found on tiny fragments consisting of single words or phrases, which makes any meaningful understanding of their contents difficult, if not impossible. A few modest observations, however, are possible. First, New Jerusalem preserves a handful of references to some specific rituals and celebrations, including the Passover (11Q18 16ii.17i.2; 27.3), thank-offerings (11Q18 16ii.17i.1), and peace-offerings (11Q18 27.5). Second, there appears to be an emphasis placed on eating and drinking (11Q18 7.2; 25.6; 27.6), including, at least in some cases, the consumption of the priestly portion (11Q18 16ii.17i.2–3).³⁹⁵ Third, references to the setting of the sun (11Q18 24.1; 26.3; 27.4; 28.3) and night-time (11Q18 25.2) may reflect an interest in “the time of ritual purity.”³⁹⁶ Finally, 2Q24 8 contains a noteworthy

³⁹⁰ 2Q24 4.13, 16; 11Q18 14ii.5; 20.6

³⁹¹ 11Q18 15.2–4

³⁹² 11Q18 16ii+17i.1, 2; 23ii.3; 25.4; 27.3; 28.4, 5; 29.6; 33.1, 2

³⁹³ 11Q18 14ii.1–5; 16i.2–3

³⁹⁴ 11Q18 30.4

³⁹⁵ For a recent treatment of the banquet motif in New Jerusalem, see Hugo Antonissen, “The Banquet Culture in New Jerusalem, an Aramaic Text from Qumran,” in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*, ed. Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegismund, STDJ 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 52–77.

³⁹⁶ DJD XXIII, 345.

passage in which the work of the priests is described as an act of atonement (להוֹזֵן מִכַּפְרִין בַּה עֲלוֹ[הִי]; 1.5; cf. 1Q20 10.13; 4Q541 9i.2; 4Q558 27.1). The context is quite broken, but the very next line reads: וְלֹא יִתְּכַלֵּא עוֹד “and it shall no longer be withheld/ended” (2Q24 8.6), in a possible reference to the ongoing vitality of the temple cult. Beyond these very fragmentary allusions, there are a few larger, though still highly damaged, passages pertaining to the priesthood and cult in the New Jerusalem manuscripts. These passages involve 1) the organization of the priesthood, 2) the vestments of the high priest, 3) the showbread ritual, and 4) the bovine offering. I will discuss each of these topics in more detail below.

4.3.3.1 Priestly Organization

A handful of fragments depict the organization of the priesthood in the context of its description of cultic rituals. Most notably, the account of the showbread ritual in 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 alludes to the arrangement of several high-ranking priests, including the high priest (11Q18 20.6) and his deputy (2Q24 4.16).³⁹⁷ We also find brief allusions to the organization of the priesthood in 11Q18 15 and 30. This section will treat each of these passages in turn, but the majority of my focus will be devoted to 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20. The details of the showbread ritual on offer in 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 will be discussed below (4.2.3.3). Here, however, I will show how this passage can help shed some light on the idealized manner in which the priesthood is presented in New Jerusalem:

11Q18 20.1–7 (with parallel from 2Q24 4.9–16, underlined in transcription)

³⁹⁷ The reconstruction of this passage relies on a collation of 2Q24 4 and 11Q18 20. The overlapping material was noticed by Jongeling in 1970 in his provisional publication of 11Q18 20. Jongeling, “Publication Provisoire,” 59. For a collation of these two fragments, see Wise, *Critical Study*, 72. Cf. DJD XXIII, 336–7; DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem*, 94.

1. eve]ry seventh day before God, a memori[al offering
2. bread. And they shall take the bread] outside the sanctuary, to the right of its west side, [and its shall be divided
3. And while I was watching, it was distrib]uted to the eight-four priests [
- 3a.] with everything was satiated the division of the tables of
4. the elders among th]em and fourteen prie[sts
5. the priests; two loaves of brea]d [upon] which was the incense
6. and while I was watching, one of the two loaves of bread was g]iven to the h[igh] priest [
7. with him; and the other (loaf of bread) was given to his deputy who was stan]ding close to him [

	כו]ל יום שביעי קודם אל דכר]נא	1.
	לחמא ויסבון לחמא]לברא מן היכלא לימין מערבה] ויתפלג	2.
	וחזית עד די פ]לג לתמנין וארבעה כהנין ש]	3.
	מזן כול שבעת פלוגת פתורי	3a.
	שביא די בה]ון וארבעת עשר כה]נין	4.
	כהניא תרתי לחמ]א די הות לבונתא]עליהון	5.
	חזא הוית עד חדא מן תרתי לחמא י]היבת לכהנא ר]בא	6.
	עמה ואחריתא יהיבת לתנינה די קא]ם פנבד]	7.

Two distinct numerical groupings of priests are referenced in the context of the showbread ritual, i.e., “fourteen ארבעת עשר כה]נין” (11Q18 20.3) and “eighty-four priests” תמנין וארבעה כהנין, i.e., “the elders among them” שביא די בהון (11Q18 20.4). It refers to a group elusively called “the elders among them” (11Q18 20.4). It refers to a group elusively called “the elders among them” (11Q18 20.4). It refers to a group elusively called “the elders among them” (11Q18 20.4), as well as to “the high priest” כהנא ר]בא (11Q18 20.6) and “his deputy (lit. his second)” (2Q24 4.16). There is no agreement on exactly how these groups of priests relate to one another, though Wise has made what appears to be the most plausible suggestion.³⁹⁸

³⁹⁸ E.g. Baumgarten suggests understanding the fourteen priests in light of *t. Ta’anit* 2:2 in which each priestly course is divided “into seven rotations for each day of the week.” Joseph M. Baumgarten, review of Yigael Yadin, *Megillat ha-Miqdaš: The Temple Scroll (Hebrew Edition)*, *JBL* 97/4 (1978): 584-9. For Baumgarten, the fourteen priests represent one rotation of the outgoing priestly course and one rotation of the incoming course. Baumgarten, review of Yadin, 585. Chyutin posits that the eighty-four priests should be understood as being divided into seven groups of twelve, though the evidence for this arrangement is disputed. For Chyutin, the eighty-four, the fourteen, and the high priest and his deputy are separate configurations of priests. Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 61.

Wise observes that Baillet, the original editor of 2Q24, saw a connection between the configuration of priests in this passage and that of the War Scroll.³⁹⁹ As Baillet noted, the War Scroll describes a group of twelve called ראשי הכוהנים “the heads of the priests” (1QM II.1), who are arranged behind כוהן הראש ומשנהו “the high priest and his assistant” (1QM II.1). As the War Scroll continues, “Twelve heads are to serve continually before God, while the heads of the twenty-six priestly divisions will serve with their divisions” (1QM II.1–2). On the basis of this comparison, Wise concluded that “the fourteen priests of [*New Jerusalem*] are the fourteen priests who were permanently stationed in the temple,”⁴⁰⁰ meaning, the fourteen priests described in New Jerusalem were comprised of the high priest, his deputy, and the twelve heads of the priests. These fourteen are distinguished from the rest of the priesthood, who are organized into courses (with each course having its own “head” priest). Wise further argues that these fourteen priests should be counted among the previously referenced eighty-four priests. In other words, the eighty-four priests “include these fourteen and seventy others.”⁴⁰¹ As for the identity of the seventy remaining priests, Wise suggests that they “represent either a course or, more probably, part of a course.”⁴⁰² Citing *t. Ta’anit* 2:2 as precedent for the priestly courses being divided into “smaller groups, one for each day of the week,” Wise argues that these seventy remaining priests “comprise one-seventh of a course.”⁴⁰³ According to this scenario, New Jerusalem would attest to priestly courses as being made up of 490 priests.

³⁹⁹ DJD III, 87; Wise, *Critical Study*, 75.

⁴⁰⁰ Wise, *Critical Study*, 75.

⁴⁰¹ Wise, *Critical Study*, 75.

⁴⁰² Wise, *Critical Study*, 75.

⁴⁰³ Wise, *Critical Study*, 75–6. As noted above, Baumgarten also read this passage in light of *t. Ta’anit* 2:2. However, Baumgarten saw the daily rotation as being comprised of seven priests, which would put the total of each course at seventy. On the other hand, Wise put the number in the daily rotation at seventy. Wise justifies his number in part by observing the following: “Four hundred and ninety priests would make up a complete course. A calculation based on this figure, and assuming 24 (or 26) courses, results in a total of 11,760–12,740 priests. This figure is comparable to the figure of 7,600 priests for the Herodian temple which J. Jeremias.” Wise, *Critical Study*, 76 n. 52.

Another fragment, 11Q18 15, provides some additional insight into how New Jerusalem envisions the configuration of the priestly courses, and reinforces its connection to the War Scroll. This fragment appears to refer to the changing of a priestly course at the end of one’s week of service:

2.] and all who will have completed their weeks [
- 3] their brothers will enter in their place, four hundred s[
4.] and he said to me: ‘For twenty-six [

2. א וכול די להוון משצין שבעתיהו]ן
3. אחיהון עללין חלפהון ארבע מאה צ
4. א ואמר לי לעשרין ושת ו

What is most notable for our purposes is the reference to the number twenty-six at the end of l. 4. This number likely refers to the total number of priestly courses that comprised the idealized priesthood as envisioned by the author of New Jerusalem.⁴⁰⁴ This stands in stark contrast to the much more usual twenty-four priestly courses. In fact, the War Scroll is the only other extant text that attests to a conception of the Israelite priesthood—ideal or otherwise—that is comprised of twenty-six priestly courses, a fact that only reinforces the parallel between 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 and 1QM II.1–2 noticed by Baillet and Wise.

The organization of the priesthood as recounted in 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 and 11Q18 15 seems to reflect an interest in the 364-day calendar, seen most obviously in its division of the priesthood into twenty-six courses. As Ben-Dov has suggested regarding the War Scroll, its twenty-six courses likely function “as a convenient division of the 364-day year into two halves of twenty-six weeks each.”⁴⁰⁵ The same calendrical considerations probably lie behind New

⁴⁰⁴ Kister, “Some Notes,” 284.

⁴⁰⁵ Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Mishmarot,” *EDEJ* 958–60.

Jerusalem’s decision to imagine a priesthood comprised of twenty-six courses. It is also likely no coincidence that both fourteen and eighty-four are divisible by seven. These numerical groupings, as Wise proposes, further confirm New Jerusalem’s “septimal ideology.”⁴⁰⁶ Even more significant is the fact that eighty-four is divisible by both seven *and* twelve—two numbers that not only have importance in New Jerusalem’s numerical schema, but also are related to the 364-year calendar.⁴⁰⁷

I will make one final note on the organization of the priesthood in New Jerusalem. Fragment 30 contains the extant composition’s lone reference to לויא “the Levites” (l. 2). This reference occurs in a context that seems to allude to the Levites making sacrifices (וְעוֹד לְוִיָּא ([דְּבַח־וְעוֹד לְוִיָּא]). However, as the editors note, “Both the syntax of the damaged clause and the reconstruction of the last word are uncertain.”⁴⁰⁸ It is possible that the first part of l. 2 should be reconstructed וְעוֹד לְוִיָּא, in which case it would actually be a prohibition against Levitical sacrifices. No solid conclusions can therefore be made about the attitudes of New Jerusalem toward the Levites, and its perspective on the scope of their cultic duties. Nevertheless, New Jerusalem does seem to reflect an awareness of the traditional division of priest and Levite.

4.3.3.2 High Priestly Vestments

According to New Jerusalem (11Q18 14ii), the high priest possesses seven crowns,⁴⁰⁹ which may reflect a broader affinity that New Jerusalem has for the number seven, referred to by Wacholder and Wise as its “heptadal numerology” or “septimal ideology,” respectively.⁴¹⁰ An

⁴⁰⁶ If Wise is correct to understand each course as being comprised of seven group of seventy, that would only further attest to the importance of the number seven in *New Jerusalem*’s configuration of the priesthood.

⁴⁰⁷ See Wacholder, “Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature,” 271.

⁴⁰⁸ DJD XXIII, 349.

⁴⁰⁹ The extant manuscript only preserves partial descriptions of the fifth, sixth, and seventh crowns.

⁴¹⁰ Wacholder, “Judaeo-Aramaic Literature,” 270; Wise, *Critical Study*, 75 n. 49.

interest in the number seven cuts across the Qumran Aramaic corpus, as we will explore in far more detail in section 6.2.10. Botanical imagery is used in the preserved descriptions of each of the high priestly crowns in New Jerusalem.

1. grape, when it comes from [the] sprouts [
2. from their shoot. And the fifth crown [
3. the inside of a cyprus flower. And the sixth crown [
4. the seventh (crown) is like the bud of a rose [
5. the high priest will be clothed

1. גפן כדי פרש מן לולבי]א
2. מנצבהון וכלילא חמי]שיא
3. גוא כפרה וכלילא שתית]א
4. שביעיא כדמות נצ ורד]
5. להוה לבש כהנא רבא]

Scholars have compared the high priestly crowns in this fragment to Josephus’ description of the high priestly crown, both of which use botanical imagery in their descriptions (*Ant.* 3.7.6 §§ 172–176).⁴¹¹ The fragment ends with a reference to the high priest’s donning of his vestments with a phrase that bears notable linguistic and syntactical similarities to passages both in the Testament of Jacob? (4Q537 12.1) and Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 7:1). This phrase is presumably followed by a description of the high priestly vestments, as is made more likely by fragmentary references to ܒܘܨ “linen” (cf. Exod 28:5, 6) and ܟܢܬܢ “shoulder-]pieces” (cf. Exod 28:7, 12, 25, 27; 39:4, 18, 20) in frag. 16i.⁴¹²

⁴¹¹ DJD XXII, 328; Kister, “Some Notes,” 283. Unlike Josephus’ account, New Jerusalem lacks comment on the crowns’ precious metals, though this absence may merely be due to an accident of preservation. More striking is the observation that Josephus describes one crown that is comprised of three tiers, whereas New Jerusalem attests to seven distinct crowns.

⁴¹² DJD XXIII, 331.

4.3.3.3 Showbread Ritual

The passage represented by 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 includes a detailed, if badly damaged, account of the showbread ritual, which follows, but expounds on and adapts, its scriptural base-text, Lev 24:5–9. For comparison's sake, I will include the ritual as recounted in both Leviticus and New Jerusalem:

Lev 24:5–9 (NRSV)

⁵You shall take choice flour, and bake twelve loaves of it; two-tenths of an ephah shall be in each loaf. ⁶You shall place them in two rows, six in a row, on the table of pure gold. ⁷You shall put pure frankincense with each row, to be a token offering for the bread, as an offering by fire to the LORD. ⁸Every sabbath day Aaron shall set them in order before the LORD regularly as a commitment of the people of Israel, as a covenant forever. ⁹They shall be for Aaron and his descendants, who shall eat them in a holy place, for they are most holy portions for him from the offerings by fire to the LORD, a perpetual due.

2Q24 4.1–20

1. their flesh [
2. for a pleasant offering [to the Lord
3. then they will enter the sanctuary[]
4. eight seahs, fine flou[r]
5. then they shall carry the bread [
6. first upon [the] al[tar
7. rows on [the] ta[ble
8. two rows of br[ead
9. of the bread, and they shall take [the] bread [
10. west, and [the bread?] shall be divid[ed
11. and while I watched [
12. the marks [
13. the elders among them, and fourteen pri[ests
14. the priests. Two loaves of bread that[
15. while] I was [watching], one of the two loaves of bread was given [to the high] pr[iest
16. with him. The other (loaf of bread) was given to his deputy who was standing close to him
17. [] While I was watching, there was given to a[ll the priests
18. [] of one ram of the flock to each man, and a man [
19. [] until the moment that they sat down []
20. [] one in all [

1. בשרהון]
2. לקורבן רעוא]
3. [וי]עלון להיכלא]
4. תמנא סאין סול]תא
5. ויטלון לחמא]◦
6. לקדמין על מד]בחא
7. סדרין על פת]ורא
8. תרי סדרי לח]מא
9. לחמא ויסבון לחמ]א
10. מערבה ויתפלג]ון
11. וחזית עד די ◦ל]
12. רישמתא כ] [ע◦ []◦[
13. שביִא די בהון וארבעת עשר כה]נין
14. כהניא תרתי לחמא די הי]ן
15. הוית עד חדא מן תרתי לחמא יהיבי]ל[כ]הן ראשא
16. עמה ואחריתא]י[היבת לתנינה די קאם פנבד]
17. []◦א [חזי הוית עד די יהיב לכ]ול כהניא
18.]ל די איל ען חד לכול גבר וגבר]
19.]ל [עד עדן די יתבו]
20. ח]ד בכול]

11Q18 20.1–7 (with parallel from 2Q24 4.9–16, underlined in transcription)

1. eve]ry seventh day before God, a memori[al offering
2. bread. And they shall take the bread] outside the sanctuary, to the right of its west side, [and its shall be divided
3. And while I was watching, it was distrib]uted to the eight-four priests [
- 3a.] with everything was satiated the division of the tables of
4. the elders among th]em and fourteen prie[sts
5. the priests; two loaves of brea]d [upon] which was the incense
6. and while I was watching, one of the two loaves of bread was g]iven to the h[igh] priest [
7. with him; and the other (loaf of bread) was given to his deputy who was stan]ding close to him [

1. כו]ל יום שביעי קודם אל דכר]נא
2. לחמא ויסבון לחמא]לברא מן היכלא לימין מערבה] ויתפלג
3. וחזית עד די פ]ליג לתמנין וארבעה כהנין ש]

- | | |
|--|-----|
| [מן כול שבעת פלוגת פתורי | 3a. |
| <u>שביא די בה]ון וארבעת עשר כה[גין</u> | 4. |
| <u>כהניא תרתי לחמ]א די הות לבונתא [עליהון</u> | 5. |
| חזא הוית עד חדא מן תרתי לחמא י]היבת לכהנא ר]בא | 6. |
|] עמה ואחריתא יהיבת לתנינה די קא]ם פנבד] | 7. |

The material surrounding the showbread ritual in New Jerusalem distinguishes it from its scriptural, Second Temple, and rabbinic counterparts. The first few preserved lines of the passage read בשרהון “their flesh” (2Q24 4.1) and לקורבן רעוא “as a pleasant offering” (2Q24 4.2), and it ends with a description of איל ען חד “one ram of the flock” being given לכול גבר “to each man” (2Q24 4.18), and with the phrase עד עדן די יתבו “until the moment that they sat down” (2Q24 4.19).

New Jerusalem thus presents the showbread ritual as couched within a larger sequence of cultic activity involving the slaughter and consumption of sacrificial meat. The fragment’s poor state of preservation precludes any definitive conclusions, but it appears as though the showbread ritual is followed by, or may even occur in the context of, some sort of priestly banquet.⁴¹³

The showbread ritual itself, however, corresponds to the Leviticus account in a number of ways. As in Leviticus, New Jerusalem recounts the arrangement of the showbread upon a table in the sanctuary: the bread is arranged into two rows (תרי סדרי לח[מא], 2Q24 4.8; שְׁתֵּי־מַעֲרֻכּוֹת, Lev 24:6) every seventh day (ל יום שביעי, 11Q18 20.1; בְּיּוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, Lev 24:8) before God (דכר[נא], 11Q18 20.1; לְפָנֵי יְהוָה, Lev 24:8; cf. Exod 25:30) as a memori[al offering (קודם אל)

⁴¹³ García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 200. See Chyutin’s comments: “At the conclusion of the [showbread] ceremony (10.10-14), there is a description of the division of the ram’s meat and of a common meal shared by priestly who sit beside tables.” Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 62.

20.1; לְאִזְכָּרָהּ, Lev 24:7).⁴¹⁴ Some aspects of the showbread ritual in New Jerusalem, however, seem to function as exegetical elaborations of Leviticus base-text, specifically of Lev 24:9, which says that the showbread “shall be for Aaron and his descendants, who shall eat them in a holy place, for they are the most holy portions for him from the offerings by fire to the LORD, a perpetual due” (NRSV). New Jerusalem answers two questions not addressed in this passage: 1) Where exactly did the priests eat the showbread? 2) How were the twelve loaves divided amongst the high priest and his fellows?

First, Lev 24:9 tells us only that the priests should consume the previous week’s showbread “in a holy place” (בְּמִקְוֹם קֹדֶשׁ). but it gives no further instructions concerning where it is to be eaten. New Jerusalem, however, provides much more detail on this point. In particular, 2Q24 4.9 // 11Q18 20.2⁴¹⁵ recounts the taking of the old showbread out of the sanctuary for it to be distributed to the priests for consumption “to the right of its west side (or, to the southwest of it).”⁴¹⁶ Unlike the Leviticus passage, New Jerusalem uses directional markers to tell the reader exactly where the old bread is taken and consumed. However, it is impossible to say too much about the precise location to which the old loaves are carried due to the fragmentary nature of this portion of the manuscripts. The most that can be said is that the old showbread is taken out of the sanctuary, likely somewhere within the confines of the priestly court, which would fulfill, but elaborate on, the command in Lev 24:9 that it be consumed בְּמִקְוֹם קֹדֶשׁ.⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁴ See the comments in DJD XXIII, 337: “Or דְּכִרָּה. Probably a rendering of אִזְכָּרָהּ (Lev 24:7; and also 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12, 6:8, Num 5:26).”

⁴¹⁵ On this join, see DJD XXIII, 337. Cf. DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem Text*, 94. Wise’s placement of 2Q24 4.9 differs slightly from the DJD editors, but the sense remains essentially the same. That is, 11Q18 20.2 refers to the removal of the previous week’s showbread from its table in the sanctuary on both readings.

⁴¹⁶ ימין can be translated either ‘right’ or ‘south.’ See Cook, DQA, 103.

⁴¹⁷ Chyutin also assumes that the old showbread is taken to the priestly court in fulfillment of the Levitical instructions to consume it in a holy place. Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 61.

Second, Leviticus informs the reader only that the showbread is to be given to “Aaron and his descendants” (Lev 24:9). New Jerusalem, on the other hand, provides details concerning just which priests are to receive the showbread and how much. Scholars who have dealt with these fragments have at times read them in light of rabbinic tradition, in which the changing of the showbread is explicitly associated with the changing of the priestly courses. According to this tradition, the showbread is divided amongst the incoming and outgoing priests after being removed from the sanctuary (*m. Sukkah* 5:8).⁴¹⁸ New Jerusalem does allude to the changing of the priestly courses elsewhere in the manuscript (i.e., 11Q18 15), though it cannot be said with certainty whether or not 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 discusses the showbread ritual in the context of the priestly rotation. It is also very hard to know just how the bread was to be divided. It can be said with relative confidence, however, that New Jerusalem depicts the loaves as being divided amongst a group of eighty-four priests (11Q18 20.3), and that the high priest and his deputy receive one loaf each (2Q24 4.14-16 // 11Q18 20.5–7). In at least this respect, New Jerusalem differs from the rabbinic tradition, which does not include the high priest as one of the recipients of the showbread.

4.3.3.4 Sacrifice

New Jerusalem includes a badly damaged description of a bovine sacrifice. Despite its poor state of preservation, several aspects of its account are worthy of note, and were recently highlighted by Perrin:

11Q18 13.1–6

⁴¹⁸ See Baumgarten, who notes that *m. Sukkah* 5:8 describes the division of the old showbread between the members of the two priestly courses. Baumgarten, review of Yadin, 585. Cf. Wise, *Critical Study*, 73–74. According to this tradition, there is some debate as to whether the twelve loaves are divided equally among the incoming and outgoing priests or if the incoming priests take seven loaves and the outgoing take five (so Rabbi Yehuda). Chyutin also references *m. Sukkah* 5 in his description of the showbread ritual. Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 61–62.

1.] by its legs, and stripped the bull [
2. he wa]shed its legs and its intestines, and salted all of it [
3. and] placed it on the fire, and brought fine sifted flour [
4. a fo]urth of a seah, and he brought all of it to the altar [
5. a fou]rth of a seah, and he poured it into [the] receptical [
6.] the [] and the flesh were mixed together [

1.]בארבע רגלוהי ונשט תורא ם[
2. ר]חַע רגלוהי וקרבוהי ומלח כולה[
3. ו]שׁויה על נורא ואיתי קמח סולת[
4. ר]זָבַע סַתָּא ואסקה למדבחה כולה[
5. ר]בַע סתא ונסך לגוא מורכִי]ותא
6. א] ובשרא מתערב בחדא[

First, the phrase בארבע רגלוהי ונשט תורא “by its four legs, and stripped the bull” (l. 1) seems to allude to the practice of binding the legs of the animal before its ritual slaughter.⁴¹⁹ As Perrin notes, “This practice is found neither in corresponding Pentateuch texts nor in other Second Temple sources outlining the process of the bovine offering.”⁴²⁰ However, Kister notes that *b. Tamid* 31b characterizes the binding of the legs of the daily lamb offering as according with the “law of the sectarians” (חוקי המינים). He also observes that 2 Enoch commands the binding of the slaughtered animal’s legs (59:4; cf. 69:5–6; 70:20).⁴²¹ Second, l. 2 refers to the salting of the entire sacrificial bull before it is placed on the fire (ll. 2–3). In this way, New Jerusalem deviates from Leviticus, which does not mention the salting of the bull.⁴²² Perrin argues that this aspect of New Jerusalem’s sacrificial regulations derives from Ezek 43:24 on the basis of “the pervasive influence of Ezekiel 40-48 on *NJ*.”⁴²³ It is also the case that on this point New Jerusalem reflects a common Second

⁴¹⁹ So Perrin *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172, following Kister, “Some New Texts,” 284.

⁴²⁰ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172.

⁴²¹ Kister, “Some New Texts,” 284. Cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172.

⁴²² See the discussion on p. 172 n. 41 of Perrin’s *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*.

⁴²³ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172.

Temple prescription, as we have seen in our discussion of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 10.13–17) in section 3.5.1.⁴²⁴ Finally, l. 5 contains the phrase *ונסך לבוא מורכב[ותא* “and he poured it into [the] receptacle.” This phrase appears to be an allusion to the wine libation.⁴²⁵ As Kister notes, this account of the libation accords with that of the rabbinic sources (*t. Sukkah* 3:14; cf. *m. Sukkah* 4:9), but “contradicts the law found in the Temple Scroll and in the Book of Jubilees, according to which the wine should be poured over the fire of the altar.”⁴²⁶

Another, even more fragmentary discussion of the details of an animal sacrifice can be found in 11Q18 22:

1.] on the four corners of [the] altar
2.] from all its fat
3.] both its kidneys
4.] the [wh]eat flour soaked
5.] the [al]tar for a smell
6.] first

1. [על ארבע קרנת מדבח[א]
2. [ין מנה כול תרבה
3. [תרתין כוליתה
4. [נ]שיפה פיל
5. [מד]בחא לריח
6. [לקדמין

As the editors suggest, “The first three lines of this fragment seem to describe the sin-offering of Leviticus 4 or Exodus 29:10–14.”⁴²⁷ However, as they also point out, the numerical reference in l.

⁴²⁴ As Perrin notes, “This specific sacerdotal halakhah enjoyed wide approval among Second Temple period authors, including Josephus and those of *ALD*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *GenAp*.” The various sources do differ, however, with regard to what stage in the sacrificial process the salt should be applied. New Jerusalem’s account is closest to that of Aramaic Levi Document, both of which have the salt being applied “only once, after the butchering and washing of the legs and entrails.” Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 172–3.

⁴²⁵ DJD XXIII, 327; Cf. Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 174.

⁴²⁶ Kister, “Some New Texts,” 285; Cf. Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 174.

⁴²⁷ DJD XXIII, 340.

1 is not found in either the Leviticus or Exodus account of the sin-offering, while Ezek 43:20 does contain a reference to four corners (אַרְבַּע קַרְנֹתָיו) in its description.

4.3.4 Conclusion

No other composition from the Aramaic Scrolls contains as much priestly material as New Jerusalem, with the possible exception of the Aramaic Levi Document (see next). For that reason, its poor state of preservation is particularly frustrating. I can, however, tease out a few concluding observations. New Jerusalem puts the priesthood, cult, and temple at the center of its conception of Israelite life and history. For instance, Levi is elevated above his brothers, including Judah, and the temple and its cult are the focal point of the eschatological future.⁴²⁸ New Jerusalem is concerned with the minutiae of the organization of the priesthood and ritual procedure. Throughout the composition, we see evidence of creative exegesis of the Hebrew scriptures in its description of the priesthood, cult, and temple, but it portrays its contents as the product of a revelatory dream-vision mediated by an angelic being. In so doing, Israel's priestly institutions are depicted as divinely sanctioned. Notably, other Aramaic Scrolls also present Israel's priestly institutions as having been divinely revealed, and thus divinely sanctioned (the Testament of Jacob?, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Visions of Amram).

⁴²⁸ Significantly, several Aramaic Scrolls feature the temple prominently in their accounts of the eschaton (i.e., Tobit, the Book of Watchers, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Animal Apocalypse), but New Jerusalem is the only one to refer explicitly to an eschatological cultus.

4.4 Aramaic Levi Document (1Q21; 4Q213–214b)⁴²⁹

The Aramaic Levi Document is a literary composition of mixed genre,⁴³⁰ which purports to be an autobiographical description of significant moments in Levi's life. The order of events recounted in the Aramaic Levi Document and the placement of some of fragments is a matter of debate, but scholars agree that the composition includes the following vignettes: a petitionary prayer; the slaughter of the Shechemites; one or two dream-visions; Jacob ordaining Levi to the priesthood; Isaac instructing Levi in laws pertaining to marriage and the sacrificial cult; the birth and marriages of Levi's children and grandchildren; Levi instructing his children to learn wisdom and the scribal arts; and a prophetic warning about the fate of Levi's progeny. A lack of clear historical referents makes it difficult to date with certainty, but it was probably written at some point in the third or early second century BCE,⁴³¹ likely serving as a source for two roughly contemporaneous compositions: the Testament of Qahat (4Q542) and the Visions of Amram

⁴²⁹ Besides the Qumran manuscripts, the Aramaic Levi Document was found among the Cairo Geniza manuscripts and a Greek translation was discovered at Mt Athos. My analysis will incorporate not just the Qumran fragments, but all of the extant Aramaic Levi Document manuscripts. I will be consulting the editions produced by Kugler, Drawnel, and Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, but my references to the Aramaic Levi Document in this dissertation follow the versification in Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*, SVTP 19 (Leiden: Brill, 2004). I am also incorporating a previously undiscovered Aramaic fragment, published by Gideon Bohak in "A New Geniza Fragment of the *Aramaic Levi Document*," in *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Geniza Fragments*, ed. Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander, JSSSup 31 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 101–14. This fragment was published after the major editions, translations, and commentaries on the Aramaic Levi Document. For more on the Rylands Fragment, see Dorothy M. Peters and Esther Eshel, "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document*," in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 237–59.

⁴³⁰ Earlier scholars referred to the Aramaic Levi Document as a "testament," primarily on the basis of its assumed connection to the Greek Testament of Levi. However, as several recent scholars have shown, the Aramaic Levi Document does not have the requisite literary characteristics to be classified with the later exemplars of the testamentary genre (e.g., The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), though it does bear some similarities to them. See the discussion in Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*, JSJSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 85–96; Frey, "Origins," 363–6. On the generic classification of the various literary units that comprise the Aramaic Levi Document, see Henryk Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics of the *Visions of Levi* (so-called *Aramaic Levi Document*)," *JAJ* 1 (2010): 303–19.

⁴³¹ For a brief summary of the various recent scholarly proposals concerning the date of the Aramaic Levi Document, see the introduction to James R. Davila's new translation in *MOTP*, 125–7.

(4Q543–547 or 4Q543–549).⁴³² Topics related to the priesthood and cult are a major preoccupation of the Aramaic Levi Document. Levi himself is presented as an ideal priest and progenitor of an eternal priestly line, and roughly one third of the extant composition is dedicated to a complex set of laws regarding the minutiae of the sacrificial system.⁴³³ In the rest of this section, I will highlight what the portrayal of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document can tell us about its author’s conception of the priesthood. After a few general comments about the elevation of Levi, I will discuss what the Aramaic Levi Document tells us about 1) the foundations of Levi’s priesthood, 2) the eternal duration of Levi’s priesthood, and the 3) character of Levi’s priesthood, focusing on its cultic, scribal-sapiential, royal, and judicial components. Finally, I will address some of the scholarly arguments concerning the provenance and function of the Aramaic Levi Document’s view of the priesthood and cult.

4.4.1 The Elevation of Levi

Joseph Angel’s characterization of the Aramaic Levi Document is apt: “*ALD* displays an unyielding fascination with Levi and the priestly office. It elevates Levi to unprecedented heights, and attributes to his priesthood royal, sapiential, and other accolades.”⁴³⁴ One of the most striking features of its portrayal of Levi is the way in which he and his offspring are depicted as fulfilling

⁴³² DJD XXXI, 259; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 31; Henryk Drawnel, “The Literary Form and Didactic Content of the *Admonitions (Testament) of Qahat*,” *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 55–73; Hanna Tervanotko, “A Trilogy of Testaments? The Status of the Testament of Qahat versus Texts Attributed to Levi and Amram,” *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, EBTL 270 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 41–59.

⁴³³ Robert A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, EJL 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 93. Cf. Michael Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins,” *JSJ* 19 (1988): 159–70, see 169; Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 269. As Drawnel notes, “The largest portion of the *Visions of Amram* is dedicated to Levi’s priestly education under the guidance of Isaac.” Drawnel, “Literary Characteristics,” 310.

⁴³⁴ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 50. For statements similar to one quoted above, see Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael Stone, “The Prayer of Levi,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 247–66, see 253 and 255; Cana Werman, “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 211–25.

God's promises to Abraham. At the end of the section involving cultic instruction, Isaac proclaims to his grandson Levi: "And blessing shall be pronounced by your seed upon the earth" (ALD 10:12; cf. 3:14–17). As Drawnel argues, this proclamation "constitutes an implicit reference to the blessing promised to Abraham by God in Gen 12:3."⁴³⁵ Other ways that Levi is elevated in the Aramaic Levi Document include his proximity to God and to the angels (ALD 6:5), his superior status vis-à-vis his brothers (ALD 10:11), his close connection to Israel's patriarchal forebears (ALD 5:1–2; 10:3, 10), and the eternal duration of his progeny (ALD 10:2, 12–14). Levi is unrivaled among the sons of Jacob, having a perpetual legacy and occupying a privileged position in relation to both the divine and human realms.⁴³⁶ Throughout the Aramaic Levi Document, its titular protagonist is identified first and foremost as a priest, and his elevated status cannot be understood apart from his priestly identity (e.g., ALD 6:4–5), but what it means to be a priest is redefined in and through the composition's description of Levi's identity and activity.

4.4.2 The Foundations of Levi's Priesthood

Levi is depicted as Israel's prototypical priest (קדמי בראש [כהנו] תה; ALD 5:3), but his priesthood does in some sense stand in continuity with the cultic, even proto-priestly, activity of his prediluvian and patriarchal forebears. The Aramaic Levi Document emphasizes that Levi

⁴³⁵ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 300. Similarly, see Levi's prayer: "You, O, Lord, blessed Abraham my father and Sarah my mother. And you said that you would give them a righteous seed blessed forever" (ALD 3:14–15). Concerning this passage, Drawnel contends, "By pointing to God's promise to Abraham and Sarah of a righteous offspring, the author reinterprets the biblical tradition that has concentrated on Isaac and his descendants and lets the reader understand that God promised to Abraham a priestly progeny that is Levi and his sons." Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 221.

⁴³⁶ Compared to the ambivalent portrayal of Levi in Gen 34 and 49, the Aramaic Levi Document appears to be far removed from its scriptural source material. Nevertheless, Levi's rehabilitation in later tradition, including the Aramaic Levi Document, may stem in part from a synchronic reading of various Pentateuchal passages, an approach which seems to be already on evidence in the Book of Malachi. See esp. Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 9–22. It is also true that much of what is said about Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document appears to be rooted in scriptural exegesis. On the exegetical basis of several aspects of Levi's portrayal in the Aramaic Levi Document and related traditions, see James Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–64.

learned his craft from his grandfather Isaac, who learned from his father Abraham, who himself learned what he knows from “the Book of Noah concerning the blood” (ALD 7:4; 10:3, 10).⁴³⁷ This notion that Israel’s prediluvian and patriarchal heroes were cultic, or even proto-priestly, figures may reflect, at least in part, exegetical concerns. As Kugel has suggested, ancient interpreters of the Hebrew scriptures may have deemed it “potentially problematic” for figures like Noah, Abraham, and Isaac to have built altars and made sacrifices, as the text of Genesis recounts them doing, since such activities “indicated that the person involved has *served as a priest*.”⁴³⁸ These ancient interpreters, he continues, probably found it “unlikely that an ancient Israelite would just go ahead and offer a sacrifice on his own” in the same way that “it would seem unlikely to us that any specialized, professional work—designing a bridge, for example, or performing a surgical operation—would be undertaken by someone without prior instruction or experience.”⁴³⁹ By recounting this chain of priestly instruction, the author of the Aramaic Levi Document may have been trying to show that the Israelite patriarchs did not act presumptuously when they constructed altars and offered sacrifices. Stone has offered a compelling exegetical reason as to why the Aramaic Levi Document might have traced its priestly legislation to Noah in particular. As he argues, “According to Gen. 8:20 Noah offers the first animal sacrifice. Gen. 9:4, in the following pericope, relates how he received the commandment about the blood. Thus, Noah’s connection to the sacrificial cult and to instructions concerning it was not by chance.”⁴⁴⁰ Beyond the exegetical reasons for doing so, moreover, the idea that Israel’s priesthood and its cultic regulations have

⁴³⁷ A similar scenario is envisioned in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542), which depicts “the priesthood” as one component of the inheritance that is passed down from the Israelite patriarchs to Levi and beyond. See section 4.6.1 below.

⁴³⁸ Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 17.

⁴³⁹ Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 17.

⁴⁴⁰ Stone, “Axis of History,” 138.

prediluvian roots may indicate a desire on the part of the author to demonstrate that the legislation associated with the Israelite cult was “rooted in remote antiquity.”⁴⁴¹

The Aramaic Levi Document does not only trace the roots of Levi’s priesthood back to Noah and Abraham, but it also depicts Levi in terms reminiscent of Melchizedek; this functions as a way of associating their two priesthoods. We can see this literary strategy at work in the account of Levi’s ordination (ALD 5:1–5). This vignette begins with Jacob offering a tithe to Levi (ALD 5:2). Levi is alone among his brothers in receiving such a gift, a privilege associated with his status as *קדמי בראש* [כהנו] *תה* “first at the head of the [priest]ood” (ALD 5:3). Upon receiving it, Levi reports: *ואלבשי לבוש כהונתא ומלי ידי* “And he invested me in the priestly garb and consecrated me” (ALD 5:4), at which point he became *כהין לאל עלמיה* “a priest of the God of eternity” (ALD 5:4).⁴⁴² Levi then offers all of Jacob’s sacrifices, blesses his father and his brothers, and is blessed by them in return (ALD 5:4–5). This passage is rooted in scriptural language, and evinces clear engagement with biblical tradition.

Kugel has demonstrated that Jacob’s tithe in the Aramaic Levi Document, which is done “in accordance with his vow,” functions as an exegetical expansion of Gen 28:20–22, wherein Jacob promises at Bethel to give God a tenth of all that is his. This promise, he argues, must have puzzled ancient readers, since “*nowhere in the rest of the story of Jacob’s life is he ever said to have fulfilled this vow.*”⁴⁴³ Jacob’s tithe to Levi, however, does more than just solve an exegetical quandary. It also establishes a connection between the priesthoods of Levi and Melchizedek

⁴⁴¹ Stone, “Axis of History,” 138.

⁴⁴² On this reading, see DJD XXII, 41; Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 89; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 149.

⁴⁴³ Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 3. Emphasis original. Cf. Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 90; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 251–3.

insofar as the encounter between Jacob and Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document is modeled on that of Abraham and Melchizedek in Gen 14:18–20.⁴⁴⁴ This connection is reinforced by the description of Levi elsewhere in the Aramaic Levi Document as כהין לאל עליון “a priest of God Most High” (ALD 5:8), a phrase used of Melchizedek both in the Gen 14 passage and in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 22:15).⁴⁴⁵

Missing from the Gen 14 account, though, are the references to the priestly garments, consecration, sacrifices, and priestly blessings (ALD 5:4–5). These aspects of Levi’s ordination appear to be indebted to the ordination traditions in the Pentateuch. It is doubtful whether we could identify a specific passage or passages from the scriptural tradition as that which the Aramaic Levi Document is engaging, though ALD 5:4–5 does bear some noteworthy similarities to Exod 28:41 and Lev 21:10, as Drawnel has observed.⁴⁴⁶ The author seems to be drawing on stock scriptural language and imagery in its account of Levi’s priestly ordination.⁴⁴⁷ By conflating the Gen 14 passage and the Pentateuchal ordination traditions, the Aramaic Levi Document “appears to be an

⁴⁴⁴ For a comparison of the content and literary structure of both texts, see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 250. Cf. Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 90–91. For more on the correspondence between the priesthoods of Levi and Melchizedek in the Aramaic Levi Document, see Anders Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 773–88; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2d ed (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 97.

⁴⁴⁵ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel are somewhat noncommittal on the question of whether we should perceive the use of this title in the Aramaic Levi Document as an explicit allusion to Melchizedek. See Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 154–5. Drawnel, on the other hand, is much more confident: “The allusion to Melchizedek is obvious.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 253. Drawnel’s confidence is not unwarranted, especially when we consider the role of Melchizedek in legitimizing the priesthood of Aaron in the closely-related Visions of Amram. See my discussion of this composition below.

⁴⁴⁶ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 253.

⁴⁴⁷ Take, for example, the phrase וּמָלֵא יָדַי (lit. “and he filled my hand”); it is the standard idiomatic expression for ordination that is used throughout the Hebrew scriptures. E.g., Exod 28:41; 29:9, 29, 33, 35; 32:29; Lev 8:33; 16:32; 21:10; Num 3:3; Judg 17:5, 12; 1 Kgs 13:33; 1 Chr 13:9; 29:31. This list is adapted from the one in DJD XXXVII, 326. A similar, though more detailed, description occurs in Sir 45, which recounts Aaron’s ordination. Like the passage in the Aramaic Levi Document, Ben Sira refers to the priestly garments, consecration, sacrifices, and blessings in roughly the same order (Sir 45:6–15). On this parallel, see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 150.

example of the adaptation of the Melchizedek tradition to an ideal priest, incorporated within the genealogical tradition of Jewish priestly descendants.”⁴⁴⁸

Several of the particular ways that Melchizedek is presented both in the Hebrew scriptures and in Second Temple literature may have proven useful for the author of the Aramaic Levi Document in crafting Levi’s priestly identity. For one thing, as the Gen 14 passage already recounts, Melchizedek is depicted as both a priest and a king (v. 18). The author of the Aramaic Levi Document may have found in the Melchizedek narrative in Gen 14 a creative means of legitimizing its conflation of royal and priest attributes.

The Aramaic Levi Document, moreover, may have also mined the Melchizedek tradition in order to highlight the eternal duration of Levi’s priesthood. The other reference to Melchizedek in the Hebrew scriptures, Ps 110, may have served as a way for the author to justify Levi’s “perpetual priesthood.”⁴⁴⁹ In this psalm, the hymnist declares to the addressee: “The LORD has sworn and will not change his mind, ‘You are a priest forever (כהן לעולם) according to the order of Melchizedek’” (v. 4). The Aramaic equivalent of כהן לעולם, admittedly, does not appear anywhere in the extant manuscript tradition, but the relative frequency with which the Aramaic Levi Document uses the term עלם to describe Levi’s priesthood “is perhaps a distant echo of the ‘forever’ of Ps 110:4.”⁴⁵⁰ The likelihood of this proposal increases when we consider that in the Visions of Amram (4Q543–549) Melchizedek himself refers to Aaron, Levi’s great grandson, as

⁴⁴⁸ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 250–1.

⁴⁴⁹ Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 779.

⁴⁵⁰ Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 779.

an כֹהֵן עֶלְמִין “eternal priest” (4Q547 4 19), in what is probably an allusion to Ps 110:4 (see section 4.7.2 below).⁴⁵¹

The Aramaic Levi Document may have also incorporated one further aspect of the Melchizedek tradition in its conception of Levi’s priesthood, one which is not attested in the Hebrew scriptures, i.e., the otherworldly status of Melchizedek and his priesthood.⁴⁵² This tradition appears most explicitly in the Second Temple period in the description of Melchizedek’s eschatological atoning work in 11Q13 (col. ii 4–9).⁴⁵³ We also catch a glimpse of it in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q401 11 3).⁴⁵⁴ Significantly, for our purposes, the Visions of Amram seems to rely on it as well (4Q544 1 10–15; 2 11–16).⁴⁵⁵ It is possible that one of the reasons that the Aramaic Levi Document made an implicit comparison between Levi and Melchizedek was to accentuate the relationship that Levi and his priesthood has with the heavenly realm. The precise relationship of Levi’s priesthood to the heavenly realm in the Aramaic Levi Document is certainly less explicit than it is in Jubilees, wherein the cultic service of Levi and his offspring mirrors that of the angelic priests (Jub. 31:14),⁴⁵⁶ or even the Visions of Amram, in which Aaron’s priesthood

⁴⁵¹ Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 20. Cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 166–70.

⁴⁵² On this component of the Melchizedek tradition and its relationship to the Aramaic Levi Document, see Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 146–59. Cf. Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 780–1.

⁴⁵³ For a recent analysis of this text and its priestly themes, see Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 146–56. Cf. Fred L. Horton, Jr., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 64–82; 167–70; Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, CBQMS 10 (The Catholic Biblical Association of America: Washington, DC, 1981), 49–74; Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*, STDJ 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 68–75; Philip Alexander, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*, LSTS 61 (London: T&T Clark International, 2006), 69–71; Eric F. Mason, ‘You Are a Priest Forever’: *Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, STDJ 74 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 168–90.

⁴⁵⁴ Carol A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, HSS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 134, 143–4; Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 33, 69–71.

⁴⁵⁵ Jones, “Priesthood and Cult.” Cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision*, 166–70. On the presence of Melchizedek in the Visions of Amram, see e.g., J. T. Milik, “Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens.” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 27; Blake A. Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the *Vision of Amram* (4Q543–547),” *JSP* 24 (2014): 3–42, esp. 27–39.

⁴⁵⁶ On this passage, see Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 41–45. Cf. James C. VanderKam, “Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 353–65, esp. 360–4; idem, “Isaac’s Blessing of Levi and His

is referred to by Melchizedek himself as רז עובדה “the mystery of his (i.e., Aaron’s) service (4Q545 4 16).⁴⁵⁷ The Aramaic Levi Document does, however, present Levi in such a way as to highlight his proximity to God and the angels, and his access to the heavenly realm.

Upon realizing that Levi was ordained as a priest, Isaac declares concerning his grandson: “You are near to God and near to all his holy ones” (ALD 6:5).⁴⁵⁸ Levi also refers to himself as ל ידיד אל “God’s friend” in a speech to his children (ALD 13:2),⁴⁵⁹ and, in his prayer, he implores God as follows: “And bring me near (וקרבני) to be your servant and to minister well to you” (ALD 3:10) and “Hearken also to the prayer of your servant Levi to be close to you (γενέσθαι σοι έγγυς)” (ALD 3:16).⁴⁶⁰ We need not attribute this motif exclusively, or even primarily, to the Aramaic Levi Document’s reliance on tradition about Melchizedek’s otherworldly priesthood. In fact, several scholars have demonstrated that Levi’s status as a visionary is likely influenced by an interpretation of Mal 2, which describes Levi as מלאך יהוה צבאות “the messenger of the LORD of hosts” (v. 7) and as someone who walked with God (הלך איתי) (v. 6; cf. Gen 5:24).⁴⁶¹ The Aramaic

Descendants in Jubilees 31,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 497–518; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 15–17.

⁴⁵⁷ For more on the significance of this phrase, see section 4.7.2 below.

⁴⁵⁸ For the interpretation of קדישוהי as a reference to the angelic host, see Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 73; Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Some ‘Qumran’ Observations on the Aramaic Levi Document,” in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*, ed. Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 393–401; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 268. See, however, the caution of Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel: “We reserve judgment as to whether קדישוהי ‘his holy ones’ means ‘angels’ or, perhaps, ‘holy, sacred things.’” Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 161. Cf. Greenfield and Stone, “Prayer of Levi,” 261.

⁴⁵⁹ On this phrase, see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 326.

⁴⁶⁰ On the possible allusion to cultic service through the use of the verb קרב, see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 217–8, 221. Cf. ALD 7:2.

⁴⁶¹ Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 30–36; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 15; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 152–6. Perrin argues that 1 Sam 2:27 may have also played a role in the author’s re-imagining of the figure of Levi as one who “was subject to otherworldly encounters.” Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 156.

Levi Document’s portrayal of Levi as being closely associated with the heavenly realm may have also taken inspiration from Zech 3, wherein the prophet receives a vision of the high priest Joshua “standing before the angel of the LORD” (v. 1).⁴⁶² We should also consider whether the frequency with which the Aramaic Levi Document uses the adjective קדוש “holy” to describe Levi, his offspring, and his priesthood is in part done to indicate an association of the Israelite priesthood with the celestial priesthood, given the tendency to describe the angels as “the holy ones” in this and related compositions.⁴⁶³

4.4.3 The Eternal Duration of Levi’s Priesthood

The Aramaic Levi Document presents the priestly office as both eternal⁴⁶⁴ and hereditary, as Isaac discloses to Levi:

And now, my child, listen to my words and attend to my commandments, and let not these words of mine depart from your heart all your days, for you are a holy priest of the Lord, and all your seed will be priests (ALD 10:1–2).

And blessing shall be pronounced by your seed upon the earth and your seed shall be entered in the book of the memorial of life for all eternity. And your name and the name of your seed shall not be annihilated for all eternity.⁴⁶⁵ And now, child,

⁴⁶² Baumgarten, “Some ‘Qumran’ Observations,” 398. Cf. Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 781 n. 24.

⁴⁶³ On Levi, his offspring, and his priesthood as “holy,” see ALD 6:4–5; 10:4, 11. Cf. 4Q545 4 16, 17. As Drawnel notes, “Although the OT often speaks about sanctification of the priests (e.g. Exod 19:22; 28:3, 41), the *Document’s* expression ‘a holy priest’ has never been used there. Levi’s holiness is greatly stressed in the *Document*.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 268.

⁴⁶⁴ A fragmentary allusion to the perpetual nature of Levi’s priesthood can be found in 4Q213a 5, which contains a broken reference to an עולם עלמא “eternal priesthood (5 i 3), a phrase which occurs both in Exod 40:15 and Num 25:13. On this phrase, see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 239. Cf. DJD XXII, 35; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 222. See also the reference Levi’s רבות שלם עלמא “anointing (or: greatness) of eternal peace” (ALD 4:11), a phrase which, Drawnel, citing Israel Lévi, argues, is “an allusion to Num 25:12–13 and came as a fusion of ברית שלם and ברית כהנת עלם.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 246.

⁴⁶⁵ For a similar expression, see 4Q541 24 ii 5 and 4Q542 1 i 10. Contrast this description of the name of Levi and his children in ALD 10:13 with the description of the name of the sinful woman in 4Q213a 3–4 3–6. The woman (Dinah?) described in this fragment is said to have “desecrated her name and the name of her father” and, as a result, “the name of her reproach will not be wiped out” (4Q213a 3–4 6). Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 236; DQA, 136. For an alternative transcription and translation of l. 6, see DJD XXII, 33–35; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 221–2.

Levi, your seed shall be blessed upon the earth for all the generations of eternity⁴⁶⁶
(ALD 10:12–14).

We should be cautious, however, before suggesting that the Aramaic Levi Document promotes the view that “all of Levi’s descendants should have been priests.”⁴⁶⁷ The evidence is more ambiguous than that. For although ALD 10:2 does have Isaac proclaim to Levi that “all of your seed will be priests,” the genealogical material in ALD 11–12 reflects a perspective on the priestly status of the various members of the Levitical line that stands in some tension with the idea of a so-called “Pan-Levitic” priesthood.⁴⁶⁸ The Aramaic Levi Document does in fact discriminate between the various children and grandchildren of Levi. Levi is informed in a dream-vision that his eldest son Gershom and Gershom’s offspring “will be cast out of the high priesthood” (ALD 11:3), with Qahat reportedly inheriting the office in lieu of his elder brother (ALD 11:6). Qahat’s status in regard to the priesthood vis-à-vis his brothers is also reflected in date and time of birth, i.e.: בִּירְחָא קַמְ]אַה [א] [in the [fi]rst month [on the fir]st of the mo[nth] at the rising of [the] sun” (ALD 11:7). Not only does this phrase appear to display a preference for the 364-day calendar, often inappropriately referred to as a solar calendar,⁴⁶⁹ but being born on the first day of

⁴⁶⁶ This passage is only extant in Greek, but phrase εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων “for all the generations of eternity” is likely a translation of the Aramaic לְכָל דְרֵי עֲלָמָא. See e.g., a similar translation of לְכָל דְרֵי עֲלָמָא in the Greek manuscript tradition of Tobit (G^{II} 13:11 // 4Q196 17 ii 15). The Aramaic phrase לְכָל דְרֵי עֲלָמָא occurs elsewhere in the Aramaic Levi Document, in a passage that may also be referring to the eternal longevity of the priestly line (4Q213a 3–4 7). Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 108 n. 166; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 236. In fact, the phrase “for all the generations of eternity” occurs with some regularity in the Qumran Aramaic writings more broadly, typically in descriptions of either the priestly line or the Jerusalem temple. See i.e., 4Q196 17 ii 15; 4Q212 1 iv 18; 4Q542 1 ii 4; 4Q545 4 17; 4Q547 9 7.

⁴⁶⁷ Werman, “Levi and Levites,” 211.

⁴⁶⁸ For the phrase “Pan-Levitic,” see Saul M. Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 261–86.

⁴⁶⁹ On the use of the 364-day calendar in the Aramaic Levi Document, see Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael Stone, “Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza,” *RB* 86 (1979): 214–30, see 224; Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 134; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 189; Tervanotko, “Trilogy of Testaments,” 51. Ben-Dov has criticized the tendency to refer to this type of calendar as a solar calendar, pointing out that while “earlier scholarship tended to view the calendar polemics as represented in Second Temple literature as a conflict between pro-solar (sectarian) and pro-lunar (proto-rabbinic) factions, this theory fails to account for the abundant literature on

the first month “would naturally predispose him for priestly consecration,” since this day “has a particular importance in the cultic life of Israel.”⁴⁷⁰ The focus on Amram among Qahat’s children suggests an even narrower interest on the part of the Aramaic Levi Document in that segment of the Levitical genealogy that leads to Aaron, Moses, and Miriam (see ALD 12:3–4).⁴⁷¹ This comports with the image of the Levitical genealogy found in the closely-related Testament of Qahat (4Q542) and Visions of Amram (4Q543–549), as we will discuss in more detail below.

4.4.4 The Character of Levi’s Priesthood

The Aramaic Levi Document reconfigures the image of the priest in part by associating Levi and his children a wide range of skills, duties, and qualities. Levi is depicted throughout the composition as a cultic practitioner, a teacher, and judge. These aspects of his persona are rooted in the Hebrew scriptures, even if they are accentuated and adapted in the Aramaic Levi Document, but Levi is also presented in ways that are less obviously grounded in scriptural tradition: He is a master of scribal knowledge, and is associated with prophecy and divination. We also see this accumulation of attributes in the case of Levi’s son Qahat, who is depicted as a royal figure in the Aramaic Levi Document. Angel refers to this literary phenomenon as “priestly magnetism,” and argues that it may reflect “the magnified political and religious importance of the priesthood in the

lunar visibility contained within the 364-day calendar tradition. Within this discipline, opposing statements are encountered with respect to the value of the moon in time-reckoning, the *Book of Jubilees* standing out as the primary—probably the sole—representative of anti-lunar polemics.” He continues by arguing that “the 364-day year does not relate—as has commonly been assumed in past scholarship—to a ‘solar year’ but to a schematic year, be this a Sabbatical, as sometimes held, or, more neutrally, a ‘364-day’ year.” Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Contexts*, STDJ 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 4 and 5.

⁴⁷⁰ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 309.

⁴⁷¹ See e.g., Drawnel’s comments on this subject: “The role of Levi’s other two sons is greatly reduced. Gershom was excluded from priesthood while Merari was described as one close to death and no priestly role is assigned to him. The high priestly role continues with Qahat’s son Amram who espoused Levi’s daughter Yochebed. Amram was given a prominent role as the one who would lead Israel out of Egypt (*A.L.D.* 76). There is no doubt that this midrashic exegesis of his name alludes to the role of Moses and Aaron in the biblical account of Exodus.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 78.

Second Temple period.”⁴⁷² In what follows, I will explore how the portrayal of Levi and his children functions as a way of offering a particular image of the priesthood and priestly service.

4.4.4.1 Cultic Character of the Priesthood

Isaac’s instructions to Levi, which take up roughly one third of the composition, highlight the principally cultic character of the priestly office as it is represented in the Aramaic Levi Document.⁴⁷³ There is a great deal of emphasis placed in this passage on the priest’s own preparation when approaching the altar. Isaac implores Levi to remain “pure in your flesh from every impurity of man” toward the beginning of his discourse (ALD 6:5), and, while this command is certainly related to the principles concerning sexual purity recounted in preceding verses (ALD 6:1–4), it also pertains to the rigorous program of ritual purity that Levi is expected to maintain in his capacity as a cultic functionary. In fact, we see a dual concern with, perhaps bordering on a conflation of, ritual *and* moral purity throughout the composition (see esp. ALD 2:4–5). Levi is expected to wash four times before and during the sacrificial offering: his whole body before entering the sanctuary (ALD 7:1), his hands and feet after vesting and before approaching the altar (ALD 7:2), his hand and feet before making the sacrifice (ALD 7:3), and his hands and feet again after sprinkling the sides of the altar with blood and before placing the various pieces of the slaughtered animal upon the altar (ALD 8:2). He is also to wash his hands and feet after the sacrifice is completed, being sure not to let any blood touch the priestly garment or remain on his person (ALD 10:6–8).

⁴⁷² Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 258.

⁴⁷³ We also see the cultic character of the priesthood insofar as Levi immediately tends to his father’s sacrifices upon being ordained (ALD 5:4–5).

The connection between the priesthood and the cult can be seen in how much space is devoted to the minutiae of sacrificial procedure. After the introduction to “the law of the priesthood” in ALD 6:1–5, the rest of this vignette, with the exception of the postlude in ALD 10:11–14, is concerned with outlining the details of how sacrifice is to be conducted from beginning to end, step-by-step, with the relevant laws following the order of the ritual. In addition to the aforementioned instructions to wash, the passage contains the following elements: the donning of the priestly garments (ALD 7:1); preparation of the sacrificial fire, including a command to inspect the wood and a list of the twelve acceptable types of it (ALD 7:4–8:1); the sprinkling of blood upon the altar (ALD 8:1); the placing of the animal upon the altar, beginning with the head (covered with the fat) and ending with the entrails (ALD 8:3–4); instructions to salt the entire animal (ALD 8:5); the accompanying meal offering (ALD 8:6); and instructions to pour wine and burn frankincense over the offered items (ALD 8:6). Following a brief interlude about the need to act in accordance with proper order (ALD 8:6–7), Isaac continues by describing the appropriate weights and measures for the various components of the sacrifice described above: the wood (ALD 9:1–5), salt (ALD 9:6–9), fine flour and oil (ALD 9:10–13), wine and frankincense (ALD 9:14–16), and list of conversions for various weights and measures (ALD 9:17–18). The last bit of ritual material informs Levi how to accept offerings from people (ALD 10:5); summarizes the sacrificial procedure outline above (ALD 10:6); and tells him how to conclude the sacrifice, including the consumption of the sacrificial and what to do with its blood (ALD 10:6–9). The emphasis on blood in these final few commands seems to be related to Isaac’s association of them with that which is contained ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τῆς βίβλου Νῶε περὶ τοῦ αἵματος “in the book of Noah concerning the blood” (ALD 10:10).

It is worth mentioning at this point that, despite the level of detail involved in these commands, the scope of “the law of the priesthood” is actually quite narrow in one important respect, namely, it only outlines the procedure for the whole burnt offering and the accompanying meal offering.⁴⁷⁴ For this reason, it does not seem like the Aramaic Levi Document intends to lay out an entire sacrificial system as an alternative to the Pentateuchal system. The sacrificial material in “the law of the priesthood” appears rather to have a literary function in the context of the Aramaic Levi Document as a whole, specifically, to make a statement about the cultic nature of the priesthood, and about how important it is for the priests to observe strict ritual purity and carry out their sacrificial duties in accordance with the correct protocol.⁴⁷⁵

4.4.4.2 Scribal-Sapiential Features of the Priesthood

Scholars have long noted that the Aramaic Levi Document has affinities with wisdom literature. Much of the secondary literature on this topic has focused on Levi’s instructions to his children in ALD 13:1–16, which takes the form of a wisdom poem.⁴⁷⁶ As Kugler has suggested regarding Levi’s speech: “The first and most noteworthy item is the premium the author places on wisdom.”⁴⁷⁷ Not only does the term חכמה “wisdom” show up fourteen times in the preserved

⁴⁷⁴ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 258.

⁴⁷⁵ So Drawnel: “The selective approach to the sacrificial system expounded in the Pentateuch and the reinterpretation of many of its rulers stems from the author’s intent to create the idealized image of the Levitical ‘supreme priesthood’ (9; 64) based on the observance of the legal due order. One should also take into account of the pedagogical thrust of the instruction which sets high professional standards for Levi and all priestly apprentices who should act in order, by measure and weight (A.L.D. 30; 31).” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 258. However, I disagree with Drawnel’s view that the Aramaic Levi Document is primarily directed to young priests for the purpose of priestly education. My position is that the Aramaic Levi Document was intended to reach a much broader audience, with the purpose of widely disseminating a particular conception of the Jewish priesthood.

⁴⁷⁶ For an earlier treatment of wisdom themes in the Aramaic Levi Document, see Michael Stone, “Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age,” in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, ed. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 575–86. Cf. Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 126–7; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 34–35; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 268–70.

⁴⁷⁷ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 127.

portions of the discourse (13:4; 13:5; 13:6; 13:7; 13:9; 13:10; 13:12; 13:13; 13:15),⁴⁷⁸ alongside of other terms with a connection to the wisdom tradition (e.g., מוסר “instruction,” 13:4; 13:6; 13:15), but there are several additional hallmark features of wisdom literature that appear throughout the poem, e.g.: proverbial wisdom (ALD 13:3), a statement about the elusive nature of wisdom (13:11–12); an emphasis on the value of pursuing wisdom (ALD 13:7–10); and a family-based educational context that resembles the instructional setting of Proverbs 1–9 (ALD 13:1–2).

However, the wisdom themes in the Aramaic Levi Document are not restricted to Levi’s speech. Isaac’s instructions to Levi in “the law of the priesthood” also provide a window into the ways in which Levi’s priestly office is envisioned as a scribal-sapiential role, with Drawnel even suggesting that the entirety of “the law of the priesthood” “be classified as a wisdom instruction,” given “the vocabulary and thematics of the whole section.”⁴⁷⁹ For instance, “the law of the priesthood” reflects a “sapiential worldview” in its description of the Israelite cult, particularly in its use of סרד “order” and related terminology to describe the ideal operation of the sacrificial system.⁴⁸⁰ We can see an allusion to this “sapiential worldview” in a brief passage between the instructions pertaining to the bovine offering (ALD 8:1–6) and those on proper weights and measures (ALD 9:1–16), in which Isaac implores Levi in the following manner:

And thus your deeds will be in order (בסרד) and all your sacrifices [for deligh]t, for a pleasing smell before God the most high. [And whatever] you do, do it in order, [by measure] and by weight (בסרד הו עב[יד במשחה] ובמתקל). Do not add anything that is not [fitting] and do not fall short of the adequate calculation (חושבן) of the wo[o]d (that is) required to sacrifice everything that is offered on the alt[ar] (ALD 8:6–7).

⁴⁷⁸ The other extant occurrence of חכמה comes in Levi’s prayer, when he asks God for “counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength” (ALD 3:6).

⁴⁷⁹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 255.

⁴⁸⁰ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 255.

Drawnel has found in this passage what he refers to as “the connecting idea underlying the priestly instruction,” which is embodied in the phrase “in order, measure, and weight.”⁴⁸¹ This phrase, he argues, appears to “stem from the Wisdom tradition according to which God created all things in order.”⁴⁸² To make this point, he highlights a passage in the Wisdom of Solomon, in which the author says concerning God’s act of creation: “But you have arranged all things by measure and number and weight” (11:20).⁴⁸³ He also highlights several striking parallels in how the concept of “order” (Aram. ܕܫܪܝܢ; Gk. τάξις) functions in the Book of Watchers (1 En. 2:1 // 4Q201 1 ii 1) and the Testament of Naphtali (2:3).⁴⁸⁴ The appearance of the term חושבן “calculation” also invites a comparison to the Astronomical Book, which uses the same term to describe “the calculation of the movements of heavenly bodies.”⁴⁸⁵ As Drawnel suggests concerning this particular parallel, “Both in the *Document* and in the *Astronomical Book* the term has a technical meaning implying an arithmetical calculation and in both compositions the resulting order cannot be changed without the risk of deviating from the proper norm.”⁴⁸⁶

These parallels with other Second Temple wisdom traditions suggest that the sacrificial cult itself in the Aramaic Levi Document is being understood from the standpoint of a “sapiential worldview.” We cannot know with complete certainty whether the Aramaic Levi Document intends to suggest that the cultic order should mirror that of the heavenly luminaries, though the linguistic and conceptual parallels do appear to imply a certain correspondence between the

⁴⁸¹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 255.

⁴⁸² Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 279. Drawnel does note, though, that the concept of “order” (Heb. עֶרֶךְ) being used in respect to “priestly liturgical action” as well as references to weights and measures in cultic contexts can be found in the Hebrew scriptures.

⁴⁸³ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 279.

⁴⁸⁴ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 279.

⁴⁸⁵ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 281.

⁴⁸⁶ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 281.

divinely established order of the cosmos and “the law of the priesthood,” that is, the divinely established order for the sacrificial system. Proper priestly service, according to “the law of the priesthood,” thus involves presiding over a well-ordered cultic system, and ensuring that there is no deviation from the norms laid out therein.

More than just displaying features of a “sapiential worldview,” “the law of the priesthood” demands that priests acquire technical scribal expertise.⁴⁸⁷ It is not only that this and other portions of the Aramaic Levi Document count pedagogical duties among those of the priest, though it certainly does so.⁴⁸⁸ It is not simply that the author associates both cultic and scribal functions with priesthood, as if these were two unrelated spheres of knowledge that could nevertheless both be mastered and implemented by a priest. Rather, “the law of the priesthood” presents technical scribal knowledge as integral to the task of carrying out the required duties of priestly service at the altar, effectively making scribal training a prerequisite for the priestly office. This is seen most clearly in ALD 9:1–18, the longest portion of “the law of the priesthood,” which deals with the proper weights and measures of the various materials to be placed on the altar, i.e., wood, salt, fine flour and oil, and wine and frankincense (vv. 1–16), and concludes with a metrological list, outlining the equivalents of a variety of measures (vv. 17–18). As Drawnel notes, “It is evident,

⁴⁸⁷ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 62–63. For more, see Drawnel’s detailed analysis of the Babylonian scribal background for understanding the metro-arithmetical computational system on evidence in “the law of the priesthood” as well as his discussion of the significance of the Aramaic term ספר in the Aramaic Levi Document. Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 280–93 and 328–32. Cf. idem, “Priestly Education in the Aramaic Levi Document (*Visions of Levi*) and Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208–211),” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 548–74.

⁴⁸⁸ See, e.g., the prevalence of the verbs אלה “to learn (*pe.*)” or “to teach (*pa.*)” and פקד “to command” in the Aramaic Levi Document, particularly in Isaac’s speech to Levi and Levi’s speech to his children. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel have argued that both the sapiential and instruction aspects of Levi’s portrayal in the Aramaic Levi Document is ultimately rooted in Deut 33:10. These aspects, they note, are also present in Mal 2:6–7, but that those verses “clearly interpret Deut 33:10.” Their contention is that these “instructional features of the priest in *ALD* became imbued with features of the sage.” Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 34–35. Drawnel, however, who argues, “It is doubtful whether the tradition attributing to Levi and his children the task of teachers of wisdom derives from Deut 33:10; Mal 2:7; Sir 45:17,” since these “texts insist on Levi’s role as the teacher of the whole of Israel, whereas the *Document* insists that the teaching is restricted to the Levitical tribe only as a means of its glorification.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 331. See also, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 269–70.

that without knowledge of relations between capacity measures Isaac’s exhortations to keep Levi’s work in order, measure, and weight (*A.L.D.* 30–31) could not take place.”⁴⁸⁹ Concern for proper weights and measures in the context of priestly service is found in the Hebrew Bible (Ezek 45:10–15; cf. Ezra 8:34), but the sheer amount of space devoted to this topic in the Aramaic Levi Document relative to the rest of the extant composition says something of its importance to the author. Moreover, as Drawnel has shown in great detail, ALD 9:1–18 is structured as “a metrological scholarly instruction intended to teach not only the quantity of the sacrificed material but also the knowledge of fractions and arithmetical ratios between metrological units.”⁴⁹⁰ This type of technical knowledge, Drawnel has shown, has clear affinities with Babylonian scribal exercises.⁴⁹¹ The value of scribal training for Levi’s offspring is made more explicit later in the composition, with Levi’s instructions to his children. Here, Levi encourages his children to teach ספר וחוכמה (ALD 13:3, 6, 15; cf. 1Q20 19:25; Jub. 4:17). Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel have interpreted ספר as a simple reference to “reading and writing,” but Drawnel is probably right to interpret this term more comprehensively as an allusion to “scribal knowledge,” which would have included “calculation skills” and the type of “metro-arithmetical knowledge” contained in ALD 9:1–18.⁴⁹² It is important to note, however, that the Aramaic Levi Document does not necessarily equate scribal and priestly knowledge. These domains overlap, to be sure, but they are not identical.⁴⁹³ It would thus be best to understand scribal expertise in the Aramaic Levi Document

⁴⁸⁹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 291.

⁴⁹⁰ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 255–6.

⁴⁹¹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 77.

⁴⁹² Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 208; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 330.

⁴⁹³ Consider, for example, the prominent role given to Joseph, a non-priestly figure, in Levi’s speech to his children. Levi holds up Joseph as a paragon of wisdom and an expert in ספר ומוסר חכמה (ALD 13:6). In my view, the Aramaic Levi Document would have likely understood Joseph to have mastered the type of scribal (i.e., computational) skills that “the law of the priesthood” presents as a *prerequisite* for understanding, but not necessarily *coterminous* with, the knowledge specifically related to the proper operation of the cult. As Drawnel points out, these computation skills

as a prerequisite for, but not as synonymous with, priestly knowledge and cultic service.⁴⁹⁴ Stated more succinctly, you need not be a priest to be a scribe, but you do need to be a scribe to be a priest.

4.4.4.3 Kingship and Priesthood

Levi and his offspring in the Aramaic Levi Document acquire royal qualities alongside of those more traditionally associated with the priesthood, as scholars have not failed to notice.⁴⁹⁵ The clearest example of such a conflation of kingship and priesthood is found in the description of Qahat and his future role in Israelite society:

And] I [sa]w that to him [would] be an assembly (כְּנִשָּׁת) of all [the people and that] he would have the high-priesthood (כְּהֵנֻטָא רַבְתָּא); *he and his seed will be the beginning of kings, a priesthood* (ἀρχὴ βασιλέων ἱεράτευμα) for [all Is]rael (ALD 11:6).

The italicized portion is only extant in the Greek translation of the Aramaic Levi Document from Mt Athos, which has led Kugler to suggest that the reference to “the beginning of kings” is nothing more than “a clumsy gloss reflecting the 6 text of Exod 19:6.”⁴⁹⁶ It is just as likely, however, that

would have had other uses in addition to cultic one, including uses related to the bureaucratic or governmental spheres, i.e., the spheres with which Joseph was associated. Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 291. We need not assume that the Aramaic Levi Document is implying that Joseph had access to the type of priestly knowledge, i.e., knowledge pertaining to minutiae of the sacrificial system, on offer in “the law of the priesthood.”

⁴⁹⁴ Here, my understanding of the scope of ספר is nevertheless somewhat different from that of Drawnel, who is more inclined to conflate the knowledge outlined by Isaac in “the law of the priesthood” and that which Levi imparts to his children as ספר ומוסר והכמה. As Drawnel argues, “[T]he use of the term [ספר] in the *Document* cannot be restricted to writing skills only, but includes all knowledge transmitted by Isaac to Levi (*A.L.D.* 14–50; 51–61).” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 329.

⁴⁹⁵ For a useful summary of such instances, see Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 265–8. Cf. Greenfield and Stone, “Remarks,” 223–4; Marinus de Jonge, “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi,’” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 367–85, esp. 371 and 379–80; Stone, “Axis of History,” 134–5; Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 784; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 35–38. Kugler, however, downplays the royal aspect of Levi and the priesthood in the Aramaic Levi Document, but, as Aschim contends, “The obvious potential of the Melchizedek tradition as a vehicle for the attribution of royal roles to a priestly figure is not sufficiently taken into account by Kugler.” Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 784. For Kugler approach, see *Patriarch to Priest*, 85, 114, and 117.

⁴⁹⁶ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 114. Kugler argues that, given the allusion to the Exodus passage, we need not assume that “the glossator was adding [anything] about kings, but only sharpening the point regarding Kohath’s relationship

the Geniza scribe mistakenly omitted the italicized phrase as a result of parablepsis.⁴⁹⁷ Even without the reference to the “beginning of kings,” though, Greenfield and Stone have shown that the onomastic midrash on the name Qahat in ALD 11:6 reflects an attempt on the part of the author to transfer Judah’s royal blessing in Gen 49 to Levi’s son Qahat.⁴⁹⁸ This convergence of royal and priestly attributes coheres with a handful of other, more fragmentary passages in the Aramaic Levi Document: i.e., one in which Levi is associated with מלכות כהנותא “the kingdom of the priesthood” (1Q21 1 2)⁴⁹⁹ and another which refers to כהנין ומלכין “priests and kings” and מלכותכן “your kingdom” in a context that appears to be recounting the future of Levi’s offspring (4Q213 2 12, 13).⁵⁰⁰ Upon surveying this evidence, Angel concludes that “the author of *ALD* envisioned priestly monarchy as the ideal governmental form.”⁵⁰¹ At the very least, the Aramaic Levi Document stands out when compared to those Jewish writings from the Second Temple period that make a

to the priesthood.” He likewise interprets the significance of the phrase מלכות כהנותא “the kingdom of the priesthood” (1Q21 1 2), positing: “The phrase fits in well with the ideology expressed in Exod 19:6.” Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 114 n. 180.

⁴⁹⁷ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel and Drawnel consider the italicized phrase to have been original to the Aramaic *Vorlage*. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 184; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 308–9.

⁴⁹⁸ Greenfield and Stone, “Remarks,” 223–4. Cf. Stone, “Axis of History,” 134–5; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 184–6. So also Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 307–8: “The author of the *Document* makes a connection between Qahat’s name קהת and the form in Gen 49:10 יקהת interpreting it as כנשת ‘congregation.’ By choosing this Aramaic noun he clearly refers to the meaning of the Hebrew word קהל ‘to congregate, assemble.’” See, however, the caution of Collins in *Scepter*, 98.

⁴⁹⁹ On this phrase, its significance, and its place in the composition, see the cautious comments of Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, who after reviewing several scholarly reconstructions and interpretations, conclude: “The association of royal language with Levi and the priesthood is clear, though the exact import of the verse is not.” Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 140.

⁵⁰⁰ DJD XXII, 20. Drawnel understands all of these phrases in relation to one another, arguing that the terms priest and king “assign to Levi’s sons the two offices summarized in the phrase ‘the priestly kingdom’ מלכות כהנותא” and that term “your kingdom” “denotes the priestly kingdom of Levi’s sons.” Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 344.

⁵⁰¹ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 268. Cf. Drawnel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 71–72. Note that the Aramaic Levi Document seems to retain the distinction between priests and kings in its prediction concerning the future of Levi’s offspring. We might consider Collins’ suggestion as an alternative to Angel’s theory regarding priestly monarchy: “The notion of a priestly kingdom is familiar from Exod 19:6 and may mean that priestly sovereignty or authority is greater than some other power, without necessarily implying that priests become kings.” Collins, *Scepter*, 97.

clear distinction between priests and kings, and associate the latter with the tribe of Judah (see esp. Jub. 31:5–20; T. Judah 21:1–4).⁵⁰²

4.4.4.4 Judicial Aspects of the Priesthood

The Aramaic Levi Document also imbues the priestly office with judicial qualities, as is suggested by the very fact that Isaac refers to his teaching as “the law (דִּין) of the priesthood” (ALD 5:8; 6:2).⁵⁰³ Isaac also characterizes his instructions as דִּין קוֹשֵׁטא “true law” (ALD 6:2), and proclaims concerning Levi: דִּינָךְ רַב מִן כָּל בִּישְׂרָא “your judgment is greater than all flesh” (ALD 6:1). This emphasis on Levi’s judicial responsibility in Isaac’s instruction in a part functions as a fulfillment of the following line in Levi’s prayer: “And make (me) a participant in your words,⁵⁰⁴ to do true judgment for all time (לְכָל עֵלָם) [למעבד // ποιεῖν κρίσιν ἀληθινὴν εἰς πάντα τὸν αἰῶνα), me and my children for all the generations of eternity (εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰῶνων) (ALD 3:17).⁵⁰⁵ Isaac never explicitly outlines what Levi’s judicial duties entail, though they probably include his responsibility to ensure the proper functioning of the cult, given the overwhelming amount of space devoted to that topic in the material that follows.

⁵⁰² Collins, tentatively dating Jubilees to the 120s BCE, argues that the “the assumption of both civil and priestly power by the Hasmoneans, provides by far the most plausible setting for the insistence on a distinction between royal and priestly offices.” Collins, *Scepter*, 107.

⁵⁰³ As Drownel posits, “His priestly rule encompasses also the judicial role (cf. Ezra 7:25–26).” Drownel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 263.

⁵⁰⁴ Compare the idea of Levi’s “participation” in God’s words with the statement describing the eschatological priest in frag. 9 of 4Q541: מֵאמְרָה כְּמֵאמֶר שְׁמַיִן “his word (is) like the word of heaven” (l. 3).

⁵⁰⁵ The idea that Levi’s children will carry on his judicial duties in perpetuity is developed further in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542), which has Qahat predict that his own descendants will execute judgment (לְמִדָּן דִּין) at the eschaton (1 ii 5). Drownel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 264. Consider as well the fragmentary passage toward the end of the Aramaic Levi Document, which, though poorly preserved, alludes to the future role of Levi’s descendants as רִאשֵׁין וְשֹׁפְטֵין “heads and judges” (ALD 13:16).

The Aramaic Levi Document also appears to envision a connection between Levi's identity as a judicial figure and his wielding of the sword against the Shechemites. Scholars generally recognize the importance of the Shechem incident for the author of the Aramaic Levi Document, with Kugler even suggesting that Levi's slaughter of the Shechemites is the basis of his elevation to the priesthood.⁵⁰⁶ This proposal goes beyond what the evidence permits us to say, but it is nevertheless clear that, in contradistinction from how this event is treated in the Hebrew text of Genesis, the Aramaic Levi Document views Levi's action against the Shechemites as a zealous, righteous defense of sexual purity and endogamy, and presents it as one of the ways by which Levi demonstrates that he is worthy of the priestly office.⁵⁰⁷ The first thing to note is that Isaac's instructions concerning the priesthood emphasize the significance of sexual purity and endogamy in the very same passage that highlights Levi's judicial acumen (ALD 6:1–5). Here, Isaac instructs Levi: "Marry a woman from my family (מן משפחתי) and do not defile (תחל) your seed with harlots (זניאן)" (ALD 6:4; cf. Tob 4:12). He implores him to avoid fornication (פחז), impurity (טמאה), and harlotry (זנות) (ALD 6:3), and his command for him to avoid "all impurity" forms an *inclusio* around the introduction to "the law of the priesthood" in ALD 6:1–5 (כל טומאה, v. 1; כל טומאת כל גבר, v. 5).⁵⁰⁸

Levi demonstrates his faithfulness to this aspect of Isaac's instruction elsewhere in the Aramaic Levi Document by marrying his cousin Milka (ALD 11:1), and by arranging marriages

⁵⁰⁶ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 67. Angel's language is a bit more measured, writing that the juxtaposition of Levi's slaughter of the Shechemites and his elevation to the priesthood in the biographical portion of the Aramaic Levi Document (12:6–7) "does not necessarily illustrate a causative relationship, but in light of the violent zeal for purity associated with the priesthood in the Bible and in Second Temple times, it is certainly suggestive." Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 270.

⁵⁰⁷ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 67.

⁵⁰⁸ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 262. Cf. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 97.

between his sons and their cousins: “to my sons [I took wives] from the daughters of my brothers” (ALD 12:1; cf. 1Q20 6:7–8). Note too that Levi arranges the marriage of his grandson Amram to Jochebed, Levi’s daughter and Amram’s aunt (ALD 12:3). But if Levi is presented in those passages as acting in faithful obedience to Isaac’s dictates concerning marital purity, the Aramaic Levi Document’s account of the Shechem incident goes a step further by presenting Levi as being responsible “for enforcement of marital purity and punishment of its transgression.”⁵⁰⁹ This act of enforcement and punishment is presented as one of the means by which Levi executes judgment against those who would threaten “communal integrity.”⁵¹⁰ In fact, a recently published fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document, known as the Rylands Fragment, indicates that Levi’s wielding of the sword against Shechem received explicit divine sanction ([סג]ר כולהוֹן אל ביד[נא]), and was depicted as consistent with Levi’s judicial responsibilities ([ו]נעבד די[ן]). The sword of Levi and Simeon are thus no longer viewed as כְּלֵי חַמָּס “instruments of violence,” as they were in Gen 49:5, but as the means by which Levi executes judgment and establishes peace by suppressing the forces of violence that threaten the integrity and stability of the community.⁵¹¹

⁵⁰⁹ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 106.

⁵¹⁰ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 67. That exogamy threatens “communal integrity” is not made explicit in the preserved portion of the Aramaic Levi Document, though the phrase “doers of violence” עבדי חמסא used to describe the Shechemites may suggest a parallel with the watchers, whose illicit sexual behavior bred chaos, violence, and destruction (see 1Q20 5:18; 11:14; 4Q531 19 2). Peters and Eshel, “Cutting Off and Cutting Down.” The Testament of Qahat, however, does make clear the close connection between intermarriage and communal stability (4Q542 1 i 5–7).

⁵¹¹ It is worth noting that Peters and Eshel have shown that the portrait of “Levi in the Rylands Genizah fragment overlaps most significantly with language contained in the Aramaic Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks*, a description of the author’s immanent future.” Peters and Eshel, “Cutting Off,” 256. See the description of week seven and eight in 1 En. 91:11–12 // 4Q212 1 iv 14–17: “And they will uproot the foundations of violence (אשי חמסא), and the structure of deceit in it, to execute judgment ([למעבד] די[ן]). After this there will arise an eighth week of righteousness, in which a sword will be given to all the righteous, to execute righteous judgment ([למעבד] די[ן] קשוט) on all the wicked, and they will be delivered into their hands.”

4.4.5 Summary

Drawing our analysis together, we can make some concluding observations on how the Aramaic Levi Document envisions the Israelite priesthood. The figure of Levi looms large in the composition's presentation of the priestly office, but it is worth noting that the knowledge pertaining to the operation of the entire cultic system is presented as coming to Levi by means of Noah, Abraham, and Isaac. Israel's priesthood, and especially its priestly lore, is thus connected to both the prediluvian and patriarchal periods, even if Levi is singled out as "first at the head of the [priest]hood" (ALD 5:3). It would be a mistake, however, to suggest that the author of the Aramaic Levi Document is attempting to pit Levi against Aaron or to posit that this composition represents a so-called "Pan-Levitic" conception of the priesthood that stood opposed to the Aaronide priesthood. Not only is there no evidence of polemical rhetoric in the Aramaic Levi Document, but such a view would ignore the prominent role assigned to that segment of the Levitical genealogy that leads directly to Aaron (i.e., Levi-Qahat-Amram), and the devaluation of Levi's son Gershom and the Gershomites. There is also no evidence that the glory and blessing associated with Levi's, and thus Amram's and Aaron's, descendants will ever be rescinded. In fact, the eternal longevity of Levi's descendants and their priesthood is one of the characteristic features of the Aramaic Levi Document.

The priesthood itself, embodied by both Levi and his descendants in perpetuity, is also valorized as Israel's central institution, and is responsible for overseeing almost every aspect of the community's corporate life. This phenomenon is seen most explicitly in Levi's accumulation of roles and responsibilities. Thus, while priestly service remains first and foremost a cultic role, Levi becomes associated with royal, visionary, scribal, sapiential, and judicial qualities, abilities, and duties. These various aspects of Levi's identity are not easy to untangle, and all appear to be

connected in one way or another to his priestly identity. For example, his judicial role is closely associated with his concern for purity, and his knowledge of scribal craft is depicted as necessary for his stewardship of the cultic system. The importance of Levi and the priesthood is also highlighted by his elevated status in relation to his brothers (ALD 10:11), his appropriation of the promise made to Abraham in Gen 12:3 (ALD 10:12), his close proximity to God and the angels (ALD 6:5), and, especially, the way in which the priesthood of Levi is implicitly compared to the royal, eternal, and heavenly priesthood of Melchizedek. Levi, the author of the Aramaic Levi Document reiterates time and again, was “chosen for the holy priesthood” (ALD 10:4), and his descendants “shall be blessed upon the earth for all the generations of eternity” (ALD 10:14). Much of this way of envisioning the priesthood can be traced back to certain passages in the Hebrew scriptures, but the Aramaic Levi Document has interpreted, adapted, expanded, and conflated such passages to construct its priestly ideal.

4.4.6 Socio-Historical Context

I conclude my treatment of the Aramaic Levi Document by addressing the claim that it was a polemical work written to oppose the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood or elements within it, which is a view most associated with Kugler and Himmelfarb among the compositions’ major commentators. Beginning with Kugler, after an analysis of “the law of the priesthood,” he argues that a comparison between the cultic regulations contained therein and those found in the Pentateuch “repeatedly shows *Aramaic Levi* to be at variance with the Torah.”⁵¹² First, he compares the number of ablutions required of Levi to the amount required in Exod 30:19–21, and suggests that the Aramaic Levi Document “adds a second ablution to be accomplished after

⁵¹² Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 109.

vesting, one which is absent in the Torah.”⁵¹³ The Pentateuch, despite containing a command to wash prior to vesting in Lev 8:6–7, contains no command to wash afterward.⁵¹⁴ Second, he points to the instructions concerning the sacrificial wood in ALD 7:4–8:1, noting that, although this passage may have scriptural roots, the “biblical foundation upon which the text rests is very narrow.”⁵¹⁵ From a simple command to “arrange wood on the fire” in Lev 1:7 and “the Priestly work’s categorization of ‘creeping things’ as unclean,” the author of the Aramaic Levi Document, Kugler suggests, has crafted a set of regulations that represents “an expansion of, or at least differentiation from the biblical mandates.”⁵¹⁶ Third, he lists a number of ways that the instructions for the whole burnt offering in “the law of priesthood” “differ from related Torah prescriptions.”⁵¹⁷ He notes that Lev 1 probably forms the foundation of the offering as outlined in the Aramaic Levi Document, but suggests that “there are considerable differences between the two descriptions.”⁵¹⁸ Such differences include the insistence that the sprinkling of the blood come after the laying of the fire on the altar in ALD 8:1 (cf. Lev 1:5–7),⁵¹⁹ the order of animal’s body part being placed on the altar (ALD 8:3–4; cf. Lev 1:8–9),⁵²⁰ the salting of every piece of the animal (ALD 8:5),⁵²¹ the command for the blood of the sacrificial animal not to be visible (ALD 8:3),⁵²² and the addition of the mixture of flour and oil, the pouring of wine, and the burning of frankincense (ALD 8:6), which Kugler acknowledges, though absent in the description of the whole burnt offering in Leviticus 1,

⁵¹³ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 104.

⁵¹⁴ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 104.

⁵¹⁵ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 104.

⁵¹⁶ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 104.

⁵¹⁷ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 106.

⁵¹⁸ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 105.

⁵¹⁹ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 105.

⁵²⁰ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 105.

⁵²¹ On this point, Kugler notes, “While the Torah requires that the meat offering be salted, only the קרבן is referred to (Lev 2:13; but see also Ezek 43:24), but *Aramaic Levi* states *explicitly* that the pieces of the holocaust offering are to be salted.” Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 105.

⁵²² Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 105–6.

appear in the sacrificial prescriptions in Num 15:3.⁵²³ Finally, Kugler argues that the extended treatment of various weights and measures in ALD 9:1–18 “lacks substantial connections with known Pentateuchal laws.”⁵²⁴ These variations in cultic procedure, many of which, Kugler notes, “require a higher degree of purity than the similar regulations in the Pentateuch,” have led him to speculate that the function of “the law of the priesthood” have in part been “to set Levi and his priesthood apart from the clergy depicted by the Torah, and to demonstrate a deeper concern for purity than that communicated by the Pentateuch.”⁵²⁵

Kugler’s interpretation of this evidence is closely connected to his understanding of the author’s decision to cast Levi as the prototypical priest, namely, that Levi is intended to function as a foil to the contemporary priests in Jerusalem and their sacrificial regulations reflected in the Mosaic Torah.⁵²⁶ Kugler argues that the Aramaic Levi Document holds up Levi as “the model for all clergy.”⁵²⁷ By presenting a set of cultic prescriptions that diverge from those found in the Torah, the author of the Aramaic Levi Document is thus establishing an implicit contrast between those priests who follow the regulations outlined in the Torah, i.e., the contemporary Jerusalem priests, and those who are a faithful to a more ancient set of regulations, reflected in “the law of the priesthood.” He also suggests that the valorization of Levi throughout the narrative functions as another implicit critique of the contemporary Jerusalem priests, who are not, in the eyes of the author, sufficiently committed to the cause of purity and do not embody the ideal of a priest as a scribal and sapiential figure.⁵²⁸ For Kugler, this view of the Aramaic Levi Document’s attitude toward the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood is confirmed when we consider the final few lines

⁵²³ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 106.

⁵²⁴ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 106.

⁵²⁵ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 109.

⁵²⁶ “Taken as a whole Isaac’s instructions could be seen as an alternative to the existing priesthood and its practices.” Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 109.

⁵²⁷ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 109.

⁵²⁸ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 136.

of the extant composition, which appear to predict the apostasy of Levi's future descendants. As he argues, this portion of Levi's speech to his children "may be the author's explanation of how a later part of the Levitical line failed in its stewardship of the office," which leads him to "entertain the possibility that the document was intended as a polemic against a branch of the priesthood with which its author was at odds."⁵²⁹

When considering the origins of such a polemic, Kugler returns to Milik's suggestion of a Samaritan provenance for the Aramaic Levi Document, which he calls "remarkably attractive."⁵³⁰ As he hypothesizes, "Perhaps the priests responsible for this work sought to lay the historical foundation for a Samaritan priesthood, one explicitly differentiated from the sacerdotal leadership in Jerusalem," though he does admit that, "without additional evidence and further study of *Aramaic Levi*, Samaritan provenance is only a possibility."⁵³¹ This proposal has not found widespread acceptance.⁵³² Scholars generally agree, even if only tentatively, that the Aramaic Levi Document is likely a Palestinian Jewish product, though its Babylonian influences have been recognized.⁵³³

There are other reasons to doubt Kugler's claim that the Aramaic Levi Document represents a polemical attack on the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. For example, Schiffman has done a rigorous analysis of the cultic regulations in the Aramaic Levi Document, and has found that much of what Kugler presents as being at odds with Pentateuchal practice is actually the product of underlying exegesis, or parallels similar developments seen elsewhere in the Qumran

⁵²⁹ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 130.

⁵³⁰ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 137. Cf. idem, "Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi (1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi)," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 351–8. On Milik's original proposal, see Milik, "Écrits préessenieniens de Qumrân," 96. For a treatment of Milik's view, see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 75–76.

⁵³¹ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 137.

⁵³² Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 75–76.

⁵³³ See e.g., Davila: "Given that our earliest manuscripts are of a Palestinian provenance, origin in that region is the natural working hypothesis, although we cannot be certain." Davila, *MOTP*, 127.

scrolls and rabbinic writings.⁵³⁴ As Davila has summarized after assessing Schiffman’s work, the Aramaic Levi Document’s variations from the Pentateuch are no greater than those found in Tannaitic or Qumran halakhah.”⁵³⁵ Moreover, much like in the rabbinic writings, Schiffman argues, the legislation in “the law of the priesthood” appears less polemical than that which is found in, say, 4QMMT, 11QT, or CD, and instead is more concerned with “filling gaps in the biblical text and describing the manner in which the rites are to be performed.”⁵³⁶

Himmelfarb’s assessment of the cultic regulations in “the law of the priesthood” also leads her to conclude that there is no evidence of a polemical attitude toward Pentateuchal law.⁵³⁷ However, Himmelfarb agrees with Kugler inasmuch as he suggests that the prediction of apostasy toward the end of the composition “makes it clear that its author disapproved of the behavior of the priests of his own time.”⁵³⁸

4Q213 4.1–8⁵³⁹

1.] your [] you/they will darken [
2.] did [they] not receive
3.] and upon whom will be the guilt
4.]is it not upon me and you, my sons, for they will know it.

⁵³⁴ One such exegetical principle that Schiffman identifies is that the Aramaic Levi Document “took the Day of Atonement ritual as typical (i.e., as a general rule for all rituals) and required that its prescriptions be observed on a regular basis in the Temple.” Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, ed. Esther Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 58 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 177–202, 183.

⁵³⁵ Davila, *MOTP*, 127 n. 11.

⁵³⁶ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 202.

⁵³⁷ Martha Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in *Aramaic Levi and Jubilees*,” in *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond*, TSAJ 151 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 61–77. As she summarizes, “On some subjects, Isaac’s directions complement the Torah’s relatively terse instructions; there is no question of contradiction or critique. On other points, Isaac’s directions stand in a certain tension with the Torah, but nowhere...do they straightforwardly contradict the Torah.” Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice,” 64. There is simply no indication, she further notes, that the Aramaic Levi Document “understands its instructions as in conflict with anyone else’s position.” Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice,” 72.

⁵³⁸ Martha Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt,” in *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond*, TSAJ 151 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 27–47, 29.

⁵³⁹ Kugler and Drawnel place this fragment at the end of the preserved composition, but it is among the “Unplaced Fragments” in Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel.

5. w]ays of truth you will abandon, from all the paths of
6.]you will be lax and you will walk in it [
7.] that d[ar]kness will come upon you
8.] now, at ti[m]es] you will be lowly

In commenting on this passage, however, she acknowledges that “it does not reveal what the priests were doing wrong,” and thus argues that we must look elsewhere in the composition to determine the animating force behind this purported dissatisfaction.⁵⁴⁰ This brings her to the marital regulations in “the law of the priesthood” in ALD 6:1–5, and ALD 6:4 in particular. Regarding this passage, she argues that “the only place in Isaac’s speech where there is any hint of polemic is in his advice about marriage.”⁵⁴¹ For Himmelfarb, ALD 6:4 represents a polemical attack on the marital practices of the contemporary priests in Jerusalem, and discerning the precise issue being condemned therein is the key to understanding the social location and function of the Aramaic Levi Document.

Himmelfarb’s view that this marriage regulation reflects an underlying polemic relies on two arguments, neither of which is persuasive in the final analysis. First, in contrast to the sacrificial prescriptions, she argues that the commands pertaining to proper marriage are written in a “polemical tone.”⁵⁴² It is not self-evident, however, that the “tone” of ALD 6:1–5 should be understood as any more polemical than the rest of “the law of the priesthood.” Nothing about the phrasing of ALD 6:1–5 requires such a conclusion, and it seems just as likely that these prohibitions against exogamy serve an admonitory, rather than a polemical, function. In fact, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel have noted that the Aramaic Levi Document as a whole is noteworthy

⁵⁴⁰ Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 29.

⁵⁴¹ Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice,” 63.

⁵⁴² “But the only portion of the instructions with a polemical tone is the very beginning (13–17), in which Isaac urges Levi to avoid ‘harlotry’ by marriage to a suitable wife.” Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 29. Cf. eadem, “Earthly Sacrifice,” 63.

for its lack of polemical rhetoric.⁵⁴³ Even where the author appears to express a preference for the 364-day calendar, as we have seen in its description of Qahat's birth, they point out that "no polemics surround" the calendrical material preserved in the extant composition, as opposed to references to the same calendrical system in, say, Jubilees.⁵⁴⁴ But even if it could be proven the marital laws in the Aramaic Levi Document were polemical in nature, Himmelfarb would still need to prove that they were directed against the contemporary priests in Jerusalem, which leads us to her second argument.

In an attempt to demonstrate the substance and object(s) of the polemic, Himmelfarb sets out to show that the legislation in the Aramaic Levi Document reflects a "rigorist" position on marital practice, one which put its author at odds with the priestly mainstream.⁵⁴⁵ Although the Dinah incident, she acknowledges, reflects a broad condemnation of the practice of exogamy, she suggests that Isaac's instructions to Levi indicate that "the stakes are higher for Levi than for Dinah or Levi's brothers."⁵⁴⁶ As she contends, "*Aramaic Levi* moves from endogamy as a standard for all Israel in its account of the aftermath of the rape of Dinah to a more restrictive definition of appropriate marriage for Levi and his descendants."⁵⁴⁷ Specifically, she argues that ALD 6:4 interprets Lev 21:14–15, a part of the high priestly marriage legislation, in such a way as "to require all future priests to marry women from priestly families."⁵⁴⁸ Both passages are cited below:

⁵⁴³ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 22. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 20. As a result of the lack of explicit polemical rhetoric on these and other matters, they are prepared to characterize the provenance of the Aramaic Levi Document as being "priestly in character," but they are agnostic on the question of whether it was associated with "a group connected with the Jerusalem temple, or an opposition group of some kind." Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 22.

⁵⁴⁴ Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi," 168; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 20. Kugler also points out the Aramaic Levi Document's "non-polemical use of a solar calendar." Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 134.

⁵⁴⁵ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 37.

⁵⁴⁶ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 30.

⁵⁴⁷ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 31.

⁵⁴⁸ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 31.

<p>Lev 21:14–15</p> <p>“A widow, or a divorced woman, or a woman who has been defiled, a prostitute (וְחַלְלָהּ זֹנֶה), these he shall not marry. He shall marry a virgin of his own kin (מִקְרָבֵי), that he may not profane his offspring among his kin; for I am the LORD; I sanctify him.”</p>	<p>ALD 6:4</p> <p>“And marry a woman from my family (מִן מִשְׁפַּחְתִּי) and do not defile (תַּחַל) your seed with harlots (זִנְיָאן), since you are holy seed, and sanctify your seed like the holy place since you are called a holy priest for all the seed of Abraham.”</p>
---	---

A Comparison of Lev 21:14–15 and ALD 6:4

Aramaic Levi Documents’s reference to Leviticus has been widely noted.⁵⁴⁹ Schiffman, for example, argues that the author of the Aramaic Levi Document is here both citing and expanding the Levitical requirement that the high priest “marry a virgin from his nation.”⁵⁵⁰ According to Schiffman, ALD 6:4 is suggesting that every priest, not just the high priest, “must marry a native Jewish woman,” and “is forbidden to marry a convert to Judaism.”⁵⁵¹ Himmelfarb agrees with Schiffman that ALD 6:4 expands the scope of Lev 21:14 to include all priests, but she argues that the author of the Aramaic Levi Document understood מִקְרָבֵי to refer not to the whole people of Israel, but to the members of a particular clan or family—in this case, members of a priestly clan or family.⁵⁵² For Himmelfarb, contrary to Schiffman, ALD 6:4 did not set out to condemn “marriage between Jews and gentiles, but marriage between priests and Jewish women who did not come from a priestly family.”⁵⁵³ She contends that this position is also reflected in both the Book of Watchers and 4QMMT.⁵⁵⁴ The author of the Aramaic Levi Document should thus be

⁵⁴⁹ Robert A. Kugler, “Halakic Interpretive Strategies at Qumran: A Case Study,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 131–40; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 267; Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 179–180; Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 99–103.

⁵⁵⁰ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 179.

⁵⁵¹ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 179.

⁵⁵² Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 30–31.

⁵⁵³ Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 47.

⁵⁵⁴ Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 37.

understood as one representative of a “rigorist” interpretative tradition, and, as a result, at odds with the mainstream of the Jerusalem temple establishment over issues of marriage.⁵⁵⁵ The prediction of apostasy toward the end of the Aramaic Levi Document is viewed by Himmelfarb against this backdrop, and marital regulations in “the law of the priesthood” are therefore read as having a polemic thrust.

Himmelfarb’s conclusion is problematic for a number of reasons. For one thing, much of her argument relies on comparative data, and, as I have already argued in my *Excursus*, we have reason to doubt an interpretation of the Book of Watchers that views it as condemning the sexual behavior of the contemporary Jerusalem priests, and even more reason to doubt that it was concerned with the very specific issue of marriages between priests and Jewish women from non-priestly families. Moreover, the notion that 4QMMT is concerned with marriages between priests and Jewish women from non-priestly families relies on a much-disputed reconstruction. In any case, it is not clear to me that ambiguities in the Aramaic Levi Document should be interpreted in light of 4QMMT, because the Aramaic Levi Document was almost certainly composed before 4QMMT.⁵⁵⁶ Finally, as Loader has recently demonstrated, Himmelfarb’s interpretation of ALD 6:4 does not “do justice to the context” of the Aramaic Levi Document itself.⁵⁵⁷ As he rightly highlights, the most obvious referent of the phrase *מן משפחת* in the context of “the law of the

⁵⁵⁵ Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 37.

⁵⁵⁶ The reconstruction in question, originating with Qimron and Strugnell and emended slightly by Himmelfarb reads: “But you know that some of the priests and [the laity mingle with each other].” For Himmelfarb argument in support of this reconstruction, see Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 33–37. For those who have questioned or rejected it, see Lester L. Grabbe, “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 89–108, see 103; Carolyn J. Sharpe, “Phinean Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 207–22; Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Inter-marriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 82–91.

⁵⁵⁷ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 101.

priesthood” is not priestly families, but “the family of Isaac.”⁵⁵⁸ The scope of just what is meant by “the family of Isaac” is demonstrated in Levi’s own fulfillment of this command, i.e., his marriage to Milka, who is described as coming *ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας Ἀβραὰμ* “from the family of Abraham” (ALD 11:1).

It is thus possible that ALD 6:4 intends to condemn marriages between priests and foreigners, those who fall outside of “the family of Abraham,” but we need not see this command as being restricted to priestly marriages. It is just as likely that the Aramaic Levi Document intends to condemn *all* exogamous marriage. As Loader has suggested, the Aramaic Levi Document, like Ezra and Jubilees, is “concerned with people marrying foreigners, and particularly concerned when priests do so.”⁵⁵⁹ In other words, the legislation forbidding exogamy applies to both priests and lay Israelites, even if the Aramaic Levi Document takes a specific interest in the behavior of priests. However, I would like to suggest that the Aramaic Levi may be read as defining endogamy, for both priests and laity, more narrowly than as simply marriage to a foreigner. Levi’s marriage reflects an ideal not just of marriage to a fellow Israelite, but of marriage to a close relative. Levi also arranges marriages of his sons to their cousins, and of Amram to Jochebed, Amram’s aunt. These marriages all resemble other, arranged marriages between close relatives in the Qumran Aramaic writings (i.e., the Visions of Amram, the Genesis Apocryphon, and Tobit). There is no evidence that this more circumscribed conception of endogamy is polemical in nature. Nor is there any evidence that it is directed only toward priests, since the Visions of Amram, the Genesis Apocryphon, and Tobit also depict marriages between close relatives as the ideal, for priests and laity alike.

⁵⁵⁸ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 102.

⁵⁵⁹ Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 102.

Finally, it is not self-evident that Levi's prediction of future apostasy reflects a condemnation of the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. This passage is very fragmentary and it is difficult, if not impossible, to contextualize it. For instance, we cannot know with any certainty exactly what type of behavior is being condemned, as even Himmelfarb concedes.⁵⁶⁰ We also simply do not have enough context to know toward which priests, if any, this passage was directed. Is the author, like Jeremiah (8:8–10), Ezekiel (22:26) and Zephaniah (3:3–4), condemning the behavior of the Judahite priests prior to the Babylonian exile? Is the behavior of the priests in the contemporary Jerusalem temple being condemned? Is what is being condemned the apostasy of Manasseh and the Jerusalemite priests who defected to Samaria with him?⁵⁶¹ All of these instances of priestly failures would be in the future from Levi's perspective. Or, does the prediction of apostasy simply play an admonitory role, without condemning any future, historical priests in particular?⁵⁶² No matter how we decide to interpret the prediction of apostasy, we must weigh this highly fragmentary passage against the myriad predictions of the eternal longevity of Levi's offspring and their priesthood, which appear throughout the extant composition.⁵⁶³

4.4.7 Conclusion

The Aramaic Levi Document is certainly concerned with matters that can broadly be described as priestly, e.g., cult, calendar, proper marriage. However, there is no evidence that its approach to such matters is polemical. There is no evidence that the Aramaic Levi Document is situating its perspective on these matters vis-à-vis another priestly group, let alone the

⁵⁶⁰ Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 29. Cf. Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 65.

⁵⁶¹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 84.

⁵⁶² It may be telling that, as Drawnel notes, "in the admonition of his descendants about their apostasy (*A.L.D.* 101–102) Levi speaks to his sons and grandsons without excluding any particular group (cf. *A.L.D.* 82). Nothing warrants Kugler's opinion that behind this speech there is one group of priests contemporary to the author that failed in carrying out their priestly duties while the other followed Levi's admonitions." Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 84.

⁵⁶³ See Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 301.

contemporary priestly establishment in Jerusalem. The Aramaic Levi Document certainly seems to be instructing the audience on several issues, and may even argue forcefully in favor of a particular approach to, say, legitimate and illegitimate marriage. Scholars go far beyond what the text allows us to say when they propose that these claims were meant to counter the claims and/or practices of the contemporary Jerusalem priests. It would be just as, if not more, plausible to suggest that the Aramaic Levi Document was written to endorse the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood, especially considering its valorization of Levi, Qahat, and Amram and its statements about the eternal duration of Levi's descendants and their priesthood

4.5 Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} (4Q541)

4Q541 is the lone surviving manuscript of an otherwise unattested composition.⁵⁶⁴ Despite its official title, no extant portion of the manuscript mentions Levi, or any other figure, by name. However, scholars have proposed a number of points of contact between 4Q541 and the Testament of Levi (esp. chs. 17–18), with some suggesting that 4Q541 may have served as a source for the Greek testament.⁵⁶⁵ Some of the similarities between these two compositions are indeed

⁵⁶⁴ Scholars have long discussed 4Q540 and 4Q541 as representatives of a single composition. See, e.g., Jean Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran," *RB* 70 (1963): 481–505, 492; DJD XXXI, 213–6; George J. Brooke, "4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, JSNTSup 84 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 83–100; John J. Collins, "Asking for Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 579–90; Michael A. Knibb, "Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 165–84, esp. 182; Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*, STDJ XLVII (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 111; Frey, "On the Origins," 362. However, these two manuscripts share no textual overlap, and it is thus more appropriate to treat them separately in the absence of any compelling reasons to do otherwise. So Dimant, review of Puech, 301; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 31. 4Q540 does not contain enough priestly material to warrant its own section in this chapter. It contains a single reference to "the temple" or "the sanctuary" (מקדש), but the manuscript's poor state of preservation makes contextualizing it nearly impossible, the interpretative proposals of several scholars notwithstanding. See, e.g., Brooke, "4QTestament of Levi^d(?)," 95; DJD XXXI, 218. In my view, it is best to plead ignorance on the question of what role the temple plays in 4Q540.

⁵⁶⁵ Brooke, "4QTestament of Levi^d(?)," 86; Knibb, "Messianism," 182–3; Johannes Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*,

compelling, but the precise nature of their relationship is difficult to discern.⁵⁶⁶ It is possible that 4Q541 should be understood as being associated with Levi in some way, but it is best to admit ignorance on this issue. No specific element in the extant fragments would necessitate that Levi be understood as the composition's pseudepigraphical author. In addition, the manuscript's poor state of preservation does not allow for any definitive statements to be made concerning the overall narrative arc of the composition. Few fragments contain any significant amount of running text, and even some of the better-preserved fragments are notoriously difficult to interpret. There are, however, a few phrases related to the priesthood and cult scattered throughout the manuscript,⁵⁶⁷

WUNT II/104 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 260–1; DJD XXXI, 214; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 110; Albert L. A. Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, STDJ 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 409; Edward M. Cook, “4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered,” in *Puzzling Out the Past: Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures in Honor of Bruce Zuckerman*, ed. M. J. Lundberg, S. Fine, and W. T. Pitard, CHANE 55 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 13–18.

⁵⁶⁶ Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 584; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 79. More doubtful is the claim that 4Q541 is related to or even a portion of the Aramaic Levi Document. This claim has been critiqued by a number of scholars, e.g., Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 584; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic Levi Document,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 453–64; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 18; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 32. Any linguistic and/or thematic similarities that 4Q541 shares with specific Qumran Aramaic writings are better attributed to the fact that these compositions are a part of a broader literary tradition and/or originate within similar—if not shared—socio-historical contexts. See Chapter 6.

⁵⁶⁷ One of the most notable is *וַאֲבָרִיכ עֵלֶת* “and I will bless the burnt offering” (4Q541 2ii.4), which the scribe amended from *וַאֲבָרִיכָה* “and I will bless you.” DJD XXXI, 231–233; Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 95; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 186. These references to priestly matters in 4Q541 generally appear in broken contexts, and often rely on somewhat speculative reconstructions (e.g., *מִן הַיְבִלָּא* ‘from the temple’; 4Q541 4ii.6) or could be interpreted in other ways: E.g. Brooke notes that 4Q541 4ii.4 may refer to a sacrificial offering if *דַּמְכָה* is interpreted as ‘your blood.’ However, Perrin points out that “the pronominal suffix is not easily reconciled with such an interpretation.” Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 186. Following Puech, DJD XXXI, 236, Perrin observes that *דַּמְכָה* could plausibly be understood as a participial form of the verbal root *דַּמַּךְ* ‘to sleep.’ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 186. Similar ambiguity surrounds the phrase *דַּכְרִין שִׁבְעָא* (4Q541 9ii.5). It is possible that this phrase should read ‘seven rams’ (cf. Num 23:1; 1 Chr 15:26; 2 Chr 13:9; 29:21; Job 42:8; Ezek 45:23), though both Brooke and Puech acknowledge that *דַּכְרִין שִׁבְעָא* could also be translated ‘seven males,’ which has a parallel in T. Levi 8:2. Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 88; DJD XXXI, 244; Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 186. Finally, one of the most debated examples comes from a highly disputed passage in frag. 24. Following Beyer, ATTM 2, 112, Perrin argues that the word *צַצָּא* in 4Q541 24ii.5 should be taken as a reference to the high priestly head piece on the basis of a parallel with the biblical term *צִיץ*, which occurs in Exod 28:36; 39:30; and Lev 8:9. Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision*, 187. Cf. Angel, *Eschatological and Otherworldly*, 79 n. 241. This possibility was also raised, though ultimately dismissed, by Puech, DJD XXXI, 255 and Cook, “Fragment 24,” 17. Cook suggests that *צַצָּא* be understood as “magical amulet or lamella” (cf. *Sefer ha-Razim* 1:35; 6:30). However, as

which give the composition a “priestly tenor.”⁵⁶⁸ It is also relatively clear that at least some of the extant fragments recount the content of one or more revelatory dream-visions,⁵⁶⁹ involving one of the patriarchs of Israel. My analysis of 4Q541 will primarily be concerned with frag. 9i, with material from some of the other fragments being used to supplement my discussion at various points. Fragment 9i contains the third-person narration of a dream-vision, which describes an unspecified (though likely eschatological) future, involving a priest-like figure who carries out a cultic and didactic mission, and who is antagonized by the people of his generation.⁵⁷⁰

Perrin notes, these two options need not be seen as mutually exclusive, given our knowledge of an Jewish amulet from the 2nd to 5th centuries CE that appeals to the *צִיָּצָה דְאֵהָרֶן* ‘the head piece of Aaron’ in an apotropaic context. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 187–8. Cf. Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002), 464; J. A. Montgomery, “Some Early Amulets from Palestine,” *JAOS* 31 (1911): 272–81, esp. 275.

⁵⁶⁸ Perrin, *Dynamic of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 186.

⁵⁶⁹ Perrin has done the most detailed job of showing that certain linguistic items in 4Q541 suggest a visionary context, i.e. the noun “vision” *חִזוֹן* (2i.9), the exclamation *אֲרוּ* (2ii.1, 6), notion of something being “hidden” *מִסְתָּר* or “deep” *עֵמִיק* (2i.9; 3.3; 7.1; 24ii.3), and the verbal root *גָּלָה* (7.1; 24ii.3). See Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 91 – 119.

⁵⁷⁰ Scholars have often conflated the literary contexts of frag. 9i and frag. 24 assuming that the identity and mission of the eschatological figure described in the former can be illuminated by the latter. Fragment 24—the only other fragment of significant length—is notoriously difficult to interpret, but it clearly includes a series of commands and prohibitions that are given to a second-person singular addressee. The speaker in this fragment informs the addressee that his obedience will bestow honor upon his family as well as merit him a great reward. It is difficult to know who is being addressed and by whom in this fragment, though lines 5–6 seem to suggest that this fragment represents the words of an Israelite patriarch, spoken to one of his sons. It is also possible that frag. 24 contains the speech of an *angelus interpres* to one of the Israelite patriarchs. Notably, various experts coming to wildly different interpretations of some portions of this fragment, e.g., Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 90–92; Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 583–6; Knibb, “Messianism,” 183–4; DJD XXXI, 252–6; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 113–5; Martin Hengel with Daniel P. Bailey, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period,” in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Source*, eds. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 75–146; Cook, “Fragment 24,” 13–18; Alexey (Eliyahu) Yuditsky, “ואל תמחולה ביד שחפא: 4Q541, Frag. 24 Again,” *DSD* 23 (2016): 221–32, but what does seem evident is that there are good reasons for rejecting the proposal that frags. 9i and 24 refer to the same figure. As Knibb argues, “Puech’s case for the view that the priest is to suffer a violent death, a crucifixion, rests on the belief that there is a relationship between frag. 24 and frag. 9i, and that the negative commands of frag. 24 have in mind the future priest. But it is not at all clear that such a connection should be made.” Knibb, “Messianism,” 184. Cf. Florentino García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” *JBT* 8 (1993): 171–208; Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 586; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra, *STDJ* 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 515–44.

There is a basic agreement among scholars that the figure in frag. 9i is a priest of some sort on the basis of the use of the verb כפר “to atone” in l. 2.⁵⁷³ His unique function and elevated status may even suggest that he is a high priestly figure—possibly the high priest of the eschatological age, though he is never explicitly identified as such. Perhaps surprisingly, frag. 9i does not provide much information concerning his cultic activities beyond the claim: “And he shall atone (ויכפר) for all the sons of his generation” (l. 2).⁵⁷⁴ This reference has been understood by some as an allusion to the eschatological Day of Atonement.⁵⁷⁵ This proposal is possible, but it should at least be noted that the verb כפר is also used to describe cultic activity in the Genesis Apocryphon and New Jerusalem, and in neither case does it refer to the activity of the high priest on the Day of

⁵⁷³ Hogeterp’s comments are representative: “The reference to atonement (4Q541 9 I 2) could imply priestly if not high-priestly affiliations of the individual protagonist.” Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 409. Cf. Starcky, “Les quatre étapes,” 492; Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 89; Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 580; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 112; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 77; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision*, 185.

⁵⁷⁴ Some scholars have simply assumed that the verb כפר here refers to sacrificial activity in the temple. E.g. Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 584. The scattered references to sacrificial activity elsewhere in the manuscript (2ii.4; 4ii.4; 9ii.5) as well as the two other Qumran Aramaic uses of כפר (1Q20 10.13; 2Q24 8.5) may point in that direction. However, it is not at all clear how the protagonist in frag. 9i relates to the sacrificial language used elsewhere in the document. Moreover, as Stökl Ben Ezra points out, the other occurrences of the verb כפר in the Qumran Aramaic corpus appear in relation to either the land and/or an altar, and refer very explicitly to sacrificial activity. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 518. Fragment 9i simply does not tell us how atonement is effectuated on behalf of the people, and both the Hebrew scriptures and Second Temple literature know of ways other than sacrifice through which atonement might occur, e.g. violence (Num 25:11-13; 2 Sam 21:1-14), almsgiving (Sir 3:30), and prayer (4 Macc 4:11-14). The latter two examples come from Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 518. Consider also the atoning activity of another eschatological figure—this time from the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls, i.e. *11QMelchizedek* (11Q13 1ii.6-8). The wording in this passage is somewhat similar to that of 4Q541 9ii.2. Like 4Q541 9ii.2, atonement in this passage, as Stökl Ben Ezra summarizes, “concerns directly the people, not the altar or the land.” Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 518. It is also unclear just how atonement is effectuated in this passage, though the reference to atonement follows a passage in which Melchizedek’s proclamation of liberty is said to be that which frees people from their iniquity (11Q13 1ii.6). It is hard to say how relevant 11Q13 is for interpreting 4Q541 9ii, but it is notable that both passages depict an eschatological figure who is associated with both instruction and atonement. Cf. Fletcher-Louis on the similarities between 4Q541 9i.2 and 11Q13 1ii.8. Fletcher-Louis argues that the sectarian reader of 4Q541 and 11Q13 “would believe the characters to be one and the same.” Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 190. This, even if true, does not settle the question of how the author of 4Q541 and its pre-sectarian readers would have understood the protagonist of 4Q541. Even if the author of 11Q13 modeled his depiction of Melchizedek on the eschatological priest of 4Q541, it still does not necessarily prove that the protagonist of frag. 9i should be understood as Melchizedek, though it is possible. For more on a possible connection between 4Q541 and 11Q13, see Hengel with Bailey, “Effective History,” 117.

⁵⁷⁵ So Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 89. Cf. 11Q13 1ii.6-8.

Atonement (cf. 1Q20 10.13; 2Q24 8.5). We must also at least consider the possibility that כפר is being used metaphorically here. Fragment 9i does not explicitly associate כפר with an altar or sacrificial rite, and it is worth noting that the Hebrew scriptures attests to a metaphorical use of the verb כפר in the Phinehas narrative wherein the violent punishment of impurity is described as a type of atonement (Num 25: 11–13; cf. 2 Sam 21:1–14).⁵⁷⁶

The atoning activity of this priestly figure is presented in a parallel construction with another description of his mission in which it is recounted: “And he shall be sent (וישתלח) to all of the sons of his people” (ll. 2–3).⁵⁷⁷ It is unclear whether שלח is simply being used metaphorically to refer to a commission or to imply spatial movement from one domain to another.⁵⁷⁸ It may be significant that one of the closest parallels to this passage from elsewhere in the Qumran Aramaic corpus narrates the commissioning of the four archangels (1 En. 10:1–22). In this passage, each of the archangels are “sent” (πέμπω; likely a translation of שלח) from heaven to earth in order to carry out a specific task.⁵⁷⁹ Michael’s task in particular, like that of the figure in frag. 9i, is

⁵⁷⁶ Xeravits argues that the language of 4Q541 9i.2, specifically the construction על כפר, “reflects the cultic language of Leviticus, a book that repeatedly underlines the atoning role of the (high) priest or Aaron.” Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 216. The same construction, however, is used in Num 25:13 to describe the effects of Phinehas’s violence.

⁵⁷⁷ Stökl Ben Ezra also suggests that the term שלח may be important for understanding the use of כפר in 4Q541 9i.3, pointing to the fact that שלח often functions as “the technical term for the scapegoat השתלח” in tannaitic literature. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 519. This observation leads him to conclude: “I suggest that the author of 4Q541 use this rare verb שלח hitp. as an allusion to the scapegoat. In other words, the protagonist achieves atonement by being sent out like the scapegoat.” Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 519. García Martínez accepts this suggestion as “a very plausible interpretation” in his review of Stökl Ben Ezra’s article. Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic Figures,” 540. However, see Collins’s skeptical remarks. Collins, “Conclusions,” 560–61.

⁵⁷⁸ If the latter is intended, is the author suggesting that this figure is coming from heaven to earth? Or, should we simply understand that he is coming from one terrestrial locale to another?

⁵⁷⁹ See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 220: “The verb ‘to send’ (usually ἀποστέλλω, but here πέμπω, doubtless translating the typical Semitic šlh) is a technical term indicating formal commissioning both of governmental officials (Neh 2:5) and of prophets (Isa 6:8).” Cf. 4Q530 2ii+6-12(?)21; 4Q558 51ii.4.

described using priestly language, and is presented both as universal in scope (cf. 4Q541 9i.2–3) and as affecting the earth (cf. 4Q541 9i.4–5).⁵⁸⁰

Even more prominent than this figure’s cultic functions are his didactic and sapiential qualities. Line 2 contains a reference to חַכְמָתָהּ “his wisdom” in the clause that immediately precedes the allusion to his atoning activity. Puech’s reconstruction of the rest of this clause as וְיִמְסְרֵם לָהֶם חַכְמָתָהּ “and he will instruct them (in) his wisdom” is uncertain, but it is in keeping with the instructional function of this figure as described in l. 3, which contains the following doublet: מֵאִמְרָהּ כִּמְאִמְרַת שָׁמַיִם וְאֵלֶּפֶתוֹנָה כְּרֵעוֹת אֵל: “his word (is) like the word of heaven and his teaching (is) according to the will of God” (cf. 4Q212 1iii.21; 4Q546 2i+3.8).⁵⁸¹ Several scholars have pointed to the didactic and sapiential aspects of frag. 9i as demonstrating the dual identity of this fragment’s protagonist as both priest and sage.⁵⁸² Whatever the precise shape of his sacerdotal and sapiential mission, it is clear, moreover, that this figure does not just serve *during* the eschaton, but is said to actively participate in the events that will usher in the final judgment, a process described using the dualistic language of light and darkness (ll. 3–5). In this respect, his mission appears to take on judicial qualities in addition to cultic and sapiential ones. The idea of a priestly

⁵⁸⁰ The description of Michael’s commission in this passage has led Angel to wonder if “Michael is already portrayed here as a sort of celestial high priest interceding in behalf of all humankind. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 29. As tantalizing as these connections may be, the fragmentary nature of 4Q541 makes it difficult to grasp how significant they are, if at all, for understanding the identity and activity of the figure in frag. 9i. Yet, as we will see in sections 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 below, 4Q541 frag. 9i does make several implicit allusions to the period of the Flood and figures associated therewith (cf. Gen 6–9). It is therefore not beyond the realm of possibility that 4Q541 is making an implicit connection between Michael’s priestly activity and the activity of the eschatological high priest as a part of broader *Urzeit und Endzeit* schema. It should also be noted that Noah’s function is described in priestly terms after the Flood in both 1 Enoch (107:16-17) and, especially, the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 10.13-18). Some possible connections between Noah and this figure, and Noah’s time and this figure’s time, will be discussed further below.

⁵⁸¹ The emphasis on knowledge and instruction in frag. 9i is paralleled in a number of more fragmentary portions of 4Q541 (e.g., 1ii.1; 2i.6, 7, 9; 7.1, 2, 4). Many of those references occur in literary contexts that are too broken to interpret with much certainty. Nevertheless, they do serve to further highlight the particular didactic and sapiential tenor of the composition.

⁵⁸² Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 584; Knibb, “Messianism,” 183; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 80.

judge participating in the events surrounding the eschatological upheaval finds parallel in the Testament of Qahat, wherein Qahat’s descendants collectively render judgment on the wicked. The Aramaic Levi Document, too, presents its priestly protagonist as a judge. These connections will be explored in greater detail in section 6.2.3.

4.5.2 An Interpretative Background

When looking for the interpretative background against which to analyze the identity and mission of the eschatological priest in 4Q541, many commentators have pointed to the plight of the so-called Suffering Servant from Isa 53.⁵⁸³ These scholars have pointed to several verbal and thematic correspondences between 4Q541 and various aspects of Second Isaiah’s Servant Songs—for example, the universal mission and vilification of the protagonist as well as a contrast between light and darkness—in order to establish a connection between the ministry of the Suffering Servant in Isa 53 and that of the eschatological priest in 4Q541.⁵⁸⁴ It is not impossible that 4Q541 drew in part upon Second Isaiah, but the language of light and darkness is a common feature in Qumran Aramaic literature, especially in the compositions containing apocalyptic elements. There is no need to assume that this motif is borrowed from or indebted to the so-called Servant Songs. Moreover, since the opposition faced by the priest in frag. 9 appears to have been primarily verbal

⁵⁸³ So, e.g., Starcky, “Les quatre étapes,” 492; Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 496; Martin Hengel, “Jesus der Messias Israels. Zum Streit über das ‘messianische Sendungsbewusstsein’ Jesu,” in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origin of Christianity*, ed. Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu Stroumsa (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 155–76; Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 93; Hengel with Bailey, “Effective History,” 108–17.

⁵⁸⁴ Brooke’s summary is representative of this basic approach: “All in all, this priest’s activities are not only referred to with some of the phraseology associated with the servant of Isaiah, but his career seems to mirror that of the servant—a universal mission, light against darkness, vilification, violent suffering, sacrifice, benefit for other.” Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?),” 93. This proposal has been critiqued by Collins. However, his alternative proposal, i.e., that the Teacher of Righteousness functions as the inspiration for the plight of 4Q541’s priestly figure, is not entirely persuasive either, especially given Puech’s paleographic dating of the manuscript, 4Q541’s apparent deviation from the typical diarchic pattern of sectarian messianism, and the pre-sectarian provenance of nearly all of the Aramaic literary compositions from Qumran, all which Collins later acknowledges as potential challenges to his theory. Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 584–6; idem, “Conclusions,” 554–5.

in nature, the violent suffering of the Servant in Isa 53 does not seem to be the best analog when attempting to locate a literary backdrop against which to analyze 4Q541.⁵⁸⁵ In my view, 4Q541 frag. 9 is more helpfully illuminated by traditions from the Qumran Aramaic writings, especially those dealing with Noah and the Flood.⁵⁸⁶

Consider first the doublet that 1. 7 uses to describe the generation of the eschatological priest, שקר וחמס “deceit and violence.” These two terms appear individually throughout the Aramaic Scrolls corpus, but they are only linked together in two other Qumran Aramaic writings, the Genesis Apocryphon and Apocalypse of Weeks. In both compositions, these terms describe the generation that was destroyed by the ancient Flood.⁵⁸⁷ The Genesis Apocryphon has Noah describe God as the one “who had compassion on the land, and who removed and obliterated from it all those doing violence and wickedness and deceit (חמסא ורשעא ושקרא), but rescued the righteous man” (1Q20 11.14). The Apocalypse of Weeks, on the other hand, uses the terms “deceit” and “violence” to describe *both* the Flood generation (Week 2) and the generation living at the time of the eschatological judgment (Week 7). Nickelsburg notes the significance of this verbal pair in the Apocalypse of Weeks by showing that the term “violence” “is also used in Gen 6:11 and 13 of the evil that precipitated the flood” and that “deceit and violence” are both “a pithy summary of the false teaching and social sins that characterize the activity of the sinners.”⁵⁸⁸ Moreover, the use of these two terms to characterize the generations of both Week 2 and Week 7 is only one aspect of a broader parallel that the Apocalypse of Weeks intends to draw between the

⁵⁸⁵ The notion that frag. 24 refers to a crucifixion at all, let alone the crucifixion of the priestly figure of frag. 9, has been rightly criticized. Collins, “Asking for Meaning,” 586; Knibb, “Messianism,” 184; Cook, “Fragment 24,” 17.

⁵⁸⁶ To my knowledge, these parallels have been noticed only by Cook, WAC, 539–40 and Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 100, 106. My sense is that these parallels have been largely overlooked due to the fact that most scholarly analyses are preoccupied with the question 4Q541’s relationship to Isa 53 and T. Levi.

⁵⁸⁷ Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 100.

⁵⁸⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 443.

time before the coming eschatological upheaval and the time of the biblical deluge, an event which is referred to in this text as “the first end” in 1 En. 93:4. This motif, however, is not unique to the Apocalypse of Weeks. As Machiela has noted, “An influential contribution of early Jewish exegesis was its strong typological link between the flood and the eschatological judgment,” which “[i]n time...caused each event to be understood in light of the other.”⁵⁸⁹ The Flood most explicitly prefigures the eschatological judgment in Matt 24:37–39 and 2 Pet 3:5–7, but we also see this interpretative tradition elsewhere in 1 Enoch (91:1–10; 18–19), the Sibylline Oracles, and, as Perrin has recently shown, the Book of Giants and Genesis Apocryphon.⁵⁹⁰ The Flood–Last Judgment typology functions on three basic levels, with different texts highlighting one or more of its constituent parts. As Jack Lewis highlighted as early as 1968: “Special attention is given by the sources to the motifs of Noah as the exemplary righteous man, the flood generation as the epitome of wickedness, and to the flood as a figure for God’s punishment.”⁵⁹¹ It seems likely that 4Q541 intends to evoke the wickedness of the Flood generation through its use of the terms “deceit” and “violence,” thereby establishing a connection between the moral character of those living in the days before the final judgment and those living in the days of Noah.

4.5.3 Noah and the Eschatological Priest

If this is indeed the case, we might expect there to be a correspondence between Noah and the eschatological priest of 4Q541. For one thing, we have already noted that the Flood–Last Judgment typology often casts Noah as a paragon of righteousness living in the midst of a wicked

⁵⁸⁹ Daniel A. Machiela, “Flood,” *EDEJ* 646.

⁵⁹⁰ For the NT references, see James L. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997), 120. See also Machiela, “Flood,” 646; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 197–209.

⁵⁹¹ Jack P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 8.

generation. Especially relevant for our purposes is Noah's purported self-description in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 6.1–6): "I was planted for righteousness. All of my days I conducted myself uprightly, continually walking in the paths of everlasting truth." He also reported that he was instructed by "the Holy One" "in the ways of the paths of truth" and was told to avoid "the highway of deceit (שקר), which leads to everlasting darkness." We find in this passage a broken reference to "all the paths of violence (חמס)," just before Noah proclaims again: "I held fast to righteousness and strengthened myself in wisdom." This depiction of Noah bears several striking resemblances to that of the eschatological priest of 4Q541. First, Noah is instructed by God and possesses both righteousness and wisdom. Compare this with the figure in 4Q541, whose "word (is) like the word of heaven," whose "teaching (is) according to the will of God," and who is said to possess wisdom. Second, Noah is described as being instructed to avoid violence, deceit, and darkness, three of the terms that characterize the generation of the eschatological priest in 4Q541.

Consider also the birth of Noah traditions in 1 En. 106–107, 1Q20 2–5, and the so-called Birth of Noah (4Q534–536), in which Noah appears to be presented as a luminous, quasi-divine figure. The first two of these three compositions recount that, when Noah was born, his father Lamech mistakenly took him for one of the watchers, as 1 En. 106:5 reports: "A strange child has been born to me. He is not like men, but (like) the sons of the angels of heaven. His form is strange, not like us. His eyes are like the rays of the sun, and glorious is his face" (cf. 1 En. 106: 2, 10; 1Q20 5.12). Compare this description with that of the priest in 4Q541, of whom it is said: "His eternal sun will shine and his fire will burn in all the ends of the earth, and it will shine upon the darkness until the darkness has departed [fr]om the earth and the mist from the dry land" (9i.3–

5).⁵⁹² Potentially more relevant than the birth of Noah traditions in 1 Enoch and the Genesis Apocryphon is 4Q534–536, the so-called Birth of Noah, in which Noah is given title “The Elect of God” (4Q534 1i.10). For example, like the priestly figure in 4Q541, 4Q534 describes Noah in terms of his intellectual capacities and universal mission, recounting that “he will know the mysteries of men. And his wisdom will reach all people (וְחֹכְמָתָהּ לְכֹל עַמְמֵי תְהֵד)” (1i.8). Also like the priestly figure in 4Q541, Noah is depicted as facing opposition from those to whom he is sent, though “a]ll their plans against him will come to an end (וְכָל חֲשָׁבוֹנֵיהוֹן עָלוּהִי יִסּוּפּוֹ)” (1i.9).

Other linguistic and thematic parallels between 4Q541 9i and the more fragmentary sections of 4Q534–536 invite further comparisons between these two elevated individuals: both are compared favorably to the divine realm or figures associated therewith, both possess “teaching,” and both live through particularly wicked periods of history. Many of these similarities were first noticed by Edward Cook, and led Dorothy Peters to conclude: “Taken together and compared to other Noah interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls, if this personage [that is, the figure in 4Q541 9i] is *not* Noah, he is at least related!”⁵⁹³

Noah’s priestly status and cultic activity in several of the Qumran Aramaic writings may also help to illuminate the writer’s decision to depict the eschatological hero of 4Q541 as carrying out atonement on behalf of his generation. We have already seen the proto-priestly role played by Noah in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 10.13–17) and his association with the sacrificial legislation found in “the law of the priesthood” in Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 10:10). Below,

⁵⁹² As a related aside, note how the Animal Apocalypse describes the Flood: “And water and darkness and mist increased on it (i.e., the land)” (1 En. 89:4). And then consider how it described the retreating flood waters: “And the water began to descend into them (the abysses) until the floor was uncovered and that vessel (the ark) settled onto the floor, and darkness withdrew and it became light” (1 En. 89:8). So, the Animal Apocalypse describes the recession of the flood waters as involving darkness giving way to light, and 4Q541 describes the activity of the priest as the removal of darkness by means of “his eternal sun” and “his fire.”

⁵⁹³ WAC, 539–40; Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 106.

we will also see that Noah appears in a cultic context in a fragmentary portion of the Visions of Amram (4Q547 5.3).

4.5.4 Conclusion

All of these connections do not necessitate the conclusion that the eschatological priest should be viewed as a Noah *redivivus*, nor does it preclude the possibility that the author of 4Q541 also intended to evoke other figures and motifs from Israel's scriptural heritage in constructing an ideal protagonist.⁵⁹⁴ Yet it is likely that the protagonist in frag. 9 is best understood against this Noachic backdrop, given Noah's prominent role in the Qumran Aramaic writings as a prototypical priest, as a recipient and intermediary of divine wisdom, as a luminous figure, and as a participant in the diluvial drama. Scholars have long noted that many apocalyptic writings draw a parallel between the period of the Flood and that of the eschatological upheaval. 4Q541 appears to reflect an awareness of this tendency in its use of the terms "violence" and "deceit" to refer to the immorality of the final generation. The decision on the part of the writer of 4Q541 to present the eschatological hero as a priest and his work as accomplishing atonement may also reflect another tradition found in some of the Flood narratives from the Second Temple period, namely, one in which a priestly figure—Noah or Michael—needs to carry out an act of cultic purification to deal with the polluted state of the earth stemming from the violence perpetuated by the wicked generation of the prediluvian era. Noah traditions from this period would have been one important source for the writer of 4Q541 to mine in constructing such an exalted priestly, sapiential, almost-otherworldly protagonist.

⁵⁹⁴ It may very well be that the author of 4Q541 appropriated traditions related to variety of figures such as Levi, Michael, and/or Melchizedek in order to add texture to eschatological protagonist of frag. 9i. The protagonist of frag. 9i in fact be a composite figure. However, it seems to me that the literary parallel with Noah predominates and offers the most explanatory value.

4.6 Testament of Qahat (4Q542)

This Cave 4 manuscript is the lone representative of a previously unknown composition referred to by most scholars as the Testament of Qahat (4Q542).⁵⁹⁵ The majority of preserved material can be found on frag. 1, which is comprised of one relatively complete column (i) and a second, more fragmentary one (ii).⁵⁹⁶ The fragmentary nature of this manuscript does not allow for any solid conclusions to be made regarding the literary character of the composition as a whole, but the preserved portions recount a series of first-person admonitions in which the speaker addresses a second-person audience. The vast majority of preserved material is addressed to a collective audience, “my sons” (בני), but at one point the speaker addresses a specific figure among this group, “Amram, my son” (עמרם ברי), which indicates that the first-person speaker is Qahat, son of Levi.⁵⁹⁷

4.6.1 Inheritance and the Priesthood

The Testament of Qahat contains a rather sparse amount of priestly material, especially when compared with some of the other compositions discussed in this chapter. In fact, the material related explicitly to the priesthood, cult, or temple in 4Q542 is limited to a solitary reference to

⁵⁹⁵ For the *editio princeps* of 4Q542, see DJD XXXI, 257–82. Puech also published a preliminary edition of 4Q542 in Émile Puech, “Le Testament de Qahat en araméen de la grotte 4 (4QTQah),” *RevQ* 15 (1991): 23–54. For other treatments of the text of 4Q542, see J. T. Milik, “4QVisions of ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97; Edward M. Cook, “Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 205–19; André Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté du sacerdoce: Remarques sur le *Testament de Qahat* (4Q542),” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*, ed. Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gittin, and Michael Sokoloff (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 39–44. Other important discussions of the *Testament of Qahat* include: Drawnel, “Literary Form”; Tervanotko, “Trilogy of Testaments.”

⁵⁹⁶ The original editor, Jean Starcky, also identified two other small fragments as belonging to this manuscript, but they are not well-preserved, and it is unclear whether they should precede or follow frag. 1. So Drawnel, “Literary Form,” 55–6; Cook, “Remarks,” 205.

⁵⁹⁷ Stone, “Axis of History,” 135; Drawnel, “Literary Form,” 55; Tervanotko, “Trilogy of Testaments,” 41.

“the priesthood” (כה[ו]נתא) at the end of frag. 1i. This reference to the priesthood occurs in a context in which Qahat predicts that his sons will “keep” (נטר) and “carry on” (*haph.* of הלך)⁵⁹⁸ their “inheritance” (ירוה[תא]), which is characterized as “truth, and justice, and uprightness, and perfection, and puri[ty, and ho]lines, and the priest[ho]od” (1i.12–13).⁵⁹⁹ By keeping and passing on this inheritance, Qahat’s sons, the narrator tells us, will be bringing a “good name” to Qahat, “joy to Levi and gladness to J[a]cob and rejoicing to Isaac and honor to Abraham” (1i.10–11).⁶⁰⁰

First, the priesthood is here listed as one of seven other terms that comprise the inheritance of Qahat’s sons. None of these terms is clearly defined, nor is their relationship to one another laid out with any specificity. Most of them are related to proper behavior.⁶⁰¹ The appearance of “priesthood” in this list seem to be somewhat out of place, since it most naturally refers to an institution, not a way of behaving. It is possible, however, that we should understand כה[ו]נתא as “priestliness” or “a priestly manner of behaving,” given its association with words so clearly related to proper behavior. It is worth noting, though, that the terms in this list do not simply connote right action, but are closely connected to knowledge throughout the Aramaic Scrolls corpus. For example, קשט “truth” is often juxtaposed with חכמה “wisdom” (e.g., 1Q20 6.4; 19.25;

⁵⁹⁸ For this understanding of the *haph.* of הלך, see Cook, “Remarks,” 211-212; Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 66.

⁵⁹⁹ Here, seven different terms are used to describe the inheritance that Qahat is transmitting to his children. See Chapter 6 for a discussion of the significance of the number seven in various contexts throughout the Qumran Aramaic collection.

⁶⁰⁰ In two other texts from the Qumran Aramaic collection, a person’s behavior causes the “name” of their family members to be exalted or besmirched, respectively (4Q541 24ii.5; 4Q213a 3–4.6).

⁶⁰¹ An interesting discussion of these terms in the context of ancient virtue ethics will be published in a forthcoming article. Elisa Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue: Ancestral Inheritance in the Testament of Qahat,” *BI* (2020) (In press). Her work makes a significant contribution not only to research on the Testament of Qahat, but on ancient virtue ethics more broadly. I thank Dr. Uusimäki for sharing a pre-published version of her article with me.

ALD 13:3–5). This convergence of ethics and knowledge is characteristic of the Testament of Qahat, and of the Aramaic Scrolls as a corpus.⁶⁰²

Second, the “inheritance,” presumably including the priesthood, originates with the “ancestors” (אבות) of Qahat’s sons: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, and Qahat (1i.12),⁶⁰³ but Qahat, as the first-person narrator, is the *direct* source of his sons’ knowledge. Qahat functions as his sons’ instructor.⁶⁰⁴ The Testament of Qahat is describing what Dimant has termed a “chain of transmission,”⁶⁰⁵ a phrase which describes a process whereby knowledge that originates with one of the Israelite patriarchs is passed on from father to son in each successive generation.⁶⁰⁶ It is clear that the transmission process at least in col. 1i involves all of Qahat’s sons, but col. 1ii narrows the scope of Qahat’s instruction: “Now, to you, Amram, my son, I comma[nd ...] and [to] your [son]s I command [...] and they have given to Levi, my father, and which Levi, my father, has gi[ven] to me” (ll. 9–11). Unlike in col. 1i, Qahat singles out his son Amram and Amram’s sons for special instruction, which involves not only oral instruction, but the transmission of “all my writings” (כול כתבי) (1ii.12).

⁶⁰² See, e.g., what Drawnel observes concerning this phenomenon in the Testament of Qahat and the Aramaic Levi Document: “Similarly to the *Admonitions* [i.e. 4Q542], Levi’s exhortations in the poem [in the Aramaic Levi Document] do not refer to the intellectual process only, but stress the necessity of acting according to the principles of truth (קושטא) and justice (צדקה; *A.L.D.* 85), two terms used together in Qahat’s exhortations as well.” Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 67.

⁶⁰³ See Puech, DJD XXXI, 273, who notes that ll. 7–8 and 11–12 make it clear that “your ancestors” refers to these specific figures.

⁶⁰⁴ “Qahat presents himself as a tutor who instructs his students, as the use of the verb פקד (Pael, ll. 9 and 10) indicates.” Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 60. The theme of father-son instruction also occurs in 1 Enoch, Testament of Jacob?, Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram, Tobit.

⁶⁰⁵ Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 34–35.

⁶⁰⁶ Dimant notes that the transmission process often involves written materials being handed down (see 4Q542 1ii.12). For others who note that the Testament of Qahat depicts a transmission process whereby knowledge is passed down along genealogical lines from Abraham to Qahat, see Milik, “4QVisions of ‘Amram,” 97; DJD XXXI, 274; Stone, “Axis of History,” 136; Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 65–66.

Third, the term “inheritance” appears earlier in 4Q542 in a parallel construction with the roughly synonymous term אַחְסָנוּ (“heritage” or “inheritance”) (1i.5–6).⁶⁰⁷ In this passage, Qahat instructs his children not to give their inheritance to foreigners (נְבִרְאִין) nor their heritage to people of mixed ancestry (כִּילְאִין).⁶⁰⁸ Qahat presents the consequences of sharing the inheritance with these people as particularly disastrous: “you become low and foolish in their eyes and they despise you; for they will become foreigners to you and they will be rulers over you” (1i.6–7). A number of scholars have seen in this passage a warning regarding the dangers of intermarriage, a conclusion which would be consistent with the command in the next line to “be holy and pure from all intermixture (עַרְבָרוּב)” and would cohere with broader preoccupation with endogamy in the Aramaic Scrolls corpus. This passage does seem to allude to marital practices. However, a full understanding of what it means to “give your inheritance (ירוֹתֶכֶון) to foreigners” must account for the use of the term “inheritance” in 1i.12, in which it is described as something that is passed down from generation to generation, from father to son.⁶⁰⁹ It may be that the author is suggesting that intermarriage is not prohibited for reasons of purity alone, but also because it disturbs the proper familial channels of knowledge-transmission. Intermarriage allows outsiders to gain access to knowledge that they could use to subjugate the sons of Qahat and their future generations (so 4Q542 1i.6–7).

The Testament of Qahat contains very little explicit information about the priesthood. There are no extant portions that describe the ordination of priests, elaborate sacrificial or ritual

⁶⁰⁷ Puech interprets this term as “richesses, possessions, trésors, biens.” See DJD XXXI, 273. However, see Cook’s comment that “the meaning ‘inheritance’ for this noun is well established.” Cook, “Remarks,” 209.

⁶⁰⁸ For more on this term, see section 4.6.2 below.

⁶⁰⁹ Cook, “Remarks,” 211–2; Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 65.

procedure, or the physical features of a temple or shrine. There can also be no facile equation of “inheritance” with “the priesthood.”⁶¹⁰ The priesthood is but one aspect of the inheritance that is entrusted to the sons of Qahat.⁶¹¹ However, it is significant to note that the priesthood—among other things—is entrusted to all of Qahat’s sons, even though Amram and his sons are later singled out for special instruction. The Testament of Qahat depicts the priesthood as something that must be carefully guarded and passed down through the proper channels, i.e., the generations of the Israelite patriarchal and priestly lines, but it does not spell out what it means for Qahat’s sons to be entrusted with the priesthood. There is no enumeration of their particular responsibilities vis-à-vis the Israelite cult. It is worth mentioning briefly what we can say about Qahat’s sons. We have already seen that the Testament of Qahat depicts them as being entrusted with their father’s writings, as stewards of ancestral book lore. Qahat’s sons thus bear a striking similarity to Abraham as described in the Genesis Apocryphon and the Aramaic Levi Document, who is in possession of the Book of the Words of Enoch in the former (1Q20 19.25) and the Writing of the Book of Noah in the latter (ALD 10:10). Qahat’s sons are also presented as the recipients of “eternal blessings” (ברכת עלמא; 4Q542 1ii.3), inviting a comparison with the Aramaic Levi Document and the Visions of Amram, which highlight the eternal longevity of Levi’s and Aaron’s descendants, respectively.

⁶¹⁰ Puech has argued that the Testament of Qahat contains “la plus ancienne attestation d’ordonnances cultuelles rattachées à Abraham et Jacob, reprises par Lévi et Qahat, que doit respecter le sacerdoce.” DJD XXXI, 274. Puech may be correct to suggest that the Testament of Qahat traces cultic knowledge back to the Israelite patriarchs. However, it is not clear how much of the patriarchal inheritance has to do with the sacrificial cult. Too many scholars simply conflate the “inheritance” with the “priesthood” or cultic procedure. See Cook, “Remarks,” 207, 212; Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 40; Stone, “Axis of History,” 136. Perrin’s circumspect language is more helpful: “While Qahat does not specify the topics disclosed—at least not in the available text—given the priestly tone of the work, it is conceivable that the inheritance of knowledge passed down from Levi to Qahat to Amram included cultic knowledge of some description.” Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 33–34. Drawnel has plausibly argued that the “inheritance” may include information about the “exemplary life of the patriarchs” based on the Testament of Qahat’s use of moralistic language as well as its naming on specific patriarchs. This information would function to give the children of Qahat an example to imitate, much like the exemplary role that Joseph’s life plays in the wisdom poem of the Aramaic Levi Document. Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 66, 67.

⁶¹¹ “Thus the process of keeping and forwarding patriarchal inheritance consists in living an exemplary moral life where priesthood is one of the elements stresses by Qahat.” Drawnel, “Form and Content,” 66.

Finally, Qahat's sons are prominent characters in the eschatological drama. They are entrusted with judicial responsibilities (ותקומון למדן דין; 4Q542 1ii.5), and a participatory role in the coming destruction of the “all sinners of eternity” (כול חיבי עלמין; 4Q542 1ii.6) and the “all [the] children of evil” (כול בני רשע]א; 4Q542 1ii.8). The other clearest example of a priestly judge is Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, but the Apocryphon of Levi^b? also alludes to the judicial role of its priestly protagonist.

4.6.2 Priestly Language

The use of priestly language in the Testament of Qahat may serve as further evidence of its interest in the priesthood, despite its lack of explicit references to it. Scholars have pointed to three specific instances of priestly language in this composition. Berthelot has suggested that the opening line of col. 1 contains a “rewording of the sacerdotal blessing” from Num 6:22–27, comparing the phrase עליכון נהירה וינהר in 4Q542 1i.1 to יאר יהוה פניו אליך in Num 6:25.⁶¹² The parallel is not exact, but it is at least possible that the author of the Testament of Qahat intended to evoke the priestly blessing in 4Q542 1i.1. Second, Caquot has argued that the phrase “his great name” (שמה רבא) in 1i.1 is a veiled reference to the Tetragrammaton, “que le grand prêtre doit articuler sur les victims de Kippur.”⁶¹³ This proposal, however, is quite uncertain. Finally, and most significantly, the Testament of Qahat contains a high concentration of language related to purity and holiness, and alludes to priestly language and concepts in its condemnation of sexual

⁶¹² Katell Berthelot, “References to Biblical Texts in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. K. Berthelot and D.S. Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 183–203, esp. 188. Cf. Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 39–40; idem, “Les testaments qumrâniens des pères du sacerdoce,” *RHPR* 78 (1998): 3–26, 17; DJD XXXI, 272.

⁶¹³ Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 40.

intermixture. Explicit use of holiness and purity language can be found in two places in the extant manuscript (4Q542 1i.8–9; 1i.13). In 4Q542 1i.8–9, Qahat commands all of his children to “be holy and pure from all intermixture (ער[ברוב]).”⁶¹⁴ Context suggests that this command has to do with assimilatory behavior, specifically improper marriage.

The verbal form on which the nominal ערבֵרוּב is based denotes the act of mixing or mingling. For example, the verb ערב is used to describe the mixing of sacrificial meat on the altar in New Jerusalem. The noun ערבֵרוּב is also used in the Targumic literature as a gloss for various terms that refer to mixed entities.⁶¹⁵ The notion of illicit mixing is evident a few lines earlier, when Qahat implores his sons not to “(give) their heritage to כִּילַאִין” (1i.5–6). As Cook recognized, the term כִּילַאִין is most likely “an Aramaicization of בְּלֵאִים, a technical term in the Pentateuch (Lev. 19:19, Deut. 22:9) for things of mixed origin.”⁶¹⁶ In the context of 4Q542, כִּילַאִין is placed in a parallel construction with נְכַרְאִין (“foreigners”), and is clearly used to denigrate people of mixed ancestry.⁶¹⁷ The Testament of Qahat appears to equate purity and holiness with the avoidance of illicit marriages, specifically marriages that could be characterized as mixed. What is less clear,

⁶¹⁴ On the reasons for preferring this reading to that of Puech’s initial reading, see Cook, “Remarks,” 210-211. Puech accepted Cook’s reading in DJD XXXI (see the discussion on pp. 274–75, which includes a list of those who endorse a reading similar to that of Puech’s initial reading).

⁶¹⁵ Cook, “Remarks,” 211.

⁶¹⁶ Cook, “Remarks,” 209. Cf. Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 40–41; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 338; idem, “Form and Content,” 69–70. Puech initially understood this word in light of Isa 32:5, 7, translating it as “escrocs” (that is, “scoundrel”). Puech revised his position in DJD XXXI, now translating כִּילַאִין as “bâtards, hybrids, assimilés” (pp. 273–74). Despite the work of Cook, Caquot, and Puech, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel retain the translation “scoundrel” on the basis of the proposed verbal link with Isa 32:5, 7. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 105, 211.

⁶¹⁷ The same parallel construction of נְכַרְאִין and כִּילַאִין appears in the Aramaic Levi Document as well. See DJD XXXI, 273; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 338; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 211. The presence of this unique parallel construction in both writings is further evidence for some type of literary relationship between them.

however, is precisely what kind of mixed marriage the author has in mind: Jew and Gentile, priest and non-priest, or priest and Gentile. The most we can say is that the Testament of Qahat is speaking against improper “mixing,” and, like many of the Aramaic Scrolls, is vehement in its rejection of exogamy. What is most important to note is that the Testament of Qahat uses priestly language in order to articulate its position on marriage. Not only does 4Q542 deploy the language of purity and holiness, but it also twice uses the priestly concept of illicit “mixing” (ערברוב; כילאיז) in order to devalue exogamous marriages. We will say more about the function and significance of the emphasis on marriage and endogamy in the Aramaic Scrolls in section 6.2.5.

4.6.3 The Elevation of Qahat

Qahat is not a noteworthy figure in the Hebrew scriptures, appearing only in a few genealogical lists (Gen 46:11; Exod 6:16; Num 3:17–19; 1 Chr 6:1, 16–18).⁶¹⁸ He is presented as Levi’s second son, in between Gershon and Merari, and as the father of Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel. Notably, we do not learn the name of Qahat’s wife in the Hebrew scriptures, despite learning the names of the wives of both Amram and Aaron (Exod 6:20, 23). Qahat is also presented in the Hebrew scriptures as the eponymous ancestor of one of the three divisions of Levites, each of which was named for one of the sons of Levi (Kohathites, Gershonites, Merarites). The Hebrew scriptures describes the particular cultic duties of the Kohathites on a number of occasions; these primarily involve stewardship of the holiest pieces of temple furniture (Num 3:31; 4:4–14; 10:21) and preparation of the showbread each Sabbath (1 Chr 9:32). Second Temple tradition largely confirms this picture of Qahat, but it does not expand his role and status all that much. In fact,

⁶¹⁸ For a helpful summary of the references to Qahat in the Hebrew Bible and in Second Temple tradition, see Tervanotko, “Trilogy of Testaments,” 50–55.

there is a relative dearth of ancient Jewish Qahat traditions outside of the Aramaic Scrolls. These writings, however, take an increased interest in Qahat as an integral member of various genealogies, stressing his connection not only to the Levitical clan, but also, through his father Levi, to the patriarchal triad of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (4Q245 1i.5; 4Q542 1i.7–11; 1ii.9–12; 4Q545 1ai.1; 4Q559 3.2–3). Qahat is also the recipient of the high priesthood in the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 11:6; cf. 4Q245 1i.5). More will be said about Qahat and his relation to the patriarchal and Levitical genealogy in section 6.2.6. At this point, it is enough to note that, given Qahat's otherwise low profile in both biblical and Second Temple literature, it seems likely that the decision to cast him as the protagonist and first-person narrator of the Testament of Qahat functioned, at least in part, as a way of legitimizing the priesthood and its connection to this particular genealogical tradition.

4.6.4 Conclusion

The Testament of Qahat contains far less priestly material than the Aramaic Levi Document and the Visions of Amram. However, it reflects a priestly worldview inasmuch as it depicts the priesthood as having been passed on to Qahat's children via Israel's patriarchs, uses priestly language in its condemnation of mixed marriages, and elevates the otherwise-obscure Qahat to a place of prominence. The Testament of Qahat also emphasizes the genealogical connection between Israel's patriarchs (Abraham-Isaac-Jacob) and the members of the Levitical-priestly line (Levi-Qahat-Amram-Aaron). This particular genealogical tradition plays a significant role in the Aramaic Levi Document, the Visions of Amram, and Biblical Chronology, as we will see in section 6.2.7.

4.7 Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)

Five copies of a previously unknown composition were found among the Cave Four manuscripts (4Q543–547).⁶¹⁹ This text has been referred to as the Visions of Amram, which is an abbreviation of the text’s own superscription: “אָפּ קאָפּי פֿון דעם בוך פֿון דעם זען פֿון אַמראַם, דעם זון פֿון קאַהאַט, דעם זון פֿון לעווי” (4Q543 1a–c.1; 4Q545 1.1). The superscription continues by describing its content as “אַל דאָס וואָס ער האָט אָנגעזאָגט זײַנע קינדער און (אַל) וואָס ער האָט זיי געלערנט” (4Q543 1a–c.1-2; 4Q545 1ai.1–2). Amram’s instruction is said to have taken place “אָפּ דעם טאָג [פֿון זײַן טויט]” (4Q543 1a–c.2 // 4Q545 1ai.2), and is dated in reference to the length of Israel’s exile in Egypt (4Q543 1a–c.4 // 4Q545 1ai.4). Despite the pedagogical focus of the superscription, however, the majority of the extant portions of the Visions of Amram relate a series of first-person narrative vignettes from the life of Amram, none of which are based on events found in the Hebrew Bible.⁶²⁰

The basic narrative outline of the Visions of Amram can be reconstructed, although the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts must be acknowledged. After the superscription, the composition begins with an account of the marriage of Amram’s daughter Miriam to his brother Uzziel, which Amram takes an active role in arranging. This passage bears striking resemblances to Levi’s arrangement of the marriages his children in the Aramaic Levi Document and Noah’s arrangement of the marriages of his children in the Genesis Apocryphon. The wedding is then followed by a seven-day celebration (4Q543 1a–c.4–7 // 4Q545 1ai.4–7). When the celebration

⁶¹⁹ Besides the *editio princeps* in DJD XXXI, Duke has published a new edition and interpretation of the extant manuscripts. Robert R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543-547)*, StBibLit 135 (New York: Peter Lang, 2010).

⁶²⁰ The amount of preserved admonitory or instructional material is minimal compared to that of the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat, two other closely related compositions.

concludes, Amram summons his son Aaron, and commands Aaron to fetch his brother Mal'akyah (מלאכיה), which is likely Moses' Hebrew name (4Q545 1i.7-9), at which point Amram addresses Mal'akyah (or, Moses) directly.⁶²¹ This discourse is followed by a narrative in which a delegation of Israelites, led by Amram, travels from Egypt to Canaan in order to bury some of their ancestors. When they arrive at the burial site, they receive word of an impending military conflict between Egypt and Canaan. This news prompts most of the delegation to return to Egypt, with Amram remaining behind in order to complete the task at hand. However, a border closure prompted by the conflict forces Amram to remain in Canaan, apart from his wife (and aunt) Jochebed for forty-one years. Amram states that he remained faithful to Jochebed, and did not take another wife from among the Canaanites (4Q543 3-4; 4Q545 1a-bii.9-19; 4Q546 2; 4Q547 1-2). This passage, like the account of Uzziel and Miriam's union, highlights the importance of endogamy for the author of the Visions of Amram. This passage also presents the responsibility to properly bury one's ancestors as a fundamental religious obligation. During Amram's time in Canaan, the Visions of Amram reports that he experienced a dream-vision, referred to in the text as חזוה די חלמא "the vision of the dream" (4Q544 1.10). The entirety of the dream-vision cannot be reconstructed with absolute certainty, but we can say that it begins with Amram encountering two otherworldly beings (4Q543 5-9; 4Q544 1.10-15; 2.11-16), contains some material related to the future of his children, Moses and Aaron (4Q545 4), recounts some information regarding various sacrifices (4Q547 5; 6;

⁶²¹ Robert R. Duke, "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the *Visions of Amram*." *DSD* 14 (2007): 34-48. This section of the manuscript is quite broken, but we do learn that Moses is the recipient of "wisdom" (חכמה) and that he is considered "a messenger of God" (מלאך אל). There are also several other suggestive references, e.g.: "your word" (ממרד), "eternal generations" (דרי עלמנין), "strong judgment" (דין חסין), "your name" (שמך), and "you will do in this land" (תעבד בארעא דא).

8), and ends with the elevation of his son Aaron to the priesthood (4Q547 9). Amram’s dream-vision will be the primary focus of the rest of this section.

4.7.1 Priestly Material in Amram’s Dream-Vision⁶²²

Like the Testament of Qahat (4Q542), there are very few preserved references to the priesthood, cult, or temple in the Visions of Amram, and Amram himself is never explicitly referred to as a priest in the extant manuscripts. The handful of clear allusions to the priesthood and cult occur in the context of Amram’s dream-vision. There, Amram is informed by Melechizedek, his *angelus interpretis*⁶²³ about the glorious future and priestly service of his son Aaron, as well as the perpetual priesthood of Aaron’s offspring (4Q545 4.15–19; 4Q547 9.6–7).⁶²⁴ The dream-vision also contains a few fragmentary allusions to sacrificial activity, some of which appear to be associated with heroes of Israel’s past, such as Noah and Levi (4Q547 5.3; 8.2; cf. 4Q547 9.5). Finally, a number of scholars have understood the appearance of Melchizedek in Amram’s dream-vision in light of various Second Temple traditions that represent Melchizedek as an otherworldly and/or eschatological high priest.⁶²⁵ The relevant passages are cited in full below, with the two larger, better-preserved fragments coming first:

4Q545 frag. 4

14. that you hea]rd, and I will explain to you your name[s]

⁶²² For a more detailed discussion of the priestly material in the Visions of Amram, see my recent article “Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of Its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem,” *DSD* 27 (2020): 1–30.

⁶²³ Melechizedek is admittedly never mentioned by name in the Visions of Amram, but there is good reason for understanding him to be Amram’s *angelus interpretis*. On the identity of the *angelus interpretis*, see Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 5–6 n. 18. Cf., e.g., J. T. Milik, “Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144; Paul Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, CBQMS 10 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 27.

⁶²⁴ In the extant manuscripts, Amram himself is never explicitly identified as priest or with the priesthood, nor does he carry out any cultic duties, though the fragmentary nature of the composition must be kept in mind.

⁶²⁵ Blake A. Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543-547),” *JSP* 24 (2014): 3–42 33–42; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 166–70.

15. that]is written in the land for him, Moses. And also concerning A[aron (or: the other)
16. [I will] explain to you the mystery of his service. A holy priest is he [
17. All his offspring will be ho[l]y to him in all generations of et[ernity
18. He will be called the seventh among the men of [his (i.e., God's)] favour. And it will be said[
19. He will be chosen as an eternal priest[

14. [די תשמ]ע ואחזה לכה שמח[ת]ך]
15. [די]כתב בארעא לה מושה ואף על א
16. [א]חזה לכה רז עובדה כהן קדיש הוא]
17. קד[י]ש להוה לה כל זרעה בכול דרי ע[למין
18. שביעי באנוש רעות[ה ית]קרה ויתאמר]
19. יתבחר לכה עלמין]

4Q547 frag. 9

2.]I delivered[
3.]h built[
4.]on Mount Sinai yts[
5.]great [...]rkh upon the altar of bron[ze
6.]rh a priest will be raised up from all the children of the age/world/eternity b'h[
7.]yh and his sons after him for all the generations of eternity in ri[ghteousness
8.]And I awoke from the sleep of my eyes. And [I] wrote the vision[
9.]from the land of Canaan. And it was for me as he said[

2.]פצית[
3.]ה בנה [
4.]בהר סיני יצ[
5.]לכה רבא על מדבח נחש[א
6.]רה יתרס כהן מן כול בני עלמא באח[
7.]יח ובנוהי בתרה לכול דרי עלמין בקו[שט(א)
8.]ואנה אתעירת מן שנת עיני וחזוא כתב[ת
9.]מן ארעכנען והוא לי כדי אמר[

4Q547 frag. 5

1. his [of]fering (or: and his leader)
2. what was/he] offered like this
3. af]ter him Noah

1.]()ק[ורבנה
2. די (מ/ת)]קרב כדן

4Q547 frag. 8

2.]A[1]l that Levi his son offered o[n the altar
 3. that] I [s]aid to you, “Upon [the] altar of stones[
 4a.]it/he will be[
 4. A]ll the offerings[

- כָּו]ל די קרב לוי ברה ע]ל מדבחה 2.
 די א]מרת לכה על מדבח]א א [די אבני]א 3.
]להוא[4a.
 כ]ול קורבנא] 4.

4.7.2 Aaron’s Priesthood

The first thing to note about these fragments is the prominent role played by Aaron.⁶²⁶ We first encounter him in the context of a predictive speech delivered by Melchizedek to Amram about the future of his two sons, in which Aaron is twice identified as a priest.⁶²⁷ Line 16 refers to him as כֹּהֵן קָדִישׁ “a holy priest,” and l. 19 notes that יִתְבַּחַר לְכֹהֵן עֲלָמִין “he will be chosen as an eternal priest.” Aaron’s priestly status is also foretold towards the end of Amram’s dream-vision, where we read: יִתְרָם כֹּהֵן מִן כּוֹל בְּנֵי עֲלָמָא “a priest will be raised up from all the children of the

⁶²⁶ One other passage is often associated with Aaron in the secondary literature, i.e., 4Q543 2a–b.1–7 // 4Q545 1ai.14–19. See e.g., J. T. Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–99; DJD XXXI, 295–96, 334–37; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 187; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 55. However, as Duke has persuasively shown, this passage does not describe Aaron, but Moses. Duke, “Moses’ Hebrew Name,” 43; Cf. Jurgens, “Reassessing,” 17 n. 32.

⁶²⁷ The name Moses is found in l. 15. Admittedly, the name Aaron is not extant in the preserved fragment, but, as Puech has noted, context suggests that this passage recounts a scenario in which Amram is being informed by his heavenly interlocuter about the future of “ses deux fils, Moïse et Aaron” as well as “leurs missions respectives.” DJD XXXI, 343. Cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 163.

age/world/eternity” (4Q547 9.6).⁶²⁸ Aaron’s priestly status in the Visions of Amram is of course consistent with his portrayal in the Hebrew scriptures, though the language used here goes beyond that of the scriptural texts, and in doing so implicitly brings the priesthood of Aaron into close association with the priestly offices of Levi and Melchizedek.⁶²⁹ In the case of the former, the language used to describe Aaron in these fragments parallels that which is used of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document (cf. esp. ALD 6:5). As Perrin has noted, “Both Levi and Aaron are called ‘a holy priest,’ whose progeny will extend ‘for all the generations of eternity’ as part of an ‘elected’ or ‘chosen’ priestly office.”⁶³⁰ With regard to the latter, the phrase “eternal priest” (לְכֹהֵן עֲלָמִין) in 4Q545 4.19 appears to be an allusion to Ps 110:4, in which the psalmist says of the addressee: “You are a priest forever (כֹּהֵן לְעוֹלָם) according to the order of Melchizedek.” The allusion to the priesthood of Melchizedek in 4Q545 4.19 is even more likely given Melchizedek’s role as Amram’s *angelus interpres* throughout the dream-vision.

The means by which Amram learns of his son’s future is significant as well, inasmuch as having an *angelus interpres* reveal this information in a dream-vision allows the author of the Visions of Amram to present Aaron’s priesthood as a matter of divine revelation. This idea is reinforced by the use of phrase רֵז עוֹבְדָה “the mystery of his (i.e., Aaron’s) service” in l. 16 of 4Q545 9. It is uncertain whether this reference to Aaron’s “service” refers to his priestly office in general or his cultic activity in particular, since the Hebrew equivalent carries both meanings in

⁶²⁸ As my translations suggests, the phrase כֹּהֵן בְּנֵי עֲלָמָא is quite difficult to render. It is clear that Aaron is being described in relation to some collective entity, but what kind? Is it a heavenly body, as Puech’s translation seems to suggest (“les fils d’éternité”)? Or, should we understand this group as Duke and Cook have (“all the sons of the world” or “all the children of the [present] age,” respectively)? DJD XXXI, 389; Duke, *Social Location*, 25; DQA, 38.

⁶²⁹ For more on this point, see Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 22. Cf. Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 165–70.

⁶³⁰ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 165.

the scriptural text,⁶³¹ but the association of the noun ܪܘܢ with divine revelation is clear, especially given its consistency of meaning throughout the Aramaic Scrolls.⁶³² The noun ܪܘܢ, typically translated “mystery,” pervades the Qumran Aramaic writings. While the precise content of each “mystery” varies from text to text (e.g., knowledge about the movements of the luminaries or the eschatological future), the word ܪܘܢ “occurs almost exclusively in contexts that deal with the divine disclosure of special knowledge to elevated individuals, such as Enoch, Noah, and Daniel (e.g., 1Q20 14:15–17; 1 En. 103:2; Dan 2:19).”⁶³³ By associating the priesthood of Aaron with the ܪܘܢ, the Visions of Amram depicts it “as one of the heavenly mysteries, revealed by an angelic mediator to an elevated Israelite hero, in this case, Amram.”⁶³⁴

4.7.3 The Priestly Genealogy

These fragments also indicate that the issue of genealogy and lineage play an important role in the author’s conception of the priesthood. Two aspects of the author’s depiction of Aaron in particular suggest that the Visions of Amram presents him as both the culmination of a line of cultic functionaries and a father of an eternal line of priests. First, 4Q545 4.18 refers to Aaron as ܫܒܥܝܢ ܪܘܢܝܢ ܕܥܘܠܝܢ “the seventh of the men of [his (i.e., God’s)] favor.” This phrase almost

⁶³¹ See, e.g., Num 18, in which it functions in both senses. Cf. Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 17–18.

⁶³² On the particular significance of ܪܘܢ in the Aramaic Scrolls, see Samuel I. Thomas, *The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, EJL 25 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 241–44; Hanna Tervanotko, “Speaking in Dreams: The Figure of Miriam and Prophecy,” in *Prophets Male and Female: Gender and Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Ancient Near East*, ed. Jonathan Stökl and Corrine L. Carvalho, AIL 15 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 147–67.

⁶³³ Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 18.

⁶³⁴ Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 18. We should note that, though Amram himself is not explicitly characterized as priest in the extant portions of the manuscript tradition, he is here counted worthy to be entrusted with the divine mysteries, which ranks him among the many protagonists of the Aramaic Scrolls, both priestly and non-priestly, who have been granted access to them by angelic or otherwise revelatory means (e.g., Enoch, Abraham, Noah, Levi).

certainly alludes to a genealogical list, and both Puech and Perrin have rightly proposed that its seven members should be identified as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Qahat, Amram, and Aaron.⁶³⁵ Much like the Testament of Qahat (4Q542), we can see here the Visions of Amram conflating the patriarchal and Levitical-priestly genealogies in order to create a single lineage that runs from the prototypical Israelite to the prototypical priest. The Visions of Amram also depicts Aaron as a priestly progenitor, the father of an eternal line of priests. This perspective is seen most explicitly in 4Q545 4.17, in which Melchizedek says of Aaron: קד[ו]ש[ו]ן להוה לה כל זרעה בכול דרי ע[ל]מין “All his offspring will be ho[l]y to him in all the generations of eternity.”⁶³⁶ This phrase speaks to the perpetual endurance of *all* of Aaron’s descendants, and suggests that the author of the Visions of Amram imagines the Israelite priesthood as an eternally valid institution rooted in the Aaronide lineage of its members. The phrase “all the generations of eternity” (πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων) appears in a similar context in the Aramaic Levi Document, in which Levi is told that all his children will serve as priests (ALD 10:2), which, as we have noted, is taken by Perrin as an indication of the attempt on the part of the author of the Visions of Amram to represent “the priestly line such that Aaron is described in terms strongly reminiscent of Levi.”⁶³⁷

4.7.4 Cultic Activity

Amram’s dream-vision also contain several allusions to cultic activity, all of which involve Aaron’s forebears. The first, and most damaged, of these fragments involves Noah (4Q547 5). We

⁶³⁵ DJD XXXI, 343; Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 164. Beyer, however, has identified the members of this list as Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Aaron. Beyer, ATTM, 213. It is unclear, though, as Perrin has pointed out, “why Amram would be left out of the genealogical chain in a text that focuses on his life and times.” Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 164 n. 16.

⁶³⁶ Cf. 4Q547 9.7: ובנוהי בתרה לכול דרי עלמין “and his sons after him [i.e., Aaron] for all the generations of eternity”

⁶³⁷ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision*, 165. For more on the significance of this phrase in the Aramaic Scrolls, see my discussion in Chapter 6 below.

have already seen that Noah plays a cultic role in several of the Aramaic Scrolls (i.e., the Genesis Apocryphon and Aramaic Levi Document), but his cultic role in the Visions of Amram is much more difficult, if not impossible, to discern. However, the presence of the verb קרב in l. 2 is suggestive of a sacrificial context. The same verb appears a few fragments later in a description of Levi's sacrificial activity (4Q547 8). Though also badly damaged, the content of this fragment is somewhat clearer. Levi is identified as לוי ברה "his son Levi" (l. 2), which indicates that the preceding lines involved some sort of reference to or description of his father Jacob. The sacrificial context of this fragment is also evident, given the appearance of the phrase על מדבח[א] די אבנ[א] "upon [the] altar of stones[" in l. 3. Stone altars are quite rare in both the Hebrew scriptures and the Qumran scrolls, appearing only in Exod 20:25; Deut 27:5; and Josh 8:31.⁶³⁸ In each of these cases, stone altars were reported to have functioned on an ad hoc basis "as a way of commemorating specific events, and were not associated with a particular site or permanent shrine."⁶³⁹ This type of altar can be contrasted with the bronze altar (מדבח נחש[א]) with which Aaron is associated in the culminating scene of Amram's dream-vision (4Q547 9.5). Unlike stone altars, the bronze altar appears fairly frequently in the Hebrew scriptures and Qumran scrolls, and always in descriptions of Israel's formal, central cultic institutions, namely, the wilderness tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple.⁶⁴⁰ The particular scenario in which the reference to the bronze altar occurs in 4Q547 9 is difficult to discern, though it has plausibly been identified as an

⁶³⁸ Jones, "Priesthood and Cult," 14.

⁶³⁹ Jones, "Priesthood and Cult," 14.

⁶⁴⁰ See e.g., Exod 38:30; 39:39; 1 Kgs 8:64; 2 Kgs 16:14, 15; 2 Chr 1:5, 6; 7:7; Ezek 9:2; 11Q19 3:14–17; 11Q21 1:1–3. Puech notes that "dans cette ligne, il est question de l'autel de bronze (Ex 27:1-8 et 38:1-7, voir 1 R 8:64 et 2 R 16:14-15) que l'on dispose devant la Tente pour les holocaustes, lors des déplacements successifs de l'Exode, avant son emplacement au Temple et son déplacement ensuite. Les *Visions de 'Amram* sont antérieures à la composition du *Rouleau du Temple* et n'ont rien d'esséno-qumranien, même si ce dernier, 11RT III 14-16, connaît la tradition de l'autel de Bronze pour les holocaustes (voir 2 Ch 4:1)." DJD XXXI, 389.

ordination ceremony in light of its affinities with “the priestly ordination traditions in *ALD*, *T. Levi* and *Jubilees* 30–32.”⁶⁴¹ In any case, the reference to the bronze altar coupled with the statement about Aaron’s elevation to the priesthood in l. 6 suggests that the Visions of Amram is drawing on traditional language and concepts in order to emphasize Aaron’s status as an ideal priest.

4.7.5 Conclusion

Admittedly, any conclusions drawn from such fragmentary evidence must remain provisional. That being said, we have enough material in these fragments to make several tentative conclusions about the conception of the priesthood in the Visions of Amram. The Visions of Amram, in its description of Aaron, connects the Israelite priesthood both to the prediluvian and patriarchal past and to the heavenly realm. This is accomplished by using language reminiscent of the priesthoods of Levi and Melchizedek to describe the priesthood of Aaron, associating Aaron with the patriarchal and Levitical genealogies, recounting the sacrificial activity of at least Noah and Levi, and having Melchizedek himself endorse the future priesthood of Aaron. By depicting the descendants of Aaron as holy in perpetuity, the author connects the contemporary priests and their successors to a priestly institution that shares in Aaron’s prestige as the prototypical, idealized priest. Aaron himself functions as the linchpin around which the Israelite priesthood pivots. He is the culmination of the patriarchal and Levitical genealogies, his cultic activity is distinguished from that of his predecessors (at least that of Levi) inasmuch as he is associated with the bronze altar, and he is the father of all subsequent generations of priests in perpetuity. There is nothing in these fragments, or any other portion of the Visions of Amram, that would suggest that their author was critical of or rejected the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood. To the contrary, this elevated

⁶⁴¹ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 55. Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 188.

description of Aaron and prediction about the eternal longevity of his descendants may indicate that the author of the Visions of Amram was a supporter of the contemporary Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.⁶⁴²

⁶⁴² For more on this question, see Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 21–24.

CHAPTER 5: MISCELLANEOUS COMPOSITIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with compositions that do not fit neatly into either of the two preceding chapters. Tobit and Pseudo-Daniel^c are both set in the exilic period, and thus can be situated according to the bipartite schema of the “core cluster” of Aramaic Scrolls (see Chapter 2). The other two compositions in this chapter, 4Q562 and 4Q559, are more difficult to place within the Aramaic Scrolls corpus. 4Q559, in particular, may fall outside of what Machiela refers to as the “main group” of Qumran Aramaic writings, given its unique genre.⁶⁴³ In any case, these two manuscripts are quite poorly preserved, and resist any definitive classification. The majority of this chapter is dedicated to the book of Tobit, which is by far the best-preserved of the four compositions and also contains a significant amount of information related to the priesthood, temple, and cult.

5.2 Tobit (4Q196–199)⁶⁴⁴

Tobit begins with a superscription that locates its titular character genealogically, historically, and geographically (1:1–2). Immediately after this superscription, Tobit describes himself in the first-person narrative voice as an exemplary individual, using phraseology that bears a striking resemblance to the self-descriptions of other figures from the Qumran Aramaic corpus: “I, Tobit, walked in the way of truth (*ἀληθείας*) and righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) all the days of my

⁶⁴³ Machiela, “Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,” 249.

⁶⁴⁴ Besides these Aramaic manuscripts, a Hebrew Tobit manuscript (4Q200) was also found at Qumran. Scholars have long debated Tobit’s language of composition, but a growing consensus holds that the book was originally written in Aramaic. For a recent argument in favor of this view, see Andrew B. Perrin, “From *lingua franca* to *lingua sacra*: The Scripturalization of Tobit in 4QTob^e,” *VT* 66 (2016): 117–32.

life” (1:3).⁶⁴⁵ Tobit follows this statement by recounting some of his noteworthy deeds so as to prove the veracity of his claim to have lived in accordance with truth and righteousness. Fitzmyer suggests that the description of Tobit’s deeds in chapter 1 can be divided into two discreet sections: his behavior in Galilee prior to the exile (vv. 3–9) and in his current exilic situation in Assyria (vv. 10–22).⁶⁴⁶ Fitzmyer’s understanding of the basic structure is certainly correct, though v. 3 seems more like a general summary of Tobit’s high moral character.

5.2.1 Tobit’s Jerusalem-centric Piety

The section pertaining specifically to Tobit’s life in the land of Israel begins in v. 4. Tobit’s behavior in this section is explicitly contrasted with the shortcomings of his fellow Naphtalites (vv. 4–6). The deeds from the pre-exilic, Galilean phase of his life that are elaborated upon in greatest detail relate specifically to Jerusalem and the temple cult. It is noteworthy that Tobit’s cultic obligations obtain only during his years in the land of Israel, while his concern for exogamous marriage practices applies in Israel and in exile. This distinction may reflect the influence of Deut 12, which introduces a section pertaining to proper cultic practice by noting that

⁶⁴⁵ The Book of Tobit has been preserved in manuscripts representing nine languages. As Robert J. Littman noted, “The relationship of these manuscripts is a complex and difficult question.” Robert J. Littman, *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*, SCS (Leiden: Brill, 2008), xix. Where available, I have relied on the Aramaic Tobit fragments from Qumran as transcribed and translated by Fitzmyer in DJD XIX. Where the Aramaic was not available, I primarily consulted the Greek manuscript of Tobit preserved in Codex Sinaiticus as transcribed in Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, eds., *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions, with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004). The Sinaiticus manuscript is the primary representative of the G^{II} manuscript family. G^{II} Tobit has been labeled the “long version,” as opposed to the G^I manuscript family or “short version.” G^{II} is quite close to both the Qumran fragments and the Old Latin version of Tobit, and most scholars have argued that G^{II} is the oldest extant Greek tradition, with G^I representing “a later recension of G^{II}.” Littman, *Tobit*, xx.

⁶⁴⁶ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 101. Dimant draws attention to the fact that “Tobit’s piety while still living in the land of Israel was of an altogether different nature” than the piety that governed his life in exile, which involved “avoiding the gentiles’ food, celebrating biblical festivals, giving alms, and ensuring proper burials for deceased compatriots (Tob. 1:11, 16–18; 2:1–9).” Devorah Dimant, “The Book of Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 121–43, 123. Dimant compares this distinction to rabbinic *halakha*, which distinguishes between precepts related to the land of Israel (to be practiced only in Israel) and those unrelated to the land of Israel (to be practiced both inside and outside of Israel). Dimant, “Qumran Halakhah,” 124.

“these are the statutes and judgments that you shall observe in the land that the LORD, the God of your fathers, gives to you” (v. 1).⁶⁴⁷

Tobit begins his description of his life in Galilee by recounting the apostasy of his fellow Naphtalites, who failed to acknowledge the special status of Jerusalem and the temple cult, instead worshipping at the national shrines of the Northern Kingdom (1:4, 5). For Tobit, Jerusalem was chosen from among all the tribes of Israel as the place where the entire nation must sacrifice, because it is there that the temple, referred to as ‘the dwelling of God’ *τῆς κατασκηνώσεως τοῦ θε[ε]ου*, was established (*ᾠκοδομήθη*) for all the generation of eternity (*πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος*) (1:4). A fuller discussion of the place of the temple(s) within Tobit’s theological conception of history will follow in my treatments of chs. 13 and 14. It is sufficient at this point to note the eternal validity of the temple within Tobit’s theological vision. The phrase that Tobit uses to communicate the eternal validity of the temple is rendered by the Greek witnesses as *πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος*, which is likely a translation of *כול דורי עלמא* (cf. G^{II} 13:11 // 4Q196 17ii.15). This phrase is used to describe the longevity of the eschatological temple toward the end of the book (Tob 13:11), but it also appears on a number of occasions throughout the Qumran Aramaic corpus in descriptions of the eschatological temple (4Q212 1iv.18 // 1 En. 91:13) and of the longevity of Levi’s and Aaron’s posterity (ALD 3:17; 10:14; 4Q542 1ii.4; 4Q545 4.17; 4Q547 9.7).⁶⁴⁸

Tobit’s description of the importance of Jerusalem and the failures of his compatriots is followed by an account of Tobit’s own piety, which is particularly Jerusalem-centric, especially

⁶⁴⁷ Tobit 1:4–8 clearly reflects the influence of Deut 12: 1) both refer to prescriptions that apply within the land of Israel (Tob 1:4; Deut 12:1), 2) both contrast illegitimate worship at various shrines with legitimate worship at God’s chosen cultic center (Tob 1:4–6; Deut 12:2–6); both refer to the fact that God has chosen a cultic center from among all the tribes of Israel (Tob 1:4; Deut 12:5); both mandate that tithes and gifts must be distributed at God’s chosen cultic center (Tob 1:6–8; Deut 12:6); and both refer to the practice of eating within God’s chosen cultic center (Tob 1:8; Deut 12:7). It is also worth noting that Tobit explicitly connects the religious prescriptions in this passage to that which is contained within the law of Moses (*ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσῆ*) (Tob 1:8).

⁶⁴⁸ For more on this point, see Chapter 6.

when considered in light of broader Second Temple and rabbinic writings.⁶⁴⁹ After a brief comment on Tobit's regular practice of making pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the festivals, the book offers a list of tithes and donations that he brings with him on his journeys (vv. 6-8).⁶⁵⁰ All of these tithes and donations are described as being brought to, distributed, spent, and/or consumed within the city of Jerusalem. This practice stands at odds with various rabbinic prescriptions, which allow for some of the priestly gifts and the Levitical tithe to be distributed "everywhere in the Land of Israel."⁶⁵¹ Dimant raises the possibility that Tobit's emphasis on bringing these tithes and donations to Jerusalem function as "a polemical reference to the practice prevailing in later Second Temple times to distribute some of the priestly and Levitical gifts in other parts of the country."⁶⁵² Yet, Tobit's perspective on this matter is not presented as being particularly controversial, and is consistent with a wide range of roughly contemporaneous Jewish sources, including several of the Qumran scrolls.⁶⁵³ Tobit's attitudes may simply reflect the convention of his day.

⁶⁴⁹ My analysis of the cultic prescriptions in Tob 1:6–8 relies primarily on the work of Dimant in "Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah." She has done the most recent and comprehensive comparative treatment of this passage, putting the regulations in Tobit in conversation with those found in the Qumran scrolls, the rabbinic writings, and the works of Philo and Josephus whenever applicable. For earlier discussions on the regulations in Tob 1:6–8, see Johann Gamberoni, "Das 'Gesetz des Mose' im Buch Tobias," in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Walter Kornfeld zum 60*, ed. Georg Braulik et al. (Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977), 227–42; Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*, MSU 17 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 23–27.

⁶⁵⁰ Deuteronomy 12 does not specify that the tithes and donations are to be brought to Jerusalem during the festivals, a detail that does appear in Tobit's account (1:6). Scholars have suggested that Tobit relies here on passages like Exod 23:14–17 and Deut 16:16, which implore Israelite men to make pilgrimage to Jerusalem three times per year for the three major festivals. E.g. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 107. It is interesting to note, however, that Tobit does not mention the amount of times he makes the pilgrimage to Jerusalem per year nor does he note which festivals he attends.

⁶⁵¹ For example, while Tobit brings both the 'first crop' (ὁ ἄπαρχαί) and the 'first fruits' (τὰ πρωτογενήματα) to Jerusalem as a priestly donation, the rabbis only required the 'first fruits' (בכורים) "be brought to the Temple (m Bikkurim 2, 2; 3, 2-4)," while the 'first crop' (תרומה גדולה) could be distributed "anywhere in the Land of Israel (cf. Tosefta Ḥalah 2, 9; Sifre, Num § 119)." Dimant, "Tobit and Qumran Halakhah," 133.

⁶⁵² Dimant, "Tobit and Qumran Halakhah," 128.

⁶⁵³ Dimant acknowledges this point when noting the similarities between Tobit and other Qumran writings on this matter: "Tobit's practice seems to agree with the Qumran halakhah, but both may reflect the older custom of bringing the priestly and Levitical dues to the Temple to be distributed there." Dimant, "Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah," 133. Continuing, Dimant also notes, "This custom is attested by Mal. 3:10; Neh. 13:5, 12-13; 2 Chron. 31:5-12; Septuagint to 1 Sam. 1:21; Jth. 11:13; Philo, Spec. Leg. I, 132-152; Josephus, Ant., V, 346." Dimant, "Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah," 133 n. 56.

Tobit’s gifts are divided into categories, and are listed “according to their importance, from the priests to the Levites and finally to the owners and the poor.”⁶⁵⁴ Dimant suggests that this order may “follow an already fixed tradition.”⁶⁵⁵ Similarly, the appearance of the phrase ‘the second tithe’ in v. 7—a phrase that does not appear in the Pentateuch, but is attested across a wide spectrum of Second Temple and rabbinic sources—suggests that here also Tobit “reflects the usage of known terms.”⁶⁵⁶ The details of Tobit’s list are clearly rooted in Pentateuchal legislation, but they also reflect a considerable amount of synthesis and exegesis. Tobit’s interpretative practices evince both similarities and differences with a variety of writings from Second Temple and rabbinic sources. Two examples should suffice to demonstrate this point.

First, one of the priestly donations is referred to as ‘the tithe of cattle’ (τὰς δεκάτας τῶν κτηγῶν). This tithe is based on the ‘tithe of cattle and sheep’ (מְעֹשֶׁר בְּקָר וְצֹאן) found in Lev 27:32. The Leviticus passage does not state explicitly that the priests are to be the recipients of this tithe, only that “it shall be holy to the LORD” (יִהְיֶה קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה). Tobit, however, reflects an underlying exegetical tradition according to which the phrase ‘to the LORD’ is taken “as a reference to the priests.”⁶⁵⁷ This exegetical tradition was a relatively common interpretative move in Second Temple literature, since Jubilees (32:15), 4QMMT (4Q396 1–2iii.3–4), and the Damascus

⁶⁵⁴ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 138.

⁶⁵⁵ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 138.

⁶⁵⁶ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 136. Fitzmyer also suggests that Tobit’s reference to the ‘second tithe’ may reflect conventional exegesis: “The author of the Book of Tobit seems to be following the postexilic interpretation of pentateuch texts on tithing, according to which the tithes were numbers: the firstlings and firstfruits went to the priests (Lev 27:26–27, 30–32) and the first tithe to the Levites (Num 18:21–24); the second tithe to the sacrificial banquet (Deut 14:22–23); and the third tithe to the poor, orphans, and widows (Deut 14:28–29).” Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 109. He goes on to note, “A still later form of the regulations for tithing can be found in Josephus, who numbers them: *Ant.* 4.4.3 § 68 (first tithe for the Levite and Aaronid priests); 4.8.8 § 205 (second tithe, the substitute of Deut 14:24–26); 4.8.22 § 240 (third tithe, for the poor).” Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 110.

⁶⁵⁷ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 130.

Document (4Q270 2ii.7–8) all state that this tithe is to be given to the priests.⁶⁵⁸ On the other hand, rabbinic tradition mandates that “this tithe was to be eaten by the owners in Jerusalem (m. Zebaḥim 5, 8; Sifre, Num § 6).”⁶⁵⁹

Second, the Levitical tithe is mentioned in Num 18:21, where we read: “To the Levites, I have given every tithe in Israel for a possession in return for the service that they perform, the service of the tent of meeting.” The passage in Numbers does not indicate “what these tithes should consist of,” but Dimant plausibly suggests that Tobit’s inclusion of ‘grain, wine, and oil’ comes from Neh 13:5, which reads in part: “the grain, wine, and oil, which were prescribed (תוצרת) to the Levites, singers, and gatekeepers.”⁶⁶⁰ This exegetical tradition also appears in the Temple Scroll (11Q19 60.6–7).⁶⁶¹ Moreover, while Tobit and the Temple Scroll advocate bringing the Levitical tithe to the temple, rabbinic tradition prescribes that “the Levites may accept this tithe anywhere (cf. *Tosefta*, *Soṭa* 13, 10; *Sifre*, *Num* § 122).”⁶⁶²

More could be said about the precise nuances of Tobit’s legal tradition vis-à-vis the related Pentateuchal, Second Temple, and rabbinic sources, but we can still make a few broad observations based on what I have shown above. For one thing, Dimant is right to highlight the extent to which Tobit differs from its rabbinic counterparts, most especially in Tobit’s insistence that all tithes and donations be brought to Jerusalem during the festivals. In this specific way, Tobit is aligned with other Second Temple sources like Jubilees, 4QMMT, the Damascus Document, and the Temple Scroll. Nevertheless, Dimant’s statement regarding Tobit’s “similarity to some details of the Qumranic position” and her conclusion that Tobit’s “author was seemingly close to, or a

⁶⁵⁸ Jubilees makes this exegetical decision explicit by including both phrases side-by-side in its discussion of this tithe: “And all the tithes of the oxen and sheep shall be holy unto the Lord and shall belong to his priests” (32:15).

⁶⁵⁹ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 135.

⁶⁶⁰ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 130.

⁶⁶¹ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 130.

⁶⁶² Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 135.

sympathizer of, the Qumran circles, or at least partly an adherent of the halakhah they espoused” must be questioned, or at least qualified. These statements imply that Jubilees, 4QMMT, the Damascus Document, and the Temple Scroll can be viewed as representing something called “the Qumranic position” or “the halakhah they espoused.” These labels flatten the complex relationship of these texts to each other and to the so-called Qumran or *yahad* movement(s).

It is also worth noting, before ending my discussion of Tob 1, that this chapter displays a very traditional Second Temple conception of the priesthood. There is an awareness, and acceptance, of a two-fold cultic division in which the priests occupy a more prestigious place than the Levites, though the Levites are in no way disparaged or degraded. The priests are linked to the posterity of Aaron and fulfill a sacrificial function. The Levites, on the other hand, are described using cultic language, but do not appear to officiate at the altar.

5.2.2 The Historical and Future Role of Jerusalem and Its Temple

With one exception (5:14), Jerusalem and its temple do not appear in Tobit again until the book’s final two chapters (13 and 14).⁶⁶³ Both chapters are dense with biblical allusions, engaging

⁶⁶³ The claim that chs. 13 and 14 represent later additions to Tobit has come to be viewed with increasing skepticism. Many scholars appeal to the presence of portions of both chapters among the Qumran finds as evidence of their originality to (or, more modestly, of their early association with) Tobit. See, e.g., Richard Bauckham, “Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel,” in *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays*, WUNT 233 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 433–59, 433; Jill Hicks-Keeton, “Already/Not Yet: Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit,” *JBL* 132 (2013): 97–117; Ruth Henderson, *Second Temple Songs of Zion: A Literary and Generic Analysis of the Apostrophe to Zion (11QPs^a XXII 1–5); Tobit 13:9–18 and 1 Baruch 4:30–5:9*, DCLS 17 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 114; Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 42. It has also been pointed out that no extant manuscripts of Tobit lack chapters 13 and 14. E.g. Hicks-Keeton, “Already/Not Yet,” 98 n. 2. Perhaps most persuasively, several scholars have argued for the integrity of Tobit on the basis of its literary and/or theological coherence. So Irene Nowell, “The Book of Tobit: Narrative Technique and Theology,” (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1983); Will Soll, “Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of a Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomic Theology,” *CBQ* 51 (1989): 209–31; Steven Weitzman, “Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 49–61; Francis M. Macatangay, *The Wisdom Instructions in the Book of Tobit*, DCLS 12 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011). For these reasons, I proceed on the assumption that chapters 13 and 14 (as well as chapter 1) are original to Tobit, as there appears to be “no reason” to conclude otherwise. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 45. However, this assumption does not preclude the possibility that material found in chapters 13 or 14 existed independently prior to the composition of Tobit. See, e.g., Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 114. Cf. John J. Collins, “The Judaism of the Book of Tobit,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*, ed. Geza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 23–40 for an

especially with Deuteronomy, the Prophets, and Psalms. In addition, a significant number of verbal and thematic correspondences between chs. 13 and 14 suggest that they were intended to be read together.⁶⁶⁴ Moreover, chs. 13 and 14 correspond with ch. 1 on several occasions on matters related to Jerusalem and the temple, with these chapters thus forming an *inclusio* around the core narrative in chs. 2–12. The author of the final version of Tobit clearly intended for this *inclusio* to give national, if not universal, significance to individual and familial drama(s) that comprise the majority of the book.

5.2.2.1 Jerusalem and the Temple in Tobit’s Hymn to Jerusalem

Chapter 13 includes two distinct hymns, one of which is addressed to the Israelites (vv. 1–8) and the other to a personified Jerusalem (vv. 9–18).⁶⁶⁵ These two hymns may have originated independently prior to their incorporation into the book, though in their current iterations they share several important verbal and thematic correspondences that serve to connect them both to one another and to the larger theological and practical message of the narrative. One of the clearest ways that the two hymns are connected to each other and to the larger narrative relates to the verbal pairings of *μαστιγῶω* ‘to afflict’ // *ἐλεέω* ‘to show mercy’ and *(δια)σκορπίζω* or *(δια)σπείρω* ‘to scatter’ // *(ἐπι)συνάγω* ‘to gather’ (see esp. Tob 13:5).⁶⁶⁶ Tobit’s use of these verbal pairings constitutes an allusion to Deut 30:3, as we can see most clearly in Tob 13:5.⁶⁶⁷ Both here and

important example of a scholar who is unconvinced by the arguments concerning the integrity of Tobit, despite the Qumran evidence and the literary analyses of scholars like Weitzman.

⁶⁶⁴ Craig R. Koester, *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*, CBQMS 22 (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), 24.

⁶⁶⁵ For this division, see e.g. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 304. Henderson has done the most detailed work on the literary structure and redactional history of the hymns found in chapter 13 (*Songs to Zion*, 114ff.).

⁶⁶⁶ See esp. the repetition of the ‘afflict’ // ‘show mercy’ paradigm, which is repeated in Tob 11:15; 13:5; and 13:9. See Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 142. Tobit is clearly intending to draw some sort of connection between the plight and restoration of its protagonist and that of the nation of Israel. So Hicks-Keeton, “Already/Not Yet,” 102.

⁶⁶⁷ Pilchan Lee, *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21-22 in the Light of its Background in Jewish Tradition*, WUNT 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 84. Cf. Di Lella, “Deuteronomic

elsewhere, Tobit uses these terms in order to highlight the pattern of exile and restoration that characterizes the narrative frame of the book. However, as becomes clear throughout chs. 13 and 14, Tobit supplements this Deuteronomic model of national sin, punishment, and restoration with additional material taken from the prophetic writings of the Hebrew scriptures. Jerusalem and the temple play prominent roles in Tobit's account of exile and restoration, especially in ch. 14.

The description of the restored city in Tob 13 incorporates phraseology that was used in ch. 1 to describe the Jerusalem of the pre-exilic period in its description of the restored city. As we have seen, ch. 1 uses the phrase *πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος* “all the generations of eternity” in order to emphasize the eternal validity of Jerusalem as God's chosen dwelling place and as a cultic center for Israel. Here, Tobit addresses Jerusalem directly and uses the same phrase: “May he [i.e., God] cheer all those within you who are captives, and love all those within you who are distressed, for all the generations of eternity (*πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος*).” In addition, the terms *γενεά* (ΓΓ) and *αἰών* (םלע) are also used throughout the Jerusalem hymn to express confidence in the eternal endurance of the restored Jerusalem.

The Jerusalem hymn recapitulates the Deuteronomic pattern of national sin, punishment, and restoration that is expressed in the previous hymn, with one important qualification (v. 9; cf. v. 5). Significantly, whereas Tob 13:5 reports that God will show mercy to “all of you” (*πάντας ὑμᾶς*), Tob 13:9 describes the recipients of divine mercy as “the children of the righteous” (*τοὺς*

Background,” 382; Moore, *Tobit*, 35; Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 309–10. Henderson later went on not only to note the “close verbal correspondence” between Deut 30:3 and Tob 13:5, but to posit that there is “a very intentional allusion” to Deut 30:1–10 in Tob 13:5–6. Henderson also argues that “this allusion appears to be reflected in the conscious imitation of the chiasmic formulation of this passage from Deuteronomy which has been embedded within the structure of Tob 13:1–6h” (*Song of Zion*, 151). Her comparative analysis of these passages is detailed and compelling.

υἱοὺς τῶν δικαίων).⁶⁶⁸ The hymn seems to be suggesting that not all of the Israelites will participate in the eschatological restoration, or at least that individual righteousness is a prerequisite.⁶⁶⁹ This idea is reinforced later by Tobit’s proclamation: “How happy I will be if a remnant of my descendants (τὸ κατάλειμμα τοῦ σπέρματός μου) should survive to see your glory and acknowledge the King of Heaven” (v. 16).⁶⁷⁰ The reference to divine kingdom in this passage reflects a broader concern with divine kingship throughout each of the two hymns in this chapter (cf. vv. 1, 6, 10, 11, 15).⁶⁷¹ In one of these references, the theme of divine kingship is explicitly connected with the construction of the eschatological temple (Tob 13:10). Notably, these dual themes of divine kingship and the building of the eschatological temple also come together in a passage from the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q212 1iv.18 // 1 En. 91:13).

The Jerusalem hymn ends with a physical description of the city itself. This passage represents the fullest description of Jerusalem in the Book of Tobit, and gives special attention to its architectural features (vv. 16–18). Most scholars have rightly noted a number of important literary connections between the description of Jerusalem in this portion of the hymn and that of Isa 54:11–12. The most important similarity between these two passages is the fact that both incorporate precious stones into their descriptions of the architectural features of the restored Jerusalem. Isaiah 54 is the only passage from the Hebrew scriptures to include this literary trope

⁶⁶⁸ G^{II} has not preserved Tob 13:7–9, and so this particular reading comes from G^I, but the phrase ‘the children of the righteous’ appears later in v. 13 in both G^I and G^{II} (cf. בְּנֵי יָ, 4Q196 18.2) in the context of a description of those who will take part in the eschatological gathering (G^I: συναγωγή; G^{II}: ἐπισυναγωγή).

⁶⁶⁹ See the discussion of Tob 14:7 below.

⁶⁷⁰ The reference to the “remnant of my descendants” is not preserved in G^I. However, 4Q196 18.6 preserves the following:]שאר[תא מן זרעי ל].

⁶⁷¹ The theme of divine kingship is one of the most salient themes in the Zion Song, and is one of the literary and conceptual features that connects the two hymns in this chapter. As Henderson suggests concerning the importance of this motif in relation to Tobit’s conception of Jerusalem in this passage, “The future Jerusalem is presented first and foremost as the royal city of God, the Great King. The divine titles attributed to him emphasize his transcendent nature as God, whose reign exceeds terrestrial and temporal confines and extends beyond earth to the heavenly and eternal. At the same time, these names are continually linked with that of earthly Jerusalem, the place of the divine sovereign residence (Tob 13:7–8, 10, 11, 15, 16).” Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 169.

in its account of the new Jerusalem, though it is one that becomes somewhat more common in Second Temple literature, likely in part under Isaianic influence: i.e., Tobit (13:16), New Jerusalem (4Q554 2ii.15; 5Q15 1i.6–7),⁶⁷² Peshier Isaiah (4Q164 1.1–4), and Revelation (21:10–21). Tobit is likely indebted to Isaiah for its description of the bejeweled new Jerusalem,⁶⁷³ but it is worth pointing out that the parallels between the passages in Tobit and Isaiah are often inexact, and the ways in which the account of the new Jerusalem in Tobit diverges from that of Isaiah at times bring it into greater harmony with later Second Temple expressions of the motif, most notably, with that of New Jerusalem, as we will explore in more detail in section 6.4.1.⁶⁷⁴ Tobit 13:16–18 offers up a brief description of the interior features of the restored city, beginning with the city’s exterior and moving inward. It begins with the gates (αἱ θύραι), walls (τά τείχη), towers (οἱ πύργοι), and embattlements (οἱ προμαχώνες) in v. 16, and proceeds to the interior features of the city in vv. 17–18, namely, its streets (αἱ πλατεῖαι), gates (αἱ θύραι), and houses (αἱ οἰκίαι). The Isaiah passage, on the other hand, describes only the city’s exterior, and thus does not reflect any inward movement in its account of the restored Jerusalem. Tobit diverges again from Isa 54 in the number of architectural features and precious materials that it includes in its description. Whereas Isa 54:11–12 mentions four or five different features and five different materials, Tob 13:16–18 delineates seven of each.⁶⁷⁵

The full extent of Tobit’s exegetical and theological creativity only comes into focus after reading ch. 14. Despite the generic differences, ch. 14 overlaps significantly with ch. 13 in its

⁶⁷² New Jerusalem also includes precious material in its description of the Temple (cf. 2Q24 3.2; 8.3; 11Q18 10i.5-6).

⁶⁷³ So, too, Lee, *New Jerusalem*, 85; Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 158; Géza G. Xeravits, “Take Courage, O Jerusalem...”: *Studies in the Psalms of Baruch 4–5*, DCLS 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 112.

⁶⁷⁴ A number of scholars have noted similarities between the description of eschatological city in Tobit and New Jerusalem, see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 317; Henderson, *Songs to Zion*, 160 n. 147; Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 42-46. See more in Chapter 6.

⁶⁷⁵ Henderson, *Songs to Zion*, 160.

language and concepts, especially those rooted in Deuteronomy and the Hebrew prophets. Yet the theological vision and conception of history on offer in ch. 14 is in some respects closer to some of the early apocalyptic writings than it is to ch. 13 or its Deuteronomic and prophetic predecessors.

5.2.2.2 Jerusalem and the Temple in Tobit's Prophecy

The final references to Jerusalem and its temple in Tobit occur in the context of a prophecy in ch. 14, spoken by Tobit to his son Tobias and Tobias's sons in the final days of Tobit's life (v. 3; cf. 4Q198 1.1–2). Tobit begins with a prediction of the fall of Assyria, based on his confidence “in the word of God about Nineveh, which Nahum spoke” (v. 4; 4Q198 1.3–4). He then continues by forecasting the deportation of the inhabitants of Judah, the desolation of the Southern Kingdom, and the destruction of the temple (v. 4). However, Tobit emphasizes that this tragedy is only temporary (v.4), noting that the post-exilic return to the land represents the initiation of an act of divine mercy that will culminate with the building of the eschatological temple, the conversion of the nations, the ingathering of the righteous Israelites,⁶⁷⁶ and the eradication of the sinful and the unjust (vv. 5–7).

In the course of this fairly brief and schematic historical overview, Tobit mentions three separate temples, i.e. the Solomonic, second, and eschatological, though as in ch. 13 the cultus is not depicted. From Tobit's vantage point within the narrative, the Solomonic temple is still

⁶⁷⁶ This passage distinguishes the first return under Cyrus from the eschatological return by saying that at this latter time “all will return from their exile” (*ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας αὐτῶν πάντες*) in order to take part in the building of the new Jerusalem and its Temple. However, this statement is qualified a few lines later with the statement that “all the sons of Israel who will be saved in those days (and) who are mindful of God in truth will be gathered together” (*πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ Ἰσραὲλ οἱ σωζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις μνημονεύοντες τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐπισυναχθήσονται*). This second statement suggests that Tobit is referring to the ingathering of a remnant of righteous Israelites, rather than every single one. It is not at all clear, though, how large or small the author imagined this remnant to be. In any case, Tobit does not seem to envision a particularly small or sectarian remnant, but he at least leaves open the possibility that some Israelites might end up being counted among “the doers of sin and unrighteousness” (*οἱ ποιοῦντες τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν*) who are excluded from the eschatological age to come.

standing, though it is soon to be destroyed, whereas both the second and eschatological temples remain off in the distant future. The author, however, would have been writing to an audience that was living long after the construction of the second temple. Notably, Tobit does not envision the post-exilic period as being characterized by rampant corruption and pollution, as do the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks.⁶⁷⁷ Instead, the post-exilic period initiates a sequence of divine mercy that will ultimately culminate in the eschatological gathering of Israel and conversion of the nations. The second temple is presented as inferior to both the Solomonic and eschatological temples, but the author does not dwell on this point nor is the legitimacy of the second temple called into question. Rather, the first return and the building of the second temple are presented as signs that the divine plan is already underway.

Tobit's prophecy nevertheless betrays a certain tension between what is and what is to come.⁶⁷⁸ This passage admits of a recognition that the current situation has not fulfilled the glorious sense of hope and expectation that is reflected in the writings of the exilic and early post-exilic prophets. There was an initial return under Cyrus, but many Israelites are still living in diasporic conditions among the nations. The temple was rebuilt, but it pales in comparison to both the Solomonic temple and especially the glorious future temple heralded in the prophetic literature. All the while, the nations remain unconverted and their rulers do not acknowledge the kingship of Israel's God.⁶⁷⁹ However, Tobit's strategy is not to disparage the first post-exilic return and the

⁶⁷⁷ The Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks are discussed above. See Chapter 6 for a comparative analysis of these three compositions.

⁶⁷⁸ Hicks-Keeton similarly summarizes the eschatology of Tobit, highlighting that "the book of Tobit holds this expectation in tension with a conviction that it is presently fulfilled—inasmuch as the process of altered history has already begun. The eschatological tension that thereby emerges encourages Tobit's reader that the hope for a restored Israel is already being realized, though it is not yet fulfilled." Hicks-Keeton, "Already/Not Yet," 98.

⁶⁷⁹ See, e.g., Henderson's comments: "The Second Temple is seen as inferior to the Solomonic and Eschatological Temples and as a temporary structure (14:5), in keeping with biblical (Ezr 3:12; Hag 2:3) and post-biblical thought. However, although the frame of the story emphasizes the juxtaposition of Jerusalem of the first Temple with Jerusalem of the Eschatological Temple, the Second Temple is not rejected by the author." Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 175.

second temple nor to despair at the discontinuity between the earlier prophetic vision and the current state of affairs. Rather, Tobit incorporates the first return and the second temple into his understanding of the divine plan by acknowledging the incomplete and provisional status of the post-exilic period and its institutions and then re-applying the prophetic literary tropes to a period of future, eschatological fulfillment. According to Tobit, the second temple functions as sign, which both confirms that the divine plan is already underway and points toward its eventual fulfillment in the eschatological future.

Tobit communicates this particular eschatological vision in part by developing language and concepts that were first introduced in ch. 13. As in the previous chapter, Tob 14 uses the twofold pairings of *μαστιγῶ* ‘to afflict’ // *ἐλέεω* ‘to show mercy’ and *(δια)σκορπίζω* or *(δια)σπείρω* ‘to scatter’ // *(ἐπι)συνάγω* ‘to gather’ in its descriptions of Israel’s past and future. However, unlike both Deuteronomy and Tob 13, this chapter decouples the verb that describes the act of divine mercy (*ἐλέεω*) from that which is used to characterize the final gathering (*ἐπισυνάγω*). That is, both Deut 30:3 and Tob 13:5 use these two verbal pairings in a tight parallelism that suggests a direct correspondence between ‘mercy’ and ‘gathering’ (or, at the very least, that give no indication the activities that these verbs describe are to be distinguished temporally):

Tob 13:5	Deut 30:3 LXX	Deut 30:3 MT
καὶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐλεήσει [καὶ συναξει ἡμᾶς] ⁶⁸⁰ ἐκ πά(ν)των τῶν ἐθνῶν ὅπου ἂν διασκορπισθῆτε ἐν αὐτοῖς	καὶ ἐλεήσει σε καὶ πάλιν συναξει σε ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς διεσκορπισέν σε κύριος ἐκεῖ	וְרַחֵם וְשַׁב וְקָבַץ מִכָּל־הָעַמִּים אֲשֶׁר הִפְצִיץ הוֹה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שָׁמָּה
And he will have mercy on all of you. [And he will gather you] from all the nations among whom you have been scattered.	And he will have mercy on you. And he will gather you again from all the nations among whom the Lord has scattered you there.	And he will have compassion on you. And he will gather you again from all the peoples among whom the Lord your God has scattered you there.

Tobit's Use of Deuteronomy 33: Based on the table found on p. 151 of Henderson, *Song of Zion*.

Tobit 14 clearly presents God's act of mercy (ἐλεέω) as being initiated at the time of the first return under Cyrus (v. 5). To be sure, this act of mercy involves both a gathering (ἐπιστρέφω) of Israelites to and a rebuilding (οἰκοδομέω) of Jerusalem and its temple. However, the eschatological culmination of this act of mercy will not arrive until there is a second gathering (ἐπισυνάγω) and a second rebuilding (οἰκοδομέω)—both of which will be greater than the first, representing the true and final fulfillment of Israel's Deuteronomic and prophetic tradition of national restoration and universal conversion (or at least of Tobit's interpretation of this tradition).

The Jerusalem hymn in ch. 13 relates in poetic form what ch. 14 recounts in prose, namely, that Jerusalem plays a pivotal role in God's plan for Israel as well as for the nations. Although both chs. 13 and 14 describe the contours of that plan and highlight the future of Jerusalem within it,

⁶⁸⁰ The bracketed material is found in G^I but not G^{II}. The inclusion of the bracketed material strengthens the connection of Tob 13:5 to Deut 30:3, but the allusion to Deut 30:3 is still evident without it, as the table demonstrates. G^{II}, like the Deuteronomy passage, makes an explicit connection between God's act of mercy and the return of Israel from exile. At the same time, however, neither Tob 13 nor Deut 30 indicate that there will be need of two distinct returns, only the latter of which will represent the climax of God's merciful action on behalf of Israel. That, however, is exactly the exegetical point that is made in Tob 14.

the city itself occupies the central place in ch. 13. On the other hand, ch. 14's more prosaic account is more explicit about the particularities of the divine plan for the future. Most notably, ch. 14 nuances the affliction/have mercy and scatter/gather dichotomies that Tobit inherits from Deuteronomy. That is, ch. 14 seems to reflect a sense of tension that is not as obviously apparent in ch. 13, but that characterizes a number of post-exilic and Second Temple compositions. Chapter 13 appears to make a neat distinction between affliction and mercy, between scattering and gathering. Chapter 13 also admits of no liminal period existing between return from exile, on the one hand, and the eschatological restoration of Jerusalem, the ingathering of the Israelites, and the conversion of the nations, on the other.

Chapter 14 complicates the dichotomies of the previous chapter even while retaining its language and concepts, likely in response to the historical vantage point of the author, who is living after the first return to Jerusalem and reconstruction of the temple under Cyrus, but before the time of apparent eschatological fulfillment. This chapter, unlike the previous one, reflects an awareness of the fact that Israel is still awaiting its final eschatological restoration. Viewed from the perspective of ch. 14, Tobit is suggesting to its audience that Israel must live in expectation of the fulfillment of the Deuteronomic and prophetic promises even in the midst of the Second Temple period. It is only in this context that the full theological implications of Tobit's practical advice can be understood.

5.2.3 Conclusion

Tobit does not involve a priestly protagonist, unlike most of the compositions discussed thus far, and its central narrative (chs. 2–12) contains only one reference to Jerusalem and the temple cult (Tob 5:14). However, chs. 1, 13, and 14 highlight the importance of Israel's priesthood,

cult, and temple. Its titular protagonist articulates his own piety in terms of his fulfillment of the scriptural obligation to worship in Jerusalem and to give tithes to the priests and Levites in ch. 1 (cf. Tob 5:14), and chs. 13 and, especially, 14 put Jerusalem and its temple at the center of its eschatological vision. Moreover, Tobit's use of the phrase "for all the generations of eternity" to describe the eternal validity of the Jerusalem temple (Tob 1:1; 13:11) draws it into the orbit of the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram, all of which use that phrase in descriptions of temple, in the case of the Apocalypse of Weeks, and priestly lineage, in the case of the others.

5.3 Pseudo-Daniel^c (4Q245)

The manuscript labeled 4Q245 is often associated with 4Q243–244, all three of which are generally discussed under the heading Pseudo-Daniel, but this way of characterizing them is somewhat misleading. For one thing, it is unclear whether 4Q245 belongs to the same composition as 4Q243 and 4Q244, which do in fact share a significant textual overlap (i.e., 4Q243 13 // 4Q244 12).⁶⁸¹ It is also difficult to discern whether or to what extent 4Q245 relies on the now-canonical Book of Daniel. The appearance of the name Daniel in frag. 1 cannot alone serve as proof of literary dependence, given the proliferation of Danielic traditions in the Second Temple period.⁶⁸²

⁶⁸¹ Earlier scholars tended to view 4Q243–244 and 4Q245 as representing a single composition. See, e.g., J. T. Milik, "‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel," *RB* 63 (1956): 411–15; Alfred Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*, SBM 12 (Stuttgart: Echter, 1971), 43–46; Beyer, *ATTM*, 105–7; Émile Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle* (Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 568–70. More recently, however, the DJD editors after assessing the evidence have argued, "It seems preferable then, to regard 4Q245 as a separate composition." *DJD XXII*, 155. This view is also held by Michael Knibb, "The Book of Daniel in its Context," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols., ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, VTSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 16–35, esp. 19 and Loren Stuckenbruck, "Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Scrolls" in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols., ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, VTSup 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 369–86, esp. 376.

⁶⁸² For the view that 4Q245 depends on the Book of Daniel, see Knibb, "Daniel and its Context." On the other hand, for the view that 4Q245 displays no clear dependence on the biblical Book of Daniel, see e.g., Stuckenbruck, "Daniel and Early Enoch," 377; Peter W. Flint, "'4Qpseudo-Daniel ar^c (4Q245)' and the Restoration of the Priesthood," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 137–50, esp. 142.

The manuscript itself, as it has been preserved, is comprised of only four fragments, the final of which contains no readable material. Most relevant for our purposes is some of the material found in frag. 1. This fragment begins with a broken reference to Daniel and a book or writing (כתב), followed by two lists—the first recounting the names of priests and the second the names of kings. The first list appears to begin with the name Qahat, but since the beginning of the list is very poorly preserved we cannot be sure that other names did not precede it.⁶⁸³ The priestly list continues chronologically, appearing to draw inspiration in large part from the list of Levi's descendants in 1 Chr 5:27–41, with two obvious differences.⁶⁸⁴ First, 1 Chr 5 privileges the Zadokite line by focusing on the descendants of Aaron's son Eleazar, which according to this list includes Zadok and his descendants. 4Q245, on the other hand, includes Abiathar, who shared the high priesthood with Zadok during David's reign and who the Chronicler traces back to Aaron via Ithamar in ch. 24. Second, unlike the list in 1 Chr 5, the one found in 4Q245 includes names from the Hellenistic and Hasmonean periods, i.e., Onias (חוני'ה) and Simon (שמעון). The name 'Onias' belongs to three high priestly figures, all of whom are associated with the Hellenistic age. The name Simon likely refers to Simon the Hasmonean since it comes after the name Onias in the list, and it is immediately preceded by a name that ends with the letters תן-, which scholars generally reconstruct as 'Jonathan.'⁶⁸⁵ As the DJD editors note, "While there were several Simons in the Hellenistic period, the sequence Jonathan-Simon is found only among the Maccabees."⁶⁸⁶ This list may conclude with Simon in l. 10, as the editors suggest, though Wise reconstructs the names

⁶⁸³ See, e.g., DJD XXII, 156; Michael O. Wise, "4Q245 (psDan^c ar) and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabaeus," *DSD* 12 (2005): 313–62, esp. 324.

⁶⁸⁴ On these two differences, see DJD XXII, 156–7.

⁶⁸⁵ See the textual notes in DJD XXII, 160.

⁶⁸⁶ DJD XXII, 156.

Johanan and Judah (i.e., John Hyrcanus and Aristobulus I) after Simon.⁶⁸⁷ In any case, the list cannot extend much beyond Simon, since another list starts on l. 11. This next list begins with David and Solomon, and preserves the names Ahaziah and (possibly) Joash in the following line.⁶⁸⁸ No other names remain, and the fragment breaks off after l. 13. It is clear that what we have here is another chronological list. This time, however, the list contains the names of kings beginning with those who reigned at the advent of the Israelite monarchy.⁶⁸⁹

Much less can be said about frags. 2 and, especially, 3. Fragment 2, as the editors observe, is followed by a blank column, and thus may represent the end of the composition.⁶⁹⁰ It appears to describe some type of eschatological scenario involving two groups of people—one of which is depicted as blind and having gone astray, while of the other it is said: they “will arise” (יקומו) and “will return” (יתובו). The term wickedness occurs twice in this fragment, once as the object of the phrase “to exterminate” (למסו). Fragment 3 contains only a broken reference to the number thirty-five (תלתין וחמשה).⁶⁹¹

Despite the fragmentary character of this manuscript, it may be possible to say something about the conception of the priesthood found therein. First, the priestly list in frag. 1 cannot be easily understood as serving a sectarian purpose. The inclusion of both non-Zadokite priests such as Abiathar and at least two Hasmoneans means that it should not be taken as representing a narrow “Zadokite” or anti-Hasmonean perspective. As the editors note, there is no evidence that any of

⁶⁸⁷ Wise, “4Q245 (psDan^c ar),” 324. This reconstruction needs to be understood in the context of Wise’s larger treatment of 4Q245.

⁶⁸⁸ DJD XXII, 160.

⁶⁸⁹ DJD XXII, 157.

⁶⁹⁰ DJD XXII, 163. Cf. Wise, 4Q245 (psDan^c ar),” 318.

the names found in the list were the subject of negative or critical comment.⁶⁹¹ Wise agrees, noting that “the author of 4Q245 exercised no evident censorship of his list. Neither did he comment upon the propriety of any individual at this point in his narrative.”⁶⁹² As Wise concludes, “It follows that the purpose of the priestly and royal lists cannot be that of rendering moral judgment. Rather, the purpose seems to be chronological.”⁶⁹³ Second, despite the inclusive character of the priestly list, both Wise and the editors argue that 4Q245 reflects an implicitly condemnatory posture toward the contemporary high priest. This argument depends on two observations: 1) the eschatological character of frag. 2 and 2) the clear delineation between the office of high priest and king implicit in the two lists of frag. 1.

The eschatological material found in frag. 2 may invite the reader to understand the lists in frag. 1 against the backdrop of the apocalyptic review of history motif, in which the arc of history is rehearsed in order to present the author’s own time as a period of great wickedness immediately preceding the final judgment.⁶⁹⁴ The author of 4Q245 may have viewed the conflation of the role of high priest and king by the later Hasmonean rulers as a particularly striking piece of evidence in favor of understanding the present moment as a definitive historical moment. On this view, the editors argue, it may be that “the priestly and royal lists are meant to show how in the author’s time these institutions have failed or gone astray.”⁶⁹⁵ Wise, too, has suggested that the presence of these two sharply delineated lists, one of priests and one of kings, functions as a way of questioning the legitimacy of the decision to conflate the two offices on the part of the later Hasmoneans, and presenting this choice as a matter of catastrophic, even eschatological, significance.⁶⁹⁶ Moreover,

⁶⁹¹ DJD XXII, 158: “Just as Abiathar’s descent seems not to have been regarded as problematic, the names Onias, Jonathan, and Simon all appear to enjoy equal status in this list.”

⁶⁹² Wise, 4Q245 (psDan^c ar),” 347.

⁶⁹³ Wise, 4Q245 (psDan^c ar),” 347.

⁶⁹⁴ DJD XXII, 157.

⁶⁹⁵ DJD XXII, 158.

⁶⁹⁶ Wise, 4Q245 (psDan^c ar),” 347.

just as the list of kings presumably included both good and bad kings, the presence of any given name on the priestly list in 4Q245 confers only legitimacy, not virtue. We do not know whether the author viewed Jonathan and Simon the Hasmoneans as noble occupants of the office of high priest. What is inferred is only that so long as the office of high priest and king remained separate, its occupants were accepted as legitimate. As the editors have summarized, “Jonathan and Simon may have been accepted by the author of 4Q245 as legitimate High Priests, and the line may have incurred blame only when it combined the offices of High Priest and King.”⁶⁹⁷ I am inclined to accept this basic view of the priestly list in 4Q245. At the very least, 4Q245 does appear implicitly to endorse a separation of the high priestly and royal offices.

5.4 Unidentified Text A (4Q562)

4Q562 is an extremely fragmentary, unidentified manuscript that nonetheless contains several interesting, though elusive, references to the priesthood.⁶⁹⁸ We cannot, however, make any definitive conclusions about the context in which these references occur, despite the suggestive character of some of the preserved words and phrases. Starcky initially grouped the twelve fragments that comprise this manuscript into two sets of six on the basis of their color.⁶⁹⁹ As Puech has shown, the extant allusions to the priesthood are found in the first set of fragments, especially frags. 1 and 2 but possibly also 4 and 6.⁷⁰⁰

The first and most explicit references to the priesthood and cult appear in frag. 1, a translation and transcription of which I have included below.

⁶⁹⁷ DJD XXII, 158. This interpretation “is favoured by the fact that the list of priests is followed by a separate list of kings.”

⁶⁹⁸ Beyer has gone so far as to character the literary genre of 4Q562 as “Priesterweissagung,” though Puech is probably right to argue the fragmentary character of the manuscript precludes a determination of its genre. Beyer, *ATM* 2, 126; DJD XXXVII, 323.

⁶⁹⁹ DJD XXXVII, 323.

⁷⁰⁰ DJD XXXVII, 323, 326–7, 329.

1.] wicked, who by the sword and in war [
2.] they will not ordain them to minister as priests
3. in the te]mple [with] the number (of) tw[o

1.] רשיעין די בחרב ובקרב] [
2.] לא ימלון ידיהן לכהנה [
3. במ]קדשא] ב[מנין תרתין] [

The expression in l. 2, which literally reads “they will not fill their hands,” reflects a common way of describing priestly ordination in the Hebrew scriptures.⁷⁰¹ The precise reason for their exclusion from the priesthood is not clear, but Drawnel and Hogeterp plausibly suggest that the language of wickedness, war, and the sword in l. 1 may indicate that perpetrating acts of violence led to their disqualification.⁷⁰² The fragment’s poor state of preservation does not allow for a more definitive understanding of this unknown group and the grounds of their disqualification from the priesthood.

Literature from Qumran and other ancient Jewish sources attest to several instances in which priests were condemned for acting violently. Perhaps the most explicit condemnation of priestly violence from Qumran is found in 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C (4Q390), an apocalyptic periodization of Israelite history, which includes the prediction “their priests will commit violence (בוהניהם יחמסו)” in a list of wicked activities that will take place during a time of great wickedness (2 i 8–10).⁷⁰³ What we do not know about the anonymous group in 4Q562 is how, if at all, they

⁷⁰¹ For example, Num 3:3 refers to “the sons of Aaron, the anointed priests, whom he ordained to minister as priests (אֲשֶׁר-מָלָא יָדָם לְכַהֵן). Puech lists the following examples: Exod 28:41; 29:9, 29, 33, 35; Lev 8:33; 16:32; 21:10; Num 3:3; Judg 17:5, 12; 1 Kgs 13:33; Ezek 43:26; 1 Chr 29:5; 2 Chr 13:9; 29:31. DJD XXXVII, 326. The example from Ezekiel appears to refer to the consecration of the altar, rather than the priests.

⁷⁰² Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 243; Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 374.

⁷⁰³ The *editio princeps* of 4Q390 was published by Devorah Dimant in DJD XXX, 235–54. For more, see Devorah Dimant, “New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 405–48; Cana Werman, “Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 229–55; Balázs Tamási, “Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship behind the Fragments?” in *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Karoly Daniel Dobos and Miklos Koszeghy, HBM 21 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 310–28; Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 358–9; Todd R. Hanneken, “The Status and Interpretation of Jubilees in 4Q390,” in *A Teacher*

are related to the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood, what type of violence they are purported to have perpetrated, and whether or not this violent activity is only one item in a larger list of malfeasances, all of which may have contributed to their disqualification. There may be reason to conclude with Hogeterp that for the author of 4Q562 “the priesthood was incompatible with bloodshed,” but there is also reason for caution.⁷⁰⁴ It is not clear that 4Q562 lays out a general principle. The violence described in l. 1 is associated with the term רשיעין “the wicked.” We do not have enough information to know whether 4Q562 would condemn all acts of violence as wicked, and thus unbecoming of priestly service, or if more specific acts of violence are in mind.

The final line of frag. 1 appears to contain a broken reference to the temple and to the number two. Puech has suggest that this line refers to the festival of wood known from the Temple Scroll and 4QReworked Pentateuch.⁷⁰⁵ This festival involves each of the twelve tribes bringing wood to the altar for the sacrifices, two by two, over the course of six days.⁷⁰⁶ The actual evidence for this view, however, is rather tenuous. In addition to the references to the temple and the number two in frag. 1, Puech points to ll. 2 and 3 of frag. 2, which read, according to his transcription:

2.]to the wood [st]ore, the quantity of logs he will gather[
3.]/ the [w]ood itself we found that

]ל[ב]תאעא שגיאעיתא הוא יכנש]	2.
]ל[א]עא הוא השבחנא די	3.

for *All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, ed. Eric F. Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 407–28.

⁷⁰⁴ Hogeterp, *Expectations of the End*, 374.

⁷⁰⁵ As Puech argues, frags. 1 through 6 refer “à l’offrande du bois au sanctuaire à la fête du bois au sixième mois, lorsque les tribus viennent, deux par deux, faire leur offrande (fragments 1–2 en particulier), ainsi que le rapportent d’autres compositions.” DJD XXXVII, 323.

⁷⁰⁶ On this festival and the relevant passages in TS and 4Q365, see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983); Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*, JSOTSup 34 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985); B. Jongeling, “A propos de la colonne XXIII du Rouleau du Temple,” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 593–5; Michael O. Wise, “A New Manuscript Join in the ‘Festival of Wood Offering’ (Temple Scroll XXIII),” *JNES* 47 (1988): 113–21; DJD XIII, 293–4.

As Puech admits regarding 1. 2, “La lecture de cette ligne n’est pas assure.”⁷⁰⁷ Even still, there is hardly enough evidence to suggest that 4Q562 is describing any specific ritual, let alone the wood festival.⁷⁰⁸ There are also a few other tantalizing, though broken and ultimately uncertain, allusions to priestly matters in 4Q562. Line 4 of frag. 2 contains the phrase **כְּהֵנִיא וְכָל שְׂבִיא**, which may refer to either “the priests and all the elders” (so Puech and Cook) or “the priests and all the captives” (so Wise).⁷⁰⁹ Finally, frag. 6 refers to **בְּרִכְתָּא** “the blessing” (l. 1) and frag. 4 may contain the word **לְבוּשׁ** “clot[hing]” (l. 1), both of which can function in priestly contexts.⁷¹⁰ In particular, priestly garments are described in New Jerusalem, the Testament of Jacob?, and the Aramaic Levi Document, though, as Puech’s transcription suggests, reading 4Q562 4 1 as “clothing” is no more than a possibility.

Issues of priesthood and priestly status are clearly of some importance for the author of 4Q562. If we had a better-preserved manuscript, 4Q562 might offer significant insight into the questions that are driving this dissertation. Unfortunately, much of the material related to the priesthood in this manuscript remains frustratingly elusive.

⁷⁰⁷ DJD XXXVII, 327.

⁷⁰⁸ The Aramaic Levi Document, on the other hand, may provide a more helpful point of comparison, a possibility Puech himself entertains. DJD XXXVII, 327. The “Law of the Priesthood” contains a section in which Levi is instructed to split the logs for the sacrificial fire, inspect them for worms, and arrange them on the fire. He is also instructed as to which twelve types of wood are acceptable to be used on the altar. It is possible that 4Q562 reflects a similar, more general interest in priestly duties related to the sacrificial fire, though this is little more than speculation.

⁷⁰⁹ Wise has suggested that a reference to Zech 2:8 (7 2) and a possible allusion to Susa (12 3) point to a Persian period setting for 4Q562, and should lead us to favor the latter reading. New Jerusalem, however, discusses a group identified as **שְׂבִיא דִּי בַהוֹן** “the elders which are among them” (2Q24 4 13) in the context of its description of the organization of the priesthood, which may lend credence to the former reading. It is not easy to decide one way or the other.

⁷¹⁰ DJD XXXVII, 329.

5.5 Biblical Chronology (4Q559)

4Q559 is one, very fragmentary example of a literary genre from the Second Temple period known as the chronograph.⁷¹¹ As Wise defines it, a chronograph is “a work whose main purpose is the delineation of a chronology.”⁷¹² Many such works were written at least in part to resolve problems or contradictions in the biblical record, and thus often had both an exegetical and historiographic purpose. What makes this particular chronographic tradition so interesting for our purposes is the central role given to the Levitical line in its calculation of the length of time that Israel spent in Egypt.

Fragments 2 and 3 contain the relevant genealogical data, and are characterized by a repeating syntactical pattern that allows us to reconstruct much of their content with some confidence, despite their poor state of preservation.⁷¹³ Beginning with at least Abraham, or maybe Terah, and including Isaac, Levi, Qahat, Amram, and Aaron, the genealogy reads: “And X, at the age of #, begat Y. And Y, at the age of #, begat Z.” The genealogy is punctuated by a reference to Israel’s exodus from Egypt (4Q559 3.4–5). Strikingly, Aaron is the climactic figure in the genealogy. Not only is the family line traced from the patriarchs through Aaron’s Levitical-priestly forebears (Levi, Qahat, and Amram), rather than through any other of Jacob’s progeny, but Aaron, not Moses, is the focal point of the brief reference to the exodus at the end of the genealogy.⁷¹⁴

⁷¹¹ Examples of the chronograph also appear in later Jewish and Christian writings. For more examples and discussion, see Ben Zion Wacholder, “Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles,” *HTR* 61 (1968): 451–81; Lester L. Grabbe, “Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography,” *SBLSP* 2 (1979): 43–68; Chaim Milikowsky, “*Seder ‘Olam* and Jewish Chronography in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods,” *PAAJR* 52 (1985): 115–39.

⁷¹² Michael O. Wise, “To Know the Times and the Seasons: A Study of the Aramaic Chronograph 4Q559,” *JSP* 15 (1997): 3–51, see 4 n. 2. Wise follows the “loose definition” of chronograph posited by Milikowsky, as opposed to a “more exclusive definition,” suggested by Grabbe, who makes a distinction between chronography and chronology. Milikowsky defines a chronograph as “as subgenre of historiography which emphasizes the dating of past persons and events.” Milikowsky, “Jewish Chronography,” 115.

⁷¹³ Noted by Wise, “To Know the Times,” 18. The ages are the most difficult part of the genealogy to reconstruct. For two different attempts to do so, see Wise, “To Know the Times,” 13–25; *DJD XXXVII*, 271–7.

⁷¹⁴ Both of these points are made by Puech in *DJD XXXVII*, 265.

Wise takes this culminating reference to Aaron as an indication of the priestly provenance of 4Q559, highlighting that the extant manuscript “does not speak of Moses, as do other ancient chronographs such as the work of Demetrius, *Seder ‘Olam Rabbah* and Eusebius’ Chronicle.”⁷¹⁵

As he continues, “In glaring contrast, here the emphasis at the Exodus is on Aaron, the first high priest.”⁷¹⁶

⁷¹⁵ Wise, “To Know the Times,” 25.

⁷¹⁶ Wise, “To Know the Times,” 25. Wise argues that the decision to focus on Aaron “is one of several indicators that 4Q559 is not merely very old, but also of priestly origin, propagandistic. This work implicitly claims that problems of biblical chronology find their solution by focusing on the priesthood.”

CHAPTER 6: SYNTHESIS

6.1 Introduction

My dissertation thus far has dealt with each composition on its own terms. It has not involved any comparative work, and has only gestured toward specific parallels and points of contact within the Qumran Aramaic corpus. I have not sought to situate any of these compositions within a particular socio-historical context, except in my discussion of the Book of Watchers and the Aramaic Levi Document. In these two cases, theories about their social location vis-à-vis the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood and temple have so dominated the secondary literary that I felt it necessary to offer an assessment of the relevant scholarship in advance of my synthesis in this chapter. Even then, I tried to spend most of my time raising concerns with the consensus position, rather than offering a fresh proposal of my own. In the next two chapters, though, I will draw together the results of my analysis in order to address two related issues. In this chapter, I will consider whether or not the Aramaic Scrolls, when considered together, offer a consistent conception of the priesthood, cult, and temple; this requires exploring the continuities and discontinuities within the corpus on each of these three topics. In the next and final chapter, I will offer a preliminary attempt to situate the Aramaic Scrolls within their socio-historical context.

6.2 The Priesthood

References to priests and the priesthood are fairly common in the Qumran Aramaic writings, though they appear most frequently in those works that deal with the lives of Jacob, Levi, Qahat, and Amram. Tobit, however, is the major exception to this rule. The other pre-Mosaic compositions also involve protagonists whose activity can be characterized as priestly, even if they

are not explicitly identified as priests. Taken together, these references to priests, the priesthood, and priest-like protagonists reflect a relatively consistent conception of the priesthood, and of priestly service. We can see this coherence among these compositions (the pre-Mosaic compositions and Tobit) in how the duties of priests are portrayed; how the priestly genealogy is understood; and how the priesthood is organized. They also share a similar approach to marriage. It will become clear, however, that the image of the priesthood in the Aramaic Scrolls is broadly compatible with the general image of priesthood that we find in most ancient Jewish writings ranging from Chronicles to Josephus, inasmuch as they 1) depict the priests first and foremost as cultic functionaries, and secondarily as scribes and judges, among other things; 2) emphasize the Levitical and Aaronide lineage of the priests; and 3) highlight the role of the high priest, and assume a bipartite division of the cultic functionaries into sons of Levi and sons of Aaron. None of the Aramaic Scrolls reflect dissatisfaction with this basic arrangement, nor do they betray a polemical posture toward the contemporary Jerusalem priesthood.

6.2.1 Cultic Obligations

Many of those who bear the title of priest in the Aramaic Scrolls are unnamed, and are described collectively simply as priests or the priests. Only three named individuals are explicitly referred to as priests in the Aramaic Scrolls: Levi, Aaron, and Melchizedek. All of the compositions that feature priests, named or unnamed, demonstrate that the priesthood is primarily, though not exclusively, envisioned as a cultic office. All of the unnamed priests in the Aramaic Scrolls are presented in cultic contexts. The Testament of Jacob? and New Jerusalem both include visions of a future temple, complete with priests serving at the altar (4Q537 12.1–2; 2Q24; 11Q18). Tobit describes the priests simply as those who serve “at the altar” and the Levites as those who

“ministered at Jerusalem,” and has its titular protagonist give them their tithes in Jerusalem as a demonstration of his piety (Tob 1:7). None of these unnamed priests are described as fulfilling any obligation outside of temple service. This observation may initially seem banal, but it is worth noting that the narratives preserved in the Aramaic Scrolls do not contain references to unnamed priests who are, say, out in the countryside serving as scribes, teachers, or judges. Whenever we come across unnamed priests, they are always found in the Jerusalem temple, and are always carrying out their cultic duties. Of the named priests, Levi is the one who is most explicitly associated with the sacrificial cult, but Aaron and Melchizedek are also depicted primarily in terms of their cultic activities. The Visions of Amram refers to the mystery of Aaron’s “service,” an allusion to his sacrificial activity (4Q454 4.16). It later associates him with a bronze altar—an important piece of cultic furniture—in a passage that appears to recount the sacrifice associated with his priestly ordination (4Q547 9.5). Melchizedek, though mentioned only briefly, receives a tithe from Abraham in a passage from the Genesis Apocryphon that closely adheres to its Hebrew base-text (1Q20 22.15; cf. Gen 14:18). Those Aramaic Scrolls that describe the activity of individuals who are identified using the title of priest clearly understand their central duty to be cultic in nature. However, a significant swath of the Aramaic Scrolls depicts priestly service as involving more than just stewardship of the cultic system, which we can see by widening the scope of our analysis to include not only those who bear the title of priest. We discover an expanded conception of what priestly activity entails in the Aramaic Scrolls when we analyze all those who are associated in one way or another with the priesthood as well as those who are depicted as engaging in cultic activity, despite not possessing the title of priest.

6.2.2 Scribal-Sapiential Qualities and Activities

A significant number of Qumran Aramaic writings expand the traditional cultic role of the priest to include activities otherwise associated with the scribe or sage. In fact, depicting a protagonist as having both sacerdotal and scribal-sapiential characteristics is one of the hallmark features of the pre-Mosaic Aramaic Scrolls. The most prominent example of this phenomenon is Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, which presents its titular protagonist as a model of wisdom and scribal craft. Levi's scribal-sapiential knowledge is depicted as essential for his proper stewardship of the sacrificial cult, but it also has broader socio-political implications, as we see in the wisdom poem. In this portion of the composition, Levi encourages his children to pursue various forms of knowledge, including scribal training, and extols the type of life enjoyed by "he who learns wisdom" (ALD 13:1–15). The scribal skill and wisdom that Levi encourages his children to acquire throughout the poem is closely associated with Joseph, who used his wisdom to rise through the ranks of the Egyptian bureaucracy, thus attaining glory, majesty, and access to the ear of Pharaoh (ALD 13:6). Levi also tells his children more directly toward the end of the extant poem that scribal and sapiential knowledge have the ability to win for its students honor and a great reputation in foreign lands (ALD 13:7–10).

Other prominent examples of the convergence of a cultic and scribal-sapiential identity include Noah and Abraham, both of whom are presented as scribal-sapiential figures, in addition to being forerunners of the sacrificial cult (1Q20 10.13–17; 21.2, 20 ALD 7:4; 10:3–4, 10; 4Q547 5.1–3). For example, the Genesis Apocryphon has Noah say of himself: "So I girded my loins in the vision of truth and wisdom (קושטא וחכמתא)" (1Q20 6.4) and "I held fast to truth (בקושטא) and

strengthened myself in wisdom (בְּחִכְמָתִי) (1Q20 6.6).⁷¹⁷ Noah is also depicted as the author of a written text in the Genesis Apocryphon and the Aramaic Levi Document, where we find references to “a [c]o[p]y of the book of the words of Noah” (1Q20 5.29) and “the writing of the book of Noah” (ALD 10:10), respectively. Abraham, too, is depicted as a sapiential figure in the Genesis Apocryphon, and is sought out by the Pharaoh’s nobles while sojourning in Egypt “because of his words and his wisdom (עַל מְלִי וְעַל חִכְמָתִי)” (1Q20 19.24). The nobles are reported to have come asking him for “scribal craft and wisdom and truth (סְפָרָא וְחִכְמָתָא וְקוּשְׁטָא),” at which point he instructs them from “the book of the words of Enoch (סְפָר מְלִי הַנוּד)” (1Q20 19.25).⁷¹⁸ Note that Abraham also consults Noah’s book in the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 10:10). The scribal-sapiential language used to characterize the intellectual acumen of Noah and Abraham bears a striking resemblance to that which pervades Levi’s wisdom poem: מְלִי חִכְמָתָא “his words of wisdom” (ALD 13:10); צְדָקָה וְקוּשְׁטָא “righteousness and truth” (ALD 13:3; cf. 13:2, 14); חִכְמָתָא “wisdom” (ALD 13:5, 7, 9, 13); and סְפָר וְמוֹסָר וְחִכְמָה “scribal craft and instruction and wisdom” (ALD 13:4; cf. 13:6, 15).⁷¹⁹

The eschatological, priest-like figure in the Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} is also characterized using both sacerdotal and sapiential language. In fact, his sapiential qualities predominate in the

⁷¹⁷ Another reference to Noah’s wisdom occurs in the so-called Birth of Noah (4Q534–536), though, unlike the Genesis Apocryphon, it does not contain any references to Noah’s priestly status or cultic duties (see 4Q534 1i.8).

⁷¹⁸ For more on the sapiential themes in the Genesis Apocryphon in the Qumran Aramaic context, see Daniel A. Machiela, “Wisdom Motifs” in the Compositional Strategy of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran,” in *Hā-’ish Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, ed. Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George J. Brooke, STDJ 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 223–47.

⁷¹⁹ On the striking parallels between Levi’s wisdom poem and Abraham encounter with the Egyptian nobles, see the discussion in Machiela, “Wisdom Motifs,” 237–9.

description of his mission. The work that he accomplishes on behalf of his generation is identified as an act of atonement (כַּפֵּר), a reference to the cultic duties of a priest, but the author also identifies him as a teacher (4Q541 9i.3) and as possessing wisdom (4Q541 9i.2). Qahat is not as clearly associated with wisdom terminology as are the other individuals mentioned above, but, like Noah and Abraham before him, he possesses and passes on book lore (4Q542 1ii.9–13), which suggests some degree of scribal training and skill. The Visions of Amram, too, depicts its titular protagonist as a scribal figure, inasmuch as its superscription identifies him as the author of a written document (4Q543 1a–c.1 // 4Q545 1ai.1; cf. 1Q20 5.29). Enoch is also portrayed in both cultic and scribal terms, with his cultic qualities being somewhat muted by comparison, especially when compared to how he is portrayed in later ancient Jewish writings, e.g., Jubilees.⁷²⁰

The priestly and scribal-sapiential domains remain distinguishable throughout the Aramaic Scrolls, such that not all scribes or sages are also priests, nor does scribal or sapiential knowledge pertain exclusively and in every case to the cultic realm. Enoch's scribal activity in the works that came to comprise 1 Enoch and the Book of Giants, for example, does not have any obvious relation to priestly service, nor does the content of his wisdom relate in any way to the proper operation of the sacrificial cult. Scribal craft and wisdom instruction are not associated with priestly identity in Tobit, Jews in the Persian Court, or the Aramaic Daniel traditions. Moreover, Levi's pointing to Joseph, his non-priestly brother, as a paragon of scribal craft and wisdom suggests that even the Aramaic Levi Document does not completely collapse the distinction between priest and scribe or

⁷²⁰ Collins overstates the case, however, when he suggests that Enoch should be viewed as a scribal, rather than a priestly functionary in the Book of the Watchers. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 54. Such a claim simply reifies a problematic assumption that priestly and scribal activities were mutually exclusive in the Second Temple period, but, as we have seen and will see in more detail below, the convergence of sacerdotal and scribal-sapiential identities were a key feature not just of the Aramaic Scrolls, but of Second Temple literature more broadly. On Enoch's priestly identity, see Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 25. On Enoch as a priest and scribe in Jubilees, see Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 25.

sage. That being said, the sheer number of priestly individuals who possess both cultic and scribal-sapiential qualities in the Aramaic Scrolls indicates that many of their authors saw a close connection between these spheres of knowledge and practice. Most, if not all, of the Aramaic Scrolls that include priestly protagonists envisioned them as learned individuals whose priestly identity includes more than service at the altar, which itself requires a scribal education according to at least the Aramaic Levi Document. They also associate them with a whole range of qualities and activities that can be characterized as scribal or sapiential, and have application even outside of the cultic sphere (e.g., wisdom, teaching, and the writings of books).

6.2.3 Judicial Responsibilities

The Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Apocryphon of Levi^b? also envision priestly service to include a judicial component. The Aramaic Levi Document, in particular, connects Levi's status as judge to his priestly identity. The priestly instructions, passed on to Levi by Isaac, are referred to as a דין "law" and as דין קושטא "true law" (ALD 5:8; 6:2), and Isaac, in the process of imparting this priestly law, proclaims concerning Levi: דינך רב מן כל בישרא "your judgment is greater than all flesh" (ALD 6:1). Levi's judicial responsibilities involve, on the one hand, stewardship of the sacrificial cult, but also include enforcing the purity laws related to proper marriage, and, if necessary, wielding the sword against those transgressors whose sexual misdeeds threaten the stability of the community. Therefore, Levi's slaughter of the Shechemites functions as a paradigmatic example of priestly judgment in defense of marital purity. We see another example of priestly judgment in the Testament of Qahat, in a passage that fulfills Levi's wish that all of his descendants in perpetuity "do true judgment (דין קשט // κρίσιν ἀληθινὴν)" (ALD

3:17). The Testament of Qahat, in a somewhat fragmentary context, has Qahat telling his children that they will arise at the time of the eschaton to execute judgment (למדן דיין) against the wicked (4Q542 1ii.5–8), using language reminiscent of Levi’s wielding of the sword against Shechem in the Rylands Fragment (ויעבד דיין). Finally, the Apocryphon of Levi^b does not use the same judicial language found in the Aramaic Levi Document or the Testament of Qahat, but it is clear that its description of its priestly protagonist envisions him as having a central role in executing judgment against the wicked during the time of travail associated with the eschaton, much like Qahat’s future descendants in the Testament of Qahat. All three of these compositions thus attest to the convergence of priestly, scribal-sapiential, and judicial qualities, and put wise priests or priestly figures in charge of judging those who have transgressed against God’s law. The Aramaic Levi Document, though, is most explicit about making an unequivocal connection between the priestly office and judicial activity. The other two compositions make this point more implicitly.

6.2.4 A Royal Priesthood

A more ambiguous case is the extent to which the Aramaic Scrolls reflect a convergence of priestly and royal authority, since, notably, the only composition to combine explicitly the language of priesthood and kingship in this corpus is the Aramaic Levi Document. This connection is clearest in the case of Qahat, who, along with his descendants, was described as “the beginning of kings” and to whom Judah’s royal blessing from Gen 49 was implicitly transferred (ALD 11:6). But we also find the phrase “the kingdom of the priesthood” (1Q21 1.2) in a fragmentary Qumran manuscript, as well as references to “priests and kings” (4Q213 2.12) and “your kingdom” (4Q213 2.13) in what seems to be a section recounting the future status of Levi’s descendants. It is not entirely clear, however, what this evidence implies about the form of priestly authority endorsed

by the author of the Aramaic Levi Document, let alone any of the other Aramaic Scrolls. It does seem to suggest that the Aramaic Levi Document connects kingship with the Levitical, rather than the Judahite (and thus the Davidic) line. It is unclear, though, whether the author intends to conflate the office of priest and king. On the one hand, the priesthood itself is envisioned in royal terms in 1Q21 1.2 and, possibly, in 4Q213 2.13, but, on the other hand, 4Q213 2.12 appears to maintain a distinction between the office of priest and the office of king. Qahat himself is presented in both priestly and royal terms, but this may simply reflect the fact that the Levitical line is viewed as the fountainhead of *both* priests *and* kings, understood as separate offices. One possible reading of the evidence is that the Aramaic Levi Document is simply responding to a particular set of historical realities during the early Hellenistic period, namely, the absence of a native kingship in Judea and the increasing political power of the priesthood and, especially, the high priesthood. This set of historical realities may also be reflected in New Jerusalem, which, unlike Ezek 40–48, gives Levi's gate, not Judah's, pride of place in the city wall, contains no references to the "prince" (נשיא), and devotes a significant amount of space to a description of the high priest (2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20; 11Q18 14ii). The appropriation of royal imagery for the priesthood in the Aramaic Levi Document may reflect an attempt to reimagine the political structures of ancient Israel in light of contemporary circumstances. I must stress, though, that this is only one possible reading.

6.2.5 Miscellaneous

Priests and priest-like figures also possess other qualities and carry out other duties that are less clearly connected to their priestly identity, and that are shared by other non-priestly figures. most notably, the reception of divine revelation through dream-visions, the instruction of their children in matters related to ethical living, and the arrangement of endogamous marriages for

their children. For example, various priestly figures receive information about their own priesthood or that of their children via dream-visions and heavenly intermediaries, but the fact that they receive this type of divine revelation is not associated with their priestly identity in any obvious way. A wide variety of protagonists, priestly and non-priestly, in the Aramaic Scrolls receive revelation through dream-visions, especially Enoch, Jacob, and Daniel. The same could be said about the tendency of the priestly figures to instruct their children. The content of their teaching may differ from that of the average Israelite father, but, as we see in the case of Tobit, there does not appear to be anything priestly per se about the duty to instruct your children in the Aramaic Scrolls.

The relationship between priestly identity and endogamy is somewhat more complex, and requires additional comment. The expectation that the *paterfamilias* should arrange the marriages of his children to close blood relatives, or at the very least encourage his children to marry in this endogamous manner, is reflected in several of the Qumran Aramaic writings. Noah, we read in the Genesis Apocryphon, finds wives for his sons “from among the daughters of my brothers,” and husbands for his daughters among “the sons of my brothers” (1Q20 6.8) The Genesis Apocryphon notes that this principle conforms to “the custom of the eternal statute” (1Q20 6.8).⁷²¹ Levi observes a similar practice according to the Aramaic Levi Document, which reports that he arranged marriages between his sons and “the daughters of my brothers” (ALD 12:1). The Visions of Amram highlights the fact that Amram ensured that his children marry in an endogamous manner by recording his arrangement of the marriage of his daughter Miriam to his brother Uzziel (4Q543 1a–c.5–7 // 4Q545 1ai.4–8 // 4Q546 1.3–4). The Book of Tobit recounts Tobit urging his

⁷²¹ This appeal to “the custom of the eternal statute” in the Genesis Apocryphon find close parallel in the Book of Tobit. As Perrin notes, “Three times in Tob. 7.11–13 Ragouel references ‘the book of Moses’ (τῆς βίβλου Μωυσέως) as governing the union of Tobias and Sarah.” Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 40.

son to “marry a woman from among the descendants of your ancestors,” and not to “marry a foreign woman, who is not of your father’s tribe” (Tob 4:12). To drive this point home, Tobit points to Israel’s heroes, who he calls “our ancestors of old,” Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as examples of obedience to the standards for a proper marriage (Tob 4:12). In addition to arranging these marriages for their children, the protagonists themselves also model endogamy, as in the case of Noah, Levi, and Amram (1Q20 6.7; ALD 11:1; 12:3; 4Q544 1.8).

Even though Isaac exhorts Levi concerning the importance of endogamy on the grounds that he is “holy seed” and “a holy priest” (ALD 6:4), the examples that we have surveyed here do not make out endogamy to be a principle that should be exclusively, or even primarily, observed by priests, nor do they place any special emphasis on the imperative for priests to marry women from priestly families. The duty of arranging endogamous marriages appears to fall to all Israelite fathers, whether priestly or not. Submitting to an endogamous marriage seems to be a demonstration of a general, as opposed to a specifically priestly, piety. Following the particular endogamic principle found in the Aramaic Scrolls would certainly ensure that priests marry women from priestly families, but the imperative to marry a close blood relative, not priestly lineage, is what is emphasized in the extant compositions. In fact, consider the example of Levi, the paradigmatic priest, who nevertheless marries Milka, the daughter of Bethuel, son of Laban (ALD 11:1). The Aramaic Levi Document makes no attempt to demonstrate that Levi’s wife comes from a priestly family, just that she is a close blood relative (cf. ALD 6:4).

The authors of the Aramaic Scrolls are anxious about exogamous marriages of any sort, not just those of priests, as is illustrated by the narrative about the illegitimate marriages between the watchers and human women in the Book of Watchers. This narrative condemns these unions as impure because they involved illegitimate partners, that is, partners representing different

“kinds.” The Book of Watchers describes the offspring of these marriages as possessing mixed ancestry ($\kappa\acute{\iota}\beta\delta\eta\lambda\alpha$), a term which alludes to the legislation against mixing in Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11 (זָרָה).⁷²² In that particular case, the difference in kind was immortal versus mortal, heavenly versus earthly, spirit versus flesh and blood. The same exegetical strategy is used to describe marriages between members of two different kinds in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat, both which call the offspring of exogamous marriages כִּילְאִין , a term that, like $\kappa\acute{\iota}\beta\delta\eta\lambda\alpha$ in the Book of Watchers, alludes to the Pentateuchal legislation against mixing (Lev 19:19; Deut 22:9).⁷²³ Whether all three of these compositions are addressing priestly marriages is doubtful. Instead, they seem to be laying out a general principle about mixed marriages that could apply in a variety of contexts. Yet, the Aramaic Scrolls do tend to lift up marriages between close family members as the ideal, as we have seen, but in those cases the command to marry a close blood relative applies to priests and non-priests alike.

As I argued earlier, even if this endogamic principle in these writings was meant to apply to all Israel, and not to the priestly class in particular, the language that they use to characterize the importance of endogamy and the danger of exogamy may nevertheless reflect the priestly outlook of their authors. We have already seen that the Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat allude to the priestly legislation regarding improper mixing in their use of the terms $\kappa\acute{\iota}\beta\delta\eta\lambda\alpha$ and כִּילְאִין . The connection between exogamy and improper mixing is also reflected in the use of the word $\text{ער}[\text{ברוב}]$ to describe exogamous relationships in the Testament of Qahat, a word which is used to describe various mixed entities in rabbinic writings and whose

⁷²² On $\kappa\acute{\iota}\beta\delta\eta\lambda\alpha$ as an allusion to Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 213.

⁷²³ Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 40–41; Cook, “Remarks,” 209; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 338; idem, “Form and Content,” 69–70.

verbal root describes the mixing of sacrificial meat in New Jerusalem. All three of these compositions display an aversion to illicit mixing, which may give us some indication that they share a priestly worldview. At the very least, they all seem to be interpreting exogamy in light of this aspect of priestly legislation. We see a similar priestly approach to endogamy and exogamy in the use of the language of purity and pollution in passages related to marriage in the Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat (1 En. 9:8; 10:11; 12:4; 15:4; ALD 6:3–5; 4Q542 1i.8–9), and the use of the language of holiness in some of the same passages in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat (ALD 6:4; 4Q542 1i.8–9).

6.2.6 The Levitical-Priestly Genealogy

Priestly identity is closely connected to issues of genealogical descent in the Aramaic Scrolls, especially descent from Levi and Aaron. Tobit uses genealogical information in its brief characterization of the priesthood, identifying those who serve at the altar as “the priests, the sons of Aaron,” and those who minister at Jerusalem as “the sons of Levi” (Tob 1:7). In the Qumran Aramaic writings, this familiar, bipartite classification of priestly status and division of labor is found only here and, possibly, in New Jerusalem (11Q18 30.2). The rest of the extant materials refer only to priests, not priests and Levites. However, Tobit’s genealogical configuration of the priesthood is consistent with what we see in a sizable swath of the other compositions. The extant Aramaic Scrolls privilege Levi over and above his brothers, apparently as a way of highlighting the socio-political significance of the Israelite priesthood.⁷²⁴ The Aramaic Scrolls also dedicate a considerable amount of space to the elevation of Levi’s descendants. The extant compositions

⁷²⁴ This move is similar, for example, to how Jubilees singles out Levi and Judah among the sons of Jacob in order to signify the importance of the priestly and royal offices, while still prioritizing Levi and the priesthood (Jub. 31:5–23), or, alternatively, how the Gospel of Matthew privileges Judah over his brothers so as to highlight Jesus’ genealogical connection to royal house of David (Matt 1:2–3).

valorize the members of the Levitical-priestly genealogy (Levi–Qahat–Amram–Aaron), and entrust the priesthood and its associated technical knowledge to them and their future offspring in perpetuity. Finally, several of the Aramaic Scrolls make an effort to connect the Levitical-priestly genealogy and its priestly lore to Israel’s prediluvian and patriarchal ancestors, presumably as a way of locating the origins of Israel’s priesthood and its traditions in deep antiquity.

The clearest example of Levi’s privileged position vis-à-vis his brothers appears in the Aramaic Levi Document, which says of him: “And you will be more beloved than all your brothers” (ALD 10:11). New Jerusalem is more implicit in its view of Levi, but also gives him pride of place among the sons of Jacob. When recounting the names of the gates surrounding the city wall, its author gives Levi’s gate the central position on the east wall, indicating his privileged position (4Q554 1i.11–1ii.10). This tendency to elevate Levi to a place of prominence vis-à-vis his brothers reflects a broader trend in Jewish writings from the Second Temple period. As I noted in section 4.3.1, the placement of Levi’s gate in New Jerusalem mirrors that of the Temple Scroll (11Q19) and Reworked Pentateuch (4Q365a), and contrasts with Ezekiel’s vision, which gives Judah’s gate the most prominent position (Ezek 48:31–34). A similar elevation of Levi vis-à-vis Judah occurs in Jub. 31:11–20. In this passage, the two brothers are singled out for Jacob’s blessing, but it is Levi who is blessed first, and whom Jacob takes in his right hand (cf. Jub. 31:13). Consider also 4QApocryphon of Joshua^b (4Q379 1.2), in which, as Angel has pointed out, “Levi is mentioned before Reuben in a list of tribal patriarchs,” and is called “beloved,” a phrase that is also used of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, but “that in biblical tradition is only applied to Benjamin (Deut 33:12).”⁷²⁵

⁷²⁵ Each of these quotations comes from Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 279–80.

However, it is important to note that, at least in the case of the Aramaic Scrolls, the focus is not narrowly on Levi, or even on Levi and his descendants. Certain of Levi's descendants are themselves elevated above their brothers. The Aramaic Levi Document, for example, not only associates Qahat with the high priesthood, but contrasts Qahat's suitability for that office with his brother Gershom's forfeiture of it (ALD 11:3, 6). Qahat's high priestly status is also attested in Pseudo-Daniel^c, which puts Qahat at or near the head of a high priestly list that extend down to include members of Hasmonean line (4Q245 1i.5–10). More generally, we have also seen how Qahat is utterly transformed in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat, from a character known only in genealogical lists in the Hebrew Bible and elsewhere in Second Temple literature (e.g., Jub. 44:14) to a multifaceted, prominent individual. Notably, unlike Levi's literary transformation, Qahat's role as a prominent character is confined to the Aramaic Scrolls.⁷²⁶

The same could be said of Amram's elevation from obscurity to prominence in the Qumran Aramaic writings, though, as Tervanotko has noted, Amram traditions are a bit more well-attested than Qahat traditions in ancient Jewish literature.⁷²⁷ None of Levi's other grandchildren appear as characters of any significance in the Aramaic Scrolls. In fact, except in the case of Amram, we learn nothing about Levi's grandchildren but their names (ALD 12:2). On other hand, we learn key biographical details about Amram in the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 12:3–5), and he is singled out among Qahat's children for instruction in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542 1ii.9), though most of what we know about Amram in the Qumran Aramaic writings comes from the Visions of Amram, in which he plays a role similar to that of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document.⁷²⁸

⁷²⁶ This observation has led Tervanotko to conclude that interest in Qahat was a relatively "marginal phenomenon in ancient Judaism." Tervanotko, "Trilogy of Testaments," 55.

⁷²⁷ Tervanotko has noted that, in addition to the Aramaic Scrolls, traditions about Amram appear in Jubilees, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*. Tervanotko, "Trilogy of Testaments," 55.

⁷²⁸ E.g., arranging the marriage of one of his children, instructing his children near the end of his life, and receiving a divine revelation by means of a heavenly mediator in a dream-vision.

Aaron is also the subject of several key passages, despite playing a relatively limited role as a character in the Qumran Aramaic writings. In fact, the only extant references to Aaron in the Aramaic Scrolls occur in *Biblical Chronology* and the *Visions of Amram*. *Biblical Chronology* depicts Aaron as the climactic figure in its genealogical list. The *Visions of Amram* presents Aaron as the prototypical Israelite priest. Significantly for our purposes, though, Aaron's priestly status does not put him at odds, but rather places him in continuity with Levi. The *Visions of Amram* uses literary clues to align the priesthood of Aaron with that of Levi. For example, both are referred to as a "holy priest" (כֹּהֵן קָדִישׁ, 4Q545 4.16; כֹּהֵן קָדִישׁ, ALD 6:4); both are said to have been "chosen" for their position (יִתְבַּחַר, 4Q545 4.19; ἐξελέχθης, ALD 10:4); and both of their descendants are described as enduring "for all the generations of eternity" (לְכוֹל דְּרֵי עֲלָמִין, 4Q547 9.7; εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων, ALD 10:14), a phrase that we will consider in more detail below.⁷²⁹ As Perrin has suggested, "By reapplying the language of *ALD*, the author of *VisAmram* augmented the priestly line such that Aaron is described in terms strongly reminiscent of Levi."⁷³⁰ The priestly line of Levi and Aaron also stand in continuity with one another inasmuch as both are closely associated with the priesthood of Melchizedek in the Aramaic Levi Document and the *Visions of Amram*, respectively.

6.2.7 The Priesthood and the Patriarchs of Israel

Beyond elevating the members of the Levitical-priestly genealogy, the Aramaic Scrolls emphasize the connections between them and their patriarchal forebears, Abraham, Isaac, and

⁷²⁹ For a table comparing the language used of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document to that of Aaron in the *Visions of Amram*, see Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 165.

⁷³⁰ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 165.

Jacob. The Visions of Amram in particular alludes to a genealogical chain that runs from Abraham to Aaron, strengthening the association between the patriarchal genealogy, on the one hand, and the Levitical-priestly genealogy, on the other. By casting Aaron as the “seventh of the men of [his (i.e., God’s)] favor” (4Q545 4.18), its author highlights his continuity not only with his Levitical ancestors, but with the founding members of the Israelite people. The same could be said of the genealogy found in Biblical Chronology. It too attaches the Levitical-priestly genealogy to the patriarchal genealogy, tracing the generations after Jacob through Levi’s line and creating a single genealogical chain running from Abraham to Aaron (4Q559 2.1–3.5). As Angel has pointed out, a Qumran manuscript known as 4QPseudo-Jubilees^{a+b} (4Q225 2ii.11–12; 4Q226 7.4–5) displays a similar tradition, depicting “Levi as fourth in a genealogical list that also includes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.”⁷³¹ We also see the continuity between the Israelite patriarchs and the members of the Levitical-priestly genealogy on display in the form of narrative accounts of the passing down of priestly teaching from father to son. The Testament of Qahat, for example, describes knowledge being passed down from Abraham through Isaac, Jacob, Levi, and Qahat to Amram and beyond (4Q542 1i.7–10; 1ii.1, 9–13), and the Aramaic Levi Document has Isaac passing on instructions concerning proper sacrificial practice to Levi, but notes that this information came from Abraham, and ultimately from a written document attributed to Noah (ALD 5:8–10:14, esp. 7:4; 10:3–4, 10).

6.2.8 The Priesthood and the Prediluvian Age

That information concerning the sacrificial cult can be traced to Noah highlights another aspect of the relationship between priesthood and genealogy in the Aramaic Scrolls: Not only do several compositions attempt to connect the Levitical-priestly genealogy and its traditions to the

⁷³¹ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological*, 279.

Israelite patriarchs, but some, like the Aramaic Levi Document, go further, locating the origins of its priestly traditions in the prediluvian period by highlighting Noah’s proto-priestly status and activity. In addition to Noah being associated with a book of sacrificial prescriptions in the Aramaic Levi Document, he is also depicted as carrying out sacrifices in the Visions of Amram and the Genesis Apocryphon, in a passage that we take up again in section 6.3 below. The passage involving Noah’s sacrifice in the Visions of Amram is far too fragmentary to say anything about, but the Genesis Apocryphon describes Noah’s sacrifice in great detail in order to show that he has conducted this ritual in accordance with the dictates of proper cultic procedure. It is worth noting at this point that other ancient Jewish traditions also trace the origin of cultic practice to the prediluvian period, with some going as far back as Enoch or even Adam.⁷³² The Aramaic Scrolls, however, at least the preserved portions of them, are consistent in highlighting Noah as the progenitor of the sacrificial cult and its protocol.

6.2.9 The Perpetual Endurance of the Priesthood

Several Aramaic writings from Qumran not only highlight the continuity between the Levitical-priestly genealogy and Israel’s patriarchal and primordial past, but also project its future as continuing in perpetuity. The term *עלם* is regularly used to describe the priesthood, individual priests, and their future descendants, particularly in accounts involving Levi, Aaron, and their posterity. Levi, for example, is associated with an “eternal priesthood (*כְּהֵנוּת עֶלְמָא*)” in the Aramaic Levi Document (4Q213a 5i.3), and the same composition refers to his “anointing (or: greatness) of eternal peace (*רְבוּת שְׁלָם עֶלְמָא*)” (ALD 4:14), which Drawnel has suggested could be

⁷³² See, e.g., traditions discussed in George J. Brooke, “Patterns of Priesthood, Priestliness and Priestly Functions in Some Second Temple Period Texts,” *JAAJ* 4 (2016): 1–21.

seen as an allusion to Num 25:12–13.⁷³³ Similarly, Aaron is called in the Visions of Amram an “eternal priest (כֹּהֵן עֹלָמִין)” (4Q547 4.19), which is almost certainly a reference to Melchizedek’s eternal priesthood described in Ps 110. Levi and Aaron’s descendants as well are said to endure in perpetuity on several occasions. The Aramaic Levi Document uses striking language in its foretelling of the future of Levi’s offspring. Levi is told that “your seed shall be entered in the book of the memorial of life for all eternity,” “your name and the name of your seed shall not be annihilated for eternity,” and “your seed shall be blessed upon the earth for all generations of eternity” (ALD 10:12–14; cf. ALD 3:17). This last phrase, “for all the generations of eternity (πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος // כּוֹל דְּרֵי עֹלָמָא,” preserved only in Greek in the Aramaic Levi Document, is particular noteworthy, given its occurrence throughout the Aramaic Scrolls in contexts dealing with the perpetual endurance not only of the priestly line, but of the Jerusalem temple as well. It is used to characterize the eternal longevity of Aaron’s descendants on two occasions in the Visions of Amram (4Q545 4.17; 4Q547 9.7), and, while its precise use in the Testament of Qahat is not entirely discernible, it appears there too in a passage regarding the eternal future of Qahat’s offspring (4Q542 1ii.4). Tobit uses this phrase to describe the eternal validity of Jerusalem and its temple (Tob 1:7; Tob 13:11 // 4Q196 17ii.15), and the Apocalypse of Weeks presents the eschatological temple as being “built in the greatness of its splendor for all the generations of eternity (לְכוֹל דְּרֵי עֹלָמִין, 1 En. 91:13 // 4Q212 1iv.18).

These examples show not only conceptual, but also verbal, correspondence. None of the Aramaic Scrolls contradict this basic notion: the descendants of Levi and Aaron will serve as priests in perpetuity. As we will see in section 6.4.2 below, the Apocalypse of Weeks and the

⁷³³ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 246.

Animal Apocalypse are harshly critical of the temple cult associated with the return from Babylonian exile, but neither condemn Levi, Aaron, or their descendants. Priests go without mention in both compositions. The Aramaic Levi Document (4Q213 3.1–8) also cannot be taken, as some have suggested, as foretelling the future forfeiture of the priesthood on the part of Levi's descendants.⁷³⁴ Not only is that portion of the manuscript tradition very poorly preserved and difficult to interpret with any confidence, but we must weigh any reading of it against the overwhelming emphasis on the perpetual endurance of Levi's descendants throughout the extant manuscript tradition (ALD 10:2, 12–14). The only other composition that might plausibly be understood as condemning future priests is Pseudo-Daniel^c, which appears to criticize implicitly those Hasmonean rulers who combined the high priestly and royal offices.⁷³⁵ If this interpretation is to be accepted, however, it addresses only the behavior of the high priests. It is also responding to a very specific moment in Jewish history: i.e., the merging of high priesthood with kingship on the part of the second generation of Hasmoneans. Pseudo-Daniel^c does not question the legitimacy of the Aaronide priesthood as an institution prior to Hasmonean overreach.

One final word about Pseudo-Daniel^c, particularly as it relates to the future of the descendants of Levi and Aaron. By including both Zadokites and non-Zadokites in its list of legitimate high priests, this composition does not seem to be self-consciously endorsing, or combatting, a sectarian or anti-Zadokite perspective. The same could be said about the rest of the Aramaic Scrolls. While several of them make distinctions between the descendants of Levi (between, say, Qahat and Gershon), none of Aaron's descendants are ever singled out in any of the extant compositions. There is no evidence that any of the Aramaic Scrolls reject the notion of a Zadokite high priest, nor do any of them appear to be defending the Zadokite high priests against

⁷³⁴ E.g., Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 130; Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas," 29.

⁷³⁵ See, e.g., DJD XXII, 157–8.

sectarian critics. The Aramaic Scrolls that deal with priestly lineage appear to emphasize a broadly Aaronic conception of the priesthood, and the overwhelming majority of them highlight the eternal endurance of Aaron's descendants.

6.2.10 The Organization of the Priesthood

Very few of the extant Aramaic Scrolls provide any information concerning the organization of the priesthood, which may be due at least in part to the fact that a sizable portion of them are set during periods of time prior to the formal founding of the Israelite cult. However, Tobit, as we have already seen, embraces the bipartite division of the priesthood into “the priests, the sons of Aaron” and “the sons of Levi” (Tob 1:7), and, though none of the other compositions make this distinction as clearly as Tobit, the Aramaic Scrolls that deal with matters of descent and genealogy privilege Aaron's ancestors and offspring among the sons of Levi. One aspect of priestly organization that is shared by a handful of Aramaic Scrolls is the office of the high priest. New Jerusalem dedicates the most space to its description of the high priest, including a detailed account of his vestments and his role in the showbread ritual (2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20; 11Q18 14ii). The Aramaic Levi Document also contains two references to the high priesthood in the context of its description of the future of Levi's children (ALD 11:3, 6). Pseudo-Daniel^c features a list of high priests that begins with Qahat in the extant fragments and culminates, so far as we can tell, with two of the Hasmonean high priests (4Q245 1i.5–10). We have also noted that both the archangel Michael in the Book of Watchers and the eschatological figure in the Apocryphon of Levi^b? function in highly priestly capacities, though neither of them are explicitly identified as a high priest.

New Jerusalem is the only one of the Aramaic Scrolls to go into any significant detail in its description of how the priesthood is organized. However, certain aspects of how it organizes the priests in relation to one another are worth mentioning, because they reflect broader themes that unite several of the other Aramaic Scrolls. As I have shown in section 4.3.3.1, New Jerusalem alludes to two specific numerical groupings of priests in its account of the showbread ritual: eighty-four priests (11Q18 20.3) and fourteen priests (11Q18 20.4). There is also reference made in this passage to the high priest (11Q18 20.6), his deputy (2Q24 4.16), and another group known only as “the elders among them” (2Q24 4.13). Scholars disagree as to how these groups and individuals relate to one another, but I argued that Wise has offered the most plausible suggestion: the group of fourteen likely includes the high priest, his deputy, and the twelve “heads of the priests,” who “are to serve continually before God” (cf. 1QM II.1–2). This suggestion is based on a parallel, first noticed by Baillet, between the arrangement of priests in 2Q24 4 // 11Q18 20 and the War Scroll.⁷³⁶ Wise goes on to suggest that this group of fourteen priests should be counted among the larger group of eighty-four, making this larger group consist of the high priest, his deputy, the twelve heads of the priests, and seventy others, who he argues “represent either a course or, more probably, part of a course.”⁷³⁷ Another reference in New Jerusalem to the configuration of the priesthood occurs in 11Q18 15.2–4, a passage which, along with the War Scroll, is the only ancient Jewish writing to put the number of priestly courses at twenty-six.⁷³⁸

These ways of organizing the priesthood in New Jerusalem gesture toward two particular themes that appear in a number of other Aramaic texts from Qumran: preference for the 364-day calendar and a numerological interest in the number seven. First, the division of the priesthood

⁷³⁶ Wise, *Critical Study*, 75; cf. DJD III, 87. For two alternative proposals, highlighted already in Chapter 4, see Baumgarten, review of Yadin, 584–9; Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 61.

⁷³⁷ Wise, *Critical Study*, 75.

⁷³⁸ So Kister, “Some Notes, 284.

into twenty-six, as opposed to the usual twenty-four, priestly courses appears to reflect a preference for the 364-day calendar. As Ben-Dov has argued with respect to the War Scroll, having twenty-six priestly courses probably serves “as a convenient division of the 364-day year into two halves of twenty-six weeks each.”⁷³⁹ Scholars have long noted that several other Qumran Aramaic writings, specifically the Enoch Astronomical Book and the Aramaic Levi Document, also display a preference for the 364-day calendar, often incorrectly identified as a solar calendar.⁷⁴⁰ For example, as I have shown in section 4.4.3, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel have argued that the information given in the Aramaic Levi Document pertaining to the births of Levi’s children contain allusions to this calendrical tradition.⁷⁴¹ The details of priestly organization on display in New Jerusalem thus demonstrate that it too should be counted among this cluster of Aramaic Scrolls that share an interest in the 364-day calendar. Second, the decision to organize priests into groups of fourteen and eighty-four reflects a broader numerological interest that pervades New Jerusalem. Both of these groupings are divisible by seven, a number that holds clear significance for the author of this composition, as both Wacholder and Wise have noted.⁷⁴² Not only does New Jerusalem have its heavenly tour guide measure the city with a rod that is seven cubits long (4Q554 1iii.17), as opposed to the six-cubit rod described in Ezek 40:5, but it also contains an otherwise unattested

⁷³⁹ Ben-Dov, “Mishmarot,” 959. It may also be relevant that eighty-four is divisible by both seven and twelve—two numbers that play a key role in the architectural scheme of the composition as a whole. As Wacholder has argued, seven and twelve comprise the basic numerical units around which the architecture of the entire city is organized in New Jerusalem. He compares the privileging of seven and twelve in the physical description of the city in New Jerusalem to the system that governs the movements of the luminaries in the Enochic Astronomical Book, in which “the sun and the moon orbit the earth and order the season according to a heptadal system supplemented by duodecimal numerology,” resulting “in a calendar whose year consisted of 364 days.” This numerical structuring of the city’s architecture and the movement of the luminaries in New Jerusalem and the Astronomical Book, respectively, implies, according to Wacholder: “Sacred space and sacred time and thus united under a common ordering principle,” i.e., the 364-day calendar. Wacholder, “Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature,” 271.

⁷⁴⁰ See e.g., Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins.” For a more detail account of the calendrical traditions on display in the Astronomical Book and the Aramaic Levi Document, see Chapters 1 and 2 of Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years*.

⁷⁴¹ See esp. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 189.

⁷⁴² Wacholder, “Judaeo-Aramaic Literature,” 270; Wise, *Critical Study*, 75 n. 49.

tradition, according to which the high priest wears seven crowns (11Q18 14ii.1–5). Interest in the number seven can be found throughout the Aramaic Scrolls, as we have seen already on several occasions: Aaron is called “the seventh among the men of [his (i.e., God’s)] favor” in the Visions of Amram (4Q545 4.18); Jerusalem is identified as the seventh of “seven glorious mountains” in the Book of Watchers (1 En. 24:2–3); and seven different precious materials and physical structures are included in the description of the restored Jerusalem in Tobit (Tob 13:16–18). Other examples include: Levi encounters seven (angelic?) beings during a dream-vision in the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD 4:12); the chosen ones will arise at the conclusion of the seventh week, and will receive “sevenfold wisdom and knowledge” in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:9–10); Amram throws a seven-day wedding feast in honor of the marriage of Miriam and Uzziel in the Visions of Amram (4Q545 1ai.7 // 4Q543 1a–c.7); and there is a broken reference to “seven rams” in the so-called Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} (4Q541 9ii.5).⁷⁴³ Enoch is also the seventh from Adam, which is striking in light of the decision to draw explicit attention to Aaron’s status as the seventh member of another, but related, genealogy in the Visions of Amram

6.3 The Cult

The Aramaic Scrolls contain a high concentration of compositions with an interest in the cult, by which I mean primarily the sacrificial cult. In particular, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Genesis Apocryphon spend a significant amount of time delineating the proper way sacrifices are to be conducted. Sacrifices are also narrated in the Vision of Amram, though the extant manuscripts do not allow us to say whether or not it devoted any space to the minutiae of sacrificial procedure. Those compositions that do contain

⁷⁴³ See also 4Q196 6.12 // Tob 3:15; 4Q206 4i.16 // 1 En. 89:2; 4Q242 1–3.3; 4Q550 1.5; 11Q18 20.3

detailed descriptions of the sacrificial system seem to show a marked interest in ensuring that they accord with their authors' understanding of the dictates of religious law, Pentateuchal law in particular. A few of the Aramaic Scrolls also are concerned with the details of other aspects of Pentateuchal law, including those regarding tithing and marriage (i.e., Tobit and the Aramaic Levi Document, respectively). In part for reasons of convenience, I will include these aspects of religious law in this treatment of the cultic material in the Qumran Aramaic writings. There are other reasons for including a discussion of these topics here, though. For one thing, as Tobit makes clear, its system of tithing is closely related to the organization of the priesthood and the operation of the sacrificial cult. The Aramaic Levi Document includes marital legislation under the rubric of "the law of the priesthood," with the marriage laws immediately preceding its extended treatment of sacrificial laws. Finally, I will follow this comparative analysis of the legal and exegetical components of the cultic material in the Aramaic Scrolls with a discussion of three compositions, i.e., the Book of Watchers, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the so-called Apocryphon of Levi^{b?}, all of which share a common, cultic approach to effects of rampant violence on the earth.

6.3.1 Sacrificial Procedure

The Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Jacob[?], New Jerusalem, and the Aramaic Levi Document display an interest in proper sacrificial procedure, and share a significant number of points of contact. First, both New Jerusalem and the Testament of Jacob[?] are distinct among the Aramaic Scrolls, inasmuch as they both depict their accounts of the operation of the cult in the context of a revelatory dream-vision. Second, the basic order of the sacrificial material is the same in the Testament of Jacob[?] and the Aramaic Levi Document. Both describe a process that begins with vesting and ritual purification prior to offering a sacrifice (4Q537 12.1; ALD 7:2) and ends

with the consumption of the priestly portion (4Q537 12.2; ALD 10:9). Rather than simply engaging in a topical discussion of the various components of cultic ritual, each of them describe the entire sacrifice, from start to finish. There are, however, a number of differences: The Aramaic Levi Document describes several additional ritual washings, i.e., before vesting (ALD 7:1); after placing the wood on the fire and sprinkling the altar with blood (ALD 8:2); after each sacrifice (ALD 10:6); and before leaving the sanctuary (ALD 10:7–8). This emphasis on washing in the Aramaic Levi Document seems to be associated with anxiety about blood.⁷⁴⁴ The Aramaic Levi Document also refers to the washing of hands and feet (ALD 7:2; 10:6), while the Testament of Jacob? only to the washing of hands.⁷⁴⁵ Third, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, and the Aramaic Levi Document share a few noteworthy, though inexact, verbal parallels, some of which are related to their common use of the periphrastic construction:

Vesting:	Placement on the Altar:	Consumption:
להוון לבשין (4Q537 12.1) להוה לבש (11Q18 14ii.5) תהוי לביש (ALD 7:2)	להוון [מסקין דבחיא למדבחה (4Q537 12.2) להנסקה למדבחה (ALD 7:3)	להוון בכ[ל] אר[ע]א אכלין (4Q537 12.2) להוון אכלין (11Q18 7.2)

A Comparison of Cultic Language

Fourth, both the Genesis Apocryphon and New Jerusalem use the verb כפר, to atone, with respect to sacrificial activity (1Q20 10.13; 11Q18 8.5). Fifth, the Genesis Apocryphon, New Jerusalem, and the Aramaic Levi Document each refer to the salting of the entire sacrifice (1Q20 10.17; 11Q18 13.2; ALD 8:5). This practice, as we have noted in 3.5.1 and 4.3.3.4, differs from the sacrificial legislation in Leviticus, which does not mention putting salt on the sacrificial meat.

⁷⁴⁴ “Each time whenever you go to the altar, wash your hands and feet; and whenever you come out of the sanctuary, let no blood touch your garment. Be not concerned with it on that same day. And wash your hands and feet thoroughly from all flesh. And let not any blood or any soul be seen upon you, for blood is the soul in the flesh” (ALD 10:6–8; cf. 8:2; 10:9–10).

⁷⁴⁵ They also use different terminology to describe ritual washing (סחי, ALD; טהיר, 4Q537).

Rather, it more closely resembles Ezek 43:24, which speaks of salting the bull and the ram in its account of the whole burnt offering. However, as Perrin points out, the practice of salting sacrificial meat is not confined to the Aramaic Scrolls, but “enjoyed wide approval among Second Temple period authors,” being found also in Josephus and the Temple Scroll. Drawnel also notes that the salting of the whole burnt offering is attested in the Mishnah (*m. Tamid* 4:3).⁷⁴⁶ Finally, the use of ordinal numbers and the word בתר “after” in the Genesis Apocryphon to describe the various stages of Noah’s sacrifice indicates that a strong emphasis is being placed on order and precision in the carrying out of the ritual process. Such an emphasis is also very clearly on display in the Aramaic Levi Document; this is evident in its use of the first ordinal number followed by repeated appearances of בתר in its description of the steps involved in the sacrificial process (ALD 8:3, 4, 6), as well as in its use of the words סרך “order” and חושבן “calculation” at a transitional point in “the law of the priesthood” (ALD 8:6–7).⁷⁴⁷

6.3.2 Scriptural Engagement

If we expand our focus on cultic regulations and practices to include not just the sacrificial system, but laws pertaining to marriage and tithing as well, we can discern another theme that unites a sizable swath of the Qumran Aramaic writings: close engagement with, and creative expansion of, scriptural legislation. Throughout this dissertation, we have looked in great detail at the myriad ways these compositions depend upon, adapt, and expound on biblical laws. To take just a short list of examples: Bernstein has argued that the salting of the sacrifice in the Genesis

⁷⁴⁶ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 277.

⁷⁴⁷ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 279.

Apocryphon is rooted in an interpretation of Lev 2:13.⁷⁴⁸ Drawnel has referred to the sacrificial prescriptions in the Aramaic Levi Document as “midrashic development of Lev 1:8–9a,”⁷⁴⁹ and Schiffman argues that the Aramaic Levi Document took the Day of Atonement sacrifice as described in Lev 16 as the model for every sacrifice.⁷⁵⁰ A handful of scholars have noted that the regulations regarding marriage in the Aramaic Levi Document involve an interpretation of the high priestly marital legislation in Lev 21:14–15.⁷⁵¹ Some scholars have recognized that New Jerusalem provides an exegetical expansion of the showbread ritual as recorded in Lev 24:5–9, though their interpretations of the New Jerusalem material vary considerably.⁷⁵² Dimant has demonstrated the interpretative principles at work in Tobit’s description of various types of tithes, all of which appear to engage material found in Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.⁷⁵³ Finally, the Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat reflect a shared exegetical approach to the issue of mixed marriages, all three of them using language from Lev 19:19 and Deut 22:11—which contain laws against the mixing of animals, seeds, and fabric—to describe the offspring of illicit unions.⁷⁵⁴ None of these compositions display evidence of a rejection of, or even an attempt to replace, Pentateuchal legislation. We do not seem to be dealing with alternative systems, written so that their adherents may dispense with the Torah. Rarely, if ever, do the Aramaic Scrolls contain outright contradictions of biblical precedent. More often than not, the exegetical strategies that they employ find close parallels elsewhere in Second Temple and rabbinic literature. Even where there are no obvious parallels between them and other Jewish

⁷⁴⁸ Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 58.

⁷⁴⁹ Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 277.

⁷⁵⁰ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 183;

⁷⁵¹ Kugler, “Halakic Interpretative Strategies,” 134; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 267; Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 179; Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees*, 99–103; Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 30–31.

⁷⁵² Jongeling, “Publication Provisoire,” 60–62; Chyutin, *New Jerusalem Scroll*, 60–61.

⁷⁵³ Dimant, “Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah,” 121–43.

⁷⁵⁴ Nickelsburg, *I Enoch 1*, 213; Caquot, “Grandeur et pureté,” 40–41; Cook, “Remarks,” 209; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 338; idem, “Form and Content,” 69–70.

writings, there is a basic consistency in their approach to the interpretation of scriptural legislation, reflecting an engagement with, not a jettisoning of, the Hebrew scriptures: filling in perceived gaps, reading one passage in light of another, and intensifying or expanding the scope of commands and prohibitions. It is unlikely that the authors of Qumran Aramaic writings are seeking to rival the legal system of a Torah-oriented contemporary priesthood, as Kugler has suggested in the case of the Aramaic Levi Document.⁷⁵⁵ We see no evidence of such a systematizing or polemical impulse in any of these compositions. Instead, it is more likely that we are witnessing ongoing scribal reflection on, and creative interpretation of, Pentateuchal law.

6.3.3 A Cultic Worldview

The Book of Watchers, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the so-called Apocryphon of Levi^{b?}, display what might be termed a cultic worldview, inasmuch as they all appear to interpret the presence of rampant violence on the earth through a cultic lens. As we have seen in section 3.2.1, Nickelsburg convincingly showed that the Book of Watchers understands the watchers' shedding of blood upon the earth (1 En. 7:3–6) as having caused the defilement of the land.⁷⁵⁶ In response, as he highlights in his reading of 1 En. 10, God implores Michael to travel from heaven to earth in order to deal “not only with sin and evil, but also their defiling consequences.”⁷⁵⁷ For the author of the Book of Watchers, the watchers' violence had caused the earth to become polluted by blood, and therefore required cultic intervention. Notably, the account of Noah's post-Flood sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon, as I showed in section 3.5.1, indicates that its author interprets the

⁷⁵⁵ Kugler, *Patriarch to Priest*, 104–9. See, however, the comments of Schiffman in “Sacrificial Halakhah,” 202 and “Pre-Maccabean Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Traditions,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 348–61. Cf. Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice,” 64 and 72.

⁷⁵⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 184 and 227–8.

⁷⁵⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 228.

watchers' violence in a similar manner.⁷⁵⁸ Unlike Gen 8, which depicts Noah's sacrifice as an act of thanksgiving and gives no indication that the earth stood in need of cultic purification after the Flood, the Genesis Apocryphon suggests that Noah's sacrifice functioned as an act of atonement (כפר) for the earth, which had been defiled by violence and bloodshed.⁷⁵⁹ In fact, the Genesis Apocryphon may have understood the violence of the watchers against the backdrop of Num 35:33–34 and its reference to blood polluting the land, especially in light of the statement in 1Q20 6.19, which reads: אשדו נפיליא דמא די אשדו נפיליא “the blood that the Nephilin had poured out” (cf. 1Q20 10.15).⁷⁶⁰ In any case, both the Book of Watchers and the Genesis Apocryphon both suggest that the state of affairs that precipitated the Flood required cultic purification, an act of atonement, which goes beyond the understanding of the events surrounding the Flood in the Book of Genesis.⁷⁶¹

The activity of the eschatological priest recorded in frag. 9i of the Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} should also be seen against this interpretative backdrop. We have already seen in sections 4.5.2 and 4.5.3 that the contents of this fragment were written with reference to traditions concerning Noah and the Flood. Its author drew an implicit parallel between, on the one hand, the generation of the Flood and that of the eschatological judgment and, on the other, between the atoning work

⁷⁵⁸ Nickelsburg has already noted the parallel between 1 En. 10 and the account of Noah's sacrifice in the Genesis Apocryphon (and Jubilees), and has argued that the description of Michael's actions in 1 En. 10 also functions as an interpretation of Gen 8:20–9:1. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 228.

⁷⁵⁹ Jubilees offers a similar interpretation of the purpose and significance of Noah's sacrifice.

⁷⁶⁰ See the discussion in VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 165–7; van Ruiten, *Primaeval History*, 226. That the Genesis Apocryphon viewed the land as defiled prior to Noah's sacrifice may also be reflected in the fact that he appears to have carried it out on the ark, before exiting and stepping foot on the land. Bernstein, “Watchers to the Flood,” 59; Falk, *Parabiblical Texts*, 70. Interestingly, Jubilees make the defilement of the land explicit in its account of Noah's sacrifice. VanderKam, “Angel Story,” 165.

⁷⁶¹ A similar motif can be found in several other Second Temple traditions that suggest that the Flood itself served a purifying function, cleansing the land of impurities caused by violence and wickedness. As Kugler has shown, Philo, the Testament of Adam, Pseudo-Clement, and Origen all suggest that the flood waters serve as an “enormous, purifying bath” that God sent “as a means not only of destroying life on earth but of purifying the very lands of the abominations that had been committed upon it.” Kugler, *Bible as It Was*, 118–9.

of Noah and that of the eschatological high priest. It is in this context that we should understand the use of word כפר to characterize the activity of the eschatological priest in Apocryphon of Levi^b?. Just as Michael and Noah provided a cultic remedy in response to rampant violence on the earth, so the eschatological high priest will offer atonement during a time of wickedness, one which mirrors the period before the Flood. Even if the parallels are admittedly inexact, and even if we cannot demonstrate that the Apocryphon of Levi^b? understood the actions of its high priest as a reaction to blood pollution, it still alludes to Flood traditions in proposing a cultic intervention at the time of the eschaton. All three compositions reflect a worldview in which cultic action is taken in response to pivotal times of crisis and upheaval as a way of setting right a world gone wrong. This way of understanding the significance of the cult is not at odds with, but rather supplements, those compositions, such as New Jerusalem and the Aramaic Levi Document, that stress the importance of regular, ongoing operation of the cult.

6.4 Jerusalem and the Temple(s)

Temples feature prominently in several of the Qumran Aramaic writings. Most often, it is the Jerusalem temple, but the heavenly temple plays a role in the Book of Watchers. In what follows, I will first show how many of the descriptions of the temples in the Aramaic Scrolls share a number of key details in common—some, though not all, of which reflect similar modes of engagement with scriptural source material, e.g., Isa 54:11–12 and Ezek 40–48. I will also highlight similarities in their descriptions of Jerusalem in cases where the temple is embedded in a larger treatment of the city as a whole. Then, I will consider the ways that various texts envision the status and significance of these temples in the context of Israelite history.

6.4.1 Descriptions of the City and Temple

The fullest description of Jerusalem and its temple in the Aramaic Scrolls occurs in New Jerusalem. It has several interesting points of contact with descriptions of temples in Tobit and the Book of Watchers. Many of these similarities go beyond what we might expect from a shared reliance on biblical tradition. It is commonly acknowledged that New Jerusalem and Tobit, like several other Second Temple writings, rely on Isa 54:11–12 for their descriptions of the city of Jerusalem and its temple, such as in their use of precious stones and metals. However, the similarities between New Jerusalem and Tobit cannot be easily chalked up to a shared dependence on Isaiah, because their accounts of the new Jerusalem at times diverge from Isaiah in similar ways.⁷⁶² One rather interesting example of how New Jerusalem and Tobit agree over and against Isaiah has been noted by Fitzmyer, Puech, and Perrin, though there is some disagreement among them as to how to understand the Tobit passage. It is important to note that the parallel still obtains regardless of which interpretation is accepted. G^{II} Tob 13:16 reads as follows: οἱ πύργοι Ἱερουσαλήμ χρυσίῳ οἰκοδομηθήσονται καὶ οἱ προμαχῶνες αὐτῶν χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ “The towers of Jerusalem were built of gold and their battlements (were built) of pure gold.” The corresponding Aramaic overlap reads: יהא תבנין ועע[יתא מגדלי ירושלם ד] הב תתבנין ועע[יתא] (4Q196 18.8).⁷⁶³ Fitzmyer interprets this line as “the towers of Jerusalem] were built of [g]old and wo[od.” On this reading, 4Q196 differs from G^{II} insofar as it adds the descriptor “and wood” to its depiction of the towers of Jerusalem.⁷⁶⁴ This reading leads Perrin to the conclusion that both Tobit and New Jerusalem “specify that

⁷⁶² A handful of scholars have already noted similarities between the description of the eschatological city in New Jerusalem and Tobit. See e.g., Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 317; Henderson, *Songs to Zion*, 160 n. 147; Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 42–46.

⁷⁶³ Fitzmyer’s reconstruction in DJD XIX, 29. See Puech’s reconstruction below.

⁷⁶⁴ So Fitzmyer: “VL agrees with G^{II}, but not with the Aramaic addition of ‘wood.’” Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 316. This reading leads to Perrin to the conclusion that both Tobit and New Jerusalem “specify that Jerusalem’s towers will be constructed of gold *and* wood (4QpapTob^a 18 8; 4QNJ^a 2 ii 15).”

Jerusalem’s towers will be constructed of gold *and* wood (4QpapTob^a 18 8; 4QNJ^a 2 ii 15).⁷⁶⁵

Puech offers a different interpretation both of Tobit and of New Jerusalem. The New Jerusalem passage in question reads: ועעיתה דהב ומגדליה אלפ [וארבע מא]ה ותלתין ותריין (4Q554 2ii.15–16).

For one thing, Puech understands ועע in both Tobit and New Jerusalem as a “parapet.”⁷⁶⁶ On this reading, both passages are describing two different architectural features: “parapet(s)” and “towers.” Puech’s proposal has the advantage of being the more natural reading syntactically in both cases. It also does not necessitate hypothesizing a difference between 4Q196 and G^{II} (and VL) in their accounts of the materials that are used to build the towers of Jerusalem. If Puech is correct, *καὶ οἱ προμαχῶνες* is simply the scribe’s interpretation of ועע[יתא],⁷⁶⁷ and thus the missing portion of 4Q196 18.8 could be reconstructed as something like ועע[יהן דהב טב on the basis of the Greek (*καὶ οἱ προμαχῶνες αὐτῶν χρυσίῳ καθαρῷ*).⁷⁶⁸ If we accept this reading, there are key similarities between Tobit’s and New Jerusalem’s description of the city’s architectural features: Both texts appear to describe a “parapet of gold,” “pure gold” in the case of Tobit. The term “pure gold”—though not used in 4Q554 2ii.15—appears elsewhere in New Jerusalem, in connection with its account of the new temple (cf. 11Q18 10i.2; 11.4). Neither parapets nor (pure) gold appear in Isaiah’s description of the new Jerusalem.

⁷⁶⁵ Perrin, “Tobit Context and Contacts,” 46. Emphasis original.

⁷⁶⁶ Cook also translates this word as “parapet” and renders these two passages as: “the parapet (will be made of gold)” (4Q196 18.8) and “its parapets were of gold” (4Q554 2ii.15). See DQA, 186.

⁷⁶⁷ Cook appears to prefer this understanding: “[ועע]יתא, the parapet (will be made of gold), 4Q196 fg 18:8 (Tobit 13:16 *προμαχῶνες*).” DQA, 186.

⁷⁶⁸ Puech reconstructs the missing portion of 4Q196 here as ועע[יתך] הב תתבנין וועע[יתך] “Jérusalem, avec de l’]or tu seras rebâtie, et [tu] boisé[ries (plaquées) d’or...” DJD XXXVII, 124 n. 58. Contra. Fitzmyer, DJD XIX, 29; idem, *Tobit*, 316. His rationale is that תתבנין requires a feminine subject, which would make Jerusalem a better candidate than the third-person, masculine plural מגדלי-. DJD XXXVII, 124 n. 58. According to Puech, then, 4Q196 diverges on this point from both G^{II} and VL, which very clearly understand “towers” as the subject of the verb “to build” (*οἰκοδομέω*).

Several other details invite comparison between New Jerusalem and Tobit, and go beyond their shared dependence on Isaiah. Both passages refer to the presence of towers in the restored city (οἱ πύργοι in Tob 13:16; מגדלי throughout New Jerusalem, e.g., 4Q554 2ii.22; 5Q15 1i.13), a feature which is absent in the Isaiah passage. Tobit also includes a description of both the exterior and interior of the city, beginning with its description of the exterior and moving inward, while Isa 54:11–12 describes only the city’s exterior. Tobit thus parallels New Jerusalem over and against Isa both in its highlighting of specific interior features such as streets (αἱ πλατεῖαι, Tob 13:16; קיש, 4Q554 1ii.13–20 and houses (αἱ οἰκίαι, Tob 13:17; בית, 4Q554 1iii.19; 4Q554a 1.4, 7), and in the inward-moving direction of its description of the city. Finally, Tobit’s mentioning of seven architectural features and seven precious materials also distinguishes it from Isa 54:11–12, which mentions four or five different architectural features and five different precious materials.⁷⁶⁹ Note that, while New Jerusalem certainly describes far more architectural features than seven, scholars have observed that its literary blueprint of the city reflects an underlying interest in the number seven.⁷⁷⁰ This interest in the number seven is not restricted to these two compositions, but is one of the features that characterizes a significant swath of the Qumran Aramaic writings.

Besides the parallels with Tobit, a few of New Jerusalem’s architectural traditions also coincide with those in some of the other Aramaic Scrolls. Various scholars, for example, have noted that both the description of the temple in New Jerusalem and the heavenly temple in the Book of Watchers (1 En. 14–16) were modeled after the tour of the restored city and its temple in Ezek 40–48. However, 1 En. 14–16 shares two details in common with New Jerusalem that

⁷⁶⁹ On this point, see Henderson, *Songs to Zion*, 160.

⁷⁷⁰ Cf. Wacholder, “Judaean-Aramaic Literature,” 270; Wise, *Critical Study*, 75 n. 49. For specific examples of this phenomenon, see the discussion of New Jerusalem in Chapter 4.

distinguish their accounts from the one in Ezekiel. Both accounts make use of the relatively uncommon title “the Great Glory” when referring to the presence of God in the temple (1 En. 14:20; 11Q18 19.3). The underlying Aramaic is not preserved in the case of 1 En. 14:20. However, the Greek phrase ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη is almost certainly a translation יקרא רבא,⁷⁷¹ which occurs in the context of tour of the temple in New Jerusalem: [ק]דיש הוא היכלא ויקרא רבא] א [“h]oly is the sanctuary and [the] Great Glory” (cf. 1 En. 102:3; Test. Levi 3:4).⁷⁷² Both texts also depict their architectural structures as having upper chambers, τὸ ἀνώτερον in 1 En. 14:17 and עליתא in 11Q18 9.1 and 21.3, which is characteristic of the temple as depicted in Chronicles, the Mishnah, and Josephus, but not Kings or Ezekiel.⁷⁷³ In addition, New Jerusalem shares some points of contact with the Testament of Jacob? in its description of the city and its temple, with Tigchelaar even pointing out that “virtually all of the preserved elements in [4Q537 12] are found in *NJ*.”⁷⁷⁴ For example, he observes that the terms בנין “structure,” קרייה “city,” and שור “wall”—the only extant descriptors of physical structures in frag. 12 of 4Q537—all appear in the New Jerusalem.⁷⁷⁵

Finally, several compositions evince a clustering of shared terminology used to highlight the splendid and glorious nature of the restored city and its temple, including: e.g., precious,

⁷⁷¹ E.g., see Milik’s reconstruction in *The Books of Enoch*, 199.

⁷⁷² This observation was first made by Kister (“Notes,” 286).

⁷⁷³ The first extant references in Jewish literature to the temple having multiple stories come from two passages in the Chronicler’s work, which mention the temple’s “upper chambers” (עליות) (1 Chr 28:11; 2 Chr 3:9). Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Construction of the Temple According to the ‘Temple Scroll,’” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 555–71, see 568; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 264. The Mishnah uses the singular עליה to describe an “upper chamber” above the temple, which likely “covered both the sanctuary and the holy of holies,” the purpose of which was to allow access to “the holy of holies from above for repairs.” Schiffman, “Construction of the Temple,” 568. Cf. Nickelsburg, who notes the appearance of an “upper chamber” (ὑπερώον) that “stood over the main room and holy of holies” in Josephus’ description of Herod’s temple in *War*. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 264.

⁷⁷⁴ Tigchelaar, “Imaginal Context,” 263.

⁷⁷⁵ In 11Q18 frag. 9, the term בנין occurs twice in close proximity to the term מקדשא. The precise relationship between these two terms in that passage, however, is not entirely clear.

splendor, majesty, glorious, glory, and greatness. The Book of Watchers uses the terms precious, glorious, and beautiful to characterize the environs surrounding the Jerusalem temple (1 En. 24:2), and it presents the heavenly temple as being unrivaled “in glory, and in majesty, and in greatness” (ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐν τιμῇ καὶ ἐν μεγαλωσύνῃ; 1 En. 14:16). Similarly, the Apocalypse of Weeks describes the eschatological temple as being built “in the greatness of its splendor” (ברבבות זוה; 1 En. 91:13 // 4Q212 1iv.18), and Tobit remarks that a desolate Jerusalem will be rebuilt “in splendor” (ἐντίμω; Tob 14:5).

Some of these parallels are more compelling than others, and, admittedly, none of them necessitate hypothesizing any direct literary relationships. That concession notwithstanding, we do see that several of these compositions show a great deal of interest in the architecture of the temple, and adapt specific biblical traditions (i.e., Isa 54:11–12; Ezek 40–48), sometimes in rather similar ways (e.g., New Jerusalem and Tobit; New Jerusalem and the Book of Watchers). I remain agnostic on the question of direct literary relationship, but the similarities that exist between particular temple traditions in the Qumran Aramaic writings do seem to reflect a shared way of envisioning the city and its temple. When we add these to the literary parallels evinced throughout this chapter, they may gesture toward a common scribal milieu.

6.4.2 The City and Temple in Israel’s History and Future

Jerusalem and its temple feature prominently in accounts of Israel’s past, present, and future in a handful of Aramaic writings from Qumran, mostly notably Tobit, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Animal Apocalypse. The temple also plays an important role in the eschatological scenarios in the Book of Watchers and New Jerusalem, though, in the case of New Jerusalem, the fragmentary nature of manuscript tradition limits what we are able to say. Tobit, the Apocalypse

of Weeks, and the Animal Apocalypse, in particular, are rife for comparison, given their attention to full scope of Israelite history and the role of Jerusalem's temple at key moments in time: the construction and destruction of the Solomonic temple, the rebuilding of the temple after the exile, and the awaited eschatological temple at the culmination of the present age. Most of my discussion here will focus on these three texts, but I will address the historical significance of the temple in the Book of Watchers and New Jerusalem as well.

While Tobit, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Animal Apocalypse all share a relatively positive view of the Solomonic temple, each express the relationship between this and subsequent temples (i.e., second and eschatological) in subtly different ways. The Animal Apocalypse sharply contrasts the Solomonic temple with the one that was rebuilt in the wake of the return from exile, and explicitly states that second temple's cultic system was "polluted and not pure" (1 En. 89:73; comp. 1 En. 89:50). In many respects, the language used to describe the second temple in the Animal Apocalypse negatively mirrors that which was used in its description of Solomon's temple.⁷⁷⁶ The Apocalypse of Weeks shares the Animal Apocalypse's critical appraisal of the post-exilic and Second Temple periods, and also appears to share its negative view of the second temple, given its complete absence from its recounting of Israel's history. Nevertheless, there are some clear differences with respect to how the two compositions envision the importance and role of the temple in Israel's past and future. The Animal Apocalypse has a very positive view of the Solomonic temple and its cult. However, it patterns its account of the eschatological Jerusalem not on the Solomonic city and temple, but the wilderness camp. It also never explicitly mentions the restoration of the temple, let alone the cult, at the time of the eschaton. In contrast, the Apocalypse of Weeks, like Tobit, pays little attention to the wilderness camp, and instead draws a clear parallel

⁷⁷⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 394; Tiller, *Commentary*, 39.

between the Solomonic and eschatological cities, with the temple featuring prominently in both—the first mirroring, and thus implicitly foreshadowing, the next. Neither the Apocalypse of Weeks nor Tobit, however, explicitly mention the operation of the sacrificial cult in the eschatological temple, as does New Jerusalem, another text in which the temple plays an important role at the time of the eschaton. These are not the only similarities between the Apocalypse of Weeks and Tobit. Nickelsburg points out additional parallels between the eschatological scenarios in Tobit and the Apocalypse of Weeks, some of which are “expressed in precisely the same words: the scattering of the people and burning of the temple; the building of an eternal, glorious eschatological temple; the conversion of the gentiles; the removal of all the wicked.”⁷⁷⁷

Some of these shared phrases and concepts, especially those related to the eschatological temple, bring these two compositions not only into close contact with each other, but reflect points of contact with the broader Aramaic Scrolls corpus, some of which we have already explored above: e.g., the phrase “for all the generations of eternity” and the use of specific terminology related to the splendor of the city and its temple. It also seems likely that New Jerusalem, like Tobit and the Apocalypse of Weeks, looks forward to “the humbling of the nations and the returning of exiles to the holy city.”⁷⁷⁸ Themes of divine kingship are also associated with the eschatological temple in Tobit, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Book of Watchers (Tob 13:7–8; 10–11; 15–16; 1 En. 91:13 // 4Q212 1iv.18; 1 En. 25:5–6).⁷⁷⁹

However, the Apocalypse of Weeks and Tobit have decidedly different perspectives on the post-exilic period. Tobit views the return from the Babylonian exile as an act of divine mercy that

⁷⁷⁷ Nickelsburg, “Tobit and 1 Enoch,” 227. He also notes that “Tobit’s time references in 14:5...indicates a fixed chronology and sequence that is compatible with the determinism of Enoch’s ten weeks.” Nickelsburg, “Tobit and 1 Enoch,” 227–8.

⁷⁷⁸ Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 46. As he writes concerning this motif, “Taken together, then, Tobit, *NJ*, and, to a lesser extent Aramaic Enoch, indicate a shared understanding that the eschatological Jerusalem, temple and all, will sit at the epicenter of the world.”

⁷⁷⁹ On the use of kingship language in Tobit’s account of the new Jerusalem, see Henderson, *Songs of Zion*, 169.

initiates a sequence of events that culminates with the eschatological judgment and reward (cf. Tob 14:5). Tobit does appear to consider the second temple to be inferior to both the Solomonic and eschatological temples, but there is no indication that it is understood as corrupt or illegitimate (cf. Tob 14:5). On these points, the Apocalypse of Weeks is much closer to the Animal Apocalypse, inasmuch as both of them view the post-exilic and Second Temple periods as unambiguously wicked. If Tobit was written before the Apocalypse of Weeks, as was likely the case, the Apocalypse of Weeks may represent the development of a shared tradition in a negative direction, at least as it pertains to the status of the second temple.

Finally, the eschatological temple plays a significant role in the religious imagination of a wide swath of Aramaic Scrolls, though only New Jerusalem devotes any attention to the presence and details of an eschatological cult. We cannot say with any certainty whether the authors of Tobit, the Apocalypse of Weeks, or the Book of Watchers exclude the cult from the eschatological temple, but its absence is at least noteworthy. In any case, New Jerusalem, Tobit, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Book of Watchers reflect a Jerusalem- and temple-centric vision of eschaton.

6.4.3 A Cult Outside of Jerusalem?

There is no convincing evidence among the Aramaic Scrolls of an alternative geographical locus for the cult, or any other religio-political institutions for that matter, whether it be Samaria, Hebron, or Bethel. The Book of Watchers, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, and Tobit all reflect a Jerusalem-centric perspective. Many other compositions related to the priesthood or the cult, but that do not give any attention to Jerusalem and the temple, likely do so for “historical” reasons. That is, they are set in the period before the conquest and settlement of Canaan. The Visions of Amram, though, does contain an allusion to the bronze altar (4Q547 9.5), an object that

is associated with Israel's central shrines: first the tabernacle, then the Jerusalem temple. We should also note that, despite being set in the pre-Mosaic period, the Genesis Apocryphon, in its retelling of Gen 14:18, explicitly clarifies the identification of Salem with Jerusalem (1Q20 22.13), and contains an elusive reference to "the holy mountain," which some scholars have identified as Jerusalem, given the use of this phrase in the biblical record (e.g., Isa 11:9; 56:7; 57:13; 65:11; 66:20; Jer 31:23; Ezek 28:14; Joel 2:1; 3:17).⁷⁸⁰ White Crawford has suggested that this reference to Jerusalem "may be a subtle polemic against the old northern kingdom of Israel, which maintained a shrine at Bethel (1 Kgs 12:29–33). Or the polemic may be aimed at the Samaritans, who maintained a sanctuary on Mount Gerizim in the vicinity of Shechem."⁷⁸¹ A handful of scholars have similarly detected anti-Samaritan rhetoric in the Book of Watchers and the Aramaic Levi Document.⁷⁸² These theories are hard to prove, but what we do most certainly see throughout the Qumran Aramaic writings is a heavy emphasis on Jerusalem, rather than any other locale, both as Israel's proper cultic center and the focal point of the coming eschatological upheaval.

6.5 Conclusion

The result of my comparative analysis can be summarized as follows:

- a.) Priestly themes pervade the Aramaic Scrolls, especially those comprising what Machiela refers to as its "core cluster."⁷⁸³

⁷⁸⁰ Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2008), 117. The list of scriptural references comes from White Crawford. Keep in mind, however, that the identification of "the holy mountain" with Jerusalem in the Genesis Apocryphon is not universally accepted. See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 180.

⁷⁸¹ White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 117.

⁷⁸² Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 196–203; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 25; Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 84.

⁷⁸³ Biblical Chronology is an important exception, inasmuch as it does not fall into either category of Garcia Martinez's bipartite schema (pre-Mosaic and Diasporic). 4Q562 is too fragmentary to determine whether or not it is a member of the "core cluster."

- b.) Of those “core” Aramaic Scrolls, priestly themes appear most often in the ones set during the pre-Mosaic period: the early Enoch literature, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram.⁷⁸⁴ The compositions with the highest concentration of priestly material are New Jerusalem and the Aramaic Levi Document.
- c.) Tobit and Pseudo-Daniel^c are two interesting examples of writings that are set during the Diaspora, but that take an interest in the temple cult and/or priesthood.
- d.) Focusing on the priestly material in the Aramaic Scrolls can allow us to discover new “patterns of association between two or more texts” in the corpus. Scholars have long noted that the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram comprise such a cluster on the basis of their interest in the priestly genealogy. My dissertation has identified several more: Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, and the Aramaic Levi Document share an interest in the details of sacrificial procedure. The Testament of Jacob? and New Jerusalem present their vision of the temple cult in the context of a revelatory dream-vision. The Book of Watchers, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} depict the earth as polluted and in need of cultic intervention. The Book of Watchers, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat allude to scriptural prohibitions against mixing in their condemnations of exogamy. The Apocalypse of Weeks, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of

⁷⁸⁴ It is uncertain whether or not Apocryphon of Levi^{b?} should be counted as one of writings set during the pre-Mosaic period.

Qahat, the Visions of Amram, and Tobit use the phrase “for all the generation of eternity” to describe the eternal validity of Israel’s cultic institutions. The Book of Watchers and New Jerusalem re-imagine the restored temple of Ezek 40–48 in their accounts of ideal temples. Tobit and New Jerusalem describe the new Jerusalem in some strikingly similar ways. The Book of Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, New Jerusalem, and Tobit depict the Jerusalem temple as playing a prominent role in their visions of the eschatological future. It is not that the compositions in these clusters share directly literary relationships, though some may. Rather, these clusters of compositions with related terms and themes further highlight just how many of the Aramaic Scrolls can be compared with one another on the basis of their priestly material.

e.) The Aramaic Scrolls reflect a relatively consistent conception of the priesthood: Levi and Aaron function as dual fountainheads of the Israelite priesthood. Their relationship is not depicted in terms of competition. Rather, the shared language used to describe them highlights the continuity of their priesthoods. The genealogical material, too, demonstrates the continuity of their priesthoods. Throughout the Aramaic Scrolls, the Israelite priesthood is also portrayed as rooted in both the primordial and patriarchal past, and as stretching into the eternal future.⁷⁸⁵ There is also a convergence of priestly and scribal-sapiential qualities in many of Aramaic Scrolls.

⁷⁸⁵ The Aramaic Levi Document seems to acknowledge that there will be a dark period in the history of the priesthood, but that must be balanced against its myriad statement about the perpetual endurance of Levi’s offspring. Pseudo-Daniel^c may reflect dissatisfaction with some of the Hasmonean high priests, but this is a critique rooted in particular historical circumstances, and is not representative of the rest of the Aramaic Scrolls—most of which were composed before the Maccabean Revolt.

- f.) Jerusalem and its temple play a central role in Israel's religious life, including at the time of eschatological judgment. Only two compositions, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks, display a negative attitude toward the contemporary Jerusalem temple, and likely do so only in the wake of the Antiochean reforms, post-175 BCE.
- g.) There is striking lack of polemical language in the Aramaic Scrolls, especially given the tendency of past scholarship to see so many of them as engaged in factional disputes.

CHAPTER 7: SITUATING THE ARAMAIC SCROLLS: A PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL

7.1 The Aramaic Scrolls in Context

By way of conclusion, I would like to reflect on the implications of my literary analysis for future research on the history of the Jewish priesthood in the early Hellenistic period.⁷⁸⁶ Prior to the official publication of, and recent focus on, the Aramaic Scrolls, it was quite common for scholars to lament the dearth of sources from this period. Stone's comments from 1978, for example, are representative of this tendency: "It has long been true that a major difficulty in writing the history of Judaism in the pre-Christian era is the paucity of information directly relating to the fourth and third centuries."⁷⁸⁷ Socio-historical reconstructions thus long relied on only a handful of compositions dated to this period, such as Qoheleth, the early Enochic writings, the Danielic court-tales, the Aramaic Levi Document, Tobit, and Ben Sira, or, alternatively, on a number of others from the Hasmonean period or later, such as 1 and 2 Maccabees, the Daniel apocalypse, Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the sectarian writings from Qumran, the New Testament, Josephus, and the Mishnah.

As Reed has recently noted, the Aramaic Scrolls have expanded dramatically "our evidentiary base for understanding Judaism in the early Hellenistic age—prior to the Maccabean Revolt, on the one hand, and the establishment of the Qumran community, on the other."⁷⁸⁸ By any count, the Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran attest to the existence of over twenty otherwise-unknown compositions, the vast majority of which likely derive from the pre-Hasmonean period. These new compositions both "reveal the broader contexts for previously-known works like *Book*

⁷⁸⁶ For a compelling "working hypothesis" regarding the socio-historical background of the Aramaic Scroll, see Machiela, "Compositional Setting."

⁷⁸⁷ Stone, "Third Century," 479.

⁷⁸⁸ Reed, "Jewish Astronomy," 7–8.

of Watchers, Tobit, and Daniel”⁷⁸⁹ and give us “a new sense of this era as marked by a flowering of Jewish literary production in Aramaic.”⁷⁹⁰ But even many recent, otherwise very illuminating, socio-historical studies of early Hellenistic Judea have not sought to integrate these Aramaic materials into their reconstructions of the period, and possess some very real shortcomings as a result.

My analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls has the potential to shed new light on several scholarly debates surrounding the history of the Jewish priesthood during the early Hellenistic period. It can assist us in testing the explanatory value of a number of influential theories, and can help us determine which of them do the most justice to the evidence. In what follows, I have chosen two specific matters of some controversy in the secondary literature, both of which have direct bearing on questions related to the social location of the Aramaic Scrolls. First, I will address the question of priestly factions organized around different eponymous ancestors, especially Levi, Aaron, and Zadok. I will begin by outlining the contours of what could be called the consensus view, which understands the history of the Jerusalem priesthood as involving a protracted period of strife, struggle, and negotiation between rival priestly groups in the pre- and post-exilic periods. There are two aspects of this consensus view that require reconsideration: 1) that the Second Temple Jerusalem priesthood could be characterized as “Zadokite” and 2) that tension or factional strife between Levites and Aaronides continued into the Hellenistic period. Second, I will address theories about the relationship between priests, Levites, and scribes in the Second Temple period. Earlier scholarship tended to posit priests and scribes as occupying non-overlapping domains:

⁷⁸⁹ Reed, “Jewish Astronomy,” 7.

⁷⁹⁰ Reed, “Jewish Astronomy,” 7. As she notes, “Interestingly, many of the surviving Jewish sources from this period are in Aramaic, rather than Greek or Hebrew. Among the notable exceptions to this pattern are the *Letter of Aristeas*, some of the Greek Jewish authors excerpted by Alexander Polyhistor (e.g., Demetrius, Artapanus, Eupolemus, Pseudo-Eupolemus), and the oldest strata of the so-called Septuagint.” Reed, “Jewish Astronomy,” 5 n. 13.

cultic and exegetical or intellectual and textual, respectively. Some more recent scholars have reconsidered this earlier view, recognizing that the priestly and scribal domains could not have been entirely separate. Scribal activity, they recognized, was overseen by the priestly authorities and had the Jerusalem temple as its locus. Yet, as in the case of the earlier scholarship, the assumption of some level tension and even conflict between priests and scribes often remains.

Until now, the Aramaic Scrolls have not played a systematic role in attempts to understand better the Jewish priesthood in this era. Admittedly, the Aramaic Scrolls cannot be used on their own in this type of historiographic work, given their relative lack of easily identifiable allusions to historical events and individuals. They can, however, supplement our understanding of the Hellenistic-era Jewish priesthood by serving as supporting evidence: confirming and nuancing aspects of some reconstructions, and problematizing others. In the remaining pages of this dissertation, I will begin to do just that, to integrate the Aramaic Scrolls into my assessment of the history of the Jerusalem priesthood in the Hellenistic period. Doing so will also allow me to say something about the likely social location of these compositions. In the course of my treatment of the priesthood during this period, it will become clear that a sizable swath of the Aramaic Scrolls were themselves most likely the products of the priesthood, written by elite priests or members of aristocratic priestly families, in part to support the contemporary Jerusalem temple and its priesthood. There is no evidence that the authors of these writings were disgruntled, disaffected, or alienated from the contemporary priestly establishment in Jerusalem.

It must be stressed that my overview of the scholarship is schematic and my attempt to incorporate the Aramaic Scrolls into a historiography of the Second Temple Jewish priesthood is preliminary. A full and complete reassessment of these scholarly debates cannot be undertaken at this point. However, I do show in what follows that the Aramaic Scrolls can make significant

contributions to our understanding of pre-Hasmonean Jewish society, and can augment the work of scholars who are attempting to offer a broader vision of Second Temple Judaism and the Jerusalem priesthood.

7.2 Levites, Aaronides, and Zadokites

Reconstructing the history of the Jewish priesthood is a notoriously difficult endeavor. There is general agreement among a significant number of scholars as to some of the broad strokes of this history, despite a lack of consensus on many of the details. For example, it is clear from the discrepancies in the biblical record, and widely acknowledged by scholars, that the configuration of the temple cult in Jerusalem reached a certain equilibrium at some point in the Second Temple era only “after a long period of struggle between rival factions.”⁷⁹¹ This period of struggle in the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods is typically thought to have involved at least three originally independent priestly groups, vying for control of the Jerusalem temple: the Levites, the Aaronides, and the Zadokites.

The Zadokites are often purported to represent the traditional Jerusalem priesthood, dating back to Solomon’s selection of their eponymous ancestor to serve as his high priest after banishing Abiathar to Anathoth (1 Kgs 2:26–35).⁷⁹² On this view, Zadokite supremacy in Jerusalem was only

⁷⁹¹ Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 135.

⁷⁹² Zadok is often understood as originally having been a priest of the Jebusite cult prior to David’s conquest of Jerusalem and only later incorporated into Israelite cultic system, a suggestion which Grabbe says has “a good deal of merit.” Lester L. Grabbe, “Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests ‘Zadokites’?” in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum and H. G. M. Williamson, JSOTSup 373 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 205–215, 206. See e.g., Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Reprecht, 1871), 176–77; H. H. Rowley, “Zadok and Nehushtan,” *JBL* 58 (1939): 113–41; Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period: Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy*, trans. John Bowden (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 129–38; Joachim Schaper, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda: Studien zur Kult- und Sozial-geschichte Israels in persischer Zeit*, FAT 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 93, 270. Opponents of the Jebusite thesis include Frank Moore Cross and Saul M. Olyan. See Frank Moore Cross, “The Priestly Houses of Early Israel,” in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 293–325; Saul M.

seriously, though ultimately unsuccessfully, challenged at the time of Josiah's Deuteronomic reforms.⁷⁹³ It must be noted, however, that references to Zadok in the Hebrew Bible are scant, and several scholars have questioned whether it is accurate to characterize the pre-exilic Jerusalem priesthood as Zadokite.⁷⁹⁴ There is a broad consensus, though, that a group identified with Zadok came to a position of power in Jerusalem at some point during the Second Temple period. Most scholars have concluded that the high priest was chosen from among their ranks until the time of Hasmonean dynasty, and have described the dominant priestly faction in the pre-Hasmonean period as Zadokite.⁷⁹⁵ Some recent work, however, has given us reason to re-think at least certain aspects of this so-called Zadokite hypothesis, as we will see in section 7.2.1 below.⁷⁹⁶

The Levites are often depicted as the chief challengers to Zadokite supremacy in Jerusalem both before and after the exile. The exact origins of this group are intensely debated,⁷⁹⁷ but they are typically associated with the Deuteronomic tradition, and Josiah's effort to centralize the

Olyan, "Zadok's Origins and the Tribal Politics of David," *JBL* 101 (1982): 177–93. For a help summary of the evidence and the debate, see Deborah W. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 64–70.

⁷⁹³ As Alice Hunt has noted, Wellhausen's thesis regarding the dominance of the Zadokite priesthood throughout the pre-exilic period has been deeply influential on academic studies of Israelite history, and has met little scholarly resistance. Alice Hunt, *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*, LHB/OTS 452 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), see esp. 19–49.

⁷⁹⁴ This issue was raised early on by John Bartlett, who challenged the traditional assumption that "the office of the leading priest in the Jerusalem temple from the time of David onwards was held only by the direct descendants of Zadok, and that succession was handed on from father to son." John Raymond Bartlett, "Zadok and His Successors," *JTS* 19 (1968): 1–18, 1. This view is cited and seconded by Hunt in her recent study on Zadok traditions in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism. As she contends, "I conclude, with Bartlett, that we cannot find evidence in Samuel–Kings for a Zadokite priestly dynasty. Neither can we find evidence in Samuel–Kings for a dominant Zadokite priesthood from the time of David. What can we say? According to the writers and redactors of Samuel – Kings, there was a priest named Zadok who served King David." Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 90.

⁷⁹⁵ For a recent and thorough discussion of the history of this scholarship, see Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 13–49.

⁷⁹⁶ See esp., Grabbe, "Pre-Maccabean High Priests"; Hunt, *Missing Priests*; Nathan MacDonald, *Priestly Rule: Polemic and Biblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44*, BZAW 476 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).

⁷⁹⁷ For some more recent attempts to reconstruct the origins and history of the Levites, see Risto Nurmela, *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*, SFSHJ 193 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998); Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*; Mark Leuchter, *The Levites and the Boundaries of Israelite Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Israelite cult.⁷⁹⁸ On this view, the Levites, identified as “the priests of the high places,” were integrated into the Jerusalem priesthood as second-class clergy during the reign of Josiah, after a failed attempt to give them equal status with their Zadokite counterparts (cf. 2 Kgs 23:4–9).⁷⁹⁹ It is typically assumed that during and after the exile the Levites tried, but ultimately failed, to secure control over the Jerusalem cult, which was reclaimed by the returning Zadokites, likely with the imperial support of the Persian government.⁸⁰⁰ However, the Levites did manage to make significant gains with respect to their place in both the Jerusalem cult and the wider society, possibly with the support of allies like Ezra and Nehemiah, though they nevertheless remained second-class, non-sacrificing clergy.⁸⁰¹

The Aaronides, it is traditionally maintained, were relative latecomers to the Jerusalem cult.⁸⁰² On the basis of the Golden Calf narrative, it is typically argued that Aaron and his priesthood can be traced back to the shrine at Bethel in the Northern Kingdom. As Blenkinsopp has confidently maintained, “The connections of Aaron, as eponym of a priestly caste, to Bethel can hardly be doubted, in view of the parallels between the episode of the gold calf in Exodus 32, in which Aaron plays a prominent and dubious role, and the establishment of the state sanctuary

⁷⁹⁸ See e.g., Albertz, *History of Israelite Religion*, 220–4; Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*; Stephen L. Cook, “Those Stubborn Levites: Overcoming Levitical Disenfranchisement,” in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, ed. Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, AIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 155–70.

⁷⁹⁹ This scenario is summarized by Grabbe in *Jews and Judaism*, 1:228.

⁸⁰⁰ Cf. Grabbe, *Jews and Judaism*, 1:228.

⁸⁰¹ On the role of Ezra and Nehemiah in elevating the status of the Levites, see Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*, 300. For a sympathetic, but critical appraisal of this aspect of Schaper’s thesis, see Lester L. Grabbe, review of Joachim Schaper, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda*, *JQR* 93 (2003): 609–11.

⁸⁰² Aaron’s status as a latecomer in the literary and historical record of ancient Israel was noted as early as 1905, by Robert H. Kennett, as was recently noted by Joseph Blenkinsopp. Robert H. Kennett, “The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood,” *JTS* 7 (1905): 70–74. Blenkinsopp himself has noted, after assessing the evidence, “The conclusion is warranted that neither Aaronite priests nor their eponymous priestly founder appears in any text, pre-exilic or postexilic, with the exception of the Priestly tradition, Chronicles, three late additions to Ezra-Nehemiah, and some psalms.” Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Mystery of the Missing ‘Sons of Aaron,’” in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe with Deidre Fulton, *LSTS* 73 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 65–77.

of Bethel by Jeroboam I reported in 1 Kings 12.”⁸⁰³ In fact, it seems plausible, as some scholars have suggested, that the Golden Calf narrative in Exodus 32 actually originated as piece of pro-Aaronide propaganda, legitimizing the Bethel cult, and only took on its polemical tone after being edited by a critical redactor.⁸⁰⁴ In the wake of the deportation of the Zadokites, it is generally suggested that Aaronides were among the priestly factions, along with the Levites and possibly others, who were vying for control of the Jerusalem cult in the exilic and early post-exilic periods.⁸⁰⁵

Despite this fractious and volatile history, many scholars argue that the situation in Jerusalem reached some sort of settlement during the Persian period, reflected most clearly in the redaction of the Pentateuch and the composition of the Books of Chronicles.⁸⁰⁶ On this view, a new genealogical and literary history was forged through a process of accommodation and collaboration, whereby Zadok was given an Aaronide lineage and Aaron was integrated into Levi’s family tree.⁸⁰⁷ This arrangement reinforced the status of the Levites as second-class, non-sacrificing clergy, but required the Zadokites to share their sacrificial duties with the Aaronides, though it also ensured that the high priest would continue to come from the sons of Zadok. Exactly how and why this rapprochement occurred is unfortunately lost to history, but scholars have

⁸⁰³ Joseph Blenkinsopp, “The Judaeen Priesthood during the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction,” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 25–43, 35. Cf. Grabbe, “Pre-Maccabean High Priests,” 208.

⁸⁰⁴ Albertz, *History of Israelite Religion*, 145; Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*, 276; Grabbe, “Pre-Maccabean High Priests,” 208.

⁸⁰⁵ On the status and role of the Aaronides and a sanctuary at Bethel in the exilic and early post-exilic periods, see Blenkinsopp, “Judaeen Priesthood.”

⁸⁰⁶ See e.g., Gary N. Knoppers, “Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 49–72, esp. 70–72. Cf. MacDonald, who described the redacted Pentateuch, as especially the Book of Numbers, as representing “a *via media* between the two main textual corpora that constitute the Pentateuch,” i.e., the Priestly tradition and Deuteronomy. For MacDonald, the textual creation of the Pentateuch preceded the priest-Levite distinction and arrangement, but that, in time, “the extra-textual reality probably imitated the text that had become canonical *Torah*.” MacDonald, *Priestly Rule*, 149.

⁸⁰⁷ So Blenkinsopp, “Judaeen Priesthood,” 39–42.

pointed to a number of possible factors that could have compelled these rivals to reconcile their differences for the sake of creating a stable cultic system.⁸⁰⁸

It is worth noting at this point that, given the nature of our sources, every reconstruction of the Jerusalem priesthood will be subject to criticism on any number of counts. The more detailed the reconstruction, the more open it is to criticism, especially by those who have their own, alternative way of interpreting the admittedly scant, complex, and allusive data. Thus far, I have tried in my summary of the scholarship to hew as closely as possible to the consensus view, and have attempted to present a general overview of the history of Jewish priesthood as currently understood, without taking up matters that, though subject to vigorous debate, are relatively inconsequential for getting a sense of the big picture. I have tried not to lose the forest for the trees. But two aspect of this reconstructed history require further comment, and can be illuminated with reference to my analysis of priestly themes in the Aramaic Scrolls.

7.2.1 A Zadokite Priesthood?

First, some scholars have recently taken note of the relative dearth of references to Zadok or the sons of Zadok in both biblical and Second Temple sources, especially when compared with the number of references to Levi and the sons of Levi, or Aaron and the sons of Aaron. The ancient Jewish literary record is replete with references to Levi and Aaron, but the evidence for a discrete priestly group that traces its ancestry back to Zadok is actually far less apparent than the

⁸⁰⁸ See e.g., Leuchter’s brief comments of the matter in a recent essay: “Perhaps new challenges such as the Golah community–homeland community conflict trumped the problems of earlier priestly fissions.” Mark Leuchter, “From Levite to Maškil in the Persian and Hellenistic Eras,” in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*, ed. Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton, AIL 9 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 215–32, 218. Blenkinsopp, on the other hand, stresses the possibility that imperial pressure coming from the Persian regime may have been a decisive factor. Blenkinsopp, “Judaean Priesthood,” 43.

overwhelming consensus on this matter would suggest.⁸⁰⁹ The most thorough analysis of references to Zadok and the sons of Zadok in recent years, and the most thoroughgoing critique of the so-called Zadokite hypothesis, was carried out by Alice Hunt in her 2006 monograph. Hunt argued persuasively that the literary evidence is far too meager to support any claims regarding the dominance of the Zadokites in the monarchic and pre-Hasmonean periods.⁸¹⁰ Even if a Zadokite identity did become an important part of the self-understanding of some group or another at some point during the late Second Temple period, it is far less clear that a group associated with Zadok ever dominated the Jerusalem priesthood in the sense suggested by many scholars of ancient Israel and ancient Judaism.⁸¹¹ It may very well be the case that the high priests of the Second Temple period were thought to have come from the line of Zadok, as current consensus holds,⁸¹² but even this conclusion is not self-evident in the literature, as Nathan MacDonald has pointed out: “Labelling the priests as ‘sons of Zadok’ is found in a small fraction of texts: in some of the latest redactions of Ezekiel’s temple vision, and in the later developments of the *Serek* tradition from

⁸⁰⁹ In an important, recent study, Jonathan Klawans has shown that Josephus is silent on the matter of, and apparently unconcerned with, Zadokite identity as it related to high priesthood, and argues that Josephus’ relative inattention to Zadokite heritage as a source of significance and contention is by no means idiosyncratic. In fact, he argues that “there is good reason to question whether the issue of Zadokite descent was as important to ancient Jews generally (or Sadducees specifically) as scholars assume. Not a single ancient Jewish source—again, Josephus or not—states that disputes over the genealogical descent of the high priesthood played any significant role in fomenting sectarian disputes among second temple period Jews.” Jonathan Klawans, *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 21. For his full assessment of the data and argument, see pp. 18–23.

⁸¹⁰ For Hunt’s summary of the biblical and Second Temple literary evidence, see Hunt, *Missing Priests*, 143 and 164.

⁸¹¹ For Hunt’s own suggestion about the identity of this group or groups, see *Missing Priests*, 190. We need not accept every aspect of her analysis and alternative reconstruction in order to recognize the merits of her contribution to the debate. The fact remains that she, and others, have shown the serious deficiencies inherent in the standard approach to the Zadokite question.

⁸¹² See e.g., Grabbe, “Pre-Maccabean High Priests,” 213–14. Grabbe’s basic argument is that the pre-Maccabean high priests would have in fact been understood as having Zadokite lineage, but this would not have distinguished them from the rest of the altar priests, all of whom were believed by most Jews to have been descendants of Zadok. He thus concludes, “The view that the high priestly line was the exclusive Zadokite line, and in this way differed from other priests, is nowhere attested in our sources. In that sense, the high priests of the Second Temple did not bear the exclusive or particular designation of ‘sons of Zadok’ or ‘Zadokite’.” Grabbe, “Pre-Maccabean High Priests,” 214. For an argument that even the Hasmonians were of Zadokite stock, see Alison Schofield and James C. VanderKam, “Were the Hasmonians Zadokites?” *JBL* 124 (2005): 73–87. See, however, Klawans, *Josephus*, 22–23 for a different interpretation of the same evidence.

Qumran, and in one part of the Ben Sira textual tradition. Every other Second Temple source is completely silent on the matter.”⁸¹³

Most of the Aramaic Scrolls are set too early in Israel’s history to serve as evidence for or against any version of the Zadokite hypothesis. However, a few data points from the Aramaic Scrolls are worth considering. The high priestly list in Pseudo-Daniel^c (4Q245) includes non-Zadokites, including Abiathar and two Hasmoneans, alongside the high priests of Zadokite stock. Pseudo-Daniel^c thus takes a fairly inclusive approach to the high priesthood, despite its reliance on the genealogy in 1 Chr 5:27–41. It cannot be associated with either a narrowly Zadokite or anti-Hasmonean perspective. It does not appear to reflect underlying polemics on the issue of high priestly descent at all. The only genealogical criterion that seems to matter is descent from Levi and Aaron, which it highlights by including Qahat at (or toward) the beginning of the list. Besides 4Q245, only two other Aramaic writings from Qumran contain references to the high priest or the high priestly office, i.e., New Jerusalem and the Aramaic Levi Document. New Jerusalem says nothing about the lineage of high priest one way or the other, at least not in the extant text. The Aramaic Levi Document, on the other hand, associates the high priesthood with Qahat. Neither of these compositions gives us any clear indication of how their authors would have understood the importance of Zadokite lineage, or lack thereof, for high priestly service, though we can say that Zadokite identity does not appear to be a salient issue in these or any of the Aramaic Scrolls, either as a source of pride or contention. In this way, they fit nicely alongside of other references to the high priesthood in the ancient Jewish literary record, none of which place a great deal of emphasis on descent from Zadok as a criterion for the office of high priest.⁸¹⁴ Even if Second Temple priests

⁸¹³ MacDonald, *Priestly Rule*, 147.

⁸¹⁴ E.g., Hecataeus of Abdera, Ben Sira, the Letter of Aristeas, Judith, and Josephus all make reference to the high priesthood, but say nothing about the occupant of the office as being a Zadokite or belonging to the sons of Zadok. As Grabbe notes, “One would think that Zadok and the Zadokites would have an important place in later Judaism.

were thought to be of Zadokite stock, Zadokite lineage does not appear to have been as salient an aspect of priestly identity as has been previously thought. We should also rethink whether we can really continue to speak of a Zadokite group, one which was recognizably distinct from their Aaronide compatriots, as comprising the dominant force within the Jerusalem priesthood. The evidence simply does not seem to support this hypothesis.

7.2.2 A Bipartite Division of the Priesthood: Priests and Levites

We can say with some confidence that by the end of the Persian period the cultic personnel in Jerusalem were most commonly described in a bipartite fashion: i.e., as priests and Levites.⁸¹⁵ From the late Persian period on, the priests as a group are typically defined in ancient Jewish literature as the sons of Aaron without distinction, though the priesthood was certainly comprised of various families, some of whom were more prominent than others. Moreover, we also see by the end of the Persian period a striking lack of partisan in-fighting between the sons of Aaron and the sons of Levi, however acrimonious their relationship might have been in the early post-exilic period.⁸¹⁶ This new-found stability between priests and Levites is reflected in the redaction of the Pentateuch and the writing of Chronicles. After Chronicles, we see no evidence of polemical rhetoric between these two groups, no evidence of one of the groups trying to delegitimize or usurp the duties of the other. From the time of the writing of Chronicles on, the priest-Levite distinction

Surprisingly, they are completely absent from much of the literature of Second Temple Judaism. This is in spite of the fact that priests in general and the high priest in particular are often mentioned in these texts.” Grabbe, “Pre-Maccabean High Priests,” 209. Cf. the discussion in Klawans, *Josephus*, 19–23.

⁸¹⁵ Zadok was clearly viewed as member of Aaron’s line, but, as we have seen, relatively few ancient Jewish writings make Zadokite lineage a salient aspect of priestly identity, at least not in the way that would suggest understanding the Zadokites as a socially and ideologically coherent group within, but distinct from, the Aaronide priesthood.

⁸¹⁶ This basic point was observed by Grabbe, who noted, “Regardless of the earlier history of the priesthood, most of the Second Temple texts present a reasonably uniform picture,” and he further points out that “the only indications of rivalry are those relating to the high priesthood and are between members of the same family,” i.e. not between priests and Levites. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion*, 135.

is widespread in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, and does not appear to be a contested arrangement. In fact, Chronicles is a very important piece of evidence in this regard, inasmuch as it elevates the Levites to a place of prominence, within both the cultic and social spheres of Judea, and yet does not attempt to challenge the basic distinction between priests and Levites vis-à-vis the sacrificial cult. We may not be able say definitively that Chronicles is a Levitical work, though it certainly takes an interest in, and has a rather high estimation of, the Levites. However, regardless of how we understand its relationship to the Levites, its apparently “pro-Levite” stance did not require a concomitant denigration of the Aaronides, nor did it challenge the basic arrangement reflected in the redaction of the Pentateuch.⁸¹⁷

This picture coheres with what we see in the Aramaic Scrolls, even though many scholars have viewed some of them as expressing pro-Levite and/or anti-Aaronide views.⁸¹⁸ In fact, the Book of Watchers, the Astronomical Book, and the Aramaic Levi Document (along with Ben Sira, Jubilees, and the Testament of Levi) are the compositions that are most often wielded as evidence in support of the thesis that factional strife between priests and Levites continued well into the Hellenistic period. On this view, Ben Sira is thought to represent a pro-Aaronide and anti-Levitical perspective, with the others representing the opposite. This view, however, simply does not withstand close scrutiny. Space prevents me from spending too much time unpacking the evidence, or lack thereof, for an anti-Levite perspective in Ben Sira and an anti-Aaronide perspective in Jubilees and the Testament of Levi. It is worth pointing out that Ben Sira’s supposed anti-Levitical conception of priesthood rests, on the one hand, on an argument from silence, i.e., the lack of a

⁸¹⁷ Knoppers, “Hierodules, Priests, or Janitors?,” 71; Steven Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*, LHB/OTS 442 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 173; Louis C. Jonker, *Defining All-Israel in Chronicles: Multilevelled Identity Negotiation in Late Persian-Period Yehud*, FAT 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 274–5.

⁸¹⁸ See e.g., Saul M. Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 261–86, 279–80; Wright, “Fear the Lord,” 203; David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origin of Scripture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 205; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 327.

mention of Levi in the Hymn in Honor of Our Ancestors (Sir 44–50), and, on the other, on its purported disagreement with anti-Aaronide works on certain theological matters. However, even if Ben Sira does disagree with some of his contemporaries on some of these issues (e.g., calendar and cosmic speculation), it is far from clear that Jubilees or the Testament of Levi is anti-Aaronide. In fact, Jubilees, like the vast majority of Second Temple writings, assumes the basic distinction between priests and Levites (30:18). And while it is true that the Testament of Levi is fiercely critical of the priesthood, there is no evidence that its author is making a claim against the basic distinction between priest and Levite, or that the Testament of Levi reflects a Levitical, as opposed to an Aaronide, conception of the priesthood.⁸¹⁹ That it is set during the patriarchal period, and speaks glowingly of Levi, is not in and of itself evidence of an attempt to undermine the status of the sons of Aaron, motivated by a “pan-Levitical” conception of the priesthood.

The evidence is even less ambiguous when it comes to the Aramaic Scrolls. These compositions help demonstrate that it is mistaken to view the Hellenistic-era Jewish priesthood as characterized by infighting between Levites and Aaronides. When the Aramaic Levi Document is read alongside of the Testament of Qahat and the Visions of Amram, it is clear that these three compositions embrace the traditional distinction between sons of Aaron and sons of Levi. All three compositions reflect an interest in Levi and his descendants, but not at the expense of the sons of Aaron. While Levi’s descendants as a class are elevated, there is nevertheless a particular focus on that portion of the Levitical line that leads to Aaron (Levi–Qahat–Amram), and Aaron himself, as well as his descendants, are singled out for special attention in the Visions of Amram. Moreover,

⁸¹⁹ “S. M. Olyan argues that the Levi-Priestly Tradition was produced by non-Aaronide Levitical circles to oppose the Zadokite and Aaronide ideologues who sought to exclude the rest of Levi from the priesthood. His argument is based on his interpretation of the Tradition’s polemics against the chief priests (*Testament of Levi* 14:2) and the corrupt priesthood (*Testament of Levi* 14:4–8). However, it is not clear whether the polemics were against the Zadokite priests or the Aaronide priests.” Yeong Seon Kim, *Temple Administration and the Levites in Chronicles*, CBQMS 51 (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 189.

priestly genealogy clearly runs through Aaron in Biblical Chronology (4Q559), and almost certainly does in Pseudo-Daniel^c (4Q245), given the reference to Qahat in its list of high priests. If the early Enochic writings, particularly the Book of Watchers and the Astronomical Book, are closely associated with the Aramaic Levi Document, as some have suggested and as I agree they are, there can be no sense in which they originate within pro-Levitical (in the sense of anti-Aaronide) circles, or ones which were allied with Levites against Aaronides, as is sometimes suggested.⁸²⁰ Finally, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks, unlike their earlier Enoch counterparts, are most certainly critical, if not outright condemnatory, of the Jerusalem temple and its cult, and, perhaps not coincidentally, reflect a post-175 BCE state of affairs in Palestine, which distinguishes them from many of the other Qumran Aramaic writings. Even these compositions, though, do not seem to display animus toward Aaron or his descendants as such, nor do we have any reason to suggest that they would be particularly sympathetic to the plight of the Levites. In fact, the priesthood as an institution goes unmentioned in both the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks.

7.3 Priests and Scribes

Many of the earlier, classic accounts of the history of Second Temple Judaism distinguish sharply between priests and scribes.⁸²¹ The priests, on this view, may once have embraced their biblical mandate to serve as teachers, judges, and interpreters of Israel's authoritative textual

⁸²⁰ E.g., Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 326–9.

⁸²¹ See e.g., Elias Bickerman, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism* (New York: Schocken, 1962), 67–71; Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, trans. S. Applebaum (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966), 124–5, 197; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 78–83; Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, rev. and ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 322–23; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 102, 160–1, 218.

traditions (e.g., Deut 33:10; Mal 2:6–7), but they abandoned these duties at some point between the time of Ezra and the Maccabean Revolt. In their place rose a class of lay scribes, who assumed responsibility as the new stewards of Israel’s textual and legal traditions. These scribes are generally identified as the ancestors of the Pharisees and rabbis of later periods.⁸²² A concise statement of this once-dominant theory is found in Tessa Rajak’s classic work on Josephus. In discussing Josephus’s claim to scriptural expertise, which he closely associates with his priestly identity, Rajak notes her suspicion on the grounds that “on the whole priests were not especially renowned in Jewish tradition for their interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.”⁸²³ She continues, “From the time of Ezra, this had been the province of the scribes, and of those shadowy figures, the Men of the Great Synagogue; and we do not even hear of the priests themselves claiming any special relationship with the Torah.”⁸²⁴ This view, however, short-changes the evidence from the Second Temple period, and often reflects a tendency in some earlier scholarship to interpret the social and religious world of Second Temple Judaism through the lens of rabbinic literature.⁸²⁵

This standard account of lay scribal expertise coming to replace priestly authority in the realm of teaching and scriptural interpretation has been successfully challenged in the past few decades by a number of scholars, though perhaps no one has done a more thorough job of

⁸²² For a summary of this account of Second Temple history, see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*, 2d ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 283–90. See also Steven D. Fraade’s summary of this scholarship in his important, though unpublished, essay “‘They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob’: Priests, Scribes, and Sages in Second Temple Times” (2003). Accessed at <https://yale.academia.edu/StevenFraade/Papers>

⁸²³ Tessa Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*, 2d ed. (London: Duckworth, 2002), 19.

⁸²⁴ Rajak, *Josephus*, 19.

⁸²⁵ Contra. Rajak, Sanders argues, “In the battle between rabbinic literature, which implies that priests needed non-priests to tell them what to do, and Josephus, who states that priests served as teachers and judges, I prefer Josephus. One of the reasons is chronological. By the time rabbinic literature was written, the lay teachers had in fact become ascendant. The Mishnah faithfully reflects a social setting, namely, its own. Josephus’ praise of the excellence of priestly rule is biased, but it nevertheless reflects a social setting in which priests played a leading part, namely, his own experience in Jerusalem. Besides his summaries, Josephus’ narratives of concrete events show the prominent roles of priests, a point that weighs quite heavily with me, though it bears more directly on the chief priests than the ordinary priests.” Sanders, *Judaism*, 291–2.

reassessing the evidence and offering an alternative account than Sanders, Fraade, and Grabbe.⁸²⁶

In reconsidering the standard view, these scholars have not only challenged the notion that priestly (including Levitical) authority was usurped by a class of lay scribes in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, but they have also done much to clarify the role of the scribe in Second Temple society, and to suggest more accurate ways of characterizing the relationship between priesthood and textuality in ancient Judaism. We have no reason to assume that the priests and Levites would have “surrendered their traditional role as biblical experts and magistrates (judging cases on the basis of biblical law), and that the Pharisees or lay scribes had taken over these roles.”⁸²⁷ Nor can we find “evidence from the Second Temple period for a major shift of Torah authority from priestly to lay hands.”⁸²⁸ The ancient Jewish literary record instead suggests that members of the priesthood, as representatives of the central cultic and political institution in Judea, continued to act as teachers and judges throughout the Second Temple period. It is not helpful to pit priests and Levites against scribes as if these would have been viewed as mutually exclusive identities. True, not every scribe would necessarily have been a priest (or a Levite), but we do have reason to believe that the priestly and scribal domains overlapped significantly throughout this period. Priests and members of priestly families likely would have especially dominated the ranks of learned, elite scribes, i.e., the ones who would have acted as administrators, advisors, diplomats, expert interpreters of scripture, translators, and composers of new works of literature (e.g., the

⁸²⁶ See esp. Sanders, *Judaism*, 279–98; Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages”; Lester L. Grabbe, *An Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel, and Jesus* (London: T&T Clark International, 2010), 43–46, 49–51. See also Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988), 241–76; Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 53–58.

⁸²⁷ Sanders, *Judaism*, 293.

⁸²⁸ Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 4.

Aramaic writings from Qumran).⁸²⁹ Put more simply, in contrast to what Rajak has suggested, Josephus was more the rule than the exception.

The Aramaic Scrolls confirm this understanding of the relationship between priests and scribes. When viewed alongside the rest of the Second Temple literary record, the Aramaic Scrolls support, and can further nuance, the work of scholars like Sanders, Fraade, and Grabbe. These Aramaic writings, as we have seen in section 6.2.2, do not completely collapse the distinction between priests and scribes, or cultic and scribal responsibilities, but they do reflect the convergence of the priestly and scribal domains by at least the early Hellenistic period. In what follows, I will incorporate the Aramaic Scrolls into my account of the much broader reassessment of the traditional view of priestly and scribal roles and authority.

7.3.1 “The Scribes”

We should thus avoid making sweeping statements about “the scribes” as a socially cohesive, monolithic group in Second Temple Jewish society, let alone a distinct class of lay intellectuals who contested or appropriated the teaching and interpretive duties of the priestly classes.⁸³⁰ In its most basic sense, scribe is an occupation, one which required, at the very least, the ability to read and write. Becoming a scribe would have also involved some level of formal training, which, as Sanders notes, would have included learning the professional script as well as

⁸²⁹ Fraade associates the convergence of priestly and scribal roles in the Second Temple period with the ascendancy of the Jerusalem temple as the dominant cultic *and* political institution in the wake of the collapse of the Israelite monarchy and the failure to re-establish it after the return from exile. He also notes the significance of the “centralized priesthood” exercising control over an emerging “common scriptural canon.” Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 8.

⁸³⁰ Grabbe’s summary of the role of the scribe(s) in ancient Jewish society is helpful in driving this point home: “The term ‘scribe’ (*grammateus* in the Greek sources) has a wide meaning, similar to our word ‘secretary’. It can mean the lowly scribe in a warehouse who keeps simple records and perhaps needs little more education than to be able to read and write and do certain sums; or it can refer to a high official in the government (like the ‘secretary of state’ in many national governments). Scribes would have functioned at various levels in Jewish society, from private (wealthy) households and businesses to civil administrations to the temple staff.” Grabbe, *Introduction*, 49.

acquiring some other relevant skills.⁸³¹ For instance, Drawnel has recently argued that scribal training would have included learning basic metrological and arithmetical skills.⁸³² Every scribe would therefore have needed to possess a certain baseline competence in matters pertaining to their occupation, but it is worth stressing that not every scribe would have been equal in skill, prestige, training, and responsibility. Some scribes would have functioned simply as clerks and copyists, while others would have used their skill and training to serve as legal experts, judges, teachers, administrators, and senior advisors.⁸³³ The more high-level, complex scribal duties, such as administration, diplomacy, literary production, or prophetic exegesis, would not have been accessible to every scribe, inasmuch as these types of activities would have required the leisure and, by implication, the wealth necessary to spend a considerable amount of time at study. For example, serving as an advisor or diplomat in Judea in the Persian and Hellenistic periods would have required mastery not only of basic textual or computational skills and familiarity with the legal and literary heritage of Israel, but also would have demanded an awareness of foreign affairs as well as a working knowledge of the languages, customs, and traditions of the Empire and other neighboring peoples.⁸³⁴ For this reason, the literature of the Second Temple period often associates scribes of a certain stature with wisdom, which may explain some of the convergence of scribal and sapiential language in some ancient Jewish writings, including the Aramaic Scrolls and, especially, the Aramaic Levi Document. However, it is important *not* to assume that the term scribe always, everywhere refers to this type of elite, highly-educated individual.

⁸³¹ Sanders, *Judaism*, 293–4.

⁸³² See e.g., Drawnel, “Priestly Education.”

⁸³³ Drawing on evidence from neighboring, non-Jewish cultures, Fraade summarizes the varied roles of the scribe as follows: “While some scribes are professional clerks or secretaries for official records and correspondence, others are administrators and diplomats of state, while still others, thought to possess oracular powers as a result of their specialized knowledge of languages and texts, function as priests and trusted counselors to kings.” Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 7.

⁸³⁴ As depicted, e.g., in *Let. Aris.* 120–127.

Even if scribes did not constitute a socially cohesive, monolithic group, there does seem to have been an emerging sense of scribal authority and text-consciousness in ancient Judaism, reflected especially in the literature of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.⁸³⁵ For example, Baruch, Jeremiah's scribe, becomes a prominent pseudepigraphic author in his own right in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. Enoch, too, becomes a great hero in Jewish apocalyptic and cognate writings in part by virtue of his scribal status (4Q203 8.4; 1 En. 12:4; 92:1; Jub. 4:17). We also see a greater, more explicit emphasis placed on textuality and on texts as sources of knowledge and authority in a striking number of Jewish writings from the Greco-Roman world. For example, several literary compositions bear superscriptions that clearly identify them as copies of written works;⁸³⁶ various Israelite heroes are said to have been in possession of books, and/or to have written down and preserved information for posterity;⁸³⁷ books and tablets come to play an important role in various visionary or eschatological contexts;⁸³⁸ and textual interpretation begins to function as a means of accessing the divine will.⁸³⁹ Many of these motifs occur in the Aramaic Scrolls, as we have seen, but we see a heightened level of text-consciousness in a wide range of Jewish literature from the Greco-Roman world.

7.3.2 Scribalism and Priestly Authority

This increased scribal authority and book-consciousness, however, does not entail a concomitant diminishing of priestly power, nor does it imply that the priests and Levites lost or surrendered their status as judges and teachers to an emergent class of lay scribes. In fact, there is

⁸³⁵ On this phenomenon, its roots, and its implications, see esp. Carr, *Tablet of the Heart* and Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

⁸³⁶ 1Q20 5.29; 4Q203 8.3–5; 4Q204 1vi.9–10 // 1 En. 14:1; 4Q242 1–3.1–2, 5; 4Q529 1.1; 4Q543 1a–c.1–4; Tob 1:1. For a helpful discussion of this motif, see Perrin, “Capturing the Voices.”

⁸³⁷ E.g., 1Q20 19.25; 4Q542 1ii.12; 4Q547 9.8; 1 En. 83:10; Jub. 2:1; 45:16.

⁸³⁸ E.g., 2Q26 1.1–3; 4Q537 1–3.3–5; 1 En. 93:2; 106:19; Jub. 30:22–23; Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5; 20:15.

⁸³⁹ As is demonstrated most clearly in the Peshet tradition attested at Qumran.

reason to believe that priests and Levites not only continued to function in their traditional roles as the judges and teachers of the nation throughout the Second Temple period, but were also the most likely to have served as scribes, particularly the type of elite, learned scribes who would have been responsible for acting as the stewards of Israel's literary heritage: compiling, collecting, interpreting, and translating scriptural texts as well as composing and disseminating new works of literature. The Qumran Aramaic writings, like a great number of other Jewish texts from the Greco-Roman period, only confirm this thesis, inasmuch as they reflect a deep connection between priestly identity and power, on the one hand, and scribal activity, book production, and textual authority, on the other.

Sanders and Fraade have catalogued references to priests serving as teachers and judges, which pervade the literary record of Second Temple Judaism.⁸⁴⁰ To highlight just a few examples: Hecataeus of Abdera (ca. 300 BCE), in describing the religio-political situation in Judea, characterized the priests as those who were “appointed to be judges in all major disputes,” and those to whom were given “guardianship of the laws and customs” (excerpted by Diodorus of Sicily in *Bibliotheca historica*, 40.3.5).⁸⁴¹ This picture is confirmed by Ben Sira (ca. early second century BCE), whose description of the judicial and instructional responsibilities of the priests is quite similar to that of Hecataeus (Sir 45:17). Josephus, too, highlighted the judicial role of the priests, depicting them as custodians of the law and as being responsible for litigation and punishment (*Ag. Ap.* 2.184–8). We also see priests and Levites playing a prominent judicial and legislative role in the Temple Scroll from Qumran, which outlines the regulations for a council consisting of twelve princes, twelve priests, and twelve Levites who are all responsible “for

⁸⁴⁰ Sanders, *Judaism*, 279–82, 290–92; Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 5–7.

⁸⁴¹ On this passage, see David Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*, TSAJ 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 32–34.

judgment and for the law” (11Q19 57:13–14).⁸⁴² These references, along with other passages cited by Sanders and Fraade, are consistent with what we find in earlier texts, especially Deut 33:10 and Mal 2:6–7, and can be summarized as follows: “Priests and Levites were the employees of the nation for the purposes of maintaining the worship of God in the temple, *and* teaching and judging the people.”⁸⁴³

The nascent scribalism and book-consciousness of the Hellenistic and Roman periods would not have altered this basic paradigm. In fact, Second Temple writings provide examples, some more explicit than others, of individuals who are both priests and scribes. The paradigmatic example is Ezra, but we also hear of a certain Zadok, whose name may suggest a priestly identity (Neh 13:13).⁸⁴⁴ Consider also Eleazar in 2 Maccabees, who is described as “one of the scribes in high position” (6:18). Again, the author does not explicitly identify Eleazar as a priest, but his name may suggest that he is of priestly stock, as in the case of Zadok the scribe.⁸⁴⁵ In any case, 4 Maccabees, in its retelling of the story of Eleazar’s martyrdom, refers to him as “a man of priestly family, learned in the law” (5:4). To be sure, the presentation of Eleazar as belonging to a priestly family may be nothing more than the idiosyncratic interpretive decision of the author of 4 Maccabees, but it nevertheless reflects a broader trend in Second Temple literature, the convergence of priestly and scribal roles and identities.

As we have seen throughout this dissertation, many of the most obvious examples of this literary phenomenon come from the Aramaic Scrolls, in their depictions of figures like Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Levi, Qahat, and Amram, and the eschatological priest of the Apocryphon of

⁸⁴² According to the Temple Scroll, the king himself is subject to the legal authority of this council (cf. 11Q19 LVII 14–15).

⁸⁴³ Sanders, *Judaism*, 298. Emphasis mine.

⁸⁴⁴ A point made by Sanders in *Judaism*, 280.

⁸⁴⁵ As Fraade notes, “The name Eleazar in Second Temple times is most commonly borne by members of priestly families.” Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 35 n. 37.

Levi^b?. The Aramaic Scrolls render problematic the notion that scribal authority replaced or superseded priestly authority in post-exilic Judah. If anything, my analysis of the Aramaic Scrolls can further solidify the extent to which the priestly and scribal-sapiential domains overlapped in the Hellenistic period. What we see in the Aramaic Scrolls, though, is consistent with trends in Second Temple literature more broadly. The convergence of sacerdotal and scribal or sapiential identities appears in writings like Jubilees and the Testament of Levi. It has also been suggested by many scholars that Ben Sira was both a priest and a scribe, though we cannot know this for certain.⁸⁴⁶ Either way, it is clear that he is both an ardent supporter of the Jerusalem priesthood and a learned, elite scribe, whose training and status likely bore some resemblance to the type of scribe described in his encomium in ch. 39. We find high-ranking priests, even high priests, being characterized as possessing great intellect in the works of Hecataeus of Abdera (*Bibliotheca historica*, 40.3.5) and Josephus (*Ag. Ap.* 1.187), and the high priest Eleazar is depicted as engaging in written correspondence with the Ptolemaic king in Egypt and selecting an envoy of highly trained, highly literate Jewish scholars to translate the Hebrew scriptures into Greek in the Letter of Aristeas (41–46; 120–127). The Letter of Aristeas also lists the priests first among those who are responsible for authorizing and confirming the accuracy of the translation of the Jewish law from Hebrew to Greek (310), and 2 Maccabees makes reference to a certain Aristobulus, who is described as being “of the family of the anointed priests, teacher of King Ptolemy” (1:10). Finally, on several occasions, Josephus closely associates knowledge of scripture with his priestly office (e.g., *Ant.* 4.303–304; *Ag. Ap.* 1.54–55), and he himself represents the connection between

⁸⁴⁶ See e.g., Menahem Stern, “Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*, vol. 2, CRINT (Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976), 561–630, 580; Burton L. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 1; Olyan, “Relationship to the Priesthood,” 262; Fraade, “Priests, Scribes, and Sages,” 10.

priesthood, education, and mastery of scripture, inasmuch as his writings bear witness to his own facility with Israel's scriptural heritage.

7.3.3 Socio-Historical Reality

Most, if not all, of the passages highlighted above likely contain some level of embellishment and exaggeration. We do, however, have reason to suggest that these literary motifs accurately capture something of the socio-historical reality of Second Temple Judaism, namely, that priests and Levites were well suited to maintain their traditional duties as judges and teachers.⁸⁴⁷ They did not have these duties wrested from them by lay scribes. In fact, we have no real evidence for an independent class of lay intellectuals with extensive scribal training, let alone one that would have had the power to usurp the responsibilities of the priesthood. We have no reason to suggest that the priesthood would have handed their responsibilities over willingly to anyone.⁸⁴⁸ That Jewish society was structured in this way throughout the Second Temple period likely had something to do with 1) the religio-political status of the Jerusalem temple in Judea; 2) the need for a significant number of scribes to carry out a range of duties related to the administration of the temple, many, if not most, of whom would have been priests and Levites; and 3) the likelihood that the priestly classes would have been among the most likely members of Judean society to possess the level of literacy, education, wealth, and leisure to produce the kind of sophisticated literature that was written in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman periods.

⁸⁴⁷ Note Fraade's comments on this point: "However much Josephus may be exaggerating his own skills, he takes for granted (and assumes his readers do too) the connection between being a priest and having knowledge of Scripture, and between that priestly knowledge of Scripture and oracular powers of interpretation." Fraade, "Priests, Scribes, and Sages," 29 n. 20.

⁸⁴⁸ It is true that some works of literature from the Second Temple period, including some of the Aramaic Scrolls, do depict members of the laity as possessing scribal training and intellectual acumen, e.g., Tobit and Daniel, but even they are presented as wealthy and well-connected, and neither of them are characterized as rivals of, or even in competition with, the Jerusalem priesthood. In fact, Tobit is explicitly presented as supporting the priests and the Levites, and acknowledging the central status of Jerusalem temple and its cult.

7.3.3.1 The Religio-Political Status of the Temple

In the Second Temple period, both the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood became the primary, if not the exclusive, indigenous religious, cultural, and political institutions in Palestine.⁸⁴⁹ The evidence suggests that the high priest in Jerusalem was empowered to fulfill not just cultic, but civic duties as well, and that influential priestly families played a prominent role in Jewish society.⁸⁵⁰ The temple itself would have functioned as a locus of intellectual life and literary production (cf. 2 Macc 1:13–14). In fact, it is hard to think of any Palestinian institution in the Second Temple period that could have rivaled the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood in terms of literary production and dissemination.

7.3.3.2 Temple Scribes

The temple bureaucracy, responsible as it was for both the domestic and foreign affairs of Judea, would have required the expertise of scribes to carry out its day-to-day operations.⁸⁵¹ These duties would have ranged from copying manuscripts and drafting letters to advising the high priest and serving as diplomatic envoys. We have every reason to believe that the majority of these functionaries would have been priests or Levites, since, as Sanders notes, there is “no reason for the temple authorities to have gone outside their own ranks in order to recruit the large number of copyists and legal experts that the temple required.”⁸⁵² Even if some of those scribes were not themselves priests, or from priestly families, they all would have depended on the priesthood for their social status and livelihood.⁸⁵³

⁸⁴⁹ Stern, “Aspects of Jewish Society,” 580. For a detailed treatment of the religio-political status of the priesthood and temple in Second Temple society, see Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle*.

⁸⁵⁰ Stern, “Aspects of Jewish Society,” 580.

⁸⁵¹ Sanders, *Judaism*, 296.

⁸⁵² Sanders, *Judaism*, 296.

⁸⁵³ Wright, “Fear the Lord,” 196.

7.3.3.3 Priests as the Educated Class

It is also worth considering just who in Second Temple society might have possessed the time, education, and resources to engage in high-level literary production, especially the composition of new works of literature, many of which reflect deep knowledge not just of Israel's scriptural heritage but of the cultural traditions of Babylon, Persia, Egypt, and Greece as well as of international affairs and of life in a royal court. Simply associating such works of literature with so-called scribal groups tells us almost nothing. Scribal training, to be sure, would have been a prerequisite for composing such complex works of literature, but it is not all that helpful to identify the social location(s) of these authors as "scribal," since, as we have seen earlier, "the scribes" did not comprise a socially cohesive, monolithic class of intellectuals, equal in skill and status, let alone wealth and leisure. Instead, Grabbe's proposal seems both more specific and more attuned to economic and political realities in Judea in the Second Temple period: "Only the very few had the resources and leisure for education; the vast majority of the population were peasant farmers or agricultural workers of some sort. Those able to devote time to literature were, first, the priests and Levites, and secondly, the aristocracy."⁸⁵⁴ Given the place of the priesthood and the temple in Judean society, the overlap between priests and aristocrats would have been considerable.

7.3.4 Recent Work on Priest and Scribes

Finally, we need to address two more theories regarding the relationship between priests and scribes in the Second Temple period. Both of these theories, like the earlier, classic theories, envision this relationship as being characterized by tension and, in some cases, by outright conflict and strife. However, what sets them apart is a recognition that the Jerusalem temple was the most

⁸⁵⁴ Grabbe, *Introduction*, 49.

likely locus of scribal and intellectual activity in Second Temple Judea. Scribal and intellectual activity, on these views, is not understood as the domain of the laity. Rather, scriptural interpretation and literary production, at least in the Hellenistic period, is understood as closely connected to and dependent upon the religio-political establishment in Jerusalem.

The first of these two theories I have called the “division of labor” theory, a phrase I have taken from Karel van der Toorn.⁸⁵⁵ On this view, Levitical scribes are understood to have taken over responsibility for textual interpretation and literary production from the sons of Aaron, whose responsibilities were circumscribed to stewardship of the sacrificial cult:⁸⁵⁶

By the time of the Chronicler (ca. 350 B.C.E.), the conflict had reached a solution by means of a division of labor between the Levites, on the one hand, and the traditional Jerusalem priesthood descending from Zadok, on the other. In the new scenario, the Levites were responsible for the teaching of Torah and the distribution of justice; in addition they served as temple singers and as guardians of the sanctuary. This division of tasks turned the Levites from priests into preachers and public teachers of Torah.⁸⁵⁷

As this quote suggests, van der Toorn relies heavily on the Book of Chronicles, which purportedly reflects a “division of labor” within the temple establishment, but he also points to several compositions from the Hellenistic period that purportedly originated within Levitical-scribal circles, and reflect ongoing tensions within the temple establishment between Levites and altar priests: e.g., the Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees, and the Testament of Qahat.⁸⁵⁸ It is undoubtedly true that some Levites served as scribes, judges, legal experts, and teachers and interpreters of scripture in the Second Temple period, as is attested throughout the ancient Jewish literary record. It seems strange to suggest, though, that the priests would have given up these

⁸⁵⁵ van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 94.

⁸⁵⁶ See also, e.g., Schaper, *Priester und Leviten*. For a brief summary of his position, see Joachim Schaper, “Levites,” *EDEJ* 885–7.

⁸⁵⁷ van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 94.

⁸⁵⁸ van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 94.

aspects of their office entirely, especially since any given priest would only be on duty at the altar for a handful of weeks per year, and would need some way of occupying their time in the interim. It is much more plausible, and does more justice to the evidence as a whole, to say that both priests and Levites had access to a scribal education, and together functioned as the primary teachers and judges of the nation, especially since neither Chronicles nor the Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees, or the Testament of Qahat support a “division of labor” theory of the priesthood.

The idea that the Chronicler’s work bears witness to a rapprochement between the Levites and the altar priests is a fairly common view. Chronicles was almost certainly either prompted by or eventually resulted in a basic equilibrium between once-rival priestly factions, and it is also clear that Chronicles reflects and accepts the distinction laid out in the redacted Pentateuch between sons of Levi and sons of Aaron on the question of service at the altar. It nevertheless dramatically increases the social position of the Levites, expanding their duties to include such things as “officers and judges” (1 Chr 26:29), “scribes” (2 Chr 34:13), and teachers of “the book of the law” “among the people” “through all the cities of Judah” (2 Chr 17:9). However, not even Chronicles suggests that all of these duties would now fall exclusively to the Levites. In fact, 2 Chr 17:7–9, far from depicting the Levites as having taken certain duties *from* the priests, depicts *both* priests and Levites as engaged in the teaching of the law among the people (cf. 2 Chr 17:7–9). Chronicles is more about the inclusion of the Levites, than the exclusion of the priests.

It is also problematic to use the Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees, and the Testament of Qahat as evidence “that the division of labor as described in Chronicles continued to obtain throughout the Hellenistic period.”⁸⁵⁹ We have already shown that it is dubious to associate these compositions with a pan-Levitical, anti-Aaronide perspective. They cannot be adequately

⁸⁵⁹ Van Der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 94.

understood if they are simply taken as representing Levitical interests in any narrow or exclusive sense. It is just as dubious to cite them as evidence for the view that “the Levites were the scribal experts of Jewish society.”⁸⁶⁰ To be sure, as van der Toorn observes, all three of these compositions describe Levi as teaching and passing on books to his children for future generations, but there is no evidence that this process would have excluded the sons of Aaron, who were firmly situated within the Levitical line well before the Hellenistic period. In fact, in the case of the Aramaic Levi Document and Jubilees, part of what is being transmitted from father to son is a set of technical instructions about how to conduct a proper sacrifice. If anything, these compositions make it clear that a priestly education would have required enough literacy to understand those instructions, i.e., those which outline the minutiae of a very complex sacrificial process. The Aramaic Levi Document, in particular, assumes that scribal training is a prerequisite for service at the altar, strongly implying that altar priests would need to know basic weights, measures, and computational skills in order to sacrifice in accordance with “the law of the priesthood.” Once in possession of such scribal skills, nothing, it seems, would have precluded any given priest from using them outside of the sacrificial sphere, either within the temple bureaucracy or in the towns throughout Judea, or from acquiring more specialized forms of training to supplement their basic priestly education, whatever that would have entailed. Not every priest would have had the interest or the ability to pursue this type of elite education, but it is probably the case that aristocratic priests from prominent families would have been more likely than the work-a-day (Levitical?) temple scribes to have had the leisure required to pursue supplemental, more highly-advanced forms of education.

⁸⁶⁰ van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 90.

The second theory is most associated with Richard A. Horsley, though a similar view is found in the work of Anthea E. Portier-Young.⁸⁶¹ On this view, the scribes are understood as a retainer class of professional intellectuals, who were dependent on the priestly aristocracy for their status and livelihood, but nevertheless viewed themselves as independent from them, at least to some extent. For Horsley, the origin of what scholars typically refer to as apocalyptic literature has its origins in scribal dissatisfaction with the collaborationism of the temple authorities with their imperial overlords. Horsley summarizes his view as follows:

The professional role of Judean intellectuals was to use their knowledge of Judean sacred traditions as advisors to the priestly aristocracy who headed the Temple. When imperial rulers and the priestly aristocracy's collaboration with that rule threatened the traditional Judean way of life, however, these intellectuals were caught in a conflict between loyalty to their patrons, who were in turn dependent on their imperial overlords and their loyalty to the traditions of which they were guardians. At least some circles of dissident Judean intellectuals were led into resisting imperial rule. The Second Temple Judean texts that have been classified as apocalyptic are the expressions of their struggle to affirm that God was still in control of history and to resist Hellenistic or Roman rule that had become overly oppressive.⁸⁶²

He provides a fairly compelling image of the social status and function of Jewish intellectuals, though the extent to which they would have seen themselves as independent or autonomous is open to debate. Many, if not most, of them would have been members of prominent priestly families, and thus steeped from birth in the theology and traditions of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood. To be sure, scribes and intellectuals, as Horsley suggests, would have been dependent on the chief priests for their livelihood, but to reduce this relationship to one of patronage is probably too reductive. Even making a sharp distinction between the “Judean intellectuals” and

⁸⁶¹ See esp., Richard A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007); idem, *Revolt of the Scribes: Resistance and Apocalyptic Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010); Anthea E. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).

⁸⁶² Horsley, *Revolt of the Scribes*, 4.

the “priestly aristocracy” likely understates the extent to which the intellectual classes were populated by people from aristocratic families, with Josephus and Ben Sira being only the most obvious examples. The authors of many of the Aramaic Scrolls likely fall into that category as well, given that their writings reflect evidence of both their elite education and their commitment to the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.

This is not to say that professional intellectuals, priestly or otherwise, would have never come into conflict with the senior-most temple authorities; in fact, this may help to explain the socio-historical contexts of a number of apocalyptic texts, especially those clustered around times of acute crisis (e.g., the reforms of Antiochus IV and the Maccabean rebellion). However, there has been a tendency in scholarship to overestimate the extent to which Second Temple Jewish literature was rooted in conflict within or over the priesthood; this is especially true with regard to the literature dating to the pre-Hasmonean, Hellenistic period. Prior to the reign of Antiochus IV and the ascendance of the Hasmoneans, we do not see much evidence in the Jewish literary record of elite dissatisfaction with, or resistance to, priestly authority.⁸⁶³ Theories that view the pre-Hasmonean period through the lens of active conflict between Aaronides and Levites, or between priests and scribes, fail to do justice to the evidence. The Aramaic Scrolls help to confirm this basic conclusion. In these writings, we gain access to a Jewish literary tradition from the early Hellenistic period that upholds the traditional relationship between the sons of Aaron and the sons of Levi, and that reflects the convergence of sacerdotal and scribal-sapiential activities and identities.

⁸⁶³ For this understanding of early apocalyptic literature, I am indebted to the insights of Reed in “Writing Jewish Astronomy.”

7.3.5 Summary

The Aramaic Scrolls were most certainly written by authors possessing an elite education, whether we imagine them to have been professional intellectuals, members of the leisured class, or both. They display a vast knowledge not only of Israel's scriptural heritage, but of a wide array of topics from astronomy to geography to physiognomy, among many others. As we have seen, priests, members of priestly families, or those otherwise connected to the Jerusalem temple were among the most likely people in ancient Jewish society to have had access to the education, leisure, and financial resources required to produce this kind of sophisticated, learned literature. Moreover, when we look at the overwhelming attention paid to the priesthood, the cult, and the temple throughout the Aramaic Scrolls, their priestly provenance grows all the more likely. That the Aramaic Scrolls, or at least some of them, were written by priests is not a new proposal. Often, however, their authors are understood by scholars as disaffected, disgruntled, or alienated from the temple establishment in Jerusalem. My analysis, though, has shown this is not the best way to read the extant evidence. Nothing in the compositions that I have surveyed would suggest that their authors were attempting to offer a critique of, or a polemical attack against, the representatives of the contemporary Jerusalem temple and its priesthood. Rather, the Aramaic Scrolls, when read alongside of the rest of the ancient Jewish literary record, provide an image of a much more stable situation in the pre-Hasmonean Jerusalem priesthood than is typically posited. In my view, it is best to understand the Aramaic Scrolls as products of the Hellenistic-era Jerusalem temple and its priesthood.

7.4 Conclusion

This dissertation began by recognizing the quickly-growing body of scholarship dedicated to considering the Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran as a corpus of interrelated literature. The

emergence of this area of inquiry depended in large part on the careful textual work of earlier scholars like Milik, Beyer, and Puech, and was prefigured by several important insights made by Milik and Wacholder about the coherence of the Aramaic Scrolls, the value of interpreting them in light of one another, and their largely pre-Hasmonean, pre-sectarian provenance. Nevertheless, Dimant's 2007 study marked the beginning of a genuinely new phase of research on these materials, inasmuch as it represented "the first essay ever to attempt a thematic classification of the corpus of Aramaic writings found at Qumran."⁸⁶⁴ Dimant was systematic in her approach and, unlike her predecessors, her work generated a significant amount of scholarly discussion, which led to the further refining of her classificatory scheme, most notably, by Tigchelaar, García Martínez, and Machiela.

To date, this new phase of research has primarily been characterized by literary analyses, exploring the points of contact between various compositions in the corpus and outlining the basic contours of the corpus as a whole, with special attention being paid to common words, phrases, themes, genres, and concepts. For example, Dimant and Perrin have both written important articles situating the Book of Tobit within its Qumran Aramaic context by highlighting its affinities with other compositions in the corpus.⁸⁶⁵ Perrin's recent monograph is another example of this sort of literary study, inasmuch as it traces and analyzes the appearance of dream-visions, the primary mode of divine revelation in the Aramaic Scrolls.⁸⁶⁶ My dissertation is, in many respects, another contribution to this type of literary approach. I have taken a particular theme, and traced its appearances across the Aramaic Scrolls in an attempt to say something about the coherence and character of the corpus as a whole. In so doing, I have demonstrated that the Aramaic Scrolls not

⁸⁶⁴ García Martínez, "Aramaica qumranica," 435.

⁸⁶⁵ Dimant, "Tobit and the Qumran Aramaic Texts"; Perrin, "Tobit's Context and Contacts."

⁸⁶⁶ Perrin, *Dynamics of Dream-Vision*.

only present a consistent conception of the priesthood, cult, and temple. I have also shown that priestly themes are present in at least half of the extant compositions, and are inextricably intertwined with the corpus's more commonly-identified features. Themes concerning the priesthood, cult, and temple are part and parcel of the broader literary and conceptual profile of the corpus as a whole, and my dissertation has demonstrated their value for further illuminating the coherence and contours of the Aramaic Scrolls as a body of interrelated literature.

My dissertation also offered a preliminary attempt to move from literary to socio-historical analysis in its concluding chapter. In particular, I have demonstrated that the tendency to view the pre-Hasmonean, Hellenistic period Jerusalem priesthood as riven by tension and strife between competing priestly groups is not well founded in the sources. Theories about on-going factional division between Levites, Aaronides, and Zadokites not only overestimate the salience of Zadokite identity in ancient Judaism, but also fail to recognize the stability of the arrangement reached between priests and Levites. I have also demonstrated that the convergence of priestly, scribal, and judicial roles that we see throughout the Aramaic Scrolls is consistent with what we know from other sources about the priesthood in Second Temple Judea. Priests did not lose or surrender their traditional duties as the teachers and judges of the nation to an emerging class of lay scribes. In fact, quite the contrary. Scribal and intellectual activity most likely remained within the purview of the Jerusalem temple and its priesthood throughout the Second Temple period. Priests were among the most likely to possess the training, wealth, and leisure necessary to act as legal experts, stewards of scripture, and authors of new works of literature. We should be careful not to distinguish too sharply between professional advisors and intellectuals, on the one hand, and the priestly aristocracy, on the other. The intellectual elite of Judean society probably consisted largely of individuals from well-connected priestly families. Characters such as Enoch, Noah, Levi, Qahat,

and Amram likely function, at least in part, as models of highly educated priests, who carry out both cultic and scribal activities.

Finally, my dissertation can also help situate the Aramaic Scrolls within the social world of Hellenistic-period Judaism. This corpus reflects a consistent and distinctive image of Israel's priestly institutions. However, the image of the priesthood, cult, and temple in the Aramaic Scrolls is not so idiosyncratic as to render it incompatible with what we find in the literature of Second Temple Judaism more generally. The compositions in this corpus may have a unique vocabulary and an identifiable set of emphases and concerns, but they are nevertheless broadly consistent with the image of the priesthood in a wide range of ancient Jewish writings in many important respects, and do not appear to reflect a factional, sectarian, or schismatic perspective. Previous scholars have at times mischaracterized the orientation and function of some Aramaic Scrolls, inasmuch as they have described them as presenting an alternative vision of the priesthood or as rejecting the contemporary Jerusalem temple and its cultic apparatus. It is better to understand these compositions as originating from within the Jerusalem temple, and as being written by highly educated priests or at least by intellectuals who were supported by the priestly aristocracy. Such a social location would account for the prominent position of Levi, Aaron, and other priests, the focus on the minutiae of cultic procedure, and the centrality of the Jerusalem temple that we see throughout the Aramaic Scrolls. We need not explain even the most striking of similarities within the corpus as resulting from the fact that their authors were members of a quasi-sectarian scribal group or a clearly demarcated wisdom school. It is enough to note that their shared education, training, profession, social status, and familial connections could account for both the very specific and more general affinities and points of contact among the compositions in the corpus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albertz, Rainer. *From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy*. Volume 1 of *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Alexander, Philip. *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts*. Library of Second Temple Studies 61. London: T&T Clark International, 2006.
- Angel, Joseph L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 86. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Reading the *Book of Giants* in Literary and Historical Context.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 21 (2014): 313–46.
- Antonissen, Hugo. “The Banquet Culture in New Jerusalem, an Aramaic Text from Qumran.” Pages 52–77 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegismund. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 131. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- _____. “The Visionary Architecture of New Jerusalem in Qumran.” Pages 439–80 in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen, and Nadine Kessler. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 278. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Aschim, Anders. “Melchizedek and Levi.” Pages 773–88 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Baillet, Maurice, J. T. Milik, Roland de Vaux, and H. W. Baker. *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Barthélemy, D., and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Cave I*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Bauckham, Richard. “Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel.” Pages 433–59 in *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 233. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. Review of Yigael Yadin, *Megillat ha-Miqdaš: The Temple Scroll (Hebrew Edition)*.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97 (1978): 584–9.
- _____. “Some ‘Qumran’ Observations on the Aramaic Levi Document.” Pages 393–401 in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran*,

and Post-Biblical Judaism. Edited by Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Bartlett, John Raymond. “Zadok and His Successors.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 1–18.

Baxter, Wayne. “Noachic Traditions and the *Book of Noah*.” *Journal of the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (2006): 179–94.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran and in their Ancient Context*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 78. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. “Mishmarot.” Pages 958–60 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

_____. “Scientific Writings in Aramaic and Hebrew at Qumran: Translation and Concealment.” Pages 379–402 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Bernstein, Moshe J. “From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.” Pages 39–64 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Traditions at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

_____. “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions.” Pages 1–26 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. “The Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.” Pages 317–43 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Berthelot, Katell. “References to Biblical Texts in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran.” Pages 183–203 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus des Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Band 1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

- Bickerman, Elias J. *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism*. New York: Schocken, 1962.
- _____. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Black, Matthew in consultation with James C. VanderKam, with an appendix on the ‘Astronomical’ chapters (72-82) by Otto Neugebauer. *The Book of Enoch, or, 1 Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. “The Judaeen Priesthood during the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods: A Hypothetical Reconstruction.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998): 25–43.
- _____. “The Mystery of the Missing ‘Sons of Aaron.’” Pages 65–77 in *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers and Lester L. Grabbe with Deidre Fulton. Library of Second Temple Studies 73. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Bohak, Gideon. “A New Geniza Fragment of the *Aramaic Levi Document*.” Pages 101–14 in *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Geniza Fragments*. Edited by Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander. Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement 31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Brooke, George J. “4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest.” Pages 83–100 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 84. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- _____. “Patterns of Priesthood, Priestliness and Priestly Functions in Some Second Temple Period Texts.” *Judaïsme Ancien – Ancient Judaism* 4 (2016): 1–21.
- Brooke, George J., John J. Collins, Torleif Elgvin, Peter W. Flint, Jonas C. Greenfield, Erik Larson, Carol A. Newsom, Émile Puech, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Michael Stone, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, in consultation with James C. VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3. Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert XXII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Broshi, Magen. “Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 9–22 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Broshi, Magen, Esther Eshel, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Erik Larson, Carol A. Newsom, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Mark Smith, Michael Stone, John Strugnell, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James C. VanderKam. *Qumran Caves 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2. Discoveries in the Judaeen Desert XIX*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

- Caquot, André. “Grandeur et pureté du sacerdoce: Remarques sur le *Testament de Qahat* (4Q542).” Pages 39–44 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Ziony Zevit, Seymour Gittin, and Michael Sokoloff. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- _____. “Les testaments qoumrâniens des pères du sacerdoce,” *Revue Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 78 (1998): 3–26.
- Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- _____. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origin of Scripture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Charles, R. H. *The Book of Enoch*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- _____. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis: Translated from the Editor’s Ethiopic Text and Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: A & C. Black, 1902.
- Church, Philip. “The Temple in the Apocalypse of Weeks and in Hebrews.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 64 (2013): 109–28.
- Chyutin, Michael. *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigraph: Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.
- Collins, John J. “4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar.” Pages 83–93 in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3. DJD XXII*. Edited by James C. VanderKam et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 403–30 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, with the assistance of A.E. Alvarez. Volume 2. Brill: Leiden, 1999.
- _____. “Asking for Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A.” Pages 579–90 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1998.
- _____. “The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives.” Pages 547–64 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence*

30 June–2 July 2008. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. “The Judaism of the Book of Tobit.” Pages 23–40 in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*. Edited by Geza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 98. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

_____. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Cook, Edward M. “4Q541, Fragment 24 Reconsidered.” Pages 13–18 in *Puzzling Out the Past: Studies in Northwest Semitic Languages and Literatures in Honor of Bruce Zuckerman*. Edited by Marilyn J. Lundberg, Steven Fine, and Wayne T. Pitard. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 55. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

_____. *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

_____. “Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 205–19.

Cook, Stephen L. “Those Stubborn Levites: Overcoming Levitical Disenfranchisement.” Pages 155–70 in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. Edited by Mark Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Cross, Frank Moore. “The Priestly Houses of Early Israel.” Pages 293–325 in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

de Jonge, Marinus. “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi.’” *Revue de Qumrân* 13 (1988): 367–85.

Di Lella, Alexander A. “The Deuteronomic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3–11.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 41 (1979): 380–9.

Dillmann, August. *Das Buch Henoch: Uebersetzt und erklärt*. Leipzig: Vogel, 1853.

Dimant, Devorah. “Ideology and History in the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90).” Pages 91–118 in Light of the Qumran Community Worldview.” Pages 91–118 in *From Enoch to Tobit: Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 114. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

_____. “Jerusalem and the Temple in the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90) in Light of the Qumran Community Worldview.” Pages 119–38 in *From Enoch to Tobit: Collected Studies in Ancient Jewish Literature*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 114. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

_____. “New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390.” Pages 405–48 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid*

18–21 March, 1991. Edited by Julio Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

_____. Review of Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie 4Q529–549*. DJD XXXI. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 292–304.

_____. “The Book of Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah.” Pages 121–43 in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. *Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

_____. “The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran.” Pages 447–67 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Volume 2. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

_____. “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community.” Pages 197–205 in *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst et al. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

_____. “The Qumran Manuscripts: Content and Significance.” Pages 23–58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness, Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

_____. “Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran.” Pages 15–43 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

_____. “Tobit and the Qumran Aramaic Texts.” Pages 385–406 in *Is There a Text in this Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts*. *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 86. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

_____. “Moon Computation in the *Aramaic Astronomical Book*.” *Revue de Qumrân* 23 (2007): 3–41.

_____. “Priestly Education in the *Aramaic Levi Document (Visions of Levi)* and *Aramaic Astronomical Book (4Q208-211)*.” *Revue de Qumrân* 22 (2006): 547–74.

_____. “Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts from Qumran and Late Mesopotamian Culture.” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2013): 145–67.

- _____. “The Literary Characteristics of the *Visions of Levi* (so-called *Aramaic Levi Document*).” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 1 (2010): 303–19.
- _____. “The Literary Form and Didactic Content of the *Admonitions (Testament) of Qahat*.” Pages 55–73 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Duke, Robert R. “Moses’ Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the *Visions of Amram*.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14 (2007): 34–48.
- _____. *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543-547)*. *Studies in Biblical Literature* 135. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Ego, Beate. “Vergangenheit im Horizont eschatologischer Hoffnung: Die Tiervision (1 Hen 85-90) als Beispiel apokalyptischer Geschichtskonzeption.” Pages 171–95 in *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Eshel, Esther. “*Jubilees* 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature.” Pages 21–36 in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 89. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- _____. “The *Imago Mundi* of the Genesis Apocryphon.” Pages 109–31 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynne LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel. “Toponymic Midrash in *1 Enoch* and in Other Second Temple Jewish Literature.” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 115–30.
- Esler, Philip F. *God’s Court and Courtiers in the Book of the Watchers: Re-Interpreting Heaven in 1 Enoch 1–36*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. *Library of Second Temple Studies* 63. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “The Aramaic Levi Document.” Pages 453–64 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3d rev ed. *Biblica et Orientalia* 18B. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2004.

- _____. “The Language of Palestine in the First Century A.D.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 501–31.
- _____. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flint, Peter W. “‘4Qpsuedo-Daniel ar^c (4Q245)’ and the Restoration of the Priesthood.” *Revue de Qumrân* 17 (1996): 137–50.
- _____. “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran.” Pages 329–67 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition & Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, with the assistance of Cameron VanEpps. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Fraade, Steven D. “‘They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob’: Priests, Scribes, and Sages in Second Temple Times.” 2003. Accessed at <https://yale.academia.edu/StevenFraade> on April 2, 2020
- Frey, Jörg. “The New Jerusalem Text in Its Historical and Traditio-Historical Context.” Pages 800–16 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- _____. “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament’: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre.” Pages 345–77 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Fröhlich, Ida. “Enmeduranki and Gilgamesh: Mesopotamian Figures in Aramaic Enoch Traditions.” Pages 637–53 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric F. Mason et al. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- _____. “‘Mamzer’ in Qumran Texts – The Problem of Mixed Marriages from Ezra’s Time: Law, Literature and Practice.” *Transeuphratène* 29 (2005): 103–15.
- _____. “Medicine and Magic in Genesis Apocryphon: Ideas on Human Conception and Its Hindrances.” *Revue de Qumrân* 25 (2011): 177–98.
- Fujita, Shozo. “The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries B.C.” Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1970.
- Gamberoni, Johann. “Das ‘Gesetz des Mose’ im Buch Tobias.” Pages 227–42 in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Walter Kornfield zum 60*. Edited by Georg Braulik et al. Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977.

- García Martínez, Florentino. “Aramaica qumranica apocalyptica?” Pages 435–50 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Les rapports avec l’Écriture des textes araméens trouvés à Qumrân.” Pages 19–40 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 270. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- _____. “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften.” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 8 (1993): 171–208.
- _____. “More Fragments of 11QNJ.” Pages 186–98 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations. New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. “Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran.” Pages 329–41 in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremer*. Edited by J. Dijkstra et al. Studies in the History of Religions 127. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “The Last Surviving Columns of 11QNJ.” Pages 178–92 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A. S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Anthony Hilhorst, and C. J. Labuschagne. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 49. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- _____. “The «New Jerusalem» and the Future Temple of the Manuscripts from Qumran.” Pages 180–213 in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. Van Der Woude. *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20 20–31*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Ginsberg, H. L. *Studies in Koheleth*, Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America XVII. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Goff, Matthew. “Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran *Book of Giants*’ Appropriation of *Gilgamesh* Motifs.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009): 221–53.
- Goldman, Liora. “The Burial of the Fathers in the *Visions of Amram* from Qumran.” Pages 231–50 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 439. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013.
- Goodblatt, David. *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 38. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.

- Grabbe, Lester L. “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society.” Pages 89–108 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. *An Introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and Religion of the Jews in the Time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel, and Jesus*. London: T&T Clark International, 2010.
- _____. “Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography.” *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 2 (1979): 43–68.
- _____. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- _____. Review of Joachim Schaper, *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda*. *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93 (2003): 609–11.
- _____. “Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests ‘Zadokites’?” Pages 205–15 in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines*. Edited by J. Cheryl Exum and H. G. M. Williamson. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 373. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. “The ‘Periphrastic Imperative’ in Aramaic and Hebrew.” *Israel Exploration Journal* 19 (1969): 199–210.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael Stone. “Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza.” *Revue Biblique* 86 (1979): 214–30
- _____. “The Prayer of Levi.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112 (1993): 247–66.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Grelot, Pierre. “La géographie mythique d’Hénoch et ses sources orientales,” *Revue Biblique* 65 (1958): 33–69.
- Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Gzella, Holger. *A Cultural History of Aramaic: From the Beginnings to the Advent of Islam*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit*. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 17. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

- Hanneken, Todd R. “The Status and Interpretation of Jubilees in 4Q390.” Pages 407–28 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by Eric F. Mason et al. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Henderson, Ruth. *Second Temple Songs of Zion: A Literary and Generic Analysis of the Apostrophe to Zion (11QPs^a XXII 1–5); Tobit 13:9–18 and 1 Baruch 4:30–5:9*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 17. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.
- Hengel, Martin. “Jesus der Messias Israels. Zum Streit über das ‘messianische Sendungsbewusstsein’ Jesu.” Pages 155–76 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origin of Christianity*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu Stroumsa. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- _____. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Volume 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Hengel, Martin, with the collaboration of Daniel P. Bailey. “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period.” Pages 75–146 in *The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Translated by Daniel P. Bailey. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Hicks-Keeton, Jill. “Already/Not Yet: Eschatological Tension in the Book of Tobit.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132 (2013): 97–117.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- _____. “Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in Aramaic *Levi* and *Jubilees*.” Pages 61–77 in *Between Temple and Torah: Essays on Priests, Scribes, and Visionaries in the Second Temple Period and Beyond*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 151. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- _____. “Temple and the Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Weeks.” Pages 219–36 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal of the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. “The Book of Watchers and the Priests of Jerusalem.” *Henoch* 24 (2002): 131–5.
- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. “Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle: Observations on 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} (4Q552–553).” Pages 173–92 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- _____. *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 83. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Holm, Tawny L. *Of Courtiers and Kings: The Biblical Daniel Narrative and Ancient Story-Collections*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Revolt of the Scribes: Resistance and Apocalyptic Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- _____. *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Horton Jr., Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Hultgård, Andres. “Persian Apocalypticism.” Pages 39–83 in *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Volume 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Hunt, Alice. *Missing Priests: The Zadokites in Tradition and History*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 452. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Jones, Robert. “Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of Its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 27 (2020): 1–30.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan. “A propos de la colonne XXIII du Rouleau du Temple.” *Revue de Qumrân* 10 (1981): 593–5.
- _____. “Publication Provisoire d’un Fragment Provenant de la Grotte 11 de Qumrân (11Q Jér Nouv ar).” *Journal of the Study of Judaism* 1 (1970): 58–64.
- Jonker, Louis C. *Defining All-Israel in Chronicles: Multilevelled Identity Negotiation in Late Persian-Period Yehud*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Jurgens, Blake A. “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Visions of Amram (4Q543-547).” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 24 (2014): 3–42.
- Kennett, Robert H. “The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1905): 70–74.
- Kim, Yeong Seon. *Temple Administration and the Levites in Chronicles*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 51. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014.
- Kister, Menahem. “Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 44 (1993): 280–90.

- Klawans, Jonathan. *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Knibb, Michael A. “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2 (1995): 165–84.
- _____. “Temple and Cult in Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Writings from before the Common Era.” Pages 367–87 in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 22. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. “The Book of Daniel in Its Context.” Pages 16–35 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Knoppers, Gary N. “Hierdules, Priests, or Janitors? The Levites in Chronicles and the History of the Israelite Priesthood.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 49–72.
- Kobelski, Paul. *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 10. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 22. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.
- Kosmin, Paul. *Land of the Elephant Kings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- Kugel, James L. *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- _____. “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings.” *Harvard Theological Review* 86 (1993): 1–64.
- _____. *The Bible as It Was*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- _____. “Halakic Interpretive Strategies at Qumran: A Case Study.” Pages 131–40 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. “Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi (1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi).” *Revue de Qumrân* 17 (1996): 351–8.

- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Lee, Pilchan. *The New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation: A Study of Revelation 21–22 in the Light of Its Background in Jewish Tradition*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 129. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Lemaire, André. “Nabonid et Gilgamesh: L’araméen en Mésopotamie et à Qoumrân.” Pages 125–44 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Leuchter, Mark A. “From Levite to Maškîl in the Persian and Hellenistic Eras.” Pages 215–32 in *Levites and Priests in Biblical History and Tradition*. Edited by Mark A. Leuchter and Jeremy M. Hutton. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 9. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- _____. *The Levites and the Boundaries of Israelite Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Lewis, Jack P. *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- Licht, Jacob. “An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran – The Description of the New Jerusalem.” *Israel Exploration Journal* 29 (1979): 45–59.
- Littman, Robert J. *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Loader, William. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees: Attitudes Toward Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Macatangay, Francis M. *The Wisdom Instructions in the Book of Tobit*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 12. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- MacDonald, Nathan. *Priestly Rule: Polemic and Biblical Interpretation in Ezekiel 44*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 476. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts.” *Judaïsme Ancien – Ancient Judaism* 2 (2014): 113–34.
- _____. “Flood.” Pages 645–6 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 147–58 in *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic*

Worldview. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe, Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski. London: T&T Clark, 2016.

_____. “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Coherence and Context in the Library of Qumran.” Pages 243–56 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 116. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

_____. “The Compositional Setting and Implied Audience of Some Aramaic Texts from Qumran: A Working Hypothesis.” Pages 168–202 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegemund. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 131. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

_____. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 79. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

_____. “Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Setting.” Pages 88–109 in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism: Engaging with John Collins’ The Apocalyptic Imagination*. Edited by Cecilia Wassen and Sidnie White Crawford. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 182. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

_____. “Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?” *Aramaic Studies* 8 (2010): 47–69.

_____. “‘Wisdom Motifs’” in the Compositional Strategy of the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran.” Pages 223–47 in *Hā-’ish Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. Edited by Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George J. Brooke. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 122. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Machiela, Daniel A., and Andrew B. Perrin. “‘That You May Know Everything from Him with Certainty’: A New Reading in 4QEnGiants^b ar (4Q530) and a Literary Connection between the *Book of Giants* and *Genesis Apocryphon*.” *Revue de Qumrân* 25 (2011): 113–25.

_____. “Tobit and the *Genesis Apocryphon*: Toward a Family Portrait.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133 (2014): 111–32.

Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Maier, Johann. “Das Gefährdungsmotiv bei der Himmelsreise in der jüdischen Apokalyptik und ‘Gnosis.’” *Kairos* 5 (1963): 18–40.

_____. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. JSOT Supplement Series 34. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

- Mason, Eric F. *'You Are a Priest Forever': Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Mertens, Alfred. *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien 12. Echter: KBW Verlag, 1971.
- Milik, J. T. "4QVisions of 'Amram et une citation d'Origène." *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972): 77–97.
- _____. "Écrits préessenieniens de Qumrân: d'Hénoch à Amram." Pages 91–106 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978.
- _____. *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda*. Paris: Cerf, 1957.
- _____. "Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- _____. "'Prière de Nabonide' et autre écrits d'un cycle de Daniel." *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 411–15.
- _____. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM, 1959.
- Milik, J. T., with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Milikowsky, Chaim. "Seder 'Olam and Jewish Chronography in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 52 (1985): 115–39.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1927.
- _____. "Some Early Amulets from Palestine," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31 (1911): 272–81.
- Moyer, Ian S. *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic*. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement 38. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.
- Neugebauer, Otto. "The 'Astronomical' Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72-82): With Additional Notes on the Aramaic Fragments by Matthew Black." Pages 386–419 in *The Books of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*. Edited by Matthew Black. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudoepigrapha 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Newsom, Carol A. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

- _____. “Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, The Hebrew Bible, and Neo-Babylonian Sources.” Pages 57–80 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- _____. “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 575–600.
- _____. “Tobit and 1 Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance.” Pages 217–39 in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck. Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Nowell, Irene. “The Book of Tobit: Narrative Technique and Theology.” Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1983.
- Nurmela, Risto. *The Levites: Their Emergence as a Second-Class Priesthood*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 193. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Olson, Daniel C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: ‘All Nations Shall be Blessed.’* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 24. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Olyan, Saul M. “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood.” *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 261–86.
- _____. “Zadok’s Origins and the Tribal Politics of David.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 177–93.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. Rev. ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Perrin, Andrew B. “Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipitis in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20 (2013): 98–123.
- _____. “From *lingua franca* to *lingua sacra*: The Scripturalization of Tobit in 4QTob^e.” *Vetus Testamentum* 66 (2016): 117–32.
- _____. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*. Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- _____. “Tobit’s Context and Contacts in the Qumran Aramaic Anthology.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 25 (2015): 23–51.

- Peters, Dorothy M. *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquities*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 26. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- _____. “Noah Traditions within the Cultural Mosaic at Qumran: Multilingual Conversations and Controversies.” Pages 431–46 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Bael. Early Judaism and Its Literature 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- _____. “The Recombination and Evolution of Noah Traditions as Found in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*: The DNA of Fraternal Twins.” Pages 223–32 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies for the Texts of the Desert of Judah 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Peters, Dorothy M., and Esther Eshel. “Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document*.” Pages 237–59 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Kipp Davis et al. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Philonenko, Marc. “La Doctrine Qoumrâniennes des deux Esprits: Ses origines iraniennes et ses prolongements dans le judaïsme essénien et le christianisme antique.” Pages 163–211 in *Apocalyptique Iranienne et Dualisme Qoumrânién*, Edited by Geo Widengren, Anders Hultgård, and Marc Philonenko. Recherches Intertestamentaires 2. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1995.
- Piovanelli, Pierluigi. “‘Sitting by the Waters of Dan,’ or the ‘Tricky Business’ of Tracing the Social Profile of the Communities that Produced the Earliest Enochic Texts.” Pages 257–81 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Popović, Mladen. “The Emergence of Aramaic and Hebrew Scholarly Texts: Transmission and Translation of Alien Wisdom.” Pages 81–114 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Puech, Émile. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle*. Paris: Gabalda, 1993.
- _____. “Le Testament de Qahat en araméen de la grotte 4 (4QTQah).” *Revue de Qumrân* 15 (1991): 23–54.

- _____. “The Names of the Gates of the *New Jerusalem* (4Q554).” Pages 379–92 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- _____. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie: 4Q550–575a, 4Q580–587*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.
- Rajak, Tessa. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. 2d ed. London: Duckworth, 2002.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. “Writing Jewish Astronomy in the Early Hellenistic Age: The Enochic *Astronomical Book* as Aramaic Wisdom and Archival Impulse.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017): 1–37.
- Reese, Günter. “Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums. Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4Esrabuches.” Ph.D. diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität, 1967.
- Reeves, John C. *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 14. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992.
- _____. “What Does Noah Offer in 1QapGen X, 15?” *Revue de Qumrân* 12 (1986): 415–9.
- Reynolds III, Bennie H. *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolism and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses, 333–63 B.C.E.* Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Rowley, H. H. “Zadok and Nehushtan.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58 (1939): 113–41.
- Rubin, Milka. “The Language of Creation or the Primordial Language: A Case of Cultural Polemics in Antiquity.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 49 (1998): 306–33.
- Russell, David S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic: 200 BC–AD 100*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

- Schaper, Joachim. *Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda: Studien zur Kult- und Sozialgeschichte Israels in persischer Zeit*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery.” Pages 177–202 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- _____. “The Construction of the Temple According to the ‘Temple Scroll.’” *Revue de Qumrân* 17 (1996): 555–71.
- Schofield, Alison, and James C. VanderKam, “Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 73–87.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Rev. ed. by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. Volume 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society, 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001
- _____. “Language, Power and Identity in Ancient Palestine.” *Past and Present* 148 (1995): 3–47.
- Schwitzer, Steven. *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 442. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Segert, Stanislav. “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft.” Pages 315–39 in *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. Bis 14. Oktober 1961*. Edited by H. Bardtke. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1963.
- _____. “Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen aramäischen Texten von Qumrân.” *Archiv Orientalni* 33 (1965): 190–206.
- Shaked, Shaul. “Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.” Pages 308–25 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Sharpe, Carolyn J. “Phinean Zeal and Rhetorical Strategy in 4QMMT.” *Revue de Qumrân* 18 (1997): 207–22.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 2002.
- Soll, Will. “Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of a Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomic Theology.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 209–31.

Starcky, Jean. “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran.” *Revue Biblique* 70 (1963): 481–505.

Stern, Menahem. “Aspects of Jewish Society: The Priesthood and Other Classes.” Pages 561–630 in *Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Volume 2 of *The Jewish People in the First Century*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976.

Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. “Messianic Figures in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran.” Pages 515–44 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Stone, Michael. “Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 19 (1988): 159–70.

_____. “Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age,” Pages 575–86 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by Patrick D. Miller, Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

_____. “The Axis of History at Qumran.” Pages 133–49 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1 Enoch 91–108*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

_____. “Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Scrolls.” Pages 369–86 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 83. Volume 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

_____. “Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the *Yahad*.” Pages 295–326 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

_____. Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran*. *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999): 658–64.

_____. *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary*. *Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism* 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

- Suter, David W. “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–11.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50 (1979): 115–35.
- _____. “Temples and the Temple in the Early Enoch Tradition: Memory, Vision, and Expectation.” Pages 195–218 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Supplements to the Journal of the Study of Judaism 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Tamási, Balázs. “Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship behind the Fragments?” Pages 310–28 in *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*. Edited by Karoly Daniel Dobos and Miklos Koszgehy. Hebrew Bible Monographs 21. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.
- Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966.
- Tervanotko, Hanna. “A Trilogy of Testaments? The Status of the Testament of Qahat versus Texts Attributed to Levi and Amram.” Pages 41–59 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 270. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- _____. “Speaking in Dreams: The Figure of Miriam and Prophecy.” Pages 147–67 in *Prophets Male and Female: Gender and Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible, the Eastern Mediterranean, and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Jonathan Stökl Ben Ezra and Corrine L. Carvalho. Ancient Israel and Its Literature 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Thomas, Samuel I. “Esoteric Knowledge in Qumran Aramaic Texts.” Pages 403–32 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceeding of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. *The “Mysteries” of Qumran: Mystery, Secrecy, and Esotericism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 25. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. “Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations.” Pages 155–71 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Character of the City and the Temple of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*.” Pages 117–32 in *Other Worlds and Their Relation to This World: Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Edited by Tobias Nicklas, Joseph Verheyden, and Erik Eynikel. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 143. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- _____. “Forms of Pseudepigraphy in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 85–101 in *Pseudepigraphie und Verfasserfiktion in frühchristlichen Briefen*. Edited by Jörg Frey et al. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 246. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.

- _____. *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*. Old Testament Studies 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- _____. Review of Michael Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran*. *Revue de Qumrân* 18 (1998): 453–7.
- _____. “Some Remarks on the Book of Watchers, the Priests, Enoch and Genesis, and 4Q208.” *Henoah* 24 (2002): 143–5.
- _____. “The Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 163–180 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- _____. “The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*.” Pages 257–70 in *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst et al. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Early Judaism and Its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- van der Toorn, Karel. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- van Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 66. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- VanderKam, James C. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia, S.C.: The University of South Carolina Press, 2008.
- _____. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- _____. “Isaac’s Blessing of Levi and His Descendants in Jubilees 31.” Pages 497–518 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. *Jubilees 1: A Commentary on the Book of Jubilees Chapters 1–21*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2018.
- _____. “Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran.” *Revue de Qumrân* 13 (1988): 353–65.
- _____. “Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90).” Pages 279–92 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- _____. “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees.” Pages 151–70 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- VanderKam, James C. and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco: Harper, 2002.
- Volkmar, Gustav. *Eine Neu-Testamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung, oder die Geschichtsvision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang*. Zurich: Riesling, 1862.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. “Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles.” *Harvard Theological Review* 61 (1968): 451–81.
- _____. “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts.” Pages 257–81 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Weeks, Stuart, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, eds. *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions, with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Weitzman, Steven. “Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 49–61.
- _____. “Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119 (1999): 35–45.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Reprecht, 1871.
- Werman, Cana. “Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13 (2006): 229–55.
- _____. “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4 (1997): 211–25.
- _____. “Qumran and the Book of Noah.” Pages 171–81 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2008.

- Widengren, Geo. “Leitende Ideen und Quellen der iranischen Apokalyptik.” Pages 77–162 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Wise, Michael O. “4Q245 (psDan^c ar) and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabaeus.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 12 (2005): 313–62.
- _____. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 49. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.
- _____. “A New Manuscript Join in the ‘Festival of Wood Offering’ (Temple Scroll XXIII).” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 47 (1988): 113–21.
- _____. “Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran.” Pages 119–46 in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplements Series 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- _____. “To Know the Times and the Seasons: A Study of the Aramaic Chronograph 4Q559.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 15 (1997): 3–51.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg Jr., and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperOne, 2005.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood.” Pages 189–222 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 255. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. “Take Courage, O Jerusalem...”: *Studies in the Psalms of Baruch 4–5*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Series 25. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015.
- Yuditsky, Alexey (Eliyahu). “ואל תמחוליה ביד שחפא”: 4Q541, Frag. 24 Again.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 23 (2016): 221–32.
- Zimmerman, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran. Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.