

Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls

JOSEPH L. ANGEL

BRILL

Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood
in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 86

Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls

By

Joseph L. Angel



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Angel, Joseph L.

Otherworldly and eschatological priesthood in the Dead Sea scrolls / by Joseph L. Angel.

p. cm. – (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah ; v. 86)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-18145-8 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Priests, Jewish–History. 2. Dead Sea scrolls. 3. Qumran community–History.
4. Jews–History–586 B.C.-70 A.D. 5. Judaism–History–Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.-210 A.D.
I. Title.

BM651.A54 2010

296.1'55–dc22

2009045375

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978 90 04 18145 8

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Rachel

Ἀπὸ γὰρ θαλάσσης ἐπληθύνθη διανόημα αὐ-
τῆς καὶ ἡ βουλή αὐτῆς ἀπὸ ἀβύσσου μεγάλης.
καὶ γὰρ ὡς διώρυξ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ καὶ ὡς ὕδραγωγ-
γὸς ἐξῆλθον εἰς παράδεισον. εἶπα ποτιῶ μου
τὸν κῆπον καὶ μεθύσω μου τὴν πρασιάν καὶ
ἰδοὺ ἐγένετό μοι ἡ διώρυξ εἰς ποταμὸν καὶ ὁ
ποταμός μου ἐγένετο εἰς θάλασσαν.

For her thoughts are deeper than the sea, her
counsel deeper than the great abyss. As for me,
I was like a stream from a river, like a conduit
channeling into a garden. I said to myself, “I
will water my plants and drench my flower-bed.”
And suddenly my stream became a river, and my
river a sea. (Sir 24:29–31)

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	IX
Abbreviations	XI
Chapter One. Introduction	1
The State of Research: Priesthood and Qumran Origins	2
Rationale and Method of the Present Study.....	14
The Plan of the Present Study	18

PART ONE

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Chapter Two. Otherworldly Priesthood in Non-Sectarian Writings	23
The Book of the Watchers	26
Jubilees	36
Aramaic Levi Document	46
4QVisions of Amram ar (4Q543-548)	53
Hebrew Ben Sira	56
4QInstruction ^d (4Q418) Frg. 81 + 81a.....	61
4QApocryphon of Levi ^{b?} ar (4Q541).....	77
Conclusion	81
Chapter Three. Otherworldly Priesthood in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: <i>Imago Templi</i> and Liturgical Time at Qumran .	83
Prefatory Remarks	83
The Provenance of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice	85
Otherworldly Priesthood in the Angelic Liturgy	87
The Relationship of Heaven and Earth in SSS.....	97
Conclusion	105
Chapter Four. Otherworldly Priesthood in Sectarian Writings	107
The Rule of Benedictions (1QSb).....	107
4QSongs of the Sage (4Q510-511)	123
The Self-Glorification Hymn	132

11QMelchizedek (11Q13)	146
Conclusion	165

PART TWO

**ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD
IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS**

Chapter Five. The Image of Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls	171
Methodological Concerns	171
The Messiah of Aaron	176
The Messiah of Aaron as Teacher	180
The Function of Atonement	195
Martial Responsibilities	196
The Eschatological Priesthood of 1QSa	202
Priestly Leadership in the Temple Scroll	203
Summary and Conclusion	205
Chapter Six. The Historical Roots of the Eschatological Priesthood	209
Political-Historical Roots: The Shift to Priestly and Scribal Authority	210
Religious-Historical Roots: Criticism of the Temple and Its Priesthood	212
Sectarian Attitudes toward the Temple	236
Priestly Imagination and the Practice of Ritual Purity at Qumran	242
Summary and Conclusion	253
Chapter Seven. The Traditional Roots of the Eschatological Priesthood	257
The Magnetic Quality of Priesthood in Second Temple Literature	258
Levi and Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls	278
Conclusion	293
Chapter Eight. Summary and Conclusions	297
Summary	297
Conclusions	305
Bibliography	311
Index of Modern Authors	351
Index of Ancient Sources	357

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation submitted to New York University in 2008. I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Lawrence Schiffman, who has been a dependable source of wisdom, guidance, and encouragement over the entire course of this project. I also wish to express my gratitude to my teachers, Professors Moshe Bernstein, Mark Smith, and Dan Fleming, for their careful reading and gracious support of my research. Special thanks are due to Professor Florentino García Martínez for accepting my manuscript for publication in this esteemed series and offering several constructive suggestions.

While completing this project I have had the pleasure of meeting several remarkable individuals from around the world and experiencing the cooperation and general spirit of good will unique to the international network of Dead Sea Scrolls scholars. I benefited greatly from presenting earlier versions of several chapters at various venues in the United States and in Israel. Parts of chapter four were presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies in Washington D.C. in December, 2008. Parts of chapters six and seven were presented at New York University's March, 2008 conference, "The Dead Sea Scrolls at Sixty: The Scholarly Contributions of NYU Faculty and Alumni." I presented a portion of chapter three at a Coffee Hour lecture at the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature at the Hebrew University. Parts of chapter two were discussed in the informal but very serious Thursday night seminars held at the home of Professor Michael Stone in Jerusalem. I thank all of those in attendance at these meetings for offering helpful and constructive criticism. In addition, I offer my gratitude to Dr. Shani Berrin for her meticulous comments on the first half of chapter seven, and Dr. Alex Jassen for commenting on chapter five and offering several helpful editorial suggestions. My students, Emmanuel Sanders and Daniel Sultan, deserve credit for compiling the indexes.

I have been blessed to receive financial support from several institutions over my years of graduate work. Doctoral research grants were provided by the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture and the Orion Center. I also received a Henry H. McCracken graduate fellowship from New York University. I thank each of these fine institutions for generously supporting my research.

This project would never have been completed without the enthusiastic support and encouragement of my family. My parents, David and Vicki Angel, have followed my research with great interest and provided support with open hearts. I am truly blessed to have such caring parents. Finally, I express my utmost gratitude to my wife Rachel, who has not only tolerated but even advanced my fascination with the tattered remains of the ancient Qumran library. My conversations with her have often yielded creative and valuable suggestions. I thank her for her original thinking, which is a constant source of inspiration. Most of all, I thank her for her patience, understanding, and stellar sense of humor.

New York, July 2009
Joseph Angel

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by D.N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJSR	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . 3d ed. Edited by J. Pritchard. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haas. Berlin, 1972–.
APOT	<i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</i> . Edited by R.H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDB	<i>The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> . Edited by F. Brown, S. Driver, and C. Briggs. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Series
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCWJWC	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 BC to AD 200
CIS	Copenhagen International Seminar
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus scriptorium christianorum orientalium. Edited by I.B. Chabot et al. Paris, 1903–
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>

DSSAFY	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment.</i> Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
DSSSE	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition.</i> Edited by F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. New York, 1997–1998.
EDSS	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.</i> Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica.</i> 16 vols. Jerusalem, 1972.
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
GKC	<i>Hebrew Grammar.</i> W. Gesenius. Revised by E. Kautzsch and translated by A.E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
ISACR	Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion
JAL	Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
Joüon-Muraoka	<i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.</i> Paul Joüon. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblio, 1993.
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT/ASOR	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament / American Schools of Oriental Research
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
NJPS	<i>Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text.</i> Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985.
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum

NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	<i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
OTS	<i>Old Testament Studies</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
QC	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RechBibl	Recherches bibliques
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
SE	<i>Studia evangelica I, II, III</i> (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], etc.)
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
SHR	Studies in the Histories of Religions (supplement to <i>Numen</i>)
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SSU	Studia Semitica Upsaliensia
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
ThWAT	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Stuttgart, 1970–.
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION¹

Since the early days of Dead Sea Scrolls research the priestly character of the Qumran community has been taken for granted and affirmed repeatedly. The ease of this assumption has been afforded by the ubiquitous and prominent references in the Scrolls to priests and priestly concerns.² In the non-biblical corpus alone, the term כהן/כוהן appears over 250 times in works of various genres.³ The purported founder and early leader of the community, the Teacher of Righteousness, is identified explicitly as a priest.⁴ His formidable arch-adversary is the “Wicked Priest,” הכוהן הרשע.⁵ In key texts concerned with the administration of the community, supreme authority is granted to sacerdotalists, בני אהרון and בני צדוק.⁶

¹ All formatting in this study follows P.H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). Unless otherwise noted, English translations of the Hebrew Bible are drawn from NJPS.

² The connection between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran site has not been taken for granted by all. See, for example, K.H. Rengstorf, *Hirbet Qumrân and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995). However, a long standing scholarly consensus recognizes that the library at Qumran indeed belonged to the Qumran community. For a summary of the evidence for linking the Qumran community directly with the Scrolls, see A.S. van der Woude, “Fifty Years of Qumran Research,” in *DSSAFY*, 1:2–6. For an expanded argument and a brilliant critique of Golb’s hypothesis, see F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 56 (1990): 521–541. See also D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare a Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58, esp. 35–36. The archaeological links between the caves and the site were noted by R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 99–106.

³ M. Abegg Jr., J. Bowley and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:340–342.

⁴ See 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 1–10 III, 15–16. Cf. 1QpHab 2:2 and 7:4–5, which describe the Teacher and an anonymous priest in nearly identical terms. See further below, pp. 193–194.

⁵ See 1QpHab 8:8; 9:9; 11:4 and 4QpPs^a 1–10 IV, 7–10.

⁶ See esp. 1QS 5:2, 9; 9:7; 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3.

Other texts pertaining to the end of days express the expectation of the arrival of a priestly messiah superior even to the powerful Davidic scion.⁷ Moreover, a steadfast concern for temple and purity permeates the entire collection. It is therefore no surprise that Scrolls scholars have long seen priesthood as a key to understanding the community's origins, identity, governance, and worldview.⁸ This perspective is reflected in several hundreds of Qumran studies published over the past six decades, whether dedicated narrowly to priestly matters or to altogether separate topics of interest.

With reference to the study of priesthood at Qumran, the overwhelming trend has been to press the Scrolls for evidence of historical realities.⁹ In particular, scholars have focused on issues such as the role of Zadokite priests in the early life of the community and the identities of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest in hopes of locating the precise historical matrix that gave rise to the Qumran community. In order to put the present study, which departs from this trend, in context, it will be worthwhile to briefly consider the history of scholarship pertaining to priesthood and Qumran community origins.

THE STATE OF RESEARCH: PRIESTHOOD AND QUMRAN ORIGINS

The Essene Hypothesis

The question of Qumran origins has puzzled scholars since the discovery of the Scrolls, leading to diverse and often strange hypotheses.¹⁰ Nonetheless, within the first decade of research, the work of Geza Vermes, Józef Tadeusz Milik, and Frank Moore Cross generated a consensus on the issue, which identified the community with the Essenes.¹¹ A

⁷ For the variety of expectations of eschatological priesthood in the Scrolls, see chapter five.

⁸ For a useful survey of the state of scholarship on priesthood at Qumran, see R. Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty*, 2:93–116; idem, "Priests," *EDSS* 2:688–693.

⁹ Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 114, n. 69.

¹⁰ Scholars have proposed that the Scrolls belonged to just about every known Jewish or Christian group of the late Second Temple period or to no single community at all. For a representative sample of opinions and bibliographic references, see J. VanderKam, "Identity and History of the Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty*, 2:507–523.

¹¹ See G. Vermes, *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda* (Paris: Desclée, 1954); J.T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957); F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995). The first edition

key element of the “Essene hypothesis” was the assertion that questions of priestly ideology motivated the schism responsible for the establishment of Qumran. The broad strokes of the theory may be summarized as follows: The origins of the Qumran community can be traced back to the historical events surrounding the Jewish conflict with Hellenism that escalated in 175 BCE. In response to the hellenizing policies of the high priests Jason and Menelaus and the edict of Antiochus IV forbidding the practice of Judaism, the Hasmonean family arose as the leader of a conservative Jewish rebel force. The Hasmoneans soon drew the support of a pious Jewish group known as the Hasidim, “an exceedingly forceful group of Israel, each one offering himself willingly in defense of the law” (1 Mac 2:42).¹² However, the Hasidim’s motives for fighting the Seleucids and their supporters differed from those of the Hasmoneans. As soon as Menelaus was executed and Alcimus was promoted to the high priesthood, the Hasidim were pacified.¹³ They parted ways with the Hasmoneans, who continued the fight for political independence. After winning increasing levels of independence from the Seleucids, the Hasmoneans, who were not of Zadokite lineage, usurped the high priesthood from the Zadokites, the traditional and rightful holders of the office. Of course this Hasmonean endeavor was opposed by Zadokite priests and their supporters, particularly the Hasidim. At this time, a leader closely associated with the Hasidim, most probably a Zadokite priest of high lineage, known by his followers as the “Teacher of Righteousness,” quarreled with the Hasmonean high priest, or “Wicked Priest.” As a result of this dispute, he fled to the settlement at Qumran with his followers, many of whom were Zadokite priests themselves. This group became known as the “Essenes.” The Qumran

of Cross’ book appeared in 1958 as *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City: Doubleday). It is generally held that Eliezer Sukenik was the first to link the Scrolls to the Essenes. See E.L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Seqirah Rishonah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948), 16. The Essene hypothesis is primarily supported by two foundations of evidence, Pliny’s geographical location of the Essenes and the many correspondences between the practices of the Essenes as described by Philo and Josephus and the description of the community’s practices found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. For a recent review and evaluation of the Essene hypothesis, see I. Hutchesson, “The Essene Hypothesis After Fifty Years: An Assessment,” *QC* 9 (2000): 17–34.

¹² Translation from S. Tedesche, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), 85.

¹³ According to 1 Mac 7:14, Alcimus’ Aaronic descent was apparently enough to convince the Hasidim of his suitability for the office of high priest, “For they said, ‘A priest of the line of Aaron has come with the army, and he will not harm us.’”

community served as the center for the Essenes who not only inhabited that location but were spread all over the country in satellite communities.

This theory, with various modifications, was perpetuated by several preeminent scholars, thus solidifying the consensus, which has held a prominent position in Qumran scholarship until present times. However, this reconstruction of Qumran prehistory, as well as the methodological approach underlying it, have often come under fire. Adherents to this hypothesis, or closely related variations, have been criticized for employing what may be described as a “scissors and paste” method.¹⁴ This approach harmonizes the internal testimony of several scrolls that seem to offer cryptic historical data, most notably the pesharim and the Damascus Document, and fits it into the grids of historical knowledge provided by previously known sources of Second Temple period history, as well as the classical sources on the Essenes. This combination is anchored absolutely in time by archaeological and paleographical data as well as a few unmistakable references to known historical personages found within the Scrolls.¹⁵ The end result is a creative and seductively coherent vision of Qumran origins.

This approach has received a fair measure of criticism from numerous vantage points. It will suffice to mention just a few prominent objections here. Philip Davies points out that at the foundations of this method is the uncritical acceptance of and trust in cryptic midrash-like texts at face value as accurate historical sources.¹⁶ Historical conclusions based on literary works so forcefully controlled by the stereotypical motifs and stock phrases of scriptural sources are, in the words of George Brooke, “at best somewhat forced, at worst merely arbitrary.”¹⁷

¹⁴ For this expression, see R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 257–261.

¹⁵ See, for example, the apparent references to Salome Alexandra in 4Q322 and 4Q324b, Aemilius Scaurus in 4Q324a, and Antiochus and Demetrius in 4QpNah.

¹⁶ See P. Davies, “The Prehistory of the Qumran Community” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 116–117. See also P. Callaway (“Methodology, the Scrolls, and Origins,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, [ed. M. Wise, et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994], 318), who dismisses the pesharim as “theological mumbo-jumbo,” untrustworthy for historical purposes. See also the study of G. Brooke in the same volume, “The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls” (pp. 339–370).

¹⁷ Brooke, “The Pesharim and the Origins,” 348.

In addition, Davies objects to the assumption that the historical origins of these texts can be correctly determined by the “external data of archaeology and other literary sources,” which were often conveniently interpreted in harmony with the prevailing hypothesis with little justification.¹⁸ In a similar vein, Charlotte Hempel warns of the dangers of harmonizing literary sources with archaeological data, claiming that “[it] is methodologically problematic since it encourages reading the results of one’s study of one body of evidence into one’s perception of the other.”¹⁹ An example of this may perhaps be seen in Roland de Vaux’s claim that the first stage of Qumran occupation coincided with the leadership of Jonathan the Hasmonean.²⁰ This assertion contradicted the conclusions he had arrived at in the preliminary reports published in the 1950’s.²¹ As such, some have claimed that de Vaux made this modification not based on archaeological considerations, but rather because it coincided with the popular theories identifying the Wicked Priest as Jonathan or Simon.²²

Attacking from a different angle, John Collins takes issue with the common assertion that the Qumran community was triggered by Zadokite resistance to the usurpation of the high priesthood by the Hasmoneans in the aftermath of the Antiochan crisis. Noting the surprising lack of textual support for this claim,²³ he remarks:

¹⁸ Davies (“The Prehistory,” 116) bitingly refers to this “awful mixture” as “Albighianism.” He notes that this method, which he terms the “first scene” in the drama of scholarship dealing with Qumran origins, dominated the first twenty years of research and continues to exert its grasp on the field.

¹⁹ C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 63. Cf. eadem, “Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 43–53; G. Boccacini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 9; P. Davies, “How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran,” *BA* 51 (1988): 203–207; reprinted in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 79–87.

²⁰ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 5 and 116–117.

²¹ See R. de Vaux, “Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân,” *RB* 61 (1954): 231; idem, “Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân,” *RB* 63 (1956): 538 and 565; idem, “Les manuscrits de Qumrân et l’archéologie,” *RB* 66 (1959): 102.

²² Such a claim is made by F. García Martínez, “The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect,” in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 83.

²³ This was already pointed out in the unpublished dissertation of C. Hauer, “The Priests of Qumran,” (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1959), 165.

The primary reason why scholars have thought that the usurpation of the High Priesthood was a factor in the secession of the Qumran sect is that it seems (to modern scholars) to be the development in the early Hasmonean period which was most likely to cause such a split.²⁴

In fact, within the Dead Sea Scrolls there is scant explicit evidence that the period of the Maccabean revolt played a key role in the formation of the Qumran community.²⁵

Finally, as Gabriele Boccaccini notes, the major shortcoming of the Essene hypothesis is its tendency to equate the Qumranites with the Essenes, even though they represent only a small part of that complex movement at best. This confusion has in turn led to the haphazard use of Qumran texts to explain “Essene” history and belief.²⁶

Recognition of the limitations of the Essene hypothesis has led to important advances in Qumran scholarship. For one, alternative theories explaining the origins and ideological roots of Qumran have been proposed, shifting the emphasis from the particular historical events leading to the establishment of the community to the broader Second Temple Jewish intellectual context. For example, Ben Zion Wacholder has claimed that the roots of the Qumran community may be found in “Ezekielianism,” a sectarian brand of Judaism heavily influenced by the traditions of the book of Ezekiel.²⁷ It is well known that the book of Ezekiel served as the basis for numerous apocalyptic and speculative traditions in the Second Temple period, and that it deeply influenced texts found at Qumran, such as the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.²⁸ To Wacholder, “Ezekielianism” began as an ideology pitted *against*

²⁴ J.J. Collins, “The Origin of the Qumran Community,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 247.

²⁵ See García Martínez “The Origins of the Essene Movement,” 78–81. He explains the reference to Antiochus in 4QpNah as an allusion to Antiochus V Eupator.

²⁶ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 6–7.

²⁷ B.Z. Wacholder, “Ezekiel and Ezekielianism as Progenitors of Essenianism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 186–196.

²⁸ See, for example, C. Fletcher-Louis, “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 367–399, esp. 395–398; C. Morray-Jones, “The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources,” *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 400–431. For the importance of the prophecies of Ezekiel at Qumran, see M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1961), 109; B. Thiering, “The Biblical Source of Qumran Asceticism,” *JBL* 93 (1974): 429–444; J. Lust, “Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran,” in *Ezekiel and His Book* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986),

the Jerusalemite priestly establishment; a movement that opposed “the sacerdotal authorities who controlled the First Temple . . . and whose descendants ruled Judaea until the Seleucid persecution.”²⁹ From this vantage point, the idealized בני צדוק of Ezekiel 40–48 are not “the pre-exilic high priestly family whose successors established the post-exilic theocratic state,” but rather the opposing ideal priests of the future temple who disapproved of those in power. In other words, the בני צדוק of Ezekiel, far from representing the priestly establishment, may be viewed as opponents of the Zadokites.³⁰ According to Wacholder, the בני צדוק of Qumran represent Hellenistic period heirs to this tradition.

Lawrence Schiffman arrives at the reverse conclusion. Noting various striking similarities between the halakhah³¹ of 4QMMT and that attributed to the צדוקים in rabbinic texts, he sees the community as originating from genuinely Zadokite circles.³² Only later on, when

100; E. Cothenet, “Influence d’Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 431–439; F. García Martínez, “L’interprétation de la Torah d’Ézéchiél dans les mss. de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–452. The last-mentioned article is now available in English (trans. W.G.E. Watson) in *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–12.

²⁹ Wacholder “Ezekiel and Ezekielianism,” 187, 191. See also S. Talmon, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 3–24. Like Wacholder, Talmon views the Qumran community as the product of an opposition party.

³⁰ In support of his case, Wacholder points out that the term בני צדוק is used in a similar “sectarian” sense in CD 3:21–4:4, and therefore displays the persistence of Ezekielian tradition at Qumran. Various idiosyncratic correspondences between uniquely Ezekielian and Qumran ideologies further his point. In the footsteps of Wacholder, Boccaccini (*Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*) also traces the ideological roots of Qumran back to anti-Zadokite Ezekielianism. He takes the hypothesis one step further to include advocates of “Enochic Judaism,” the brand of Judaism best exemplified by the book of *1 Enoch*, among the community’s direct ancestors. Boccaccini posits a linear development from Ezekielianism to Enochism to Essenism. The Qumran group represents a militant branch of Essenism. For a collection of recent reactions to Boccaccini’s work, see *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 329–425.

³¹ The application of this rabbinic expression to Qumranite law throughout this study reflects standard terminology in the field and is not meant to indicate the dependence of the Qumranites on rabbinic legal categories. Cf. the discussion and works cited by C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 25.

³² Schiffman has often been misunderstood as claiming that the בני צדוק of Qumran are identical with the aristocratic Sadducees mentioned in Josephus and the New Testament. However, he holds that the צדוקים of the Mishnah, whose halakhah bears similarities

Hasmonean leadership solidified and all hope of reconciliation between the parties was lost, did the Qumran group radicalize and transform into a bitter separationist enclave.

Leaving aside their strengths and weaknesses, theories such as Wacholder's and Schiffman's have highlighted the gaps in our knowledge regarding the variety of groups in Second Temple period Judaism. Furthermore, they have underscored the need to broaden our perspective regarding Qumran origins beyond the confining borders of the Essene hypothesis.

Beyond the Essenes: Qumran as a Splinter Movement

The push to move beyond the limitations of the Essene hypothesis was already initiated in the 1960's and 1970's in the work of scholars such as Gert Jeremias, Hartmut Stegemann, and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor.³³ These scholars, while maintaining their trust in the pesharim for historical data and in many ways confirming the old consensus regarding Qumran origins, moved the field forward significantly through their application of literary criticism to the Scrolls. In particular, they contributed to the resolution of one of the major pitfalls of the Essene hypothesis, which improperly identifies the Qumranites as the Essenes, rather than as an Essene subgroup. In his careful study of the key figures mentioned in the pesharim, Jeremias determines that the Wicked Priest and the Man of the Lie in Peshar Habakkuk are clearly two different individuals.³⁴ With Milik and Vermes, he identifies the Wicked Priest as Jonathan the Hasmonean. On the other hand, the Man of the Lie, although not precisely identifiable, is determined to be a leader of a group within the community, who rejected and broke away from the Teacher of Righteousness. Thus the door to a more complex explanation of Qumran origins, involving an internal community rift, was opened. Following the work of Jeremias closely, Stegemann also identifies the Wicked Priest as Jonathan and adds that the Teacher of Righteousness was the Zadokite high priest of the

with Qumran halakhah, are not to be identified with these Sadducees. See further J. VanderKam's judicious review of Schiffman's theory in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 93–95.

³³ Pointed out by P. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 17–21.

³⁴ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, (SUNT 2; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963).

“intersacerdotium,”³⁵ who was replaced by Jonathan in 152.³⁶ Reacting to this injustice, the Teacher of Righteousness sought refuge with the Hasidim, who had fled to the wilderness due to the murder of Onias II in 172/1 as well as the unacceptable influence of Hellenism in Jerusalem. In his new context away from Jerusalem, the Teacher caused a rift. As a result of this conflict, some of the Hasidim followed him to Qumran. These were the Essenes. The majority, however, followed the Man of the Lie, separating from the Teacher, hence becoming the “Pharisees.”

After a series of literary analyses of the Damascus Document crowned by an article on Essene history, Murphy-O’Connor arrives at many of the same conclusions as Stegemann.³⁷ The Wicked Priest was Jonathan and the Teacher was the Zadokite priest of the intersacerdotium. In addition, when the Teacher fled to the wilderness he caused a rift in his host community and left with his followers to Qumran, while the others remained loyal to the Man of the Lie. However, to Murphy-O’Connor, the preexisting community to which the Teacher fled was not the Hasidim, but rather the Essenes. This conclusion is suggested by the rules and regulations of the Damascus Document, which reflect a Jewish community surrounded not by Jews but by Gentiles. Accordingly, the Damascus Document was written for Essenes of the Babylonian exile who had returned to Israel during the early successes of the Hasmoneans. This group soon became disillusioned with the religious state of affairs in Israel and withdrew into “camps.” According to Murphy-O’Connor, the Qumran community is therefore not to be identified as the Essenes, but rather as a splinter group of Essenes, followers of the Teacher of Righteousness after the break with the Man of the Lie.

The work of Jeremias, Stegemann, and Murphy-O’Connor, although essentially strengthening the broad strokes of the early consensus on Qumran origins, brought about a critical development in Qumran

³⁵ See Josephus, *Ant.* 20.237. There he claims that the position of high priest remained vacant for seven years from the death of Alcimus to the rise of Jonathan. However, in *Ant.* 12.414, 419, and 434, he says that Judah became high priest after Alcimus’ demise.

³⁶ H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrargemeinde* (Bonn: 1971), 102 and 210–220, with nn. 328–329.

³⁷ See J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14-VI, 1,” *RB* 77 (1970): 201–229; idem, “A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3,” *RB* 78 (1971): 210–232; idem, “The Original Text of CD 7:9–8:2 = 19:5–14,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 379–386; idem, “The Translation of Damascus Document VI, 11–14,” *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553–556; idem, “The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3–19),” *RB* 79 (1972): 200–216; idem, “A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 33–XX, 34,” *RB* 79 (1972): 544–564; idem, “The Essenes and Their History,” *RB* 81 (1974): 215–244.

scholarship. For one, it controverted the claim that the Qumranites simply broke off from the larger body of Judaism due to a priestly dispute with the Jerusalem temple authorities. The situation was actually a more complex one in which the Qumran community formed after breaking off from a parent community as a result of an internal rift. The community, then, is not identical with the Essene movement, but rather should be seen as a splinter group which broke off from a larger movement. Indeed, the idea that the community formed as the result of a break from a pre-existing parent group has had an enormous impact on Qumran scholars and is a key component of the well-circulated Groningen hypothesis of Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude,³⁸ as well as Boccaccini's Enochic / Essene hypothesis.³⁹

In passing, it is important to note a related development brought about by literary-critical study—the realization that some of the most significant documents from Qumran, including the Damascus Document and Community Rule, are composite works. This has encouraged the study of Qumran texts with methodologies popularly employed in biblical studies, such as source and redaction criticism.⁴⁰ The result of such research has certainly challenged adherence to the old harmonistic model. As Hempel notes,

whereas early Qumran scholarship tended to promote a programme of harmonization, recent scholarship is acknowledging diversity and complexity, not only from one document to the next, but even within individual documents.⁴¹

³⁸ See García Martínez and van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis;" F. García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–142. This hypothesis locates Essene origins not in Babylon but in Apocalyptic Palestinian Judaism of the third century BCE, prior to the Antiochan crisis. For recent scholarly reactions to the Groningen hypothesis, see *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 249–326.

³⁹ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*. For a useful comparison of the Groningen and Enochic / Essene hypotheses, see W. van Peurson, "Qumran Origins: Some Remarks on the Enochic / Essene Hypothesis," *RevQ* 20 (2001): 241–253.

⁴⁰ For some parade examples, see P. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983); idem, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran* (Biblica et Orientalia 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977); M.O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990); J. Murphy O'Connor, "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* 76 (1969): 529–549; J. Pouilly, *La règle de la communauté de Qumran. Son évolution littéraire* (Paris: Gabalda, 1976).

⁴¹ Hempel, "Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes," 47–48.

This perspective has translated into a more nuanced view of the Qumran community. It is now commonplace that the various compositional layers of works such as the Community Rule and the Damascus Document reflect historical and ideological developments within the community.⁴² Therefore, the phrase “Qumran community” refers not to a monolithic sectarian enclave, but rather to a social movement in a constant state of historical and ideological development.⁴³

Zadokite Priests as Community Founders: A Recent Challenge

The vigorous study of several fragmentary Cave 4 manuscripts of the Community Rule in the 1990's has given rise to new debate over the role of Zadokite priests in the early history of the community.⁴⁴ As noted above, from the beginning, most Qumran scholars believed that the community was founded and governed by Zadokites who had broken away from the Jerusalem establishment. This hypothesis gathered support especially from the Cave 1 manuscript of the Community Rule (1QS), which names בני צדוק as the community's ruling figures.⁴⁵ However, the Cave 4 copies of the Community Rule lack such references to Zadokites. In the place where 1QS attributes authority to בני צדוק, 4QS^b and 4QS^d simply have הרבנים, a reference to a lay or mixed priestly-lay leadership (cf. 1QS 6:8).⁴⁶ According to Sarianna Metso, 1QS is a late expanded and reworked recension of the Community Rule, while the shorter 4QS^b and 4QS^d represent an earlier version. If she is correct, then it would seem that the Zadokites were first introduced into positions of

⁴² However, see A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), who attempts to explain differences between S manuscripts not only according to chronological evolution, but also spatial distance and diverse audience settings. I thank Dr. Schofield for sharing her research with me prior to publication.

⁴³ See further J.J. Collins, “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–111.

⁴⁴ For a brief history of the study of these manuscripts, see P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 14–15.

⁴⁵ See 1QS 5:2, 9. Analogously, the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa) envisions Zadokite priests as rulers of the community in the end-time. See 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3.

⁴⁶ G. Vermes, “Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–255; S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 78, 80.

power later on in the community's history.⁴⁷ This would appear to contradict the common view of Zadokite involvement in the early history of the community.⁴⁸

In support of her case, Metso notes that it is easier to explain the addition of scriptural legitimization and theological additions to the expansive 1QS than the omission of such significant words from 4QS^b and 4QS^d:

The adding of biblical proof-texts may indicate that at the time when 1QS was copied (or a little earlier) enthusiasm within the community had begun to show signs of waning, and the strict rules needed to be justified by allusions to the Scriptures. The large number and the nature of grammatical variants indicate that the work of editing did not just mean joining passages together and adding glosses but modifying the text in a more profound manner.⁴⁹

Still, there are some good reasons to doubt Metso's conclusions. The oldest Cave 4 manuscript (4QS^a), a papyrus dating to the second half of the second century BCE, contains material more closely related to the long recension of 1QS.⁵⁰ More importantly, most scholars, including Metso herself, recognize that 4QS^b and 4QS^d were copied some fifty years *after* 1QS, in the last quarter of the first century BCE.⁵¹ It remains

⁴⁷ Metso, *The Textual Development*, 89–90, 106. See also the redaction-critical study of C. Hempel, "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa," *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–269. In line with Metso's conclusion, she claims that the earliest compositional layer of 1QSa lacked any reference to Zadokites. For more on the differences between 1QS and 4QS^b/4QS^d and their significance, see P. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of the *Serekh Ha-Yahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 453; J. Charlesworth and B. Strawn, "Reflections on the Text of Serek ha-Yahad Found in Cave IV," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403–435; C. Hempel, "Comments on the Translation of 4QSD I, 1," *JJS* 44 (1993): 127–128; R. Kugler, "A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok?" *DSD* 3 (1996): 315–320; G. Vermes, "The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok-Priests-Congregation," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; 3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 1.375–384; P. Garnet, "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1–7: Towards a Serek Text History," *JSP* 15 (1997): 67–78.

⁴⁸ For further arguments against Zadokite ascendancy at the beginning of the community's life, see the evidence and works cited by Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," 97–100. See also Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 24, 51–72, who pointed out how slim the evidence was even before the data from Cave 4 was available for general study.

⁴⁹ Metso, *The Textual Development*, 89–90.

⁵⁰ See D. Dimant, "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 619.

⁵¹ Based on paleographic analysis, F. Cross (in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* [PTSDSSP 1; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck); Louisville:

unclear why community members would find it necessary to copy older, seemingly obsolete, versions of the Rule several decades after a newer version had already been crafted. This observation casts serious doubt on her suggestion.⁵²

To date, no consensus has been reached as to the recensional history of the Community Rule. Likewise, there is no agreement on the historical implications of the data. However, this state of affairs has not hindered speculative attempts to apply the discrepancies between the witnesses to the history of the community. For some scholars who have accepted the priority of the Cave 4 manuscripts, the history of Qumran leadership is seen as evolving from an original grassroots democratic system to an elite priestly oligarchy.⁵³ On the other hand, those who believe in the priority of 1QS are able to maintain the common view that the early community was indeed founded and governed by priests. Later on, the criterion of priestly descent seems “to have lost its exclusivity and primacy.”⁵⁴

Rejecting these historicizing approaches, Davies cautions against accepting a straightforward relationship between literary and historical communities. He suggests that the co-existence of differing recensions of the Community Rule at Qumran is evidence that that composition never functioned as a rule book for any real community. Rather, it was a product of imagination, akin to other Jewish “utopia-writing” of the period.⁵⁵

Westminster John Knox Press, 1994], 57) dates both 4QS^b and 4QS^d to “ca. 30–1 BCE.” On the other hand, it is generally agreed that the script of 1QS places it between 100–75 BCE. See J. Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 2; cf. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. G. Ernest Wright; Garden City: Anchor Books, 1965), 170–264, esp. 169–171.

⁵² See Alexander, “The Redaction-History,” 453. Metso’s suggestion is rejected by Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXVI, 15. For a recent argument that 4QS^b and 4QS^d “represent a late abbreviated and perhaps selective version of the Rule rather than an older and more original edition of it,” see Dimant, “The Composite Character,” 618–622 (quote appears on p. 619).

⁵³ See, e.g., A. Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 142–153. Cf. C. Hempel, “Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 74–80.

⁵⁴ D. Schwartz, “On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT / ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 167.

⁵⁵ P. Davies, “Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls,” 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), 155–160.

While most scholars might disagree with Davies' assertion, it does draw attention to a vital methodological issue in Qumran studies—the process by which scholars translate literature into socio-historical constructs.

RATIONALE AND METHOD OF THE PRESENT STUDY

From History to Imagination

As noted above, for decades, the study of the role of priesthood at Qumran has focused largely on questions pertaining to historical realities. As Davies, among many others, highlights, the problem with this situation is that historical information is not easily obtainable from the Scrolls—especially from the main sources normally used for historical reconstruction, the pesharim and the Damascus Document. Events in these texts are described in stereotypical language drawing so heavily upon the Hebrew Bible that “biblical history and the fate of the historical Israel blend into one with the community’s history.”⁵⁶ Reports of social conflict are so clichéd that they could well refer to any number of known or unknown events in the Second Temple period.⁵⁷ The only secure date attainable from the pesharim comes from Peshar Nahum, which mentions the Seleucid Demetrius (presumably Demetrius III)⁵⁸ by name. Yet this document makes no mention of the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, or the Man of the Lie. As for the rest of the pesharim, George Brooke reminds us

they have no way to provide a date for their purported history without recourse to identifying some or other stereotypically described event with historical circumstances described in some other sources. The variety of interpretations suggests at least for the moment that this is hazardous.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 61.

⁵⁷ Even the relatively certain identification of the *Kittim* with the Romans does not clarify the situation precisely enough. See M. Bernstein, “Peshar Habakkuk” *EDSS* 2:649–650.

⁵⁸ See S. Berrin, “Peshar Nahum,” *EDSS* 2:653.

⁵⁹ Brooke, “The Pesharim and the Origins,” 349–350. For a far more trusting view, see the approach of H. Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2008), passim; J. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), passim. For Charlesworth’s attempt at developing a method for discerning the reliability of history in the pesharim, see pp. 70–77.

The other possible textual chronological anchor, the “390 years” after Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction mentioned in CD 1, likely relies on Ezekiel’s use of that number as the duration of punishment for the sins of Israel. Although this figure, when added to the “twenty years” of groping in blindness, arrives at the approximate date that scholars believe witnessed the earliest origins of the Qumran group,⁶⁰ it is schematic and should not be taken as chronologically exact.⁶¹ As for the vast number of scrolls with no apparent historical data, it goes without saying that the task of extracting historical information from them is even more difficult.

In light of these challenges, as well as the current uncertainty regarding priestly involvement in Qumran origins, Robert Kugler notes that “we have for too long asked the Scrolls to give us evidence of social realities where the literature more often seems to convey imagined realities instead.”⁶² Indeed, the ahistorical nature of the majority of the evidence calls for a shift in focus away from the socio-historical realities of priesthood at Qumran, and toward the image of priesthood throughout the community’s literature. The present study therefore largely abandons such historical inquiry in favor of investigation of the imagined constructs of priesthood in the Scrolls corpus. The primary objective will be to study these constructs and discover the theological notions implied by them.

This endeavor does not negate the possibility of gathering a type of historical information. As Davies observes, we ought to look at the documents of Qumran as ideological projections from authors “whose own nature is hidden within the text and needs to be discovered before the literature can be properly interpreted historically.”⁶³ Since it is clear

⁶⁰ It should be noted that this calculation assumes that the Qumranites had the correct date for Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction (586 BCE). In light of the inaccurate dating of this event in rabbinic literature, such an assumption is dubious.

⁶¹ Cf. Collins, “The Origin,” 250–251. Besides, as Hempel points out (*The Damascus Texts*, 60) a large number of scholars claim that one or both chronological figures in CD 1 are “intrusive and best regarded as secondary glosses.” She notes further that in deriving history from the Damascus Document, scholars have focused on two main problems: chronological references and the identification of various mysteriously described individuals and groups. For a refreshing exception, see the novel approach of M. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

⁶² Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 114.

⁶³ Davies, “Redaction and Sectarianism,” 159.

that priesthood is central to the Qumran corpus, the present investigation of the visions of priesthood in the Scrolls may also clarify something of the nature of the authors encoded in the text.

Classification of the Scrolls

While it is commonly asserted that the Dead Sea Scrolls represent a “library” owned by the Qumran community,⁶⁴ no one would claim that all of the material found at Qumran was produced there. Clearly, the Qumranites preserved and cherished writings that they themselves did not compose. This class of literature includes both “biblical” works, writings that would find their way into the canon of the Hebrew Bible, and “non-sectarian” works, including various pseudepigraphical and apocryphal writings, some known prior to the discovery of the Scrolls, some not. Throughout the present study, we will distinguish carefully between these types of works, which represent the larger literary heritage of Second Temple period Judaism, and the “sectarian” corpus, literature that may be identified with relative certainty as the product of the Qumran community.⁶⁵ Following the current trend in Scrolls scholarship, this study will utilize this system of classification as a means of distinguishing between ideas that infiltrated Qumran from abroad and idiosyncratic expressions of the Qumran community itself.

That said, it is important to bear in mind some problems, recently recognized by scholars, with the tripartite division of Qumran literature into biblical, non-sectarian, and sectarian texts. For one, the term “biblical” cages scholars into an anachronistic taxonomy, which retrojects late notions of canonicity onto the Scrolls corpus. Indeed, it is difficult to

⁶⁴ Dimant (“The Qumran Manuscripts,” 32–33) comments that one cannot “escape the conclusion that the collection was intentional and not a haphazard assemblage of disparate works . . . the site, the caves and manuscripts must be seen as one complex.” See further García Martínez and van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis;” and the remarks of Y. Shavit, “The ‘Qumran Library’ in the Light of the Attitude towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period,” in *Methods of Investigation*, 299–317.

⁶⁵ Dimant (“The Qumran Manuscripts,” 27–28) notes that a text may be identified as sectarian only when it combines the distinctive terminology of the community with a peculiar set of ideas. As she observes, “such clusters of terms and ideas concern roughly four major areas: (1) the practices and organization of a particular community, (2) the history of this community and its contemporary circumstances, (3) the theological and metaphysical outlook of that community, and (4) the peculiar biblical exegesis espoused by that community.” My use of the term “sectarian” is not meant to invoke its sociological connotations. Rather, I use the expression since it is the conventional one to describe the writings produced by the Qumran community over against those composed by others.

know if the Qumranites distinguished the authority of documents such as the Temple Scroll or *Jubilees* from, say, Deuteronomy or Isaiah. Furthermore, the classification “non-sectarian” is too broad. Included under this single rubric are works as divergent in provenance and worldview as *1 Enoch* and Ben Sira. Labeling both non-sectarian obscures not only their vastly differing perspectives, but also their relationships with the Qumran community. The phrase “sectarian” is beset with problems as well. If, as noted above, the Qumran group was established due to the split of a child from a parent movement, how can we be sure about which of these communities is represented by a particular sectarian text? In light of the composite nature of many of the documents, this problem is compounded exponentially. Sectarian literature is not univocal, and variations may be the result of geographic or temporal distance, or the personal perspectives of the copyists.⁶⁶

Scholars have taken strides forward in resolving some of these issues by devising alternative systems of categorization. Dissatisfied with the imprecision of the old distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian documents, Devorah Dimant proposes a third intermediate category of literature, “between the sectarian literature proper and writings devoid of any connection to the community.”⁶⁷ She notes that while this group of texts shares characteristic sectarian ideas, it lacks the distinctive features characteristic of the output of the Qumran community.⁶⁸ Alternatively, Boccaccini points to a new “taxonomic consensus” which avoids anachronistic assumptions and divides Qumran texts along ideological lines. On the basis of distinctions in ideology, form, and style the texts may be divided into (a) sectarian literature authored by the Dead Sea Scrolls community, (b) works which appear closely related to the Qumran group but may belong to a sectarian parent or sister group directly related to it, and (c) texts which show little or no elements peculiar to

⁶⁶ In view of this fact, this study employs the phrase “Qumran community” to refer to any group or groups involved in one way or another with the process that gave rise to the sectarian scrolls. It is to be noted that this definition does not require that all of them, at some point or another, inhabited the Qumran site.

⁶⁷ D. Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 106.

⁶⁸ Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian,” 107. As possible examples of such texts she points to the Temple Scroll, *Jubilees*, the Apocrypha of Jeremiah and Joshua, and the Words of the Luminaries. Interestingly, most of these texts are focused on reworking scriptural sources.

Qumran or related movements (such as biblical scrolls).⁶⁹ Alternatively, the Groningen hypothesis divides the “non-biblical” Qumran texts into four different stages from the prehistory and history of the community based on ideological distinctions: (a) apocalyptic stage, (b) Essene stage, (c) pre-Qumran-stage and (d) Qumran-stage. Viewing the Qumran corpus as containing the literary vestiges of several different stages in community and pre-community history allows for conflicting theological, legal, and social notions found within the Scrolls to be smoothly synthesized along a chronological axis.⁷⁰ For example, this approach has been utilized productively to explain the historical, legal, and terminological discrepancies between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule in terms of separate but related mother and daughter communities.⁷¹

While such suggestions have added important nuance to our understanding of the Qumran library, they represent approximations at best. The present study makes use of the conventional distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian documents with an awareness of its pitfalls and the possible advantages of alternate systems of categorization.

THE PLAN OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The body of the present study is divided into two parts, each of which investigates central and pervasive images of priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The first (chapters two through four) is dedicated to portrayals of otherworldly priesthood in Qumran writings. Numerous documents envision angels as priests serving in a celestial temple or human priests as akin to angels. Such traditions occur not only in texts certainly authored by the Qumranites themselves, but also in non-sectarian texts of varying and often unknown provenance. Part one endeavors to uncover the theological meaning and significance of the notion of otherworldly priesthood in the Qumran corpus as a window into the distinct nature of the Qumran community and its relationship with the broader stream of Sec-

⁶⁹ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 57–58. Cf. idem, “Qumran and the Enoch Groups: Revisiting the Enochic-Essene Hypothesis,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; 3 vols; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:37–66.

⁷⁰ But see Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*.

⁷¹ See esp. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*. This model is also often used to explain discrepancies between the Essenes as described in the classical sources and the somewhat conflicting testimony of the sectarian scrolls.

ond Temple Judaism. This task is accomplished by means of comparing and contrasting non-sectarian and sectarian depictions of otherworldly priesthood.

Chapter two examines otherworldly priesthood traditions as they appear in an array of non-sectarian texts. It observes which texts and literary contexts contain portrayals of otherworldly priests, and how they present them. Special attention is paid to patterns of language and their theological implications. In addition, the relationships of these texts to one another and to the Qumran community are considered.

Chapter three focuses on the most extensive Second Temple period text to deal with otherworldly priesthood, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. Although the provenance of this extraordinary liturgical work remains unclear, it is argued that the preservation of so many copies at Qumran is indicative of its liturgical use by the community. Its statements about otherworldly priesthood may thus be seen as a reflection of Qumranite religious practice and belief. This chapter has two major objectives. First, it treats the depiction of otherworldly priesthood in the Songs, paying special attention to the implied relationship between heavenly and earthly communities. Then, in hopes of clarifying the significance of the use of the Songs for the community, it evaluates the scholarly debate on the function of the Songs at Qumran, and, more particularly, the Songs' conception of the relationship between celestial and terrestrial priesthoods.

Chapter four brings part one to a close by treating several examples of otherworldly priesthood traditions in surely sectarian documents. Like chapter two, it notes which sectarian texts and literary contexts include such portrayals, and how otherworldly priesthood is presented in them. The sectarian texts are compared and contrasted with those treated in chapters two and three in order to determine the unique function and importance of otherworldly priesthood traditions for the Qumran community itself.

Part two, also comprised of three chapters, is dedicated to the numerous images of eschatological priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Such depictions of priesthood are limited almost entirely to sectarian works, and their roots are not readily apparent. This part of the study investigates the historical and traditional roots of such portrayals in order to better determine their significance at Qumran. As in part one, this is accomplished by means of textual and comparative literary study.

Chapter five is concerned with determining the various roles envisioned for the priestly messiah and other individuals that resemble him

in the Scrolls. The differing portrayals of and ways of referring to these end-time figures make clear that there was no single expectation among community members.

Chapter six investigates the historical background of the concepts of messianic and eschatological priesthood observed in chapter five. The expanded role of the priesthood in the Second Temple period is noted. Sectarian criticisms of the Jerusalem temple and priestly establishment are examined alongside non-sectarian ones as a means of determining the peculiar social context that nurtured sectarian hopes in an end-time priesthood. Special attention is paid to the issues of moral and ritual purity, and the motivating factors for the physical separation of the community from Jerusalem are re-examined.

Chapter seven concludes part two with a study of the traditional roots of the visions of eschatological priesthood noted in chapter five. This chapter has two parts. In the first, representations of ideal priestly figures in several non-sectarian documents are brought to bear on sectarian images of eschatological priesthood. The second part focuses on the accumulation of several non-sectarian documents at Qumran that appear to grant an elevated status to Levi and his descendants. It inquires whether this phenomenon might further illuminate the traditional roots of end-time priesthood in sectarian writings.

The concluding chapter of the present study (chapter eight) summarizes its results. In addition, it considers how the images of priests and priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls examined in previous chapters reflect on the nature of the Qumran community and broader segments of Second Temple Judaism.

PART ONE

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD
IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CHAPTER TWO

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD IN NON-SECTARIAN WRITINGS

Various Qumran texts either explicitly or implicitly present the notion of an “otherworldly priesthood.” With this term I refer to either or both of two distinct conceptions of priesthood: that of angels as priests serving before God in a celestial temple, and that of elevated human priests likened to angels and, at times, beckoned to serve God in the heavenly temple as do the angels. Inasmuch as these conceptions appear side by side in several texts and share a cosmological perspective that envisions God’s celestial abode as a temple manned by lesser beings, they may be treated together. From the large number of witnesses to these ideas preserved at Qumran, it is clear that they occupied a special place in the Qumranite priestly imagination.

At its root, the notion of otherworldly priesthood encountered in the Qumran texts is indebted to the dominant conception of the heavenly realm as a royal court in the Hebrew Bible as well as older ancient Near Eastern literature.¹ According to this model, God sits on a throne surrounded by lesser divine beings who serve as his royal councilors (see especially 1 Kgs 22:19–22; Isa 6:1). The purpose of the council is to render judgment and make and enforce divine decrees (Psalm 82; Zech 3:1–10; Job 1:6–12; 2:1–6).

If God dwells in a celestial palace, it is only natural that his earthly residence, the temple, should also be conceived as a divine palace. Indeed, in the Hebrew Bible the word **היכל** refers not only to the temple but also to the king’s palace. However, in the Second Temple period, there is

¹ Mesopotamian, Ugaritic, and Phoenician literature all refer to the “assembly of the gods.” On the divine council in the Hebrew Bible and its ancient Near Eastern background, see F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), 186–190; E.T. Mullen, *The Assembly of the Gods*, (HSM 24; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 175–209. For the participation of Israelite prophets and other ancient Near Eastern mediators of divinity in the divine council, see R.P. Gordon, “Standing in the Council: When Prophets Encounter God,” in *The God of Israel* (ed. R.P. Gordon; University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 190–204.

increasing evidence of the reverse assumption—a shift to a conceptualization of God’s royal court as a celestial temple and his councilors as supernatural priests.² Indeed, already in Ezek 9:2–3, 11; 10:2, God’s angel who prepares Jerusalem for the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar appears in linen pants, the distinctive garb of priests (cf. Dan 10:5; 12:6–7).³ As we shall see, later Second Temple literature testifies to the same trend, where the heavenly court looks more like a temple and the supernatural advisors more like priests. However, the royal imagery is never fully lost. As Martha Himmelfarb notes, “In relation to a god, temple and palace are two aspects of the same dwelling place.”⁴ Therefore, even in documents in which the notion of temple dominates, traces of the imagery associated with the royal palace often appear.

Portrayals of otherworldly priesthood appear ubiquitously in the Scrolls corpus. In the present chapter, we will focus on the notion of otherworldly priesthood in a range of non-sectarian documents. The goal here will be mostly descriptive: How are otherworldly priests portrayed? In which texts and literary contexts do these traditions appear? What language is used and what does it imply? How do these texts relate to one another and to the Qumran community?

² The celestial temple notion has deep roots in ancient Near Eastern mythology. The *Enuma Elish* (v, 119–130, [ANET 503]) portrays Marduk’s earthly temple as a copy of his heavenly dwelling. In the Baal Epic, Baal and other gods actually partake in the building of Baal’s temple. In the Hebrew Bible, the “model” (תבנית) of the Tabernacle which God shows Moses on the mountain (Exod 25:9, 40; 26:30) may well be a vision of God’s heavenly dwelling place (see Goppelt, “τύπος,” *TDNT* 8:256–257). Exodus 24:10 apparently provides a glimpse of the grandiose physical characteristics of that dwelling place. See further, M.S. Smith, “Biblical and Canaanite Notes to the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Qumran,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 585–588. D.N. Freedman (“Temple Without Hands,” in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977* [ed. A. Biran; Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981], 21–30) suggests that God is perceived as dwelling in a heavenly temple in Exod 15:17 and Ps 78:67–69. As we shall see below, the idea of the celestial temple as an archetype for the earthly temple was a popular one throughout Second Temple period literature. Cf. the classic article of V. Aptowitzer, “The Celestial Temple as Viewed in the Aggadah,” in *Binah: Studies in Jewish Thought* (ed. J. Dan; Binah: Studies in Jewish History, Thought, and Culture 2; New York: Praeger, 1989), 1–29. The article originally appeared in Hebrew in *Tarbiz* 2 (1931): 137–153, 257–287.

³ For more on white linen garb, see n. 116.

⁴ M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 14.

As I have noted above, the category “non-sectarian” includes a wide range of documents of varying origin and genre. Some of them, such as *Jubilees* and 4QInstruction, originated from the same wing of Judaism out of which the Qumran community would later emerge. Others, such as Ben Sira, were composed in contexts much more distant from Qumran. In bringing such texts together, I do not mean to imply their homogenous perspective or importance to the Qumran community. However, inasmuch as they were known and presumably studied at Qumran, together they constituted important elements of the traditional heritage of the community and as such exerted a degree of influence on its religious imagination.

In the following pages, I have arranged seven texts in the order that in my view best facilitates discussion. First, I will consider the possibility that the notion of otherworldly priesthood appears in the myth of the *Book of the Watchers*, likely the oldest text to be considered in this chapter. Probably dating to the third century BCE, the *Book of the Watchers* was a widely circulated and influential work that affected numerous later Second Temple compositions, including several to be observed later on in this chapter.⁵ While angels and humans are never explicitly referred to as priests in this text, it has been interpreted widely as drawing an analogy between the watchers (or angels) and priests. Conversely, the human figure Enoch appears to enjoy a lofty angelic status. Then we will turn to a group of texts in which otherworldly priesthood appears to be closely connected with the characterization of Levi and his descendants as exalted priests. These include *Jubilees*, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, and 4QVisions of Amram.⁶ Next, we will treat the otherworldly priesthood traditions of two wisdom works discovered at Qumran, Ben Sira and 4QInstruction. Finally, we will observe a unique case of otherworldly priesthood found in a document that may be related to the characterizations of Levi mentioned above, the so-called 4QApocryphon of Levi^{b?} (also known as 4QAaron A and 4QTestament of Levi^d[?]).

⁵ For the early reception history of the *Book of the Watchers*, see A. Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 80–83.

⁶ Fragments of a tantalizing manuscript from Cave 3 (3Q7 5–6) mention both לוי and מלאך הפנים. Unfortunately, the context of these references is irrecoverable. For the text edition, see M. Baillet, in M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 99.

THE BOOK OF THE WATCHERS

Clearly, Enochic traditions were popular at Qumran. Cave 4 yielded eleven manuscripts (early second century BCE to early first century CE) from various portions of the corpus now known as *1 Enoch*. In addition, several fragmentary Qumran manuscripts (early first century BCE to early first century CE) of the Aramaic *Book of Giants* have been identified.⁷ Finally, various works preserved at Qumran, both non-sectarian and sectarian, show a working knowledge of Enochic tradition.⁸

Though much of the *1 Enoch* material displays close similarities to the Qumranite sectarian material (promotion of a solar calendar, elevated eschatological consciousness, cosmological dualism), based on the ancient date of the oldest manuscripts (earlier than the formation of the Qumran community) as well as indications of content, scholars unanimously agree on its broader Second Temple period origins. George Nickelsburg points to three significant distinctions between “the Qumranic profile” and that of the *1 Enoch* material: (1) The notions of covenant and adherence to the Law of Moses, while central at Qumran, are “strikingly absent” from the sapiential ethic and eschatology of *1 Enoch*; (2) the myth explaining demonic origins in 1QS 3–4 differs from that of the story of the watchers in *1 Enoch*; and (3) the Qumranites, in their later history, gained knowledge of the end through interpretation of the prophets, while in *1 Enoch* revelation of divine secrets is primordial and pseudonymous.⁹ We may add *1 Enoch’s* oft-repeated vision of a universalistic eschatological salvation (10:21; 91:14; 90:37–38) as opposed to the destruction awaiting all non-community members in Qumranite thought (see,

⁷ See L. Stuckenbruck in S.J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 8–94. For the original identification of the Book of Giants at Qumran, credit goes to J.T. Milik. See idem, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 298–339. More recently, see L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997).

⁸ For example, non-sectarian: *Jubilees*, Genesis Apocryphon, *Aramaic Levi Document*; sectarian: 4Q180–181, 1QH^a 12:30–41. On these last two, see n. 11. Unless otherwise noted, line and column numbers of 1QH^a are given according to H. Stegemann, E. Schuller, and C. Newsom, *1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a-f}* (DJD XL; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009).

⁹ G. Nickelsburg, “The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About,” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum; Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113.

for example, 1QM 1). Nevertheless, the popularity of Enochic material at Qumran suggests that the community “attracted people who prize” such texts and who “brought their copies of these texts with them.”¹⁰ Furthermore, it appears that the community provided an ambience that encouraged the continued use of Enochic traditions and their incorporation into new sectarian texts.¹¹

The most important data concerning the otherworldly priesthood in *1 Enoch* comes from the *Book of the Watchers* (chapters 1–36, henceforth *BW*). This work was likely completed by the middle of the third century BCE, which would rank it among the oldest Enochic compositions.¹² The plot centers on the activities of the watchers, the rebellious angels who sought out and took human wives, begot malevolent “bastard” giants who plagued the earth, taught divine secrets to humanity, and were hence banished from heaven by God through the mediation of the patriarch Enoch.

Angels as Priests?

As we have noted above, the term “priest” is never used to describe angels in *BW* (or in the entirety of *1 Enoch*). Nevertheless, it is often noted that the heavenly watchers are representative of earthly Jerusalemite priests in the narrative.¹³ This contention comports with the apparent

¹⁰ G. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 77.

¹¹ Two examples of such works are 4Q180–181 and 1QH^a 12:30–41. On the connection of the former with Enochic tradition see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 248–253. On the latter’s relationship with Enochic tradition, see Nickelsburg, “The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH^a 4:29–40),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11, 1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:649–659.

¹² For a handy and brief introduction to the compositions making up *1 Enoch*, see M. Stone, “Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period; Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. M. Stone; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 395–406. For more on the dating of *BW*, see J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 111–114; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 169–171.

¹³ D. Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in *1 Enoch* 6–16,” *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–135; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 20–23; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 207–211; E. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic* (Oudtestamentische Studiën 35; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 195–203. Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 64–65, is less certain.

portrayal of their heavenly residence as a temple in which they serve God. According to 9:1, the four archangels “looked down from the sanctuary of heaven upon the earth.”¹⁴ In 12:4 as well as 15:3, the fallen watchers are described as those who have forsaken “the high/highest heaven, the sanctuary.” Moreover, in Enoch’s ascent to heaven (14:8–23), the upper realm is described in terms which relate rather precisely to the three major architectural sections of the earthly Jerusalem temple, the אולם (1 Kgs 6:3; cf. Ezek 40:48), היכל (1 Kgs 6:17; cf. Ezek 41:1), and דביר/קדש הקדשים (1 Kgs 6:5, 16; cf. Ezek 41:4).¹⁵ In the inner sanctum, Enoch beholds the “Great Glory” sitting upon a throne, associated with cherubim (14:18–20).¹⁶ Apparently, this throne was envisioned as the heavenly counterpart of the cherubim seat that served as a throne for the invisible presence of God in the holy of holies of the Jerusalem temple.¹⁷

More explicitly priestly is the terminology used to describe the activities of the angels in the heavenly temple. Thus, in 12:4 the watchers forsook the “highest heaven, the sanctuary of the(ir) eternal station.” The word “station” (στάσις) probably translates a term equivalent to מעמד, in the sense of “priestly course.”¹⁸ Moreover, the “watchers and holy ones”¹⁹ are described as those who “draw near” (οἱ ἐγγίζοντες) to God (14:23).

¹⁴ “Sanctuary” is omitted in the Ethiopic and the Greek Akhmim manuscript, but appears in 4QEn^a ar (4Q201) 1 IV, 7 (מן קדש[י] שמיא) as well as in Syncellus (ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). For the Qumran manuscript, see Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 157. Unless otherwise noted, translation of 1 Enoch follows Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch.

¹⁵ So Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 14. The “wall” in the Ethiopic of 14:9 may be considered as related to the אולם of a temple if we prefer the Greek “wall of a building” (τείχος οἰκοδομῆς). See also Milik’s suggestion “walls of a building” based on the plural κύκλω αὐτῶν (“surrounding them”) in the next line (*Books of Enoch*, 198). Nickelsburg (“Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 [1981]: 581, n. 19) sees the use of the term “great house” (οἶκον μέγαν; לבית רב) for the heavens in 14:10 as a sure reference to a celestial temple. It is noteworthy that this vision of the celestial temple, indebted to Ezekiel 40–44, had a heavy influence on later visionary conceptions of heaven found in the apocalypses and Hekhalot literature.

¹⁶ Textual problems with v. 18 make the exact association of the cherubim with the throne unclear. See the emendation and discussion of Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 257–258.

¹⁷ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 10–11.

¹⁸ So Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 271. On the term’s meaning of priestly course in the literature of the period, see H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu* (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 70–72. However, see also M. Black’s suggestion מקום for στάσις (*The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* [SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 143).

¹⁹ Following the textual suggestion of Black, *The Book of Enoch*, 151.

The Greek verb utilized to denote drawing near (ἐγγιζω) appears several times in the LXX denoting priestly service in the temple (often translating קרב, נגש), and the same is likely the case here.²⁰

In addition, the proper role of angels as intercessors is emphasized when God tells Enoch to inform the watchers that “You should petition in behalf of men, and not men (i.e., Enoch) in behalf of you” (15:2; cf. 9:2–3, 10 [cf. 4QEn^a 1 IV 6–22]; 40:5–7; 47:2; 99:3; 104:1). Intercession here is to be understood as a priestly role.²¹ This conclusion appears to comport with the commissioning of the archangel Michael (10:11–11:2; cf. 90:22–23). In 10:20–21, Michael is ordered to “cleanse the earth from all impurity and from all wrong and from all lawlessness and from all sin, and godlessness and all impurities that have come upon the earth.” As a result of this action, “all the sons of men will become righteous.” Michael’s intercessory function here is closely linked to his leading role in the binding of the watchers and their demonic leader. It has been observed that this story is an etiological allegory for the scapegoat ritual of Leviticus 16, according to which the people’s transgressions are hurled into the wilderness with the goat of Azazel.²² As such, 1 *Enoch* 10 may have served as the myth to accompany the priestly ritual of Yom Kippur.²³ This opens up the possibility that Michael is already portrayed here as a sort of celestial high priest interceding in behalf of all humankind, a conception that resonates in later Jewish literature.²⁴

²⁰ Observed by Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 20 and Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 585, n. 37. As opposed to later texts to be introduced below, no explicit mention is made here of angelic sacrifices.

²¹ For a good example of the intercessory role of the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible consider Exod 28:29: “Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel on the breastpiece of judgment upon his heart whenever he enters the holy place as a continual memorial before the Lord.” The idea of angelic intercession in behalf of humans was popular in the Second Temple period (see 1 *En.* 47:2; 99:3, 16; Tob 12:12; *T. Levi* 3:5; 5:6–7; Rev 8:3; and the other texts cited by R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912], 21), and may be traced back to the Hebrew Bible (Zech 1:12; Job 5:1; 33:23). The notion may be related to the heavenly court setting in which God is pictured as sitting on the throne of judgment while supernatural beings argue over the fate of human beings (Psalm 82; Zech 3:1–10; Job 1:6–12; 2:1–6).

²² See P. Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *JBL* 96 (1977): 220–226; D. Dimant, “1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective,” *SBLSP* (1978) 326–327; C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 463.

²³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 463. His comments come in the midst of a larger discussion on the elucidation of the phrase למשרת מיכאל that appears in 1QM 17:6.

²⁴ See, for example, 3 *Baruch* 11–16; *b. Hag* 12b. The picture here is close to that of the celestial high priest Melchizedek depicted in 11Q13. On the identification of Michael

In passing, it is important to note the relationship between Michael's role as intercessor and his charge to annihilate evil from the world. The purification of the earth will only be brought about by Michael's forceful imprisonment of the chief demon Shemihazah and his associates, his obliteration of the giants, the sons of the watchers, and his "destruction of all perversity from the earth" (10:11–16). In the wake of these events, known history ends and humanity will enjoy "the storehouses of blessing that are in heaven" and experience truth and peace "for all the days of eternity and for all the generations of men" (11:2; cf. 90:28–42). This scenario clearly parallels Michael's role as chief eschatological military rival of the evil powers opposing God and his people in both the book of Daniel (10:13, 21; 12:1) and the *War Scroll* (1QM 17:5–8).²⁵ A similar role is attributed to the heavenly high priest Melchizedek in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13) 2:12–14, a text to which we shall return below.²⁶

with Melchizedek, possibly from the period predating the formation of the Qumran community and through the Middle Ages, see pp. 155–156.

²⁵ A similar reference to an unnamed angel occurs in *As. Mos.* 10:1–2:

Then his kingdom will appear throughout his whole creation.
 Then the devil will have an end.
 Yea, sorrow will be led away with him.
 Then will be filled the hands of the messenger,
 who is in the highest place appointed.
 Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies.

(trans. J. Priest, "Testament of Moses," *OTP*, 1:931–932)

Charles, *APOT* 1:421, comments that the reference to the "filled hands" of the angel "signifies the designation of power as warrior, not as priest." However, there is no clear reason why the author would use a phrase specific to priests in order to confer power onto a warrior. It is much more likely that the angel is here a priest with military duties.

²⁶ See pp. 146–164. The close relationship between priesthood and violent confrontation of evil comes as no surprise. Indeed, the common phrase in Classical Hebrew denoting installation into priestly office, *למלא יד* (literally: "to fill the hand"), may possess a violent connotation. See, e.g., A. Cody, *A History of Old Testament Priesthood* (Rome: PBI, 1969), 152–154. Various texts in the Hebrew Bible link the acquisition of priestly privilege with zealous violence against the wicked. In Exod 32:26–29, only after slaughtering their wicked idolatrous brethren, are the Levites consecrated as priests by Moses. It is thus through the violent purging of evil that the Levites acquire the privilege of priesthood. In a similar manner, Phinehas is granted a "covenant of eternal priesthood" (*ברית*) *כהנת עולם*; Num 25:13; cf. Ps 106:29–31) for slaying Zimri and Kozbi (Num 25:7–8). See further J.J. Collins, "The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence," *JBL* 122 (2003): 12–13. According to W. Janzen (*Old Testament Ethics: A Paradigmatic Approach* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 108), "the exemplary dimension of

Human as Angelic Priest? Enoch's Special Status

Expanding upon the report of Gen 5:24 that Enoch “walked with God; then he was no more, for God took him,” *BW* attributes an exalted status to the patriarch. His rank is comparable to that of the angels:

Before these things, Enoch was taken; and none of the sons of men knew where he had been taken, or where he was, or what had happened to him. And his works were with the watchers, and with the holy ones were his days.²⁷ (12:1–2)

Indeed, in *1 Enoch* 12–16 Enoch assumes the role of mediator between God and the fallen watchers. Moreover, the above-mentioned task assigned to the angel Michael in chapter 10 is carried out by none other than Enoch in 12:3–6; 14:4–7; and 15:2–16:4.²⁸ Significantly, he is granted the privilege of accessing the glorious divine presence, an honor denied to some angels.²⁹ As VanderKam argues, such pieces of evidence indicate that Enoch is portrayed in these chapters “not only associating with angels (whether good or bad) but outranking at least some of them.”³⁰ *BW*'s conception of Enoch's otherworldly status stands in a long tradition (of uncertain antiquity) of speculation about Enoch's exalted identity that is beyond the scope of the present inquiry.³¹ For our present purpose it will suffice to consider whether or not the elevated Enoch figure of *BW* displays priestly characteristics.

his act was not its violence . . . but Phinehas's zeal for the Lord and his atoning for the people. These were hallmarks of true priesthood.” Nevertheless, this consideration does not erase the positive assessment of his violent actions. As we shall see, both the *Aramaic Levi Document* and *Jubilees* share a positive view of Levi's violent acts in Shechem, connecting it to his ordination as priest. Michael's violent acts in *1 Enoch* 10 may also at least in one sense be viewed as a Second Temple period outgrowth of a known biblical priestly role.

²⁷ For the likely dependence of this passage on Gen 5:24, see VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 130–131.

²⁸ This discrepancy in the accounts may be explained by the fact that *1 Enoch* 6–11 and 12–16 were originally independent units which were later combined into a passable literary unity. Still, the present state of the text is telling of Enoch's lofty status in the eyes of the redactor.

²⁹ See *1 En.* 14:20–15:1.

³⁰ VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 131.

³¹ See the survey of G. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, First Book of,” *ABD* 2:508–516. See also VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*; idem, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988).

Enoch is termed “scribe” (12:3) or “scribe of righteousness” (12:4; 15:1) in *BW*, but never “priest.” Nonetheless, several scholars maintain that Enoch is portrayed here as an archetypal sacerdotalist.³² This claim is usually supported by the following observations: The background for scribal activity is primarily priestly.³³ Enoch’s role as intercessor for the watchers as well as his access to God’s presence in what appears to be the heavenly temple represent privileges best understood as priestly. In addition, there is a strong possibility, to which we will return below, that the myth of *BW* served as a typological criticism of the Jerusalemite priesthood. In the light of this observation, the close parallels between Enoch and the priest Ezra are particularly interesting. Both figures are called “scribe” and both deal with remarkably similar circumstances—the marriage of a class of holy individuals to a group of women forbidden to them, and the resulting defilement.³⁴

It is often pointed out that traditions from at least as early as the second century BCE recognize Enoch’s priestly credentials and further develop them.³⁵ According to *Jub.* 4:25, Enoch “burned the evening incense of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain.”³⁶ This would comport with Aaron’s role in *Exod* 30:7–8.³⁷ According to Nickelsburg, the portrait of Levi in the *Testament of Levi* already in its pre-Christian Aramaic form is modeled after an understanding of Enoch as priest, even as high priest.³⁸ *2 Enoch* and the later *3 Enoch* likewise understand the patriarch as a primordial otherworldly priest.³⁹ Such portrayals may well be seen as outgrowths of the depiction of Enoch in *BW* as a priest. However, since all of them postdate *BW*, they cannot shed certain light on the latter’s original understanding of Enoch.⁴⁰

³² See esp. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 99–103; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 23–25; S.D. Fraade, “They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob’: Priest, Scribe, and Sage in Second Temple Times,” (unpublished paper). I thank Professor Fraade for sharing his work with me.

³³ Argued in detail by Fraade, “They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob.” For further discussion of the scribe-priest relationship, see chapter seven.

³⁴ See Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 585, for further parallels.

³⁵ See esp. Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 25–46.

³⁶ Unless otherwise noted, translations of *Jubilees* follow J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; *Scriptores Aethiopici* 88; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

³⁷ See also the mention of “the words of Enoch” in Abraham’s instructions to Isaac regarding matters of sacrificial cult in *Jub.* 21:10.

³⁸ Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 588–589.

³⁹ For a convenient summary of the primary evidence, see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 23–24.

⁴⁰ It is interesting to note that while *Jubilees* attributes the most familiar priestly role of sacrificial service to Enoch and perhaps to priestly angels as well (see below), no such

The Relationship of Heaven and Earth Implied by BW

The story of the fallen watchers provides a unique and in some ways surprising picture of the celestial temple and priesthood in relation to the earthly realm. On the one hand, the ontological gap between angel and human is presumed. According to God's will, immortal spirit and perishable flesh ought to remain separate (15:4). Ideally, the superior priests of heaven intercede before God in behalf of inferior earthbound humans (15:2). Yet the gulf between angel and human is not unbridgeable. Enoch, a special and righteous human, ascends to heaven, though the experience is said to be overwhelmingly terrifying (14:9, 13, 24–25). Conversely, the watchers descend to earth, choosing to defile themselves by engaging in sexual relations with human women. In doing so they have not only ruptured the natural division between spirit and flesh established by God,⁴¹ but also have defiled themselves with blood, thus putting at risk the sanctity of the heavenly temple in which they serve (15:3–4). The fact that some of the angels nearly defile the heavenly temple is striking. As noted above, the myth of the fallen watchers draws its image of the celestial temple from the description in the book of Ezekiel (40–44). Yet, whereas in Ezekiel this temple is perfect and unprofanable, here it may indeed be profaned by its priests. Interestingly, all other Second Temple period texts that mention the angelic priesthood portray it as perfectly obedient to God.⁴²

What does the relationship between the heavenly priesthood and the earthly realm in *BW* imply? In order to address this question, we must consider the genre of the story of the fallen angels, which is best seen as a mythological paradigm for the origin of sin and evil in the world.⁴³ Interpreted as such, the myth of the watchers has a

cultic role is performed by Enoch or the angels in *BW*. This point might be said to put into question the priestly understanding of Enoch in *BW*. Alternatively, might the lack of reference represent a negative attitude toward sacrifice?

⁴¹ From the perspective of the forbidden mixture of sacred and profane, the watchers' sharing of heavenly secrets with humankind may be seen as a sin of the same ilk.

⁴² See, e.g., the portrayal of angelic priesthood in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice treated in chapter three. Cf. Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 22.

⁴³ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 52. For a comparison of "paradigmatic" and "etiological" interpretations of the myth, see Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest."

reciprocal relationship to society: not only does the myth reflect a certain attitude toward society, it also draws from society a system of encoding that is used to spell out the specific terms of the narrative.⁴⁴

Accordingly, the myth reflects the projection of a perceived crisis to the mythological plane by an author within his third century BCE Palestinian milieu.⁴⁵ By omitting any explicit reference to a “real” historical crisis and projecting it into the primordial superhuman mythological realm, the anxiety caused by the comparatively insignificant historical events experienced by the author is defused.⁴⁶

Due to the primordial setting of the story, its implicit typological view of history, and its resulting multivalent nature, it is impossible to pin down the precise historical setting for its composition.⁴⁷ However, without drawing overly firm historical conclusions, David Suter has offered the provocative suggestion that a major function of the myth was to criticize the earthly Jerusalemite priesthood.⁴⁸ To Suter, the report that the watchers, or heavenly priests, took inappropriate terrestrial wives, defiled themselves “with the blood of women,” and begot bastards⁴⁹ reflects the author’s concern with the laws pertaining to marriage and sexual relations in his day, particularly as they related to the priests of Jerusalem. Further support for such an interpretation may be gleaned from various Second Temple period works.⁵⁰ As early as the fifth century, Ezra and Nehemiah report the sinful and illegitimate marriages of priests to foreigners (Ezra 10:18–44.; Neh 13:29). This criticism may be echoed later

⁴⁴ Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 117.

⁴⁵ For this date, see the works cited in n. 12.

⁴⁶ See further, Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 49–51.

⁴⁷ See J.J. Collins, “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers,” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 97–98; idem, “Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P.D. Hanson and G.W. Nickelsburg,” *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 320–321.

⁴⁸ “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest.” Alternatively, Nickelsburg (“Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11,” *JBL* 96 [1977]: 383–405) suggests that the myth represents a reaction to the tremendous suffering in Palestine brought about by the Diadochi in the wake of Alexander’s conquests. In this case, the destruction and bloodshed wrought by the giants would correlate to the numerous diadochic campaigns in Palestine at the end of the fourth century BCE. Furthermore, the account of the immoral supernatural procreation in *BW* may be read as a parody of the claims “that certain of the Diadochi had gods as their fathers. Our story, then, would be saying, ‘Yes their fathers were divine; however, they were not gods, but demons’” (pp. 396–397).

⁴⁹ 1 Enoch 10:9, τοὺς μᾶζηθεοὺς = ממזרין.

⁵⁰ See Suter, “Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,” 124–131.

in *Aramaic Levi Document* 14–18 (Bodleian b 14–18 and the Mount Athos Greek manuscript; cf. 4Q213 4), the *Testament of Levi* (14:6; cf. 9:9–10), the Damascus Document (CD 4:12–19) and the *Psalms of Solomon* (2:11–13; 8:9–13). As for the defilement of the watchers by blood, both CD 5:6–7 and *Pss. Sol.* 8:12 claim that defilement by menstrual blood sullies the temple. Given such support, the myth should indeed be viewed as projecting the perceived sins of the earthly priests of the Jerusalem temple onto the angelic priests of the celestial temple.⁵¹ The exile of the fallen watchers from the heavenly temple would thus represent the expulsion, or desired expulsion, of sinful priests from the Jerusalem temple.

Notably, the criticism of the priesthood here does not amount to a complete condemnation. Only some of the angelic priests fall, while others remain serving in the heavenly temple. It follows that only some of the earthly priests were viewed as defiled—a more optimistic perspective than we find in later criticisms that vilify the entire priesthood.⁵²

In sum, the paradigmatic nature of the myth of the watchers serves to clarify its unique portrayal of the otherworldly priesthood. While the form of Ezekiel's temple influenced *BW*'s vision of the heavenly temple, the function of its custodians, the angelic priests, is infused with meaning suitable to the goals of the myth. As noted, these goals cannot be defined with complete historical precision, but it is most likely that the story served as a criticism of the perceived corruption of the Jerusalemite priesthood. From such a perspective, Enoch's ascent to heaven might be said to represent the hope for the rise of a new type of priest.⁵³

⁵¹ See recently M. Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 21–28, who argues that the criticism of the Jerusalem priests in *BW* does not have to do with purity but rather with marriage to women from lay families. She brings as support the possibly similar attitudes of *Aramaic Levi Document* 15–17 and 4QMMT B 75–82.

⁵² For criticism of the priesthood in an array of Second Temple period texts, see chapter six below. On the distinction between pre- and post-Hasmonean criticism of the priesthood see Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 22–23.

⁵³ For a fine argument that the authors of the Enochic literature were disaffected members of the Jerusalem priesthood, see B. Wright, “Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira,” *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 133–149.

JUBILEES

At least fourteen manuscripts of an extensive work of “rewritten Bible” today known as the book of *Jubilees* were discovered in the Qumran caves, certainly ranking it as one of the most cherished documents preserved by the Qumran community.⁵⁴ *Jubilees* is dependent on older traditions, also popular at Qumran, about the patriarchs Enoch and Levi deriving from *1 Enoch* (see *Jub.* 4:15–26) and the *Aramaic Levi Document*⁵⁵ (see *Jub.* 30:1–32:9) respectively.⁵⁶ Later Qumran writings revere *Jubilees* as a significant work. Indeed, the Damascus Document cites the “Book of the Divisions of the Jubilees and Weeks” as an authoritative source (CD 16:3–5).⁵⁷ Many ideas advocated by *Jubilees* can be found in sectarian writings, including, for example, the acceptance of a 364-day solar calendar,⁵⁸ designation of the festival of Shavuot (celebrated on 3/15) as a day of covenant renewal, exaltation of the priestly office over against royal leadership, and belief in two-spirit dualism.⁵⁹ However,

⁵⁴ Only Psalms (36), Deuteronomy (29), Isaiah (21), Exodus (17), and Genesis (15) were preserved in larger (or, perhaps in the case of Genesis, equal) numbers.

⁵⁵ Or a work like it, such as R. Kugler’s hypothetical “Levi-apocryphon,” which, according to his proposal, served as a source for the common Levi material found in the *Aramaic Levi Document* and *Jubilees*. See idem, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 150–169. For further discussion of the *Aramaic Levi Document*, see below, pp. 46–53, 265–273.

⁵⁶ For the relationship between *1 Enoch* and the Enoch traditions in *Jubilees*, see VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 179–190. For a comparison of the *Aramaic Levi Document* and the Levi material in *Jubilees*, see Kugler’s chart, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 147–149. See also VanderKam, “Isaac’s Blessing of Levi and his Descendants in Jubilees 31,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 497–518, esp. 511–518.

⁵⁷ Cf. the overlapping reading of 4QD^e (4Q270 6 II, 17).

⁵⁸ *Jubilees* is known for its fervent rejection of any use of the moon in calculations of the calendar. The Qumran solar calendar(s) therefore relates more closely to that preserved in the *Astronomical Book* (*1 Enoch* 72–82), which employs the moon in some of its calculations. See U. Glessmer, “Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *DSSAFY*, 2:213–278; J. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 111. See further, J. Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Context* (STDJ 78; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

⁵⁹ For examples of the possible influence of *Jubilees* on Qumran thought see J. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 143–146. On the nature of the relationship of *Jubilees* to the Qumran community, see idem, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 255–285.

scholars widely recognize that the author never indicates a sectarian self-awareness, and his language assumes the relevance of his message for all of Israel. The extra-sectarian provenance of the text is confirmed by its date. Based on paleographical evidence, the oldest Qumran manuscript (4Q216, which is most likely not the autograph) dates between 125 and 100 BCE.⁶⁰ The composition of the work thus pre-dates the earliest Second Temple period settlement at Qumran.⁶¹ The author's apparent knowledge of the *Book of Dreams* and its references to the Maccabean revolution (1 *Enoch* 83–90), places the composition at some point after 164 BCE. Based on these and other considerations, James VanderKam puts the work slightly after the *Book of Dreams*, but prior to the schism responsible for the formation of the Qumran community, most probably between 160 and 150.⁶²

Angelology plays a central role in *Jubilees*, and the following analysis certainly cannot treat that enormous topic in full.⁶³ We shall focus primarily on the text's portrayal of otherworldly priests. Like *BW*, *Jubilees* never explicitly applies the term "priest" to an angel, but as we shall see, the angelic fulfillment of such a role is explicit. In turn, human priests of the line of Levi are likened to angels.

The Angels and Israel

It will be worthwhile to begin with a discussion of *Jubilees'* view of the relationship between angels and humans. Chapter two clearly describes God's creation of the angels:

⁶⁰ See J. VanderKam and J.T. Milik in H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1–3. The paleographic evidence is supplemented by the above-noted citation of *Jubilees* by the *Damascus Document*, the oldest copy of which dates to 100–50 BCE (4Q266).

⁶¹ Here I follow J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 64–66. Due to the apparent absence of second century pottery types at Qumran, she dates the earliest Second Temple period settlement to about 100 BCE.

⁶² VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [2001], 17–21.

⁶³ For the angelology/demonology of *Jubilees*, see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [2001], 126–131; idem, "The Demons in the 'Book of Jubilees,'" in *Die Dämonen; die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (ed. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K.F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2003), 339–364; idem, "The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees," *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–393; L. Stuckenbruck, "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions," *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–377; T. Hanneken, "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses," *Hen* 28 (2006): 11–25.

For on the first day He created the heavens that are above, the earth, the waters, and all the spirits who serve before him, namely: the angels of the presence; the angels of holiness; the angels of the spirits of fire; the angels of the spirits of the winds; the angels of the spirits of the clouds, of darkness, snow, hail and frost; the angels of the sounds, the thunders, and the lightnings; and the angels of the spirits of cold and heat, of winter, spring, autumn, and summer and of all the spirits of his creatures which are in the heavens, on earth, and in every (place). (2:2)

The celestial beings were thus created in a tripartite hierarchy, with the angels of the presence at the top, followed by the angels of holiness, and finally by the angels of cosmic phenomena. Only the first two groups continue to play a role in the remainder of the book, while the third is not mentioned again. 2:18 reports that the top two tiers of angels are charged to celebrate the Sabbath. Of all the nations on earth, only Israel is commanded to celebrate the Sabbath along with the angels and God. All the other nations, as well as the angels of cosmic phenomena, presumably continue to work on the seventh day due to their inferior state of holiness (2:19, 31). In this way, *Jubilees'* picture of earth is modeled on its vision of celestial reality—there is a direct parallelism between the existence and actions of heavenly beings and those of their human counterparts on earth. Written into the very order of creation, Israel corresponds to the angels closest to God, while the Gentiles correlate to those farthest away. A similar message may lie behind *Jubilees'* report that the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness were created circumcised (15:27). God commanded Israel to be circumcised as well, since “he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels” (15:27). The fact that the angels are by nature circumcised seems to imply that by fulfilling the covenant of circumcision, Jews become earthly replicas of God’s celestial inner circle. On the other hand, the Gentiles did not receive such a command, for God “chose them not” (15:30).

Israel as a Kingdom of Priests

In *Jubilees*, the entire nation of Israel’s elevated holiness is expressed in priestly terms drawing upon Exod 19:6: “You shall be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (ואתם תהיו-לי ממלכת כוהנים וגוי קדוש). Thus, according to *Jub.* 16:18 Israel is destined to “become a people whom the Lord possesses out of all the nations ... a kingdom, a priesthood, and a holy people.”⁶⁴ The extension of priestly holiness to all of Israel here

⁶⁴ On the variant “a kingdom and priests” (or “a kingdom, a priesthood”) as an ancient

appears to have possessed more than mere symbolic meaning for the author. Such an attitude is particularly evident in passages dealing with sexual impropriety, a theme also of great concern to *BW*.⁶⁵ An example of this attitude appears in the retelling of the story of Reuben and Bilhah. After the rape of Bilhah, the author describes the weightiness of sexual sin in sacerdotal terms:

No sin is greater than the sexual impurity which they commit on the earth because Israel is a holy people for the Lord its God. It is the nation which he possesses; it is a priestly nation; it is a priestly kingdom; it is what he owns. No such impurity will be seen among the holy people. (33:20)

Israel must not defile itself in such a manner precisely because of its priestly status. An instructive example of an identical attitude occurs in the story of Dinah and Shechem (chapter 30). In this retelling, Dinah's rape serves as a catalyst for harsh new legislation found nowhere in the Pentateuch: A man who marries off his daughter or his sister to a Gentile must be stoned, while the woman must be burned (30:7).⁶⁶ A few verses later, the author provides the rationale for such precaution:

If one does this or shuts his eyes to those who do impure things and who defile the Lord's sanctuary and to those who profane his holy name, then the entire nation will be condemned together because of all this impurity and this contamination. There will be no favoritism nor partiality; there will be no receiving from him of fruit, sacrifices, offerings, fat, or the aroma of a pleasing fragrance so that he should accept it. (So) is any man or woman in Israel to be who defiles his sanctuary. (30:15–16)

As in *BW*, sexual misconduct leads not only to the defilement of the individual but also to the defilement of the temple itself.⁶⁷ This in turn puts

Jewish interpretation of the phrase ממלכת כוהנים כוהנים, see Charles, *APOT* 2:38. See further, Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 53–84.

⁶⁵ As we shall see below, this theme was also a great concern for the authors of the *Aramaic Levi Document* and Greek *Testament of Levi*. For an in-depth study, see W. Loader, *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

⁶⁶ The woman's punishment may be drawn from Lev 21:9: "When the daughter of a priest defiles herself through harlotry (כי תחל לינות), it is her father whom she defiles, she shall be put to the fire (באש תשרף)."

⁶⁷ This attitude has been compared to the perspective of the Holiness Code (over against P) that sexual defilement has an ethical element (cf. Lev 18:24–25). See M. Himmelfarb, "A Kingdom of Priests: The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997): 89–104. For a comparison of H and P, see I. Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

the entire nation of Israel's relationship with God in danger. However, here the warning is sounded not just to the hereditary priests, but to all of Israel, which has clearly assumed the status of a "kingdom of priests."

On the one hand, *Jubilees* portrays the priesthood as democratized (and, as a consequence, merit-based).⁶⁸ On the other hand, it does not (or cannot) completely ignore the scriptural notion of a hereditary priesthood within Israel. Levi's appointment to the priesthood as well as the ascription of the office to his bloodline is indeed given special attention. In this connection it is important to note that from the point of view of *Jubilees*, Levi is not the first priest but a link in a chain of priests stretching all the way back to Adam and including such figures as Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, and Isaac.⁶⁹ It appears that this view of priesthood developed in large part as an exegetical response to the biblical reports of priestly activities, such as the building of altars and offering of sacrifices, performed by the patriarchs (e.g., Gen 8:20; 12:7; 26:25). From the perspective of the author of *Jubilees*, the offering of animals and building of altars could not possibly have been *ad hoc* improvisations. Rather, they were proper expressions of authorized priestly status carried out according to primordial priestly instruction that had been transmitted through the ages.⁷⁰

The tension between democratized and hereditary notions of earthly priesthood plays out in *Jubilees'* portrayal of the angels of the presence and holiness. On the one hand, as we have seen in the cases of Sabbath observance and circumcision, these angels correlate to all of Israel, which is itself described as a democratized priesthood. On the other hand, as we shall presently see, in the sections dealing with the priesthood of Levi (chapters 30–32) these angels are said to correspond only to that limited hereditary line.

⁶⁸ *Jubilees* is not alone in this. See the interesting parallel in *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Num 15:39–40, which states that the Jews become like the angels who serve before the Lord (כמלאכי־יא) (דמשמשין קדם ה' ציצית). The ציצית here is apparently understood as a miniature version of the golden ציץ donned by the high priest (Exod 28:36).

⁶⁹ Adam appears as a priest in rabbinic tradition as well. See especially the popular traditions regarding Adam's otherworldly high priestly vestments, which he passed on to his descendants (*y. Meg.* 1:11; *Gen. Rab.* 20:12; 63:13; 97:6; *Num. Rab.* 4:8; *Tanhuma Buber toledot* 67 and *bereshit* 9; *Tanhuma toledot* 12; *Aggadat Bereshit* 42; *Frg. Tg.* on Gen 48:22; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 27:15; *Pirqe R. El.* 24; *b. Pesah.* 54b. See also Jerome, *Qu. Hebr. Gen.* on Gen 27:15).

⁷⁰ For a possible reference to such instructions, see *Jub.* 45:16. On the "chain of priests" exegetical motif in *Jubilees*, see J. Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 17–19.

Angels as Priests and Levites as Angels

In *Jubilees*, the angels are depicted as fulfilling sacerdotal duties in the temple above. *Jubilees* 6:18 may already imply the existence of such a heavenly cult:⁷¹ “This entire festival [Shavuot] had been celebrated in heaven from the time of creation until the lifetime of Noah.” The question of how exactly this festival was celebrated in heaven is perhaps clarified in the address to Moses in 6:22:

You should celebrate it at each of its times one day in a year. I have told you about its sacrifice so that the Israelites may continue to remember and celebrate it throughout their generations.

Considering *Jubilees*' cosmological perspective, the fulfillment of “celebration” through “sacrifice” on earth may also apply to the heavenly celebration mentioned in 6:18.

The most explicit references to the heavenly cult come in the context of the multiple explanations of the selection of Levi as eternal priest (30–32). *Jubilees* 30 connects Levi's acquisition of the priesthood to the violent purging of sexual sin at Shechem.⁷² In direct opposition to the biblical account, Levi's zealous act of vengeance against the Shechemites is counted as a righteous deed. Indeed, as a direct result of that act, we are told:

Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as Levites to serve before the Lord, *as we (do) for all time*. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. (30:18)

The phrase “as we (do) for all time” is clearly the first person comment of the narrating angel and refers to the highest angels who continually⁷³ serve God in the heavenly temple. Presumably this includes both classes of highest angels, for in 2:18, both groups are included by the use of the first person plural pronoun. Significantly, this passage not only envisions angels as heavenly priests, but draws an analogy between those angels

⁷¹ So G.B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1971), 158.

⁷² See also *Aramaic Levi Document* 78–79 (Cambridge d 16–20); *T. Levi* 12:5; and implicitly, 2:2–3. *T. Levi* 5:3 apparently takes a different view of the connection between Levi's ordination and the events at Shechem. There he is ordained *prior* to his zealous actions. See further Kugel, “Levi's Elevation,” 39–40.

⁷³ C.T.R. Hayward (*The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* [London: Routledge, 1996], 85–107) sees the “continuous” nature of the service as a reference to the *tamid* sacrifice.

and their human counterparts, here the descendants of Levi. A similar picture of otherworldly priestly service appears in Isaac's blessing of Levi and his sons in *Jubilees* 31, which is worth quoting at length:

(13) May the Lord of everything—he is the Lord of all ages—bless you and your sons throughout all ages. (14) May the Lord give you and your descendants extremely great honor; May he make you and your descendants (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones. The descendants of your sons will be like them in honor, greatness and holiness; may he make them great throughout all ages. (15) They will be princes, judges, and leaders of all the descendants of Jacob's sons. They will declare the word of the Lord justly and will justly judge all his verdicts. They will tell my ways to Jacob and my paths to Israel. The blessing of the Lord will be placed in their mouths, so that they may bless all the descendants of the beloved. (16) Your mother named you Levi, and she has given you the right name. You will become one who is joined to the Lord and a companion of all Jacob's sons. His table is to belong to you; you and your sons are to eat (from) it. May your table be filled throughout all history; may your food not be lacking throughout all ages. (17) May all who hate you fall before you, and all your enemies be uprooted and perish. May the one who blesses you be blessed, and any nation that curses you be cursed.

If the “holy ones” of v. 14 are the angels of holiness,⁷⁴ then the correspondence between the nation of Israel and the first two classes of angels noted above has been transferred completely to Levi and his descendants in this context.⁷⁵ More importantly for our present purpose, the analogy between angelic and human sacerdotalists is especially noteworthy. In v. 14, Isaac prays not only that Levi's progeny will behave like the angelic priests (“approach him to serve in his temple”) but also *be* like them (“in honor, greatness, and holiness”). The precise significance of these comparisons is unclear. Do they simply imply the expected parallelism of heavenly and earthly realms, in which case the lower priests and temple only represent mirror images of the higher ones? Or is the blessing envisioning something more—perhaps that the earthly priests enter and serve in the celestial temple and may thus more literally be said to be like the angels in honor, greatness, and holiness?

⁷⁴ So Charles, *APOT* 2:60.

⁷⁵ In light of this observation, v. 17's application to Levi and his descendants of the blessing “may the one who blesses you be blessed, and any nation that curses you be cursed” is to be viewed as a similar transference of Israel's role to the priesthood. The Pentateuch applies this same blessing not to the priests, but to all of Israel (Num 24:9; Gen 12:3; 27:29).

Scholars have noted how Isaac's blessing employs a complex web of scriptural allusions, relying especially on Deut 33:9–11 and Mal 2:5–7.⁷⁶ At this point, it will be worthwhile to consider *Jubilees'* reliance on the latter. Like *Jubilees*, Malachi 2 shares a concern for the covenant of Levi (vv. 4, 8) and the defilement of priests through intermarriage (v. 11). VanderKam has studied the connections between the texts in detail.⁷⁷ For our purpose it is important to note *Jubilees'* use of Mal 2:7, where the prophet proclaims in the name of the Lord: "Surely the lips of the priest guard knowledge, and they shall seek Torah from his mouth, for he is a *mal'ak* of the Lord of Hosts" (כי-שפתי כהן ישמר-ו (-דעת ותורה יבקשו מפייהו כי מלאך ה'-צבאות הוא *Jub.* 31:15 mentions the sacerdotalists' mouths and portrays them as a source of teaching.⁷⁸ More strikingly, the author of *Jubilees'* comparison of the earthly priests to those serving in heaven appears to depend on an understanding of Malachi's identification of the priest with the term מלאך in the specific sense of "angel." A similar understanding of Mal 2:7 seems to underlie numerous other texts, to be observed below, which attribute an otherworldly quality to human priests.⁷⁹

The appeal that Levi and his descendants should "out of all humanity . . . serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones" (*Jub.* 31:14) demands further attention. As VanderKam notes, the literal meaning of the term that he translates as "humanity" is "flesh."⁸⁰ He may be correct in taking the phrase idiomatically. However, Crispin Fletcher-Louis has made the intriguing suggestion that the passage indicates far more than a mere parallelism between the actions of human and angelic priests. Instead, the phrase "out of all flesh" here indicates "a real ontological transfer from one realm of being to another."⁸¹ In support of his case, Fletcher-Louis points to what he considers to be similar occurrences of the phrase in Sir 45:4 (referring to Moses' "consecration" by

⁷⁶ For the uncovering of biblical allusions and motifs in *Jubilees* 31, see VanderKam, "Isaac's Blessing," 497–519.

⁷⁷ See idem, "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 353–365; idem, "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 359–373.

⁷⁸ However, in *Jubilees* the mouth is the source of blessing (recalling the priestly blessing of Numbers 6), not teaching as in Malachi. Cf. Hebrew Ben Sira 50:20.

⁷⁹ In addition to the texts to be treated below, cf. *L.A.B.* 28:3 and *Liv. Pro.* 16:1–2.

⁸⁰ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [1989], 204. Accordingly, in his retroversion of *Jub.* 31:12–17 into the original Hebrew ("Isaac's Blessing," 501), he suggests for the phrase "out of all humanity."

⁸¹ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 16.

God)⁸² and in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁸³ He adds that the “extremely great honor”⁸⁴ attributed to the priests may be taken in its exalted theological sense, as in the description of the high priest Simon in Ben Sira 50.⁸⁵ This would in turn point to the belief that the priesthood “somehow embodies God’s own Glory.”

Although Fletcher-Louis’ interpretation of *Jub.* 31:14 is provocative, caution is in order.⁸⁶ Regarding the attribution of “extremely great glory” to the priests, Fletcher-Louis himself notes that it is not certain in this context whether that quality is to be understood in a narrowly anthropological or explicitly theological sense. Furthermore, if the Latin witness to this verse preserves the superior text, glory is not attributed to Levi and his descendants here at all.⁸⁷ Improving upon the defective Ethiopic, the Latin reads “*magno intellegere gloriam eius*” (“greatly to understand his glory”). According to this reading, Isaac hopes that Levi and his children will be granted *an understanding of* the divine glory and the full gravity of the privilege of serving so near to it.⁸⁸

Although it is far from clear that an actual ontological transformation is envisioned in *Jub.* 31:14, the likening of the temple service as well as the glory, greatness, and holiness of the angelic and human ministers underscores the elevated status of Levi and his descendants. Fletcher-Louis is correct in noting that this language is linked to a larger body of Second Temple literature that readily envisions the terrestrial priests as sharing in something of the nature of their celestial counterparts. As we shall see below, two non-sectarian wisdom works found at Qumran, Ben Sira and 4QInstruction, preserve related traditions. The *Letter of*

⁸² The Hebrew reads: [] ויבחר בו מכל. The lacuna is reconstructed with certainty as בשר on the basis of the Greek: ἐκ πάσης σαρκός.

⁸³ See for example 4Q418 81 1–2. Furthermore, a Qumran fragment of the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4Q213b [4QLevi^c] 1 1) reports that Levi, in the context of a heavenly vision, is loved “more than / from all flesh” (מן כל בשר [א]).

⁸⁴ The word “honor” may with certainty be retroverted to the original Hebrew כבוד.

⁸⁵ For Ben Sira 50, see pp. 56–61. The divine glory is associated with the priesthood and the temple / tabernacle in numerous biblical passages. See, e.g., Lev 9:6, 23–24; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chr 7:1–6; and throughout the book of Ezekiel.

⁸⁶ For a critique of Fletcher-Louis, see pp. 100–101.

⁸⁷ For this suggestion, see VanderKam’s discussion in *The Book of Jubilees* [1989], 203–204.

⁸⁸ Indeed, as VanderKam (“Isaac’s Blessing,” 505) points out, the lack of such an understanding led to the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Cf. Moses’ response to Aaron about the deaths of his two sons in Lev 10:3: “This is what the Lord meant when he said: Through those who are near me I will show myself holy, and before all the people I will be glorified.”

Aristeas provides another example from a Hellenistic Egyptian context far removed from Qumran. It describes Eleazar the high priest decked out in the high priestly garments as follows:⁸⁹

It was an occasion of great amazement to us when we saw Eleazar engaged on his ministry, and all the glorious vestments, including the wearing of the garment with precious stones upon it in which he is vested . . . He was clad in an outstandingly magnificent girdle, woven in the most beautiful colors. On his breast he wears what is called the "oracle," to which are attached twelve stones of different kinds, set in gold . . . each stone flashing its own natural distinctive color—quite indescribable. Upon his head he has what is called the "tiara," and upon this the inimitable "mitre," the hallowed diadem having in relief on the front in the middle in holy letters on a golden leaf the name of God, ineffable in glory. The wearer is considered worthy of such vestments at the services. Their appearance makes one awestruck and dumbfounded: A man would think he had come out of this world into another one. I emphatically assert that every man who comes near the spectacle of what I have described will experience astonishment and amazement beyond words, his very being transformed by the hallowed arrangement of every single detail. (96–99)

Not only does the high priest appear otherworldly in his splendor, with the divine glory radiating forth from his vestments, but even the spectator is guaranteed some sort of transformation through the visual experience. As a piece of temple propaganda, this description clearly makes its point by means of hyperbole.⁹⁰ However, the language does recall *Jubilees*; the earthly priest possesses an exalted status and is comparable to a supernatural being. In a similar vein, it may be significant that Hecataeus of Abdera refers to the Jewish high priest as acting as an "ἄγγελος."⁹¹ Finally, as we shall presently see, a similar attitude is found in some pre-Qumranite Aramaic works, such as the *Aramaic Levi Document* and 4QVisions of Amram, which, like *Jubilees*, portray Levi and/or his descendants as exalted figures analogous or close to angels. The widespread appearance of this motif in works of vastly differing provenance and genre testifies to its prominence well beyond the Qumran community and its direct predecessors.

⁸⁹ Translation follows R.J.H. Shutt, *OTP* 2:19.

⁹⁰ On the exaggerated style of *Let. Aris.* see M. Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (JAL; New York: Ktav, 1973), 48–52.

⁹¹ Diodorus, *Bibliotheca Historica* 40, 3.5. See J. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 74–76. On the authenticity of the passage cited, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 18–25; also R. Doran, "Pseudo-Hecataeus," *OTP* 2:905–919. For further discussion of this passage, see below, pp. 263–264.

ARAMAIC LEVI DOCUMENT

Seven fragmentary Hasmonean/early Herodian period manuscripts of the *Aramaic Levi Document* (henceforth *ALD*) were recovered from the Qumran caves.⁹² Like *Jubilees*, the text shares many close connections with sectarian works including utilization of a solar calendar, exaltation of the priestly office over against royal leadership, and two-spirit dualism. However, as Michael Stone points out, the text's lack of specifically sectarian terminology as well as its early date indicates that it should be attributed to "the wing of Judaism from which the Qumran sectarians were but one group of descendants."⁹³ *ALD* influenced other non-sectarian texts found at Qumran in large numbers, particularly *Jubilees* and Visions of Amram (4Q543–548), as well as the single copy of Testament of Qahat (4Q542). It almost certainly served as the inspiration for the latter two works. In addition, *ALD* (or a work very similar to it)⁹⁴ was most likely used as a source by the author of the book of *Jubilees*.⁹⁵ This puts the composition of the former prior to the middle of the second century BCE.⁹⁶

Upon its discovery, scholars immediately recognized a close relationship between *ALD* and the second century CE Greek *Testament of Levi*. While the latter is a Christian work in its present form, it is generally acknowledged that its author utilized the former as a source.⁹⁷ Christian

⁹² Two manuscripts of this document were already discovered in the Cairo Genizah and published in the early 1900's. See J. Greenfield and M. Stone, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza" *RB* 85 (1979): 214–230. For the Qumran manuscripts, see M. Stone and J. Greenfield, in G.J. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1–72. The eleventh century Greek manuscript of *T. 12 Patr.* from Mount Athos was also recognized as containing insertions which translate *ALD* into Greek. See M. de Jonge et al., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1, pt. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1978), xvii.

⁹³ M. Stone, "Levi, Aramaic" *EDSS* 1:486. See also J. Greenfield, M. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 19–22. For more on the provenance of *ALD* see the discussion and works cited below, pp. 271–273.

⁹⁴ See n. 55 above. For a comparison of *ALD* and the Levi material in *Jubilees* (30:1–32:9), see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 147–149.

⁹⁵ For a recent argument for the priority of *Jubilees*, see J. Kugel, "How Old Is the 'Aramaic Levi Document'?" *DSD* 14 (2007): 291–312.

⁹⁶ *Jubilees* may be dated to the middle of the second century BCE. See p. 37 above. For arguments for dating *ALD* to the third century see, Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 134–135. See also the discussion and works cited below, pp. 271–273.

⁹⁷ The extent and nature of the use of *ALD* as a source for *T. Levi* is a long-debated and

material in *T. Levi* cannot easily be disentangled by means of text criticism. Nonetheless, with the help of *ALD* and related texts, underlying pre-Christian traditions may be discerned.⁹⁸ As a rule, however, we shall try to hew closely to the preserved text of *ALD*.

ALD shares many commonalities with *BW*, and, despite the fact that they have different heroes, it has been suggested that the two works originated in the same circles.⁹⁹ Using strikingly similar imagery, each work portrays its ancient protagonist as ascending to heaven in a dream vision in order to be commissioned by God—Enoch as “scribe of righteousness” to the watchers and Levi as high priest given an “anointing of eternal peace” (רבות שלם עלמא; 1QTLevi ar [1Q21] 3 = Bodleian a).¹⁰⁰ Milik has plausibly suggested that 4QLevi^a ar (4Q213 3–4) displays a knowledge of *BW*.¹⁰¹ The Qumran fragment is closely paralleled by *T. Levi* 14. In the first verse of that chapter, Levi informs his sons that he has “learnt from the writing of Enoch that at the end you will act impiously against the Lord.”¹⁰² He then proceeds to lay emphasis on their sins of sexual impropriety and intermarriage with Gentiles. The exact words of the criticism are not found in *1 Enoch*, but they recall Enoch’s accusations against the watchers. Furthermore, whereas in *BW* the watchers are responsible for the spread of evil in the world (*1 En.* 13:2; 16:3), here in *T. Levi*

extremely complex question. See Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 171–220; M. de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: 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. E.G. Chazon and M. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 71–89. For a convenient overview of opinions, see R. Kugler, *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 47–56.

⁹⁸ See the discussion of J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 89–90.

⁹⁹ M. Stone, “Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins,” *JSJ* 19 (1988): 159–170. The influence of *BW* on *T. Levi* was most likely not direct but rather a result of the latter’s dependence on *ALD*. See further, Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 588–590.

¹⁰⁰ For the text, see J.T. Milik in D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 87–89. Himmelfarb (*Ascent to Heaven*, 30) notes that while Enoch implicitly fills a priestly role and is explicitly designated “scribe,” Levi is designated priest par excellence and his descendants fill scribal duties. For Enoch’s “curious” role as priest in *Jubilees* 4, see VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 184–188.

¹⁰¹ Milik, *The Books of Enoch* 23–24. The text numbering follows Stone and Greenfield, DJD XXII, 20–22.

¹⁰² Unless otherwise noted, translations of *T. Levi* follow H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

that dubious distinction is bestowed upon the sons of Levi (14:4). Thus it appears that at an early date *BW* was indeed understood as a paradigmatic polemic against the priesthood.

The Celestial Temple and Its Liturgy

Like *BW* and *Jubilees*, *T. Levi* portrays the angelic priesthood in the celestial temple, but in a more extensive manner. In *T. Levi* 5:1, an angel opens the gates of heaven for Levi, who sees “the holy temple and the Most High upon a throne of glory.” The image of the heavens as a singular temple, while in line with the portrayal of *BW*, is at variance with *T. Levi* 2–3, which presents an angelic guide showing Levi seven different heavens. In the seventh and highest heaven “dwells the Great Glory in the holy of holies far beyond all holiness” (3:4).¹⁰³ The discrepancy has received much attention, and many scholars see the rather jumbled description of the seven heavens in chapters 2–3 as the result of a later reworking of earlier traditions.¹⁰⁴ *T. Levi*’s image of the heavenly temple apparently recasts those of *BW* and *ALD*.¹⁰⁵ I shall return to some examples of this below.

¹⁰³ Revealing yet another connection between the two works, the rare divine epithet “the Great Glory” (ἡ δόξα ἡ μεγάλη) appears in Enoch’s ascent in *BW* as well (1 *En.* 14:20).

¹⁰⁴ Charles (*APOT* 2:304–306) argues that the original text contained three heavens, a structure that would resemble the tripartite architectural layout experienced by Enoch in his ascent. It later evolved into a system of seven heavens. For an argument to the contrary—that the seven-heaven schema was original, and later abbreviated to a three-heaven schema, see J.E. Wright, *The Early History of Heaven* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 143–148. A. Yarbro Collins (*Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* [JS]Sup 50; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 25–30; eadem, “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses,” in *Death, Ecstasy, and Otherworldly Journeys* [Albany: SUNY Press, 1995], 59–93) agrees with Charles and suggests that the original three heavens may have resulted from an inner Jewish development, “based perhaps on a reading of שמי השמים in the Hebrew Bible.” Furthermore, she claims that an extremely fragmentary portion of *ALD* (4QLevi^a ar 1 II, 11–18) “clearly” betrays the existence of more than one heaven. De Jonge (“Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII,” in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation* [ed. M. de Jonge; SVTP 3; Leiden: Brill, 1975], 253), on the other hand, sees no evidence that the text of *ALD* originally presupposed more than a single heaven (so too J.T. Milik, “Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen,” *RB* 62 (1955): 404). On the expansion of heaven into seven heavens, a phenomenon also observed in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, later apocalypses, and the Hekhalot literature, see Yarbro Collins (“The Seven Heavens”). She argues for the strong influence of Babylonian magic and cosmology (contrary to the commonly held view which posits the influence of the seven planetary spheres of Greek cosmology).

¹⁰⁵ So Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 32.

Whatever the case, for our current purpose it is most important to note the sacerdotal roles of the angels in this celestial temple. In the sixth heaven, just below the “Great Glory,” the angels of the presence “minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous, and they offer to the Lord a pleasant odor, a reasonable and bloodless offering” (3:5–6). The fifth heaven houses the angels “who bear the answers to the angels of the presence of the Lord” (3:7). This most probably describes the intercessory function of angels in behalf of humanity.¹⁰⁶ In the fourth heaven, “thrones” and “authorities,” presumably two classes of angels, offer continuous praise to God (3:8). The three lowest heavens are related to eschatological punishment. The third and second heavens thus house “the powers of the hosts” and “spirits of the afflictions,” which execute vengeance on “the spirits of deceit and Beliar” and “the lawless ones” respectively (3:2–3).

In sum, the function of the heavenly angels here may be divided into three classes: violent purging of evil, propitiation / intercession, and worship. The first two priestly functions are familiar already from *BW*. However, as we have seen, *T. Levi* goes farther, providing explicit details of the angelic worship. In the sixth heaven, the angels of the presence offer “a pleasant odor, a reasonable and bloodless offering.” Due to the “bloodless” (ἀναίμακτος) nature of the worship, the angels here are involved in liturgical worship (similar perhaps to the praise offered by the angels in the fourth heaven) that is comparable to the “pleasant odor” emitted by sacrifices.¹⁰⁷ Noting the recurrence of the phrase “a reasonable and bloodless offering” (λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφορὰν¹⁰⁸) in Christian texts possessing a negative attitude toward sacrifice, Marinus de Jonge detects here a similar Christian polemic against bloody sacrificial worship.¹⁰⁹ Yet Himmelfarb has pointed out that in light of

¹⁰⁶ So Hollander and de Jonge, *The Testaments*, 138–139. For another example of the intercessory role of an angel in *T. Levi*, see 5:6. The nameless angel there is most likely to be identified with Michael (cf. the texts cited above in n. 21 and the tradition preserved in *Pirqe R. El.* 37 and *Tg. Ps.-J.* [Gen 32:25] according to which Michael brings Levi to heaven and introduces him to God, who appoints him to the priesthood).

¹⁰⁷ “Pleasant odor” (ὄσμη εὐωδίας) is the common term used in the LXX to translate *ריח ניח*, which is used consistently in the Hebrew Bible in connection with sacrifices that please God (Exod 29:18; Lev 1:9; Num 18:17; Ezek 16:19; etc.).

¹⁰⁸ The key phrase in the Christian parallels is ἀναίμακτος. Various terms are used for “offering.” See Hollander and de Jonge, *The Testaments*, 138.

¹⁰⁹ M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin* (Van Gorcum’s Theologische Bibliotheek 25; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953), 48–49. In a later study (“Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII,” 259), de Jonge accepts the

parallel Second Temple period texts that do not reject physical sacrifice (such as *BW*, *Jubilees*, and *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*), this passage need not necessarily be interpreted as polemical. Rather, it may be underscoring the simultaneous correspondence and difference of heavenly and earthly worship.¹¹⁰ Supporting this contention, she observes how the smell of the angelic sacrifices (זבחי קדושים) in song thirteen of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (11Q17 8–7, 2–3) is described as “the aroma of their offerings” (ריח מנחותם) and “the ar[o]ma of their libations” (ר[י]ח נסכיהם). Carol Newsom comments on the word ריח there as follows:

In the OT where ריח is used in connection with sacrifice, it always occurs in the stereotyped phrase ריח ניהוח. The *Shirot* seems intentionally to vary biblical terminology relating to the technical matters of the cult, perhaps as a means of suggesting the difference as well as the correspondence between the heavenly and the earthly service.¹¹¹

Against de Jonge’s assumption, *T. Levi* 3:6 may be reflecting a similar conception of sacrifice, which it could have inherited from *ALD*. Admittedly, evidence for this claim is absent from *ALD*. Nonetheless, judging from the probable origins of *ALD* within the same circles that penned *BW* (which apparently has no problem with physical sacrifice),¹¹² the former’s detailed attention toward proper sacrificial instruction, and *T. Levi*’s dependence upon *ALD*, it is no stretch to imagine that the lost parts of *ALD* included a section portraying angelic sacrifice and liturgy. This claim, of course, cannot be proven, but its plausibility may be considered in light of further study of the texts.

Angelic and Human Priests in ALD

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.¹¹³ Other major themes in the work include the purity of the levitical line, the transmission of priestly cultic

criticism of Jürgen Becker (*Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* [AGJU 8; Leiden: Brill, 1970], 267–268, n. 6), who locates the origins of the view of true sacrifice as spiritual rather than physical within Hellenistic Judaism. See further Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 33–36, 128, n. 23.

¹¹⁰ Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 33–36. See further chapter three below.

¹¹¹ C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 372–373.

¹¹² See Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi, and Peter,” 588–590.

¹¹³ See the discussion and works cited below, pp. 265–273.

lore over the generations, and admonitions against sexual sin. We will return to these important themes below in chapters six and seven. For now, we will only consider *ALD*'s portrayal of otherworldly priesthood.

T. Levi gives a rather robust portrayal of the heavens as well as the actions of its angelic priesthood. By contrast, *ALD* tells us very little, although angels do appear. In 4QLevi^b ar 2 15–18, an angel takes Levi up to the gates of heaven in a vision. And in *ALD* 4–7 (cf. 4QLevi^c ar) it is implied that Levi was installed into the priesthood by seven angels.¹¹⁴ In *T. Levi* 8:1, these seven are clad in “white raiment,” reminiscent of the seven angels in the book of Ezekiel (9:2–3, 11; 10:2) who wear linen pants (מכנסי בד).¹¹⁵ The garments of the angels in both Ezekiel and *T. Levi* recall those that the high priest is to wear once a year on the Day of Atonement when he enters the holy of holies (Lev 16:4).¹¹⁶ Thus, the white clothing of the angels in *T. Levi* 8 most likely identifies them as priests. Though the clothing of the seven is not described in the preserved portions of *ALD*, it is possible that *T. Levi* followed *ALD* in this case.

Like *Jubilees*, *ALD*'s explicit concern for the human priesthood of Levi and his descendants differentiates its portrayal of otherworldly priesthood from that of *BW*. In the latter, the rebellion of some of the angel-priests and the near defilement of the heavenly temple is a symbolic representation of the author's anxieties regarding the earthly temple and priesthood. In *T. Levi*, however, the heavenly temple and its service are perfect and seemingly unprofanable. And while Levi's descendants will stray from their ordained path in the future (*T. Levi* 14–17; cf. Bodleian b 14–18 and the Athos Greek manuscript), Levi is invested by the angels precisely in order to legitimize his earthly office.¹¹⁷ Indeed, the

¹¹⁴ “And those seven departed from me” (ונגדו שבעתן מן לותי).

¹¹⁵ These may be identical with the seven archangels named in *1 Enoch* 20. For another case of an angel wearing linen, see Dan 10:5; 12:6–7.

¹¹⁶ To be sure, plain linen garments are to be worn also by the ordinary priests when they remove the ashes from the altar (Lev 6:3). Leviticus does not describe the color of the high priest's Day of Atonement garb, but in *m. Yoma* 3:6 we are told that they are white (בגדי לבן). On the symbolism of the priestly vestments, see M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 165–174.

¹¹⁷ To be sure, most scholars view *ALD* as containing two visions by Levi. According to J. Kugel (“Levi's Elevation,” 27–37), the first vision (which he calls “Levi's Apocalypse”) is not mainly concerned with priesthood, but rather with showing that Levi, like Enoch and other visionaries, was “called on high to be told of the secrets of the heavens and the coming judgment to be passed on humankind.” However, the second vision (“Levi's Priestly Initiation”) is indeed focused on the elevation of Levi to the status of “priest of the Lord.” On the other hand, Kugler (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 47–59) argues that *ALD*

installation of Levi by angelic priests confers upon his human priesthood a sort of angelic status: “For you (Levi) will stand near¹¹⁸ the Lord and will be his minister and will declare his mysteries to men” (*T. Levi* 2:10).¹¹⁹ A similar phrase is preserved in *ALD* 18: “You are near to God and near to all his holy ones” (קריב אנת לאל וקריב לכל קדישוהי).¹²⁰ While *ALD* does not make its point as explicitly as *T. Levi*, it appears that a similar position is implied in the two texts.

This point may be supported by a comparison of the relationship between humans and angels in *BW* and *T. Levi*. In *BW*, the ontological distinction between angel and human which represents the gulf between human priest and non-priest is well defined. This distinction persists even in Enoch’s ascent to heaven, during which he is completely horrified by the awesome appearance of the heavenly temple. The terrifying structure of fire, ice, and snow leaves Enoch prostrate and trembling on the floor. In order to approach God, Enoch relates that “one of the holy ones came to me and raised me up and stood me (on my feet) and brought me up to the door” (14:24). Enoch’s incapacitating fear underscores the natural difference between him and the heavenly angels who dwell in that awesome place. By contrast, Levi shows no sign of fear during his vision of heaven or his interaction with angels. Indeed, the very same elements of fire, ice, and snow, which compose the awe inspiring temple that shock Enoch, are portrayed in *T. Levi* as the weapons housed in the second heaven that are to be used for the punishment of the wicked in the end (3:2). Unlike Enoch, Levi neither trembles nor bows; instead, he seems completely at home in the celestial realm.

contained only a single vision. Whatever the case, it is clear from the textual remains that the exalted status of Levi’s priestly office and its legitimacy are primary concerns for the author.

¹¹⁸ An apparent word play on the name לוי. For a similar transformation of the original biblical word play, see *Jub.* 31:16–17.

¹¹⁹ Cf. *Jub.* 30:18; 31:14; and discussion below.

¹²⁰ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 73, notes that the setting is similar to that of Zechariah 3, where the high priest Joshua stands in front of the angel of the Lord and is cleansed so that he might fulfill his cultic function. See also J. 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. C. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S. Paul; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 398–399. Both scholars interpret the term קדישוהי as a reference to angels. However, see the doubts of M. Stone and J. Greenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 260–261. Baumgarten speculates that the physical posture that Levi assumes in his prayer “may be in emulation of one of the physical characteristics ascribed to the angels.”

Some have explained Levi's calm reaction as indicating the transformed significance of the temple and priesthood for *T. Levi's* Christian author.¹²¹ As in the book of Revelation, the mundane temple and cult have lost their old force. This interpretation may indeed hold some truth.¹²² However, Himmelfarb evidently goes too far when she asserts that "the author of Aramaic Levi with his intense interest in the earthly priesthood would surely have made his hero react appropriately to the heavenly temple."¹²³ In fact, there is no reason why the earlier text could not have portrayed Levi as retaining his composure while in heaven. As we have already seen, according to *ALD*, Levi's very name implies that he is by nature "near to God and near to all his holy ones." As father of the true priestly line, Levi's ease may be read as a confirmation of his (and his descendants') elevated standing before God. Moreover, we have seen in *Jubilees*, which is closely related to and even dependent upon *ALD*, and in more general Second Temple literature such as the *Letter of Aristeas*, that there seems to be a certain comfort with the description of human priests in otherworldly terms. It is therefore possible that Levi's calmness in *T. Levi* reflects an older notion inherited from *ALD*—the notion that the earthly priesthood of Levi is analogous to and somehow participates in the nature of the angelic priesthood serving God in the celestial temple. This notion finds particular support in the closely related 4QVisions of Amram.

4QVISIONS OF AMRAM AR (4Q543–548)

Six badly damaged copies of the Aramaic work dubbed Visions of Amram by Milik were discovered in Qumran Cave 4.¹²⁴ Scholars generally date the text to the mid-second century BCE or earlier.¹²⁵ The *terminus ante*

¹²¹ See M. de Jonge, "Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in *Testament Levi* X, XIV–XV and XVI," in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge* (NovTSup 63; Leiden: Brill 1991), 180–190; idem, "The Testament of Levi and 'Aramaic Levi,'" in *Jewish Eschatology*, 244–262; Himmelfarb, *Ascent*, 32.

¹²² Note for example the four columns or so of detailed sacrificial instructions in *ALD* (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 75–89) over against the extremely diminished and comparably vague instructions of *T. Levi* 9:7.

¹²³ *Ascent to Heaven*, 32.

¹²⁴ The title is based on the text's self identification as a "copy of the writing of the words of the visions of Amram" (פרשן כתב מלי חוות עמרם). See Milik, "4QVisions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972): 77–99.

¹²⁵ E. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes arameéens, première partie: 4Q529–549*

quem is established by the earliest Qumran exemplar, which Emile Puech has dated to near 125 BCE based on paleography. If correct, this would put it prior to the establishment of the community at Qumran. In any case, since the document lacks the highly technical terminology of the sectarian texts and is written in Aramaic, most scholars agree that it likely originated outside of Qumran.¹²⁶

Despite its fragmentary state of preservation, Visions of Amram is the only document from Qumran that is clearly to be classified in the testament genre. Throughout the text, the priestly patriarch Amram relates the visions of his lifetime to his sons, Aaron and Moses, from his deathbed (cf. 4Q543 1 1-2 = 4Q545 1 I, 1-2). As noted above, Visions of Amram as well as the related Testament of Qahat (4Q542), are closely linked to and even dependent on *ALD*, although the precise relationship between the three cannot be determined. Each of these documents shares a stark spiritual dualism in tandem with a deep concern for the legitimacy, continuity, and teachings of the priestly line of Levi. These similarities have led naturally to the view that Visions of Amram belongs to a larger body of Aramaic literature attributed to key figures from Israel's sacerdotal history that was composed in the third and early second centuries BCE, a time when temple office was hotly contested.¹²⁷ We shall return to the possible goals of this complex of traditions below in chapter seven.

One passage preserved partially in two separate copies of Visions of Amram (4Q543 2a-b and 4Q545 1 I) may provide further testimony to the above notion that the human priesthood was perceived as possessing a supernatural quality. The composite text reads as follows:¹²⁸

(DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 285-287; idem, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle* (2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 2:532; Milik, "Visions de 'Amram," 78. See also K. Beyer, (*Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], 85), who claims that the composition is cited by *Jub.* 46:10-11, which would guarantee a date prior to the middle of the second century BCE (see above). The argument of P. Kobelski (*Melchizedek and Melchireša'* [CBQMS 10; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981], 24-36) for classifying Visions of Amram as a sectarian text is not convincing.

¹²⁶ See Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 34-35; B.Z. Wacholder, "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500-165 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts," in *Archaeology and History*, 257-281.

¹²⁷ So M. Stone, "Amram," *EDSS* 1:24; cf. R. Kugler ("Testaments," *EDSS* 2:934), who suggests that these works may be identified with the books given by Jacob to Levi his son "that he might preserve them and renew them for his children" (*Jub.* 45:16).

¹²⁸ See Puech, DJD XXXI, 294-295, 334-337.

and we will give you wisdom (וּנְתַן לְכֶּה חִכְמָה) [...] it will be added to you ... God you will be and an angel of God you will be called (אֵל תְּהוּהוּ וּמַלְאָךְ) (אֵל תְּתַקְרָה) ... you will do in this land and a judge ... and when your name ...

The identity of the addressee is unclear.¹²⁹ Presumably, the message is directed to either Aaron or Moses. Milik, who saw this fragment as part “d’un discours d’Amram à Aaron,” suggests that it is Aaron who is labeled here as one who “will be called an angel of God.”¹³⁰ Indeed, the addressee’s possession of wisdom and position as judge recall priestly prerogatives. However, wisdom and the vocation of a judge can certainly just as well be applied to Moses. The same holds true for the designation “angel of God,” and even, perhaps, “god.”¹³¹ On the other hand, Moses is nowhere mentioned explicitly in the document. In addition, just a few lines prior to our text, Aaron is summoned by Amram, apparently in order that he might reveal to him his visions and bless him (4Q545 1 I, 8). Furthermore, other portions of the Visions of Amram have a pronounced interest in the sacrificial cult and priestly succession, both matters more properly connected with Aaron. For instance, in 4Q547 9 7, someone in the midst of a vision,¹³² most probably Amram, declares: “The priest will be exalted among all my sons forever” (יִתְרָם) (כֹּהֵן מִן כֹּל בְּנֵי עֵלְמָא). As has been noted, the visionary call for the exaltation of the priest is reminiscent of the priestly ordination traditions in *ALD*, *T. Levi* and *Jubilees* 30–32.¹³³ Given the combined weight of these details, Aaron is most likely the one who “will be called an angel of God.”

¹²⁹ The identity of the addressors is unclear as well. Taking וּנְתַן as a first person plural (cf. F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998], 2:1085; Puech, DJD XXXI, 285), we can only speculate as to the identity of the speakers. Puech suggests either angelic messengers or ancestors of Aaron. If a Hebraism, וּנְתַן could signify a third person masculine singular verb.

¹³⁰ Milik, “Visions de ‘Amram,” 94. He is followed by Puech, DJD XXXI, 295.

¹³¹ Cf. Exod 4:16 where Moses is portrayed “as a god.” Due to the fragmentary nature of the text, Fletcher-Louis’ claim (*All the Glory*, 187–188) that Aaron is here labeled a “god” cannot be proven. Puech’s interpretation, which takes the first אֵל as “*le nomen rectum* d’une expression parallèle à suivante אֵל וּמַלְאָךְ,” is to be preferred. His suggestion [בְּחִיר] אֵל is suitable.

¹³² This may be inferred from the following line (l. 8), “And I awoke from the sleep of my eyes and [I] wrote the vision” (וַאֲנִי אֶתְעִירַת מִן שְׁנַת עֵינַי וְחִוּוֹא כָּתַבְתִּי (ת)).

¹³³ See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 188.

HEBREW BEN SIRA

Small portions of the Hebrew wisdom book of Ben Sira discovered in the Qumran caves confirm that that work was known to the Qumran community.¹³⁴ Ben Sira is clearly a non-sectarian text, originally composed by the Jerusalemite sage and avid supporter of the Zadokite priesthood Jesus ben Sira between the years 190 and 175 BCE. Various notions expressed by Ben Sira blatantly conflict with the distinctive religious views proffered in sectarian texts as well as their closely related precursors. For instance, Ben Sira displays an undying support for the Jerusalemite priesthood over against the harsh criticism of such works as *BW* and various later sectarian compositions (e.g., 1QpHab).¹³⁵ Furthermore, whereas these latter works endorse a solar calendar, Ben Sira demotes the sun (even below its tempered role in Gen 1:14) and prefers a lunar calendar (43:1–8). Ben Sira also takes a negative stance against those who allege that they have received revelation through dreams and visions (34:1–8) and those seeking knowledge of divine mysteries (3:21–24), two enterprises central to the literature most cherished by the Qumranites.¹³⁶ The discovery of Ben Sira at Qumran thus appears to challenge a key methodological assumption of the Groningen Hypothesis, which presumes that any non-biblical work preserved at Qumran by definition reflects Qumranite beliefs and may therefore be used to reconstruct the theology and ideology of the

¹³⁴ Portions of the work appear in only two manuscripts: 2Q18 preserves a few words from Sir 6:14–15 (or 1:19–20), 20–31, and *Psalms Scroll^a* (11Q5) includes Sir 51:13–19, 30. An additional copy preserving text from chapters 39–43 was discovered at Masada.

¹³⁵ Ben Sira's outspoken support for the Jerusalem priesthood is ingeniously expressed in 7:29–31, which utilizes Deut 6:5 in order to equate the honoring of the priests with the commandments to love and to fear God. On Ben Sira's positive attitude toward the priesthood, see H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT 2,6; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1980); S. Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," *HTR* 80 (1987): 261–286.

¹³⁶ Benjamin Wright claims that Ben Sira's position on these issues shows an awareness of the apocalyptic circles that penned *BW* and *ALD*, and that his work reflects a direct polemical response against them. See idem, "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* (ed. P.C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 189–222; idem, "Putting the Puzzle Together." The former article now appears also in Wright's fine collection of essays, *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint* (JSJSup 131; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

community and its apocalyptic predecessors.¹³⁷ However, while the theological and ideological differences between Ben Sira and sectarian (and related pre-sectarian) literature are stark, it is possible to imagine a scenario in which these differences were overlooked, ignored, or perhaps even harmonized by the Qumranites. One might consider as an analogy the inclusion and embracement of conflicting theological and ideological material in the Jewish and Christian Bibles by faith communities. It is indeed possible that the diverse sapiential material of Ben Sira, which includes both practical and “existential” wisdom, was approached in a similar manner. Moreover, Ben Sira shares theological concerns and thematic and formal characteristics with 4QInstruction, another nearly contemporary wisdom work which, as we shall see below, may have garnered authoritative status at Qumran. One further area that may have encouraged the reading of Ben Sira at Qumran is a particular aspect of how it imagines the priesthood—in otherworldly terms.

Simon as Exalted High Priest

Although Ben Sira does not explicitly mention a celestial cult, his portrayal of the high priestly figure Simon the Righteous (219–196 BCE) is noteworthy in this regard. At the climax of the long hymn praising the heroes of Israel’s past, Ben Sira describes the Zadokite high priest Simon II in exalted terms surpassing any offered for previous figures (50:1–21). Simon is “the greatest of his brothers and the magnificence of his people” (גדול אחיו ותפארת עמו), refurbisher of the temple, and protector of the people (50:1–4). While conducting the daily¹³⁸ temple service he is “exceedingly splendid” (מה נהדר),

¹³⁷ For example, García Martínez (“Qumran Origins,” 116) proposes: “In view of the character of the Qumran Community it seems to me out of the question that it (the Qumran community) should have preserved and made use of a work incompatible with its own theology.” Similarly, García Martínez and van der Woude (“A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis,” 525) claim that the presence of any work at Qumran “does assure us that the work in question was understood as compatible with its own ideology and its own *halakhah*, that is, coming from the Essene movement or from the apocalyptic tradition which inspired it.” Wright notes that both Ben Sira and the apparently pro-Hasmonean 4Q448, the so-called “Prayer for the Health of King Jonathan,” seem to undermine this assumption. See idem, “One ‘Methodological Assumption’ of the Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 286–290.

¹³⁸ Most commentators understand the ceremonies in this chapter as relating to Yom Kippur, but see F. Fearghail, “Sir 50, 5–21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole-Offering?”

like a brilliant star (emerging) from among clouds; and like the full moon during the festival days; and like the sun shining on the king's temple; and like the rainbow which appears in the cloud (כוכב אור מבין עבים וכירח מלא) (מבין בימי מועד וכשמש משרקת אל היכל המלך וכקשת נראתה בענן).¹³⁹ (50:6-7)

In view of Ben Sira's vast knowledge and learned use of Scripture as well as the unique phraseology here, the comparison of the high priest to the heavenly luminaries derives from Ps 148:3: "Praise him sun and moon, praise him all you shining stars" (הללוהו שמש וירח הללוהו כל-כוכבי) (אור). As Mitchell Dahood comments on that verse, the phrase כוכבי אור is a *hapax legomenon* which, since אור means "morning" in Job 24:14, "could be synonymous with Job 38:7, כוכבי בקר, 'the morning stars.'"¹⁴⁰ Interestingly, in both Ps 148:3 and Job 38:7 the heavenly bodies are clearly paralleled by angels or sons of God, the members of God's heavenly council who serve before his royal throne in biblical literature.¹⁴¹ This connection comports with Ben Sira's repeated use of royal imagery in 50:3 and 7 (היכל המלך).¹⁴² Simon is thus comparable to a radiant heavenly body / angel in the king's dwelling above.¹⁴³ Unsurprisingly, his service at the altar is expressed with the root שרת (50:14, 19), a common biblical

Bib 59 (1978): 301-316, who shows on the basis of *m. Tamid* 6:4-7:3 that the ceremonies relate more closely to those of the *tamid*. See also Hayward's arguments in *The Jewish Temple*, 50.

¹³⁹ Hebrew text of Ben Sira follows the edition of P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹⁴⁰ M. Dahood, *Psalms* (3 vols.; AB 16-17A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1965-1970), 3:353.

¹⁴¹ See the texts and secondary literature cited above in n. 1. Psalm 148:3 is preceded by a verse which parallels angels and "hosts": הללוהו כל-מלאכי הללוהו כל-צבאו. In Job 38:7, the parallelism is just as clear: ברן-יחד כוכבי בקר//ויריעו כל-בני אלהים. On the association of angels with astral bodies, see the comments and literature cited by J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 393-394.

¹⁴² Most of the fifteen appearances of the term מלך in Ben Sira refer not to God but to a human king. See *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973), 200.

¹⁴³ Simon's comparison with a bright star and the sun may also have royal implications. Hayward (*The Jewish Temple*, 51) notes that while portrayal of individuals in such terms is rare in the Hebrew Bible, when it occurs, it has royal connotations. See, e.g., Ps 89:38; 2 Sam 23:4; Num 24:17; cf. *T. Levi* 18:3 and *T. Jud.* 24:1. For the cosmogonic significance of the temple priest in Ben Sira, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 44-72. For the same theme in broader Second Temple and biblical literature, see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 56-87. On the deliberate parallelism between personified Wisdom and Simon the Righteous by means of comparison with the beauty of natural phenomenon in Ben Sira 24 and 50, see C.T.R. Hayward, "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's

term for priestly service. However, Ben Sira may also have had in mind the use of that same root to describe the service of God carried out by the angels/hosts in such scriptural passages as Ps 103:20–21:

Praise the Lord you his angels, you mighty ones who do his bidding and obey the sound of his word. Praise the Lord, all his heavenly hosts, you *his servants* who do his will (ברכו ה' מלאכיו גבורי כח עשי דברו לשמע בקול דברו) *his servants* (ברכו ה' כל-צבאיו משרתיו עשי רצונו) (cf. Ps 104:4)

Simon is exalted still further by his comparison with a rainbow, which picks up the language of Ezek 1:28:¹⁴⁴

Like the appearance of the rainbow in the clouds on a rainy day, such was the appearance of the radiance around him. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord (כמראה הקשת אשר יהיה בענן ביום הגשם) (כן מראה הנגה סביב הוא מראה דמות כבוד-ה).

Here, the image of the rainbow is utilized to describe the effulgence surrounding Ezekiel's vision of "the glory of God." The divine glory (כבוד ה'), as elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, denotes the visible manifestation of God on earth.¹⁴⁵ By echoing Ezek 1:28, Ben Sira seems to imply that the high priest in his service conveys the divine radiance into the temple.¹⁴⁶ As in *Let. Aris.* 96–99, the phenomenon of brilliant light is apparently brought about by the donning of the high priestly garments, which are described in 50:11 as "vestments of glory" (בגדי כבוד) and "vestments

Attitude to the Temple Service," in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology* (ed. S.W. Sykes; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 23–24; idem, "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira," *SJOT* 6 (1992): 127.

¹⁴⁴ So P.W. Skehan and A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 552.

¹⁴⁵ Exodus 16:7; 24:16–17; 40:34–35; Lev 9:4, 6, 23; Num 14:10, etc. See BDB, 458, definition 3c. For the possibility of the glory as a figure such as appears in the Ezekiel passage, see Exod 33:18, 22. See further the brief comments of M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 51.

¹⁴⁶ A further aspect of the radiance of the priest is asserted by *T. Levi*. In 4:2, a verse which derives directly from *ALD* (see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 32–33; Greenfield and Stone, "Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, [ed. H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T. Tobin; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990,], 153–161, esp. 157), the angel-guide tells Levi that God has made him "a minister of his presence." He is further promised that he will "light up a bright light of knowledge in Jacob" and will be "as the sun to all the seed of Israel" (4:3; cf. 18:3–4). As in Ben Sira, the priest is compared to the sun. However, here the light imagery is connected explicitly with knowledge. As we shall see below (chapter four), the association of otherworldly priesthood, light, and salvific knowledge was a significant one for the Qumranites.

of magnificence” (בגדי תפארת).¹⁴⁷ Thus, “when he ascends onto the altar there is majesty (הוד), and the courtyard of the temple is made splendid (יהדר)” (50:11).¹⁴⁸ The “magnificence” (תפארת) associated with Simon’s garments applies as well to Simon himself, for he is “the magnificence of his people” (תפארת עמו). As bearer of the headdress inscribed with God’s name as well as pronouncer of that name, Simon “became magnificent in the name of the Lord” (התפאר בשם ה’) (50:1, 20).¹⁴⁹ Moreover, just as the temple “is made splendid” (יהדר) by Simon, he himself is deemed “exceedingly splendid” (מה נהדר). Ben Sira paints a similar picture a bit earlier in his poem dedicated to Aaron (45:6–22), which links כבוד, הוד, and תפארת to both the high priestly vestments and the exalted status of Aaron, the first high priest.¹⁵⁰

Ben Sira’s depiction of both Simon and Aaron brings to mind Isaac’s blessing of Levi in *Jub.* 31:14. If we recall, there Isaac prays that Levi and his children will be made like the angels of the presence and the holy ones by receiving glory (כבוד) from God. Isaac’s prayer for the selection

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Exod 28:2, 40, according to which the priestly vestments are made לכבוד ולתפארת. Haran (*Temples*, 174) explains that the garments of the high priest “serve to indicate a kind of dialectical elevation into that sphere which is beyond even the material, contagious holiness characterizing the tabernacle and its accessories.”

¹⁴⁸ The brilliant light radiating from the priestly vestments is a popular theme in Second Temple and later literature. We have already noted it in *Let. Aris.* 96–99. See also Josephus, *Ant.* 3.184–187; 216–217, where he utilizes sun imagery to explicate the significance of the high priest’s ephod and head-dress with God’s name upon it. See also Add Esth D 15:6; *Gen. Rab.* 38:8; *L.A.B.* 25:6; 26:15; 3 *Enoch* 12. The motif is also present in the story of Alexander the Great’s encounter with Simon the Righteous preserved in several witnesses (Josephus, *Ant.* 11:326–338; Pseudo-Callisthenes, *Alexander Romance* 2:24; *Josippon* 10:3–51; Samaritan Chronicle II [folio 129B–130B]), including rabbinic literature (*b. Yoma* 69a; *Megillat Taanit* ch. 9, [21st of Kislev]; cf. *Lev. Rab.* 13:5; *Pesiq. Rab.* 14:15). Hayward (*The Jewish Temple*, 16) notes that despite the differences in the light symbolism in these various works, “at the root of all their thoughts lies the ancient biblical tradition of God’s presence in the Temple defined as ‘glory,’ a dazzling radiance manifesting God’s accompanying with Israel.”

¹⁴⁹ It is noteworthy that Sir 49:16 states that “the magnificence of Adam is above every living thing” (ועל כל חי תפארת אדם). Skehan and Di Lella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 550) see the word תפארת as a *mot crochet*, which clearly links up with the section about Simon. In this connection, it is interesting to recall the tradition cited above (n. 69) that claims that the high priestly vestments were originally the garments of Adam, which he passed down to his priestly descendants. It is possible that a similar priestly tradition lays behind the conviction declared in sectarian literature (1QS 4:23; 1QH^a 4:27; CD 3:20) that the community will inherit “all the glory of Adam” (כול כבוד אדם). However, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 45–46.

¹⁵⁰ On this poem and its extreme exaltation of Aaron, see Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 63–72.

of Levi and his children “out of all flesh” (מכל בשר) also parallels the language of Ben Sira. The laypeople, “all flesh” (כל בשר), hurry to bow on the ground (50:17), while splendid Simon is surrounded by “all the sons of Aaron in their glory” (כל בני אהרון בכבודם) (50:12). As noted above, a Qumran fragment of *ALD* (4QLevi^c 1) relates in the context of a heavenly vision that Levi is loved “more than / from all flesh” (מן כל בשר|א). God’s selection of Moses “from all [flesh]” in Ben Sira 45:4 may capture a similar idea.¹⁵¹

Based on their parallel use, it is reasonable to assume that the roots כבוד, פאר, הדר, פאר, כבוד, הוד and הוד are synonymous in their general thrust in Ben Sira 50 (cf. 45:6–22).¹⁵² They all seem to refer to God’s presence as captured by the garments and perhaps person of the high priest during temple service. Thus, while Ben Sira fails to explicitly mention a celestial cult, it assumes that the divine presence, conveyed by the earthly high priest, permeates the ritual of the earthly temple. This notion is very close, though not identical, to what we have observed in *Jubilees* 31.

4QINSTRUCTION^D (4Q418) FRG. 81 + 81A

Unknown prior to its twentieth century discovery, 1Q/4QInstruction is preserved in eight different Qumran manuscripts.¹⁵³ The large number of

¹⁵¹ Much of the Hebrew praise of Moses is fragmentary. However, in the Greek, God “consecrated” (ἡγίασεν) Moses (as priest?) and “chose him out of all flesh” (ἐξελέξατο αὐτὸν ἐκ πάσης σαρκός). On the exaltation of Moses at Qumran see C. Fletcher-Louis, “4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 240–242; idem, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT 2, 94; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 185–198.

¹⁵² On the equivalence of הוד and הדר in the Hebrew Bible as well as the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, see C. Newsom in E. Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 273.

¹⁵³ The manuscript numbers are as follows: 4Q415, 4Q416, 4Q417, 4Q418, 4Q418a, 4Q423, and 1Q26. This composition has received much well-deserved attention in recent years. See especially J.-S. Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatology* (STDJ 81; Leiden, Brill, 2009); D.F. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations 3; Near Eastern Studies 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004); M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003); E. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001); T. Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction” (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University, 1997); idem, “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,” *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–463; idem, “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,” in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F.H. Cryer

copies, the fact that it may be quoted in 1QH^a 18:29–30,¹⁵⁴ and other factors have led many scholars to the conclusion that it was a highly influential and perhaps “canonical” document at Qumran.¹⁵⁵ 1Q/4QInstruction is a sapiential work in which an instructor (perhaps the מַשְׁכִּיל) addresses a student (מַבְיֵן), mostly regarding issues of practical wisdom such as financial matters and social/familial relationships. However, the preserved portions also touch upon matters of religious mystery, i.e., eschatology and cosmology. The call to contemplate the “mystery that is to come” (רִזְ נְהִיָּה) is a recurring theme. By means of such contemplation, those addressed will ultimately participate in the glory of the angels.¹⁵⁶ Although all copies of 1Q/4QInstruction appear in Herodian hands, the DJD editors date its composition to some point between the books of Proverbs and Ben Sira.¹⁵⁷ The majority of commentators date it to somewhere in the second century BCE.¹⁵⁸

and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; CIS 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113–150; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

¹⁵⁴ See 4Q418 55 10, וְלִפִּי דַעְתָּם יִכְבְּדוּ אִישׁ מֵרַעְהוּ.

¹⁵⁵ For this suggestion see J. Strugnell and D.J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: 4QInstruction (Mūsār I^e Mēvin): 4Q415 ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press), 36.

¹⁵⁶ There is no clear evidence in 4QInstruction for the enjoyment of *present* participation with the angels as there is in the sectarian documents. See further J.J. Collins (“The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001* [ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 57–58).

¹⁵⁷ Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 36. On the other hand, Collins places 4QInstruction within a different line of development from Proverbs and Ben Sira based on its incorporation of eschatology into wisdom instruction. See his “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 64–65. See also T. Elgvin (“Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* [ed. D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 38), who notes that the biblical and post-biblical tradition of ‘the wisdom of God’ is here reinterpreted “in an apocalyptic manner.”

¹⁵⁸ A. Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,” in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998), 113–159; J.J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 117–127; Elgvin, “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology,” 440–463. H. Stegemann, on the other hand, calls for a much earlier date in the fourth / third century. See *idem, Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 142–143.

The milieu of 1Q/4QInstruction's origins has been heavily debated. Based on its interest in family and economic matters, as well as its lack of explicit reference to any community, several scholars have claimed that it was addressed to Judean society in general.¹⁵⁹ Indeed, according to the DJD editors, the absence of sectarian vocabulary and distinctive dualism confirms a general non-sectarian and post-exilic sapiential Jewish background.¹⁶⁰ Schiffman has bolstered this claim by illustrating that on the few occasions when the document touches on matters of halakhah, such as the vows of women, it does not conform to sectarian halakhic rulings, but rather agrees "generally with the law as defined in what we later know as the Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition."¹⁶¹ Based on the rhetorical situation of instruction, Harrington and Strugnell propose origins in some type of school setting and suggest that the teacher was a sage with formal functions in official courts in the Persian, Ptolemaic, or Seleucid periods, at "the imperial centre or Palestinian provincial ones."¹⁶² Yet it is unclear why such a court scribe would be so well-versed in religious mysteries. Furthermore, there are no clear references to court material.¹⁶³ Indeed, in view of the eschatological material, Collins has recognized a milieu of religious instruction behind the composition. This instruction was not meant for Jewish society at large but rather for the initiates of some movement with access to special wisdom available only to the elect. (This theme was of course picked up later by the Qumranites).¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁹ For example, Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 36. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–207, 247–248, similarly argues for a larger non-sectarian sapiential context. On the basis of his comparison of the notions of cosmology and predestination in 4QInstruction and the sectarian documents, Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 45–92, concludes that it should not be classified as sectarian, but did have a significant influence on sectarian wisdom traditions.

¹⁶⁰ DJD XXXIV, 22–36. On the other hand, J. Scott ("Korah and Qumran," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* [ed. P. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 182–202) argues on the basis of 4Q423 5, which mentions the judgment of Korah, that the document describes, in paradigmatic terms, a schism in leadership during the early years of the sect. He therefore concludes that 4QInstruction is of sectarian provenance. Elgvin ("Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 1Q/4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives*, 84, n. 63) rightly points out that Scott makes his argument on the basis of the terminology of a few specific passages "without discussing the character of the work as a whole."

¹⁶¹ L. Schiffman, "Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives*, 100.

¹⁶² DJD XXXIV, 21.

¹⁶³ So Elgvin, "Priestly Sages," 78.

¹⁶⁴ See Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 117–127; idem, "The Eschatologizing of Wisdom," esp. 64–65.

Similar to Collins, Torleif Elgvin argues that 4QInstruction's utilization of such terms as "eternal planting," "sprout," "men of favor," and "those who inherit the land," points to a social circle, similar to those behind the various books within *1 Enoch*, which saw itself as the nucleus of Israel destined to be saved in the end-time.¹⁶⁵ Alternatively, in light of several seemingly priestly concerns (such as casting of lots, the priestly prohibition of mixing different species, vows, and festivals), Armin Lange suggests a temple milieu for the work.¹⁶⁶ Finally, Eibert Tigchelaar proposes a plausible and more flexible solution, worth bearing in mind: He suggests that the addressee was not a professional sage, but could be anyone in society. The intent of the work was thus

to admonish people from all layers of society to behave according to their God-given ordained position, and promise them everlasting glory. Those who understand, know that, in spite of their need, they will be rewarded by God, whereas the foolish or ungodly will be punished.¹⁶⁷

Particularly relevant to our present discussion of otherworldly priesthood is a long passage found in 4Q418 81 + 81a. The first fourteen lines of this extensive fragment (of twenty total lines) read as follows:¹⁶⁸

(1) of your lips he has opened a spring in order to bless the holy ones (שפתיכה פתה מקור לברך קדושים). And you, as an everflowing fountain (כמקור עולם), praise [...] He has separated you from amongst all (2) fleshly spirit (הבדיל בשר רוח ככול רוח בשר). And you, separate yourself (הנור) from everything that he hates, and set yourself apart (הנור) from all abominations of the soul. [Fo]r he has made everyone (3) and has caused each man to inherit his own inheritance. But he is your portion and your inheritance in the midst of mankind / the children of Adam (והוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם) and he has set you over his [in]heritance. And you (4) shall honor

¹⁶⁵ Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come," 113–150. In Elgvin's view, the thematic and linguistic connections with sectarian literature on the one hand, and the lack of many characteristic features of sectarian orientation on the other hand point to the origins of the document in either a proto-sectarian community or the larger Essene movement. See idem, "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology," 460–463.

¹⁶⁶ Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 131. The suggestion fits with his larger theory that a Jerusalem temple milieu lies behind a sequence of third / second century BCE sapiential works including 4QInstruction, 4QMysteries, the second redaction of Qohelet, and the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS 3–4).

¹⁶⁷ Tigchelaar, "The Addressees of 1Q/4QInstruction," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 75. Gershon Brin arrives at a similar conclusion in "Wisdom Issues in Qumran: The Types and Status of the Figures in 4Q424 and the Phrases of Rationale in the Document," *DSD* 4 (1997): 297–311.

¹⁶⁸ Text and translation draw from Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 300–303.

him through the following: through sanctifying yourself for him just as he has appointed you as a most holy one¹⁶⁹ (בוה כבדהו בהתקדשכה לו כאשר) (שמכה לקדוש קודשים) [over all the] land, and among all the [go]dly [ones] (5) he has cast your lot, such that your glory is very great (הפילה גורלכה וכבודכה) (הרבה מואדה וישימכה לו) And he has appointed you for himself firstborn (בכור) in [...] (6) And I will give you my favor. Oh you, are not all my good things yours? So always walk in faithfulness to me[...] (7) your deeds. And you, seek his judgments from the hand of all your adversaries, in all [...] (8) love him, and with eternal kindness and mercy for all those who keep his word; but his zeal (וקנאתו) [...] (9) As for you, he has [op]ened up for you insight, and he has set you over his treasure (שכל [פתח לכה] (ובאוצרו המשליכה) and an *ephah* of truth he has appointed[...] (10) they are with you. And it is in your power to turn away anger from the men of favor (ויבידכה להשיב אף מאנשי רצון) and to punish [...] (11) with you/ your people. Before you take your inheritance from his hand, glorify his holy ones (כבד קדושי) and bef[ore ...] (12) open [a sp]ring of all the holy ones (פתח [מ]קור¹⁷⁰ כול קדושים). And all who are called by his name (will be) holy [...] (13) during all the periods, his splendor, his magnificence for the eter[nal] plantation (הדרו פארתו למטעת עולם) [...] (14) [...] world in it will walk all those who inherit the land (כול נוחלי ארץ), for in he[aven] ...]

Although otherworldly priests or priesthood are never mentioned explicitly, this fragment reveals several interesting points of contact with the texts discussed above. Lines 1–4 state that God separated the addressee from “amongst all fleshly spirit” (בכול רוח בשר),¹⁷¹ and that he should

¹⁶⁹ Elgvin (“An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 136) notes that if the sanctuary (the holy of holies) were meant, the phrase would have been spelled קודש קודשים rather than קדוש קודשים. Instead, he reads “to sanctify the holy ones.” However, as Tigchelaar (*To Increase Learning*, 233) notes, the verb לקדוש in the *qal* never appears in the Hebrew Bible, and in any case, cannot mean “to sanctify.” Lange’s “as a holy among holy things” is also possible. (“The Determination of Fate,” 40). With Goff, *The Worldly*, 106, I read the phrase as emphasizing the holiness of the addressee while alluding to the holy of holies.

¹⁷⁰ Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 308, read שיר[. I read מ[קור with L. Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God’: Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. L. Stuckenbruck and W. North; JSNTSup 263; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 63, n. 50. As he notes, there are several reasons why such a reading is preferable: “(1) The ligature atop the left vertical stroke of a letter following the lacunae is more consistent with a ק than with ש; (2) *contra* Strugnell and Harrington, the lacunae on line 12 and the varying shape of the tail of ק in the manuscript make it possible to restore מ[קור; and (3) a ש would require the foregoing space after פתח to be wider than spaces between any of the other words in the column.” Moreover, restoring מ[קור פתח matches the formula used in the context of blessing the holy ones in l. 1.

¹⁷¹ For the rare occurrences of the phrase רוח בשר in Qumran writings, see Strugnell and Harrington DJD XXXIV, 304. See further A.E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 104–106.

sanctify himself. This language is quite similar to that of *Jub.* 31:14. The separation from “flesh” also recalls Sir 50:17 (cf. 50:12) and 45:4, as well as 4QLevi^c 1. Line 5 relates that God exalted the addressee and bestowed upon him very great glory (וּכְבוֹדָהּ הַרְבֵּה מְאֹדָה).¹⁷² This parallels the majestic glory attributed to both Aaron and Simon by Ben Sira (45:6–22; 50) and the “exceedingly great glory” that Isaac prays God will give to Levi and his descendants (at least according to the Ethiopic version), making them comparable to the angels in “glory, greatness, and holiness” (*Jub.* 31:14). Furthermore, in line 13, the use of the roots הָדַר and פָּאֵר recalls their prominent use in Ben Sira 50 to describe Simon’s numinous splendor.

The Identity of the Addressee

But what is the identity of the addressee in 4Q418 81? Commentators have often observed that the addressee’s “possession” of God as an inheritance (וְהוּא חֶלְקָהּ וְנַחֲלָתָהּ בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי אָדָם; l. 3) surely echoes the statement made by God to Aaron in Num 18:20: “You will have no inheritance in their land, nor will you have any share among them; *I am your share and your inheritance among the children of Israel*” (בְּאַרְצָם לֹא תִנְחַל וְחֶלְקָהּ לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ בְּתוֹכָם אֲנִי חֶלְקְךָ וְנַחֲלָתְךָ בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל).¹⁷³ Since this individual is also designated לְקָדוֹשׁ קִדְשִׁים in line 4, Lange concludes that the fragment should be interpreted as referring to the election of Aaron or Aaronid priests.¹⁷⁴ In support of his case, he cites various clues from the text related to the actions of the addressee: In line 1, the association of the praise of God with an “everflowing spring” may be taken as an allusion to the motif of the temple well, and this fits with the priestly praise of God taking place in the temple.¹⁷⁵ In line 2, the addressee is told to separate from abominations of the soul by means of the root גָּוַר, which often carries a priestly connotation in post-exilic literature.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² Cf. n. 145.

¹⁷³ See A. Lange, “The Determination of fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 39–48; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 305.

¹⁷⁴ “The Determination of Fate,” 40–41. On the translation of לְקָדוֹשׁ קִדְשִׁים, see n. 169. Noting the diversity of professions of the addressee, Tigchelaar (*To Increase Learning*, 236) suggests that frg. 81 may have been written for priests whereas other sections of the work were not. At least regarding frg. 81, his approach is compatible with Lange’s.

¹⁷⁵ Lange cites several examples of the well’s association with the temple: Ezek 47:1 ff.; Ps 36:10; 46:5; 65:10.

¹⁷⁶ Lange cites G. Mayer, “גָּוַר—nezer” *ThWAT* 5:329–334.

Finally, in line 7, the elect one is charged to seek out (or “interpret”) God’s laws, a well-known priestly function.¹⁷⁷

Like Lange, Fletcher-Louis interprets the fragment as referring to the vocation of a priest.¹⁷⁸ Control over God’s treasure (אוֹצְרוֹ, l. 9) is most appropriate for a priestly steward of the temple, which is the center of God’s treasure in all possible senses of that expression. Fletcher-Louis finds additional support especially in line 10, where it is reported that the addressee has the power to turn wrath away from the men of favor (וּבִידְכָה לְהַשִּׁיב אֶף מֵאֲנָשֵׁי רִצּוֹן). In the Hebrew Bible the deflection of divine wrath from the elect is strictly a priestly function (Moses¹⁷⁹ [Ps 106:23], Phinehas [Num 25:11], Jeremiah [Jer 18:20]). Moreover, in texts nearly contemporary with 1Q/4QInstruction, the zealous acts of Mattathias and his son Judah are repeatedly compared to those of Phinehas (1 Mac 2:26, 54; cf. 2 Mac 8:5). Thus, according to 1 Mac 3:8, Judah Maccabee destroyed “the ungodly out of the land; thus he turned away wrath from Israel.”¹⁸⁰ The oblique reference to “zeal” (קְנָאוֹתוֹ) in line 8 may also recall such acts as were associated with the zealous Maccabees and Phinehas.¹⁸¹ Thus the priestly or quasi-priestly identity of the addressee in the present fragment appears to be quite probable.

As we have noted, the phrase והוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם in line 3 is a reworking of Num 18:20, אני חלקך ונחלתך בתוך בני ישראל (which transfers God’s blessing of Aaron onto the addressee). However, there is room to question whether or not the addressee’s priestly status is of a literal hereditary nature.¹⁸² 4Q418 81’s exchange of Numbers’ בני בתוך ישראל for בני אדם in בתוך בני אדם is notable. Fletcher-Louis, who views the passage as

¹⁷⁷ For a refutation of each of these points as support for Lange’s thesis, see B. Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 2, 201; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2005), 164–165.

¹⁷⁸ *All the Glory*, 178–185.

¹⁷⁹ For the identification of Moses as a priest see Ps 109:6. See further Cody, *A History*, 39–52.

¹⁸⁰ Additionally, in its retelling of the story of Korah (Numbers 16), the first century CE Wisdom of Solomon portrays Aaron as driving back wrath by means of prayer and incense (18:21).

¹⁸¹ Cf. Wis 18:15–16 and *Jos. Asen.* 22, which also provide evidence that the turning away of divine wrath was viewed as a strictly priestly vocation. For Fletcher-Louis’ full argument, see *All the Glory*, 176–185.

¹⁸² It is not always correct to assume that the allusion carries the context of the biblical source. The closely related Hodayot, for example, is known to use biblical allusions and citations free from their original context. See further, Wold, *Women*, 43–80. On the use of

addressing a literal priest, sees the phrase **בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי אָדָם** as further evidence of the cultic cosmological emphasis on Adam expected from priestly tradition: “The scene envisaged in 4Q418 81 3–4 is . . . like that in Sirach 50 where the high priest embodying God’s Glory is surrounded by the cultic community who fulfill the vision for the true Adam in a restored Eden.”¹⁸³ Although this interpretation may hold a measure of truth,¹⁸⁴ it is more likely that the language expresses the spiritualization and democratization of priestly prerogatives. In support of such a reading, Elgvin points to the often-overlooked, yet robust royal terminology that resonates alongside the priestly motifs of the fragment.¹⁸⁵ Indeed, the rich combination of priestly and royal expressions in this passage indicates the use of symbolic language and decreases the probability that it is addressed to a real priest.¹⁸⁶

Since lines 10–14 presumably refer to an elect community (“men of favor,” “his holy ones,”¹⁸⁷ “eter[nal] plantation,” “those who inherit the land”) the column becomes a meaningful unit only if the addressee is

biblical traditions in 4QInstruction and in the Qumran wisdom literature in general, see G. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 201–222.

¹⁸³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 180.

¹⁸⁴ Indeed, in 4Q423 1–2 the connection between Adam, the addressee, and the garden of Eden may be related to the context here. See Elgvin, DJD XXXIV, 508–513.

¹⁸⁵ Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 80–83, notes several possible parallels between the language of 4Q418 81 1–14 and that used in royal contexts in the Hebrew Bible, such as King Solomon’s prayer and God’s promise to him in 1 Kgs 3:6–14 and the royal Psalm 89 (as well as Pss 2:7 and 110:4). For example: 1 Kgs 3:6, **חֶסֶד גָּדוֹל** (2)//l. 8, **וּבְחֶסֶד וּבְרַחֲמִים**; 1 Kgs 3:9, **לֵךְ גַּם-עֵשֶׂר גַּם-**, **דָּרוֹשׁ מִשְׁפָּטִי**; 1 Kgs 3:13, **וְכַבֹּד וְכִבוּדָהּ הַרְבֵּה מוֹאדָה**, and l. 6 **וְטוֹבֵי לֶכֶה אֲתָן וְאַתָּה לְהִלּוֹא לֶכֶה טוֹבֵי**; 1 Kgs 3:14, **וּבְאֲמוֹנָתוֹ הֵלֵךְ תְּמִיד**, and l. 14, **אֲמוֹנָתוֹ/אֲמוֹנָתִי**, Psalm 89: **חֶסֶד** (vv. 25, 29, 34; cf. l. 8), **יִתְהַלְכוּ כֹּל נֹחֲלֵי אָרֶץ** (v. 31; cf. l. 7); **בְּכֹר** (v. 28; cf. l. 5). Additionally, he points out several striking parallels in ancient Near Eastern texts, which describe the position of the divinely appointed Mesopotamian king as “firstborn son” (cf. l. 5); “princely priest” (cf. the priestly predicates of l. 3); called by the name of God (cf. ll. 12, 14); intercessor (cf. l. 10); wise, with knowledge to discern (cf. l. 9); receiving all good gifts from the gods (cf. ll. 5–6); guarding the people (cf. l. 10); punishing the unjust (cf. l. 10); faithful to God (cf. l. 6); loves God (cf. l. 8); gives God glory (cf. l. 4); and several more.

¹⁸⁶ That is, unless a Hasmonean king-priest is proposed as a candidate. However, I must agree with Elgvin that it is highly unlikely that the apocalyptic eschatology of 4QInstruction could have arisen in a context close to the Hasmonean establishment. See Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 80, n. 55.

¹⁸⁷ Although Elgvin takes this occurrence of the term **קְדוּשֵׁי** here as referring to the earthly elect, it most likely refers to angelic beings. See the discussion below.

seen as a member of that group.¹⁸⁸ Such terms indicate the author's view of the group as "the nucleus of the future-restored Israel," which is separated by God from the rest of faithless Israel.¹⁸⁹ Indeed, the plant root imagery here, as in other Second Temple period sources, represents the elect righteous community.¹⁹⁰ Following that metaphor, the group is destined "to inherit the land" (l. 14). The righteous community's anticipation of communion with the angels (ll. 1, 4, 11, 12, and several other citations in 4QInstruction) is surrounded with imagery of the "eternal plantation," "garden," "sprout," and "fountain," terms which link up with both Eden and the temple throughout Second Temple literature.¹⁹¹ Thus there is reason to believe that the circle(s) behind 4QInstruction conceived of itself as a type of ideal temple.¹⁹²

Elgvin thus concludes that the addressee is an exalted member of the elect community. As a participant in the mysteries of heaven and communion with the angels (ll. 1, 4, 11, 12, and see below), the addressee

¹⁸⁸ So Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without," 26.

¹⁸⁹ However, see Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 307–309, who argue that a sectarian identification is not necessary on the basis of these terms.

¹⁹⁰ See, e.g., 1 En. 10:16; 84:6; 93:5, 10; Jub. 1:16; 36:6; cf. 1QS 8:5–6; 11:8; CD 1:7; 1QH^a 14:18; 16:5–28; 1QpPs 1–10 II, 2–11. To be sure, it is not at all clear that the "eternal planting" here in 4Q418 81 refers to the elect community. Indeed, P.A. Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 325, concludes that "it is impossible to identify either the meaning or the referent of the 'eternal planting.'" However based on the context of the occurrence, Elgvin is likely correct in seeing the phrase as a reference to the elect community which includes the addressee. For a similar conclusion, see Goff, *The Worldly*, 113. For more on the plant root at Qumran see P. Swarup, *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness* (Library of Second Temple Studies 59; London: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 1–107; 193–195; Tiller, "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 312–335. See also Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch*, 444–445; S. Fujita, "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature in the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 30–45. For the eternal plant in Qumran and rabbinic literature, see J. Licht, "Mataat Olam ve-Am Pedut El," in *Mehqarim ba-Megillot ha-Genuzot: Sefer Zikaron le-Eliezer Lipa Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Heikhal Hasefer, 1961), 1–27.

¹⁹¹ See, e.g., M. Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira," in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. J. Scott and P. Simpson-Housley; Contributions to the Study of Religion 30; New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 63–78; G. Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. E. von Beate, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1999), 285–301; and below, pp. 90–91.

¹⁹² Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without," 28–29.

is here invested with symbolic priestly and royal terms.¹⁹³ As such, one may speak of “a ‘democratization’ of both priestly and royal/messianic predicates, so that we have a messianic community without a messiah.”¹⁹⁴ That “collective messianism”¹⁹⁵ is present here is supported by the fact that the eschatological passages of 4QInstruction fail to mention any restoration of Zion, a Davidic king, or any other eschatological figure.

Elgvin’s interpretation is attractive. Precedent for the democratization of royal privileges appears in Isa 55:1–5, where the Davidic promise is transferred to all of Israel.¹⁹⁶ In a similar vein, levitical prerogatives, expressed in terms of “inheritance” in Num 18:20 as well as in Deut 10:9, appear to be spiritualized in Psalms 16 and 73.¹⁹⁷ In line with the theological move of those Psalms, 4QInstruction interprets Pss 16:5–11 and 73:23–28 as promises of eternal life for the righteous.¹⁹⁸ It is therefore plausible that 4Q418 81 is indeed extending or reappropriating priestly and royal privileges, in order to empower a community, which perhaps “opposed the privileges of the Aaronic establishment in Jerusalem.”¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ Cf. the discussion of the Self-Glorification Hymn in chapter four below.

¹⁹⁴ Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 83.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. A. Caquot, “Le Messianisme qumrânien,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 231–247.

¹⁹⁶ See O. Eissfeldt, “The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55, 1–5,” in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor James Muilenburg* (ed. B.W. Anderson and W. Harellson; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), 196–207. See also G. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 10–11.

¹⁹⁷ For Psalm 16, see esp. v. 5, מִנַּת-חֶלְקִי וְכוּסִי, הָאֱלֹהִים לְעוֹלָם. Elgvin (DJD XXXIV, 517) borrows the term “spiritualize” from G. von Rad’s work on these Psalms. See G. von Rad, “‘Gerechtigkeit’ und ‘Leben’ in der Kultsprache der Psalmen,” in *Festschrift, Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet von Kollegen und Freunden* (ed. W. Baumgartner; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950), 418–437. An English version of von Rad’s article now appears in *From Genesis to Chronicles: Explorations in Old Testament Theology* (ed. K.C. Hanson; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 187–204; see esp. 200–204. It should be noted that several scholars believe that Psalm 16 was authored by a real sacerdotalist. See, e.g., R.J. Tournay, “À propos du Psaume 16, 1–4,” *RB* 108 (2001): 21–25; K. van der Toorn, *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life* (SHCANE 7; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 210–211.

¹⁹⁸ Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: The Evidence of 4QInstruction” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Museum, 2000), 245–246; idem, DJD XXXIV, 517.

¹⁹⁹ Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 135. On the close relationship between the

Fletcher-Louis' claim that 4Q418 81 1–14 has in mind a real, and not a metaphorical priest is unconvincing.²⁰⁰ He bases his argument on two main points. First, he notes a formal distinction: These fourteen lines conspicuously omit the familiar vocative form which appears throughout 4QInstruction referring to the clearly lay student, *ואתה מבין*, in preference for the simpler *ואתה* (six times). However, just after our passage, in 4Q418 81 15, the more familiar address immediately appears again. Fletcher-Louis takes this distinction as an “obvious” proof that the addressee is no longer the lay student but a priest. However, as he himself notes, the simpler vocative form *ואתה* does indeed occur several additional times throughout 4QInstruction. In these passages, however, there is no discernible concern for priestly matters.²⁰¹

Fletcher-Louis' second argument is more substantial. The first lines of 4Q423 5, which contain the clearest reference to priests in all of 4QInstruction, read as follows:²⁰²

(1a) [...] Take care lest you give back to Levi the prie[st] (*והשמר לכה פן*) [*משפט קורח*] (1) [...] the judgment of Korah (*תשיב ללוי כוהן*). And as he opened your ear (2) [to the mystery that is to come ... head of] y[our] fathers [...] and leader of your people (3) [H]e divided the [p]ortion of all rulers (*והחילת כל מושלים*) and fashioned every [...] by his hand, and he the wages of (4) [...] He will judg[e] all of them in truth and visit upon fathers and sons, [upon proselyte]s together with every native born (*ישפט כולם*) *באמת יפקוד לאבות ובנים*] *לגרים* עם כל אזרחים).

According to Fletcher-Louis, three observations about this fragment support his case that 4Q418 81 is referring to a real priest. First, the

Enochic complex of traditions and those preserved by 4QInstruction, see A. Caquot, “Les textes de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),” *RHPR* 76 (1996): 1–34, esp. 22; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 212–217. For a more cautious approach see L. Stuckenbruck, “4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation,” 245–261. See also Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 62–63: “It is especially significant that the Epistle of Enoch and 4QInstruction are each addressed to an elect group, not to Israel at large ... I do not suggest that these two groups should be identified, but there was surely some relationship between them.” On the other hand, J. Frey (“Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts,” in *The Wisdom Texts*, 387) sees “no indications linking it (4QInstruction) to a specific religious community, let alone a community separated from the temple.” See also, Lange, “In Diskussion mit dem Tempel,” 131.

²⁰⁰ *All the Glory*, 184–185.

²⁰¹ 4Q416 2 II, 4, 14, 19, 20; 4Q416 2 IV, 5; 4Q417 2 I, 17; 4Q417 2 II +23 6; 4Q418 206 5. The contexts of these passages mostly deal with matters of practical wisdom, including social relationships and everyday financial matters.

²⁰² Elgvin, DJD XXXIV, 518–519.

reference to the Korah episode of Numbers 16 seems to be a warning against those who would resist the God-ordered distinction between priest and non-priest. Secondly, lines 2–3 appear to refer to the different portions that God has given to various groups within Israel’s leadership by means of language similar to that of 4Q418 81 (ג[ו]חלת כל מושלים). Finally, he takes line 1a as a warning to honor the “Levites’ divinely sanctioned position within Israel’s constitution.” He argues that it is unlikely that a document which pays such close attention to the biblical warning against obscuring the boundaries between real priests and non-priests “would intend 4Q418 81 1–14 to be read in any other way than an address to a ‘real’ priest.”²⁰³

However, in light of 4Q418 81’s metaphorical reworking of Num 18:20 (a text that also referred originally to the distinction between “real” priest and Israel), it is probable that a similar interpretation is called for here in 4Q423 5. Just as the blessing of Aaron is extended to the elect in 4Q418 81, the “judgment of Korah” may be extended here to the lay leaders mentioned in lines 2–3.²⁰⁴ Indeed, the punishment of Korah is utilized in contemporary literature as a “paradigm for the eschatological judgement of the enemies of Israel.”²⁰⁵ As such, this passage may involve a metaphorical “warning for ungodly leaders.”²⁰⁶ In keeping with the priestly metaphor of 4Q418 81, it would be no surprise if “Levi the prie[st]” represented the quasi-priestly elect.²⁰⁷ As for lines 2–3, they hardly preclude such an interpretation. The terms נשיא and ר[יש אבות] (יכ[ה]) most likely refer to contemporary leaders of Israel, whose “portion” has been allotted by God, just as the portion of the elect has been granted

²⁰³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 185.

²⁰⁴ See Scott, “Korah and Qumran,” 182–202, who argues that 4QInstruction is a sectarian text and that the judgment of Korah was seen as a paradigm of the eschatological judgment expected for the lay leaders of the sect who took part in a schism during the sect’s early years. Alternatively, we may suggest that the “judgment of Korah” awaits all those whose ears have not been opened to the mystery that is to come (cf. ll. 1–2).

²⁰⁵ Elgvin, DJD XXXIV, 519–520. Cf. 4Q458 2 II, 4; 1 *En.* 90:18; 99:2; and 4Q491 1–3 1. The fact that Korah is not explicitly mentioned in most of these texts does not alter the resonance of the image of the earth opening up to swallow the wicked.

²⁰⁶ Elgvin, DJD XXXIV, 519. Recently, Elgvin (“Priestly Sages,” 80) has changed his interpretation of this passage, arguing that it reflects the tensions surrounding the ruling Aaronid priests in the pre-Maccabean period. According to this interpretation, 4Q423 5 is indeed a warning not to oppose the priestly authorities, in this case probably the ruling pre-Maccabean high priest.

²⁰⁷ Cf. below, pp. 291–293.

by God (cf. 4Q418 81 3).²⁰⁸ Line 4 guarantees that just as all are given their portion by God, all will be judged by him. In view of the special emphasis on the rewards anticipated by the elect throughout 4QInstruction,²⁰⁹ it is likely that the text is here contrasting the eschatological punishment of a group of wicked leaders with the rewards of eternal life and communion with the angels that await the chosen group.²¹⁰

*Heaven and Earth: Addressee, Holy
Ones, and the Eternal Plantation*

The ambiguity of the addressee's identity and the uncertainty surrounding the provenance of the text make it extremely difficult to determine the assumed relationship between heavenly and earthly realms in 4Q418 81.²¹¹ However the appearance of the theme of praise helps clarify the relationship of the angels, the addressee, and the earthly community.

There is a general consensus among scholars that the addressee is an exalted human figure who somehow enjoys both angelic and priestly status. As noted above, in addition to this figure the fragment mentions a human community, which it labels "men of favor" and "eternal plantation." Since the addressee has a position among the angels (l. 4) and the power "to turn away wrath" from this community (l. 9), it is reasonable to assume that the community is subjugated to him and that he serves as an intermediary between it and the heavenly realm.²¹² But what is to be made of the "holy ones" (קדושים), mentioned in the context of blessing and glorification in lines 1, 11, and 12?

²⁰⁸ Cf. the strikingly similar description of Essene belief by Josephus, *War* 2.140 (Thackeray LCL): "He will for ever keep faith with all men, especially with the powers that be, since no ruler attains his office save by the will of God."

²⁰⁹ See 4Q417 1 I, 14-18; 4Q417 2 I, 10b-12; 4Q418 55 8-11; 418 69 12b-15; 418 126 II, 8-10; cf. 11.

²¹⁰ Even if it is maintained that 4Q423 5 does warn against the blurring of the distinction between the God-ordained priest and non-priest, this would not necessarily mean that 4Q418 81 must refer to a literal priest. Above, we observed competing conceptions of the priesthood in *Jubilees*. On the one hand all of Israel is portrayed as "a kingdom and priests and a holy nation" (*Jub.* 16:18) which is parallel to the highest classes of angels. On the other hand, in the chapters dealing with the ordination of Levi as priest (30-32), only Levi and the Levites are correlated to the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness, and the priesthood is made to represent all of Israel (cf. 31:17). It is conceivable that 4QInstruction, especially in view of its multiple addressees, also contains conflicting understandings of the priesthood as either democratized or strictly hereditary.

²¹¹ For a recent review of scholarship on the issue, see Wold, *Women*, 161-182.

²¹² So Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 305; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 236; Wold, *Women*, 178.

1 שפתיכה פתח מקור לברך קדושים ואתה כמקור עולם הלל []ז הבדילכה
בכול

- 1 of your lips he has opened a spring in order to bless the holy ones. And you, as an everflowing fountain, praise []z. He has separated you from amongst all

11 עמכה בטרם תקח נחלתכה מידו כבד קדושו ובט]רם
12 פתח [מ]קור כול קדושים וכול הנקרא לשםו קודש]

- 11 with you / your people. Before you take your inheritance from his hand, glorify his holy ones and bef[ore
12 open [a sp]ring of all the holy ones. And all who are called by his name (will be) holy [

In each context, it is not entirely clear whether the holy ones refer to members of the elect human community or to angelic beings. Citing the paucity of evidence for the veneration of angels in Second Temple Judaism, Fletcher-Louis prefers the former option. According to his interpretation, the addressee, who is an exalted angelomorphic priest (labeled a “most holy one” in l. 4), is being called to bless and glorify the lay community of the faithful (the “holy ones”). This would parallel the call for the angelomorphic priesthood of *Jub.* 31:15 “to bless all the seed of the beloved,” presumably referring to the priestly blessing of Numbers 6.

However, the term “holy ones” likely refers to angelic beings in this context.²¹³ Elsewhere in 4QInstruction, it denotes angels (cf. 4Q417 1 I, 17).²¹⁴ Indeed, Collins is apparently correct in pointing out that in the entire Dead Sea Scrolls corpus the substantive use of the adjective קדושים can never be said to refer to human beings unambiguously.²¹⁵ Furthermore, in connection with line 1, Loren Stuckenbruck has noted an analogous blessing of the angels pronounced by a priest in Sefer ha-Milḥamah (11Q14) 1 II, 5–6: “blessed are all his holy angels” (ברוכים כול מלאכי קודשו).²¹⁶ Indeed, there is considerable support for a venerative

²¹³ See Goff, *The Worldly*, 109–110.

²¹⁴ “According to the pattern of the holy ones he created him (man)” (כתבנית קדושים) (יצרו).

²¹⁵ Collins, *Daniel*, 313–317. However, the term can often be reasonably interpreted as referring to the chosen, who enjoy a close relationship with the angels. Cf. 1QSb 4:23 and 1QM 12:8. See further Goff, *The Worldly*, 110, n. 135.

²¹⁶ Stuckenbruck, “Angels’ and ‘God,’” 64. For a treatment of angel veneration in the Qumran Scrolls, see idem, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT 2, 70; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck],

attitude toward angels within 4QInstruction itself (cf. 4Q416 2 III; 4Q417 1 I; 4Q418 55; 4Q418 69).²¹⁷ More directly, Stuckenbruck points to the language of the passage itself. In both the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, when the activity of “opening up the lips” appears in a context of blessing and praise, it only refers to praise of God. As such, the activity of line 1 should be taken as directed “upwards” to the angels, and not to the righteous community below. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the blessing of angelic beings appears in 4Q418 81.

Since the theme of the praise of angels as well as some of the language of line 1 (פתח מקור) reappear in lines 11–12 (פתח [מ]קור),²¹⁸ it is likely that lines 11–12 are picking up the subject matter of line 1.²¹⁹ Stuckenbruck notes that if this is true, the translation of line 12’s כול קדושים becomes significant. He observes that the phrase may be taken in two ways: “open a fountain *for* all the holy ones” or “open a fountain *of* all the holy ones.”²²⁰ If the former option is chosen, then

we may consider whether this watering metaphor extends to the “plantation” [of line 13]. In this way, the fountain (perhaps referring to the instruction given to the addressee) would be that which feeds or waters the eternal plantation (i.e. the human community of “holy ones” called by God’s name).²²¹

In this case, the holy ones to be honored would indeed be identifiable with the elect human community. However, for this translation to be correct, one might rightly expect a dative *lamed* introducing the indirect object before כול. The more likely translation calls for the opening of a fountain *of* all God’s holy ones. In this case, the addressee is called to open the

1995), 149–164. For more on angel veneration, see L. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (2d ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998); C. Newman, J. Davila, and G. Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Origins of the Worship of Jesus* (JSJSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1999). See also Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 1–32.

²¹⁷ Further, see Wold, *Women*, 177.

²¹⁸ For this reading, see n. 170.

²¹⁹ For this reason, I find Elgin’s suggestion (“The Mystery to Come,” 120) that the references to the “holy ones” in ll. 1 and 11 denote angels, whereas the reference in l. 12 refers to the community, unconvincing.

²²⁰ An obvious third option would be to read the word פתח as a third person singular perfect. In this case, God would most likely be the subject who is to open the spring (cf. l. 1). But the addressee’s exalted status and activities make פתח as an imperative in l. 12 equally possible.

²²¹ Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 65.

fountain of (i.e., belonging to) the angels,²²² which would then nourish the chosen community (the eternal plantation). Hence, the community would be allowed “to receive or participate in the fountain which belongs to the angels.”²²³ As Stuckenbruck observes, this interpretation not only fits better with the grammar of the clause, but also dovetails nicely with the picture of the angels in 4Q418 55 8–12 and 4Q418 69 II, 12–14. In the former passage, the acts of lowly humanity are compared with the exemplary acts of the angels. Notably, the angels tirelessly seek “the roots of wisdom” (הכאנוש הם כי יעצל) whereas men are “sluggardly” (שורשי בינה). It is these same angels who “will inherit an eternal possession” (אחוזת עולם) (ינחלו). The comparison is thus not meant so much to highlight the difference between the angelic and human realms as to hold out the activities of the angels as an example to be emulated by humans.²²⁴ Thus, in 4Q418 69 II, 10–13, the elect, who are “the truly chosen ones” (בחירי אמת), are called to model themselves on the sons of heaven whose lot is “eternal life” (חיים עולם).²²⁵ By participating in angelic wisdom, the addressee as well as the eternal plantation is guaranteed a share in angelic immortality.²²⁶

Conclusions on 4Q418 81

4Q418 81 never explicitly refers to the notion of an otherworldly priesthood. However, as noted above, the language of the fragment clearly relates to the Second Temple period traditions which attribute an otherworldly splendor to the human priesthood. The priestly addressee is designated a “most holy one,” his glory has been multiplied greatly by God, who has cast his lot with the angelic beings. The exalted status of the addressee allows him not only to intercede in behalf of the “men of favor,” but also to link the heavenly and chosen earthly communities, making

²²² The “fountain” of the angels may refer to their superior knowledge of God’s mysteries, especially if the word מקור refers to concealed wisdom here as it does in 1QS 11. See A. Rofé, “Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives*, 1–3; Wold, *Women*, 178.

²²³ Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 65. See also M. Fishbane, “The Well of Living Water: A Biblical Motif and Its Ancient Transformations,” in *Sha’arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 3–16.

²²⁴ See Stuckenbruck, “‘Angels’ and ‘God,’” 68–69.

²²⁵ The same promise of eternal life is made to the addressee in 4Q417 2 II, 10–12. On 4QInstruction’s teaching about the blessed fate of the elect community, see esp. Goff, *The Worldly*, 206–214.

²²⁶ For an extensive study of the belief in immortality in the Qumran documents, see Puech, *La Croyance*.

available angelic nourishment (wisdom?) to the “eternal plantation” by opening “a fountain.”

4Q418 81 differs from the texts observed above in its view of the priestly privileges as non-literal and spiritualized. This peculiarity might be explained by Elgvin’s argument that the work sprung from “apocalyptic circles where Levitic or Aaronic descent played no significant role.”²²⁷ Whatever the case, this chosen community accessed God’s mysteries and was destined for eternal life by means of participation with the angels. Interestingly, the image of the “eternal plantation” as elect community in association with communion with the angels is picked up by the sectarian documents of the Qumranites, particularly 1QS 11:7–9 and 1QH^a 14:15–18.²²⁸ Moreover, 1QS 11:3 refers to the opening of “a fountain of his (God’s) knowledge.” Thus, it is evident that the central religious concepts of 4QInstruction had a considerable impact on the theology of the Qumranites. However, as multiple commentators have pointed out, these sectarian texts depict liturgical communion with the angels to an extent above and beyond 4QInstruction.²²⁹ As we shall see in the following two chapters, a priestly conception of a *present* fellowship with the angels within parabolic liturgical time permeated the Qumranite religious experience. By contrast, in 4QInstruction, most passages adduced as evidence for a “realized eschatology” similar to that found in the Hodayot and 1QS are better interpreted as anticipating *future* glory.²³⁰ However, it is only a short step from that position to the sense of present exaltation found in the sectarian literature, especially the liturgical works.²³¹

4QAPOCRYPHON OF LEVI^b? AR (4Q541)

4QApocryphon of Levi^b? (also known as 4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and 4QAaron A) provides yet another picture of a human priest with otherworldly qualities. According to Puech, paleography indicates a copying date near 100 BCE.²³² Since this document also lacks the highly technical

²²⁷ “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” 135.

²²⁸ On these two texts see Tiller, “The ‘Eternal Planting,’” 328–331. The classic treatment of the community’s participation in glory with the angels in the Hodayot appears in Kuhn, *Enderwartung*.

²²⁹ Stuckenbruck, “‘God’ and ‘Angels,’” 66; Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 58; Goff, *The Worldly*, 114.

²³⁰ See especially Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 57–58.

²³¹ Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom,” 58.

²³² E. Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique:

terminology of the sectarian texts and is written in Aramaic, it most likely originated outside of Qumran,²³³ perhaps in the same circles responsible for the Aramaic patriarchal “testament” material found at Qumran (4Q537–539; 4Q542; 4Q543–549).²³⁴ Lines 2–5 of 4Q541 9 provide the passage of interest:²³⁵

ח] 2 כמתה ויכפר על כול בני דרה וישתלח לכול בני
ע] 3 מה מאמרה כמאמר שמין ואלפונה כרעות אל שמש עלמה תניר
4 ויתזה נורהא בכול קצוי ארעא ועל חשוכא תניר אדין יעדה חשוכא
מ] 5 ארעא וערפלא מן יבשתא

- 2 [And he will transmit to them]²³⁶ his [w]isdom. And he will atone for all the children of his generation and he will be sent to all the children
3 of his [peop]le. His word is like a word of the heavens and his teaching is like the will of God. His eternal sun will shine;
4 and fire will burn in all the ends of the earth. And on the darkness it will shine; then the darkness will disappear
5 [fr]om the earth and the cloud from the dry land.

Puech has drawn attention to a significant parallel passage in *T. Levi* 18:2–5:

Then the Lord will raise up a new priest, to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed; and he will execute a judgment of truth upon the earth in course of time. And his star will arise in heaven, as a king, lighting up the light of knowledge as by the sun of the day; and he will be magnified in the world until his assumption. He will shine as the sun on the earth and will remove all darkness from under heaven, and there will be peace on all the earth. The heavens will exult in his days, and the earth will be glad, and the clouds will rejoice, and the knowledge of the Lord will be poured out upon the earth as the water of the seas, and the angels of the glory of the presence of the Lord will rejoice in him.

4QTestLevi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:452; and more recently, idem, DJD XXXI, 227.

²³³ See the works cited in n. 126.

²³⁴ For this possibility, see Puech, DJD XXXI, 213–216. See also J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2,104; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998), 272; G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 111.

²³⁵ Transcription generally draws from Puech, DJD XXXI, 241. Translation generally draws from G. Brooke, “4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. M.C. de Boer; JSNTSup 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 83–100.

²³⁶ Following Puech’s reading (וימסר) based on barely visible letter traces. See his comments in DJD XXXI, 243.

On the basis of the similarities between these texts (e.g., light/sun imagery, the themes of instruction and seemingly redemptive removal of darkness, all in association with a glorious priestly figure), Puech argues that 4Q541 should be identified as additional Aramaic Levi material, “probablement un testament.”²³⁷ However, as several scholars have pointed out, since 4QApocryphon of Levi^{b?} shows no clear parallels with *ALD*, it is not likely that both are part of the same composition. While it is clear that 4QApocryphon of Levi^{b?} bears some generic resemblance to *T. Levi*, their precise relationship remains unclear.²³⁸

Whatever the case, it is clear from the appearance of the theme of a struggle between light and darkness ending with the future arrival of a universal savior, that our text has eschatological significance.²³⁹ We shall return to this aspect of the fragment in our discussion of priestly messianism in part two. For now, however, it will suffice to make a few observations regarding the nature of the protagonist. Puech characterizes him as both a priest and a sage.²⁴⁰ The former assertion is confirmed by the report that “he will atone (ויכפר) for all the children of his generation” (line 2).²⁴¹ The latter assertion is established by the report about his divinely sanctioned “teaching” and heavenly “word” (l. 3), and

²³⁷ “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 491. Indeed, even prior to the publication of 4QApocryphon of Levi^{b?}, G. Nickelsburg and M. Stone (*Faith and Piety in Early Judaism*, [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983], 199, n. 3) suggested that *T. Levi* 18 corresponds with the lost climax of *ALD*: “Correlations between Levi’s prayer . . . the description of his call (chap. 4), and chapter 18 suggest that this last passage in some form was the climax of the Aramaic text.”

²³⁸ See J.J. Collins, “Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A,” in *Texts and Contexts; Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts; Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman* (ed. T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 579–590. Also M. de Jonge, “Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?” in *Jewish Eschatology*, 199; R. Kugler, “Testaments,” *EDSS* 2:934.

²³⁹ However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the future acts of the figure were interpreted as *ex eventu* prophecy (similar to how Christians viewed the prophecy of *T. Levi* 18 as already fulfilled by the coming of Jesus).

²⁴⁰ See Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 492–496. Also, M. Knibb, “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 183. Puech’s additional characterization of the figure as “un serviteur méprisé et rejeté,” (496–499) has been challenged by Collins (*The Scepter*, 123–126), who argues that it is more likely that his misfortunes have been modeled on the career of the historical Teacher of Righteousness than on the suffering servant of Isaiah.

²⁴¹ In addition, the difficult מַצָּח of frg. 24 may refer to the donning of the high priest’s צִיָּץ. See Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte*, 80, who translates “das Stirndiadem (des hohenpriesters).”

that he perhaps transmits “his [w]isdom” (l. 2) to his contemporaries.²⁴² The priest-sage combination is a familiar one; it figures prominently in *Jubilees*, *ALD* (cf. 4QVisions of Amram ar [4Q543 2a–b, 2]), 4QInstruction^d (4Q418 81), and Ben Sirā.²⁴³

The exalted nature of this priest-sage is worth noting. Although there is no mention of priestly garments here, the otherworldly glory / brilliance accompanying the priest (“his eternal sun will shine”) is reminiscent of *Let. Aris.* 96–99, *Jub.* 31:14, 4Q418 81 5, and especially Sir 50:6–7. Furthermore, his words have a divine quality about them, and his teachings represent God’s will. As in 4Q418 81, there appears to be a close connection between knowledge of God’s mysteries and the salvation brought about by the intermediary figure.

But the image of the rising “eternal sun”²⁴⁴ that removes “darkness [fr]om the land” here goes beyond the motif of the divine light associated with the priesthood and possesses a specifically eschatological connotation. It is most likely connected with the eschatological image of the rising of the “sun of righteousness” (שמש צדקה) in Mal 3:20.²⁴⁵ Furthermore, the appearance of the sun has clear eschatological significance in the important non-sectarian sapiential text 1Q/4QMysteries.²⁴⁶

ולא ידעו רוז נהיה ובקדמוניות לוא 3
 התבוננו ולא ידעו מה אשר יבוא עליהם ונפשם לא מלטו מרוז נהיה 4
 וזה לכם האות כי יהיה בהסגר מולדי עולה וגלה הרשע מפני הצדק 5
 כגלות [ח]ושך מפני אור וכתום עשן וא[יננ] עוד כן יתם הרשע לעד 6
 והצדק יגלה כשמש תכון תבל וכול תומכי רוי [בליעל] אינמה עוד 7
 ודעה תמלא תבל ואין שם לע[ד] אולת 8

²⁴² The sapiential interest recurs throughout the document. Cf. 4Q541 2 I, 6–9; 2 II, 6; 7, 4. See Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 492–493; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 268–269.

²⁴³ See especially Sir 24:1–12, where personified wisdom officiates in the temple mysteriously like an angel of the presence. Wisdom’s liturgical function here is intimately associated with that of the priests of the temple. See further, H. Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation* (trans. P. Sherrard; London: KPI in association with Islamic Publications, 1986), 306. For more on the combination of priestly and sapiential functions in idealized figures in Second Temple literature, see chapter seven.

²⁴⁴ For the use of this phrase as a divine name in magic texts until the late Roman period, see M. Philonenko, “Son soleil éternel brillera (4QTestLévi d(?) 9 i 3),” *RHPR* 73 (1993): 405–408.

²⁴⁵ So Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” 494. For the association of light with righteousness and knowledge in sectarian literature, see below, pp. 160–162.

²⁴⁶ Text, translation, and line numbers draw from the reconstructed composite text of L. Schiffman in T. Elgvin et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 356, which is based on 1Q27 1 I, 1–12; 4Q299 1 1–9; 4Q300 3 1–6.

- 3 But they did not know the mystery that is to come, and the former things they did not
 4 consider. Nor did they know what shall befall them. And they did not save their lives from the mystery that is to come.
 5 And this shall be the sign to you that it is taking place: When the begotten of unrighteousness are delivered up, and wickedness is removed from before righteousness,
 6 as [d]arkness is removed from before light. (Then,) just as smoke wholly ceases and is n[o mor]e, so shall wickedness cease forever,
 7 and righteousness shall be revealed as the sun (throughout) the full measure of the world. And all the adherents of the mysteries of [Belial] will be no more.
 8 But knowledge shall fill the world, and folly shall never[more] be there.

Here, the emergence of the sun symbolizes the eschatological triumph of righteousness over wickedness.²⁴⁷ Significantly, the victory of light is equated with the revelation of God's mysteries on earth (l. 8, "knowledge shall fill the world"; cf. Isa 11:9). Those who do not have knowledge of the *רז נהיה*, the unenlightened, will perish. 4Q541 9, with its fusion of sapiential and solar imagery, clearly preserves a related scenario. More importantly for our present purpose, the eschatological protagonist's priestly status reveals a feature of the otherworldly priest that we have yet to encounter—his role as eschatological savior.

CONCLUSION

Portrayals of angels as priests and human priests as otherworldly are prominent in the non-sectarian writings preserved at Qumran. Depictions of the angels as priests focus on their cultic service before God in the celestial temple.²⁴⁸ In addition, these angels serve as propitiators/intercessors, and bring about the purification of the cosmos by means of their violent extirpation of sin (especially of the sexual variety),²⁴⁹ an activity which, quite contrary to biblical tradition, turns Levi into an ideal candidate for the exalted priestly office.²⁵⁰ On the other hand, the depiction of the human priesthood as otherworldly is achieved through the emanation of ethereal radiance/glory (*כבוד*) from the

²⁴⁷ Cf. 11QPs^a 26:11 and the discussion of 11QMelchizedek below, pp. 160–163.

²⁴⁸ See *BW*; *T. Levi* 3; *Jub.* 31:14.

²⁴⁹ See *1 En.* 10, cf. *T. Levi* 3:2–3.

²⁵⁰ See *Jub.* 30; *T. Levi* 12:5; 2:2–3; *ALD* 78–79.

priest.²⁵¹ The brilliant light emitted by the priest (or priestly vestments during the temple service²⁵²) represents an eruption of the divine on earth and therefore not only underscores his role as intermediary between God and the earthly community but also his exalted status. A similar notion may underlie the common claim that the priestly figure was separated “from all flesh,”²⁵³ and may have been a contributing factor in the comparison of the exalted priest to the sun.²⁵⁴ In addition to radiating light, it appears that these otherworldly human priests brought enlightenment to the world through their wisdom,²⁵⁵ thus fulfilling the words of Mal 2:7: “Surely the lips of the priest guard knowledge, and they shall seek Torah from his mouth, for he is an angel of the Lord of Hosts” (כִּי-שֹׁפֵטִי) (כהן ישמרו-דעת ותורה יבקשו מפיהו כי מלאך ה'-צבאות הוא).

The non-sectarian witnesses to otherworldly priesthood span an impressive array of genres, including paradigmatic myth (*BW*), rewritten Bible (*Jubilees*), testament (4QVisions of Amram, *ALD?*/*T. Levi*), wisdom works of varying provenance (Ben Sira, 4QInstruction), and testament-like literature concerned with a priestly eschatological figure (4Q541 9). Each work uses the motif for its own specific purposes, variously combining the priestly figure with the roles of king, sage, and eschatological savior. This variety points to the widespread popularity of the notion of the angelic priesthood in Jewish society in the third and second centuries BCE. Indeed, we have seen from the *Letter of Aristeas*' description of Eleazar that the image of the luminous, otherworldly high priest was also familiar to the Hellenized community of Alexandria. The fact that the Qumran community cherished so many non-sectarian works with the notion of otherworldly priesthood is thus more of a testimony to the currency of the idea in Second Temple period society in general than to the peculiar belief system of the Qumranites. In order to discover how the Qumran community itself envisioned otherworldly priesthood, we turn to an extraordinary liturgical work utilized by the community, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.

²⁵¹ See *Jub.* 31:14; *Sir* 50; 45:6–22; 4Q418 81; 4Q541 9; *T. Levi* 18.

²⁵² See *Sir* 50:11; *Let. Aris.* 96–99.

²⁵³ See 4QLevi^c ar 1; *Jub.* 31:14; 4Q418 81 1–2; cf. *Sir* 50:17.

²⁵⁴ See *Sir* 50:7; 4Q541 9 3; *T. Levi* 18:4.

²⁵⁵ See 4Q418 81; *ALD* 88–89 [Cambridge e = 4QLevi^a ar 1 I]; *Jub.* 31:15; 4Q541 9; cf. 4Q543 2a–b, 2.

CHAPTER THREE

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD IN THE SONGS OF THE SABBATH SACRIFICE: *IMAGO TEMPLI* AND LITURGICAL TIME AT QUMRAN

Having treated portrayals of otherworldly priesthood as they appear in the non-sectarian corpus, we are ready to approach the Qumran document that, by far, contains the most extensive such portrayal, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. As we shall see below, the provenance of this cryptic text is not entirely clear. However, it is apparent that the Qumranites valued it highly and made liturgical use of it. It thus may be said to reflect Qumranite religious practice and belief. The present chapter looks at the depiction of otherworldly priesthood in the Songs and the theological notions implied by it. It also assesses the current debate in the field about how these ideas reflect on the nature of the spirituality of the Qumran community.

PREFATORY REMARKS

According to most scholars, the notions of angelic priesthood and celestial temple at Qumran belong to a larger cosmology, with deep roots in broader Jewish apocalyptic thought, as well as in biblical and broader ancient Near Eastern religion. This worldview envisions the universe as a horizontal duality in which the heavenly and earthly realms mirror one another. According to this perspective, there is a direct parallelism between the existence and actions of heavenly beings and those of their human counterparts on earth. It is important to note that at Qumran this notion is situated within an all encompassing vertical duality between the forces of good (God, the beneficent angels, and the “sons of light”) on the one hand and the evil powers (Belial, the wicked spirits, and the “sons of darkness”) on the other.¹ The former are represented by righteousness,

¹ See J. Maier, “Religious Beliefs, Qumran Sect,” *EDSS* 2:754, who argues that “the natural division between heaven and earth is, relative to this, of secondary importance.” For more on angels at Qumran see M. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield

purity, and light while the latter are represented by wickedness, impurity, and darkness. As asserted by the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26),² humanity is divided into sons of light and sons of darkness, and each group is allotted to the corresponding angelic host, led by the Prince of Lights and the Angel of Darkness/Belial respectively. The gulf between the heavenly and earthly realms is traversed by communion with angels, as found in several sectarian texts. Such communion appears to be manifest in two directions, with both the presumption and expectation of humans ascending and angels descending.³ As has often been noted, this latter phenomenon especially necessitated elevated standards of ritual purity within the community.⁴

Scholars have seized on the Qumran community's view of the heavens and earth as parallel realms, turning it into a key interpretive paradigm for explaining all manners of the community's worldview and behavior. However, the question of exactly what the various images of the angelic priesthood contained in sectarian documents mean for understanding the earthly community at Qumran is under debate. The discussion has generally focused on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, as it provides the most detailed and explicit portrait of the angelic priesthood and the celestial temple not only at Qumran, but in all of Second Temple Jewish literature. We will turn to this debate below, after briefly introducing and treating the text.

Academic Press, 1992); Wold, *Women*; D. Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community," in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (ed. A. Berlin; Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103; J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 130–149; B. Frennesson, "In a Common Rejoicing": *Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran* (SSU 14; Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999); M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992). See also J. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. J.J. Collins and G. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 135–151.

² Whether or not this source was composed at Qumran, its inclusion into 1QS reveals the importance of its dualistic themes for the community.

³ For human ascent, see, e.g., 1QH^a 11:20–23, 14:15–16; 1QSb 3:25–26, 4:24–26; 4Q491 11 I. For angelic descent, see, e.g., 1QM 1:10–11; 12:1–9; 1QS 11:7–8; 1QSa 2:8–9. M. Weinfeld ("The Heavenly Praise in Unison" in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* [LSTS 54; T. & T. Clark International: New York, 2005], 48) notes that the common lot of the Qumranites and the angels is expressed in three ways in sectarian literature: joining together in praise, sharing a common fate (eternal life), and taking part in holy war together.

⁴ See, e.g., 1QM 7:6; cf. 4QD^b and 4QFlor 1–2 I, 4.

THE PROVENANCE OF THE SONGS OF THE SABBATH SACRIFICE

The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (henceforth, SSS)⁵ is a group of thirteen “mystical”⁶ songs, all to be performed on each of the first thirteen Sabbaths of the year.⁷ The songs have traditionally been understood as summoning and describing the worship of the angelic priests in the heavenly temple. Ten fragmentary copies of the document have survived, nine of which were discovered in the Qumran caves (eight from Cave 4, one from Cave 11); one copy was found at Masada. The large number of manuscripts at Qumran indicates the importance of this text for the community. The manuscripts date paleographically from the Late Hasmonean period (c. 75–50 BCE; 4Q400) to the late Herodian period (c. 50 CE; Mas1k [ShirShabbⁱ] and 11QShirShabb).⁸

There has been considerable debate regarding the document’s provenance. Carol Newsom notes that while the text assumes a solar calendar and displays close similarities (particularly with regard to speculation about the heavenly temple and its angelic priesthood) with works that were cherished but not composed at Qumran (e.g., *Jubilees* and *T. Levi*⁹), this evidence alone clearly cannot secure a sectarian label. The case for sectarian provenance is indicated, however, by its various links with undisputedly sectarian texts. For example, the appearance of the word למשכיל as an introductory heading has close parallels only with specifically sectarian texts such as the Community Rule

⁵ The document was named by its first editor, J. Strugnell (“The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Q Serek Širot ‘Olat Haš-šabat,” in *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959* [VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960], 318–345.), based on the initial phrase which opens each song, עולת השבת.

⁶ See P. Alexander, *The Mystical Texts* (LSTS 61; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2006), 5–11, who justifies the use of the term. For further discussion of the term’s appropriateness, see B. Nitzan, “Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–183, and E. Wolfson’s response in the same volume, “Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response,” 185–202.

⁷ It is possible that this process was repeated in each of the three remaining quarters of the year. See J. Maier, “Šiřê ‘Ôlat hash-Shabbat’: Some Observations on Their Calendric Implications and on Their Style,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:543–560.

⁸ Newsom, *Songs*, 86, 168, 363.

⁹ As noted above, *T. Levi* in its current form is a Christian work of the second century CE. However, it relies heavily upon the traditions of *ALD*, which may be dated prior to the middle of the second century BCE and was preserved at Qumran in seven manuscripts.

and 4QSongs of the Sage (4Q510–511).¹⁰ The phraseology of several passages in SSS, especially those which cover the themes of predestination and eschatology, resemble the phraseology of sectarian literature.¹¹ Moreover, SSS shares numerous distinctive expressions (היכלי, רוקמת רוח קודש קודשים, מלך, אלוהות, רקיעי הטוהר, etc.) and similar references to the *merkabah* with 4QBerakhot (4Q286–290), a text with close ties to the Community Rule, which makes explicit mention of עצת היחד and is therefore in all likelihood sectarian. Based on such admittedly indirect data, Newsom originally concluded that it was a sectarian work.¹²

In a later study she reversed her position, tentatively arguing for an extra- and pre-sectarian provenance for SSS.¹³ While acknowledging that the evidence is far from conclusive, she based this new view on three main points: (1) the absence of polemics characteristic of sectarian literature; (2) the discovery of a copy at Masada; and (3) the numerous appearances in the text of the word אלוהים, a divine epithet that is almost always avoided in texts deemed undisputedly sectarian.¹⁴ However, each of these points has been questioned. The first two may be discarded straightaway. As Newsom herself notes, the absence of sectarian polemic does not in itself ensure a non-sectarian origin, as the literature of a religious sect may certainly be concerned with matters other than polemics that define its identity and practices over and against the larger religious establishment.¹⁵ As for the Masada discovery, many plausible reconstructions could explain how a copy of SSS found its way there without requiring a non-sectarian provenance. For example, it has been suggested that Qumranite refugees brought the manuscript with them to the fortress at some point during the Great Revolt.¹⁶ The third point carries more weight but is certainly not conclusive. It is indeed true that sectarian texts seem to

¹⁰ C. Newsom “‘He Has Established for Himself Priests’: Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath Shiro,” in *Archaeology and History*, 104.

¹¹ For a list, see C. Newsom and Y. Yadin, “The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *IEJ* 34 (1984): 81. See further below, pp. 94–95.

¹² Newsom, *Songs*, 1–5.

¹³ C. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D.N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 179–185. Cf. Elgvin, “Priestly Sages,” 76, n. 40, who suggests that SSS may come from a similar milieu as the earliest Hekhalot traditions (4Q301) in the pre-Maccabean temple milieu.

¹⁴ The term אלוהים, it must be noted, mostly refers to angelic beings in SSS. See the brief comment of D. Falk (*Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998], 129, n. 23) on the flexibility of the term.

¹⁵ Newsom, “Sectually Explicit,” 180.

¹⁶ Newsom and Yadin, “The Masada Fragment,” 77.

prefer the divine epithet **אל**, but **אלוהים** does appear in the closely related 4QSongs of the Sage as well as in 1QSb 4, both sectarian texts. Newsom explains away the appearance of **אלוהים** in the explicitly sectarian Songs of the Sage as a rare exception on the grounds that the songs were “conceived of as words of power. In such a context the use of a normally restricted divine name is readily explicable.”¹⁷ But if so, the same should also apply to SSS which summon the angels to worship in the heavenly temple.¹⁸ Indeed, it is noteworthy that each of these texts (SSS, Songs of the Sage, and 1QSb 4) is concerned with the worship of the angels and governed by the **למשכיל** heading. As Daniel Falk observes, we may thus infer that “use or non-use of the term **אלוהים** in writings of the Yahad may be influenced by genre: it is found in mystical and magical works, especially recitations connected with the Maskil.”¹⁹ As such, we cannot take the appearance of the divine epithet **אלוהים** in SSS alone as proof of non-sectarian provenance.

In the end, there is no clear answer. What is certain, however, is that even if SSS originated in circles outside of Qumran, it nonetheless functioned as an adopted text within the religious framework of the Qumran community.²⁰ The fact that the Qumranites owned at least nine copies of the work testifies to this point. We can therefore be reasonably certain that SSS reflects the religious views/practice of the Qumran community at the date of the documents, despite ambiguity about their provenance.

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD IN THE ANGELIC LITURGY

SSS is an extensive and cryptic document and requires a much more detailed investigation than is possible here. In the following remarks we will focus only on passages and phrases directly bearing on the portrayal of the heavenly priesthood in relation to the earthly community. In particular, we are interested in two interrelated points: the portrayal of the structure and nature of the angelic priesthood and its reflection on that of the earthly community, and the text’s characterization of the ontological distinction between angelic and human priests.

¹⁷ Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit,’” 180.

¹⁸ So Morray-Jones, “The Temple Within,” 410.

¹⁹ Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 129. **אלוהים** also appears twice in the Daily Prayers (4Q503 13 1; 37 + 38 14). Again here, the theme of angelic worship appears.

²⁰ See Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit,’” 185.

The largest and most significant fragment of Song 1 (4Q400 1) describes the establishment of an angelic priesthood by God (ll. 3–4, 10, 19) as well as this priesthood’s characteristics and purpose (ll. 12–20). The establishment of the priesthood is described in the following language:

3 כִּיָּא יִסְדַּ [21] בְּקִדּוּשֵׁי־קִדּוּשִׁים וַיְהִי לּוֹ לְכוֹהֲנֵי
4] מִשְׂרָתֵי פָּנִים בְּדַבֵּיר כְּבוֹדוֹ בְּעֵדָה לְכוֹל אֱלֹהֵי

- 3 For he has established] among the eternally holy ones the holiest of the holy ones, and they have become for him as priests of
4] ministers of the Presence in the inner room of his glory, in the assembly of all the gods of

As commentators have noted, the above passage distinguishes between two classes of angels:²² the eternal holy ones in general and a more privileged sub-unit within that group, the “holiest of the holy ones,” who have become priests.²³ The language of the passage is reminiscent of the spatial division of the temple into “holy” and “holy of holies,” and relates to two documents widely believed to date back to the second century origins of the Qumran community, namely 4QMMT and 1QS 8–9.²⁴ Explaining the rationale of a law banning the marriage of priests to Israelites, 4QMMT reasons that Israel is “holy, while the children of Aaron are h[oly of holies]” (ב[ג]לל שהם קדושים ובני אהרון ק[דושי קדושים] (B 79).²⁵ Similarly, in 1QS 8:5, just after we hear that the council of the community (עצת היהוד) is to be composed of twelve laymen and three priests, it is characterized as a “house of holiness [consisting] of Israel and a most holy congregation [consisting] of Aaron” (בית קודש לישראל וסוד)

²¹ Reconstruction follows the suggestion of Newsom, *Songs*, 97. She restores the words כִּיָּא יִסְדַּ at the beginning of the line on the basis of similar language describing the establishment of the angelic priesthood in l. 19, and possibly also in l. 10.

²² For the term קדושים as denoting angels in the Hebrew Bible and Qumran Literature, see Collins, *Daniel*, 313–317. J. Davila (*Liturgical Works* [Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 100) reminds us that although here the term appears to refer to angels, “the inclusion of the proleptically glorified human worshipers may be implied as well.”

²³ This language may represent an exegesis of Lev 21:6. There, the priests the sons of Aaron are to be holy (קדושים יהיי), for they bring offerings before God.

²⁴ So Fletcher-Louis, “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?” 372–382; idem, *All the Glory*, 293–298.

²⁵ See E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma’āše Ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press), 57. For the editors’ justification of the reconstruction, see *ibid.*, n. 79. For the background of this law see *ibid.*, pp. 171–175.

(קודש קדשים לאהרון). It is worthwhile to quote the passage that contains this phrase at length (1QS 8:4–10):²⁶

(4) When these are in Israel, (5) the council of the community shall be established in truth (ה[עצת היחד באמת] נכונה). It shall be an everlasting plantation, a house of holiness [consisting] of Israel and a most holy congregation (6) [consisting] of Aaron (קודש לישׂראל וטוד), chosen by (divine) pleasure to atone for the earth and to repay (7) the wicked their reward (לכפר בעד הארץ ולהשב לרשעים) (גמולם). It shall be that tested wall, that precious corner stone (היאה חומת) (הבחן פנת יקר), (8) whose foundations shall neither rock nor sway in their place. It shall be a most holy dwelling (9) for Aaron, with all-encompassing knowledge of the covenant of justice, and shall offer up a pleasant odor (מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון בדעת כולם לברית משפט ולקריב ריח ניהוח). It shall be a house of perfection and truth in Israel (ובית תמים ואמת בישראל) (10) that they may establish a covenant according to everlasting precepts. They will be accepted to atone for the land and to decide judgment over wickedness; and there will be no more iniquity (הויו לרצון לכפר בעד הארץ ולהרוץ משפט) (רשעה ואין עולה).²⁷

As has long been recognized, this passage portrays the hierarchically ordered Qumran community as the animate embodiment of the image of the ideal temple. The members themselves are equated metaphorically with the architectural elements of the building. The community's very existence thus fulfills an atoning function directly analogous to the "pleasant odor" of sacrifice that reaches God.²⁸ This transformation is made possible by the perfection of the Qumranite life, which is brought about by knowledge of the true *ברית משפט*. As Joseph Baumgarten notes, "inasmuch as all of them know the covenant of the law they 'offer a

²⁶ Hebrew text follows E. Qimron, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 34. The translation and the one in the following note loosely draw from G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (4th ed; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 80–81.

²⁷ Cf. the strikingly similar characterization of the community in 1QS 9:3–6: "When these become members of the community in Israel according to all these rules, they shall establish the spirit of holiness according to everlasting truth. They shall atone for guilty rebellion and for sins of unfaithfulness that they may obtain loving-kindness for the land without the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice (לכפר על אשמת) (פשע ומעל חטאת ולרצון לארץ מבשר עולות ומחלבי ובה) (פשע ומעל חטאת ולרצון לארץ מבשר עולות ומחלבי ובה). The proper offering of the lips for judgment (is as) righteous sweetness, and perfection of way as a delectable freewill offering (ותרומת שפתים למשפט כניחה צדק ותמים דרך כנדבת מנחת רצון). At that time, the men of the community shall set apart a house of holiness for Aaron, for the most holy community, and a house of the community for Israel, for those who walk in perfection בעת ההיאה יבדילו אנשי היחד בית קודש לאהרון להיחד קודש קודשים ובית יחד לישׂראל ההולכים) (בתמים).

²⁸ See above, chapter two, n. 107.

pleasant savor' and 'atone for the earth' ... the 'oblation of the lips through the (study of) law is like a pleasant savor of righteousness.'²⁹

The similar language of 1QS 11:8–9 implies that this temple-community conceived itself as incorporated into a celestial reality: "He has joined their assembly to the sons of heaven to be a council of the community, a foundation of the building of holiness, and eternal plantation throughout all ages to come" (ועם בני שמים חבר סודם לעצת יחד וסוד מבנית קודש למטעת) (עולם עם כול קץ נהיה).³⁰ Interestingly, while the earthly Qumran community is compared in these passages with inanimate parts of a building, in the seventh song of SSS (4Q403 1 I, 41), the celestial temple is portrayed in animate terms, thus underscoring the reversibility of community and temple: "Let all the [foundations of the hol]y of holies praise, the supporting pillars of the supremely lofty abode, and all the corners of its structure" (יהללו כול י[סודי קוד]ש קודשים עמודי משא לזבול רום רומים וכול) (פנות מבנית).³¹

The phrase "eternal plantation" in the 1QS passages points to an old tradition that associated the temple with the garden of Eden, also thought to be the future paradise of the righteous.³² Accordingly, incorporation into the community-temple, the eternal plantation / building of holiness / house of perfection and truth "confers 'advance membership' in the world to come and is, at the same time, a return to humanity's original state of angelic purity,"³³ represented by prelapsarian Adam. Hence, CD 3:19–20 claims that God "built for them a sure house ... and those who hold fast to it are destined to live forever and all the glory of Adam shall be theirs" (ויבן להם בית נאמן בישראל אשר לא עמד כמהו למלפנים ועד הנה) (cf. 1QS 4:23). The apparent self-identification of the Qumran community as אדם מקדש אדם in 4QFlorilegium (4Q174 1–2 I, 6) is also to be understood in this context.³⁴ The phrase

²⁹ J. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of 'netinim' and Proselytes in 4QFlorilegium," *RevQ* 8 (1972): 94.

³⁰ Cf. Morray-Jones, "The Temple Within," 421.

³¹ Text, translation, and reconstruction follow Newsom, DJD XI, 269, 272, 276.

³² Cf. above, pp. 75–76. See further J. Levenson, "The Temple and the World," *JR* 64 (1984): 297–298; idem, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985) 127–133; M. Barker, *The Older Testament: The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1987), 233–245; Morray-Jones, "The Temple Within," 421; Himmelfarb, "The Temple and the Garden of Eden," 63–78; Hayward, *The Jewish Temple*, 88–93, 111–112.

³³ Morray-Jones, "The Temple Within," 421.

³⁴ Notably, the building / plantation combination also occurs here (4Q174 1–2 I, 2–6).

may be translated as a “sanctuary of men / man” as well as “sanctuary of Adam.” This double entendre implies both the present embodiment of the temple by the human community, and the “Edenic” nature of that perfect human temple.³⁵ Even so, this self-identification does not negate the belief in a future eschatological temple.³⁶ Rather, the community most likely anticipated such a temple through its own existence.³⁷

The correlation of community to temple also occurs in an important fragment of 4QSongs of the Sage, a group of unambiguously sectarian magical hymns governed by the *למשכיל* heading.³⁸ The recitation of these hymns was meant to afford protection against demons.³⁹ Based on their Herodian script, Maurice Baillet dates the two surviving manuscripts of 4Q510 and 4Q511 to the last quarter of the first century BCE and around the turn of the era respectively.⁴⁰ In 4Q511 35, 2–5 we read:⁴¹

For detailed discussion, see G. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 178–193.

³⁵ Cf. Brooke’s claim (“Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran community,” 289) that the ambiguity of the term *מקדש אדם* allows for an “*Urzeit und Endzeit* eschatology,” in which “the place of the community in that scheme can be allowed to stand all in the same phrase.” For the relationship between temple, cosmos, body, and community in early Jewish and Christian sources see Morray-Jones, “The Temple Within.”

³⁶ For example, as noted by Cross (*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 85, n. 3), 1QM 2:1–6 shows that community members were expected to perform legitimate sacrifices at this temple in the days of the final war: “They shall arrange the chiefs of the priests behind the chief priest and his deputy, twelve chiefs who are to serve steadily before God . . . in the gates of the temple (*בשערי המקדש*) . . . they shall take up their station for their festivals, for their new moons and Sabbaths, and for all the days of the year (*יתיצבו למועדיהם לחודשיהם*) . . . These shall take up their station at the holocausts and at the sacrifices to prepare a soothing incense for the good pleasure of God, to atone on behalf of all his congregation (*אלה יתיצבו על העולות ועל הזבחים לערוך מקטרת ניהוח לרצון אל לכפר*) . . . (בעד כול עדתו).” Unless otherwise noted, text and translations of 1QM generally follow J. Duhaime, in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Damascus Document, War Scrolls and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 96–141.

³⁷ So Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 212. For more on the experience of hierohistory at Qumran, see pp. 101–106.

³⁸ For the evidence regarding this text’s provenance, see Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit,’” 183–184.

³⁹ For the precise “magical” function of this text see B. Nitzan, “Hymns from Qumran, 4Q510–4Q511,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 53–63.

⁴⁰ M. Baillet, *Qumran grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 215, 219.

⁴¹ Text follows Baillet, DJD VII, 237.

ובקדושים יקדי[ש] 2
 אלוהים לו למקדש עולמים וטהרה בנברים והיו 3
 כוהנים עם צדקו צבאו ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו 4
 יהללוהו בהפלא נוראות 5

- 2 And some of the holy ones God will sancti[fy]
 3 for himself as an eternal sanctuary and (as) purity among the cleansed.
 They shall be
 4 priests, his righteous people, his host and ministers, the angels of his
 glory.
 5 They shall praise him with wondrous marvels.

The translation of this important fragment is notoriously tricky, and we shall treat the text more fully in the following chapter.⁴² For now it suffices to note that this passage pictures God as sanctifying for himself “holy ones” who are identified not only as an eternal temple but also as priests. More so than in any of the above passages, there appears to be a shared ontological terminology for angels and humans. If our preliminary translation is correct, the holy ones who are priests are labeled both “righteous people,” and “angels of his glory.” Reminiscent of the angel-priests of SSS, they praise God “with wondrous marvels.”⁴³

In view of the close similarity between the structure of the angelic priesthood as described in 4Q400 1 I, 3–4 (קדושי קדשים and קדושי עד) and the structure of the Qumran community as described in the sectarian texts cited above, the claim for a specifically sectarian provenance of SSS appears to be viable. However, a passage from a decidedly non-sectarian text that we have discussed above—4QInstruction^d (4Q418 81 4–5)—suggests broader origins for the conception of the human community in terms of temple architecture:

בזה כבדהו בהתקדשכה לו כאשר שמכה לקדוש קדשים [לכול] תבל 4
 ובכול [א]ל[ים] 5
 הפיל גורלכה וכבודכה הרבה מואדה

- 4 honor him through the following: through sanctifying yourself for him
 just as he has appointed you as a most holy one [over all the] land, and
 among all the [go]dly [ones]
 5 He has cast your lot, such that your glory is very great.

As noted above, the difficult phrase לקדוש קדושים is best read as an emphasis on the holiness of the addressee by means of an allusion to

⁴² See below, pp. 128–132.

⁴³ For dozens of appearances of the Hebrew root פלא in SSS, see DJD XI, 462–463.

the holy of holies of the temple.⁴⁴ Moreover, as with 4Q511 35, the text here shows clear analogizing between human and angel: in line 4, the addressee is to “sanctify himself.” This language parallels 4Q400 1 I, 15, “all the eternally holy ones shall sanctify themselves” (יתקדשו כול קדושי) (עד), which denotes the activity of the lower angel-priests. Lines 4–5 relate that God “cast your lot among all the [g]odly [ones].” Moreover, the “lot” terminology is similar to several sectarian passages portraying the communion of human with angel.⁴⁵

Although SSS’s division of the heavenly priests in terms of temple architecture parallels the sectarian notions of 1QS, 4QMMT, and 4Q511 35, 4QInstruction’s non-sectarian provenance shows that this metaphor belonged to a broader Second Temple priestly tradition. As such, the division of angelic priests into קדושי קדושים and קדושי עד should not be regarded as evidence of the sectarian origins of SSS.⁴⁶ At the same time, it does not preclude sectarian origins: thanks to 4QMMT and 1QS, we know that this tradition was indeed taken up by the Qumranites.

Regardless of provenance, 4Q400 1 I, 3–4 may be said to envision the structure of the heavenly priesthood and that of an earthly community as duplicates in their replication of the ideal temple.⁴⁷ Support for this claim may be found in 4Q403 1 I, 10–27, a highly formulaic portion of the sixth song that records the blessings bestowed by the seven נשיאי רוש (“chief princes” = angelic priests of highest rank) upon various

⁴⁴ See p. 65, n. 169.

⁴⁵ Two particularly notable parallels occur in 1QH^a:

And a perverted spirit you have purified from great sin that it might take its place with the host of the holy ones and enter into community with the congregation of the children of heaven. *And you cast for man an eternal lot with the spirits of knowledge* (רוח נעוה טהרתה מפשע רב להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קדושים ולבוא ביחד עם) (עדת בני שמים ותפל לאיש גורל עולם עם רוחות דעת) (11:22–23)

For the sake of your glory you have purified a mortal from sin so that he may sanctify himself for you . . . so that he might be united wi[th] the children of your truth and in the lot with your holy ones (להיחד עם) (בני אמתך ובגורל עם קדושיכה) (19:13–14)

See further, Lange, “The Determination of Fate,” 39–48.

⁴⁶ Pace Fletcher-Louis, “Heavenly Ascent,” 369–382.

⁴⁷ To be sure, the angelology of SSS is complex and difficult to decipher, and varying organizational models seem to coexist within the text. In several passages the angelic priests appear to be divided hierarchically into seven orders, each presumably associated with one of the seven holy areas, but this organization is not always consistent. See further Newsom, *Songs*, 23–38.

groups. The recipients of blessing include ידועי עולמים, טהורי עולמים, רומי דעת, הול[כי יו]שר, יודעי רוי ... טוהר, גבורי שכל, תמימי דרך, קדושים מיסדי וועדי צדק and others.⁴⁸ While Newsom notes that all these terms are probably angelic epithets, she does not exclude the possibility that some of them refer to the common community of earthly and angelic worshippers.⁴⁹ This view is understandable in the light of such terms as הול[כי יו]שר and תמימי דרך, which emphasize moral rectitude and may thus be seen as labels more fitting for righteous human worshippers.⁵⁰ However, on the basis of the summary statement in line 26, וכול נשיאין רוש, יברכו יח[ד ל[א]ל[ן]הי אלים the [e]l[lo]hei elim),⁵¹ it seems that angelic beings are here in view. The overwhelmingly angelographic orientation of the text further supports this conclusion, although it is uncertain.⁵²

Although the numerous terms used to describe those who receive blessing in 4Q403 1 I, 10–27 most probably refer to angels, they have close parallels in terminology to the Qumran community. For example, the angelic epithets נועדי צדק (4Q403 1 I, 27) and רוחות צדק (4Q403 1 I, 38),⁵³ are arguably mirrored by the designation of Qumran community members as בני צדק (1QS 3:20, 22; 1QM 1:8) and אנשי גורל מלכי צדק (11Q13 2:8), disciples of the מורה הצדק.⁵⁴ More strikingly, the term תמימי דרך, which is applied to the angels in 4Q403 1 I, 22, is also utilized as a technical term for the earthly community not only in the passage from 1QS cited above (9:4–5)⁵⁵ but also in several other sectarian passages.⁵⁶ Notably, the concept of “walking in perfection” often appears in the context of the priestly atoning function of the community (1QS 3:9, 8:9–10,

⁴⁸ For a complete list, see Newsom, *Songs*, 28.

⁴⁹ Newsom, *Songs*, 28, 196–197.

⁵⁰ See Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 243–244; Strugnell, “The Angelic Liturgy,” 331; Newsom, *Songs*, 196.

⁵¹ Although the term אלוהי אלים probably denotes God elsewhere (4Q402 4 8), in light of the parallel use of נועדי צדק in l. 27, we must take it as a reference to angels. See Newsom’s plausible justification of this reconstruction in DJD XI, 266. See further her comments on “Angelic Elim” and “Angelic Elohim,” *Songs*, 23–24.

⁵² So Newsom, *Songs*, 196.

⁵³ Cf. the discussion of the term מ[ל]אכי צדקה (4Q287 2 13; 4Q286 12 3) and אלי הצדק (11Q13 2:14).

⁵⁴ Cf. the discussion of the term צדק in our treatment of 11QMelchizedek below, pp. 160–162. The appearance of the term עם נמהרי צדק as a designation for community members in 1QH^a 13:23–24 may be paralleled by the angelic רצונו of 4Q403 1 I, 20.

⁵⁵ See above, n. 27.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., 1QS 2:2; 3:9–10; 4:22; 8:10, 18; 9:5, 9; 1QM 14:7; 1QH^a 9:38; CD 2:15–16.

9:4–5). Moreover, in several places 1QS emphasizes that in order to participate in the holy community, initiates must “behave perfectly” (8:18, 9:9; cf. 2:2). 1QS 4:21–23 sets forth that community members (תמימי), by virtue of their purity from all “evil deeds,” will be made to understand the “wisdom of the sons of heaven” and, therefore, “all the glory of Adam” will belong to them. This last example in particular illustrates an ontological proximity between upper and lower communities: by virtue of the perfection of the תמימי דרך below, the Qumran community will share in the salvific knowledge of the perfect ones above, the בני שמים. Parenthetically, we may note that the most conspicuous quality of the angels throughout SSS is their access to divine knowledge. They are labeled as ידעים דעת, יודעי רוי ... טוהר, גבורי שכל, קדושים מיסדי דעת, ידועי עולמים, רומי מיסדי דעת, אלי דעת. We shall return to the topic of knowledge of divine secrets in relation to the Qumranite priestly imagination in chapter four.

Further examples can be found throughout SSS in which epithets of the heavenly priesthood bring to mind the human community below, if not specifically that of Qumran.⁵⁷ In 4Q400 1 I, 6, the context strongly implies that the phrase עם בינות refers to the angelic priests, an unusual appellation for heavenly beings.⁵⁸ As Newsom notes, the term עם is also exceptionally applied to angels in 1QM 12:8 (עם קדושים). However, the phrase עם בינות may be seen as parallel to 1QH^a 10:21 and CD 5:16, לעם כי לא, and לא בינות respectively.⁵⁹ By echoing Isa 27:11, לא כי לא, these texts refer to the unenlightened Jewish opponents of the Qumranites. The description of the angels as עם בינות in line 6 thus evokes images of the enlightened earthly Qumran community. Another example may be seen in the angelic epithets נשיאים and כוהנים, all of which commonly refer to human beings in both biblical and Qumran literature, but almost never to angels.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ For the following discussion, cf. Fletcher-Louis, “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?” 367–381.

⁵⁸ See the discussion of Davila, *Liturgical Texts*, 102; Fletcher-Louis “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?” 373–374.

⁵⁹ Newsom, DJD XI, 180.

⁶⁰ Newsom, *Songs*, 27, struggles to find parallels. For נשיאים, she notes that the fifth heaven in *Sefer ha-Razim* is inhabited by twelve angels called נשיאי הכבוד. For ראשים she notes only the possible parallel in *As. Mos.* 10:2, in which “the hands of the angel shall be filled who has been appointed *chief*.” Despite the suggestion of Charles (*APOT* 2:421) that the angel is here designated as a warrior, the “filling of the hands” of the angel suggests a priestly identity as well. See above, chapter two, n. 25.

Beyond the field of shared epithets, SSS also envisions angels fulfilling various priestly duties mirroring those of the priests below. In 11QShir-Shabb 8–7, angelic priests are depicted as offering זבחים, מנחות, and נסכים. In addition, 4Q400 1 I, 16 attributes a propitiating function to the angelic priests, a function that we have also seen attributed to angels in non-sectarian literature.⁶¹ As we have seen above, line 15 speaks of the angels “sanctifying themselves,” a phrase which is otherwise never applied to angels, but utilized for the chosen quasi-priestly addressee in 4Q418 81 4. In line with this pattern, line 17 describes the angels as teachers: “and from their mouths (come) teachings concerning all matters of holiness together with precepts of” (ומפיהם הורות כול קדושים עם משפטי).⁶² The language is clearly reminiscent of Mal 2:7, which describes the priest as a teacher who is also a מלאך ה-צבאות.⁶³ We have observed the importance of the teaching role attributed to the exalted human priesthood in the non-sectarian texts, and it is well known that at Qumran it was the inner group of priests who taught the community.⁶⁴ On the other hand, while it is commonplace for angels to have a revelatory function in apocalyptic works, the language of teaching is used only rarely for angels.⁶⁵

As we have seen in this brief sample, SSS describes the angelic priesthood with language that conspicuously mirrors that applied to the earthly community in sectarian documents. The reflection of the two presumably distinct communities in such terms has the effect of linking the angelic and the human. Indeed, as we shall see below, many scholars view SSS as a vehicle for uniting the worshipping community mystically with the angelic priests. Nonetheless, an ontological boundary between the two groups does stand out at times. The most important passage in this regard is 4Q400 2 6–8, a unique passage in SSS due to its use of first person grammatical forms. In these lines, immediately following a description of a communion in praise with the elite angels (l. 1) and a long digression about them (ll. 2–5), we encounter a candid comparison of the human and angelic worshippers from the perspective of the earthly worshippers:⁶⁶

⁶¹ See, e.g., 1 *Enoch* 10, *T. Levi* 3; cf. *Jos. Asen.* 15:7–8.

⁶² The translation follows that of Newsom, *DJD* XI, 178.

⁶³ Indeed, Newsom notes that “the ambiguous word מלאך may have provided grounds for speculation about the angelic priesthood” in this line. Newsom, *Songs*, 105.

⁶⁴ See esp. 1QS 4:3–8.

⁶⁵ See Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 205, 241–242; Fletcher-Louis, “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?” 374. The angels do instruct humans, however, in *Jub.* 3:15; 4:15; 8:3; and 10:10. I thank Dr. Michael Segal for these references.

⁶⁶ Reconstructions and translation loosely follow Newsom, *Songs*, 110–111.

6 מה נתחשב [ב]ם וכוהנתנו מה במעוניהם וק[ודשנו מה ידמה לקודש]
 7 קודש[י]הם [מה] תרומת לשון עפרנו בדעת אל[ים]
 8 ל[ר]נתנו גרוממה לאלוהי דעת[

- 6 How shall we be considered [among] them? And as for our priesthood, how shall it (be considered) in their dwellings? And as for [our] ho[liness, how can it compare with] their [surpassing]
 7 holiness? [What] is the offering of our tongues of dust (compared) with the knowledge of the g[ods]?
 8] for our [jub]ilation, let us exalt the God of knowledge[

Reminiscent of the Qumran *Niedrigkeitsdoxologien*,⁶⁷ these rhetorical questions express praise in the form of self-deprecation. Despite their lowly status, however, the speaker calls on the earthly priests to sing praises and participate with the heavenly cult (l. 8).⁶⁸ Undeniably, this passage shows a keen awareness of both the disparate natures of the angelic and human priests and their related character.⁶⁹

What are we to make of the above data? On the one hand the mirroring of angelic priesthood with the human community results in the semblance of ontological participation. Indeed, the situation is sometimes so perplexing that in several passages scholars cannot agree on whether humans or angels are referred to. On the other hand, 4Q400 2 6–7 acknowledges a clear distinction between the angelic and human priesthoods. In order to understand this tension, we may consider the function of the text within the imaginal realm of those who utilized it.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF HEAVEN AND EARTH IN SSS

What spiritual role did these thirteen Sabbath songs play for the Qumran community? The divergent answers to this question underscore the difficulties this text poses for scholars.⁷⁰ For our purposes, it will suffice

⁶⁷ See, e.g., 1QH^a 9:27–28; 11:24–26.

⁶⁸ See Newsom, DJD XI, 187.

⁶⁹ Pace Fletcher-Louis (*All the Glory*, 307). See further Alexander, *The Mystical Texts*, 45–47.

⁷⁰ For a case in point, note the difference of opinions as to the location of the climax of the work and its enormous interpretive ramifications in the studies of Newsom (“He Has Established”), Morray-Jones (“The Temple Within”), and Fletcher-Louis (“Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?”). For the proposal that the recitation of SSS served as a substitute for the Sabbath burnt offering, see A.S. van der Woude,

to address the conception of the relationship between the heavenly and earthly priesthood conveyed by SSS, a question which, as noted above, has been debated. The discussion centers around three general interpretive paradigms. First, the celestial temple and angelic priesthood in SSS represent a projection into heaven of the earthly priesthood at Qumran. According to this model, the “imaginary” vision of the heavenly temple is constructed on the basis of the “real” earthly temple. Second, the vision in SSS does not portray a heavenly priesthood at all, but rather refers to the human angelomorphic priesthood at Qumran. Third, and opposite to the first position, the angelic priesthood and celestial temple of SSS are visions of a heavenly pattern after which the community below modeled itself.

Unsurprisingly, explanations from the perspective of the first position have dominated scholarship.⁷¹ The work of Newsom is representative of the trend. Followed by many others, she views SSS as a ritualistic medium through which the community members were translated into the heavens in order to participate in the praise of the angelic priests.⁷² She thus concludes that SSS “is a quasi-mystical liturgy designed to evoke a sense of being present in the heavenly temple.” Their purpose was “the praxis of

“Fragmente einen Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11Q SirSabb),” in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala; Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres* (ed. W.C. Delsman, et al. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1982), 332; Maier, “Shirê ‘Ôlat hash-Shabbat,” 553, 560; I. Knohl, “Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple Cult,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 26. Alternatively, Falk (*Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 148–149) maintains that SSS served as accompaniments used by the earthly priests to the heavenly altar service: SSS “cannot be considered a complete innovation. It seems to draw on themes and forms used at the Temple, presumably to maintain continuity in an exiled setting . . . Far from supplying evidence for a new type of liturgical prayer which could only develop as a replacement for the Temple cult, it suggests instead attempts to preserve elements of priestly liturgy.” For the suggestion that SSS is an apocalypse, the purpose of which is to develop speculative information about the heavens, see J. Carmignac, “Quèst-ce que l’Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân,” *RevQ* 10 (1979–1981): 3–34.

⁷¹ E. Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E/sotericism Recovered,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* [ed. H. Najman and J. Newman; JSJSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 184–185) attributes this orientation to the “dominance of social scientific method in the study of history and other disciplines included in the rubric of the humanities.”

⁷² Newsom, *Songs*, 64. See also B. Nitzan, *Biblical Influence in Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (Ph.D. diss., Tel Aviv University, 1989), 302, 306, 307–308 (Hebrew); M. Weinfeld, “Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 244.

something like a communal mysticism.”⁷³ Following Johann Maier,⁷⁴ she claims that this primary purpose of SSS must be understood in light of the priestly self-understanding of the Qumran community.⁷⁵ Their claim to the true priesthood suffered from an inherent disadvantage since it was located away from the temple, the undeniable source of priestly legitimacy. As such, SSS can be viewed, in large part, as a compensatory liturgical work; it makes a case beyond rhetorical argument, providing not only “a model for their priesthood” but also “experiential validation of their claims.”⁷⁶ Quite sensibly, according to this explanation, the SSS vision of the heavenly priesthood is modeled on the basis of the historical experiences, needs, and desires of the earthly Qumranite priests. Moreover, according to this interpretation, apart from the mystical union accomplished by the liturgy, the human and angelic communities remain clearly distinguished from one another.

The second view has been raised in recent scholarship warning against a simplistic view of the duality between the heavenly and earthly realms at Qumran. Noting the sophistication of the symbolic configurations of Second Temple Jewry in general and at Qumran in particular, Philip Alexander claims that it is “a mistake to assume that they all believed in a crude two- or three-decker universe.” Rather than viewing the heavens “literally as ‘up there,’ these Jews were “perfectly capable of conceiving of heaven as ‘another dimension.’”⁷⁷ Fletcher-Louis goes further, challenging the very existence of a simplistic heaven / earth parallelism at Qumran. To him, the dichotomy of heavens / holy versus earth / profane reflects more on the modern desacralization of space than on any Jewish belief of the first century CE. He points out that in Second Temple Judaism, as

⁷³ This conclusion is at odds with that of L. Schiffman (“Merkavah Speculations at Qumran: The 4Q *Serek Shirot Olat ha-Shabbat*,” in *Mystics, Philosophers and Politicians, Festschrift for A. Altmann* [ed. J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski; Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 5; Durham: Duke University Press, 1982], 15–47), who notes that the lack of any visionary journey in the text points to its speculative nature rather than to a mystical quality.

⁷⁴ J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der “jüdischen Gnosis”*: *Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkâbâh* (Kairos Religionswissenschaftliche Studien 1; Salzburg: O. Müller, 1964) 133–135.

⁷⁵ Newsom (“He Has Established,” 116–117) astutely recognizes a broader religious problematic underlying the text, that of “the necessity but the difficulty of adequate worship.” This problem was common not only to a “wide spectrum of contemporary Judaism” but also to a “wide spectrum of human religious experience.” See further the discussion below.

⁷⁶ Newsom, “He Has Established,” 115.

⁷⁷ Alexander, *Mystic Texts*, 54.

well as at Qumran, there is a vision of the earthly realm as divided into concentric spheres of holiness surrounding Jerusalem and the temple at the cosmic center. At that nexus, the correlation of heavens and earth is much more complex than normally assumed.⁷⁸ In this space there is an inextricable identity between the angels and Israel, which “rends the veil between the upper and lower stories of the traditional map.” Utilizing a history-of-religions approach, Fletcher-Louis concludes that it is this very space that the Qumran priests inhabited. SSS therefore contains a self-description of the elite angelomorphic Qumranite priesthood, which was living in a time and space elevated from mundane history, experiencing an almost completely realized eschatology. As support for this claim, he notes the various “inappropriate” applications of anthropomorphic terminology to the priestly angels in SSS as well as comparable angelification of human priests in contemporary texts both from Qumran and the larger Second Temple period milieu.

Such an explanation would clarify the puzzling absence of the angels’ words of praise throughout the text. The Maskil is not calling *angels* to praise (a function that would be out of line with other texts in which the Maskil enlightens community members, never angels).⁷⁹ Rather, he is conducting a call that is met with the response of the divinized community members themselves.⁸⁰ In response to this rather shocking claim, scholars have noted the severe underplay of metaphor and hyperbole in Fletcher-Louis’ analyses.⁸¹ Further, as Alexander points out, analogous to *imitatio dei*, for *imitatio angelorum* to work, the angels *must* be described in anthropomorphic terms. This is completely appropriate for a text of the type of SSS, composed by earthly priests. Moreover, we should not assume that the Qumranites were so far removed from reality that they lived as angels in a completely realized eschatology. Doves of texts point

⁷⁸ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 472–475.

⁷⁹ Fletcher-Louis cites the following למשכיל texts as examples: 1QS 3:13; 9:12; 1QSb 1:1; 3:22; 5:20; CD 12:21; 13:22; 4Q269 9 III, 15; 4Q510 1 4; 4Q511 2 I 1; 1QH^a 20:14; 4Q298 1–2 I; 4Q255 recto.

⁸⁰ For alternative explanations of this phenomenon see D. Allison “The Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 189–197; E. Chazon, “Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 101; Knohl, “Between Voice and Silence.”

⁸¹ While it is true that in some Second Temple period texts humans are labeled *elohim* or angels, as Alexander (*The Mystical Texts*, 45) notes, this “usage is actually rare, and the meaning is not always as clear as Fletcher-Louis supposes. He seriously underplays the possibility of metaphor and hyperbole in these cases, and too quickly takes them in a literal sense.”

in the opposite direction; the Qumranites were currently suffering (they were particularly troubled by their fleshiness!) but expected the end to arrive soon.⁸²

The third position appears in Henry Corbin's research on temple phenomenology, which is largely overlooked by Qumran scholarship.⁸³ In his book, *Temple and Contemplation*, Corbin makes the following claim:

The opposition between the vision of the material temple "localized" on earth, and the vision of the ideal spiritual temple, is somewhat artificial, since in fact the *imago templi* as such is always perceived on the level of the in between, of the imaginal, "the meeting place of the two seas" . . . [This] implies a situation which is above all *speculative*, in the etymological sense of the word: two mirrors (*specula*) facing each other and reflecting, one within the other, the Image that they hold. The Image does not derive from empirical sources. It precedes and dominates such sources, and is thus the criterion by which they are verified and their meaning is put to the test.⁸⁴

This statement is part of a larger warning against reductionism and the projection of flat, one-dimensional historical assumptions onto the image of the temple in Qumran thought.⁸⁵ Rather than reducing the mythological temple concept to the level of the imaginary (often deemed fictional), the celestial temple archetype may be located within the framework of the community's imaginal experience of hierohistory.

The notion of celestial temple at Qumran was largely inspired by the book of Ezekiel, which clearly had a major impact on the Qumran community and related sectarian movements of the Second Temple period.⁸⁶ In Ezekiel, the destruction of the temple is envisioned not only as a

⁸² See Alexander, *The Mystical Texts*, 45–47.

⁸³ For an exception, see Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries." I thank Professor Wolfson for bringing Corbin's work to my attention. More recently, see E. Tigchelaar, "The Imaginal Context of the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup 122; Leiden, Brill, 2007), 257–270.

⁸⁴ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 303 and 267.

⁸⁵ This sentiment is echoed by Wolfson ("Seven Mysteries," 184–185), who criticizes the type of binary logic that "presumes a unilateral relation of upper mirroring lower, which further implies that the symbolic is constructed on the basis of the historical." Quite to the contrary, on the basis of the fantastic nature of Qumran thought (especially as seen in SSS), Wolfson contends that it is more likely that the historical is "reflective of the symbolic, the tangible construed on the basis of the imaginal . . . the paradigmatic image, the symbolic constellation configured in the visionary's heart."

⁸⁶ This corresponds with the claim of Wacholder ("Ezekiel and Ezekielianism," 187) that "the book of Ezekiel served as a kind of textbook or systematic program for sectarian Judaism of the Second Temple era." See further chapter one, n. 28.

physical event, but also as a cosmic catastrophe, comparable to the exile of Adam from Eden. The physical destruction pales in comparison with its spiritual consequence: the departure of the divine presence. Since the most important element of the temple is not its physical form but the divine presence, the destruction of the temple is not fatal. Temporarily, God becomes a spiritualized *מקדש מעט* (Ezek 11:14–16) in exile. According to this system, the return of the divine presence and the restoration of the temple have cosmological significance.⁸⁷ This restoration is not historical, and should not be confused with the temple rebuilt at the behest of the Achaemenids.⁸⁸ Rather it is a restoration guaranteed to be unprophane, a “supra-terrestrial Image, divine in origin.”⁸⁹ This restoration is to occur at the eschaton, a time completely distinct from known history.⁹⁰ Hence, the detailed description of the restored temple of Ezekiel 40–48 is not meant to “glorify the brilliance of its external appearance but to herald the establishment of divine sovereignty in the universe, at its ultimate zenith.”⁹¹ This temple is not terrestrial but celestial. This point manifests itself in the imagery describing the restored temple in terms of a restored Eden,⁹² a notion developed intensively in the Second Temple period, and, as we have noticed above, especially at Qumran. The final verse of the book of Ezekiel points to the celestial nature of Ezekiel’s temple. Rather than “Jerusalem” or related geographical/earthly terms, the heavenly temple city is simply named “The Lord is there.” Thus, for Ezekiel the priest-prophet, the *imago templi* is the center of God’s actions in hierohistory.

⁸⁷ Pace P. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 238, who sees Ezekiel 40–48 as “the fountainhead of the hierocratic [i.e., temple establishment] tradition.” For a strong argument that Ezekiel’s model for the temple possesses cosmological significance, see S. Niditch, “Ezekiel 40–48 in a Visionary Context,” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 208–224.

⁸⁸ On Ezekiel’s vision of the restored temple as a reflection of his theology, see J. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48* (HSM 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) esp. 129–158; I. Duguid, “Putting Priests in Their Place: Ezekiel’s Contribution to the History of the Old Testament Priesthood,” in *Ezekiel’s Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality* (ed. S. Cook and C. Patton; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), 43–59.

⁸⁹ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 292. Corbin’s analysis of Ezekiel’s temple vision (pp. 284–292) relies heavily upon the unpublished dissertation of S. Fujita, “The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries BC” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1970).

⁹⁰ Ezekiel’s concept may be compared to that of the temple to be restored “on the day of creation” in col. 29 of the Temple Scroll.

⁹¹ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 291.

⁹² See esp. the prophecy against the king of Tyre, Ezek 28:12–14.

To Corbin, the same theology of God as spiritualized temple in exile as well as the expectation of a restored temple standing beyond the confines of history played a major role in the religious worldview of the Qumranites. Notably, this theology is evidenced both by numerous non-sectarian documents preserved at Qumran, including the New Jerusalem texts and the closely related Temple Scroll, and by the sectarian corpus. The Qumranite vision of the events of history as possessing a celestial archetype is what confers on the experience of time there “a parabolic dimension which elevates all events to the level of parables.”⁹³ In such a system, eschatology cannot be understood as an event suddenly ending linear history. Instead, at Qumran there was a connection between the existential meaning of eschatology and liturgical time. Only with such a connection does “the image of the final temple acquire its authentic and existential significance as the eternal theocratic kingdom.”⁹⁴

Liturgical time does not occur within the irreversible chronology of “secular” history. Rather, it is cyclical and repetitive and occurs at the place where earthly and heavenly temples conjoin. It is within liturgical time that the Qumran community gained access to events which were already over and still to come, always expecting the end.⁹⁵ As such, from the standpoint of SSS, the earthly priesthood and temple are nothing more than mere copies of the celestial images. What the Qumranites imagined with regard to the heavenly realm became the blueprint for construction of the terrestrial community. It is this imaginal mechanism which infuses the earthly temple and priesthood at Qumran with vitality, which revives from the fallen temple below the image of the ideal temple above.

Corbin’s point about liturgical time is born out by the Hodayot, which expressly refers to the barrier broken down between the angelic and the human within liturgical experience. Consider 1QH^a 11:22–24:

And a perverted spirit you have purified from great sin that it might take its place with the host of the holy ones and enter into community with the congregation of the children of heaven. And you cast for man an eternal lot

⁹³ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 296.

⁹⁴ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 297.

⁹⁵ Indeed, as Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries,” 197–198) observes, according to the seventh song of SSS (4Q403 1 I, 32–33), it is the liturgy itself that somehow contains the experience of the divine glory: “In the splendor of the praises is the glory of his kingship, in it are the praises of all the gods together with the splendor of all [his] king[lines]” (בהדר) (תשבחות כבוד מלכותו בה תשבחות כול אלוהים עם הדר כול מלכ[ותו]).

with the spirits of knowledge, that he might praise your name in a common rejoicing and recount your wonderful acts before all your works (ורוח נעוה) טהרתה מפשע רב להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קדושים ולבוא ביחד עם עדת בני שמים ותפל לאיש גורל עולם עם רוחות דעת להלל שמכה ביחד רנה ולספר נפלאותיכה לנגד (כול מעשיכה).

As Jacob Licht observes, the community's participation with the angels occurs "באמירת שבה ותהילה לפני האל דווקא."⁹⁶ Licht's observation is supported not only by other passages in the Hodayat (see especially 19:4–6, 10–14), but also by other liturgical works preserved at Qumran, such as 1QS 11, 4QpapPrQuot (4Q503 = *Daily Prayers*), 4QBerakhot and the "Hymn to the Creator" in 11QPs^a.⁹⁷ Each of these texts assumes the communion of humans and angels within a liturgical context and portrays the praise of angels and humans in parallel terms. As Elliot Wolfson characterizes it, the composition of such liturgical poetry "is predicated on the imaginal excursion into the theophanic realm, an excursion that breaks down the barrier of the angelic and human, celestial and mundane." The language of double mirror imagery of heaven and earth, such as that in SSS, indicates that

the angelic camp and the priestly congregation are indifferently the same, that is, the same precisely in virtue of being different—the experience of transformation, which is ongoing and repeated rather than intermittent and singular, requires that the two parties are identical and disparate, for if human and angel were not the former, how could they be the latter?⁹⁸

Like Corbin, Wolfson holds that in this system, the "real" is predicated from the imaginal; the earthly is modeled on the vision of the heavenly: "For is the Qumran material not exemplary of a society wherein the fantastic served as the vehicle of implementation of the real?"⁹⁹

⁹⁶ J. Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot: mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 84, n. 22.

⁹⁷ Notably, these texts derive from varying contexts, ranging from the clearly Qumranic (4QBerakhot) to the questionably Qumranic (SSS), to the extra-Qumranic (4QpapPrQuot, "Hymn to the Creator"). All, however, assume communion with angels in liturgical contexts, and hence the phenomenon was certainly not unique to Qumran. Indeed, the practice continues today in the Jewish liturgy. See, for example, M. Weinfeld, "Traces of *Kedushat Yozer* and *Pesukei De-Zimra* in the Qumran Literature and in Ben-Sira," *Tarbiz* 45 (1975–1976): 15–26 (Hebrew), and "The Angelic Song Over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts," in *Time to Prepare*, 131–157.

⁹⁸ Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries," 211.

⁹⁹ Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries," 209.

Ultimately, Wolfson, like Fletcher-Louis, concludes that SSS does not refer to two separate communities at all, but rather to the liturgically angelified priesthood of the Qumran community. Yet, this conclusion is not fully supported by the evidence. While the notion of a transformation allowed Qumranites to participate with the priestly angels in a “synchronisme liturgique,”¹⁰⁰ there is no basis for the claim that the transformation was perceived as a total ontological one. We have observed that within the angelic liturgy itself, the distinction between human and angelic priesthoods is not completely dismissed (4Q400 2). As Esther Chazon observes, in SSS there is a “substantive and qualitative distinction between human praise and that of the angels.” Indeed, in all of the liturgical texts from Qumran which describe the joint praise of angels and humans, “human praise is like, but not equal to angelic praise.”¹⁰¹ Moreover, as we have noted above, a long list of Qumran texts (including liturgical works) testify to an acute Qumranite awareness and continued experience of earthly tribulations and struggle against sin. This of course, stands in an interesting tension with the claim that the earthly community viewed itself fully as angels. The heads of the Qumranites may have been in the heavens, but they were equally aware that their feet were at least for the moment still firmly rooted on the ground. However, their experience of sacred liturgical time presupposes a partially realized eschatology, an imaginal realm that allowed community members to share in the experiences of the angels. Paradoxically, on the one hand, the Qumranite “temple” drew its vitality precisely from the envisioning of the community as a model of the imaginal temple. On the other hand, they never completely lost touch with earthly reality, maintaining the thin line between divine and human.

CONCLUSION

SSS testifies to the centrality of the imaginal symbol of the celestial temple and its heavenly priesthood for the Qumranites. It is also the most extensive Qumran document to represent the heavenly priesthood as a duplicate of its earthly counterpart; each community structured as a replica of the temple (“holy” and “holy of holies”). The possibility that

¹⁰⁰ Corbin (*Le paradoxe du monothéisme* [Bibliothèque des mythes et des religions 1; Paris: L’Herne, 1981], 110, 126–127) uses this phrase to describe the relationship between heaven and earth in Qumran angelology.

¹⁰¹ Chazon, “Liturgical Communion,” 101, 105.

the document was composed outside of Qumran does not fundamentally alter this assumption. SSS was used at Qumran and, regardless of older meanings the text may have held for other groups, it is its use in the particular context of the Qumran community that interests us.¹⁰²

What epistemological mechanism is implied by SSS's vision of the angelic priesthood in the celestial temple? Structuralist approaches that posit that the vision represents a spiritualized description of the earthly temple projected into heaven where the celestial image somehow reflects the situation on earth, while in one sense intuitive etically, do not account for the full weight of the emic symbol of the *imago templi*. As we have seen, the symbol of the unprofanable ideal temple that would emerge in a time other than known history goes back to Ezekiel. In addition, numerous texts composed prior to the formation of the Qumran community expect or presume an unprofanable heavenly temple. Several of these texts were part of the Qumran library (e.g., Temple Scroll, New Jerusalem) and it is clear that they were integral to the Qumran community's self-conception. This suggests a much older and deeper spiritual inspiration for SSS. To attribute these songs solely to earthly causation is to flatten the emic significance of the imaginal temple for the Qumranites and to evacuate it of its dynamic archetypal power. As Corbin notes, in SSS the "celestial *imago templi* arises in a form which accords with the scope of the angelic liturgy and with the hidden reality of a hierohistory that resuscitates from the fallen Temple the figure of the ideal Temple reserved for god, angels, and the righteous."¹⁰³ On the other hand, we do not completely reject Newsom's claim that this liturgy had a compensatory function for the Qumran priests who found themselves distanced from their earthly source of power and legitimacy. This is certainly part of the historical and cultural landscape surrounding the Qumranite use of SSS, but it does not fully explain the imaginal world reflected in the text.

¹⁰² For a fine example of how non-sectarian compositions found at Qumran should be studied for their new and additional meanings in their Qumranite context, see G. Brooke, "Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 79–94.

¹⁰³ Corbin, *Temple and Contemplation*, 298.

CHAPTER FOUR

OTHERWORLDLY PRIESTHOOD IN SECTARIAN WRITINGS

In chapter three, we observed the centrality of the symbol of the imaginal temple and its priesthood in SSS, and, by extension, for the Qumranites. The experience of sacred liturgical time implied by that text brought about a partially realized eschatology whereby human worshippers escaped linear historical existence and became like the angels. This temporal transformation was paralleled by a spatial one. The homology between humans and angels allowed for joint action occurring across the boundary of physical space in the archetypal image of the temple. Although no traversal between heaven and earth or vice versa is expressed in the language of SSS, the opportunity of communion is nonetheless implied by the parallel descriptions of the heavenly and earthly worshippers. Whether or not SSS was composed by a member of the Qumran community, the religious mechanism implied by that text may be said to have been adopted by the Qumranites.

The present chapter turns to notions of otherworldly priesthood in documents of certain sectarian provenance. How do these compare and contrast with those of SSS and the texts discussed in chapter two? What theological notions are implied by sectarian depictions of otherworldly priesthood and what do they suggest about the nature of the Qumran community? Four texts will be treated: the Rule of Benedictions, 4QSongs of the Sage, the “Self-Glorification Hymn,” and 11QMelchizedek. In addition, one text of unknown provenance, 4QUnidentified Fragments C (4Q468b), will be treated within the larger discussion of 11QMelchizedek.

THE RULE OF BENEDICTIONS (1QSB)

The sectarian text best known for touching on the notion of otherworldly priesthood is the Rule of Benedictions, or 1QSB. The document consists of a list of very fragmentary blessings addressed to various groups and individuals within the community which were to be recited by the **משכיל**.

It has long been noted that this composition should be interpreted in light of the fact that it was originally preceded on the same scroll by the Rule of the Community (1QS) and the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa). All three works are written in the same hand, which may be dated paleographically to the first quarter of the first century BCE. According to the prevailing view, the Rule of the Community (also known as the Manual of Discipline) represents the “manual” of rules and regulations according to which the pre-messianic community at Qumran lived, while the Rule of the Congregation, at least in its present form, is an eschatological rule describing the life and conduct of the Qumran community envisioned for the impending messianic age. As Schiffman characterizes it, the Rule of the Congregation is a “kind of mirror image of the society described in the Manual of Discipline.”¹ Thus, the Rule of Benedictions, which directly follows the Rule of the Congregation on the 1QS/Sa/Sb scroll, may be seen as a set of “eschatological benedictions of the present age, which the sect believed would be recited at the dawn of the eschaton.”² In support of this claim, scholars have noted the text’s inclusion of a blessing for the Prince of the Congregation, one of the future eschatological leaders of the community (cf. CD 7:20–21; 4QpIsa^a 5–6 3; 1QM 5:1).³ Furthermore, whereas the annual covenantal renewal ceremony of the Rule of the Community (1QS 2) includes both blessings *and* curses against the enemies of God, 1QSa (also closely patterned on the priestly blessing of Numbers 6) lacks curses. This probably indicates that from the point of view of the Rule of Benedictions, God’s enemies have already perished in the eschatological battle between the forces of light and dark-

¹ L. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 9. See also the suggestions of D. Barthélemy in the *editio princeps*, DJD I, 108–109 and those of J.T. Milik, pp. 121–122 and 128–129. For a differing interpretation, see H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505; and especially Hempel’s powerful redaction critical remarks in, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus,” 251–269. See further chapter five, n. 127.

² Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 75. Cf. M. Abegg Jr., “1QSB and the Elusive High Priest,” in *Emanuel*, 3–16, who claims that 1QSB is the “full text (and thus no accidental appendix) of the blessings associated with the yearly renewal ceremony in 1QS I–III, and that the eschatological High Priest is he who is faithfully serving when—in the imagery of 1QSa—the Royal Messiah (the Prince) arrives to take his seat at the banquet table before the faithful. Until then the blessings of 1QSB faithfully reflect the present priest (you) and while looking forward to the coming Prince (him).”

³ See B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. J. Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 140, n. 69, 141; J. Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim: mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 274.

ness. Finally, the fact that the text includes blessings addressed to “those who fear God” (1:1), “the sons of Zadok the priests” (3:22), “the Prince of the Congregation” (5:20), and almost certainly other unpreserved groups and leaders of the congregation indicates that the blessings were to be performed at a ceremony where all of the congregation, including its leaders, was to gather. As Bilhah Nitzan notes, from the apparent ascending order of status of those blessed in 1QSb, “we may assume that the solemn occasion described therein is similar to that described in the Rule of the Congregation.”⁴ The opening line of the Rule of the Congregation, “And this is the rule for all the Congregation of Israel in the end of days” (וזה סרך לכל עדת ישראל באחרית הימים),⁵ confirms that the “solemn occasion” in question is some sort of eschatological assembly.⁶ However, given the eschatological orientation of the community and the connection at Qumran between the existential meaning of eschatology and liturgical narration depicting the imaginal realm discussed in chapter three, it is likely that the Rule of Benedictions was “recited proleptically in the Community, which certainly lived out the belief that they were living in the eschatological age.”⁷ Indeed, as we have observed, a similar mechanism is operative in SSS, which was also to be recited by the *משכיל*, the visionary-poet.⁸ As we shall see, many verbal and thematic links with SSS, which was recited in the “present,” increase the likelihood that 1QSb was indeed recited proleptically,⁹ rendering “future present, albeit present as the future that is to come, an imaginal bridging of time.”¹⁰

In its original form, 1QSb opened each blessing with a prose introduction that identified the party to whom it was to be addressed. As mentioned above, the present text preserves portions of only three of these introductions (addressed to *בני צדוק הכהנים*, *ירא* [יאל], and *נשיא העדה*). The

⁴ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 140–141.

⁵ For the possibility that this line represents a later Zadokite redaction, see the works of Stegemann and Hempel cited in n. 1.

⁶ According to Stegemann (“Some Remarks to 1QSa,” 494), the expression *אחרית הימים* here refers not to the messianic age but to “the *present* time of the author, which he regards as the last period of history including the future ‘turn’ with the coming of the messiah, the final judgement, and the start of salvation.” See further A. Steudel, “*אחרית הימים* in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–246.

⁷ Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 2, n. 9; cf. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 141; Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte*, 284.

⁸ Cf. esp. the treatment of 4QSongs of the Sage below, pp. 123–132.

⁹ So Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte*, 284.

¹⁰ Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries,” 193.

result is that we are left with several remaining sections of blessings without a clear statement regarding their intended addressees. In turn, this allows for several interpretive possibilities. In the following discussion, we will treat only the blessing directed expressly toward the Zadokite priests, and then turn to the language of 1QSB 4:22–28, which, for good reason, many scholars have assumed to preserve a blessing for the high priest.

The Blessing for the Zadokite Priests (1QSB 3:22–4:21)

The blessing for the Zadokite priests spans several fragmentary lines from 1QSB 3:22 to 4:21 (4:6–19 are lost). Reminiscent of the role played by the Zadokite priests in 1QS 5:2, this text relates that they are the God-chosen custodians of the covenant (בחר בם אל לחזק בריתו; 1QSB 3:23). This role is actualized through their function as supremely authoritative teachers and judges of divine law (3:23–24).¹¹ The phrase “to strengthen his covenant” (לחזק בריתו) may indicate the perception that other priests were abrogating the covenant, and it is possible to detect related polemical notions within the blessing.¹² However, for our present purposes we shall focus on the portion of the blessing in the last few lines of column 3:¹³

דברי ברכה למ[שכיל לברך] את בני צדוק הכוהנים אשר	22
בחר בם אל לחזק בריתו [חון כול משפטיו בתוך עמו ולהורותם	23
כאשר צוה ויקימו באמת [] ובצדק פקדו כול חוקיו ויתהלכו כאש[ר]	24
בחר יברככה אדוני מ[מעון קו]דשו וישימכה מכלול הדר בתוך	25
קדושים וברית כהונת[עולם יח]דש לכה ויתנכה מקומכה [במעון]	26
קודש ובמעשיכה יש[פוט כו]ל נדי[ב]ים וממזל שפתיכה כול [27
עמים ינחילכה רשית] ים ועצת כול בשר בידכה יברך	28

¹¹ From the appearance of the term “peoples” (עמים) in 3:28, it appears that their authority may have been perceived to stretch over Gentiles as well. See further J. Maier, “Rule of the Blessings,” *EDSS* 2:792.

¹² See esp. 3:26, *כהונת* [דש לכה ויתנכה מקומכה, J. Charlesworth (*Rule of the Community* [PTSDSSP 1], 120) has seen in this line a reference to the disenfranchisement of the Qumran priests from their proper מקום, i.e., the Jerusalem temple. This reading would be strengthened if we accept Milik’s reconstruction (DJD I, 124), *כהונת*[עולם יח]דש לכה. It is interesting to note that the presumably lay אל יראי אל קודש [במעון] קודש קודש [רי]ת[ת] קודשי בב[רי]ת[ת] מחזקי בב[רי]ת[ת] קודשי. For more on priestly polemics at Qumran, see chapter six.

¹³ J. Charlesworth and L. Stuckenbruck, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 126–127.

- 22 Words of blessing for the M[askil to bless] the Sons of Zadok, the priests whom
 23 God chose to strengthen his covenant [...] *hwn* all his precepts in the midst of his people and to teach them
 24 as he commanded. And they raised up in truth [...] and watched over all of his statutes in righteousness and walked just a[s]
 25 he chose. May the Lord bless you from his [ho]ly [abode]. May he set you as a splendid ornament in the midst of
 26 the holy ones, and [may he r]enew for you the covenant of the [eternal] priesthood, and may he give you your place in the
 27 holy [abode]; and by your deeds may he ju[dge all] the no[b]le ones; and from what flows forth from your lips all [...]
 28 the peoples. May he bequeath you the first fruit[s ...] *ym*. And may he bless the counsel of all flesh by your hand.

This text is a strong piece of evidence that the notions preserved in the documents observed in the previous two chapters had direct and profound influence on the Qumranite priestly imagination. If we accept Milik's plausible suggestions for line 25 and the end of line 26, then the "holy abode," the place from which God sets forth his blessing in line 25, is the very same place where the earthly Zadokite priests are called to take their God-granted place among the "holy ones" in line 26.¹⁴ Considering the occurrence of the same phrase in 4:25 (ואתה כמלאך פנים) (במעון קודש), as well as the analogous use of the phrase היכל מלכות in 4:25–26, this is plausibly a reference to the participation of the Zadokite priests with the angels who, as portrayed in SSS, serve in the cosmic temple.¹⁵ This assertion is supported by various close literary connections with Isaac's blessing of Levi in *Jub.* 31:14–20. Both blessings emphasize the judicial and pedagogical roles of the blessed (*Jub.* 31:15, 1QSb 3:23–24), their performance of the priestly blessing ([presumably of Num 6:24–26] *Jub.* 31:15, 1QSb 3:28), and their access to cultic dues (*Jub.* 31:16, 1QSb 3:28). It is plausible then to assume that 1QSb's call for the Zadokite priests to take their place "in the midst of the holy ones" should be seen in light of *Jub.* 31:14, also a blessing calling for sacerdotalists to serve in God's "sanctuary as the angels of the presence and the holy ones."¹⁶

¹⁴ Although the term קדושים here might be interpreted as referring to the human community members, in light of the close correspondences with the non-sectarian literature and with the more explicit blessing in 4:24–28, it appears more likely that קדושים here refers to angelic beings. Cf. chapter three, n. 22.

¹⁵ Though מעון קודש never appears in SSS, see the analogous פלא מעוני in 4Q403 1 II, 19, 23; 4Q405 8–9 3.

¹⁶ Both passages employ the language and themes of Malachi 2.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the language describing the pedagogical role of the Zadokites is also paralleled closely by the description of the angelic priests of the inner sanctum in the first song of SSS: “knowledge among the priests of the inner sanctum. And from their mouths (come) teachings concerning all matters of holiness together with precepts of” (דעת בכוהני קורב ומפיהם הורות כול קדושים עם משפטי) 4Q400 1 I, 17).¹⁷

Several other literary connections confirm that the sectarian blessing of the Zadokite priests in 1QSB stands in close connection with the texts observed in the previous two chapters. For instance, 1QSB 3:28, “may he bless the council of all flesh by your hand” (ועצת כול בשר בידכה) (יברך), apparently refers to the raising of the hands by the priests in their performance of the priestly blessing found in Num 6:24–26.¹⁸ As we have seen, references to “all flesh,” in distinction from the priests who are chosen by God for service, occur in *Jub.* 31:14 and *ALD* (4QLevi^c 1). However, the allusion to the priestly blessing here more precisely recalls Ben Sira 50:17–22, where we are told that “all flesh together hurried and fell on their faces to the ground ... Then he came down and lifted up his hands” (כול בשר יחדו נמהרו ויפלו על פניהם ארצה ... אז ירד ונשא כפיו).¹⁹ In other words, the priest, by virtue of his election by God, enjoys a spiritual existence that is somehow elevated above that of all ordinary “flesh.”²⁰ The contrast between the priest and “all flesh” becomes most apparent during the performance of the priestly blessing of Numbers 6, which invokes God to “shine his face” upon the people through the intermediation of the priest. The use of the phrase “all flesh” in 1QSB 3:28 also recalls the statement in 4Q418 81 1–2 that God has separated the priestly addressee “from amongst all fleshly spirit” (הבדילכה בכול רוח) (בשר). In addition, the portrayal of the wisdom-laden speech of the priests as a liquid “flow” from the “lips” of the Zadokites (מזל שפתיכה) in 1QSB 3:27 recalls 4Q418 81 1’s depiction of the knowledgeable speech of the quasi-priestly addressee with the words “... of your lips he has opened a spring” (שפתיכה פתח מקור).²¹

¹⁷ See above, p. 96.

¹⁸ Cf. Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 282.

¹⁹ Cf. *Jub.* 31:15.

²⁰ Cf. the similar transformation implied by the term מבשר in the Self-Glorification Hymn analyzed below (4Q491 11 I, 13; 4Q427 7 II, 16–18) and in 1QH^a 7:16–17.

²¹ The mention of “lips” in each context likely derives from Mal 2:7: -כהן ישמרו- דעת.

Further literary connections are apparent in the hope expressed in 1QSB that God will set the Zadokite priests as a “splendid ornament in the midst of the holy ones” (מכלול הדר בתוך קדושים) (3:25–26). The language immediately recalls the splendid light (הדר) given off by the high priestly figure and his garments during the temple service in Sir 50:5, 11, as well as the description of the exalted addressee in 4Q418 81 13. The word מכלול is difficult. It is a *hapax legomenon* in the Scrolls, and likely its meaning is similar to the closely related term כליל, meaning “crown / ornament.”²² In Ben Sira’s poem to Aaron, which contains many verbal and thematic parallels with 1QSB’s blessing of the Zadokites,²³ one of the majestic garments that God places upon Aaron within the context of elevating him is a כליל תפארת (45:8).²⁴ Based on the shared terminology and theme of priestly elevation in these texts, it is reasonable to propose that the מכלול הדר of 1QSB 3:25 is designed to recall the Second Temple period tradition of priestly appearance preserved especially in Ben Sira,²⁵ which views the radiance emitted by the high-priestly garments during temple service both as the manifestation of the divine presence on earth and as a symbol of the earthly priest’s authority and otherworldliness. As we shall presently see, this interpretation is supported by the likely reference to the luminous high priestly garments in 1QSB 4:27–28.

The Blessing for the High Priest (1QSB 4:22–28)

As noted above, the words of blessing contained in 1QSB 4:22–28 do not name the intended recipient. The text reads as follows:²⁶

²² For כליל, see 1QSB 4:2. For מכלול in the Hebrew Bible, see Ezek 23:12; 38:4; cf. Ezek 27:24; Ps 50:2. See also Milik’s brief comments in DJD I, 125. Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 2:446, list the word as a noun and translate it with the adverbial “splendidly.” On Hebrew noun forms with preformative *mem*, see GKC § 85; Joüon-Muraoka § 88L.

²³ Consider, for example, Aaron’s glorious elevation accompanied by the report of his God-granted role as teacher in Sir 45:6–17: “And he raised up a holy one, Aaron of the tribe of Levi, and he set him as an eternal statute and he put upon him majesty and he served him in his glory . . . And he gave to him his commandments and he set him over statute and decree that he might teach his nation statute, and decree to the children of Israel” (וירם קדוש את אהרון למטה לוי וישימהו לחק עולם ויתן עליו הוד וישרתהו בכבודו . . . ויתן לו) (מצותיו ומשיליהו בחוק ומשפט וילמד את עמו חק ומשפט את בני ישראל).

²⁴ Cf. the כליל כבוד of 1QS 4:7 discussed below.

²⁵ Cf. *Let. Aris.* 96–99; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.184–187, 216–217.

²⁶ Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 126–129.

	[] כה ויצדיקה מכול ר	22
[] בחר בכה	ולשאת ברוש קדושים ועמכה לב	23
[] כה ברת בידכה	אנשי עצת אל ולוא ביד שר יד	24
[] באיש לרעהו ואתה	כמלאך פנים במעון קודש לכבוד אלהי צבא	25
[] תהיה סביב משרת	בהיכל	
[] לעת עולם ולכול קצי	מלכות ומפיל גורל עם מלאכי פנים ועצת יחד	26
	נצח כיא	
[] לתבל בדעת ולהאיר	אמת כול מ	27
	שפטיו וישימכה קוד	
	[] ש] בעמו ולמאור	
	פני רבים	
	[] נור לקודש קודשים כיא	28
	[] תק] דש לו ותכבד שמו וקודשיו	

- 22 [...] you. And may he make you more righteous than all *r*[...] he chose you[
- 23 and to raise up the head of the holy ones, and your people to bl[ess ...] you *brt* in your hand
- 24 the men of God's council, and not by the hand of a prince *yd* [...] by each man for his fellow. And (may) you (be)
- 25 like an angel of the presence in the holy abode for the glory of the God of host[s ... May you] be round about serving in the temple of the
- 26 kingship, casting the lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community [...] for] eternal time and for all perpetual periods. Because
- 27 [true (are) all] his [p]recepts. May he make you hol[y] among his people, and for a light [...] to the world with knowledge and to illuminate the face of the many
- 28 [...] a diadem for the holy of holies, because [...] you are made ho]ly for him, and shall glorify his name and his holy things.

In the *editio princeps*, Milik suggested that this section is a continuation of a long blessing addressed to the Zadokite priests beginning from 3:20 and ending at 5:17.²⁷ Licht, however, views this as far too long of a section for this purpose. Instead, he proposes that the blessings of 1QSB were considerably shorter and, in light of their close relationship with 1QSA, addressed to the very same officials mentioned there. Furthermore, since the composition begins with the lay *יראי אל* and ends with the *נשיא העדה*, it appears that the blessings were arranged in ascending order of prestige.²⁸ In line with these observations, Licht suggests that 4:22–28 was a blessing

²⁷ Milik, DJD I, 118–130.

²⁸ Stegemann's objection ("Some Remarks to 1QSA," 496) that if the blessings had truly been arranged in ascending order of importance then the blessing of the high priest would come *after* that of the Prince of the Congregation is dealt with by the simple observation by Fletcher-Louis (*All the Glory*, 151 n. 5) that *Jubilees* 31, which clearly served as a conceptual model for our text, also blesses the superior priestly figure (Levi) before the secondary royal figure (Judah).

intended for the eschatological high priest. In support of this argument, he notes that the measure of praise declared in 4:22–28 goes beyond what column 3 predicates of the Zadokite priests. Furthermore, the phrases, “a diadem for the holy of holies” (נֹר לְקֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים) and “serving in the temple of the kingship” (מִשְׁרֵת בְּהִיכַל מַלְכוּת), may hint at the headdress worn by the high priest and that figure’s annual entry into the holy of holies respectively.²⁹ Although Licht’s conclusions remain open to question,³⁰ they have been followed by a majority of commentators, including Schiffman and Charlesworth.³¹ In addition, recently Fletcher-Louis has made a strong case that 1QSb 4:22–28 is dealing with a high priestly figure. Like Licht, he notes that the phrase נֹר לְקֹדֶשׁ קֹדְשִׁים must refer to the holy diadem (נֹר הַקֹּדֶשׁ) donned by the high priest in Exod 29:6; 39:30; and Lev 8:9.³² Since God’s name was to be inscribed on this headdress, the call of 1QSb 4:28 to “glorify his (God’s) name” is fitting. In addition, he sees the references to the “lot,” “[p]recepts,” and the giving of light in lines 26–27 as allusions to the חֶשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט and the אֹרִים וְתוּמִים, which were identified by the Qumranites, Josephus, and other Jews of the time as the light giving oracular stones of the high priest’s breastpiece.³³ Quite plausibly, Fletcher-Louis understands all of these likely references to the high priestly garb in 4:26–28 as invocations of their theological significance represented in such works as Ben Sira and the *Letter of Aristeas*, and as a recollection of the high priestly garb referred to in the thirteenth song of SSS.³⁴

²⁹ Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 274–275.

³⁰ See especially Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa,” 488: “There is no trace of the Priestly Messiah either in 1QSa or in 1QSb, and both works were not composed for some future times, but for the present of the Essenes.” See also the doubts of Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 283–285. He does conclude, however, that “es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass es parallel zum Segen für den ‘Fürsten der Gemeinde’ auch eine Benediktion für den eschatologischen Hohenpriester bzw. den priesterlichen Messias gab.”

³¹ See Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 72–76. Charlesworth (*Rule of the Community* [PTSDSSP] 1) lists the section as a “Blessing of the Zadokite High Priest” on p. 119, but on p. 120 seems to argue that 4:22–25 was actually a blessing directed toward the Zadokite priests as a whole.

³² With this observation he follows Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 282.

³³ For Urim and Thummim at Qumran, see discussion and works cited in nn. 49–50 below. For a thorough treatment of the history of interpretation of the Urim and Thummim, see C. van Dam, *The Urim and Thummim: A Means of Revelation in Ancient Israel* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997). See also the review essay of V.A. Hurowitz, “True Light on the Urim and Thummim,” *JQR* 88 (1998): 263–274.

³⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 155–157; idem, “Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence?” 388–399.

As with 1QSb 3:22–28, the elevated priestly identity of the recipient here is reinforced by the various links with the non-sectarian priestly traditions discussed above. This is especially the case with the call in 4:25–26 for the addressee to be “like an angel of the presence in the holy abode for the glory of the God of host[s] . . . May you] be round about serving in the temple of the kingship” (כמלאך פנים במעון קודש לכבוד) (אלהי צבאות] ות] היה סביב משרת בהיכל מלכות). As commentators have universally noted, the picture here (even more so than 1QSb 3:22–28) is very close to the description in *Jub.* 31:14. Both blessings envision the priest serving in the temple specifically like an angel of the presence and bestowing divine wisdom upon the people; and both emphasize the motifs of glory and holiness. The continuation of the text may also be compared to 4Q541 9 3–4, which ascribes a teaching function to the eschatological high priest³⁵ and portrays him as radiating light to “all the corners of the world” (בכול קצוי ארעא).³⁶

The difficult phrase ולשאת ברוש קדושים (4:23) may have in mind the physical ascension of the addressee,³⁷ similar to what occurs with Levi in *ALD* (4QLevi^b ar 2 15–18) and *T. Levi* (2; 5). Although this suggestion cannot be fully established, the link of 1QSb 4:22–28 to Malachi 2’s account of God’s covenant with Levi is suggestive in this regard. We have already observed the dependence of *Jubilees* 31 on Malachi 2,³⁸ and in light of the relationship between *Jubilees* 31 and 1QSb 4, the latter’s close relation to Malachi 2 comes as no surprise. As in Malachi 2, 1QSb 4 speaks of the priest as a מלאך who imparts divine wisdom to “many” (רבים; Mal 2:6–7; 1QSb 4:27). In addition, the call for the high priest to glorify God’s name (ותכבד שמו) in 1QSb 4:28 parallels Malachi 2:2, the only verse in the Hebrew Bible where glorifying God’s name is described as a priestly duty (לשמיי לתת כבוד).³⁹ As James Kugel has shown in detail, Malachi 2 was the scriptural basis used by Second Temple period exegetes to craft the story of Levi’s ascension to heaven (*Jubilees* 32; *ALD*; *T. Levi*).⁴⁰

³⁵ “His word is like a word of the heavens and his teaching conforms to the will of God” (מאמרה כמאמר שמין ואלפונה כרעות אל).

³⁶ Cf. 1QSb 4:27, “and for a light [. . .] to the world” (ולמאור] לתבל).

³⁷ So Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 152.

³⁸ See above, p. 43.

³⁹ Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 154.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Jos. Asen.* 22:13; *Pirqe R. El.* 37. See Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation,” 30–36. He points to several cruxes in Malachi 2 which led to such an interpretation: First, the appearance of the name Levi in the singular allowed for the possibility that God’s covenant with Levi (2:4) was with the individual patriarch himself. Second, the report that Levi “walked with” God “in peace and uprightness” (2:6) was probably taken as an indication of Levi’s

It is possible, therefore, that *ולשאת ברוש קדושים* in 1QSb 4:28 is dependent on a similar tradition.⁴¹

The expression *היכל מלכות* (4:25–26) is to be taken as synonymous with the *מעון קודש* of 4:25, yet its precise sense is an issue. It is closely paralleled by the phrase *היכל המלך* of Sir 50:7 (cf. v. 3), referring to the Jerusalem temple in which the high priest Simon sparkled like the sun. However, the meaning of the phrase is more in line with the closely related expression *היכלי מלך* in SSS (4Q400 1 I, 13),⁴² which likely refers to the imaginal sanctuary/ies accessed by means of liturgical narration, the *imago templi* in which earthly and celestial community conjoin in praise of God.⁴³ The fact that both 1QSb and SSS are liturgical works formally governed by the *למשכיל* heading comports with this suggestion, as do several further examples of shared language and themes:

As noted above, the first song of SSS (4Q400 1 I) deals with the establishment of the angelic priesthood, which it describes as “ministers of the presence in his glorious shrine” (*משרתי פנים בדביר כבודו*). This, of course, is comparable to the description of the high priest in 1QSb 4:24–26.⁴⁴ The eighth song (4Q403 1 II, 35) characterizes the angelic priests as figures who “cause knowledge to shine among all the gods of light” (*מאירי*)

ascent to heaven. It was during this ascent that Levi “stood in awe before” God’s name, and indeed this was interpreted as the occasion on which God “gave him” a “covenant of life and peace” (2:5). Finally, the consonants of the phrase *והוא שמני נחת* may have been read “from my heavens he went down” rather than “he stood in awe before my name” (cf. the similar reading found in b. *Ber* 12b).

⁴¹ It is possible that *ולשאת ברוש קדושים* is related to the awkward ending of Mal 2:3, *ונשא אתכם אליי*, which may have been understood as an oblique reference to Levi’s ascension to heaven. To be sure, in its present context this phrase is part of a negative statement directed at the sinful priests of the Jerusalem temple. However, the abrupt switch from first to third person surely could have left an opening for such a broad interpretation.

⁴² Cf. the phrase *מלכותי מקדשי* in a similar context in 4Q405 23 II, 11; also perhaps 4Q287 12 11. The parallel language of 1QSb 4:25–26 and 4Q400 1 I, 13 is noted by B. Frennesson, “*In a Common Rejoicing*”, 87, n. 14. On the plural form in the SSS citation, Newsom (DJD XI, 181 and 287) remarks: “In many cases the use of the pl. in terms for heaven seems to be merely a stylistic variant.”

⁴³ I thus partially concur with Milik’s observation in DJD I, 127, that *היכל מלכות* of 1QSb 4:25–26 is an “allusion probable au temple de la Jérusalem Nouvelle.” The occurrence of *היכלי מלך* in 4Q400 1 I, 13 is a precursor to the identical expression used in the Hekhalot literature of the Amoraic period to denote the celestial palaces through which the visionary travels. Cf. Newsom DJD XI, 181; Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 102–103.

⁴⁴ Newsom notes the parallel in DJD XI, 180. Her suggestion is briefly taken up by Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries,” 209–211. Cf. the reference to the *מלאכי פנים* in 1QH^a 14:16: “to all the men of your council, in the lot together with the angels of presence” (*לכול אנשי*) *לכול אנשי*).

דעת בכול אלי אור). As Newsom notes, this passage is linked thematically with 4Q400 1 I, 17, where the angels are described as teaching “precepts.” However, it also recalls the illuminating knowledge radiated by the high priest in 1QSB 4:27: “his p]recepts. May he make you hol[γ] among his people, and for a light[...] to the world with knowledge and to illuminate the face of the many” (מ[שפטי] וישימכה קוד[ש] בעמו) [ולמאור]. Finally, 1QSB’s blessing of the high priestly addressee, like SSS, breaks down the ontological boundary between human and angelic priests. This is evident from the second activity attributed to him in line 26, namely, the casting of the lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community (ומפיל גורל) (עם מלאכי פנים ועצת יחד). It is not exactly clear what is meant by “casting the lot,” although the phrase seems to be connected to the determination of cosmic fate.⁴⁵ Regardless, it is important to note that in bidding the addressee to cast the lot with both the angels of the presence and the council of the community,⁴⁶ the passage implies that the high priest is participating with both groups.⁴⁷ This is not to say that he is in two places at once, above and below, but that, as in SSS, liturgical transport has granted access to the imaginal temple and the envisioning of participation there with the angels. The presence of עצת יחד then, should clearly be taken as depicting the community’s presence in this imaginal temple, rather than as the high priest’s simultaneous presence on heaven and earth.

Light and Knowledge

For our present purpose, it will be worthwhile to return briefly to the light imagery of 1QSB 4:27. The language of this line, like much of 1QSB, evokes the priestly blessing of Num 6:24–26, which speaks of the “shin-

⁴⁵ In 1QS 4:26, as well as several other places in the Scrolls (cf. 4Q181 1 II, 5; 1QM 13:9–10; 4Q418 81 5), God is the one who “casts the lot,” i.e., determines the fate of human beings. For more, see Lange, “The Determination of Fate,” 39–43. If the high priest is given this privilege here, he may be being portrayed as God’s agent within creation and history. See further, Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 152–153. For an alternative explanation see Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 285.

⁴⁶ As a reference to the Qumran community, this phrase appears overwhelmingly in the form עצת היחד. However, the form עצת יחד does occur several times, apparently with the same meaning. Cf. 1QSa 1:26; 1QS 3:2, 11:8; 4Q257 III, 3. For more on the meaning of the term עצת at Qumran, see J. Worrell, “עצה: ‘Counsel’ or ‘Council’ at Qumran?” *VT* 20 (1970): 65–74.

⁴⁷ So Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries,” 210–211.

ing” of God’s face.⁴⁸ We have already seen the theme of the luminous priest in Ben Sira 50, 4Q541 9, *T. Levi* 18, and *Let. Aris.* 96–99, and echoes of it appear in sectarian literature.⁴⁹ As noted above, Fletcher-Louis claims that 1QSB 4:27–28 refers to the radiant headdress and breast-piece of the high priest containing the light-giving Urim and Thummim. The mysterious oracular stones clearly informed Qumran theology⁵⁰

⁴⁸ For the use of Numbers 6 in 1QSB see especially Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa,” 497–501. On the influence of that biblical passage on this particular line, see the comments of Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 282.

⁴⁹ See, e.g., 1QS 2:3; 4:2, 22.

⁵⁰ The following four examples are particularly clear:

(1) 4QTestimonia (4Q175) quotes Deut 33:8–11 (ll. 14–20), Moses’ blessing of Levi, likely with the priestly messiah in mind. The citation loosely follows the MT, but an important variant occurs in l. 17 (Deut 33:10). While the MT reads וירור משפט־ך ליעקוב ויראירו משפט־ך ליעקב. The reading of 4QTestimonia is paralleled by the LXX δηλωσσοσυσ (cf. Aquila’s even closer reading, φωστσοσυσ), which picks up on Deut 33:8’s δῆλωσῶσυσ αὐτοῦ, just as the Hebrew ויראירו picks up on ואור־ך. Thus, both 4QTestimonia and the LXX link the illuminating teaching function in v. 10 to the Urim and Thummim of v. 8 (cf. T. Gaster, “A Qumran Reading of Deuteronomy XXXIII 10,” *VT* 8 [1958]: 217). Although 4QTestimonia’s reading is thus not exclusively sectarian, I propose that it was the result of an intentional choice; the Qumranite author was emphasizing the role of his priestly figure as mediator of divine illumination utilizing Urim and Thummim imagery. Cf. J. Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Šedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic,” *ANRW* 2.19.1:230.

(2) 4QpIsa^d (4Q164) interprets Isa 54:11–12, which speaks of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, as referring specifically to the Qumran community, made up of “the council of the community, [] priests, and the peo[ple]” (עצת היחד [] כוהנים והעם). Lines 4–5 of frg. 1 interpret the precious stones mentioned in Isa 54:12 as “twelve [...] giving light as the judgment of the Urim and Thummim” (שנים עשר [...] מאירים כמשפט האורים והתומים). Several suggestions have been made to fill in the crucial lacuna. (For a convenient review, see M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* [CBQMS 8; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979], 125–131.) However, based on line length and a comparison of other sectarian texts concerned with the structure of community leadership, J. Baumgarten’s suggestion that it is twelve “chief priests” who are giving light “as the judgment of the Urim and Thummim” is most plausible. See idem, “The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, the Apocalypse, and the Sanhedrin” in *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 148. Even without this reconstruction, the text illustrates the importance of the Urim and Thummim for the Qumranites.

(3) The Tongues of Fire text (1Q29 + 4Q376) does not explicitly mention the Thumim, but there is a reference to the Urim in a highly damaged fragment that also mentions הכהון המשיח (4Q376 1 I). The text describes how “the left-hand stone which is on his left hand side shall be revealed to the eyes of all the assembly until the priest finishes speaking” (האבן השמאלית אשר על צדו השמאלי תגלה לעיני כול הקהל עד כלות הכהן לדבר) (4Q376 1 II, 1–2, with overlap from 1Q29). Strugnell (in M. Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* [DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995], 124–125) compares this passage to Josephus’ description of the shining oracular stones in *Ant.* 3.214–215, which probably refers to the Urim and Thummim. See idem, “Moses-Pseudepigrapha

and are likely a point of focus in the last song of SSS.⁵¹ In light of the earlier comparison of the high priest to an angel of the presence, this passage exhibits the well-circulated Second Temple period tradition that by virtue of the brilliant garments and the “light-giving stones [Urim and Thummim], Israel’s chief priest was an otherworldly being.”⁵² Although one may take issue with the overly-literal aspect of Fletcher-Louis’ interpretation, he is certainly correct in suggesting that the high priestly clothing symbolizes the high priest’s embodiment of the divine glory. However, the explicit connection of the light imagery with the transmission of knowledge (דעת) also requires comment.

Commentators have long recognized the centrality of “knowledge” in the theological landscape of the Qumran community and have attempted to identify its various senses within the Scrolls.⁵³ The particular application of the term in 1QSb 4:27 should be understood in light of several of its appearances in 1QS, and especially in light of its use in the Treatise of the Two Spirits, a document also governed by the למשכיל heading (1QS 3:13). There we read that “from the God of knowledge comes all that is and will be” (מאיל הדעות כול הויה ונהיה; 1QS 3:15), i.e., that everything which occurs and will occur in the world does so according

at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works,” in *Archaeology and History*, 221–256. Although the text does not appear to be of sectarian provenance, the multiple copies found at Qumran (1Q29, 4Q376, and probably 4Q375 and 4Q408) provide a significant further witness to the importance of Urim and Thummim for the community.

(4) The use of the unusual term אורתום/אורתם, which occurs seven times in Quman literature in descriptions of the supernal light associated with the divine presence and God’s heavenly abode is most probably related to the importance of the Urim and Thummim at Qumran. Cf. the following note.

⁵¹ The אורתום, or “perfect light” of SSS (4Q403 1 I, 45; 1 II, 1; 4Q404 5 4; cf. 1QH^a 12:7, 24; 21:15; 4Q392 1, 5), as suggested by A. Dupont-Sommer (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey* [New York: Macmillan, 1952], 74), appears to be a contraction of the singular forms of אוריים and תומיים. Cf. Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 91. For the suggested reading אורתים, meaning “early light,” see Stegemann, Schuller, and Newsom, DJD XL, 160–161.

⁵² Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 158.

⁵³ For an early attempt, see W.D. Davies, “‘Knowledge’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25–30,” *HTR* 46 (1953): 113–139. On the nature of knowledge at Qumran, see I. Gruenwald, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism: Studies in Apocalypticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Gnosticism* (BEATAJ 14; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), 65–124; H. Ringgren, “Qumran and Gnosticism,” in *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13–18 Aprile 1966*, (ed. U. Bianchi; SHR 12; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 379–388; M. Mansoor, “The Nature of Gnosticism in Qumran,” *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo*, 389–400; C. Newsom, “Knowing as Doing: The Social Symbolics of Knowledge at Qumran,” *Semeia* 59 (1992): 139–153; Wolfson, “Seven Mysteries,” 194–206.

to the divine cosmological program, “his glorious plan” (מחשבת כבודו; 1QS 3:16). However, as is characteristic in apocalyptic thought, this divine knowledge is not reserved for God alone. 1QS 4:18 relates that God has set an end for the existence of deceit “in the mysteries of his understanding and in the wisdom of his glory” (ברזי שכלו ובחכמת כבודו). However, from 1QS 4:6, it is clear that community members, or “the sons of truth” (בני אמת), have access to “the truth of the mysteries of knowledge” (אמת רזי דעת), and, as such are crowned with “a crown of glory together with a resplendent attire in eternal light” (כליל כבוד עם מדת הדר באור) (עולמים; 1QS 4:7–8). The eternal light given off by the community members enlightened by the mysteries of God’s knowledge underscores their similarity to immortal⁵⁴ angels (cf. Dan 12:3: והמשכלים יזהרו כזהר הרקיע; ומצדיקי הרבים ככוכבים לעולם ועד).⁵⁵ The radiant “crown” and “attire” of 1QS 4:7–8 recall the glowing clothing and knowledge of the high priest of 1QSb 4, as well as the מכלול הדר of the Zadokite priests in 1QSb 3. The crucial role of knowledge in the community’s transformation is made more explicitly in 1QS 4:22–23:

To instruct the upright ones in the knowledge of the Most High and to enlighten those whose way is perfect in the wisdom of the sons of heaven, for God has chosen them for an eternal covenant, and all the glory of Adam is theirs (להבין ישרים בדעת עליון וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל תמימי דרך כיא בם בחר) (אל לברית עולמים ולהם כול כבוד אדם).

By means of initiation into the knowledge of the Most High, which corresponds to the “wisdom of the sons of heaven,” the community members return to the original glorious angelic state of prelapsarian Adam, who was created, according to priestly tradition, in the image of God (cf. CD 3:19–20).⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Newsom (“Knowing as Doing,” 145) characterizes the mechanism offering the opportunity for community members to transcend time as follows: “Although the human knower is located in the temporal realm, the ultimate object of knowledge, the plan of God, is not. From the perspective that the knowledge of that plan allows, past, present, and future are simultaneously available.” An analogous statement may be made about the Qumranite transcendence of the spatial realm and indeed appears to lie at the center of the imaginal transport to the *imago templi*.

⁵⁵ As noted above, implicit in the analogous natures of earthly and heavenly worshipers is the ability of humans to act together with the angels. In Dan 12:3 too, the likening of the משכילים to the stars appears to represent more than a mere analogy. On the association of angels with astral bodies in this verse, see Collins, *Daniel*, 393–394.

⁵⁶ Thus the above-mentioned self-conception of the community as a מקדש אדם points to its participation in the secrets of the God of knowledge (אל דעות) and the angels. On

The above understanding of דעת, which clearly permeated Qumran thought,⁵⁷ is crucial to interpreting the call for the high priest to be “for a light[...] to the world with knowledge and to illuminate the face of the many” in 1QSb 4:27. By virtue of his elect priestly status, he serves like an angel of the presence. Like the מאירי דעת of SSS (4Q403 1 II, 35)⁵⁸ and the eschatological high priest of 4Q541 9 3, he has become brilliant with knowledge of God’s mysteries, and is able to illuminate the face of the “many,”⁵⁹ a technical term used by the community to designate itself.⁶⁰ He is thus the intermediary through whom the community is enlightened, and as a consequence, also the vehicle by which it becomes analogous to the angels. The transformation of the human community allows it to participate in the immortal lot of the angels.⁶¹ Considering this representation, it is no surprise

further connections between the Treatise of the Two Spirits and Genesis 1, see Newsom, “Knowing as Doing,” 147–149. For related Adam legends in rabbinic literature, see the classic article of A. Altmann, “The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends,” *JQR* 35 (1945): 371–391.

⁵⁷ See 4Q402 4 12–13 + Mas1k 1 2–3; 1QH^a 9:21–23; 15:29–30; 20:14–16; etc.

⁵⁸ See also the angelic epithets אורי אור (4Q403 1 II, 35), אופני אור (4Q405 20 II-22, 3), and אלוהי אורים (4Q405 46 2).

⁵⁹ This is very similar to the scenario observed in 4Q418 81 (see above, pp. 73–76). There also, the wisdom provided by the addressee to the community serves to join them with the angels. However, rather than utilizing the metaphor of light/enlightenment, the imagery there is of water which nourishes a plantation.

⁶⁰ See J. Charlesworth, “Community Organization: Community Organization in the Rule of the Community,” *EDSS* 1:135–136.

⁶¹ Noting the inextricable link between knowledge of the divine secret, participation with (or “transformation into”) angels, and liturgy at Qumran, Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries,” 206) argues that not only the recital of SSS, but the very composition of the work probably ensued from an “imaginal transport by which spatial and temporal barriers were traversed by the initiates who viewed themselves as being shaped by God into ‘vessels of knowledge’ (כלי דעת) to contemplate the ancient mysteries of wisdom (4Q436 1 I, 2).” In support of his case, he notes the derivation of the title משכיל from the word שכל, which in some instances is certainly interchangeable with the term דעה in its above mentioned sense. He cites as examples 1QH^a 18:29: ולבני אמתכה and 1QH^a 19:31: שכל דעה להבין בנפלאותיכה. Since שכל denotes a form of visionary knowledge in these cases, it is only fitting that the role of the משכיל, the enlightened sage-poet, is to enlighten others, initiating them into the mysteries of God’s knowledge through his composition of liturgical poetry. Considering the המשכיל heading and liturgical context of 1QSb and its theological and terminological similarities with SSS, Wolfson’s comment about SSS as an “imaginal transport” applies equally to 1QSb. For the role of the משכיל at Qumran, see L. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (ABRL; Garden City, Doubleday, 1995), 123–125. See also, Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 237, n. 45, who emphasizes the liturgical implication of the term.

that the high priest is envisioned as casting the lot with the angels of the presence and the council of the community simultaneously.

Summary of the Evidence of 1QSb

In sum, analysis of the blessing of the Zadokite priests and the high priest in 1QSb reveals that these pericopae lie in continuity with the depictions of otherworldly priesthood observed in the previous two chapters. The non-sectarian traditions according to which the earthly priestly figure is enshrouded by glorious brilliance indicating his status above “all flesh” find both thematic and terminological echoes in 1QSb. In addition, like SSS, 1QSb envisions the otherworldly priest as luminescent teacher of divine knowledge within a liturgical context (למשכיל). Through the priestly mediator’s transmission of דעת, the earthly community, analogous to the angels, becomes illuminated with divine knowledge. Although there is no explicit mention of the participation of the terrestrial community and the angels, the representation of the mediating role of the Zadokite high priest implies as much. His casting the lot with both the angels of the presence and the council of the community implies the experience of a realm in which humans and angels may act together.

Two elements that distinguish the sectarian depiction of 1QSb from the non-sectarian literature are worth noting. First, 1QSb 3 calls the priests “a splendid ornament amongst the holy ones,” who are specifically named as בני צדוק. This is the same group that appears to lead the community both in the present and the future age, at least according to 1QS 5:2, 9 and 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3. Second, the concept of knowledge in 1QSb 4 relates most closely to the particular sectarian concept of knowledge outlined in the Treatise of the Two Spirits. Thus, while 1QSb draws on non-sectarian otherworldly priestly tradition, it also adapts it to the specific context and worldview of the Qumranites.

4QSONGS OF THE SAGE (4Q510–511)

Above, in our discussion of the correlation of earthly community to temple, we mentioned a portion of a fragment (4Q511 35) from the collection of sectarian magical hymns entitled 4QSongs of the Sage.⁶²

⁶² See p. 92.

As we noted there, the purpose of these hymns למשכיל was to protect the “sons of light” from malevolent spirits. As Nitzan puts it, in this liturgy,

the Maskil from Qumran—also known to us from other writings as graced with knowledge, as meticulous in observing the commandments, and functioning as a kind of representative of the public to utter words of song and blessing—wages war against evil by singing God’s praises.⁶³

Having treated 1QSb, we are now in a better position to understand the contents of 4QSongs of the Sage in connection with the theology of otherworldly priesthood at Qumran. However, before we return to the key passage (4Q511 35), it is important to note that the technical sense of the term דעת in 1QSb 4:27 relates closely to the use of that term throughout 4QSongs of the Sage. Twice in these prophylactic songs God is identified as “God of knowledge” (אלוהי דעות) (4Q510 1 2; 4Q511 1 7–8; cf. 5Q511 143 2). In each context, the radiance of the God of knowledge terrifies evil antagonists who are forced to flee. Consider 4Q511 1 6–8:⁶⁴

6 כִּי־אֵין מִשְׁחִית בְּגְבוּלֵיהֶם וְרוּחֵי רָשָׁע
7 לֹא יִתְהַלְכוּ בָּם כִּי־אֵל הוֹפִיעַ כְּבוֹד אֱלֹהֵי
8 דְּעוֹת בְּאִמְרֵיו וְכוּל בְּנֵי עוֹלָה לֹא יִתְכַלְכוּ

6 For there is n[o] destroyer within their borders, and evil spirits
7 do not walk in them. For the glory of the God of knowledge shines
8 through his words, and none of the sons of wickedness is able⁶⁵

As in 1QSb, the brilliance of God’s knowledge is shared with the heavenly beings and select humans. Indeed, the enlightened משכיל makes this claim about himself explicitly in 4Q511 18 II, 7–8: “For God made the knowledge of understanding shine in my heart” (כִּי־אֵל הָאֵיר אֱלֹהִים דְּעַת) (בִּינָה בְּלִבִּי). Or, again, in 4Q511 28–29 3: “You [God] have [pl]aced

⁶³ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 237.

⁶⁴ Unless otherwise noted, transcriptions of 4QSongs of the Sage follow Baillet, DJD VII, 215–262, and translations loosely follow García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:1026–1037.

⁶⁵ For כִּלְכַל as an auxiliary verb in Qumran Hebrew with the meaning “to be able,” see M. Bernstein, “כִּלְכַל ‘שִׁמְשָׁמְעוּתוֹ יִכְלִי’,” *Leš* 67 (2004): 45–48. His remarks pertaining to this passage (p. 44, n. 2) are worth noting: “הַשּׁוֹרָה, אֵת הַעֲמוּד וְאֵת הַקְטָע. אֲבָל יִיתְכַּן שֶׁאֲחֵרֵי יִתְכַלְכוּ הֵיחָד מִקּוֹר + ל־ לְדַאֲבוּנוֹ, הַמִּילָה שֶׁאֲנוֹ מַעֲוִינֵינוּ בָּהּ מְסִימָת אֵת.” The translation “is able” follows Bernstein’s suggestion over against more commonly seen translations such as Baillet’s (DJD VII, 220), “ne pourra résister.”

knowledge in my foundation of dust” (ש[מתה דעת בסוד עפרי]).⁶⁶ By means of his access to the light of divine knowledge, the *משכיל* himself terrifies the spirits of darkness through the words of his song (4Q510 1 4–6):

ואני משכיל משמיע הוד תפארתו לפחד ולב[הל]	4
כול רוחי מלאכי חבל ורוחות ממזרים שדאים לילית אחים ו[...]	5
והפוגעים פתע פתאום לתעות רוח בינה	6

- 4 And I, Maskil, declare the splendor of his radiance in order to
frighten and terr[ify]
5 all the spirits of the ravaging angels and the bastard spirits, demons,
Lilith, owls and [...]
6 and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge.

Here the actual recitation aloud (*משמיע*) of the song invoking the light of God’s knowledge functions as a weapon against the various forces of evil that seek to “lead astray the spirit of knowledge.”⁶⁷ This is different from, but not contradictory to, the function of the light of divine knowledge observed in 1Q5b 4, where it serves as a means of elevating the earthly community to angelic status. Despite this difference, as we shall see presently, the Songs of the Sage indeed assumes a homology between earthly and heavenly communities, similar to that encountered in 1Q5b, SSS, and other liturgical works.

Given the Maskil’s possession of and ability to use divine knowledge, it is no surprise that in the highly fragmentary 4Q511 8 he reveals that “God made me [dwell] in the shelter of Shaddai ... [in the shadow of his ha]nds he hid me ... [he has conceal]ed me among his holy ones ... [in unis]on with [his] holy ones ... [giving th]anks unto God.”⁶⁸ From this elevated position amongst God’s holy ones he calls the angels and the earthly community of the righteous to praise God as well. His call to righteous humanity in 4Q511 10 7–8 (= 4Q510 1 8–9) reads as follows:

⁶⁶ This passage shows a similar awareness by the speaker of his human lowliness as we observed in 4Q400 2. 4Q511 18 II, 7–8 also may be judged to be speaking in a similar tone, especially in light of the following line, which mentions the “depravities” and “guilt” of the speaker.

⁶⁷ Cf. the similar function of songs of praise to God (uttered by forces of justice and light) in 1 *Enoch* 69.

⁶⁸ Basically following Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 270. I accept her suggestion that the frg. depends on Psalm 91 and Isa 49:2, which serves as a crucial basis for her reconstruction and translation.

7 [רננו צדיקים] באלוהי פלא ולישרים תהלי כבודו
8 [י] רוממוהו כול תמימי דרך בכנור ישועות

- 7 [Rejoice, righteous ones,] in the God of wonders. For the upright ones are the praises of his glory.
8 [May] all the perfect of the way exalt him, with a lyre of salvation.⁶⁹

It is noteworthy that the epithets denoting the earthly righteous here, *תמימי דרך* and *ישרים*, are almost identical to two phrases utilized to describe the angelic priests in 4Q403 1 I, *תמימי דרך* and *הול[כי יו]שר*. As observed above, in that context the application of the term *תמימי דרך* (often used as a technical expression denoting the earthly community members) to angels underscores the ontological association between upper and lower communities so characteristic of SSS. The use of the phrase *תמימי דרך* for righteous humans in 4Q511 10 is thus best understood in light of the passage from 1QS cited above, which states that the earthly *תמימי דרך*, by virtue of their purity from all “evil deeds,” will be made to understand the “wisdom of the sons of heaven” and, therefore, will become analogous to angels in wisdom (4:22–23). In other words, the perfectly righteous and pure way of life of the Qumranites allows them to participate in the divine wisdom of the angels. This interpretation is supported by several passages in the Songs of the Sage which assume the homology between upper and lower realms brought about by the imaginal liturgical excursion. Thus, the continuation of 4Q511 10 (l. 11) declares that God “shall judge in the council of angels and men” (*בסוד אילים ואנשים ישפוט*). The point is made more expressly in 4Q511 2 I, 7–10:

7 שם [י] ישראל [בש]נים עשר מחנות קדוש[י]70 ל[ה]ת[ה]ל[ך]
8 [ולבוא ב]71 גורל אלוהים עם מלא[כי] מאורות כבודו בשמו [ת]בוחת
9 [הם תכן למועדי שנה [ומ]משלת יחד להתהלך] ב[גורל]
10 [אלוהים] לפי כבוד [ו]לשרתו בגורל עם כסאו כיא אלוהי

- 7 He placed Israel in [t]welve camps of [his] holy ones [so that they may walk]
8 [and come into] the lot of God with the ang[els of] the luminaries of his glory. In his name the pr[ai]ses of

⁶⁹ Translation loosely follows Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 260.

⁷⁰ Following the reconstruction of Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 261, n. 114, made on the basis of comparable phrases in 4Q511 2 I, 6 and 4Q511 8 8–9.

⁷¹ Again, following Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 261, n. 115.

- 9 their [] he has instituted according to the feasts of the year, [and] the communal [do]minion, so that they may walk [in] the lot of
 10 [God] according to [his] glory [and] serve him in the lot of the people of his throne. For the God of [...]

According to this passage, the earthly community, “Israel,” is invited to join “the lot of God” with the “ang[els of] the luminaries of his glory.” Significantly, it is by means of the liturgy, the ת[ש]בוהת instituted by God himself, that the camps of heaven and earth may both walk “in the lot of God according to his glory.” The phrase מלא[כי] מאורות occurs only once in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and its special use here indicates two important points. First, the angelic beings who are included in God’s lot are described in terms of light, which, as we have seen, represents their illumination by divine knowledge. The human counterparts for the angels of the luminaries, are the “sons of light” (בני אור; 4Q510 1 7), who also share in God’s lot. Together, these illuminated participants in God’s lot fend off the forces of darkness. Second, as Maxwell Davidson observes, it seems that the angels of the luminaries are to be linked here with the heavenly bodies, המארת הגדלים, mentioned in Gen 1:16.⁷² This might be gathered from the mention of “communal dominion” (ממשלת יחד) in line 9, which echoes the use of the term ממשלת in Gen 1:16 with reference to the authority of the sun and the moon over day and night. It is clear from the present context that the phrase ממשלת יחד envisions the dominion shared by the joint community of the בני אור and the heavenly luminaries (cf. Dan 12:3).⁷³ As we shall see shortly, the language linking angels and humans continues in the reference in line 10 to “ministering” (לשרתו) and “the people of his throne” (עם כסאו). Thus, it appears that Baillet was quite correct in the *editio princeps* when he sensed that “les perspectives terrestre et céleste sont peut-être volontairement confondues.”⁷⁴

The homology between heavenly and earthly worshippers expressed in 4QSongs of the Sage and the opportunity of joint action implied by it are crucial to understanding 4Q511 35, the only fragment of the composition that explicitly refers to priests. The first five lines of that fragment read as follows:

⁷² Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 283.

⁷³ See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 174–175.

⁷⁴ Baillet, DJD VII, 222.

1 רִיב לְאֵל⁷⁵ בְּכֹל בָּשָׂר וּמִשְׁפָּט נִקְמוֹת לְכָלֹת רִשְׁעָה וְלוֹעַז[ף]
 2 אִפִּי אֱלֹהִים בְּמִזְוִקֵי שִׁבְעִתַּיִם וּבִקְדוּשֵׁי יְקִדֵּי[ש]
 3 אֱלֹהִים לֹא לְמִקְדָּשׁ עֹלָמִים וְטַהֲרָה בְּנִבְרִים וְהִיוּ
 4 כֹּהֲנִים עִם צְדָקָה וּמִשְׁרָתִים מְלֹאכֵי כְבוֹדוֹ
 5 יִהְלְלוּהוּ בְּהַפְלָא נֹרְאוֹת

- 1 [God has an indictment] against all flesh, and a judgment of vengeance to exterminate wickedness, and for the rag[ing]
- 2 anger of God.⁷⁶ Some of⁷⁷ those seven times refined and some of the holy ones God will sancti[fy]
- 3 for himself as an eternal sanctuary and (as) purity⁷⁸ among the cleansed. They shall be
- 4 priests, his righteous people, his host, and ministers, the angels of his glory.
- 5 They shall praise him with wondrous marvels.

This difficult passage apparently opens with a few words dedicated to God's eschatological judgment and punishment of the wicked.⁷⁹ We are immediately informed that the destruction at that time will not be total. Instead, God will consecrate two subgroups from among "those seven times refined" and "the holy ones." As Nitzan notes, the former group refers to the earthly righteous and stems from Ps 12:7, מִזְוִקֵי שִׁבְעִתַּיִם.⁸⁰ This phrase may be compared to 1QH^a 13:18, where, concerning the member of the earthly community, it states that he is "like purified silver in the furnace of the smiths to be refined seven times" (וּכְכֶסֶף מְזוּקָק בְּכֹר נֹפְחִים)

⁷⁵ With Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242. Cf. the reading א[לו]הים, proposed by Baillet and adopted by García Martínez and Tigchelaar.

⁷⁶ Baillet, DJD VII, 237, followed by García Martínez and Tigchelaar *DSSSE* 2:1033 and D. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, Vol. 6: *Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 6:185, does not end the sentence here. Instead, he prefers to read the מִזְוִקֵי שִׁבְעִתַּיִם as the recipients of God's wrath: "et pur la ra[ge de] la colère de Dieu contre les sept fois purifiés." However, considering the overwhelming likelihood that מִזְוִקֵי שִׁבְעִתַּיִם refers to righteous humanity, I prefer to read them as an object of God's sanctification.

⁷⁷ Against the translations of Nitzan (*Qumran Prayer*, 242), Vermes (*The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [5th ed.; New York: Allen Lane/Penguin Press, 1997], 422), and Frennesson ("In a Common Rejoicing", 74), the *hiph'il* form of the root קדש takes a direct object in the accusative (see GKC § 119). Therefore the *bet* should be understood in the sense "among." For this reading, see Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, Vol. 6, 185; J. Davila, "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *DSSAFY*, 2:479, n. 48.

⁷⁸ With Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242, n. 63, I read this word as a *niph'al* of the root ברר. Cf. 2 Sam 22:17 (= Ps 18:27).

⁷⁹ On the relationship of the magical protection of the Songs of the Sage to the eschaton, see Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 253–259.

⁸⁰ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 276, n. 12; cf. Baillet, DJD VII, 238. Cf. the similar terminology applied to the Levites in Mal 3:3.

לטהר שבעתים). Concerning the latter term, “the holy ones,” it is reasonable to assume that, as in the vast majority of its occurrences in the Scrolls, it is to be understood as referring to angelic beings.⁸¹ Thus, the select humans and angels together will be made by God into “an eternal sanctuary.”⁸² It is no surprise that this imaginal liturgical temple is characterized by praises of “wondrous marvels” offered by the unified angelic and human community.

My suggestion that the conjoined liturgical community of righteous humans and angels are the subject of the verb יהללוהו at the beginning of line 5 is supported by the language of line 4, והיו כוהנים עם צדקו צבאו, ומשרתים מלאכי כבודו. To be sure, scholars have noted that the translation of this line is far from straightforward and they offer various interpretations. Baillet translates: “Et ils seront prêtres, Son peuple juste, Son armée et ministres des anges de Sa gloire.”⁸³ Presumably, by reading משרתים as a construct form, he is attempting to avoid an unsettling description of human priests as the angels of God’s glory.⁸⁴ According to this reading, the line contains four epithets, all of which refer to human subjects (priests, his righteous people, his host, and the ministers of the angels of his glory). Baillet’s reading is unacceptable first and foremost because משרתים is not a construct, but rather an absolute form.⁸⁵ The line thus contains five appositional epithets rather than four. Furthermore, his apparent aim to exclude the possibility of an angelic identity for the priestly subjects conflicts with the prior term צבאו, which has a primarily angelic connotation at Qumran and in post-biblical literature.⁸⁶

⁸¹ However, note the phrase “for the holy ones of his people” (לקדושי עמו) in 4Q511 2 I, 6, which may refer to human beings. On the other hand, as noted in our discussion of SSS, in 4Q400 1 I, 6, the context strongly implies that the phrase עם בניו refers to angelic priests (cf. another possible use of the term עם for angels in 1QM 12:8, (עם קדושים)).

⁸² Davila (“Heavenly Ascents,” 479) notes that according to this text, “some, but not all, of the members of the sect would achieve apotheosis at the eschaton to serve as priests in the heavenly temple alongside the angels.” According to his translation, the same should also apply to the angels. It remains unclear to me why here only some of the righteous should be sanctified as an eternal temple. In 1QS 8–9, the whole community enjoys that privilege.

⁸³ DJD VII, 237.

⁸⁴ Baillet is followed by A. Caquot (“Le service des anges,” *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 425), who translates “ceux qui servent Ses anges glorieux.” He explains the relationship of the righteous to the angels as analogous to the relationship between priests and Levites in the OT (Num 3:6; 8:26).

⁸⁵ Noted by Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 283.

⁸⁶ See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 164–165. He adds there that “if the text refers to the human priests as ‘servants of the angels of His Glory’ there is a real danger that this

Alternatively, based on his assertion that the sectarians *never* “live in heaven, let alone become angels” anywhere in the Qumran corpus, Davidson proposes the following translation of lines 4–5: “And they will be priests, his righteous people, his host. And ministers, angels of his glory shall praise him.”⁸⁷ According to this reading, the absolute form of משרתים is correctly recognized, but the first three epithets (priests, his righteous people, his host) refer to the righteous human community, while the last two (ministers, angels of his glory) refer only to the angelic beings. While Davidson is correct to note the presence of both humans and angels in line 4, his division of the sentence and the resulting scenario, which reserves the praising activity in line 5 only for the angels, are unconvincing. We have already seen within the context of the Songs of the Sage the expectation that lower and upper communities should join together in praise of God (4Q511 2 I, 7–10), and there is no reason not to expect the same phenomenon here, particularly since much of the language is shared. Indeed, in lines 2–3 of fragment 35 itself, God sanctifies some of the human מזוקקי שבעתים and angelic קדושים and turns them into a *single* unit, the “eternal sanctuary.” Moreover, the terminology itself suggests a picture that envisions a unified liturgical community of angels and humans. As noted, the term צבאו applies more appropriately to angelic beings. In addition, the epithet משרתים need not refer exclusively to angels. We have encountered instances of exalted human priests ministering (שרת) before God in 1QSb 4:25 (cf. *Jub.* 31:14) and Sir 50:14, 19.⁸⁸ Furthermore, the same root appears in 4Q511 2 I, 9–10 in a context of joint angelic and human service: “[and] the communal [do]minion, so that they may walk [in] the lot of [God] according to [his] glory [and] serve him in the lot of the people of his throne” (וממשלת יחד להתהלך [ב]גורל [אלוהים] לפי כבודו [ו] לשרתו בגורל עם כסאו). In this passage, it is likely that the ממשלת יחד, the conjoined community of illuminated angels and men who share in God’s lot, is the subject performing the act of “serving.” The epithet “people of his throne” does not refer to the earthly community of the righteous alone, nor to “les anges qui entourent le trône

would mean a *reverence of angels* ... [and] runs the risk of being read as a description of the worship by humans of angels.”

⁸⁷ Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 284. For a similar translation, see Davila, “Heavenly Ascents,” 479.

⁸⁸ For the application of the term to angels, see 4Q400 1 I, 4: משרתי פנים בדביר כבודו. *Jubilees* 30:18 paints a picture of angelic and human priests serving in unison: “Levi’s descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as Levites to serve before the Lord, as we (do) for all time.”

de Dieu,”⁸⁹ but to the transformed liturgical community that surrounds God’s throne in the cosmic temple.⁹⁰ As we have seen, we are not dealing here with two separate communities but with a single conjoined unity.⁹¹ Based on this observation, it appears that Baillet’s above-mentioned suggestion that the language of 4Q511 2 I intentionally confuses earthly and celestial perspectives also applies here. Line 4 of fragment 35 may thus be considered a list of epithets referring to a single conjoined community. As such, I have translated line 4 as follows: “They shall be priests, his righteous people, his host, and ministers, the angels of his glory.”⁹² Together, in liturgical communion the imaginal community envisioned as comprised of priests, people, and angels offers the praise of “wondrous marvels” mentioned in line 5.

The interpretation of line 4 as a list of intentionally inclusive epithets meant to underscore the unity of heavenly and earthly groups in a single community finds support also in 4Q511 35’s close links with the texts surveyed above, which use a similar literary strategy in their depiction of the elevated nature of priests. The intentional inclusion of the language recalls most clearly the approach of SSS, but, as we have seen, this also occurs in *Jubilees*, Ben Sira, 4QInstruction, 4QVisions of Amram, 4Q541 9, and 1QSb. Furthermore, the depiction of the eternal temple (מקדש עולמים) of 4Q511 35 3 as embodied by priests, people, and angels of his glory among others, and offering praises to God with “wondrous marvels” is paralleled vividly by the description of the animate temple in the seventh song of SSS: “That there may be wondrous songs (sung) with eter[nal] joy. With these let all the f[oundations of the hol]y of holies praise, the supporting pillars of the supremely lofty abode, and all the corners of its structure” (לזמרות פלא בשמחת עול[מים] באלה יהללו כול י[סודי] קוד[ש]; 4Q403 1 I, 40–41).⁹³ The notion of liturgical community as embodiment of the temple itself goes beyond the pictures of *Jub.* 31:14 and 1QSb 4, where, rather than becoming that structure, the sacerdotalists are bidden to “serve *in*”

⁸⁹ So Baillet, DJD VII, 222.

⁹⁰ For the term עם as denoting angels, see n. 81 above.

⁹¹ The imagery recalls the playful words of Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries,” 184): “Mirrored and mirror are indistinguishable when the mirror is mirrored as the mirrored of the mirror.”

⁹² For similar translations, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 2:1033; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 242; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 162; Parry and Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, Vol. 6, 185.

⁹³ Cf. 1QS 11:8, where we are told that the סוד מבנית קודש is composed of the community of men and angels joined together by God (ועם בני שמים חבר סודם לעצת יחד).

it as angels of the presence. Fletcher-Louis argues that this difference in perspectives between *Jubilees* and 4Q511 “reflects the fact that *Jubilees* is proto-Essene, lacking the sense—which appears in the community’s own later literature—that the righteous themselves can act as *Ersatz* Temple.”⁹⁴ If he is correct, then it becomes difficult to explain why the imagery of 1QSb, which is certainly sectarian, shares the perspective of *Jubilees* rather than 4Q511. This question resonates when we consider the depiction of the community as the embodiment of the temple earlier on in the Rule Scroll. It is possible that the difference in imagery is due to the fact that 1QSb 4 is dealing with a singular subject, the high priest, whereas 4Q511 apparently envisions the whole community. However, it is more likely that the different viewpoints of *Jubilees* and 1QSb on the one hand, and 4Q511 on the other hand, vis-à-vis the portrayal of the imaginal temple are a result of literary context and flexibility, and are not to be pressed too hard.

In sum, the fortuitous references to an “eternal sanctuary” and “priests” in 4Q511 35 are crucial not only to an understanding of the religious-cosmological system undergirding 4QSongs of the Sage, but also as a further example of the centrality of the symbol of the imaginal temple and its priesthood in the Qumranite religious imagination. Like SSS and 1QSb, in 4QSongs of the Sage transcendence of time and space is achieved by means of liturgical transport to the imaginal realm. The earthly community’s union with angelic beings, which represents the zenith of human endeavor, is achieved through its embodiment of the imaginal temple, the imperishable sacred realm of the spiritual worship of God. As such, the portrayal of the conjoined community as priests worshipping God there should come as no surprise.

THE SELF-GLORIFICATION HYMN

The Self-Glorification Hymn relates the first-person boasts of a mysterious figure who claims to be incomparable in glory and takes a seat among the “gods” (i.e., angels). It makes no explicit reference to priests or priesthood. However, since the language of the text implies a priestly identity for the speaker, the document’s contents are relevant to our discussion. Four witnesses to the Hymn, which have been characterized as comprising two different recensions, are extant: 4Q491 11 I (= Recen-

⁹⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 166.

sion B), and portions of three Hodayot manuscripts, 4Q427 7, 1QH^a 25:34–27:3, and 4Q471b + 4Q431 I (= Recension A).⁹⁵ Paleographically, all four manuscripts date from the late Hasmonean/Herodian periods and, on the basis of content, a sectarian provenance is certain. The relationship between the preserved manuscripts is complex, and we shall not treat it in detail here.⁹⁶ It will suffice to note that the thematic and linguistic affinities between 4Q491 11 I on the one hand, and the composite text constructed out of the three Hodayot witnesses on the other, have been enough to convince most, but not all, scholars that these manuscripts represent two recensions of the same work.⁹⁷ The following discussion makes use of the generally accepted “recension” terminology with the awareness that the determination of the precise relationship between the textual witnesses will require much further study.

4Q491 11 I (Recension B) reads as follows:⁹⁸

(8) [...] wonderfully, awesome deeds [...] (9) [...] his might. Let the right[eous ones]⁹⁹ rejoice, let the holy ones exult in (ויגילו ויקים) ... in righteousness (בצדק) (10) [...] Israel. He established it of old (as) his tr[uth], and the mysteries of his wisdom in al[...] might (11) [...] and the council of the poor for an eternal congregation (ועצת אביונים לעדת עולמים) and [they are to say, Blessed be God who has seated me among]¹⁰⁰ the eternally (12) perfect (תמימי עולמים)—(given me) a throne of power in the congregation of the gods (כסא עוז בעדת אלים). No king of old will sit therein, neith[er] will their nobles [...] No]ne can compare (13) [to]

⁹⁵ The labels Recension A and Recension B were first introduced by E. Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 189–191. Cf. eadem, in E. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 422.

⁹⁶ For in-depth discussion of the relationship between the different manuscripts, see M. Wise, “מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219; Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 175–203; F. García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” in *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (ed. E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 63; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105–125.

⁹⁷ For the generally accepted view, see, e.g., J. Duhaime, *The War Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 35–40. To my knowledge, the dissenting position is expressed only by García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 105–125, esp. 114–118.

⁹⁸ Transcription and translation generally draw from Wise, “A Study of 4Q491c,” 182–183. Line numbering follows Baillet, DJD VII, 26–27.

⁹⁹ Following the reading of Baillet. Wise reads a[n]g[el]s = א[ל]י[הו]א.

¹⁰⁰ The reconstruction follows Wise. On the basis of the sudden switch from third person plural to first person singular forms, a reconstruction of this type seems likely. See further the discussion below.

my glory; none has been exalted save myself, and none can oppose me. I sit in [... hea]ven, and none (14) [su]rround (me). I am reckoned with the gods, my habitation is in the holy congregation (אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני) (בעדת קודש). [My] desi[re] is not according to flesh, [rather] my [por]tion lies in the glory of (15) the holy [dwell]ling¹⁰¹ (לי) (אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני). [W]ho has been accounted despicable like me, yet who is like me in my glory? (ומיא בכבודי ידמה) Who [...] (16) [like] me? Who bea[rs all] sorrows like me? And who [suffe]rs evil like me? None! I have been instructed, and there is no teaching that compares (17) [to my teaching] (להוריתי) (לוא תדמה להוריתי). Who can attack me when I op[en m]y [mouth,] who can endure the flow of my lips (מי מול שפתי מי) (יכיל)? Who can challenge me and so compare with my judgment? (18) [...] for I am recko[ned] with the gods (ב) (אני עם אלים אחשב) [...] my glory is with the sons of the king, not (with) [pure] gold nor the gold of Ophir. (19) [...] L (ל)¹⁰³ (20) [Exult,] righteous ones, in the God of (צדיקים הללו) (במעון) [...] Give praise in the holy dwelling, sing t[o him ...] (הקודש זמרוהו) [...] Pr[oclaim with expressions of gladness, [burst forth in] eternal joy without cea[sing ...] (שמחת) (השמיצו בהגיה רנה הביעו ב) (שמיצו) [...] עולמים ואין השבת [...]

In the *editio princeps* (DJD VII), Baillet identified the approximately sixty fragments of 4Q491 as a Cave 4 version of the War Scroll (4QM^a), which differs significantly from the Cave 1 version. This designation influenced his interpretation of 4Q491 11 I, in which, as we have seen, the call to prayer of a group labeled the “righteous” (ll. 8–11, 20–24) forms an envelope around the first person singular speech of an individual who boasts that he has received “a throne of power in the congregation of the gods” (כסא עון בעדת אלים), among other honors. Placing the text near the part of 1QM where Michael is sent as an aid to the righteous (1QM 17:6 ff.), Baillet identified the first person speaker as the archangel Michael and dubbed the fragment “cantique de Michel et cantique des justes.”

A few years later, Morton Smith challenged this identification on the basis of the fact that Michael is nowhere mentioned in 4Q491 11 I and that the comparable context in 1QM provides no occasion for such a speech.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, the language employed by the speaker is only

¹⁰¹ Again, reconstructions follow Wise.

¹⁰² Following Baillet, DJD VII, 27. Wise has אלים מעמדי.

¹⁰³ At the edge of the left margin of l. 19, the ascending stroke of a large *lamed* may be discerned. The function of this letter or the word of which it was once a part cannot be determined. For some suggestions, see Wise, “A Study of 4Q491c,” 191–193.

¹⁰⁴ M. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a” in *Archaeology and History*, 181–188. Although published in 1990, the original paper dates back to 1985.

suitable for a human being. No angel would contrast himself with “the kings of old/the East” (מלכי קדם) and “their nobles” (נדיביהמה). An archangel such as Michael would take his throne in heaven for granted. But “this parvenu not only boasts of his, but in doing so makes clear that he was not originally at home in the heavens.” After making a number of further arguments along these lines, Smith concludes that the speaker is a human being most reminiscent of the author of the Hodayot, who similarly proclaims his sufferings, his freedom from carnal desires, the overpowering quality of his teaching, his admittance into the company of angels and participation in their lot, and his possession of glory like that of God. However, in distinction with the Hodayot, Smith sees in 4Q491 11 I the influence of speculation on deification by ascent to heaven, “speculation which may have gone along with some practices that produced extraordinary experiences understood as encounters with gods or angels.”¹⁰⁵

Smith’s suspicion of a literary link between 4Q491 11 I and the Hodayot was subsequently proven correct by the publication of the above-mentioned Cave 4 Hodayot manuscripts, which not only seem to contain a version of the canticles in 4Q491, but also overlap with the last columns of 1QH^a. Moreover, in a widely influential study, Martin Abegg isolated 4Q491 11 I from its supposed War Rule related literary context. On the basis of differences of script and orthography, he divided the material originally edited by Baillet as a single manuscript (4Q491) into three distinct manuscripts. He labeled the first two manuscripts 4Q491a and 4Q491b.¹⁰⁶ The former preserves fragments of a document similar to 1QM (especially cols. 14–17), and the latter consists of material related to the eschatological war but different from 1QM. In addition, due to differences in letter height, Abegg separated 4Q491 11 I (and frg. 12) from 4Q491b, and labeled it 4Q491c. Since the canticles of 4Q491c

A revised version of the paper appeared as “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290–301.

¹⁰⁵ Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens,” 186–188.

¹⁰⁶ M. Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Evans and P. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73. He assigns Baillet’s frgs. 8–10, 11 II, 12–15, 18, 24–28, 31–33, and 35 to 4Q491a. He includes in 4Q491b frgs. 1–7, 16–17, 19, 20–21, and 23. M. Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 137, n. 6.

possess no parallels to the War Rule, he suggested that the manuscript belongs to a different composition altogether.¹⁰⁷ His conclusion was supported by Esther Eshel, who found that some of the orthography and terminology of 4Q491c are unique to this text alone.¹⁰⁸

Abegg's conclusions influenced speculation regarding the identity of the speaker in 4Q491 11 I. Indeed, partially due to the separation of 4Q491c from a concrete literary context, scholars have generally explicated the meaning of the hymn with reference to the community context of the Hodayot.¹⁰⁹ However, while Recension A certainly was attached to one version of the Hodayot,¹¹⁰ the literary background of 4Q491 11 I remains obscure.¹¹¹ Exemplifying a more cautious approach, Schuller

¹⁰⁷ He further suggested that 4Q491c might even derive from a Hodayot manuscript and come "from a psalm that followed the current broken end of the Thanksgiving Hymns." Abegg, "Who Ascended to Heaven?" 72.

¹⁰⁸ Eshel, "4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn," 176.

¹⁰⁹ For instance, assuming that the Hodayot were authored by the Teacher of Righteousness, Abegg suggested that the exalted figure of the Self-Glorification Hymn "is none other than the Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the Yahad." M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 404–405. See also Abegg, "Who Ascended to Heaven?" 72.

¹¹⁰ See E. Schuller, "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description," *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–150. She notes that 4Q427 may not be a copy of the Hodayot as known from Cave 1 since no portion of the "Teacher Hymns" appears in it. The manuscript may only have included "Hymns of the Community." See, however, in the same volume, the response of J.J. Collins and D. Dimant, "A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller," 154, which calls this traditional distinction into question.

¹¹¹ However, García Martínez ("Old Texts and Modern Mirages," 111–114) argues that there is insufficient evidence to warrant the separation of 4Q491c from 4Q491b. (Moreover, Professor Abegg informs me in a personal communication that he is no longer convinced by some of his original arguments for dividing 4Q491 into three manuscripts [e.g., orthography, morphology, line height].) For García Martínez, this means that 4Q491 11 I is to be identified as part of the War Rule related material in 4Q491b and that the identity of the speaker of the hymn is to be understood within this context. Nevertheless, as Brian Schultz (*Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered* [STDJ 76; Leiden: Brill, 2009], 30, n. 67) observes, "even if García Martínez's assumption should be correct, it must also be pointed out that the Hymn was then duly removed from such a war context very soon thereafter. It is nowhere to be found in M's extant text, nor is it likely that it was once part of the end which has been lost: 4Q491B ... relate[s] to cols 2–13 of M ... and not the last section of M which begins at col. 15. Thus, while García Martínez may well be right in that this *Self-Glorification Hymn* ... is not related to H as is currently thought, its relationship to M, if there ever was any, would have been short lived ... Furthermore, even the Hymn's contents are out of character with the rest of M Material. García Martínez suggests that it is a prayer of victory to be said by a kind of 'heavenly messiah' (p. 124), 'the head of the heavenly army who opposed the army of darkness' (p. 122). If so, the Hymn is all the more an anomaly in M because all the texts on the eschatological war never do anything more than taking the existence

wonders “if these hymns [Baillet’s “Canticle of Michael” and “Canticle of the Righteous”] had a distinctive origin and usage and were secondarily joined with Hymns of the Teacher and perhaps other hymns to form the collection we know as 1QH^a.”¹¹² Whatever the case, she observes further that “whoever the referent may be in 4Q491 11 I, in the recension of this psalm that is found in the Hodayot manuscripts, the ‘I’ is to be understood in relationship to the ‘I’ voice we hear speaking in the other psalms.”¹¹³ As we shall see, the proposal that the Teacher of Righteousness was involved in the authorship of the Hodayot has exerted a powerful influence on the lively discussion surrounding the speaker’s identity in the Self-Glorification Hymn.

The Identity of the Speaker

Few scholars have followed Baillet’s suggestion that the speaker is to be identified with the archangel Michael.¹¹⁴ Indeed, there is good reason to view this personage as an exalted human, and not an angelic figure. Following Smith, several scholars find evidence that the speaker was not originally at home in heaven. Dimant notes that it would be inappropriate for an angel to compare himself with “kings” (4Q491 11 I, 12) and refer to himself as teaching by using a phrase applied elsewhere to humans

of such an angelic being for granted. Nowhere are any of the specifics of his role during the eschatological war described; we only know that he is ‘there’ and that because of his involvement, whatever it may be, the war will be won. Why then would a scribe isolate this one aspect of the angelic being’s role and insert it into a body of literature which details the responsibilities of mortals only?” Given these persuasive arguments, it is best to conclude that the identity of the speaker in 4Q491 11 I should not be tied strictly to the context of 4Q491b. I thank Dr. Schultz for sharing his research with me prior to publication.

¹¹² Schuller, “The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts,” 149–150.

¹¹³ Schuller, DJD XXIX, 102. Note, however, that Schuller now accepts the assertion of García Martínez observed in n. 97 above.

¹¹⁴ A.S. van der Woude is an exception. See his review of DJD VII in *TRu* 55 (1990): 256–257. See also M. Hengel, “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit,” in *Der leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte* (ed. B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher; FAT 14; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996), 90; García Martínez, “Old Texts and Modern Mirages,” 118–124. Dimant (Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 154) originally expressed sympathy for the identification of the speaker as an angel based on the appearance of terms that only appear elsewhere in SSS, such as “sons of the king” (בני המלך) and “gold of Ophir” (כתם אופיר). Upon further study, however, she concluded that the speaker is indeed to be understood as a human being. See D. Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B,” *JQR* 85 (1994): 161.

(מול שפתי; 4Q491 11 I, 17).¹¹⁵ Eshel observes that the speaker's claim in 4Q491 11 I, 14, "[My] desi[re] is not according to flesh" (לא כבשר תאו[תי]), emphasizes his separation from ordinary mortals—a proud assertion certainly out of place in the mouth of an angel.¹¹⁶ Scholars also point to the protagonist's very human characteristic of bearing "sorrows" in line 16.¹¹⁷

Among the vast majority of scholars who prefer a human speaker, there is no consensus as to his precise identity. Admitting the difficulty of the problem, Puech leaves open several possibilities: "Maître / Instructeur / Sage, Messie roi-prêtre (?)."¹¹⁸ Stegemann prefers to view the text as an example of "collective messianism," where, comparable to the Songs of the Servant (Isa 42:1–9; 49:1–6; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12), "sometimes the collective of the people of Israel is spoken off [*sic*] like an individual." In this case, the "I" of the text would represent the collective of Israel "raised to a quasi heavenly status."¹¹⁹ Pointing out several royal features of the speaker, especially his seat on a heavenly throne, Israel Knohl prefers to see the speaker as the royal messiah.¹²⁰

According to a very popular line of interpretation, the speaker is viewed as an exalted priestly figure. We have already noted Abegg's assertion that this figure is the Teacher of Righteousness, who is elsewhere explicitly identified as a priest.¹²¹ Both Collins and Eshel allow for the possibility that an image of the Teacher of Righteousness was an under-

¹¹⁵ Dimant, "A Synoptic Comparison," 161.

¹¹⁶ E. Eshel, "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn," in *The Provo International Conference*, 626; eadem, DJD XXIX, 422.

¹¹⁷ See, e.g., I. Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. D. Maisel; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000), 77; Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 144–145. As Collins warns, this interpretation is dependent on the reconstruction.

¹¹⁸ Puech, *La Croyance*, 2:494. Apparently, he prefers above all the "sage" possibility, for earlier (p. 492) he labels the text "un hymne des justes et une exaltation du sage avec les petits et les pauvres."

¹¹⁹ Stegemann, "Some Remarks to 1QSa," 502. A similar position is held by A. Steudel, "The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM)," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 525, n. 93, and E. Puech, "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 489. See also Hengel, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte," 90: "Die Grenze zwischen Individuum und Kollektiv scheint fließend zu sein, der vorbildliche Einzelne verkörpert die Gemeinschaft, wie umgekehrt die Gemeinschaft in einer idealen Einzelgestalt dargestellt werden kann."

¹²⁰ Knohl, *The Messiah*, 80–86.

¹²¹ On the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness as a priest, see p. 193 and n. 98 there.

lying inspiration,¹²² but they conclude that the speaker is most likely the eschatological high priest known from other Qumran texts such as 4Q541 9.¹²³ Finally, in line with his larger thesis about the angelomorphic priesthood at Qumran, Fletcher-Louis claims that the speaker is no eschatological “fantasy,” but rather a living priestly leader of the community who has been transformed into an angel.¹²⁴

There is indeed good reason to identify the protagonist in the Self-Glorification Hymn as an exalted priest. In a span of six lines in Recension B, he boasts of his illustrious glory (כבודי) no less than three times (ll. 13, 15, 18).¹²⁵ Both versions of the Hymn tell of his position among the angels. Thus in Recension B, “I am reckoned with the gods, my habitation is in the holy congregation” (אני עם אלים אתחשב ומכוני בעדת קודש),¹²⁶ and in Recension A, “a friend of the holy ones” (רע לקדושים).¹²⁷ The motifs of numinous glory and the participation of earthly *priests* with angels within a liturgical context are familiar from both 1QSB and 4QSongs of the Sage.¹²⁸ Also in both versions, the speaker lays special emphasis upon his role as a teacher: “and no teaching will be equal [to my teaching]” ([להוריתי] (והוריה לוא תדמה להוריתי)).¹²⁹ This coincides with the pedagogical role attributed to the otherworldly priesthood in 1QSB 4, 4Q400 1 I, 4Q541 9, 4Q418 81, and *Jubilees* 31.¹³⁰ The use of the phrases מזל שפתי and משפטי in this context recalls the teachings and judgments of the elevated Zadokite priests of 1QSB 3.¹³¹ In addition, the speaker’s claim that לוא כבשר תאוןתי recalls the notion that the otherworldly priest is distinguished from all “flesh.”¹³²

¹²² Since the style and content of the Self-Glorification Hymn are completely different from those of the “Teacher Hymns,” thought by many scholars to have been composed by the Teacher, Collins rejects the Teacher of Righteousness identification. See Collins, *The Scepter*, 148.

¹²³ Collins, *The Scepter*, 146–149; Eshel, DJD XXIX, 426–427. See also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 308.

¹²⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 204–216.

¹²⁵ Cf. 4Q427 7 I, 11; 4Q471b 1a–d (DJD XXIX, 428) 7–8.

¹²⁶ 4Q491 11 I, 14.

¹²⁷ 4Q427 7 10; cf. 4Q471b 1a 6.

¹²⁸ Although Knohl (*The Messiah*, 83) is correct to observe that the depiction of the enthronement of the exalted figure among the angels distinguishes the Hymn from works depicting the exalted figure as serving in the celestial temple, he misses the mark in his claim that “in neither version of the hymn is any priestly element associated with the main character.” See further the discussion of enthronement below.

¹²⁹ 4Q491 11 I, 16–17; cf. 4Q471b 1a 3–4.

¹³⁰ The parallel with 1QSB 4 and 4Q541 9 is noted by Eshel, DJD XXIX, 425.

¹³¹ 4Q491 11 I, 17; cf. 4Q471 1a 5.

¹³² See 4QLevi^c ar 1; *Jub.* 31:14; 4Q418 81 1–2; 1QSB 3:28; cf. Sir 50:17.

Although Knohl interprets the protagonist's enthronement as an indication of his royal messianic status, this suggestion is unlikely.¹³³ Noting the lack of warlike features and any reference to the defeat of Israel's enemies, Collins finds "little analogy with the Davidic Messiah."¹³⁴ Furthermore, parallels suggest that a priest (or priest-king) may indeed enjoy the same honor. Thus, in Heb 8:1–2 (cf. 10:12), Jesus, the high-priest in the order of Melchizedek, "has taken his seat at the right of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord, not any human being, pitched."¹³⁵ The archetypal priest Enoch is also portrayed as seated on a celestial throne in the late first century BCE *Similitudes of Enoch*, as is Enoch-Metatron in the much later 3 *Enoch*.¹³⁶ Moreover, although Psalm 110, "The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand . . . You are a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek," is never explicitly cited in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), it had a demonstrable influence on that document.¹³⁷ It is therefore possible that 11Q13's portrayal of Melchizedek as a celestial high priest/judge drew from the enthronement imagery of Psalm 110, though this cannot be proven. In any case, despite its conspicuous royal connotations, enthronement in heaven certainly does not preclude a priestly identity in the literature of the period.

There are thus solid grounds for maintaining that the speaker is a priest. But a question remains: is he a purely eschatological figure destined to arrive in the imminent future? Or, is he a present member

¹³³ It should be noted that the speaker's enthronement in heaven is never explicitly mentioned in the preserved text and results from textual reconstruction. See 4Q491 11 I, 11–12.

¹³⁴ Collins, *The Scepter*, 147.

¹³⁵ Following the translation of H.W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 216. The imagery appears to draw from Zech 6:13, where the high priest stands at the right hand of the throne of the messianic king. It is interesting to note the comment of W. Lane (*Hebrews 1–8* [WBC 47; Dallas: Word Books, 1991], 205) on this passage: "That Jesus was the ministering priest in the celestial sanctuary was a crucial consideration in the writer's argument for the superiority of Jesus to the Levitical priesthood." As we shall see below, a similar hermeneutic was apparently employed by the Qumranites in their attempts to distinguish themselves from the corruption they perceived in Jerusalem. For a recent study of the Qumran texts as background for the presentation of Jesus as high priest in Hebrews, see E. 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).

¹³⁶ For the identification of Metatron-Enoch as the high priest of the celestial temple, see P. Alexander, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *OTP* 1:265, n. 12.

¹³⁷ See the analysis of 11QMelchizedek below pp. 146–164.

of the community who has undergone some type of extraordinary experience, as Smith has claimed?

The Liturgical-Eschatological Priest of the Self-Glorification Hymn

As noted above, both Collins and Eshel have argued that the exalted priest of the Self-Glorification Hymn is a future eschatological figure rather than a visionary who has already undergone an amazing transformation. In support of this case, Collins notes that nearly all contemporary texts which speak of the enthronement of a human being in heaven “are eschatological and relate either to final judgment or to the final destiny of the just.”¹³⁸ Since the Self-Glorification Hymn mentions enthronement, but never, as we might expect in the context of a visionary ascent, provides details of an ascent or heavenly geography, it is, for Collins, speaking of an eschatological figure. Collins rightly views the tone of the Hymn as close to the realized eschatology of the Hodayot, but also notes that several anthropological details distinguish the hymnist from the author of the Hodayot:

While the author of this hymn boasts of his ability to bear troubles, he does not complain about persecution, as does the author of the Hodayot. Neither does this hymn show the sense of human sinfulness typical of 1QH^a, the sense of being snatched from the pit and of being a creature of clay. The tone of this hymn is more confident, and the exaltation of the speaker surpasses anything found in the Hodayot.¹³⁹

Given the incomparable language applied to this figure as well as the likelihood that the text was composed long after the lifetime of the Teacher of Righteousness, Collins argues that the best candidate for the first person voice of the Hymn is the “one who will teach righteousness at the end of days” (CD 6:11) or the eschatological “Interpreter of the Law” (4Q174), who should be associated with the eschatological high priest of 4Q541 9. Eshel concurs on the basis of the above-mentioned parallels between the speaker and the high priests of 1QSb 4:22–28 and 4Q541 9.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ Collins, *The Scepter*, 144. He discusses Psalm 110 in NT tradition, Daniel 7, *Similitudes of Enoch*, 4Q521, 1 En. 108:12, Rev 3:21, *Ascen. Isa.* 9:24–26 and Ezekiel the Tragedian’s *Exagoge*, 68–69. Out of all of these texts, the only one which is not clearly eschatological is that of Ezekiel the Tragedian.

¹³⁹ Collins, *The Scepter*, 148.

¹⁴⁰ She adds (DJD XXIX, 426) that “one may assume that a scribe, coping with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, composed the Self-Glorification Hymn thinking of the Teacher of Righteousness while describing the eschatological high priest.”

While Collins and Eshel are correct to view the speaker of the Hymn as “eschatological,” they may be incorrect in their claim that the speaker was a figure reserved for the future. Rather, the speaker was arguably a member of the Qumran community. He should be considered eschatological only inasmuch as the liturgical experience allowed him to escape linear historical time and take a seat among the angels. Several pieces of evidence suggest this conclusion.

First, Collins’ argument that the enthronement of a mortal in heaven points to the future is not certain. It is true that according to many contemporary texts this is the case (cf. especially Daniel 7). However, Collins himself observes that the story of Moses’ enthronement related by Ezekiel the Tragedian is not (or need not be) eschatological and unquestionably reflects an actual experience of ascent.¹⁴¹ As Fletcher-Louis notes, Christian evidence also implies that enthronement *was already* attained by the community of believers. Thus, according to Eph 2:6 “God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus” (cf. Col. 3:1–4). Furthermore, pseudepigraphic texts, such as the Jewish *Orphica* (Recension C, ll. 33–34) and *T. Job* 33:2–9 imply the belief that heavenly enthronement is achieved by the truly righteous in the *present* life. Finally, although no throne is mentioned, in 4Q511 8 the Maskil reveals that “God made me [dwell] in the shelter of Shaddai . . . [in the shadow of his ha]nds he hid me . . . [he has conceal]ed me among his holy ones.”¹⁴² In light of these examples, it is worth noting Fletcher-Louis’ evaluation: “Even if most Jews believed enthronement would happen in the future the strongly realized eschatology of the Qumran community might naturally lead them to the view that they, or their leaders, had attained that for which other Jews waited.”¹⁴³

Second, Collins’ claim that the extraordinarily confident tone of the Hymn is irreconcilable with the radically negative assessment of humanity in the Hodayot and therefore must be oriented toward the future is also questionable. In the first place, as Fletcher-Louis observes, any assessment of the overall anthropological perspective of the text on the basis of the relatively small number of preserved lines cannot be certain. Even so, Collins’ claim only applies to Recension B,¹⁴⁴ for in Recension A

¹⁴¹ Collins, *The Scepter*, 145.

¹⁴² Cf. Eshel, DJD XXIX, 424, n. 19.

¹⁴³ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 207–208.

¹⁴⁴ See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 208–212.

(4Q427 7 II, 16–18), the very same person who is to “take a stand¹⁴⁵ in place[before you, and come into community with] the sons of heaven” (להתיצב במעמד] לפניכה ולבוא ביחד עם [בני שמים)¹⁴⁶ asks: “What is flesh in relation to these things? How is [dust and clay] to be recko[ned]?”¹⁴⁷ The tension-filled imagery is familiar from 4Q400 2 as well as the Hodayat. It expresses the Qumranite awareness of the paradox between their lowly mortal nature and their ability to access the realm of divine beings. All of the evidence examined to this point suggests the conclusion that this tension was not a temporal one (moral lowliness/present vs. angelic communion/eschaton),¹⁴⁸ but rather a tension between present and simultaneous paradoxical states of existence.

Third, Collins himself has noted a major difficulty with his previous identification. No other text depicts a future messianic figure engaged in first person speech, and the audacity of his claims is unparalleled:

The problem is that nowhere else in the corpus of the scrolls do we find words placed in the mouth of either Messiah, and so there is no parallel for a speech such as we find in 4Q491 by a messianic figure. Neither is there any parallel for such claims by anyone else.¹⁴⁹

As such, “the implied authorship remains enigmatic,” and we may not assume that the speaker is a future figure.

Fourth, and finally, there are several positive reasons for identifying the speaker of the Hymn as a present member of the community transformed by means and in the context of liturgy. In seeking the speaker’s identity, scholars have generally started with Recension B, focusing in particular on the Canticle of Michael (4Q491 11 I, 8–18). They have virtually ignored the Canticle of the Righteous (4Q491 11 I, 20–24) and its potential bearing on the issue, even though it is clearly closely related to the former, and versions of both hymns appear in succession in all four manuscripts.

¹⁴⁵ The term מעמד may have a priestly implication here. See chapter two, n. 18.

¹⁴⁶ Reconstruction follows Schuller, DJD XXIX, 107.

¹⁴⁷ See Schuller’s illuminating textual comparisons in DJD XXIX, 107. While Collins claims that the enthronement, and hence incomparable exaltation, of the speaker is unique to Recension B, Eshel (DJD XXIX, 422, n. 8) points out that the phrase אֲנִי יִשְׁבְּתִי, which appears in 4Q471b 1b 3 and 4Q427 6 2 indicates that the same concept is also present in Recension A. Therefore, one cannot argue that Recension A speaks in this manner because of a “watered-down” status of the speaker in the Hodayat version.

¹⁴⁸ I disagree with Puech’s argument (*La Croyance*, 2:327–419) that the past tense verbs of the hymns are to be read as prophetic perfects, in anticipation of a future salvation.

¹⁴⁹ Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 147.

Internal comparison of the two hymns in both recensions reveals a special affinity between the speaker and the community. In the Canticle of Michael, the speaker is labeled ידיד המלך (4Q427 7 I, 10 vis-à-vis 4Q431 1 6). A few lines later, in the Canticle of the Righteous, the members of the community are called to sing to God by means of the vocative ידידים (4Q427 7 I, 13).¹⁵⁰ While the exalted singular figure enjoys a position בכוֹר [מע]ן קודש (4Q491 11 I, 14–15), the community is bidden to give praise to God במעון הקודש (4Q491 11 I, 20; 4Q427 7 I, 14–15), the very same locale where the exalted Zadokite priests and high priest of 1QSb 3:25 and 4:25 take their place among the angels. While in the first hymn the exalted figure takes a seat in the כסא עז בעדת (4Q491 11 I, 12), in the second, the poor righteous community¹⁵¹ takes its place עם אלים בעדת יחד (4Q427 7 II, 9). The parallel language may imply that the righteous are envisioned as enthroned as well. Furthermore, the psalmist's expression of suffering, "who bea[rs all] sorrows like me?" (מיא יש[א] צערים כמוני),¹⁵² may be related to the important references to the poor in the hymn.¹⁵³ Thus just prior to the shift into the first person in the Canticle of Michael, we hear of the "council of the poor for an eternal congregation" (עצת אביונים לעדת עולמים).¹⁵⁴ In the Canticle of the Righteous, God "lifts up the poor from the dust to [the eternal height,] and to the clouds he magnifies him in stature, and (he is) with the heavenly beings in the assembly of the community" (יורם מעפר אביון ל[רום עולם] ועד שחקים יגבירהו בקומה ועם אלים בעדת) (יחד).¹⁵⁵ Finally, it is worth noting that while the psalmist's teachings are incomparable,¹⁵⁶ in their call to bless God, the righteous are described as enjoying access to the knowledge of God's mysteries: "Bless the one who wonderfully does majestic deeds . . . seal[ing] mysteries and reveal-

¹⁵⁰ This mirror imagery only occurs in Recension A. Wise takes this as evidence of "the melding process that was the Hodayot redaction." For the epithet אל ידיד, which refers to Benjamin in Deut 33:12, as a title transferred to Levi, see 4Q379 1 2; *ALD* 83. Cf. the comments of Schuller, *DJD* XXIX, 103.

¹⁵¹ I interpret the third person singular here (אביון) as a reference to the entire community. This reading appears to be confirmed by the collective commands two lines earlier, ה[שמיעו] ואמ[ן] יחד.

¹⁵² 4Q491 11 I, 16; cf. 4Q471 1a–d 3.

¹⁵³ So P. de Souza Nogueira, "Ecstatic Worship in the Self-Glorification Hymn," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003), 391–392.

¹⁵⁴ 4Q491 11 I, 11.

¹⁵⁵ 4Q427 7 II, 8–9.

¹⁵⁶ 4Q491 11 I, 16–17; cf. 4Q471b 1a–d 3–4.

ing hidden things, raising up those who stumble and those among them who fall [by res]toring the step of *those who wait for knowledge*” (ברכו המפלי גאות ... [ל]חתום רוים ולגלות נסתרות להרים כושלים ונופליהמה [לשי]ב [לכת קוי דעות]).¹⁵⁷ Indeed, later on they proclaim: “We have known you, God of righteousness, and we have become enlightened” (ידענוכה אל). Thus, it appears that the speaker and the community mirror each other, sharing in three interrelated experiences: exalted heavenly status, suffering, and access to divine knowledge.¹⁵⁸ The speaker, by summoning the righteous community to worship, is evidently leading them to an experience of heavenly glorification comparable to his own.

The language of the two canticles suggests a liturgical context for this activity. This is confirmed by the numerous plural imperatives which call for praise and celebration with the celestial assembly (Recension B: [ירננו], [זמרו, שירו, שמחו, הרנינו, הללו, רוממו]; Recension A: [ה]שמיעו, [ה]זמרו, [ה]ירננו, [ה]ללו, [ה]רוממו, etc.). Michael Wise has offered the suggestion that the Hymn was sung by the whole community led by the Maskil (at least in the Hodayot recension), and that every member of the liturgical community was meant to identify with the first person speaker.¹⁵⁹ This proposal would explain not only the above-mentioned similarities between the speaker and the righteous, but also the apparent sudden switch from plural to singular grammatical forms in Recension A (1QH^a 25:31), which “requires the conjoining of an initial speaker, the Maskil, with others who presumably began by listening.”¹⁶⁰ The identity of the speaker in the Self-Glorification Hymn appears to be inseparable from the liturgical community which he summons to worship.

The references to joint liturgical celebration with the angels and the incomparability of teachings within the context of worship found in the Self-Glorification Hymn favor a liturgical rather than a future eschatological framework. Although Schuller has noted that Recension A (4Q427 7 II, 2–7) contains a “description of the final destruction of evil and the

¹⁵⁷ 4Q427 7 I, 18–20.

¹⁵⁸ De Souza Nogueira, “Ecstatic Worship,” 392.

¹⁵⁹ Wise, “A Study of 4Q491c,” 216–219. His claim that the righteous are to arrive in heaven after death lacks convincing support.

¹⁶⁰ Wise, “A Study of 4Q491c,” 217. Although his argument is based on a reconstruction, his supporting proofs are convincing. A similar switch from plural to singular must also take place at the beginning of the Cantic of Michael in Recension B (4Q491 11 I, 11–12).

appearance of the eschatological blessings,¹⁶¹ it is best to interpret this not as a future event but as the hierohistory experienced by community members in the context of their liturgy.¹⁶²

Although priesthood is never explicitly mentioned in the Self-Glorification Hymn as it is in 4QSongs of the Sage, 1QSB, SSS, or the other texts examined above, the speaker's stated characteristics mark him as a priestly or quasi-priestly figure. (It is not possible to know for certain whether the figure was modeled after the historical Teacher of Righteousness.) By means of the liturgical experience, this identity appears to extend to all members of the community (whether literal priests or not), who share a special affinity with the speaker.

11QMELCHIZEDEK (11Q13)

Within the sectarian corpus, the theme of otherworldly priesthood is not restricted to liturgical compositions. It appears also in the distinctive "inspired biblical exegesis" or *peshar* literature of the Qumranites. As a "thematic" *peshar*,¹⁶³ 11QMelchizedek differs markedly from these sectarian liturgical works, but it would be ill-advised to distinguish too sharply between liturgical and exegetical endeavors on the part of the Qumranite authors, for whom the cultivation of poetic forms of liturgical piety and oracular Torah analysis represented two central and related spiritual outlets.¹⁶⁴ Indeed, research has confirmed the importance of self-conscious meditative biblical exegesis within the liturgical compositions.¹⁶⁵ On the other hand, *peshar* interpretation, by uncovering the communicated will of God in historical events, similarly expressed the depths of Qumran spirituality, allowing community members access to

¹⁶¹ Schuller, DJD XXIX, 101.

¹⁶² Cf. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 210–212.

¹⁶³ On the distinction between "thematic" and "continuous" *peshar*, see J. Carmignac, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédék," *RevQ* 7 (1970): 360–362; S. Berrin, "Pesharim," *EDSS* 2:644–647.

¹⁶⁴ See, e.g., the statement of Wolfson, "Seven Mysteries," 187: "From the same ranks came forth visionary poet and inspired exegete, *maškil* and *moreh šedeq*, entrusted with knowledge of the mysteries of the prophets that pertained especially to the eschatological end." Cf. S. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 66, n. 67, who describes the line between study and worship at Qumran as "somewhat porous."

¹⁶⁵ Davila, "Heavenly Ascents," 481, includes as examples the Hodayot, SSS, and Self-Glorification Hymn. On the self-conscious biblical exegesis of SSS, see esp. C. Newsom, "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot," *JJS* 38 (1987): 11–30.

divine “knowledge,” albeit through a different medium. Thus, I propose that although 11QMelchizedek is not a liturgical text, nonetheless, by means of inspired biblical exegesis it brought about a comparable result for those who produced it—access to God’s hierohistorical plan, the envisioning of eschatological salvation within the grand cosmic scheme.¹⁶⁶

11QMelchizedek is an extremely damaged manuscript dating paleographically to the middle of the first century BCE.¹⁶⁷ The document quotes or alludes to Leviticus 25, Deuteronomy 15, Isa 52:7; 61:1–3, Ps 7:8–9; 82:1–2, and probably Dan 9:25, all in connection with an eschatological description of the end of the tenth jubilee.¹⁶⁸ The text portrays Melchizedek, a figure known from only two passages in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 14:18–20 and Ps 110:4), as a celestial redeemer aided by a heavenly retinue. On the Day of Atonement, he rescues God’s people, the children of light, and prevails over his archenemy Belial and the spirits of his lot.

Originally the text consisted of at least three columns. The best preserved and most important textual remains appear in column 2:¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ Milik (“Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša’ dans les ancient écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 [1972]: 109–124; idem, *The Books of Enoch*, 248–254) saw 11QMelchizedek as a portion of a larger hypothetical “Peshar on the Periods” (see 4Q180 and 4Q181), which describes the malevolent and beneficent activities of angels during the course of the preordained jubilee periods. Interestingly, the other known thematic pesharim, including 4QFlorilegium, 4QPeshar on the Periods, and 4QCatena^a, are also focused on eschatological motifs.

¹⁶⁷ According to F. García Martínez, E. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (in F. García Martínez, E. Tigchelaar and A.S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* [DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998], 223), the script correlates to what Cross characterizes as a “late Hasmonaean or early Herodian book hand” (c. 50–25 BCE). Based on the relatively archaic form of some letters, Milik (“Milkî-šedeq,” 97) dated the text to the middle of the first century BCE. For further discussion of the paleographical dating of the text, see E. Puech, “Notes sur le Manuscrit de 11QMelkî-šedeq,” *RevQ* 12 (1987): 507–508. A. Steudel (“Melchizedek,” *EDSS* 1:576) claims that the composition of the text may be dated to the second half of the second century BCE based on formal criteria such as quotation and interpretation formulas. If she is correct, it would be the oldest purely exegetical text from Qumran.

¹⁶⁸ For the time scheme of 11QMelchizedek in comparison with calculations of the periods of history in contemporary literature, see Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 49–51.

¹⁶⁹ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 224–230. For the *editio princeps*, see A.S. van der Woude, “Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI,” *OTS* 14 (1965): 354–373. For further textual analysis, see Y. Yadin, “A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran,” *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–154; M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, “XIQMelchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–326; J.A. Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11,” in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*

(2) [] and as for what he said: 'In [this] year of jubilee [each of you shall return to his property,] concerning it he said: 'And th[is] is (3) [the manner of the remission:] every creditor shall remit what he has lent [his neighbor or his brother for it has been proclaimed] a remission (4) of Go[d.] Its interpretation] for the final days concerns the captives, who [] and whose (5) teachers have been hidden and kept secret, and from the inheritance of Melchizedek (ומנחלת מלכי צדק), fo[r] and they are the inheritan[ce of Melchize]dek who (6) will make them return (המה נחל[ת] מלכי צדק) (אשר ישיבמה אליהמה וקרא להמה דרור לעווב להמה] משא) [] over [th]em [] accor[ding to] a[ll] their [doing]s, for (9) it is the time for the year of grace of Melchizedek and of [his] arm[ies, the nati]on [of] the holy ones of God, of the administration of justice (הואה הקץ לשנת הרצון למלכי צדק) (ולצב[איו] עם קדושי אל לממשלת משפט of David, who said: 'Elohim shall [st]and in the ass[embly of God]; in the midst of the gods he shall judge.' And about him he sa[id: 'And] above [it,] (11) to the heights, return: God shall judge the nations.' And as for what he s[aid: 'How long will you] judge unjustly, and be par[tial] to the wick[e]d. [Se]lah,' (12) the interpretation of it concerns Belial and the spirits of his lot (פשרו על בליעל ועל רוחי גורלו) wh[o], in [the]ir tur[ning] away from God's commandments to [commit evil]. (13) And Melchizedek will carry out the vengeance of Go[d]'s judgments (ומלכי צדק יקום נקם) [משפטי א]ל [and on that day he will f]r[ee them from the hand of] Belial and from the hand of all the s[pirits of his lot.] (14) And all the gods [of righteousness] are in his assistance (ובעורו כול אליה צדק); [and h]e is (the one) wh[o] all the sons of God, and he will [(15) This [] is the day of the [peace ab]out which he said [through Isa]iah the prophet who said: ['How] beautiful (16) upon (the) mountains are the feet [of] the messen[ger who an]nounces peace, the mes[senger of good who announces salvati]on, [sa]ying to Zion: your God [is king']. (17) Its interpretation: the mountains

(London: G. Chapman, 1971), 245–267; repr. from *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41; J. Carmignac, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédék," 343–378; Milik, "Milki-šedeq," 96–109; F.L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century AD and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS 30; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 60–82; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, 3–23; Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit 11QMelki-sédeq," 485–513; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 389–412; J.J.M. Roberts, in J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP 6B; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 264–273; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 68–75.

[are] the prophet[s]; they [] every [] (18) And the messenger i[s] the anointed of the spir[it] ([ה] [משיח הרוי] [אה] [והמבשר הו]), as Dan[iel] said [about him: ‘Until an anointed, a prince, it is seven weeks.’ And the messenger of] (19) good who announ[ces salvation] is the one about whom it is written [(20) ‘To comfo[rt] the [afflicted,] its interpretation]: to [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld] (21) in truth [] [(22) [] has turned away from Belial and shall retu[rn to] [(23) [] in the judgment[s of] God, as is written about him: ‘[saying to Zi]on: your God is king.’ [Zi]on i[s] (24) [the congregation of all the sons of righteousness, who] establish the covenant, who avoid walking [on the p]ath of the people. And ‘your G[o]d’ is (25) [Melchizedek who will fr]ee [them from the han]d of Belial. And as for what he said: ‘And you shall blow the ho[rn in] all the [l]and (of) ...

Interpretation of this text has largely revolved around the discussion on Melchizedek’s nature. Commentators have correctly noted Melchizedek’s exalted status. This is certainly evident in the notion that he is capable of saving the people of God from the supernatural Belial and the spirits of his lot (l. 13). In 4QpPs^a (4Q171 3–10 IV, 21), this salvific act is to be performed by God. In line 9, Melchizedek replaces the tetragrammaton in the quotation of Isa 61:2,¹⁷⁰ and in line 13 he brings about “the vengeance of God’s judgment” (another allusion to the same verse). Similarly, in line 5 the reference to “the inheritance of Melchizedek” is apparently replacing the biblical notion of Israel as “the inheritance of God” (cf. Deut 32:9; 1 Sam 10:1; Ps 78:71, etc.).¹⁷¹ The phrase אנש[י] גורל in line 8 is also suggestive of Melchizedek’s elevated status; in Qumran literature the only other characters mentioned as possessing גורל are supernatural (God and Belial), never human.¹⁷² In addition, in line 10 the אלוהים who “stands in the assembly of God” from Ps 82:1 is almost certainly to be interpreted as a reference to Melchizedek.¹⁷³ Some scholars have interpreted such data as evidence that Melchizedek

¹⁷⁰ Isa 61:2: ‘לקרא שנת-רצון לה’; 11Q13 2:9: ‘למלכי צדק’.

¹⁷¹ Cf. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 231. Fitzmyer (“Further Light on Melchizedek,” 257–258) suggests that the reference is to the priestly inheritance of the Levites alluded to in Josh 18:7, נחלתו ה’ כהונה (cf. Deut 10:9; 18:2). Cf. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 58.

¹⁷² Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 60.

¹⁷³ This reading is dependent on the interpretation of the first word of l. 10 (עליו) as a reference to Melchizedek. This was proposed by van der Woude in the *editio princeps*, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt,” 364, 367–368. The reading was challenged by Carmignac (“Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkišédék,” 353, 365–367), who preferred to read עליו as a reference to משפט in l. 9. See also Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 261.

is indeed YHWH himself, or perhaps a divine hypostasis.¹⁷⁴ However, considering the well-known general trend in Second Temple period literature of angels taking on functions ascribed to God, it is more likely that Melchizedek is depicted here as an angelic being with a status of its own, separate from God.¹⁷⁵ As evidence of this, several scholars have noted that 2:13 presupposes a distinction between God and Melchizedek, who serves as his mediator: Melchizedek exacts the vengeance of *El's* judgments, not his own.¹⁷⁶

In addition to divinity, some would attribute a human nature to Melchizedek. This claim has been supported by the attempted identification of Melchizedek with the human *מבשר* of Isa 52:7, quoted in 2:15–16.¹⁷⁷ In 2:18–20, this figure is identified as the “anointed of spirit” (*משיח הרוח*), about whom both Daniel (9:25) and Isaiah (61:1–2) speak. However, although the text is fragmentary and it is impossible to be certain, it appears that Melchizedek should not be identified with this figure.¹⁷⁸ In line 16 the herald states, “Your God is king” (*מלך אלוהיך*; Isa 52:7), which clearly distinguishes him from *אלוהים*, who, as we have seen, is identified with Melchizedek in 11Q13. A more likely identity for the herald “anointed of spirit” (*משיח הרוח*) is suggested by the parallel phrase

¹⁷⁴ So M. Barker, *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox; London: SPCK, 1992), 88–89, 224 (for Barker, YHWH is not identical to God, but rather represents his son and viceroy.); F. Manzi, *Melchisedek e l'angelologica nell'epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran* (AnBib 136; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1997), 67–96; R. van de Water, “Michael or Yhwh? Toward Identifying Melchizedek in 11Q13,” *JSP* 16 (2006): 75–86. For Melchizedek as a divine hypostasis, see Milik, “Milki-šedeq,” 125; Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal,” 222.

¹⁷⁵ On the angelic replacement of God in the myth of the eschatological battle against the forces of evil, see J. Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 259–272. On the identification of Melchizedek as a heavenly power in Christian and Gnostic literature, see B. Pearson, “Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M. Stone and T. Bergren; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 176–202; Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 87–114.

¹⁷⁶ Van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt,” 368; Kobelski, Melchizedek, 74. H. Ringgren (*The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [trans. E.T. Sander; New York: Crossroad, 1995], 81) denies the existence of hypostases of God in Qumran literature. However, as the work of Baumgarten (“The Heavenly Tribunal”) and Wolfson (“Seven Mysteries”) shows, this area of research is far from settled and requires more attention.

¹⁷⁷ See, for example, Van de Water, “Michael or Yhwh?” 81. The possibility is also left open by Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek,” 254.

¹⁷⁸ This is indeed the position of the majority of commentators. See, van der Woude, “Melchisedek,” 376; Milik, “Milki-šedeq,” 126; Puech, “Notes sur le manuscrit XIQMelki-šedeq,” 513; Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 78; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, 61.

משיחי רוח קדש in CD 2:12 referring to the prophets (cf. Ps 105:15 and 1 Chr 16:22). It appears, therefore, that the מבשר is most plausibly an eschatological prophet, perhaps engaged in the work of publicizing the coming reign of Melchizedek. Van der Woude and de Jonge are thus likely correct in their suggestion that he is the expected eschatological herald-prophet referred to in 1QS 9:11 and 4QTestimonia 5–8.¹⁷⁹

Others argue that Melchizedek must be partially human because of the close dependence of 11QMelchizedek upon Scripture. According to this claim, since Gen 14:18–20 and Ps 110:4 presumably refer to Melchizedek as a human figure,¹⁸⁰ it is unlikely that that name would be comfortably applied to a completely otherworldly figure.¹⁸¹ However, the development of such an understanding of Melchizedek at Qumran is hardly precluded, particularly in light of the mysterious nature of that figure in the above-mentioned biblical sources.¹⁸² Indeed, the epithet מלאך שלום which appears in the context of the eschatological battle between good and evil in 4Q228 1 I, 8 is probably to be understood as an angelic interpretation of Melchizedek's title מלך שלם in Genesis 14.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ De Jonge and van der Woude, "XIQMelchizedek and the New Testament," 306–308; followed by García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 231. Milik and Puech each suggests that this figure is none other than the Teacher of Righteousness. On the role of the eschatological prophet in 11QMelchizedek, Rule of the Community, and 4QTestimonia, see A.P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 157–196.

¹⁸⁰ To be sure, Psalm 110 is probably a pre-exilic royal psalm which was originally addressed to a ruler in Jerusalem (see the comments of and literature cited by L. Allen, *Psalms 101–150* [WBC 21; Waco: Word Books, 1983], 83–85. See also D. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* [SBLMS 18; Nashville: Abingdon, 1973], 19) For the dating of this Psalm (as well as Genesis 14) to the Hasmonean period, see J.A. Soggin, "Abraham and the Eastern Kings: On Genesis 14," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 283–291; H. Donner, "Der verlässliche Prophet: Betrachtungen zu 1 Makk 14, 41 ff. und zu Ps 110," in *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten* (BZAW 224; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1994), 213–223.

¹⁸¹ See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 217.

¹⁸² Cf., for instance, the treatment of these passages in Hebrews 7. On the "midrashic" expansion of the sparse biblical material on Melchizedek into a "sort of mythical biography" at Qumran and in early Christianity, see D. Flusser, *The Jewish Roots of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes/Hebrew University, 1988), 186–192; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*, 51–55.

¹⁸³ Suggested by Milik, "Milki-šedeq," 137. Cf. Isa 33:7; 3Q8 1 2; 3Q428 17 3. Also see *T. Dan* 6, where the angel of peace is portrayed as the mediator between God and humanity in the context of the period of Israel's lawlessness and the destruction of the opposing kingdom.

Furthermore, the author's dependence on Scripture clearly did not force him to comply with the "literal" meaning of biblical traditions, especially as modern exegetes might understand it.

Melchizedek as Angelic High Priest

As we have observed, Melchizedek's exalted status and eschatological functions in 11Q13 point to his angelic nature. Comparison with similar angelic figures from elsewhere in the sectarian corpus, such as the archangel Michael, confirms this notion. Before discussing the relationship between Melchizedek and these figures, it will be useful to survey the evidence for his priestly status.

Although explicit allusions to actual priestly activity carried out by Melchizedek do not appear in 11Q13, his high priestly status seems certain. First, in addition to royal imagery, the name Melchizedek was likely to have evoked images of the כהן לאל עליין (Gen 14:19) and the כהן לעולם (Ps 110:4). It is notable that in its interpretation of Gen 14:19, *Targum Neofiti* views Melchizedek as a "priest serving in the high priesthood" (כהן משמש בכהונתא רבתא). This fits with later rabbinic traditions that identify Melchizedek as high priest of the messianic age.¹⁸⁴ In 11Q13 2:8 we read of "atonement" made on behalf of the sons of light and the men of Melchizedek's lot. Based on this reference and the fact that Lev 25:9 is in play, the reconstruction of יום הכפורים in line 7 appears to be accurate.¹⁸⁵ Though it cannot be confirmed textually, Melchizedek is the perfect candidate to fulfill the all-important high priestly duties on this eschatological Day of Atonement.¹⁸⁶ This conjecture is supported by 2:9's adaptation of Isa 61:2, הואה הקץ לשנת הרצון למלכי צדק. As Pierre Grelot has shown, it is likely that Isa 61:1–10 was modeled as a speech by a high priest.¹⁸⁷ In addition, Kobelski notes the strongly cultic nuance to the association of the terms כפר and רצון in Qumran

¹⁸⁴ See *b. Sukk.* 52b; *Midr. Hazita* 2, 13 § 4; *Pesiq. Rab.* 15:14/15; *'Abot R. Nat.* 34.

¹⁸⁵ So García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 231.

¹⁸⁶ Indeed, both van der Woude and Fitzmyer suggest that the root כפר also be reconstructed before על עוונותיהמה in l. 6 and tentatively view Melchizedek as the one performing the atoning acts. See also A. Aschim, "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, 139; Puech, *La Croyance*, 2:551. Despite van der Woude's earlier suggestion, de Jonge and van der Woude ("XIQMelchizedek and the New Testament," 303–306) question Melchizedek's role as agent of expiation.

¹⁸⁷ P. Grelot, "Sur Isaïe LXI: La première consécration d'un grand prêtre," *RB* 97 (1990): 414–431.

literature.¹⁸⁸ It is thus likely that 11Q13 portrays Melchizedek as the high priest who will bring release “from [the debt of] all their iniquities,” and make atonement on behalf of the sons of light.

Melchizedek’s status as angelic high priest in 11Q13 is further supported by Newsom’s reconstruction of his name in 4Q401 11, a fragment that she would locate somewhere in songs three through five of SSS.¹⁸⁹ Newsom reconstructs the first three lines of the fragment as follows:¹⁹⁰

1 [ו כוהנ]י
2 א[לוהי דעת וכו]
3 מלכי [צדק כוהן בעד]ת אל

- 1] w priest[s
2 G]od of knowledge and k[
3 Melchi]zedek, priest in the assemb[ly of God

The language of line 3 is proximate to the application of Ps 82:1 to Melchizedek in 11Q13 2:10 (אלוהים [נ]צב בע[דת אל] בקורב אלוהים ישפוט), which seems to justify the reconstruction. In addition, we may consider the general concern of SSS with the activities of the angelic priesthood. The only other reference in SSS to כוהן in the singular appears in 4Q403 1 II, 24, “chief [] from the priest of the inner sanctum” (ראש [] מכוהן), which probably refers to a single angelic high priestly figure ranked above the lower angelic priests.¹⁹¹ This would be similar to the depiction of Melchizedek in 11Q13, who, as we have seen, performs high priestly duties and is aided by a heavenly retinue (2:14). Moreover, if James Davila is correct that the alleged references to Melchizedek in SSS relate to 4Q402 frgs. 1–4, which speak of a celestial conflict with such terms as מלחמת אלהים, מלחמת שחקים, מלחמת אלהים, כול יסודי פשע, and ישפט, then both SSS and 11Q13 originally described the eschatological war in heaven and portrayed Melchizedek as the high priestly eschatological redeemer.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 65, notes the following parallels: 1QS 8:6, 10; 9:4; 1QM 2:5. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 218, adds the illuminating examples of 4Q400 1 I, 16 and 4Q513 2 II, 4, which he takes as depictions of angelic humans performing propitiation. See also de Jonge and van der Woude, “XIQMelchizedek and the New Testament,” 305.

¹⁸⁹ Newsom, “He Has Established,” 106. She also suggests the reconstruction מל[כי צדק] for 4Q401 22 3, but this reading is less certain. See DJD XI, 213.

¹⁹⁰ Newsom, DJD XI, 205.

¹⁹¹ Newsom, DJD XI, 288, observes that it is also possible to understand the singular form כוהן קורב “distributively, referring to one of the angelic priests in each of the seven councils or priesthoods.”

¹⁹² Davila, “Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven,” 262–264.

The position of Melchizedek as militarily oriented heavenly deliverer and head of the celestial hosts runs parallel to the function of other supernatural characters known from sectarian texts such as the “Great Hand of God” (4Q177 4:14), the “Prince of Light” (1QS 3:20), and the “angel of his truth” (1QS 3:24). The same holds true for the archangel Michael, who appears in this role not only within sectarian texts (1QM 17:6–8), but also in a broader tradition stretching from *BW* to the book of Daniel to early Christian and later rabbinic works. While most commentators have noted Melchizedek’s role as lead-warrior in the eschatological battle and its parallelism with the roles of the above-mentioned figures, some have overlooked its specifically priestly quality.¹⁹³

The association of the priest Melchizedek with a martial function may harken back to early interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. In Psalm 110, we find that the “priest in the order of Melchizedek forever” also leads troops into battle (v. 3) and defeats and rules over his enemies (vv. 1–2). Less obviously, the episode of Gen 14:18–20 may have drawn a similar interpretation. In Gen 14:14–16, Abram miraculously defeats the allied armies of the four kings with the help of a mere three hundred and eighteen men. As Anders Aschim notes, it is possible that Abram’s subsequent interaction with Melchizedek was interpreted as follows: Abram’s battle does not only involve an earthly encounter. Rather, his patron angel, Melchizedek, leads the angelic forces of good to a military victory over the evil powers who support Abram’s enemies. As a result of his success, Abram honors Melchizedek with a tithe, and Melchizedek blesses him.¹⁹⁴

Related literature illustrates the appropriateness of the divine warrior role for the celestial high priest. Above, we noted how in *1 En.* 10:20–21, Michael is ordered to “cleanse the earth from all impurity and from all wrong and from all lawlessness and from all sin, and godlessness and all impurities that have come upon the earth” so that all of humanity will become “righteous.”¹⁹⁵ However, this priestly purification is brought about only through Michael’s commission as a divine warrior; he is to imprison the chief demon Shemihazah and obliterate the giants, thus

¹⁹³ See for example de Jonge and van der Woude, “11QMelchizedek and the New Testament,” 306: “He is so much ‘God’s warrior’ that his priestly activities remain completely in the shadow.”

¹⁹⁴ A. Aschim, “Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?” *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 243–258.

¹⁹⁵ For Michael as celestial high priest in talmudic tradition, see *b. Hag.* 12b, *b. Zeb.* 62a, and *b. Men.* 110a.

destroying “all perversity from the earth” (1 *En.* 10:11–16; cf. 90:22–23). A similar picture of a *nuntius* appears in the final stage of eschatological events described in *As. Mos.* 10:1–3.¹⁹⁶

Then his kingdom will appear throughout his whole creation.
 Then the devil will have an end.
 Yea, sorrow will be led away with him.
 Then will be filled the hands of the messenger,
 who is in the highest place appointed.
 Yea, he will at once avenge them of their enemies.
 For the Heavenly One will arise from his kingly throne.
 Yea, he will go forth from his holy habitation
 with indignation and wrath on behalf of his sons.

Here the destruction of the devil is accompanied by the “filling of the hands” of an angel, who has been identified by most commentators with Michael.¹⁹⁷ The “filling of the hands” is, of course, a technical designation for his ordination into the priesthood.¹⁹⁸

Melchizedek and Michael

Both of the above examples parallel the depiction of Melchizedek in 11Q13,¹⁹⁹ and it is therefore unsurprising to find that Michael and Melchizedek are identified in medieval Jewish literature.²⁰⁰ This identification may have been made centuries earlier in the pre-sectarian 4QVisions

¹⁹⁶ Trans. J. Priest, “Testament of Moses,” *OTP* 1:931–932.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. the role of Michael in 1QM 17:5–8; Rev 12:7–9; *Apoc. Bar.* 11:4. Commenting on *As. Mos.* 10, M. Barker (“The High Priest and Worship of Jesus,” in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, 100–102) notes how the divine warrior motif is transformed from such passages of the Hebrew Bible as Deut 32:43, Isa 26:21, Mic 1:3, and Hab 2:20. In the latter, the divine warrior “who emerges from the holy place is unambiguously the Lord.” In the former, however, he is the enthroned warrior priest. She argues that such an application of the divine warrior motif to the priestly figure lies behind the theophanic description of Simon in Sir 50:6–7.

¹⁹⁸ See chapter two, n. 26.

¹⁹⁹ Milik (“Milki-šedeq,” 123), followed by Kobelski (*Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ*, 66–68), draws attention to another strikingly parallel case, the eschatological high priest of the final jubilee in the hymn of *T. Levi* 18. Like Melchizedek, this priest will bring about the end of Beliar’s reign at the appointed time and inaugurate the redemption. However, in its present form, the hymn is a Christian work referring to the priesthood of Jesus (see de Jonge, *The Testaments*, 90–91).

²⁰⁰ *Yal. Ḥadash* f. 115, col. 3, no. 19: “Michael is called Melchizedek . . . the priest of El Elyon who is the priest on high” (cited in W. Lueken, *Der Erzengel Michael in der Überlieferung des Judentums* [Göttingen: E.A. Huth, 1898], 31). See also *Zohar Ḥadash* folios 22, 4; 41, 3.

of Amram, six copies of which were preserved at Qumran.²⁰¹ In 4Q544 (Amram^b) 1 10–15; 2; 3, two opposing supernatural figures quarrel for control over a dying individual (cf. Jude 9). One of them, מלכי רשע (4Q544 2 3), is said to “rule over all darkness,” (2 5) while the other, whose name is lost, “rules over all that is bright” (2 6) and perhaps also “[over all the sons of li]ght” (3 1). Given the intensely dualistic tone of the document and the fact that מלכי רשע is a grammatically perfect counterpart for מלכי צדק, it is likely that Melchizedek originally appeared as the righteous angel.²⁰² Since 3 2 refers to the “three names” of the righteous angel, Kobelski has reconstructed “Michael, Prince of Light, and Melchizedek.”²⁰³ The suggestion is uncertain, but if correct, the identification of Michael and Melchizedek would have preceded the formation of the Qumran community. Regardless of this possibility, this text confirms that Melchizedek was viewed as a celestial figure at least from the early second century BCE.

Melchizedek and Levi

The Melchizedek tradition appears to have reflexes in two pre-sectarian works with a strong focus on the priesthood of the patriarch Levi, *Jubilees* and *ALD*. *Jubilees* 32:1–2 reads as follows:

That night he stayed at Bethel. Levi dreamed that he—he and his sons—had been appointed and made into the priesthood of the most high God forever. When he awakened, he blessed the Lord. Jacob got up early in the morning on the fourteenth day of this month and gave a tithe of everything which had come with him—from people to animals, from money to all utensils and clothing. He gave a tithe of everything.

Commentators have long noted the transparent references to the scriptural traditions concerning Melchizedek in this passage which create a parallelism between Abram-Melchizedek and Jacob-Levi.²⁰⁴ Like Mel-

²⁰¹ For the dating of this text, see above pp. 53–54.

²⁰² As Kobelski (*Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ*, 55) notes, the name מלכי רשע “was probably formed in opposition to the commonly accepted interpretation of Melchizedek’s name as ‘king of uprightness.’” Cf. Philo, *Leg.* 3.79; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.180; *War* 6.438; *Heb* 7:3.

²⁰³ It may be significant that in 1QM 17:6–8, Michael is associated with both light and צדק. For Kobelski’s treatment of Amram^b, see *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ*, 24–36.

²⁰⁴ See, e.g., R.H. Charles, *APOT* 2:61; VanderKam, “Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran,” 364–365; R. Doran, “The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context,” *JSJ* 20 (1989): 3–4; A. Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 776.

chizedek in Genesis 14, Levi is the priest of the Most High God who receives a tithe from an Israelite patriarch. Like the priest in the order of Melchizedek in Ps 110:4, Levi and his descendants shall serve God “forever.” A related tradition appears in *ALD* 9. The relevant passage is preserved by three overlapping witnesses, Bodleian a 15-b 1, 4Q213b 4–6, and 1Q21 4 1:²⁰⁵

Then when Jacob [my father] tithed everything which he possessed, in accordance with his vow (לה היה די הוה לה) [אבי] מעשר כול מה די הוה לה (כנדרה), [then] I was before (him) at the head of the [priesth]ood ([באדין] תה), [אנה הוית קדמי בראש] (כהנון) תה, and to me of all his sons he gave a gift of tit[he] to God (ולוי מכל בנוהי יהב קרבן מעשר] [ר] לאל), and he invested me in the priestly garb and consecrated me and I became a priest of the God of eternity (ואלבשי לבוש כהנותה ומלי ידי והוית כהן לאל עלמיה).

Once again at Bethel, Levi is ordained as priest and given a tithe by Jacob.²⁰⁶ According to Kugler, the final word of the passage, עלמיה, is written over the word עליין in the Genizah manuscript.²⁰⁷ If he is correct, then it “appears the author of our text wished to depict Levi’s relationship to Jacob as similar to the one that existed between Abram and Melchizedek, and to claim for Levi the sacerdotal role of the latter figure.”²⁰⁸ The same conclusion appears to apply to the depiction of Levi in *Jubilees* 32.²⁰⁹

²⁰⁵ Generally following the composite text, translation, and reconstruction of Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 70–71.

²⁰⁶ In both *ALD* and *Jubilees*, Jacob’s giving of the tithe at Bethel is an exegetical response to his vow of Gen 28:20–22, which is nowhere explicitly fulfilled (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.341 and *Gen. Rab.* 81). See further, Kugler, “Levi’s Elevation,” 2–5.

²⁰⁷ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 89 and n. 105. The photograph of the relevant Qumran fragment is inconclusive. See DJD XXII, pl. III.

²⁰⁸ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 90–91. This supposition is supported by *ALD* 13 (Bodleian b), which clearly refers to Levi as עליין לאל. The Greek witness there reads ἐγὼ ἱεράτευσα τῷ κυρίῳ δεσπότη τῶ οὐρανῶ.

²⁰⁹ In this connection, it is interesting to note that in *Jubilees* 13’s retelling of the events of Genesis 14, the figure Melchizedek is omitted just where one would expect to find him most: “One who had escaped came and told Abram that the son of his brother had been taken captive. When he (Abram) had armed his household servants . . . (lacuna) . . . for Abram, and his descendants the tithe of the firstfruits for the Lord. The Lord made it an eternal ordinance that they should give it to the priests who serve before him for them to possess it forever” (13:24–25). Many scholars assume that Melchizedek must have appeared in the original text, which otherwise follows Genesis closely, and that the omission was the result of a mechanical scribal error. See, e.g., Charles, *APOT* 2:33. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [1989], 2:82, suggests a haplography already on the Hebrew level (from אברם ויעל אברם, על אברם), and offers an “exceedingly tentative” reconstruction, based on two Ethiopic manuscripts, which mentions Melchizedek. Others prefer to see the omission as an intentional one, either original or at some later point in the book’s

Another depiction of Levi as a Melchizedek-like priest may appear in *Jubilees* 30. Contrary to the parallel account in Genesis, this chapter portrays the vengeance that Levi (and Simon) take on Shechem for the violation of Dinah as a righteous act. As a result of his just actions, Levi is elevated to the priesthood:²¹⁰

Proclaim this testimony to Israel: "See how it turned out for the Shechemites and their children—how they were handed over to Jacob's two sons. They killed them in a painful way. It was a just act for them and was recorded as a just act for them." Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as Levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. So blessing and justice before the God of all are entered for him as a testimony on the heavenly tablets . . . We ourselves remember the justice which the man performed . . . He has been recorded on the heavenly tablets as . . . a just man. (30:17–20)

While it is clear that this depiction of Levi draws from the story of Phineas's zealous reaction to sexual impropriety in Num 25:6–13,²¹¹ Aschim has noted several good reasons why Melchizedek should be seen as an additional influential model. First, the Ethiopic root *šdq*, used to describe the righteous behavior and character of Levi, appears here seven times. Second, recalling Ps 110:4, Levi's descendants are chosen for the priesthood "for all time." Third, the description of Levi as one worthy of the priesthood who "carries out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel," recalls the warrior-priest role attributed to the figure in Psalm 110 (and possibly Melchizedek in Gen 14) and the application of that role to the celestial Melchizedek in 11Q13. Fourth, the report that Levi's descendants will serve before God "as we (the angels) do" implies that this priesthood will be a celestial one, similar to Melchizedek's in 11Q13.²¹²

transmission. For the former, see P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. W.J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 160, 248; for the latter, see Aschim, "Melchizedek and Levi," 777–780. However, conclusions based on the notion that the omission was intentional are speculative at best.

²¹⁰ On this particular explanation for the elevation of Levi to the priesthood and a suggestion explaining the exclusion of Simon from priestly privileges, see Kugel, "Levi's Elevation," 47–48.

²¹¹ See for example C. Werman, "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Inter-marriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.

²¹² Aschim, "Melchizedek and Levi," 781–784.

It is to be noted that in Hasmonean times, the rulers laid claim to an eternal priesthood (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; 1 Mac 14:41). They also applied to themselves the title “priests of the most high God” (*As. Mos.* 6:1), apparently with the intention of portraying themselves in a Melchizedekian light.²¹³ The evidence cited above shows that a parallel literary strategy was applied from at least the early second century BCE to the patriarch Levi by the authors of *ALD* and *Jubilees*. But what was the motivation behind this move?

11QMelchizedek illustrates that the tradition of a celestial priestly Melchizedek was extant in the early / mid first century BCE. The appearance of the angelic מלכי רשע in 4QVisions of Amram pushes this date back, to at least the early second century BCE. It thus appears likely that the authors of *ALD* and *Jubilees* knew of this tradition.²¹⁴ We may therefore assume that the literary portrayal of Levi according to the contours of Melchizedek lent to the priesthood of Levi an otherworldly quality.²¹⁵ This is likely given the statements in *ALD* 18 (Bodleian b 16–17) and *Jub.* 31:14 expressly envisioning Levi the priest as near to and serving among the angels.

While traditions which idealize Levi and grant his priesthood an otherworldly quality were very popular at Qumran,²¹⁶ it is notable that *all* the documents which contain them are non-sectarian. The Qumranites received, but as far as we know, did not compose such traditions about Levi. On the other hand, they also extended such representation, as witnessed by the examples of the profound and central role of the notion of otherworldly priesthood in sectarian liturgical texts noted above. Moreover, the Qumranites *did* compose a work focusing on the tradition of the celestial high priest Melchizedek. What can we deduce from this situation?

²¹³ Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 16.163; *b. Roš. Haš.* 18b. C. Gianotto (*Melchisedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche [sec. II a.C.-sec. III d.C.]* [Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 12; Brescia: Paideia, 1984], 45–51) claims that the Hasmonean appeal to the authority of the biblical figure Melchizedek served as a strategy to legitimize their royal-priestly dynasty.

²¹⁴ Beyer (*Die aramäischen Texten*, 85) claims that 4QVisions of Amram is cited in *Jub.* 46:10–11.

²¹⁵ For a similar, but more dualistic view, see Aschim, “Melchizedek and Levi,” 780–781.

²¹⁶ Between *Jubilees* and *ALD*, some twenty manuscripts have been preserved. For more on the significance of Levi traditions at Qumran, see pp. 278–293.

Melchizedek, Righteousness, Light and the Qumranites

In light of the central importance and particular associations of the concept of צדק at Qumran, the appropriateness of the name Melchizedek (“king of righteousness” or “my king is righteousness”)²¹⁷ for the celestial high priest of the Qumranites becomes apparent. The root צדק appears over four hundred times with multiple nuances in the non-biblical corpus,²¹⁸ and scholars have long recognized the notion of righteousness as a hallmark of Qumran theology.²¹⁹ In the sectarian texts righteousness is at the heart of God’s very nature (1QH^a 26:33). It follows that that quality was required also of community members.²²⁰ As lowly creatures unworthy of God’s attention (1QS 11:20–22), human beings cannot attain righteousness on their own (1QH^a 12:31–32). However, by the grace of God, the Qumranites did become righteous in their experience of hierohistory, which, as we have seen, they achieved by means of liturgical communion with the angels.²²¹ Thus, as we have noted, in the Angelic Liturgy there is an implied homology between the angelic נועדי צדק (4Q403 1 I, 27) and רוחות צדק (4Q403 1 I, 38)²²² and the earthly בני צדק (1QS 3:20, 22; 1QM 1:8),²²³ who learn the “ways of righteousness” (see 4Q420 1a11-b 5) and follow the founder of the community, the מורה הצדק. In 4Q511 35 4, we observed that the priests, identified as the “angels of his glory” (מלאכי), are simultaneously “his righteous people” (עם צדקי). In the Self-Glorification Hymn we noted the striking affinity between the community of the צדיקים as described in the Canticle of the Righteous (4Q491 11 I, 20) and the exalted priestly figure of the Canticle of Michael. According to 1QSb 3, the בני צדוק הכוהנים, who are located among the holy ones

²¹⁷ Both translations are possible. On the grammatical debate, see Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, 42–43; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*, 55–56.

²¹⁸ Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 2:631–634.

²¹⁹ See Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 63–67; O. Betz, “Göttliche und menschliche Gerechtigkeit in der Gemeinde von Qumran und ihre Bedeutung für das Neue Testament,” in *Ethik und Lebenswirklichkeit: Festschrift für Heinze-Horst Schrey zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. C. Günzler; Darmstadt, 1982) 1–18; J. Charlesworth, “Righteousness,” *EDSS*, 2:781–782; R. Arnold, “Qumran Prayer as an Act of Righteousness,” *JQR* 95 (2005): 509–529; Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal;” R. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran* (Studia Post-Biblica 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983), 4–6.

²²⁰ Charlesworth, “Righteousness,” 781–782.

²²¹ On the achievement of righteousness through grace, see Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran*, 108.

²²² Cf. the reconstructed מלאכי צדקה (4Q286 12 3; 4Q287 2b 13) in Nitzan, DJD XI, 34, 51 and אלי צדק (11Q13 2:14) in García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 225.

²²³ See further Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal,” 219–239, esp. 223.

in the holy abode (ll. 25–27), conduct their judicial actions **בצדק** (l. 24). Similarly, in 1QSb 4, God is bidden to make the high priest, who shall be like an angel of the presence in the holy abode, “more righteous than all . . .” (**ויצדיקכה מכורל**).

Although 11Q13 is not a liturgical work, it is suggested above that the oracular biblical exegesis and visionary liturgy of the Qumranites originated from the same spiritual wellspring. As such, we should not distinguish too sharply between the religious perspective underlying the two genres. Indeed, each form brought about a comparable result for those who produced it—access to God’s cosmic plan. We may thus interpret the centrality of the notion of **צדק** in 11QMelchizedek in light of its use in the liturgical texts. The “men of the lot of Melchizedek” (**אנשי גורל**) “**מלכי צדק**” (מלכי צדק) may be identified with the “sons of light / sons of righteousness” (**בני אור/בני צדק**), i.e., the Qumranites themselves (cf. their equation with **בני [אור]** in 11Q13 2:8). But the “inheritance of Melchizedek” (**נחלת מלכי צדק**) does not consist of human beings alone. The “gods of righteousness” (**אלי הצדק**)²²⁴ who assist (**ובעזרו**; 2:14) Melchizedek in his duties are the heavenly counterpart of the earthly lot of Melchizedek. The picture is thus of a conjoined community unified by its quality of righteousness and led by “the king of righteousness,” which will overcome the forces of evil at the end of the last jubilee. This is reminiscent of the situation in the War Scroll, where under the leadership of Michael the angelic beings “assist” the sons of light against the forces of Belial.²²⁵

We may also relate the portrayal of the eschatological high priest in terms of **צדק** in 11Q13 to the portrayal of the high priestly figures of 4Q541 9, 1QSb 4, and *T. Levi* 18 due to the close association between **צדק** and light / knowledge appearing in certain documents found only at Qumran.²²⁶ For example, a portion of the “Hymn to the Creator” from the great Psalms scroll reads as follow:

²²⁴ This reconstruction is highly likely given the context and the reference to **אלי הצדק** in Isa 61:3. Cf. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 232.

²²⁵ Cf. the “assistance” given to the sons of light by angelic beings in 1QM 12:7 (**ועדת**) **וישלח עזר עולמים**); 17:6 (**ושר מאור מאז פקדתה לעזורנו**); 13:10 (**קדושיכה בתוכנו לעזר עולמי[ם]**) **ויעזרו** (**מלאך אמתו יעזר לכול בני אור**); and 4Q177 12–13 I, 7 (**לגורל [פ]דותו**). It is no coincidence that in the War Scroll, priests and priesthood play a critical role at every stage of the war, enforcing laws of purity, conducting rituals, leading prayers, exhorting troops with speeches, and directing military movements with trumpet and horn blasts. For more on the image of eschatological priesthood in the War Scroll, see chapter five.

²²⁶ For the ancient Near Eastern and biblical background for the association of **צדק** with solar imagery, see esp. Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal,” 225–229.

Justice and righteousness (צדק) are the base of his throne.
 He separated light (אור) from darkness, and with the knowledge of his
 heart (בדעת לבו) he established the dawn (שהר). (11QPs^a 26:11)

A passage from the War Scroll relates righteousness with light:

And [the sons of ri]ghteousness shall shine (ו[בני צ]דק יאירו) to all the edges
 of the earth, they shall go on shining (הלוך ואור), up to the end of all the
 periods of darkness. (1QM 1:8)

It is the righteous nature of the בני צדק which allows them to shine
 continuously. A similar eschatological passage from 1QMysteries (1Q27)
 brings together light, righteousness, and God's knowledge:

When those born of sin are locked up, evil will disappear before righteous-
 ness (הצדק) as [da]rkness disappears before light (אור). As smoke vanishes,
 and n[o] longer exists, so will evil vanish forever. And righteousness will
 be revealed like the sun (והצדק יגלה כשמש) ... and knowledge will fill up
 the world (ודעה תמלא תבל). (1 I, 5–8)

Here, the dawning of righteousness is compared to the rising sun which
 spreads the light of knowledge throughout the world. The image is espe-
 cially close to those of 4Q541 9, 1QSb 4, and *T. Levi* 18, which all por-
 tray the otherworldly priest as radiating the light of otherworldly knowl-
 edge. In addition, a recently published fragment of unknown provenance
 (4Q468b) that associates light and righteousness with otherworldly
 priesthood appears to be relevant to the discussion.

4Q468b (4QUnidentified Fragments C)

4Q468b is a tiny fragment, preserving only twenty-two words (or parts
 of them), which speaks of an otherworldly priest (either an angel or an
 exalted human):²²⁷

1 גנ[שתי אני לנוגהו]
 2 באור [משבצתו יתהלכו כול ב]
 3 מלך עלי ואור נגהו על]
 4 ש[מ]ש בצאתה מזבול]
 5 בני [עול ובני צד]ק
 6 קו[דש קוד]ש שים
 7 [יד לו]

²²⁷ Text, reconstruction, and translation generally follow those of M. Broshi, DJD XXXVI, 403.

- 1] I [have appr]oached his radiance [
 2 In the light] of his *mišbešet* will walk all [
 3]He dominated (ruled over?) me and the light of his radiance over
 4 Su]n coming forth from the (heavenly) abode [
 5 sons] of wickedness and sons of right[eousness
 6 ho]lly of ho[lies
 7]*yk lw*[

Given the broken character of the text, no interpretation is certain. Magen Broshi, the DJD editor, has offered two possible readings of the text: “It deals either with a heavenly figure or with the splendour of the earthly high priest.” Preferring the latter option Broshi, decides that an earthly eschatological high priest “fits the context better.”²²⁸ If the reconstruction of the word שמש at the beginning of line 4 is correct, the protagonist, like Simon of Ben Sira 50 and the eschatological high priest of 4Q541 9, is likely compared to the shining sun. However, this is very uncertain given that two of the three letters are reconstructed. Even so, the combination of light imagery (ניגהו, ויגהו) with the appearance of dualistically opposed groups slated for eschatological reward and punishment (בני [עול ובני צד-ק]) in the context of strong priestly terminology (קודש קודש-ים, זכור משבצתו), recalls both Melchizedek of 11Q13 and the exalted human eschatological high priests of 4Q541 9 and *T. Levi* 18. Given the similarity of 4Q468b’s otherworldly priest with both exalted earthly (4Q541 9) and angelic eschatological (11Q13) high priests, it is impossible to decide on his precise identity.

Conclusions on 11QMelchizedek

Beyond its obvious exegetical advantages, the choice of the name Melchizedek for the celestial high priest by the Qumranite author of 11Q13 is an unsurprising reflex of the centrality of the notion of righteousness at Qumran and its intimate relationship with the light / knowledge associated with the otherworldly priestly figure. To be sure, as we have seen, the use of light imagery to depict the glorious otherworldliness of priests is not limited to sectarian works. However, at Qumran such imagery is uniquely linked with the illuminative aspects of צדק.²²⁹ Although “light” does not appear in 11Q13, the righteous reign of the celestial high priest

²²⁸ M. Broshi, DJD XXXVI, 403; For further discussion see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, 193–194.

²²⁹ See Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal,” 230–233.

Melchizedek does bring about an end to the hegemony of Belial, wickedness, and darkness, and also atonement for the sons [of light]. Thus, the popular identification of Melchizedek with the Prince of Light becomes all the more probable.

These observations have important consequences for our understanding of the designation of Qumranites with the terms **צדק** and **אור**. While full-fledged members of the community were called “sons of righteousness” (**בני צדק**) and “sons of light” (**בני אור**), it appears from 4Qcrypt A Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn (4Q298) that candidates for admission to the community were termed “pursuers of righteousness” (**רודפי צדק**) and “sons of dawn” (**בני שחר**). According to Stephen Pfann and Menahem Kister, the phrase “pursuers of righteousness” indicates that the initiates have not yet achieved righteousness.²³⁰ Similarly, the term “sons of dawn” appears to imply the stage at the beginning of the initiates’ road on the way to becoming sons of light.²³¹ Only after the rigorous initiation process could community members come to possess righteousness/light. They learned about the “ways or righteousness” from the priestly Maskil, who also led the liturgy which brought about the unification of the earthly community with the entire lot of righteousness (SSS, 1QSB, 4QSongs of the Sage, Self-Glorification Hymn), including the good angels and God. Analogously, community members were granted access to righteousness through the inspired biblical interpretations of the **מורה הצדק**, the priest who was identified with the **צדיק** of Hab 2:4 (1QpHab 8:1–3; cf. 1:12). The analogy with liturgical communion is especially strong in 11QMelchizedek, where by means of biblical exegesis the Qumranites envision themselves (**אנשי גורל מלכי צדק**) as united with the supernatural forces of righteousness (**מלכי צדק, אלי צדק**). It is possible that the priestly connotation of **צדק** also lurks behind the important designation of certain community members as **בני צדוק** and **בני הצדוק**.²³²

²³⁰ S. Pfann and M. Kister, DJD XX, 1–30, esp. 17, 21.

²³¹ Contra J. Baumgarten (“The ‘Sons of Dawn’ in CDC 13:14–15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes,” *IEJ* 33 [1983]: 81–85), who understands the terms **בני אור** and **בני שחר** as synonymous.

²³² For the difficult phrase **בני הצדוק** in 1QS 9:14 and the Cave 4 parallel **בני הצדק**, see Kugler, “A Note on 1QS 9:14.”

CONCLUSION

From the above survey, it is clear that the sectarian portrayals of otherworldly priesthood owe much conceptually and terminologically to their non-sectarian forebears. Like the older traditions, the Qumran compositions both depict human priests in angelic terms (1QSb, 4Q511 35, Self-Glorification Hymn) and angels as fulfilling priestly duties, (11QMelchizedek, SSS). However, there are two notable idiosyncrasies in the sectarian portrayals.

First, as opposed to the numerous genres that witness the otherworldly priest traditions in the non-sectarian texts, the sectarian documents are, with the exception of 11QMelchizedek, liturgical works. Their recitation is designed to bring about transport to the imaginal realm of the cosmic temple, where earthly “priests” celebrate with the angels. In some cases this transformation is experienced by an elect group of priests (SSS, 1QS 3, 4Q511 35), while in others a glorious individual priest who brings about the enlightenment of a community is envisioned (1QSb 4, Self-Glorification Hymn, 4Q468b?).²³³

The streamlining of otherworldly priest traditions into liturgical contexts in sectarian documents underscores an important development in the spirituality of the Qumran community that distinguishes it from its parent movements. The Qumranites applied the otherworldly priest traditions specifically to themselves (or to their selected intermediary) as an expression of their attainment of the pinnacle of human experience—divine service with the angels and participation in the mysteries of divine knowledge. In liturgical time, it was possible to live this “immortalizing” temple-centric experience repeatedly. It is important to note, however, that while the Qumranite posture against the Jerusalem temple establishment likely contributed to this unique priestly self-conception, its roots are to be found in older and broader Second Temple period spirituality.

Second, both non-sectarian and sectarian texts consistently apply light imagery in association with the otherworldly priesthood. In the former, we noted that the notion of light radiating from the otherworldly priest figure is mainly connected with his embodiment of divine glory (4Q418 81 5, *Jub.* 31:14). This manifests itself, according to some texts, with the donning of the high priestly vestments (*Sir* 45; 50:11; *Let. Aris.* 96–99;

²³³ The latter examples find analogy especially in the eschatological high priest of 4Q541 9 and the elect addressee of 4Q418 81, each of whom are involved in transmitting divine knowledge to an elect group.

Josephus, *Ant.* 3.184–187; 216–217). Similar traditions about the brilliance of the otherworldly priest and the sacerdotal garments were clearly utilized by the Qumranites (1QSb 3:25; 4:26–28; 4Q468b 2?).²³⁴ However, another prominent aspect of the light imagery in the sectarian texts that speak of otherworldly priesthood deserves attention, namely the unique access of community members to divine knowledge. As we have seen, the Qumranites participated in the mysteries of God's knowledge and thus became enlightened (בני אור, קוי דעת) like the angels (אלי אור), (מאירי אור, אלי דעת).²³⁵ For community members, this enlightenment was also emblematic of the righteousness that they had attained (בני צדק, אנשי גורל מלכי צדק אלי צדק), (מלאכי צדק, רוחות צדק, נועדי צדק, מלכי צדק אל) (הצדק).²³⁶

In this connection, it is worth noting again that 1QSb 3 envisions the Zadokite priests (community leaders according to 1QS 5:2, 9 and 1QSa 1:2, 24; 2:3) “as a splendid ornament amongst the holy ones.” As Joseph Baumgarten observes, the possibility that the name בני צדוק, mentioned very infrequently in Second Temple period literature (besides the DSS, only in Ezekiel 40–48 and Sir 51:12), was specifically chosen due to its evocation of the Qumranite notion of צדק (and not due to genealogy) must be considered seriously.²³⁷ In fact, none of the above evidence requires that the Qumranites themselves were, entirely or largely, a community of hereditary priests. In 4QInstruction^d (4Q418 81), possibly an authoritative document for the Qumranites, we observed that the priestly privilege has been spiritualized and utilized as a symbol for election. Moreover in liturgical time, community members were transformed into “an everlasting temple” composed of “priests, his righteous people, his host and ministers, the angels of his glory” (4Q511 35). The context here

²³⁴ On the Urim and Thummim traditions at Qumran, see above, nn. 50–51.

²³⁵ Cf. the interpretation of 4Q418 81 above, which sees the quasi-priestly addressee as nourishing community members with supernal wisdom. As noted, 4QInstruction was influential on Qumranite theology and may even have been canonical for community members.

²³⁶ The non-sectarian 4Q541 9 (cf. *T. Levi* 18) already provides a picture of an eschatological high priest who will illuminate the world with his divine teachings, and whose “eternal sun will shine” against his “evil generation.” It is thus not surprising that most scholars view this text as lying especially close to sectarian sentiment.

²³⁷ See Baumgarten, “The Heavenly Tribunal”, 235: “In the light of . . . the place of *Sedeq* in Qumran apocalyptic and the illuminational role of the *moreh ha-šedeq*, it is highly plausible to assume that the name *šadok* was preferred because of its association with *Sedeq*.”

hardly requires a literal Qumranite priesthood (though it obviously does not exclude the possibility). It does, however, like the other sectarian texts observed (SSS,²³⁸ 1QSb, 4QSongs of the Sage, Self-Glorification Hymn, 11QMelchizedek, 4Q468b), point to the centrality in Qumranite theology of the cosmic temple as a symbol of both God's eternal sovereignty and the apex of the community's spiritual achievement. In turn, the otherworldly priesthood tradition at Qumran is to be seen not simply as an indication of the priestly lineage of the visionaries, but as an appropriate symbolic offshoot of the temple model: The ideal role of humanity is as eternal servants, as otherworldly "priests" offering eternal praise in the ideal temple, or, at times, figuring as the temple itself.

²³⁸ To be sure, the provenance of SSS remains unclear. However, I include it here because of the obviously important role it played in Qumranite spirituality. See above, pp. 85–87.

PART TWO

ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD
IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CHAPTER FIVE

THE IMAGE OF ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

It is well known that some of the sectarian documents from Qumran express an expectation of the arrival of a priestly messiah, the messiah of Aaron (משיח אהרן). According to 1QS 9:11, the *locus classicus* for the discussion of Qumran messianism, “the anointed of Aaron” was to be accompanied by two additional eschatological figures: a prophet (נביא), and a lay, presumably royal, messiah (משיח ישראל). The distinctive notion of a priestly messiah may be said to reflect the central role of priesthood and temple in the mindset of the Qumranites. In this chapter, we shall investigate the roles envisioned for the priestly messiah and other comparable figures in the Scrolls.

METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS

Before launching into a discussion of priestly messianism, it will be worthwhile to consider some important methodological issues. Over the six decades since the discovery of the Scrolls, the study of Qumran messianism has amassed an impressive bibliography. Excited by the prospect of illuminating the history of the messianic idea so vital to the development of Western civilization, scholars have been engaged in a lively conversation about Qumran messianism from the earliest years of the study of the Scrolls.¹ Since the 1992 publication of several exciting texts that shed new light on Qumran messianism,² the situation has only intensified, and recent years have witnessed the publication of several major

¹ For a bibliography of the most important works from the first twenty-five years of research, see J. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (ed. W. Meeks; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 114–118.

² The *editio princeps* of four key works appeared in 1992. See E. Puech, “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131; idem, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 475–522; idem, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi,” G. Vermes, “The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285),” *JJS* 43 (1992): 85–94.

books³ and collections of essays on the subject.⁴ This flood of attention begs the question: for whom has messianism been more important, the Qumranites or us? According to the calculations of Craig Evans, out of a total of 647 non-biblical scrolls, only six, and at most eight, refer to an anointed person (משיח) who may be understood as an eschatological messiah (CD, 1QS, 1QSa, 4Q252, 4Q458, 4Q521, and perhaps 4Q381 and 4Q382). If we include texts without an explicit mention of a messiah, but still containing messianic material (1QSB, 1QM, 4Q161, 4Q174, 4Q175, 4Q285, and 4Q376), the number rises to thirteen. This is less than two percent of the non-biblical corpus.⁵ These numbers do not betray a religious movement preoccupied with the coming of the messiah(s).⁶ Indeed, in asserting a conspicuous absence of such a concern in such major sectarian works as the *Hodayot*, the *War Scroll*, 4QMMT, and the *pesharim*, one of the leading experts in the field has concluded that “messianism at Qumran may never have been the most dominant theological

³ See A. Laato, *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations* (USF International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); Collins, *The Scepter*; K. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1995); W. Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1998); G.S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*. See further the bibliography compiled by M. Abegg, C. Evans, and G. Oegema, *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1998), 204–214.

⁴ See J. Charlesworth ed., *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. Strouma, eds., *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (TSAJ 32; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1993); C. Evans and P. Flint eds., *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, and Oegema eds., *Qumran-Messianism*; E. Stegemann, ed., *Messiasvorstellungen bei Juden und Christen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993). See also the contributions of J. VanderKam (“Messianism in the Scrolls”) and E. Puech (“Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament”) in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 211–234 and 235–256 respectively.

⁵ C. Evans, “Qumran’s Messiah: How Important is He?” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (ed. J.J. Collins and R. Kugler; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 135–138.

⁶ In contrast, every work in the New Testament canon mentions the Greek word for messiah, christ. It occurs some three hundred and fifty times in total. (A precise count is complicated by manuscript variants.)

concern.”⁷ This is perhaps not surprising in light of the imaginal liturgical experience which continuously and repeatedly granted community members something of a share in salvation. On the other hand, from the testimony of core sectarian documents such as 1QS and CD, it is clear that the expectation of messianic figures, including a priestly messiah, accompanied some of the most important sectarian visions of the advent of the age to come. Therefore, while the importance of messianic belief at Qumran should not be overemphasized, the study of messianism remains a component of any investigation into the Qumranite priestly imagination.

One of the greatest challenges in the study of Qumran messianism has been the apparent diversity of messianic concepts encountered in the various texts. As we have noted, 1QS 9:11 mentions three figures: “a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel” (נביא ומשיחי אהרן וישראל). Due to the disproportionate attention given to 1QS since its discovery, this passage has set the norm for discussion: the community awaited two messiahs who were to be accompanied by the eschatological prophet, one a priest, the other a king.⁸ However, another copy of the Rule from Cave 4 (4Q259 1 III, 5–6) lacks these lines, along with the entire passage found in 1QS 8:15b–9:11.⁹ Viewing 4Q259 as representative of a more ancient version of the Rule of the Community,¹⁰ some scholars have interpreted it as evidence that the community did not espouse messianic beliefs in its early decades.¹¹ Complicating the situation, other texts refer either to a Davidic or lay messianic figure without reference

⁷ J. Charlesworth, “Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS),” in *Qumran-Messianism*, 133.

⁸ See, e.g., M. Knibb, “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *DSSAFY*, 2:384–385: “The starting point for the discussion of messianism at Qumran ought to be the statement in 1QS 9:11 ... the typical Qumran expectation of two messiahs, one a priest, the other a royal figure.”

⁹ For the text, see P. Alexander and G. Vermes, *DJD XXVI*, 144–145. See also Metso, *The Textual Development*, 53–54. See further the discussion of Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 19–21.

¹⁰ Argued by Metso, *The Textual Development*, 71–73; eadem, “The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 304, n. 10; eadem, “The Use of Old Testament Quotations,” in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, 226–228. On the other hand, Alexander has maintained that the older text of 1QS was omitted secondarily from 4Q259. See idem, “The Redaction-History,” 452–453; Alexander and Vermes, *DJD XXVI*, 148.

¹¹ See J. Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 70 (1963): 482–487; Charlesworth, “Challenging the *Consensus Communis*,” 130–131. Cf. Collins, *The Scepter*, 83.

to a priest (4Q246, 4Q252, 4Q521) or an eschatological priest without a king (4Q541).¹² According to some scholars, there is also evidence of heavenly messiah and collective messiah concepts.¹³ Divergence from the expectation expressed in 1QS 9:11 is further seen in the Damascus Document's numerous references to "the messiah of Aaron and Israel" (משיח אהרן וישראל).¹⁴ Taking the phrase as a reference to a singular figure, several scholars maintain that in certain redactional layers, CD awaits only one messiah.¹⁵ On this questionable basis, some have attempted to map out different stages of development in Qumranite messianic belief.¹⁶ Others insist that a consistent doctrine of dual messianism is

¹² Regarding texts which refer to a royal messiah alone, F.M. Cross ("Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse [4Q246]," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996], 4) observes that to argue that they "represent circles in which the traditional doctrine of the diarchy had been replaced by a merging of the two figures in to one—as happened in Christianity, and to some degree in later Judaism after the fall of the temple (indeed after the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome) when the rule of the high priest was permanently broken—is a precarious argument from silence."

¹³ On the notion of a heavenly messiah, see, e.g., the comments of García Martínez, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 173–177. On the collective messiah concept, see Stegemann, "Some Remarks to 1QSa," Steudel, "The Eternal Reign," Brooke, "Florilegium," *EDSS* 1:298.

¹⁴ See CD 12:23; 14:19; 19:10; cf. 20:1.

¹⁵ See, e.g., J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959), 125–126; M. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 60; P. Davies "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. Lim; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 219–232; M. Wise and J. Tabor, "The Messiah at Qumran," *BAR* 18/6 (1992): 60–65; M. Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 125–144; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 221–225. To be sure, the grammar of the phrase may also be read as referring to two figures. This was noted already in 1922 by L. Ginzberg (*An Unknown Jewish Sect* [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976], 227–228). See also J. VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 230. As M. Abegg ("The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *DSSAFY*, 1:334–335) points out, there are two analogous examples in the Hebrew Bible where a singular noun form in construct with two nouns may function as a plural: "the heads of Oreb and Zeeb" (וראש-ערב וזאב) (Judg 7:25) and "the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah" (מלך-סדם) (Gen 14:10). (Abegg thus retreats from the position he had taken in his earlier article.) Frank Cross ("Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs," 3, n. 7) points out a similar example from the Aramaic of 4Q246 1:6: "the kings of Assyria and Egypt" (מלך). He adds that the verb יכפר עונם in the phrase יכפר עונם (which appears right after the mention of משיח אהרן וישראל) in CD 14:19 should be read as a *pu'al* imperfect rather than an active *pi'el*, which some have interpreted as implying a singular messiah who shall atone.

¹⁶ See Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân," 481–505. See also G. Brooke, "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 215–

evident throughout the entire sectarian corpus.¹⁷ However, neither of these approaches is completely satisfactory. As Schiffman warns,

It is clear by surveying the scrolls that a variety of motifs and beliefs are distributed throughout many different texts in what may appear to be random fashion ... Either several parallel approaches coexisted within the group, or the ideas evolved gradually over time ... Most likely, both dynamics operated in the Qumran community. It is virtually impossible to separate coexisting trends from those developing over time.¹⁸

Indeed, it thus appears that the construction of a precise historical sequence for the messianic ideas and texts found at Qumran is a futile task. On the other hand, an approach which treats “the Qumran corpus as a more or less coherent and systematic collection of texts or ... look[s] in their various statements about messiahs for a systematic belief” is no more suitable.¹⁹ We must therefore draw conclusions on the basis of close attention to terminology and avoid the temptation of harmonizing the evidence into broad synthetic literary and historical schemes.²⁰

Yet the terminology itself is problematic. The numerous titles and epithets given to eschatological figures in the Scrolls, such as “the priest,” “Interpreter of the Law,” “Branch of David,” “Prince of the Congregation,” and “Son of God,” have generated a certain amount of confusion among scholars. Should we attempt to relate such figures to the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel?²¹ According to the minimalist school of thought, such identifications will lead only to more confusion, and the study of Qumran messianism should be limited to those few texts which expressly mention

230. See the criticisms of Collins, *The Scepter*, 77–82. For an early criticism of Starcky’s theory, see R. Brown, “J. Starcky’s Theory of Qumran Messianic Development,” *CBQ* 28 (1966): 51–57.

¹⁷ See esp., Collins, *The Scepter*, 74–101. See also Cross, “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs,” 1–13; W. Schniedewind, “Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the *Damascus Document*,” in *The Provo International Conference*, 523–536; Evans, “Qumran’s Messiah,” 142.

¹⁸ Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 326–327; idem, “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Messiah*, 128.

¹⁹ Davies, “Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 219. See also the warnings of S. Talmon, “The Concept of Māšīah and Messianism in Early Judaism,” in *The Messiah*, 102, and D. Neufeld, “‘And when that one comes’: Aspects of Johannine Messianism,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 120–140.

²⁰ Davies, “Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 219.

²¹ In the case of the messiah of Israel, most scholars have assumed that he is identical with the royal Davidic figure explicitly mentioned in 4Q174, 4Q252, 4Q161, and 4Q285. But the passages which speak of the messiah of Israel in 1QS, 1QSa, and CD never associate him with David. This has led Pomykala (*The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 171–216; 232–246) to argue that there was an expectation of a non-Davidic lay messianic ruler, the

the word משיח.²² However, restricting the investigation of messianic figures on the basis of terminology results in the exclusion of several key texts which may be said to pertain to a messiah, in the sense of a future priestly, royal, or otherwise characterized leader who plays a liberating role in the end-time.²³ Accordingly, Collins sees the correlation of the various epithets as “an essential step in the interpretation of the scrolls.”²⁴ I tend to agree with Collins on this point. As long as we remain aware of the possible variety implied by terminological differences and resist the temptation for a sweeping synthesis, comparison (but not necessarily identification) of the priestly messiah with other figures such as the priest, the Interpreter of the Law, the Teacher of Righteousness, and the “one who will teach righteousness in the end of days” (CD 6:11) serves to advance the understanding of messianic belief at Qumran.

THE MESSIAH OF AARON

The phrase משיח אהרן/אהרן (or once, משיח מאהרן) appears five times in the Scrolls,²⁵ but never in isolation.²⁶ Rather, it is always accompanied by the word “Israel,” principally by means of the expression משיח אהרן

messiah of Israel, in the early period of the community’s development. Unfortunately, his conclusions rely too heavily upon an overconfident view of the date of composition of various scrolls.

²² Charlesworth, “Challenging the *Consensus Communis*,” 124. See also J. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 73.

²³ The definition is Oegema’s. Cf. his survey of definitions of the term messiah in idem, *The Anointed and His People*, 22–27.

²⁴ Collins, *The Scepter*, 60. On the correlation of messianic titles, see idem, “Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M. Wise et al.; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 213–227. See also the comments of J. Poirier, “The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses at Qumran,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 222.

²⁵ CD 12:23; 14:19 (= 4Q266 10 I, 12); 19:10–11; 20:1; 1QS 9:11.

²⁶ The phrase המשיח אהרן appears in the Apocryphon of Moses B^a (4Q375 1 I, 9) and Apocryphon of Moses B^b (4Q376 1 I, 1) in contexts which are doubtfully eschatological. While these texts are fragmentary, it appears that they relate to a ritual similar to that of the Day of Atonement, during which Aaron entered the holy of holies. See J. Strugnell, DJD XIX, 123. Strugnell observes further (p. 114) that 4Q376 1 I, 9, [ה] כוהן המשיח אשר, is a quotation of Lev 21:10 in which הכוהן המשיח substitutes for הכהן הגדול מאחרי המשחה and המשיח substitutes for המשחה. The only other appearance of the word משיח in the Scrolls also refers to priestly anointing. 1QM 9:8–9 says of the priests leading the eschatological battle: “They shall not desecrate the oil of their priestly anointing with the blood of a worthless people” (לוי] א יחלו שמן משיחת כהנותם) (בדם גוי הבל).

וישראל. Interestingly, each of these references occurs in the authoritative sectarian rule books (CD, 1QS). As noted above, it is debatable whether the expression משיה אהרן וישראל refers to one or two messiahs. It will therefore be helpful to begin with a well-known case that clearly refers to two messiahs.

1QS 9:9–11 reads as follows:²⁷

ומכול עצת התורה לוא יצאו ללכת	9
בכול שרירות לבם ונשפטו במשפטים הרשונים אשר החלו אנשי יהוד לתסר במ	10
עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל	11

9	They shall not depart from any
	counsel of the Torah to walk
10	in all the stubbornness of their heart, but they shall be judged by the first
	precepts which the men of the community were first instructed ²⁸
11	until there shall come a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel

Unfortunately, here we are told nothing more about these three eschatological figures other than that they will come in the future—their arrival simply marks the end of a period in the community's history. However, we may glean an important finding from the literary context. 1QS 9:9–11 appears in a larger section pertaining to the formation of the community and its early development.²⁹ After describing the atoning effects of the community's existence (1QS 9:3–5), the text defines it as analogous to the temple, “a house of holiness for Aaron, for the most holy community, and a house of the community for Israel, for those who walk in perfection” (בית קודש לאהרון להיחד קודש קודשים ובית יהוד לישראל) (ההולכים בתמים; 9:6).³⁰ The dual temple-structure of the community is thus suited to the dual messiahs of line 11. Lines 7–8 grant exclusive authority to the priestly leadership, the sons of Aaron, in matters of judgment and property (במשפט ובהון) and forbid the mingling of property with those outside of the community. In a community analogous to the temple, such measures served as a barrier and safeguard of its

²⁷ Unless otherwise noted, all following text and translation of 1QS generally follow Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1).

²⁸ For this meaning for the root יסר in the Scrolls, see L. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 49–54.

²⁹ According to J. Murphy-O'Connor (“La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté,” 528–549), this passage is part of the “manifesto” (8:1–16, 9:3–10:8), the earliest portion of the work, which he dates back to the early second century BCE, even before the settlement at Qumran. In the light of the Cave 4 evidence, this view has been challenged.

³⁰ See above, pp. 88–89.

continuous purity.³¹ In the continuation, lines 9–11 warn community members against backsliding from the official sectarian interpretations of the Torah (כול עצת התורה);³² they must exhibit complete obedience to the first precepts (המשפטים הרשונים) until the arrival of the new age. Thus it is implied that in the messianic era, the “first precepts,” which currently hold sway over the community, will be superseded and a new legal framework will be introduced (cf. 1 Mac 14:41; 4:46).³³

In order to understand the nature of the eschatological legal shift accompanied by the arrival of the messiahs, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of המשפטים הרשונים. A number of interesting interpretations have been offered, all of which correctly note that the expression refers to the specific rules and regulations of the community. For example, Schiffman translates the adjective רשונים as “original;” that is, the community viewed its own laws as scripturally based and hence original / authentic in distinction with those of the Pharisees, which were viewed as having no basis in Scripture.³⁴ Other scholars, such as Knibb and Davies, note that the phrase implies an early stage in community development, even prior to the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness.³⁵ Hence, המשפטים הרשונים refers to laws promulgated during the earliest stages of the community (or by the movement from which the community stemmed) and remaining in force later on in the life of the community. There is much to recommend this reading. It not only fits the immediate literary context, which is concerned with the formation and legal structure of the primitive community, but it is also supported by evidence from the Damascus Document.³⁶ Indeed, referring to “all those who hold fast to these precepts” (כל המחזיקים במשפטים האלה), the conclusion of the *Admonition* (CD 20:31–32) warns in parallel language: “They are to be instructed in the first precepts according to which the men of the community were judged” (והתיסרו במשפטים הראשונים אשר נשפטו בהם אנשי היהוד). This statement is in turn illuminated by CD 4:7–9, which states that “the first ones” (הראשונים) who were instructed (התוסרו) according to “the precise mean-

³¹ See A.I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 105–107.

³² So P. Guilbert, in J. Carmignac, P. Guilbert, and E. Cothenet, *Les Textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés*, (2 vols.; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961–1963), 1:63.

³³ See Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 139; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 190.

³⁴ Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 51–52. For משפט as a technical term for community regulations, see *ibid.*, pp. 42–49.

³⁵ Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 139, cf. 76; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 197; recently followed by Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 169–172.

³⁶ See further Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 168–172.

ing of the Torah” (כפרוש התורה) are to be followed by another group, fittingly called “those who come after them” (הבאים אחריהם). These latter are to follow the same פרוש התורה as their predecessors “until the completion of the period of these years” (עד שלים הקץ השנים האלה). It may plausibly be assumed that the “first ones,” i.e., the early community members (or members of a parent movement), of CD 4:8 were the original recipients of the “first precepts” mentioned in 20:31 (but termed פרוש התורה in 4:8).³⁷ However, these precepts must not be abandoned by “those who come after them,” i.e., the later community members; rather, they must be observed until “the completion of the period of these years.” This time period may certainly be correlated with the end of the present “period of wickedness” (קץ הרשעה; see CD 6:10, 14) and the arrival of the messianic age. Indeed, CD 12:23–13:1 expressly states that a legal revolution will accompany the arrival of the messiah(s): “This is the rule for the settlers of [the] c[amps] who walk in accordance with these (rules) during the period of wickedness until the arising of the messiah of Aaron and Israel” (זה סרך מושב [ה]מ[חנ]ת המתהלכים באלה בקץ הרשעה עד עמוד משיה) אהרן וישראל; cf. 14:18–19³⁸).³⁹

Returning to the Rule of the Community, on the basis of the literary context and parallel language, it is reasonably certain that 1QS 9:9–11 speaks of the same eschatological legal transformation expected by the Damascus Document. Community members must continue to follow the first precepts instructed to the early (or parent) community before the rise of the Teacher, even though they presently have access to his

³⁷ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 197.

³⁸ Although this passage is fragmentary, the reconstruction of C. Rabin (*The Zadokite Documents* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1954], 70) is likely close to the original text: “this is the exact statement of the rulings in which [they shall walk during the epoch of wickedness, until there shall arise the Messijah of Aaron and Israel.”

³⁹ Why should the question of whether or not the first precepts were still obligatory for later members of the community arise in the first place? The answer lies in a consideration of the historical development of the Qumran community and the realization that the Damascus Document is a composite text which reflects that development, containing a core, composed by a community often described as a “parent” of the Qumranite group, and a later Qumranite recension, reflecting the views of the new community devoted to the instruction of the Teacher of Righteousness. Davies (*The Damascus Covenant*, 197) plausibly suggests that since the Qumranites viewed the rulings of the Teacher of Righteousness as supremely authoritative, the continued authority of the legislation promulgated by the “parent Damascus community” would necessarily have been questioned. However, since the Qumranite recension calls for community members to obey the “voice of the Teacher of Righteousness” (האוינו לקול מורה צדק; CD 20:32; cf. 20:28), his “statutes of righteousness” (חקי הצדק; 20:33), and the “first precepts,” it is clear that the latter were not entirely superseded by the former.

authoritative teachings. With the coming of the messiahs, the first precepts would be abolished, and a new law would presumably be established (cf. CD 6:11).⁴⁰

How would this eschatological legal revolution be brought about? Were any or all three⁴¹ figures to play a part, or was this role to be fulfilled by only one or two of them? What was the specific role of the messiah of Aaron in this shift? Due to the terseness of 1QS 9, it is necessary to turn to other texts in order to address these questions. However, since neither the lay messiah of Israel nor the royal messiah who is often identified with him are ever associated with legal or teaching activities, we may exclude the lay or royal messiah's candidacy outright.⁴² We are left then with the eschatological prophet and the messiah of Aaron, either of whom may plausibly be identified as the teacher of the law expected in the new age. Since the goal of the present investigation is to illuminate the role of the priestly messiah in the Qumranite religious imagination, we shall focus mainly on the data pertaining specifically to that figure.⁴³

THE MESSIAH OF AARON AS TEACHER

We have noted how in 1QS 9:9–11 the arrival of משיח אהרן, among others, was to mark the end of an era characterized by a shift in legal frameworks. The same is implied by CD 12:23–13:1 and 14:18–19, regardless of whether the phrase משיח אהרן וישראל is taken as a reference to one or two figures. It is noteworthy that a prophet does not appear in these ref-

⁴⁰ For the idea of a new law for the eschatological period in ancient Judaism, see W.D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or Age to Come* (JBLMS 7; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952); H. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (JBLMS 10; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), 14–28; M. Wise, “The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1991), 146.

Why would the first precepts be superseded in the eschatological age? Davies (“Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 223) offers the following answer: “Since this law prescribed living in settlements and maintaining a limited connection with the Temple (and whatever else is dependent upon its current relationship with the Judean authorities and other Jews), it would cease with the restoration of true Israel to its Temple; at this time the sect would cease to be a sect, assuming its rightful role as the one true Israel.”

⁴¹ This is evidently implied by Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas,” 120: The “prophet is to join the Messiahs in deciding outstanding controversies in Jewish law.”

⁴² On the character and role of this figure, see esp. Collins, *The Scepter*, 49–73.

⁴³ For an extended consideration of the juridical duties of the eschatological prophet, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 159–177.

erences.⁴⁴ More detail as to the specific role of the messiah of Aaron with regard to the law is likely supplied by 4QTestimonia (4Q175).

4QTestimonia is one of few nearly completely preserved manuscripts from Qumran. It contains a set of four marked off paragraphs, each of which contains quotations of earlier texts, without any intervening citation formulas or interpretations.⁴⁵ In order of appearance, the quotations derive from Exod 20:21 in the Samaritan version (= MT Deut 5:28–29

⁴⁴ According to Vermes (*An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999], 166), the lack of reference to the eschatological prophet may be attributed to the community's belief that he had already arrived in the form of the Teacher of Righteousness. In this identification he is in agreement with a long line of scholars. See, e.g., Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, 23; P. Winter, "Notes on Wieder's Observation on the *dwrš htwrh* in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus," *JQR* 45 (1954): 39–47; W. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956–1957): 17; J. Gibley, "Prophétisme et attente d'un messie prophète dans l'ancien Judaïsme," in *L'Attente d'un Messie* (ed. L. Cerfaux; RechBibl 1; Bruges: Desclès de Brouwer, 1958), 127–128; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1962), 95; A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 75–89, 186; Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 54; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1960), 61–68, 88–99; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 75–89; G.R. Driver, *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 480–484; D. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 131; M.O. Wise, "The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness," 152. However, the identification of the Teacher as an eschatological figure is unlikely—first and foremost because in the handful of scrolls which speak of him, he is never regarded as a messiah, but rather as a figure from the past. Furthermore, the parallelism between the title מורה הצדיק and the clearly eschatological יורה הצדיק of the Well Midrash (CD 6:11) does not imply that the former may be strictly identified with the latter (see below). See further M. Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P.R. Davies and R.T. White; JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 51–65. Therefore, I suggest that the lack of reference to the prophet along with משיח אהרון reflects the circumstance that the eschatological prophet and priestly messiah were not always clearly distinguished from one another. Alternatively, it may be the case that the role of the eschatological prophet is envisioned as taken up by the one who will teach righteousness in the end of days. Van der Woude (*Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 55), along with Strugnell, ("Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," 221–256, esp. 234), García Martínez (in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 163) Zimmermann (*Messianische Texte*, 332–342), and several others identify this figure with Elijah *redivivus*. But even if this identification is correct, it does not guarantee that the functions of eschatological prophet and priest are envisioned as separate in CD. Indeed, according to later Jewish tradition Elijah was both eschatological prophet and high priest. See further the evidence gathered by J. Poirier, "The Endtime Return," 227–236.

⁴⁵ The *editio princeps* was prepared by J.M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956): 182–187. See also idem, *Qumran Cave 4.I* (4Q158–4Q186) (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 57–60, together with J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7

and Deut 18:18–19; ll. 1–8), Num 24:15–17 (ll. 9–13), Deut 33:8–11 (ll. 14–20), and Josh 6:26 along with a passage also found in a previously unknown Qumran work, the Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q379 22 II, 7–14; ll. 21–30).⁴⁶ Although the text lacks specifically sectarian terminology, it was copied by the same scribe who penned the Rule Scroll (100–75 BCE). 4QTestimonia is to be considered a sectarian work. As we shall see, this conclusion is supported by the contents of the document.

The lack of any intervening commentary in 4QTestimonia has resulted in interpretive difficulties for modern exegetes. However, based on the fact that each of the three biblical quotations is a prophecy involving future figures of authority (and that the interpretation of Numbers 24 at Qumran is explicitly messianic [see CD 7:18–21]), the majority of scholars interpret it as an expression of sectarian messianic belief.⁴⁷ Scholars agree that the fourth citation, which applies Joshua's curse of the one who would build Jericho to the "cursed man" (אִישׁ אָרוּר) and his two sons, the "weapons of violence" (כְּלֵי חַמָּס), is a decidedly historical allusion and not a prediction about the future.⁴⁸ Largely on the basis of this fact, the messianic interpretation of the document has been challenged by some commentators.⁴⁹ However, even if there is room for a contemporary

(1970): 225–229; J. Carmignac in *Les Textes de Qumran*, 2:273–278; and, most recently, F.M. Cross, *Pesharim* (PTSDSSP 6B), 312–327.

⁴⁶ C. Newsom, "The 'Psalms of Joshua' from Cave 4" *JJS* 39 (1988): 56–73; eadem, *JDJ* XXII, 237–288.

⁴⁷ See R. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53, 82; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 317; van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 184; J. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 84; idem, "Qumran Messianism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 98; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 174; idem, in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 186; VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 226; Collins, "He Shall Not Judge by What His Eyes See: Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 150; Puech, "Messianisme, Eschatologie et Résurrection dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 283; F. Dexinger, "Reflections on the Relationship between Qumran and Samaritan Messianology," in *Qumran-Messianism*, 93; A. Steudel, "Testimonia," *EDSS* 2:937; T. Beall, "History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity* 5,2: *The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton; HdO 57; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 143; Cross, *Pesharim* (PTSDSSP 6B), 309; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 58; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 161–163; 173–176.

⁴⁸ Similar to the speculation regarding the identity of the Wicked Priest, the "cursed man" has been interpreted as referring to virtually every Hasmonean Ruler. For a run-down of the various theories and bibliographic references, see Steudel, "Testimonia," *EDSS* 2:937–938; Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 310–311.

⁴⁹ See J. Lübbe, "A Reinterpretation of 4Q Testimonia," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 187–197

interpretation, this cannot override the clear eschatological overtones of the text. As many scholars have noted, since each of the first three citations refer to prophetic, royal,⁵⁰ and priestly protagonists respectively, the messianic belief encountered here is identical to that of 1QS 9:11.⁵¹ It follows that we may identify its implied priestly protagonist as the messiah of Aaron.

For our present purposes, it is necessary to focus on the third paragraph of the document (ll. 14–20), which quotes Moses' blessing of the tribe of Levi in Deut 33:8–11. These verses, referring as they do to the symbols of the priestly office and to the future work of the priesthood, would have been particularly attractive for an exegete seeking a testimonium for the messiah of Aaron. Moreover, as Kugler notes:

Moses' blessing for the tribe of Levi is spoken at first as though it were meant for the [*sic*] Levi alone . . . While Genesis 34 presents Levi as such a zealot, and Exod 32:25–29 and Num 25:6–13 indicate that his descendants won the office by their sword-bearing action, only this passage brings together Levi the individual, a violent passion for purity, and a consequent elevation to priestly leadership. And it adds . . . that Levi was especially occupied with the law and wisdom in its instruction.⁵²

Indeed, already in early Second Temple times Deut 33:8–11 contributed significantly to Malachi's portrayal of Levi as the ideal priest (Mal 2:4–7).⁵³ The influence of Deut 33:8–11 is also clearly detected in the later idealistic (though not necessarily eschatological) portraits of Levi found in *ALD*,⁵⁴ *Jub.* 30:18–20; 31:12–17, and *T. Levi* 4:3, 6; 8:17.⁵⁵ It is no

(followed by Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran," 132–133), who argues that the document has "contemporary rather than future import."

⁵⁰ To be sure, the author was likely aware that the star and the scepter of Num 24:15–17 are interpreted as referring to two figures in CD 7:18–21. However, in this context, the reference must be to a single figure. Cf. *Tg. Ps.-J.* and *Frg. Tg.* to Num 24:17; *y. Taan.* 68d; Rev 22:16. See G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, (Studia Post-Biblica 4; 2d ed; Leiden: Brill, 1983), 165–166.

⁵¹ Xeravits (*King, Priest, Prophet*, 58) suggests that we may hypothetically "suppose that the *Testimonia* could even have been compiled by this scribe, seeking to collect biblical passages supporting this theological concept." See also Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 349, n. 190.

⁵² Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 16.

⁵³ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 9–22, claims that the portrait of Levi in Mal 2:4–7 is the result of a synoptic reading of Gen 34; Exod 32:25–39; Num 25:6–13; and Deut 33:8–11.

⁵⁴ For several examples, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 74, 103, 161, 163.

⁵⁵ For a study of the history of the use of Deut 33:8–11, see R. Fuller, "The Blessing of Levi in Dtn 33, Mal 2, and Qumran," in *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift*

surprise then that the author of 4QTestimonia chose these very same verses as a testimonium for his ideal messianic priest.

The passage under discussion, lines 14–20, reads as follows:⁵⁶

(14) And of Levi he said: Give to Levi (הבו ללוי)⁵⁷ your Thummim, and your Urim to your faithful one whom (15) you tried at Massah, and (with whom) you contested at the waters of Meribah; who said to his father (16) and to his mother, ‘I do not know you’; and his brothers he disregards, and his children he does not (17) know. For he has kept your command and guards your covenant. And they will make your precepts shine forth to Jacob, (18) your law to Israel (ויאירו משפטיך ליעקוב תורתכה לישראל). They shall place incense in your nostril(s), and the whole offering on your altar. (19) Bless, oh Lord, his substance, and favor the work of his hands. Smite the loins of his foes, and as for his enemies, (20) let them not rise again.

The text follows MT loosely except for some minor variants mostly concerning the shifting of Levi from third person plural to singular. One might imagine that if the text were being used specifically as a testimonium for the messiah of Aaron, all of the third person plurals would have been leveled out into singulars, but this consideration apparently did not concern the scribe, for the plurals of Deut 33:10 are maintained.⁵⁸ However, a variant of some significance does occur for that same verse in line 17. While the MT reads *ויאירו משפטיך ליעקוב*, our text reads *ויאירו משפטיך ליעקוב*. As suggested above, this seems to be a deliberate change made by the scribe, designed to emphasize the role of the ideal priestly figure as the illuminated and illuminating mediator of divine teachings.⁵⁹

While the citation mentions the testing of the Levites in the desert, the violent zeal with which they rejected idolatry and preserved the covenant with God, and their oracular and cultic privileges, the salient image here is of Levi/Levites as the future authoritative teacher and intermediary of God’s commands to the nation. This illuminating pedagogical function was doubtlessly viewed by the Qumranites as the defining charac-

für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. R. Bartelmus, T. Krüger, and H. Utzschneider; *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 126; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 31–44.

⁵⁶ Translation generally follows Cross, *Pesharim* (PTSDSSP 6B), 316–317.

⁵⁷ These words are absent in the MT. The reading is in line with the LXX, *δοτε Λεβι*.

⁵⁸ Cf. the comments of Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 17: “It would have been tempting to secure completely the basis for the LPT [Levi-Priestly tradition] with a blessing from Moses that was spoken to Levi, and to Levi alone. But if that were the case one wonders why the scribe of 4QTestimonia did not complete the task either, leaving plural forms in v. 10.”

⁵⁹ This is in line with the readings of LXX and esp. Aquila. See above, chapter four, n. 50.

teristic of the expected messiah of Aaron. This assertion is substantiated by comparative evidence from the Qumran corpus, which, although never referring to the messiah of Aaron, certainly speaks of comparable eschatological priestly figures. These figures include “one of the priests of renown” (4QpIsa^a), an anonymous eschatological priest (4Q541 9), “the Interpreter of the Law” (CD; 4QFlorilegium), and “the one who will teach righteousness in the end of days” (CD).

We will begin with the eschatological priestly figure of Peshar Isaiah^a, who appears in connection with a royal messiah. 4QpIsa^a (4Q161 8–10 III, 22)⁶⁰ interprets the “shoot from the stump of Jesse” (חוטֵר מִגֹּזֵעַ יֵשׁוּ) of Isa 11:1 as a reference to “David who will arise in the en[d of days]” ([דְּוִיד הַעֹמֵד בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים]), clearly an allusion to the awaited Davidic messiah.⁶¹ A few lines later, the peshar interprets Isa 11:3, “neither will he judge by what his eyes see, nor will he decide by what his ears hear” (וְלֹא-לְמַרְאֵה עֵינָיו יִשְׁפֹּט וְלֹא-לְמִשְׁמַע אוֹזְנוֹ יִכְחִיחַ), as a call for the subordination of the royal messiah in matters of law to other figures: “As they teach him, so will he judge, and according to their command . . .” (וְכַאֲשֶׁר יִרְוּהוּ כֵן). Although the identity of those who will teach the Davidic messiah is not explicitly preserved in the text, the language recalls the teaching function of the Levites alluded to in Deut 33:10 (יִירוּ מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ) as well as that of the levitical priest in Mal 2:6–7; (תּוֹרַת אֱמֶת הִיִּתָּה בְּפִיהוּ; וְתוֹרָה) (יִבְקֶשׁוּ מִפִּיהוּ). This identification is confirmed by the reference in the next line (l. 29) to “one of the priests of renown,” (אֶחָד מִכֹּהֲנֵי הַשֵּׁם) who will go out “with him” carrying garments in his hand.⁶² If this document assumes a dual messiah scheme similar to 1QS and 4QTestimonia, then this latter figure may be identified as the priestly messiah who heads the teaching of the law in the end of days, and, in this case at least, instructs the royal messiah. However, the indistinct title “one of the priests of renown,” does not inspire confidence in a messianic identity. In addition (and as scholars often overlook), the textual remains attribute the teaching role to a group and not to an individual, and a sure conclusion on this score is not presently possible. Whatever the case, the text surely testifies to the

⁶⁰ Following the line numbers of M. Horgan, *Pesharim* (PTSDSSP 6B), 92–97.

⁶¹ For the significance of Isaiah 11 in the messianic exegesis of Second Temple Judaism, see Collins, *The Scepter*, 24–26, 49–73.

⁶² Could this be a reference to the light-giving priestly garments? Cf. Ben Sira 45; *Let. Aris.* 96–99; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.184–187; 216–217, etc. Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, 1983), 1:352–353, suggests a parallel with the war garments of the priests and the “first priest” described in 1QM 7:10–12.

Qumranite vision of the eschatological priesthood as the authoritative medium for the instruction of the law to be practiced in that era.

The second figure is the unnamed eschatological priest of 4Q541 9. As noted above,⁶³ this text preserves a portrait of a priest whose “word is like a word of the heavens” and whose “teaching conforms to the will of God” (מאמרה כמאמר שמין ואלפונה כרעות אל) (מאמרה). The importance of this figure’s teaching is evidenced by its link to the eschatological triumph of light over darkness (ll. 3–5). As the only non-sectarian scroll which clearly speaks of an eschatological priest, it lies extremely close to sectarian sentiment, and may even have influenced it.

The third figure is the “Interpreter of the Law” (דורש התורה). This character appears four times in the Scrolls corpus, always in sectarian documents.⁶⁴ The epithet is used in different ways. In the Well Midrash of CD 6 (which we will return to below), it represents a figure from the past, identified usually either as the founder of the parent movement of the Qumran community or, more likely, as the historical Teacher of Righteousness.⁶⁵ But in 4Q174 and CD 7:18 it clearly has eschatological significance. (The reference in 4Q177 is too fragmentary to tell whether the figure in question is from the past or the future.) The following discussion will thus focus on the allusions to the Interpreter in 4QFlorilegium and CD 7.

4QFlorilegium (4Q174) is a thematic pesher from the late first century BCE labeled by some scholars “Midrash on Eschatology” due to its numerous references to אהרית הימים.⁶⁶ Fragment 2 10–13 of that document provides a carefully abbreviated citation of 2 Sam 7:11–14 followed by a quotation of Amos 9:11, the interpretation of which is mainly concerned with the future arrival of the royal messiah, here termed the Branch of David (cf. Jer 23:5; 4Q252 V 3–4).⁶⁷ However, this savior figure will not arrive alone: “the Branch of David who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law who [...] in Z[ion in the] end of days” (צמח דויד)

⁶³ See pp. 77–81.

⁶⁴ CD 6:7; 7:18; 4Q174 2 I, 11–12; 4Q177 II 5.

⁶⁵ For the former opinion, see Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 119–125; idem, “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism” in *Pursuing the Text*, 70–84; repr. in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (SFSHJ 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 171. For the latter opinion, see Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 441–444; M. Knibb, “Interpreter of the Law,” *EDSS* 1:383.

⁶⁶ J. Allegro, “Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim,” *JBL* 77 (1958): 350–354; A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

⁶⁷ Cf. the rabbinic eschatological understanding of צמח in *y. Ber.* 2:5; *Lam. Rabba* 1:16.

העומד עם דורש התורה אשר [...] בציון] אהרית הימים). Clearly, the pairing of the Interpreter with the royal messiah marks him as a future messianic figure himself.

The Isaiah-Amos-Numbers Midrash of CD 7 preserves a nearly identical portrayal of two future figures, this time on the basis of Num 24:17. The star and the scepter of that verse are interpreted respectively as referring to “the Interpreter of the Law who will come to Damascus” (דורש) (התורה הבא דמשק) and “the Prince of the Whole Congregation” (נשיא כול) (העדה). Since it is possible to read the participle הבא as referring to a past action, some have argued that the דורש התורה here, as in CD 6:7, must be a figure from the past.⁶⁸ However, the fact that the Prince is clearly to be related to the Davidic royal messiah⁶⁹ makes it likely that the accompanying Interpreter, as in 4QFlorilegium, is a messianic figure as well, and the equally possible future translation is thus to be preferred. The eschatological reading is bolstered by the fact that Num 24:17 is interpreted in a messianic sense in 4QTestimonia as well as in numerous contemporary Jewish and Christian texts.⁷⁰

Unfortunately, these two references give no information about the Interpreter’s function apart from what is implied by his title: he is the messianic figure entrusted with the seeking out of the law in the end of days. We may better understand this function by considering the meaning of the root דרש at Qumran. As Schiffman points out, it had already taken on a technical, exegetical significance identical to its later tannaitic usage in the sense of deriving the law through Scriptural exegesis.⁷¹ More

⁶⁸ See for example, S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Vol. 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (New York: Ktav, 1970), 72; Caquot, “Le Messianisme qumrânien,” 241–242; Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 147; idem, *Behind the Essenes*, 38; idem, “The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where Is ‘Damascus’?” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 510; C. Milikowsky, “Again: *Damascus* in Damascus Document and in Rabbinic Literature,” *RevQ* 41 (1982): 104; J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The *Damascus Document* Revisited,” *RB* 92 (1985): 242.

⁶⁹ See esp. 4Q285 5 4, which appears to identify נשיא העדה with צמח דוד. See further the evidence gathered by C. Evans, “Prince of the Congregation,” *EDSS* 2:694.

⁷⁰ Cf. the formulation of García Martínez (“Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments*, 36): “The strict parallelism between the two figures, the fact that both are interpreted beginning with the same biblical text (to which later tradition was to give a clear messianic value) and, above all, the details that 4Q174 brings us about this Interpreter of the Law who will come at the end of time together with the ‘shoot of David’—a figure whom 4Q174 explicitly identifies with the Prince of the congregation—are enough to resolve the ambiguity of the text in favor of the interpretation which sees reflected here hope in two messianic figures.”

⁷¹ Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 57. However, see his suggestion on p. 60 that the term also encompasses the generation of “aggadic” exegesis.

specifically, at Qumran it meant deriving from the exoteric Torah (נגלה) its “hidden interpretation” (נסתר = מדרש), i.e., the specifically sectarian laws.⁷² Accordingly, the goal of a member of the community who interprets (איש הדורש) in 1QS 8:11–12 is to teach the formerly hidden laws to community members: “Any matter that has been concealed from Israel and found by a man who interprets the Torah—he shall not conceal it” (וכול דבר הנסתר מישראל ונמצאו לאיש הדורש אל יסתרהו) (Significantly, the דורש function here not only refers to exegesis, but also assumes the ultimate goal of teaching. As 1QS 6:6–7 shows, this duty was not reserved to one figure alone, but was a perpetual obligation for all community members:⁷³ “Where there are ten members there must not be lacking there a man who interprets the Torah day and night continually, each man relieving⁷⁴ another” (ואל ימש במקום אשר יהיו שם העשרה איש דורש בתורה יומם וליילה) (תמיד על יפות איש לרעהו). It is within the framework of the fundamental importance of the study of the Torah and the teaching of its interpretation at Qumran that we must view the role of the eschatological Interpreter. In the age to come, he will appear with the royal messiah and make known the laws that he derives from the Torah, which are the eschatological mirror image of the נסתרות derived by the past Interpreter of the Law (CD 6:7) and presently derived by community members engaged in the study of the Torah.⁷⁵

It would seem that the presumable function of the דורש התורה in 4QFlorilegium and CD 7 is compatible with the role envisioned for the messiah of Aaron in 4QTestimonia. But if the Interpreter is a priestly figure, then why is there no indication of his priestly character? Furthermore, the title דורש התורה does not appear to necessitate a specifically priestly identity.⁷⁶ Such considerations have led some scholars to identify him with the eschatological prophet, the prophet like Moses referred to in 1QS 9:11 and implied by 4QTestimonia 1–8, who will receive the divine directive, and “speak to them all that I command him” (וידבר אליהמה את)

⁷² On נגלה and נסתר, see Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 22–32.

⁷³ So P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Leiden, 1957), 103.

⁷⁴ Read חליפות = על יפות.

⁷⁵ For more on the eschatological future as mirror image of the community’s present, see Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 68–71; idem, *Reclaiming*, 338–339.

⁷⁶ Indeed, according to Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 203, “from Ezra 7:10, Sir 32:15, 1 Mac 14:14 and Jub. 1:12 it might be deduced that the task of seeking the Law is everybody’s.” I would add to his list 1QS 6:6–7, which requires all community members to do so.

כּוֹל אֲשֶׁר אֲצִוּוֹ; 4QTestimonia 5–6; cf. MT Deut 18:18).⁷⁷ This argument has been supported by the connections between the Interpreter and the prophet Elijah, principally the parallel between CD 7:18–19 and 1 Kgs 19:15–16, according to which God instructs Elijah to go to Damascus and to anoint Hazael and Jehu as kings, and Elisha as a prophet.⁷⁸

The identification of the Interpreter as a priest rests on three major lines of evidence. First, as VanderKam points out, the star imagery of Num 24:17, which is interpreted as a reference to the Interpreter in CD 7, is utilized with respect to the eschatological high priest in *T. Levi* 18:3 (cf. *T. Judah* 24:1–6).⁷⁹ Second, 4QFlorilegium frgs. 6–7 preserve a quotation of Deut 33:8–11 followed by a reference to the Urim and Thummim in a quotation which likely interprets Deut 33:8's לַאִישׁ חֲסִידֶיךָ. The appearance of these verses within an eschatological setting suggests that, as in 4QTestimonia, they refer to the priestly messiah.⁸⁰ The cryptic reference to יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶהְרֹן in frg. 5 2 provides an additional tantalizing hint that two messiahs are under discussion. If Brooke's suggestion that frg. 5 interprets Num 24:15–17 is correct, then there is further evidence that 4QFlorilegium envisioned two messiahs, a royal one ("Branch of David") and a priestly one ("Interpreter of the Law").⁸¹

Third, and finally, as noted above, even if the identification of the Interpreter with Elijah is correct, it cannot be taken as evidence of the exclusively prophetic nature of his authority. Indeed, the identification of Elijah not only as eschatological prophet but also as high priest,⁸² likely held a place in the popular Jewish imagination from Hasmonean times.⁸³

⁷⁷ García Martínez, "Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts," 38; idem, in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 183–184. Cf. Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân," 497.

⁷⁸ Observed by van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 55–57. Nonetheless, he concludes that the Interpreter was a priest.

⁷⁹ VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 228. Was such astral imagery a contributing factor to 4QTestimonia's rendering of Deut 33:10, וְיִיאִירוּ מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ?

⁸⁰ Cf. G. Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran*, 204): "The essential link between the functions of this eschatological figure as Interpreter of the Law and as priest is provided by the fortunate preservation among the fragments of 4QFlor (6–11) of a section of Deuteronomy 33." See also Fuller, "The Blessing of Levi," 40–41.

⁸¹ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 204, 160–161.

⁸² These identifications are well known in later Jewish tradition. See van der Woude, *Messianischen Vorstellungen*, 55–57.

⁸³ See esp. D.G. Clark, "Elijah as Eschatological High Priest: An Examination of the Elijah Tradition in Mal. 3:23–24," (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1975), who argues for origins in the Hasmonean period. See also the comments of S.M. Bryan (*Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* [SNTSMS 117; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002], 96) on the early date of the tradition complex identifying

Therefore, the association with Elijah “could imply a priestly motif as well as a prophetic one, and an eschatological High Priest could also have a prophetic persona.”⁸⁴

This evidence provides sufficient support for the identification of the Interpreter as a priestly figure. We cannot, however, exclude the possibility that he was envisioned as possessing a prophetic function as well. Nonetheless, based on the priestly identification some scholars hold that he is identical with the messiah of Aaron.⁸⁵ However, there is no explicit textual support for such interchangeability, and it is worth noting again that the Interpreter is paired only with the royal Branch of David and the Prince, whereas the messiah of Aaron is associated with the messiah of Israel.⁸⁶

The fourth eschatological figure relevant to our discussion is **יורה הצדק** **יורה הצדק**, who appears only in CD 6:11. The reference occurs at the end of the Well Midrash (CD 6:2b–11a), which belongs to a larger pericope describing the origins of the Qumran community, or possibly its “parent Damascus community” (CD 5:20–6:11).⁸⁷ The midrash interprets Num 21:18, “the well was dug by the princes and excavated by the nobles of the people, with a ruler” (**באר הפרוה שרים כרוה נדיבי העם במחקק**), as follows:⁸⁸

(4) The “well” is the Torah and those who “dig” it are (5) the penitents of Israel who depart from the land of Judah and dwell in the land of Damascus. (6) God called them all “princes,” for they sought him and their honor was not (7) rejected by anyone’s mouth. And the “ruler” is the Interpreter of the Torah (**והמחוקק הוא דורש התורה**), of whom (8) Isaiah said, “He takes out a tool for his work.” And the “nobles of the people” are (9)

Elijah with the high priest Phinehas. See further C.T.R. Hayward, “Phinehas- the Same Is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition,” *JJS* 29 (1978): 22–34.

⁸⁴ Collins, *The Scepter*, 115.

⁸⁵ See, e.g., J. Liver, “The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature of the Second Commonwealth,” *HTR* 52 (1959): 161, 181; VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls.”

⁸⁶ Cf. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 171.

⁸⁷ The question hinges on the controversial identification of the “land of Damascus” in l. 5. In my opinion, it is most probably a prophetic code name (see Amos 5:25–27) applied to Qumran, so the text refers to the origins of the Qumran community. See Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 72–73; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 94. For understandings of Damascus in its straightforward geographical sense, see Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 16, 119–125, and Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 207. For Damascus as an allegorical name for a place of captivity, namely Babylon, see Murphy-O’Connor, “The *Damascus Document* Revisited,” 223–246.

⁸⁸ Unless otherwise noted, translations of CD generally follow the edition of J. Baumgarten and D. Schwartz, *Damascus Document* (PTSDSSP 2).

those who come to excavate the well with the statutes which were ordained by the ruler (במחוקקות אשר חקק המחוקק) (10) to walk in them in the entire time of evil (להתהלך במה בכל קץ הרשיע), and (who) will obtain no others until the rise of (11) one who will teach righteousness in the end of days (עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים).

As is commonly noted, the midrash mentions two individuals from different chronological stages of the community, the דורש התורה and the יורה הצדק. The Interpreter is here a figure from the past. Reminiscent of the passage from CD 4 observed above, the statutes that this individual ordained are to remain in force in the community (להתהלך במה) for the duration of the period of wickedness (קץ הרשיע). Only with the arrival of the future Teacher will these laws cease to operate and a new law be revealed. These circumstances clearly link the יורה הצדק to the messiah(s) of CD 12:23–13:1; 14:19 (reconstructed); and 1QS 9:9–11, and the title seems particularly suitable to the image of the eschatological priest as teacher. The messianic nature of the future Teacher is confirmed by the terminology utilized to describe his arrival. In our passage, as well as in CD 12:23–13:1; 19:10–11; 20:1; 14:19; and 1QS 9:11, a temporal preposition (עד/ב) is immediately followed by the infinitive absolute form of בוא/עמד, itself followed by the designation for the messianic figure.⁸⁹

In seeking a more precise identification of the יורה הצדק, scholars have generally focused on two related issues: the relationship between the past and future individuals mentioned in the midrash; and the clear analogue between the title of the latter figure and the title מורה הצדק, utilized to denote the founder of the Qumran community.⁹⁰ Davies, for instance, argues that the Well Midrash is best read as an account of the foundation of the parent Damascus community. As such, the יורה הצדק must have been a future figure expected by this community, while the historical Teacher mentioned in other passages was an individual who later made

⁸⁹ See the charts of M. de Jonge, “The Role of Intermediaries in God’s Final Intervention in the Future According to the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Jewish Eschatology*, 38; repr. from *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (ed. O. Michel et al.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969), 44–63, and Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 48.

⁹⁰ The Teacher is always referred to as a past figure in CD and the pesharim. Indeed, his death is reported in CD 19:35–20:1 and 20:14. B.Z. Wacholder’s argument (“Does Qumran Record the Death of the *Moreh*? The Meaning of *he’aseph* in *Damascus Covenant* XIX, 35, XX, 14,” *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 323–330) that האסף does not refer to the death of the Teacher but rather to the “gathering” of the community for an assembly is unconvincing. See esp. the response of J. Fitzmyer, “The Gathering in of the Teacher of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 261–265.

claims to this messianic title. Thus, passages such as CD 1:11, which speak of the מורה הצדק as a historical leader, represent the later redaction of the Qumranites,⁹¹ who, breaking from the larger Essene movement, accepted this figure's messianic aspirations.⁹² According to this reading, the דורש התורה of CD 6:7 must be the leader of the Damascus parent community prior to the arrival of the expected messianic Teacher.

However, several considerations suggest that the דורש התורה of 6:7 is more plausibly identified with the historical מורה הצדק. First and foremost, no preeminent pre-Teacher of Righteousness leader is ever mentioned. Rather, according to CD 1, the first such leader was the Teacher himself, who joined a "blind," rudderless group which had been struggling already for twenty years by the time of his arrival. Contrary to Davies' assumption, the Well Midrash cannot be said to unequivocally place the Interpreter at the very beginning of the community's foundation, and thus distinguish him from the late arriving Teacher of CD 1:11.⁹³ It is therefore more prudent not to unnecessarily invent more Teacher figures without cause. Moreover, the fact that the Interpreter is an eschatological figure in 4QFlorilegium and CD 7 but a historical figure in CD 6, and that the final form of CD speaks of historical and eschatological Teachers of Righteousness clearly displays that these terms could be used to refer to past or future figures and that they might be interchangeable.⁹⁴ The interchangeability of the Interpreter and Teacher titles is further suggested by the implied parallelism between the roles of the two figures in the Well Midrash: The Interpreter, by making known the hidden laws of the Torah through inspired exegesis, is the historical mirror image of the eschatological Teacher to come. It follows that the יורה הצדק should not be identified with the Teacher *redivivus*,⁹⁵ but rather

⁹¹ On CD 1:11 as a later interpolation, see Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 63–64, 200. But see M. Boyce, "The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 615–628, who claims that the reference to the Teacher in this passage constitutes an integral part of the textual unit.

⁹² Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 119–125; idem, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days,'" *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–317. His hypothesis is accepted by Murphy-O'Connor, "The *Damascus Document* Revisited," 240–244, and Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 184; idem, "The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness," 121–147.

⁹³ Cf. Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—a Messianic Title?" 57–58.

⁹⁴ So Collins, *The Scepter*, 104.

⁹⁵ Knibb ("The Teacher of Righteousness—a Messianic Title?" 59; idem, "Teacher of Righteousness," *EDSS* 2:921) notes that if the Teacher's followers regarded him as the messiah, we should expect to find some clear indication of such a belief in the extant Scrolls. However, no such indication exists.

as the typological, eschatological counterpart of the historical Teacher. Indeed, as Collins correctly observes,

The use of . . . [the title] Teacher of Righteousness for figures of the historical past and the eschatological future underlines a feature of the eschatology of the Scrolls that has often been noted. This eschatology has a restorative aspect and involves the fulfillment and perfection of the institutions of past and present.⁹⁶

As such, we may look to the slim data concerning the historical Teacher in order to fill out the rather hazy vision of the future Teacher.

The מורה הצדק is mentioned only about twenty times throughout the Scrolls corpus, the majority of appearances occurring in the pesharim.⁹⁷ 4QpPs^a (4Q171), in its interpretation of Ps 37:23–24 (1–10 III, 15–16), explicitly identifies him as a priest and founder of the community: “Its interpretation concerns the priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness] (פשוּרו על הכוהן מורה הצדק)⁹⁸ whom] God [ch]ose as the pillar. F[or] he

⁹⁶ Collins, *The Scepter*, 112; cf. de Jonge, “The Role of Intermediaries,” 38.

⁹⁷ The epithet occurs only in the following documents: 1QpHab, 4Q171, 4Q173, 1Q14, and CD. The variants מורה הצדק and מורה הצדקה occur in CD 1:11; 20:32 and 1QpHab 2:2 respectively. The title is most probably derived from Hos 10:12: צדק עַד-יבא ויורה צדק or Joel 2:23: ובני ציון גילו ושמחו בה' אלהיכם כי נתן לכם את המורה לצדקה: לַצְדָקָה. Though the literal sense of these verses clearly pertains to rain, it is interesting to note that the Targum, Symmachus, and the Vulgate understand these passages as referring to a teacher or teaching activity. Similarly the Babylonian Talmud (*Bek.* 24a) identifies the former passage as an allusion to an eschatological teacher who will clarify religious questions. According to some scholars (J. Teicher, “The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish Christian Sect of Ebionites,” *JJS* 2 [1951]: 97; Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 313), the title was coined in antithesis to the נביא אֵלֹהִים of Isa 9:14. However, it should be noted that the antithesis is explicitly provided by that verse as זקן ונושא-פנים.

⁹⁸ The reconstruction מורה הצדק is justified by a few factors. First of all, each of the ten times that the term מורה is followed by a legible (or mostly legible) word beginning with the letter *heh* in the pesharim, that word is הצדק (or, in one case, הצדקה [see 1QpHab 2:2]). The same should clearly be the case here. A comparison with two passages in 1QpHab confirms this reconstruction and, thus, the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness as a priest. In its interpretation of Hab 1:5, 1QpHab 2:8–10 declares that a certain “priest” (הכוהן) has been granted by God the special ability to correctly interpret the predictive words of his prophets. Although this passage also uses the term הכוהן, it never explicitly identifies this priest with the Teacher. However, the pesharim’s interpretation of Hab 2:2 in col. 7 validates such an identification (כול רזי דברי אשר הודיעו אל את כול רזי דברי פשוּרו על מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את כול רזי דברי עבדי הנביאים). Just like the priest in 2:8–10, the Teacher here is said to have received from God the ability to understand עבדי הנביאים כול דברי עבדי הנביאים. On the basis of the nearly identical terminology in these two passages we may conclude that the Teacher of Righteousness is indeed portrayed as a priest in 1QpHab, which in turn supports the reconstruction of 4Q171 1–10 III, 15.

Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*, 102, 210–220, argues that the use of the term הכוהן, which refers to the eschatological high priest in 1QSa (see below), to designate the Teacher

established him to build for him a congregation of [...].” Consistent with our findings above in chapter four, the mediation of צדק at Qumran was indeed envisioned as properly carried out by the priest. It would seem then that by analogy the יורה הצדק is best identified as an eschatological priest, who, through his instruction, will align his audience with God’s lot of righteousness. However, several pieces of evidence show that prophetic functions were attributed to the historical מורה as well. As noted above, 1QpHab 7:4–5 and 2:8–9 both report that God made known to the Teacher כול דברי עבדיו הנביאים. 1QpHab 2:2–3 further reports that the Teacher received instruction “from the mouth of God” (מפיא אל). Wise rightly considers this “a transparent claim that the T of R was a typological Moses, since according to Num 12:6–8 God spoke only to Moses ‘mouth to mouth.’”⁹⁹

It seems to me that the following observation of Marinus de Jonge can assist us in dealing with this mixture of evidence:

I don’t think that we should try to systematize more than the documents themselves. The functions of the figures involved, in as much as it is through them that God guides and helps His people, are of far greater importance than the actual persons and their designations.¹⁰⁰

It is true that 1QS and 4QTestimonia envision three different individuals carrying out the roles of prophet, priest, and king. However, this particular form of messianic expectation actually represents an exception at Qumran.¹⁰¹ As noted above, the evidence suggests that there was no single canonical messianic view. In the case of the מורה/יורה pattern found in the final form of CD, it appears that two ideal leadership roles, priest and prophet, are envisioned as concentrated in a single historical figure who anticipated his eschatological mirror image. Since a prophet is not mentioned together with the משיח אהרן וישראל of CD or the eschatological

indicates that he was the high priest of the Intersacerdotium. However, his suggestion has been refuted on the basis of biblical, numismatic, and inscriptional evidence by M. Wise, “The Teacher of Righteousness and the High Priest of the Intersacerdotium: Two Approaches,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 587–618.

⁹⁹ Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll*, 186. For his argument that the community viewed the Teacher as a new Moses, see pp. 184–189; idem, “The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness.”

¹⁰⁰ De Jonge, “The Role of Intermediaries,” 40.

¹⁰¹ Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 228, notes that since the only two witnesses to this expectation (1QS and 4QTestimonia) were written by the same scribe, there is a possibility “that this pattern was his personal opinion or invention.”

דורש התורה of CD 7 and 4QFlorilegium, it may be the case that the prophetic role was subsumed by those priestly figures as well.

Before moving on to investigate the other roles of the eschatological priesthood, it is important to recall the prominence of the teaching function in the otherworldly priest traditions observed in chapters two through four. Such imagery is central not only to non-sectarian texts, both in eschatological (4Q541 9) and not necessarily eschatological contexts (*Jub.* 31:15; *Sir* 45:5-7; 24:1-12), but also to the sectarian liturgical compositions (4Q400 1 I, 17; 1QSb 3:23-24; 4:27; 4Q491 11 I, 16-17; cf. 4Q471b 1a-d 3-4). This suggests that the images of the otherworldly priest and the priestly messiah were at least partially cut from the same mold. We may assume that underlying this commonality is the exegesis of *Deut* 33:10, *Mal* 2:7, and other such scriptural passages that emphasize the pedagogical function of the priest.

THE FUNCTION OF ATONEMENT

In CD 14:19, the phrase משי[ה אהרן וישראל is followed by the mysterious words יכפר עונם. Many scholars have interpreted this expression as evidence that a priestly messiah was expected to make atonement for the transgressions of the people.¹⁰² However, grammatical considerations put this reading into question. In each of the six other instances of the verb כפר in CD, it is accompanied by a preposition (על, בעד), and the subject of the action is God.¹⁰³ If the verb in question in 14:19 were active, we might expect such a preposition, or at least the particle את.¹⁰⁴ It is thus more plausible to read יכפר as a *pu'al* imperfect: "their iniquity will be atoned."

That said, this reading does not demand that the passive reference to atonement be completely disassociated from the role of the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel. Indeed, the book of Leviticus especially attributes the act of כפרה to Aaron/the high priest (*Lev* 16:6, 11, 16, 17, 32-34,

¹⁰² See, e.g., J. Baumgarten, "Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19 [4Q266 10 I 12-13]," in *The Provo International Conference*, 537-544; E. Christiansen, "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What It Entails according to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*, 79. As VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 230, points out, the singular verb form cannot be taken as proof of a singular subject. Rather, it merely agrees with the subject משיה, which may be taken as either singular or plural.

¹⁰³ CD 2:5; 3:18; 4:6, 9, 10; 20:34.

¹⁰⁴ Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 188.

etc.). According to 1QM 2:1 the high priest at the time of the eschatological war (כֹּהֵן הַרֵאשִׁי) will preside over the temple cult, putting him in prime position to follow suit. Indeed, in 1QM 2:5, the ultimate object of the reconstituted cult is described precisely in terms of atonement (לְכַפֵּר) (בְּעֵד כּוֹל עֲדָתוֹ). The notion of an atoning eschatological priest garners support from 4Q541 9 2, according to which the protagonist will unambiguously “atone for all the children of his generation” (וַיִּכְפֹּר עַל כּוֹל בְּנֵי דֹרָה). Another parallel comes from 11Q13, in which Melchizedek brings about release “from the debt of all their iniquities,” and “atones on behalf of the sons of light” on the Day of Atonement (2:6–8). It must be noted, however, that Melchizedek is best seen not as a messianic protagonist, but rather as an angelic priestly figure similar to Michael. Even so, it seems plausible that the priestly messiah was expected to fulfill an atoning function.¹⁰⁵ Considering the emphasis on the atoning role of the paradigmatic priest in Leviticus, the scarce mention of this role in the Scrolls is surprising. This may be due to the circumstance that it was so obvious that it did not need to be stated too often. More plausibly, the perfection of the Qumranite way of life and the belief that atonement was achieved through the very existence of the temple-community (see esp. 1QS 8:6, 10; 9:4) may have decreased the application of such imagery to an individual community figure.

MARTIAL RESPONSIBILITIES

CD 19:10–11 relates that upon the arrival of the messiah(s) of Aaron and Israel “those who remain will be handed over to the sword” (וְהַנְּשָׂאֲרִים) (יִמְסְרוּ לַחֶרֶב). From this phrase it is certainly not clear that a priestly (or, indeed, any) messiah will take part in the actual violence, but the question remains open. A few sectarian portraits of the eschatological priesthood in a martial context will help illustrate the sectarian imagination in this regard.

¹⁰⁵ Such atonement would presumably occur as a result of the prescribed rituals performed in the reconstituted temple of the eschatological age (such as those mentioned in 4QFlorilegium and 11QT). On the other hand J. Baumgarten, (“Messianic Forgiveness,” 537–544) argues that the Qumranites, parallel to the early Christians, viewed the atonement as brought about by the mere arrival of the “divinely anointed redeemer through whom forgiveness of sin will be granted.” Unfortunately, Baumgarten’s hypothesis is largely based on the reconstruction of 4Q266 11 I, 12–13. Moreover, the reconstitution and function of the temple cult narrated in 1QM 2 would speak against such an interpretation.

The best-known portrait of this sort comes from the War Scroll (1QM). This document is generally understood as a composite account of the eschatological battle between the supernatural and human forces of light and darkness envisioned by the Qumranites as ushering in the end of days.¹⁰⁶ Although the text does refer to the familiar Aaron/Israel duality,¹⁰⁷ it shows no interest in priestly, royal, or otherwise characterized messianic protagonists.¹⁰⁸ References to Num 24:17–19 (11:6–7) and King David's defeat of Goliath (11:1–3) are given no individual messianic import.¹⁰⁹ Rather, the passage focuses on the people's eschatological practice of power as an illustration of God's might.¹¹⁰ It is striking, however, that the war is envisioned as prosecuted by priests every step of the way.

Priests are mentioned over thirty times in 1QM fulfilling various leadership duties (many of which have scriptural precedent, such as the blowing of trumpets) during the eschatological war, but never actually engaging in violence. While most references are to plural כוהנים, there are six allusions to כוהן הראש or simply הכוהן, the eschatological high priest.¹¹¹ The roles attributed to this figure include the following. He is to “strengthen the heart” of the troops and offer encouraging speech to those about to enter into battle (16:13–15; 10:2–3 [cf. Deut 20:2–4]). He is to recite the “prayer of the appointed time for wa[r]” (תפלת מועד המלחמה) to his brothers the priests, the Levites, and all the men of the rule (15:4). Before the battle, he, along with these others, is to bless the God of Israel, who fights alongside his people (18:5). In addition, 19:11 reports in a broken context that he is to “draw near” (ויגש) to the troops. As noted

¹⁰⁶ B. Schultz (*Conquering the World*, 340–353) defends and expands upon J. Duhaime's view of the War Scroll as a “war manual for priests.” See J. Duhaime, “The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–151.

¹⁰⁷ See 1QM 3:13–14, which describes the army's banner, on which the names of Israel, Aaron, and the twelve tribes of Israel are to be written. Cf. the description of the writing on the Prince's shield in 1QM 5:1.

¹⁰⁸ The allusion to משיחיה חזוי תעודות in 1QM 11:7–8 clearly refers to anointed prophets of the past, not future messiahs. Although the “Prince of the Whole Congregation” is mentioned as the owner of a shield in 5:1, he is otherwise completely absent, and it is the priests who manage the war effort. It is true that Israel is championed by the archangel Michael in 1QM 17, but this section does not describe the earthly kingdom of Israel, so it is unclear what role might be envisioned for a messiah.

¹⁰⁹ Schiffman, “Messianic Figures and Ideas,” 123.

¹¹⁰ See esp. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign,” 521–524.

¹¹¹ 1QM 2:1 [4Q494 l. 4]; 10:2; 15:4; 16:13 [4Q491 10 II, 13; 11 II, 11]; 18:5; 19:11. Cf. הכוהן האחד in 7:12. For the term הכוהן expressing the notion of “high priest,” see 1 Kgs 4:2; 2 Kgs 11:9; 16:10; 22:10. See further, J. Bergman, et al., “כהן—kohen,” *ThWAT* 4:62–79. For the distinct figure הכוהן החרוץ למועד נקם (1QM 15:6), see the works cited below, n. 124.

above, 1QM 2:1 portrays כוהן הראש a bit differently; he presides over the reconstituted temple cult of the eschatological period. As Xeravits observes, all other roles attributed to him gain their legitimacy from this particularly important position.¹¹²

The high priest's role in the eschatological war is thus envisaged as thoroughly ceremonial. Again, it is important to note that the War Scroll does not portray him as a messiah, but rather as the spiritual leader of the cultic/military congregation, who is accompanied by other less important sacerdotal and lay leaders. Salvation is brought about by God, whose mighty acts manifest not in individual messianic figures, but rather in his people Israel.

A further picture of priestly leadership in the context of eschatological warfare is represented in the damaged fragments of *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285), the so-called "pierced-messiah text."¹¹³ This late first century BCE manuscript¹¹⁴ speaks of the final victory of the forces of good over evil and is closely related to the teachings of 1QM.¹¹⁵ One major difference, however, is the expanded role of the Prince of the Congregation. Whereas 1QM is barely concerned with this figure, *Sefer ha-Milhamah* openly speaks of his military power and success. Utilizing Ezekiel's account of the defeat of Gog (Ezek 39:3–4), frg. 4 describes the Prince's defeat of the Kittim and probably the delivery of their king into his power. The most important passage for our purpose occurs in frg. 7. After a few lines linking the Branch of David (צמח דוד) to Isa 10:34–11:1 (cf. 4QpIsa^a above) and presumably identifying him with the Prince of the Congregation, the text continues:¹¹⁶

¹¹² Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 213.

¹¹³ On the controversy surrounding the sensationalist interpretation of Eisenman and Wise (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* [Rockport: Element, 1992], 24–30), see J. Tabor, "Pierced or Piercing Messiah?—The Verdict Is Still Out," *BAR* 18/6 (1992): 58–59; G. Vermes, "The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research," 85–90; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 344–347. The definitive edition is by P. Alexander and G. Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 228–246.

¹¹⁴ For the paleography, see Nitzan, "Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285)," *RevQ* 61 (1993): 79; W. Lyons, "Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory," *DSD* 3 (1996): 136, n. 23; Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 232. The radiocarbon data supports the paleographical dating. See G. Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," in *DSSAFY*, 1:446–448.

¹¹⁵ See Milik ("Milki-šedeq," 143), who claims that 4Q285 represents a part of the original conclusion of 1QM. More recently, Stegemann, (*Die Essener*, 146) has argued that 4Q285 is "einer späteren essenischen Fassung der Kriegsregel." Vermes and Alexander (DJD XXXVI, 231) consider it closely related to but independent of 1QM.

¹¹⁶ Text and translation follow Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 238–239.

	צמח דויד ונשפטו את]	3
	[והמיתו נשיא העדה צמ[ח]]	4
	בתפיים ובמחוללות וצוה כוהן]	5 דויד
	[ח]לל[י] כתיים []ל[]]	6 הראש
3	[] the Branch of David, and they will enter into judgment		
	with		
4	[] and the Prince of the Congregation, the Bran[ch of David,]		
	shall put him to death ¹¹⁷		
5	[with timbrel]s ¹¹⁸ and dances. And [the chief] priest will command		
6	[the c]orps[e] of the Kittim []l[]		

Although the text is highly fragmentary, we may infer that the scene describes the period just after Israel's final victory, when the king of the Kittim will be executed by the Prince. Unfortunately, both the identity of the priest in line 5 and the nature of his command are unclear. Regarding the latter problem, Alexander and Vermes suggest that the command could refer either to the disposal of the corpses of the Kittim alluded to in the next line or to his judicial instruction to the Branch of David,¹¹⁹ a scenario analogous to 4QpIsa^a 8–10 28–29.¹²⁰ Another less likely possibility is that the priest is ordering the Prince to carry out the execution.

As for the identity of the priest, I have reconstructed **הראש כוהן** on the basis of *Sefer ha-Milhamah's* close links with 1QM and the fact that corpse impurity is one of the latter's outstanding concerns.¹²¹ 1QM 9:7–8 (cf. 4Q493 ll. 4–6; 4Q496 frg. 15) reports that

when the slain (**החללים**) fall down, the pri[est]s shall keep blowing (the trumpets) from afar. They shall not come to the midst of the slain (**החללים**) (so as) to become defiled in their unclean blood, for they are holy. They shall [no]t profane the oil of their priestly anointing with the blood of a worthless nation.

¹¹⁷ Although it is possible to vocalize **והמיתו** as a perfect consecutive third person m. pl. *hiph'il* of **מות**, syntactic and grammatical considerations as well as the immediate and general context call for a singular form + third m. s. pronominal suffix. See further, Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 240; Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 66.

¹¹⁸ Reconstructing with Abegg, "Messianic Hope in 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113 (1994): 90, and Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 346, on the basis of the biblical phrase **בתפיים ובמחוללות**, which appears in celebratory contexts in Exod 15:20 and Jud 11:34.

¹¹⁹ Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 241.

¹²⁰ For more on the relationship between 4Q285 and 4Q161, see R. Bauckham, "The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist," *DSD* 2 (1995): 202–216.

¹²¹ There are thirty references to corpses (**חלל/חללים**) in 1QM. See Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 1:265.

It is not difficult to imagine that this prohibition would have been thought to weigh heavily on the priest leading the war effort. It would thus seem appropriate for the chief priest to order the Prince with regard to corpse disposal in 4Q285 7 5, especially since that text deals with the period immediately after the final battle and mentions the corpses of the Kittim in line 6 (cf. the procedures for burying the dead of Gog's army in Ezek 39:11–16). On the other hand, it is also possible to restore כוהן השם], on analogy with the priests of renown who instruct and command the Branch of David in the similar martial context of 4QpIsa^a 8–10 28. However, we must recall that there the Branch is instructed by and follows the command of a plurality of priests. All that we are told about a singular priest of renown in that context is that he will hold garments in his hand.

Whatever the case, we may at least conclude that 4Q285 7 envisages an eschatological priest of some importance operating beside the royal messiah after the final battle. Unfortunately, no clarification is offered as to whether this figure is an individual priestly messianic protagonist (and thus we would have here a further example of dual messianism) or the leader of a group of priests that heads the eschatological congregation (as in 1QM). The expanded role of the Prince in 4Q285 vis-à-vis 1QM allows for the possibility that in parallel fashion the eschatological responsibilities of the individual priest were expanded as well, but it must be admitted that he is never identified as a messiah. However, if this priest's command is directed at the Branch, then we may infer that he is in some sense superior to him.

One further relevant passage from 4Q285 appears in frg. 8 (reconstructed with the assistance of the extensive overlaps in 11Q14 1 II, 2–15), which preserves a blessing for Israel to be recited after the final victory over the Kittim. The blessing is a pastiche of biblical passages, including several related to the entrance into the promised land (Exod 23:25–26) and the observance of God's commandments (Lev 26:3–7; Deut 11:14–15; 28:11–12).¹²² As Alexander and Vermes note, the singular form וברכם (l. 1) implies that the blessing is to be pronounced by the eschatological high priest.¹²³ This is further corroborated by the introductory phrase

¹²² For the suggestion that the recitation of this blessing represented the inauguration of the ideal kingdom of the Prince as presaged by Ezekiel, see Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 214.

¹²³ Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXXVI, 243.

כֹּהֵן וְעֵנָה וְאָמַר (ll. 1–2), for in 1QM 16:15, the subject of those verbs is the כֹּהֵן הַרִּוּאֵשׁ.¹²⁴

In sum, the Qumranites envisioned priestly leaders as important players in the eschatological battle; even more important than their lay counterparts. Although they lead the war effort, they are never depicted as taking part in actual violence and are largely limited to ceremonial roles, such as the offering of prayers, blessings, and speeches of encouragement, and the blowing of trumpets.¹²⁵ In 1QM messianic hopes appear to be collectivized. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the eschatological high priest's activities are not particularly distinctive from those of the rest of the priests. His importance lies not in the glory of his deeds as an individual, but in his representation of God's dominion on earth as symbolized by his leadership of the restored cultic eschatological community. However, in *Sefer ha-Milhamah*, which certainly gives credence to the importance of an individual royal messiah, the role of the individual priest may be augmented—thus a single priest commands (4Q285 7 5) and blesses (4Q285 8 1). The command function draws a suggestive parallel to the priestly messiah's authority in legal matters observed above. However, in its present state of preservation, it is impossible to determine the exact nature of the eschatological priesthood in 4Q285. The same statement applies to the martial context of 4Q161.

Finally, it is important to recall that eschatological military duties are often attributed to such angelic priestly figures as Michael and Melchizedek.¹²⁶ In these cases, the angelic priest is depicted as defeating demonic beings militarily and hence purging evil from the world. At times this role is described in vivid physical terms of direct combat (e.g., 1 *Enoch* 10).

¹²⁴ Cf. 1QM 15:7, where the subject of those same verbs is הכֹּהֵן הַחֲרוּץ לְמוֹעֵד נֶקֶם. On this figure and his distinction from הכֹּהֵן הַרִּוּאֵשׁ, see Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. B. and C. Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 209–217. See further, N. Martola, “The Priest Anointed for Battle,” *Nordisk Judaistik: Scandinavian Jewish Studies* 4 (1983): 21–40.

¹²⁵ Unfortunately, the allusion in 4QpHos^b (4Q167 2 3) to “the last priest who will stretch out his hand to strike Ephraim” (כֹּהֵן הָאַחֲרוֹן אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ לְהַכּוֹת בְּאַפְרַיִם) remains unclear. However, in 4QpNah (4Q169 3–4 I, 2) Ephraim designates the “lion of wrath,” i.e., the Pharisees. If the same is the case here, then it is probable that the “last priest” is an *ex eventu* allusion to Alexander Jannaeus and his brutal assault on the Pharisees in 88 BCE. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that 4QpHos^b 2 2 mentions the “lion of wrath” (כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוּץ) and l. 3 is interpreting Hos 5:14, “For I am like a young [lion to E]ph[raim].” In 4QpNah, the “lion of wrath” is clearly identifiable with Alexander Jannaeus.

¹²⁶ See, e.g., 1 *En.* 10:11–16; cf. 90:22–23; *As. Mos.* 10:1–3; 11QMelch; 1QM 17:6–8; 4Q402 frgs. 1–4.

The eschatological priesthood of 1QM is thus envisaged as fulfilling a parallel role. By contrast, purity concerns make direct combat for these human priests unimaginable.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD OF 1QSA

A unique portrait of eschatological priesthood appears in the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa), the so-called “Messianic Rule” for “all the congregation of Israel in the end of days” (1:1). 1QSa is a composite document, the majority of which is constituted by an old literary stratum with no original eschatological orientation (1:6–2:11a).¹²⁷ However, in its present form, the text reads as a demonstration of the Qumranite belief that the community was living in the end of days and, in a sense, already experiencing the messianic age. The key passage of interest comes from a portion of the document describing the procedures for the messianic banquet (2:11b–22).¹²⁸

(11) Th[is] [(is) the ses]sion of the men of renown [who are invited to] the feast¹²⁹ (מִוֵּעַד) for the council of the community when (12) [God] will lead forth¹³⁰ (יִלְיֵד) the messiah (to be) with them: [The priest]¹³¹ shall enter [at] the head of all the congregation of Israel and all (13) [his] br[others, the sons of] Aaron, the priests [who are invited to] the feast, the men of renown. And they shall sit (14) be[fore him, each man] according to his

¹²⁷ See especially Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa,” 253–269, who, based on several strong points of contact with CD, demonstrates that the communal legislation of 1:6–2:11a “goes back to the Essene parent movement of the Qumran community.” This “nucleus” was embedded into its present messianic setting and underwent a “Zadokite recension” which reflects the social background of 1QS 5. See also, Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 159–160.

¹²⁸ Charlesworth and Stuckenbruck, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 117.

¹²⁹ Translation follows the suggestion of Cross, *The Ancient Library*, 76, n. 1, accepted by both Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 53, and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 117.

¹³⁰ The reading of this extremely damaged word has long been a point of contention in Qumran scholarship. Barthélemy originally suggested ילִיד but later accepted Milik’s suggestion, which I have followed. See DJD I, 117. As has been noted abundantly, the possible reading ילִיד would simply recall the symbolic imagery of Psalm 2 and need not bring to mind a physical event. See further Charlesworth’s textual note in *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 109, and the critique of this note in Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 27, n. 65.

¹³¹ On the basis of the elevated position of the priest in ll. 18–19, this reconstruction is very likely. It is accepted by Cross, Schiffman, and Charlesworth. For additional possibilities, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 267. Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 99–106, claims that the priest of l. 12, is different from the priest of l. 19.

importance. And after (them) the [messi]ah of Israel [shall enter]. And the heads of (15) the t[housands of Israel] shall sit before him, [each m]an according to his importance.

After a few lines which further describe the seating arrangements at the banquet and the arrangement of the communal table, the text continues:

(18) No man [shall stretch out] his hand to the first portion of (19) the bread or [the new wi]ne before the priest; fo[r he shall] bless the first portion of the bread (20) and the new wi[ne, and shall stretch out] his hand to the bread first of all. And aft[er (this has occurred)] the messiah of Israel [shall stret]ch out his hands (21) to the bread. [And after that] all the congregation of the community [shall ble]ss (and partake).

Regardless of whether this meal, which mirrors the eating practices of the community expressed in 1QS 6:4–6, is best understood as sacral or non-sacral in character,¹³² the role of הכוהן here is once again ceremonial. Although the context is not directly martial, as in 1QM he is to lead the reconstituted, hierarchically-arranged eschatological congregation in blessing. On the other hand, his pairing with and apparent ascendancy over the messiah of Israel underscores his own glory and suggests equivalent status with the messiah of Aaron, mentioned earlier in the Rule Scroll.

It is notable that the eschatological priest's priority in blessing the food parallels the role attributed to the priest presiding over the present community meals in 1QS 6:5–6: "the priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand in order to bless the first portion of the bread and the new wine" (הכוהן ישלח ידו לרשינה להברך בראשית הלחם והתירוש) A similar mechanism appears in the multiple references to the authority of the sons of Zadok in 1QSa (1:2, 24; 2:3), which mirror the present communal authority assigned to them in 1QS 5:2, 9. This suggests that 1QSa's vision of the role of the eschatological priesthood was modeled closely on the present realities of the community at the time of the copying of the manuscript in the early first century BCE.

PRIESTLY LEADERSHIP IN THE TEMPLE SCROLL

Finally, for the sake of completeness, we will briefly consider the imagery pertaining to priestly leadership in the Temple Scroll. Even though this scroll is best interpreted as a non-sectarian text concerned mainly with

¹³² For this issue, see the discussion and works cited below, pp. 247–253.

the appropriate cultic ideal for the present age, and not eschatology, its imaginative perspective as well as its closeness to sectarian writings warrant such consideration.¹³³ According to the Temple Scroll's vision of the ideal sanctuary and its cult (cols. 3–48), the high priest (הכהן הגדול) presides over the temple and fulfills his duties on the Day of Atonement.¹³⁴ In the light of scriptural precedent, this is not surprising. In a similar vein, it is no surprise that the Temple Scroll emphasizes the legal authority of the priests—56:6–11 cites Deut 17:8–13, which assigns supreme legal authority to both the priest and the judge. However, it is interesting to note that in the section pertaining to the laws of the king (cf. Deut 17:14–20), temporal authority is envisioned as subordinate to that of the high priest. Thus in 58:18–19 it is reported that the king shall not go forth into battle “until he has come before the high priest and he has sought on his behalf the judgment of the Urim and Thummim; on his command he shall go out and on his command he shall come in” (ולוא יצא עד יבוא לפני הכהן הגדול ושאל לו במשפט האורים והתומים על פיהו יצא ועל פיהו יבוא). Furthermore, 57:11–15 expands Deut 17:20 (“he shall not raise himself above his brothers”) to create the institution of the royal council, which must include twelve laymen, twelve priests, and twelve Levites.¹³⁵

¹³³ Although many scholars have seen 11QT as a product of the Qumran community, since it lacks the basic terms and expressions characteristic of sectarian literature, displays a different method of deriving law, and differs with respect to halakhah and general interests, it is best to deem it as non-sectarian in origin. See L. Schiffman, “The Law of the Temple Scroll and its Provenance,” in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. F. García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 3–18; idem, “The Temple Scroll and the Nature of its Law: The Status of the Question,” in *The Courtyards*, 33–52; H. Stegemann, “The Origins of the Temple Scroll,” in *Congress Volume, Jerusalem, 1986* (VTSup 40; Leiden: Brill, 1988) 235–256; B. Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5–23. The paleographic dating of a fragmentary copy of the Temple Scroll (4Q524) to 150–125 BCE further supports the view that the Temple Scroll is not a product of Qumran. See E. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 87. The Temple Scroll's various correspondences to sectarian principles, such as its 364 day solar calendar and its prohibition of polygamy and uncle-niece marriage, are best explained by the hypothesis that the scroll was composed by an earlier group out of which the later Qumran community developed. See F. García Martínez, “Temple Scroll,” *EDSS* 2:927–933; idem, “The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem,” in *DSSAFY*, 2:441–442; S. White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*, (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 26–29. For the debate over whether or not the Temple Scroll is eschatologically oriented, and a convincing argument that it is not, see Collins, *The Scepter*, 104–111.

¹³⁴ See 11QT 23:9; 25:16; 26:3.

¹³⁵ Baumgarten, “The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran,” 145, followed by J. Milgrom,

The king is enjoined not to “raise his heart” above the council and to “do nothing without their advice.” Interestingly, the quorum of thirty-six also appears in 1QM 2:1–3, which, by contrast, places the high priest at its head, and attributes to it cultic activities. In addition, the pattern of the composition of the council is the same as the various forms of community councils presented in the Scrolls¹³⁶ and, in 4QpIsa^d, twelve chief priests “give judgment by the light of the Urim and Thummim.”¹³⁷

In sum, we may note that the Temple Scroll’s portrayal of the ideal priesthood has many points of contact with sectarian visions of the eschatological priesthood. Each presents the priesthood as the ideal cultic leadership and the supreme legal authority. These similarities may be said to result from common expectations based upon Scripture. However, the preeminence of the priestly figure and his ability to “command” the royal figure is a distinctive similarity with less obvious antecedents. This commonality is no doubt the result of a shared traditional outlook of the Temple Scroll and the sectarian texts which viewed the temporal authority “in a limited fashion, circumscribed his role, relativized his status alongside a priestly messianic figure and subordinated his authority to the priests.”¹³⁸

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the above survey, we encountered only a few instances in the Dead Sea Scrolls that expressly speak of the priestly messiah, the messiah of Aaron. Unfortunately, those references never give a clear indication of the expected role of that figure. However, he is often associated with the end of the present era of wickedness, which will entail the proliferation of a new law.¹³⁹ From 4QTestimonia’s use of Deut 33:8–11, it appears that the priestly messiah will engage in the teaching and dissemination of this new law. This picture is supplemented by other texts that do not explicitly mention the priestly messiah (or the new law), but clearly envisage the

“Studies in the Temple Scroll,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 502 n. 3, suggests that this group may have been shaped on the Chronicler’s model of Jehoshaphat’s central tribunal (2 Chr 19:5–11).

¹³⁶ García Martínez, “Temple Scroll,” *EDSS* 2:931. See further Baumgarten, “The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran,” 145–146; Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:349–353.

¹³⁷ Cf. chapter four, n. 50.

¹³⁸ Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 215.

¹³⁹ See 1QS 9:11; CD 12:23–13:1; 14:18–19.

eschatological priesthood as fulfilling an authoritative instructive function.¹⁴⁰ Further evidence may be drawn from the function implied by the names of the priestly eschatological figures דורש התורה and יורה הצדק. While some scholars identify these two figures with the messiah of Aaron, it is important to note that, unlike the latter, neither of them is ever called messiah or ever appears together with משיח ישראל. Considering the fluidity and variation of messianic belief evidenced in the Qumran Scrolls, it is best not to force such identifications without further evidence.

Beyond the dominant instruction imagery linked to the eschatological priesthood, we have seen evidence of less emphasized roles. It is possible that CD 14:19 connects an atoning function to the priestly messiah. This would be in line with the role of the exalted eschatological priestly figures of 4Q541 9 and 11QMelchizedek. As 1QM 2:1–5 indicates, the atonement brought about by the high priest at this time was likely imagined as a function of his leadership over the restored temple cult.

Additionally, the War Scroll gives an extensive description of the role of the eschatological priesthood within the context of the final battle between the forces of light and darkness. In line with its program emphasizing God's might as represented through the acts of the collective body of Israel, 1QM decreases the importance of individual eschatological protagonists. The high priest thus mostly acts in concert with other priests, Levites, and lay leaders. His role is purely ceremonial, and includes leadership of the restored temple cult, prayers, blessings, and speeches of encouragement. His importance lies not in his individual acts of grandeur, but in the symbol of his leadership of the restored eschatological congregation.

The portrayal of the eschatological high priest in 1QSa 2 is unique. On the one hand it relates to that of 1QM in that it locates him as the ceremonial leader of the restored congregation in the end of days. On the other hand, his pairing with and superiority to the messiah of Israel indicates an individual glory unfamiliar from 1QM. It appears then that 1QSa 2's portrayal represents a mixed picture according to which the high priest is important both as an individual eschatological protagonist and as the leader of the perfected congregation. A similar portrayal may lie behind 4Q285 7 + 8, which, although closely related to 1QM, seems to augment the importance of a singular priest. The same may be the

¹⁴⁰ See 4QpIsa^a; 4Q541 9; 4Q285 7 5; cf. 11QT 58:18–19; 56:6–11; 57:11–15.

case with 4Q161, which singles out one of the many priests of renown. However, the fragmentary state of these two documents precludes any certain conclusions.

A noteworthy theme in all of the above texts is the bifurcation of power between priestly and lay/royal authority. Even if CD's משיח אהרן וישראל is considered a single personage, the division between these two types is still clear. In many texts the power and importance of the eschatological priest appears to outstrip that of his counterpart.¹⁴¹ This certainly may be said to reflect the general transfer of focus away from the monarchy and toward the priesthood and the temple in the Second Temple period, as well as the unique historical circumstances and exegetical outlook of the Qumranites. These issues will be dealt with in the following chapters. For now, it suffices to note that such visions reflect the Qumranite ideal and expectation that ultimate authority would be vested in the Torah and the priesthood.¹⁴²

Finally, it is important to consider how Qumranite conceptions of priestly messianism/eschatological priesthood relate to other ideal visions of priesthood found in the Qumran library. Common to all of the depictions of the eschatological priesthood observed in this chapter is a linear view of time, whereby the present period of wickedness will soon give way to an idealized messianic era, which is often prefigured by an eschatological war. This historical conception differs markedly from the circular and repetitive hierohistorical outlook of the liturgical texts, which never mention a priestly messiah, but rather speak of the exalted priest as an intermediary through whom the community might gain supernal knowledge and experience the eternal rewards of the righteous. Yet both the historical-messianic and the hierohistorical-liturgical texts often envision the idealized priest as an authoritative figure of instruction. On the other hand, portrayals of the priesthood as the military leadership or as the leadership of the reconstituted hierarchical congregation do not appear in the liturgical works depicting the otherworldly priesthood. As we might expect, such portrayals are unique to texts that periodize history and await the eschatological battle and the final victory.¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ See 1QS*a*; 4Q161; 4Q285; cf. 1QM *passim*; 11QT 58:18–19. In the case of 1QS*a*, however, it may be argued that the priest's prominence is due to the liturgical setting.

¹⁴² Cf. J.J. Collins, "The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, 217.

¹⁴³ Even though we treated 11QMelchizedek and its otherworldly warrior-priest with the liturgical texts above, such periodization of history is essential to its outlook.

Visions of a priestly messiah / eschatological priesthood that will “interpret the law,” “teach righteousness,” instruct the lay authority, lead the restored military / cultic congregation, and atone for the people not only reflect the exalted role of the priesthood at Qumran, but also the palpable frustration of the Qumranites with the current exercise of the office. Indeed, such hopes only make sense from the perspective that the current temple and its priesthood are far from the ideal. This point is confirmed by the numerous well-known criticisms of the Jerusalemite priestly establishment encountered in the sectarian corpus, especially in CD and the pesharim. However, it is worth noting that in the case of pre-sectarian Enochic literature similar frustration with the priesthood did not manifest itself in priestly messianic hopes. This suggests that the unique worldview and historical circumstances of the Qumran community are to be seen as important catalysts to its distinctive eschatological hopes.

However, for the pious traditionalists of Qumran, such religious ideas could not simply be created out of whole cloth. The expectation of an eschatological priesthood was not perceived as an innovation, but rather as a reflection of the true meaning of traditional written sources. Indeed, like the sectarian liturgical otherworldly priesthood traditions, it appears that the notion of priestly messianism must be seen as a creative sectarian adaptation of a larger body of non-sectarian traditions which themselves were spun out of creative biblical exegetical processes. It is to these historical and exegetical roots of Qumran’s priestly messianism that we now turn.

CHAPTER SIX

THE HISTORICAL ROOTS OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD

Predictably, the roots of the Qumranite vision of eschatological/messianic priesthood are to be found in the Hebrew Bible. Leviticus assigns various cultic acts to the anointed priest, *הכהן המשיח* (4:3, 5, 16; 6:15). Daniel refers to historical high priests with the word *משיח* (9:25–26).¹ Moreover, the split reflected in the Qumran texts between lay and sacerdotal eschatological authority is prefigured by the diarchy of Zerubbabel and Joshua, the “two sons of oil” of the early restoration community mentioned in Zechariah 4.² Scholars also point to such passages as Jer 33:14–26, where levitical priests are elevated beside the king.³ However, none of these biblical texts refer to an anointed priest in the sense of a *future* messianic figure. In the previous chapter, we observed how Num 24:17 and Deut 33:8–11 were applied by the Qumranites to such a personage; but exegesis of these verses alone does not account for the invention of a priestly messiah. Indeed, the Qumranites show themselves perfectly capable of interpreting “obvious” messianic passages non-messianically.⁴ It is therefore clear that such interpretation was not required by a close reading of the text. Rather, it involved a conscious choice and reflects the attitudes and perceptions of the interpreters. In particular, the Qumranite expectation of an ideal priestly figure who would arrive in the future reflects the community’s expressed dissatisfaction with the current exercise of the sacerdotal office in Jerusalem and its dismay with the

¹ See Collins, *Daniel*, 355–356.

² See esp. D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (TSAJ 38; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994), 57–60; Talmon, “The Concept of Māšīah,” 106–107.

³ Cf. 1 Chr 29:22, where Solomon and Zadok are anointed simultaneously. For a survey of possible biblical foundations for the Qumranite priestly messiah expectation, see J. Villalón, “Sources vétéro-testamentaires de la doctrine qumranienne des deux messies,” *RevQ* 29 (1972): 54–69. See also Caquot, “Le Messianisme qumrânien,” 232–234.

⁴ For example, in CD 7:16–17, the “king” of Amos 5:26 is interpreted as the “congregation.” In 4QFlorilegium 1:19, the “anointed one” of Ps 2:2 is interpreted as the plural “chosen ones.” See further Collins, “The Nature of Messianism,” 216–217.

resulting pollution of the temple. With the arrival of the priestly messiah, who would teach the new law to, preside over, and possibly atone for the purified cultic community, this situation would be rectified.⁵

In hopes of elucidating the roots of the Qumranite notion of end-time priesthood, we shall investigate both its historical and traditional textual roots. In the present chapter we shall treat the former, the historical context in which the belief flourished. First, we will briefly consider the political history of the priesthood in Second Temple society. Then, the bulk of the chapter will deal with the religious-historical background of the Qumranite representations of end-time priesthood. In chapter seven, we shall turn to the traditional sources that likely lay behind such portrayals. As we shall see, the combination of these two factors goes a long way in explaining the development of the image of eschatological priesthood at Qumran.

POLITICAL-HISTORICAL ROOTS: THE SHIFT TO PRIESTLY AND SCRIBAL AUTHORITY

Second Temple period Judah witnessed a dramatic paradigm shift with respect to political structure. With the dissolution of the Davidic dynasty, power swung from the royal palace toward the rebuilt Jerusalem temple, which became the command center of the restored Judahite community.⁶ The Persian period saw the rise of a diarchic form of government, consisting of a lay governor and a high priest, both of whom, of course, were subordinate to foreign rule. Although the evidence is sparse for this period, it appears that the lay leader governed civil affairs while the priest attended to cultic matters.⁷ By the early Hellenistic period, however, we have evidence that the high priest was exercising political power without the assistance of a civil governor.⁸ Since the Hellenistic empires did not

⁵ Collins, *The Scepter*, 84.

⁶ To be sure, the first two governors of Yehud, Zerubbabel and Sheshbazzar, were Davidides, but the Persians appear to have discontinued this policy for fear of arousing the nationalistic hopes of the Judahite community. See Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 34. For the government of the province of Yehud in the early Persian period, see L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 73–79.

⁷ See the discussion of D. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*, (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 120–122.

⁸ See U. Rappaport, “The Coins of Judea at the End of the Persian Rule and the Beginning of the Hellenistic Period,” in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham*

appoint governors alongside the high priests, the power and prestige of the high priestly office rose to unprecedented heights.⁹ Eventually under the Hasmoneans, who were independent from foreign rule, the originally separate offices of high priest and king were unified by a succession of individual rulers.

Another significant shift was brought about by the emergence, under the Persians, of the Torah as the law of the land (see Ezra 7:25–26). The unparalleled authority of the written word of God necessarily gave rise to a new type of power; that of the scribe trained in the close reading and interpretation of the Torah.¹⁰ In order to become a scribe one needed both natural intelligence and a good education. As Ben Sira pointed out at the beginning of the second century BCE, such education required the opportunity of leisure, and by inference, plenty of money (38:24–33). Naturally, priests were top candidates for this position as the temple and its leadership enjoyed the backing of the foreign imperialistic powers. However, the scribal office certainly did not require priestly lineage.¹¹ Thus, although many priests were scribes (e.g., Ezra), there was

Schalit Memorial Volume (ed. O. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern; Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben-Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980), 7–21 (Hebrew); J. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 122–124.

⁹ Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 7–23.

¹⁰ For Jewish scribalism in Second Temple times, see J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (trans. F. and C. Cave; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 233–245; D. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (JSNTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT-Press, 1989); E. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 161–176; M. Bar-Ilan, “Scribes and Books in the Late Second Commonwealth and Rabbinic Period,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. Mulder; CRINT 2.1; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 21–24.

¹¹ Indeed, several influential scholarly accounts posit a shift of scribal power from priests to elite laymen in the Second Temple period. See, e.g., E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC – AD 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979) 2:322–323; E. Bickerman, *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism* (New York: Schocken, 1962), 67–71; S. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 102, 160–161, 218; idem, “The Temple and the Synagogue,” in *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives* (ed. T. Madsen; Provo: Brigham Young University, 1984), 151–174, esp. 161–162; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 1:78–83; V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (trans. S. Applebaum; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966), 124–125, 197, and notes on 456–457. However, a number of scholars

a great potential for conflict between the power of the priestly office, based on hereditary entitlement, and the power of the scribal office, based on knowledge/merit.¹² The concurrent rise of these two offices, priest and scribe, as well as the disappearance of Davidic authority in the Second Temple period provides important historical background for understanding the image of the end-time priesthood at Qumran.

RELIGIOUS-HISTORICAL ROOTS: CRITICISM OF THE TEMPLE AND ITS PRIESTHOOD

While the restored Jerusalem temple was, as a rule, revered by the Jewish people, from the very beginning it was not immune to criticism. Quite unlike Solomon's temple, the orders and funding to build the second came directly from a foreign king, a fact which, for some at least, may have enshrouded it in a cloud of suspicion.¹³ Biblical sources from the Persian period remark on the Second Temple's pitiful appearance in comparison with that of the First (Ezra 3:12, Hag 2:3), and Tobit 14:5 explicitly hopes for a more glorious temple in the future. Later on, Ben Sira prays that God will once again fill the temple with his glory (36:19), implying the less than perfect spiritual status of the present temple.

Far graver than these sentiments, other Second Temple period texts express shock and resentment at what was perceived as the defiled state of the temple. These expressions, by and large, do not condemn the institution of the temple itself, but rather the pollution of the temple by people.¹⁴ These people could be Gentiles who were either invited into

have challenged the assumption that a class of popular lay scribes arose in Second Temple times. See, e.g., R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 53–58; A. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988), 241–276, esp. 273–276; E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), chaps. 18, 21; S. Fraade, “They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob.”

¹² A good example of such tension occurs in Nehemiah 13. There, on the basis of the authority of the “book of Moses,” the lay Nehemiah demonstrates that his power in matters concerning the temple outstrips that of the priests. For more on the tension between scribal and priestly offices in the Second Temple period and into the Rabbinic period see, Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, passim.

¹³ See *b. Yoma* 9b–10a. E. Urbach (“Matai Pasqah ha-Nevuah?” in *The World of the Sages: Collected Studies* [2d ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002], 2) suggests that this view is reflected also in Onkelos’ version of Gen 9:27.

¹⁴ However, the *Apocalypse of Weeks* may be an exception. Strikingly, it omits mention

the temple precincts by Jews or made their way in by force.¹⁵ Most often, however, they were Jews, principally priests, who were considered impure for various reasons.¹⁶ For example, according to *As. Mos.* 4:8, a group of pious Jews was “mourning and moaning” (*tristes et gementes*), because they were not “able to bring offerings to the Lord of their fathers.” The inability of this scrupulous group to make offerings was due to the impure status of the temple, which was brought about by its sinful priesthood (cf. 5:3–4).¹⁷ The trauma caused by such priests finds vivid expression in one of the Mishnah’s suggested punishments for the priest who served at the altar in a state of impurity: “The young men among the priests took him outside the temple court and split open his brain with clubs.”¹⁸

Numerous sources, both non-sectarian and sectarian, specify the defiling offences committed by the Second Temple priesthood as well as the laity. The offending practices may be divided broadly into the two categories of ritual impurity and moral impurity, although for the

of the Second Temple in its review of the time period between the exile and the author’s own lifetime, and speaks rather of “a perverse generation” (1 *En.* 93:9–10; 91:11). This may amount to a complete rejection of the Second Temple from its inception.

¹⁵ See, e.g., *Neh* 13:8–9; *Dan* 11:31; 2 *Mac* 6:2; cf. *Ezek* 44:7; *Ps* 79:1. For the perception of Gentiles as impure in ancient Judaism, see J. Klawans, “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism,” *AJSR* 20 (1995): 285–312; idem, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), esp. 21–42. For the Qumranite perspective, see H. Harrington, *The Purity Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004), 116–127.

¹⁶ There is precedent for the charge of temple defilement against priests in the Hebrew Bible. Referring to the First Temple, *Zeph* 3:4 claims that Jerusalem’s “priests have profaned the sanctuary” (כהונה חלל-קדש). In 2 *Chron* 36:14, the blame for the pollution of the temple is put on both the priests and the people (ריטמאו את-בית ה'). For the decreased prestige of the priesthood in the Second Temple period, see D. Schwartz, “Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifice: Opposition and Spiritualization in the Late Second Temple Period,” (Ph.D. Diss.; Hebrew University, 1979), 14–25. He cites three formal factors as causative: The high priest was not anointed, there was no longer access to the Urim and Thummim, and the high priest (from Menelaus on) lacked Zadokite lineage.

¹⁷ Following the interpretation of J. Tromp (*The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* [SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993], 181–183) against the view of D. Schwartz (“The Tribes of *As. Mos.* 4:7–9,” *JBL* 99 [1980]: 217–223) that the cause of sadness here is the geographical distance between the “two tribes,” who he thinks still reside in Babylon, and the temple. Tromp’s conclusion is supported by J. Goldstein (“The Testament of Moses: Its Content, Its Origin, and Its Attestation in Josephus,” in *Studies on the Testament of Moses* [ed. G. Nickelsburg; SCS 4; Cambridge [Mass.]: SBL, 1973], 49), who views the phrase *tristes et gementes* as making use of *Ezek* 9:4 (Vulgate: *gementes et dolentes*). In that context, those “words refer to the scrupulous minority, scandalized over the abominations of the majority.”

¹⁸ *Sanh.* 9:6. The translation is from H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 397.

Qumranites the line between the two is often blurred.¹⁹ According to the Bible, the sources of the former type of impurity are usually natural, bodily, or related to cultic acts. The latter type, however, derives from the performance of wicked acts, particularly sins related to the social realm.²⁰ While the defilement of the temple, and indeed the entire land, is brought about by moral impurity according to the Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26), chapters 1–16 of Leviticus champion the view that temple defilement is caused strictly by ritual impurity.

The following survey of specific complaints is by no means exhaustive, but rather intends to set the most important accusations leveled by the Qumranites within the context of broader non-sectarian grievances against the temple establishment. By treating the critical attitudes of the Qumranites toward the temple alongside those of their ancestors and contemporaries, we will gain a better understanding of the specific social context that nurtured sectarian hopes for an eschatological priesthood.

Moral Impurity

*Sexual Misconduct*²¹

One of the most frequent complaints against the priests is their introduction of impurity into the temple by means of sexual transgression. This includes both intermarriage and violation of certain laws found in Leviticus 15 and 18. As for the former, priestly exogamy appears in Ezra 10:18, Neh 13:29, *ALD* 16–17, *T. Levi* 14:6, 4QMMT B 75–82, and perhaps *BW*.²² To be sure, there is no indication in the Torah that marriage with a Gentile causes impurity of any sort.²³ However, by the time of

¹⁹ For the blurring of ritual and moral impurity at Qumran, see Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 27–30. For the distinction between ritual and moral impurity from the Hebrew Bible through Tanaaitic times, as well as a defense of the use of such categories, which never appear in the ancient sources, see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, passim. His comments on Qumran appear in pp. 67–91.

²⁰ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 21–42.

²¹ In classifying sexual misconduct under moral rather than ritual impurity, my interpretation is in harmony with Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 43–60.

²² Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 231, notes several parallels between *1 Enoch* 12–16 and the last chapters of Ezra. See also Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 21–28, who argues that the criticism of the Jerusalem priests in *BW* is a criticism of priests who marry women from lay families. From the perspective of the author, she argues, this represented intermarriage. She brings the possibly similar attitudes of *ALD* 15–17 and 4QMMT B 75–82 as support.

²³ See, e.g., Exod 34:15–16; Deut 7:3.

the restoration the connection begins to be made. Malachi states that “Judah has profaned what is holy to the Lord (חלל יהודה קדש ה')—what He desires—and espoused daughters of alien gods” (2:11).²⁴ Similarly, Ezra’s prayer links intermarriage to impurity:

Now, what can we say in the face of this, O our God, for we have forsaken your commandments, which you gave us through your servants the prophets when you said, “The land that you are about to possess is an unclean land (ארץ נדה היא) through the uncleanness of the peoples of the land through their abhorrent practices (בגדת עמי הארצות בתועבתיהם) with which they, in their impurity (בטמאתם), have filled it from one end to the other. Now then do not give your daughters in marriage to their sons or let their daughters marry your sons.” (Ezra 9:10–12)

Although the exhortation against intermarriage at the end of the passage is parallel to Deut 7:3, the prophetic pronouncement to which Ezra alludes is unknown. However, as several commentators note, it is very close to Lev 18:24–25 of the Holiness Code, which, after listing a number of immoral sex acts such as incest, intercourse with a menstruant, bestiality, and homosexuality, concludes: “Do not become defiled (אל תטמאו) with all of these, for with all these have the nations become defiled (נטמאו הגוים), which I shall expel before you. And the land became impure . . . (ותטמא הארץ).” The echo of Leviticus 18 in Ezra’s prayer reveals that his concern is moral rather than ritual impurity.²⁵ Furthermore, it is noteworthy that Ezra’s use of the word נדה to denote moral impurity matches the program of the Holiness Code, which in Lev 20:21 expands the use of the term נדה to include morally impure incestuous relations. However, in Leviticus 1–16, נדה denotes only the ritual impurity of menstrual blood.²⁶

The connection between intermarriage and moral impurity becomes even more explicit in the Hellenistic period. As we observed above (chapter two), according to the author of *Jubilees*, the sin of intermarriage

²⁴ Schwartz (“Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifice,” 84) interprets Judah here as “not referring specifically to that tribe” but rather as a figurative reference to priests due to the context—Malachi 1 and 2 contrast evil and ideal priests. J. O’Brien, *Priest and Levite in Malachi* (SBLDS 121; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 121–123, claims that this verse deals only with idolatry, but considering the proximity of this passage to the social context mentioned by Ezra and Nehemiah, as well as the language, intermarriage cannot be ruled out as a possible referent.

²⁵ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 44, also hears an echo of Ezekiel 36 in Ezra’s prayer. In this, he follows the observation of A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century* (London: Oxford University Press, 1928), 215.

²⁶ See esp. Leviticus 15. See Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, passim, who believes that Leviticus 1–16 is earlier than the Holiness Code. For his reclassification of pentateuchal material belonging to P and H, see *ibid.*, pp. 8–110, and esp. the chart on pp. 104–106.

defiles not only the individual involved but the temple itself (*Jub.* 30:15–16).²⁷ According to the *ex eventu* review of history in the proto-sectarian 4QApocryphon of Moses C, the prediction that Israel will “defile my temple” (מקדשי יטמאו) appears in close proximity to the charge that they “will profane their offsp[ring] with fo[reign]ers” (את [יחלל]ו [את] ובבני נכר [יחלל]ו את) (זרע קדיש ורעך הך קודשא) (4Q390 2 I, 9–10).²⁸ In a similar vein, in *ALD* Levi is warned by Isaac:

Beware my son of all fornication and impurity and of all harlotry (מן כל פחזו וטמאה ומן כל זנות). And marry a woman from my family and do not defile your seed with harlots, since you are holy seed, and sanctify your seed like the holy place (זרע קדיש אנת וקדיש ורעך הך קודשא) (16–17)

It is unclear whether the word “harlots” (זניאן)²⁹ refers here only to women of non-Israelite stock or if it also includes lay Israelite women.³⁰ If the latter, then *ALD* shares the tradition preserved in the early sectarian document 4QMMT (B 75–82), which likely considers the “intermarriage” of priests and Israelites to be זנות that pollutes the “[holy] seed” (ומטמאי[ם]) (את זרע [הקודש]).³¹ A similar ruling may be preserved in 4QHalakha A

²⁷ For further examples of sexual sin as morally defiling in *Jubilees*, see 4:22; 7:21–22; 20:3–5; 30:3; 33:7; 33:18–20. On the use of the Holiness Code in *Jubilees*, see Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 61–63.

²⁸ D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 91–116, dates this document to the second century BCE at the latest. Due to its conceptual proximity to Qumranite notions of history, yet lack of distinctive sectarian terminology, she deems it “related, but not identical, to the sectarian literature” (p. 112).

²⁹ The Greek reads πολλῶν, a corruption that Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 160) emend to πορνῶν.

³⁰ On the expansion of the meaning of the term זנות in Second Temple texts and its use as a social boundary marker, see J. Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 135–138.

³¹ Scholarly discussion of this passage has been extensive. Here I follow the conclusions of Qimron in Qimron and Strugnell, DJD X, 171–175 and Himmelfarb, “Levi, Phinehas,” 6–11. However, 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. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 135–136, believes the text too murky for such a positive conclusion. See also in the same volume, L. Grabbe, “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society,” 103, n. 54. Alternatively, C. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 82–89, argues that 4QMMT is here referring to the marriage of priests to women of Gentile descent who had converted to Judaism. So too Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the

(4Q251) 177.³² Whatever the case, the fact that the sanctity of the priestly seed is directly equated with the sanctity of the “holy place” draws an unequivocal link between the moral sin of exogamy and temple defilement (cf. *T. Levi* 14:5–15:1). A similar concern may underlie 4QTestament of Qahat 1 I, 5–9: “Do not give your inheritance to foreigners or your heritage to scoundrels ... be holy and pure from all mingling” (ואל [תתנו ירותתכון לנכראין ואחסנותכון לכילאין ... והוא קד[י]שין מן כול [ער]בובי).

A further noteworthy sexual sin is mentioned in *Pss. Sol.* 8:13: “They trampled the altar of the Lord [coming] from all kinds of uncleanness, and with menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common meat.”³³ The subjects here are priests who had had contact with menstruants but had not purified themselves prior to performing sacrifice and eating sanctified meat.³⁴ As in *Lev* 15:31, disobedience to the laws of menstrual purity leads to the sullying of the temple. As noted above, the observance of these particular laws in relation to temple defilement appears to have been a major concern of the author of *BW* almost two hundred years earlier (see *1 En.* 15:3–4). Moreover, from *CD* 4–5 we learn that a similar problem also concerned the Qumran community. *CD* 4:15–18 quotes the assessment of “Levi son of Jacob” that Israel has been entrapped by Belial and committed the three grave sins of fornication, arrogance, and defilement of the sanctuary (הראשונה היא

Fragments of the Aramaic Levi Document from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery,” in *Reworking the Bible*, 180. However, see the critique of this position in Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 27.

³² That line reads: “A man may not marry his un[married] daughter [to a non-priest” (אל יקה איש בתו[נ] ערה לאיש זר). According to the DJD editors (E. Larson, M. Lehmann, and L. Schiffman, in J. Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4XXV: Halakhic Texts* [DJD XXXV: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999], 46), “this appears to be a law against marrying off one’s daughter to a non-Jew or against a priest marrying off his daughter to a non-priest.” See also the laconic 4QOrdinances^b (4Q513) 2 II, which refers to “fornication” (זנות), the sexual union of female priests with foreigners (בעלות לבני הנכר), “pure (food) of holiness,” (טהרת [הק]דוש), eating “from all the heave offerings of the[” (מכול תרומת ה[ן]) and “guilt by their profaning” (אשמה בחללם). It appears then, that this unclear text may be interpreted as a rebuke of priests who engage in intermarriage and perhaps other illicit sexual unions and are therefore banned from eating the *terumah* offering and touching the sacred purities. See J. Baumgarten “Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 393–395; L. Schiffman, *Rule of the Community* (PTSDSSP 1), 159, nn. 12, 14; K. Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon’s Historical Background and Social Setting*, (JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 70–71.

³³ Translation from Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 56.

³⁴ In *Pss. Sol.* 1:8; 2:3; and 8:26, the desecration is attributed to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In these instances the priests are surely included, though not singled out.

הזנות השנייה ההון השלישית טמא המקדש).³⁵ While זנות in this difficult passage is equated with polygamy and perhaps remarriage after divorce (CD 4:20–5:2),³⁶ the sin of טמא המקדש is more fully explained in CD 5:6–8:

And they also continuously polluted the sanctuary by not separating according to the Torah, and they habitually lay with a woman who sees blood of flowing (גם הם מטמאים את המקדש אשר אין הם מבדיל כתורה ושוכבים עם) (הרואה את דם זובה); and they marry each one his brother's daughter or sister's daughter (ולוקחים איש את בת אחיהם ואת בת אחותו).

As numerous scholars note, the first charge must refer to a sectarian dispute over the interpretation of the biblical laws pertaining to menstruants,³⁷ while the second condemns those who allow incestuous uncle-niece marriages.³⁸ Apparently each of these transgressions was perceived as causing temple impurity.³⁹ But the question of exactly why this should be the case has vexed scholars. Indeed, Davies has claimed that the passage as it stands makes little sense since it “condemns as defilement of the sanctuary an activity which really has nothing to do with the sanctuary

³⁵ J. Greenfield, “The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15–19,” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 319–322, claims that CD is quoting the words of Isaac to Levi in *ALD* 16–17 (which we have just cited above). He thus emends CD's second sin, הרהין, to read הפחו, in line with *ALD*. Schwartz, *Damascus Document* (PTSDSSP 2), 19, n. 38, incorrectly point out that the *ALD* fragment records Levi's warning to his children. In fact, it records Isaac's warning to Levi. Thus, even if we accept Greenfield's emendation, the author of CD has put Isaac's words into the mouth of a different speaker. It seems more likely that the quotation was taken from an unknown Levi apocryphon similar to *T. Levi*. For polemics against fornication, greed, and defilement of the temple put in the mouth of Levi in *T. Levi*, see 14:6; 15:1; 17:11.

³⁶ For a handy summary and bibliography of the scholarly debate on the meaning of זנות here, see Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 82–83, 86.

³⁷ See most recently, P. Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst for Division* (STDJ 65; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 299: “It is inconceivable that the Pharisees and the Sadducees did not follow the biblical menstrual purity rules; we must assume that their rules were considered too lenient in comparison with the stricter Qumran rules, whose boundaries we can only guess at.” For a suggestion as to the precise issue at the heart of the dispute, see E. Regev, “Were All the Priests the Same? Qumranic Halakhah in Comparison with Sadducean Halakhah,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 182; idem “On Blood, Impurity and Body Perception in the Halakhic Schools in the Second Temple and Talmudic Period,” *AJSR* 27 (2003): 1–23 (Hebrew section). See also Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 68–69.

³⁸ As Ginzberg (*An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 23–24) notes, this contradicts the normative rabbinic view found in *b. Yeb.* 62b. Perhaps the condemnation of incestuous relations found in Unidentified Fragment A (*olim* 4Q387 5) is related to this charge. See further, Dimant, *DJD XXX*, 197–199.

³⁹ Could such concerns also underlie the priestly defilement apparently resulting from sexual impropriety (זנות) mentioned in 4QOrdinances^b 2 II?

at all.”⁴⁰ If we claim that the defilement was caused by a person who had contact with a menstruant and subsequently entered the temple,⁴¹ that still leaves the incestuous uncle-niece marriages unaccounted for.⁴² Recently, Jonathan Klawans has offered a plausible interpretation of the data: “The two sexual sins—sexual contact with an impure woman, and incest—are listed as examples of sanctuary defilement precisely because these sexual sins defile the sanctuary, *morally*.”⁴³ He supports this assertion by appealing to the fact that both of these sexual sins appear in the Holiness Code (Lev 18:19, 13) as sources of moral defilement, and that CD particularly draws on Holiness Code traditions. The fact that CD has expanded the biblical prohibition of aunt-nephew marriages by logical deduction does nothing to alter this fundamental point. Moreover, the prohibition of polygamy / remarriage after divorce is not included at this particular juncture as an example of temple defilement because there is no biblical hint that such activities cause moral impurity.⁴⁴ If the meaning of *וְיִטְמְאוּ אֶת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ* in CD 20:23 is to be taken in the same specific sense, then these two perceived sexual crimes were serious enough to motivate the house of Peleg to leave Jerusalem (20:22–23).⁴⁵

While the specific mention of “the altar” in *Pss. Sol.* 8:13 identifies the culprits as priests, CD 4 charges all of “Israel” with these sins. However, since the author is citing polemical words of Levi very similar to those known to us from Levi apocrypha, it appears that he is adapting “material originally directed against the priesthood to an exegesis of Isa 24:17 aimed at criticizing the practices of the nation at large.”⁴⁶ Thus, despite the broadened frame of reference, the criticism of defilement by menstrual impurity no doubt would have also conjured images of the wayward priesthood for the Qumranites. This interpretation is bolstered by

⁴⁰ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 110. See also idem, “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 289.

⁴¹ For entrance into the temple in a state of impurity as a cause of sanctuary defilement, see Num 19:20.

⁴² Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, 158, n. 22, does away with this question with the unlikely suggestion that uncle-niece marriages represent a second example of *נוֹרָה*, the first of the three “snares” mentioned in CD 4:15–18.

⁴³ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 54. This explanation need not apply to the reference to menstrual impurity in *Pss. Sol.* 8, which may be complaining about ritual impurity.

⁴⁴ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 54–56.

⁴⁵ On the various possible identifications of this group, see R. Ratzlaff, “Peleg, House of,” *EDSS* 2:641–642.

⁴⁶ S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 394.

the portrayal of the acts of the Wicked Priest in Peshar Habbakuk. Interpreting Hab 2:17, “By the city’s blood amid the pillages of the land” (מדמי) (קרייה והמס ארץ),⁴⁷ 1QpHab 12:7–9 reads: “The ‘town’ is Jerusalem, where the Wicked Priest committed abominable deeds and defiled God’s sanctuary” (הקרייה היא ירושלים אשר פעל בה הכוהן הרשע מעשי תועבות ויטמא את) (מקדש אל). Here, the defilement of the temple by the Wicked Priest, who is almost certainly to be taken as a Hasmonean ruler, is related to crimes associated with blood. As William Brownlee points out, this text recalls Ezek 22:1–12, in which Jerusalem is termed עיר הדמים due to the bloody crimes perpetrated within it.⁴⁸ While murder is given a prominent place in that passage, the crime of contact with menstruants also appears. Considering this parallel from Ezekiel and the passage from CD cited above, the charge here likely conjured up images of temple defilement caused by menstrual impurity.

In a similar vein, 1QpHab 8:12–13 elaborates on the atrocities of the Wicked Priest as follows: “He pursued abominable behavior with every kind of defiling impurity” (ודרכי ת[ו]עבות פעל בכל גדת טמאה). Of course, the term גדה in its most specific sense refers to menstrual impurity (Lev 15:19–24; Ezek 22:10). However, it would be a mistake to limit the charges against the Wicked Priest in this passage so specifically since the terms גדה and תועבה, as in the Holiness Code and the book of Ezra, are used in an expanded sense at Qumran. In fact, throughout Qumran literature these terms are used “with reference not to any sin in particular, but to grave sin in general.”⁴⁹ Indeed, as we shall presently see, there was a pronounced inclination at Qumran to view all transgressions and immorality as causing impurity.⁵⁰

Non-Sexual Misconduct

An impressive variety of sources condemns the Second Temple priesthood for its moral depravity beyond the realm of sex. Popular charges

⁴⁷ Translation follows W. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 196. MT reads: מדמי אדם והמס ארץ קרייה וכל ישיבי בה. For a suggestion regarding the exegetical strategy of the pesherist’s intentional alteration of the MT, see Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 205.

⁴⁸ Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 206.

⁴⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 70. Indeed, while 1QpHab 8:9–13 charges the Wicked Priest with arrogance, apostasy, greed, and theft, there is no explicit reference to sexual sin.

⁵⁰ B. Nitzan, *Megillat Peshar Habbakuk* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 179. She cites as examples: CD 3:17; 6:15; 11:20–21; 1QS 3:4–6; 4:10, 21; cf. *Jub.* 21:21; 23:14.

in this category include such offences as greed, theft, apostasy, violence, and arrogance.⁵¹ As we have just noted, the Qumranites viewed such immorality as a source of impurity. However, they were not the inventors of this conviction, but rather the inheritors of a long tradition reaching back to the Hebrew Bible.⁵² According to Jacob Milgrom, the biblical notion that sin pollutes the altar, even from afar, lies behind the rationale for the laws of the *קטאת* (“purification”) sacrifice, which is meant to purify not the sinner but rather God’s altar from the deleterious effects of sin.⁵³ Indeed, according to the Holiness Code and other biblical traditions, the three grave sins of bloodshed, idolatry, and sexual immorality are capable of defiling not only God’s sanctuary, but also the entire land of Israel.⁵⁴ (This perspective is to be distinguished from that of Leviticus 1–16, which, for the most part, posits a radical separation between the realms of purity and morality).⁵⁵ The pollution caused by these sins represents a permanent danger unless repentance is undertaken and sacrifice is offered. Expanding on this tradition, various proto-sectarian texts testify to the belief that immorality beyond the three grave sins mentioned above defiles the temple. For example, according to the *ex eventu* prophecy of 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C, Israel will be delivered into the hands of the “sons of Aaron,” “the priests of Jerusalem” who will act wickedly, and commit idolatry (4Q390 1 3; 4Q387 2 III, 6). During this evil period, Israel

⁵¹ Greed and theft: *Jub.* 23:21; 2 Mac 4:32–33, 39, 42; *Pss. Sol.* 8:12; *As. Mos.* 5:5–6; *T. Levi* 14:5; 17:11; 4Q390 2 I, 8–9; 1QpHab; 9:4–6; 12:10; 4QpNah 3–4 I, 11; CD 6:15–16; Josephus, *Ant.* 20.8.8; 20.9.2; *b. Pes.* 57a; 85a (cf. *m. Gittin* 5:4); *t. Men.* 13:18–20 (= *t. Zeb.* 11:16); *m. Sheqal.* 1:4. Apostasy: 4Q387 2 III, 6; 4QpNah 3–4 II, 9; 2 Mac 4:11–15; *T. Levi* 17:11; *As. Mos.* 5:3. Violence: *Jub.* 23:20; 4Q390 2 I, 10; *T. Levi* 17:11; CD 6:18; 1QpHab 11:4–6; 12:6; 4QpNah 3–4 I, 11–12. Arrogance: *Pss. Sol.* 17:8, 26, 46; 1QpHab. 8:10; *b. Pes.* 57a; *m. ‘Ed.* 8:3.

⁵² See E. Regev, “Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran,” *DSD* 10 (2003):262–263, who compares moral pollution in ancient Judaism to the phenomenon of *miasma* in ancient Greek religion.

⁵³ J. Milgrom, *Leviticus, 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; Doubleday: New York, 1991), 254–269; idem, “Israel’s Sanctuary: The Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray,” *RB* 83 (1976): 390–399. Milgrom’s theory is not universally accepted. See, e.g., J. Gammie, *Holiness in Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 38–41. However, his basic observation regarding the defiling force of sin has not been refuted. For more on Milgrom’s theory, see P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*, (JSOTSup 106; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 155–160.

⁵⁴ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 15.

⁵⁵ See Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 87–92.

will have done evil in my eyes, and what I did not want they will have chosen: to pursue wealth and gain (להתגבר להון ולבצע) [and violence, ea]ch robbing (יגזול) that which belongs to his neigh[b]our, and oppressing (ויעשוק) each other. They will defile my temple (יטמאו מקדשי), [they will profane my Sabbaths,] they will for[ge]t my[fes]tivals, and with fo[reign]ers [t]he[y] will profane their offspr[ing]. Their priests will commit violence (כוהניהם יהמסו).⁵⁶ (4Q390 2 I, 8–10)

It is noteworthy that the defilement of the temple is never associated with matters of ritual impurity but rather only with sinful behavior. While the immorality of the priests is at the forefront of the blame for temple defilement, the possessive pronoun at the end of כוהניהם (l. 10) ensures that the sins are here envisioned as committed by all of Israel. 4Q390 2 I, 8–9 finds an almost exact verbal parallel in *Jub.* 23:21.⁵⁷ That verse laments the desecration of the holy of holies as follows:

Those who escape will not turn from their wickedness to the right way because all of them will elevate themselves for (the purpose of) cheating and through wealth so that one takes everything that belongs to another. They will mention the great name but neither truly nor rightly. They will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination.

Once again, immorality, not ritual laxity, is viewed as the cause of temple defilement. If naming the “great name” refers to the pronunciation of God’s name in the priestly blessing (Num 6:27) or on the Day of Atonement (*m. Yoma* 6:2), then the culprits here are priests, most likely those in power during the Hellenistic crisis. Even according to the Temple Scroll, which is concerned primarily with expanding and intensifying the Bible’s rubrics of *ritual* purity, the moral sin of bribery “causes great guilt, and defiles the temple (ומטמא הבית) with the sin of iniquity” (51:14–15).⁵⁸

The fact that so many non-sectarian texts (which, judging from their heavy influence on sectarian thought and the large numbers of copies discovered at Qumran, were of great import to the Qumranites,) draw the connection between the immoral acts of the priesthood and temple defilement shows that the Qumran community was well aware of and interested in this notion. Indeed, the passages from Peshier Habakkuk cited above (8:8–13; 12:7–10) show that they accepted it as well.⁵⁹ Sig-

⁵⁶ Following the text and translation of Dimant, DJD XXX, 245–246.

⁵⁷ Dimant, DJD XXX, 111.

⁵⁸ Thus, Himmelfarb’s claim (*A Kingdom of Priests*, 92) that there is an “absence of any association of impurity with sin in the Temple Scroll” is in need of correction. For a suggestion regarding the exegetical basis upon which 11QT connects bribery with temple defilement, see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 50–52.

⁵⁹ See Regev, “Abominated Temple,” 257; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 69–72.

nificantly, the Wicked Priest's defilement of the temple is not explicitly related there to any bodily or ritualistic impurity, but rather to his sins of arrogance (רם לבו), apostasy (ויעזוב את אל ויבגוד בחוקים), greed (ויקבוץ הון), and theft (גזל הון אביינים).⁶⁰ It appears that the Damascus Document was also particularly sensitive to the sin of theft:

And all who were brought into the covenant (are) not to enter the sanctuary to light his altar in vain, (but rather are) to be "closers of the door" of whom God said, "Who of you will close my door and not light my altar in vain?"—unless they take care to perform according to the exact requirements of the Torah during the time of evil and to separate (themselves) from the sons of the pit (ולהבדל מבני השחת) and to refrain from the wicked wealth (which is) impure due to oath(s) and dedication(s) and to (being) the wealth of the sanctuary, (for) they (the sons of the pit) steal from the poor of his people (ולהגזור מהון הרשעה הטמא בנדר ובהרם ובהון המקדש ולגזול את) (עניי עמו), preying upon wid[ow]s and murdering orphans. (CD 6:11–17)

Admittedly there is no explicit mention of temple defilement here, but the juxtaposition of a prohibition against entering the temple and offering sacrifice there with the accusation that the temple's wealth derives from theft and is thus impure implies as much.⁶¹ It is possible that the author held that the sacrifices that were purchased with this impure money were also contaminated and thus polluted the temple.⁶² At any rate, the charge of theft is reminiscent of that against the Wicked Priest, but here it is leveled against בני השחת, sinful outsiders who are destined for destruction. According to the Rule of the Community, such deceitful outsiders and all of their property (אותם ואת כול אשר להם) are a source of impurity (טמא בכול הונו[ם]) and therefore must be avoided by community members (להבדל מכול אנשי העול; 1QS 5:10–20).⁶³ Indeed, according to

⁶⁰ As observed above, the characterization of his offences with the term נדה is best taken in the expanded sense of the term occurring throughout sectarian literature of grave sinfulness in general. See, e.g., 1QS 4:10, 22; 5:19; 11:14; CD 3:17; 1QH^a 4:31; 9:24; 19:14.

⁶¹ Davies ("The Ideology of the Temple," 287–301) believes that this passage still allows those who accept the temple's regulations to enter and participate in the cult. However, if the wealth, oaths, and sacrifices of the temple are thought to be tainted, how can partial participation be justified? It seems far more likely that the prohibition here is absolute.

⁶² Suggested by Regev, "Abominated Temple," 258. Cf. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 129.

⁶³ As Hultgren (*From the Damascus Covenant*, 293, n. 138) notes, this is strikingly parallel to the language of separation utilized in CD 6:14–15. In fact, in a Cave 4 version of D (4Q266 3 II, 20–21) the language is even closer to the אנשי העול of 1QS 5—community members are likely warned to separate from בני העול rather than בני השחת (Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 41). Regarding the text of the Rule of the Community, cf. 4QS^b and 4QS^d, which are much shorter. That the text is calling for separation of community

1QS 8:13 it appears that the Qumranites perceived this consideration as a justifiable cause for secession from their sinful contemporaries: “They shall separate themselves from the dwelling of the men of deceit in order to walk into the wilderness to prepare there the way of the Lord.” While the temple of Jerusalem was defiled for the time being, the Qumran community retreated to study and fulfill the correct interpretation of the law in the wilderness so that it could assume the characteristics of the true and pure atoning temple (see esp. 1QS 8–9). There, in conformity with the strictest rules of moral and ritual purity, it awaited the messianic age, when it would return triumphant to the “wilderness of Jerusalem” and once again participate in the purified cult (1QM 1:3; 2:1–6).⁶⁴ We shall return to Qumranite attitudes toward the Jerusalem temple and the community’s self-perception as a temple in exile below.

The above observations give rise to the possibility that the original catalyst for the separation of the Qumran community from the temple and Judean society in general was at its heart a matter of moral defilement. Central to the consideration of this possibility in recent years has been the discussion surrounding 4QMMT. Six copies of this seminal yet very fragmentary document were discovered in Cave 4, dating from approximately 75 BCE to 50 CE, although the content and tone suggest a date of composition somewhere in the middle of the second century.⁶⁵ The text appears to be a letter written by the leaders of the nascent Qumran community to the leaders of the temple establishment of Jerusalem,⁶⁶ most

members from outsiders, and not novices or members banished due to transgressions (cf. 1QS 6:16–17; 8:23) is indicated by the fact that the closest subject is the אנשי העזר of 5:10. See further, Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 286, n. 123.

⁶⁴ D. Schwartz, “Temple and Desert: On Religion and State in Second Temple Period Judaea,” in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 37. Cf. F. Schmidt, *La pensée du Temple: de Jérusalem à Qoumrân* (Paris: Les Éditions du Seuil, 1994), 134–141.

⁶⁵ Qimron supports this dating with numerous lexical, literary, and historical arguments in DJD X, 109–121.

⁶⁶ Strugnell expresses doubts about the identification of 4QMMT as an epistle in DJD X, 205; idem, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 70–73. S. Fraade raises the possibility that MMT may have been intended only for intra-communal consumption and composed in the late Hasmonean period. See idem, “To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s),” *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–526. See also M. Grossman, “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History,” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 3–22. For further possible motivations underlying the composition of MMT, see H. von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (STDJ 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 235. However, the fact that the document centers on halakhic disputes with an external group, the leader of which is addressed in a direct and personal manner, leaves little room to doubt that it

likely headed by a Hasmonean high priest who followed the legal rulings of the Pharisees.⁶⁷ It outlines about twenty halakhic disputes in matters of temple cult and sacrificial law (section B), followed by a homiletical conclusion, which presumably aims to convince the addressee(s) to follow the interpretations of the Torah just set forth by the authors (section C).⁶⁸ Written in a polemical yet conciliatory tone, it gives the distinct sense that if only the addressee(s) would accept the halakhic suggestions of the addressors, peace could be made between the two groups. Since most, if not all, of the legal disputes have to do with ritual impurity, it is implied that the ritual defilement of the temple is at stake.⁶⁹ It thus appears that the authors of MMT have already decided to temporarily boycott the temple (although it is unclear whether this required a withdrawal from Jerusalem). This interpretation dovetails nicely with the view that the purpose of MMT was for the early leadership of the Qumran community “to call on . . . the Hasmonean leader to effect a reconciliation that would allow them to return to their role in the Temple.”⁷⁰ Indeed, as we have noted, even after generations of separation from the temple cult, the Qumranites awaited the day when they could again participate in the reconstituted cult in the messianic age.⁷¹

Beyond MMT’s adamant attention toward ritual impurity, section C appears to refer to matters of moral depravity. In a very fragmentary section that mentions the words “and concerning the wome[n] (וְעַל הַנְּשִׂיִם)”,

was composed as a letter (regardless of whether or not it was actually sent). Cf. Regev, “Abominated Temple,” 252, n. 33.

⁶⁷ So Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 87–88; M. Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 323 (Hebrew); E. Regev, “Yose ben Yoezer and the Qumran Sectarrians on Purity Laws: Agreement and Controversy,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998* (ed. J. Baumgarten, E. Chazon, and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 106–107.

⁶⁸ See L. Schiffman, “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 94–97.

⁶⁹ E. Regev, “The Temple Impurity and Qumran’s ‘Foreign Affairs’ in the Early Hasmonean Period,” *Zion* 64 (1999): 135–156; idem, “Abominated Temple,” 245–249, argues that the laws of MMT all have to do with the ritual purity of the temple, which the authors saw as compromised by the priestly establishment. Cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 189, n. 28.

⁷⁰ Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 84. See idem, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” in *BA* 53 (1990): 64–73; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 256; Regev, “Abominated Temple,” 253.

⁷¹ See esp. 1QM 2:1–6.

“treachery” (מעל), “malice” (חמס), and “fornication” (זנות; C 4–5),⁷² the author cites Deut 7:26, which warns against bringing “an abomination in[to your house]” (ל ביתכה תביא תועבה א; לוא; C 6).⁷³ As Qimron and Strugnell note, the restored word ביתכה may refer to the temple in this context.⁷⁴ In this case the sinful characteristics listed just above might be seen as the cause of temple defilement. Moreover, in the continuation of the text the authors inform us:

We have separated ourselves from the multitude of the peo[ple] (פרשנו מרוב) [העם] [and from all their impurity] and from being involved with these matters (מהתערב בדברים האלה) and from participating with [them] in these things. And you [know that no] treachery or deceit or evil can be found in our hand (לוא ימצא בידנו מעל ושקר ורעה). (C 7–9)

On the basis of this passage, Hanan Eshel suggests that it was not the disputes over ritual impurity in section B that caused the author’s group to separate itself, but rather “due to other reasons that probably had to do with the hellenization of Jerusalem.”⁷⁵ Expanding on Eshel’s line of reasoning, Eyal Regev has recently argued that like Peshet Habakkuk, MMT provides evidence that the Qumranites separated from the Jerusalem establishment because they believed that the temple had been defiled due to *moral* impurity.⁷⁶

This reading of MMT is unconvincing for several reasons. First, it is tenuous to arrive at such a conclusion on the basis of a few fragmentary lines, especially when the bulk of the document is concerned with intricate matters of ritual purity. While it is true that the word מעל (C 4, 9) may at times be used in the sectarian scrolls to indicate general moral transgressions,⁷⁷ the overall tenor of the document indicates that the term should be translated more literally as “misappropriation of holy property” (cf. Lev 5:15).⁷⁸ Secondly, the irenic tone of the document as well

⁷² Translation of these terms follows Qimron and Strugnell, DJD X, 59.

⁷³ See M. Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 47, who claims that in the continuation in l. 7, התועבה שנואה היא, Deut 7:26 is being read harmonistically with Deut 12:31, which contains both תועבה and שוא.

⁷⁴ Qimron and Strugnell, DJD X, 58, n. 6.

⁷⁵ H. Eshel, “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 60–61.

⁷⁶ Regev, “Abominated Temple,” 243–278.

⁷⁷ Regev, “Abominated Temple,” 250, n. 28, cites as examples CD 20:23 and 1QH^a 19:14.

⁷⁸ So D. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 76; H. Eshel, “4QMMT and the History,” 60, n. 24 (following the suggestion of J. Kugel).

as the strong plea to the ruler in section C to accept their legal interpretations indicates that the authors wished to participate once again at a properly regulated temple and that the basis of the dispute was halakhic. Presumably, if their legal opinions on these matters had been accepted, the conflict would have ended then and there. On the other hand, if the separation described in section C had been perceived as due to moral defilement of the temple, then the only solution to such defilement would have been for the offenders to repent from their sins.⁷⁹ However, MMT never even hints at a call for moral repentance.⁸⁰ Thus, the authors' claim that they have separated from the ריב העם is better viewed as an attempt to convince the addressees of their religious sincerity—they have separated themselves from the abominable behavior of the multitude of the people and are therefore to be taken seriously.⁸¹ Indeed, it seems plausible that their use of the verb פָּרַשׁ in this context is intended as a positive comparison with the pious Pharisaic addressees (פָּרוּשִׁים) who may have been running the temple at the time.⁸²

The fact that Peshar Habakkuk, part of CD's Admonition, and perhaps the Rule of the Community view the schism between the Qumranites and the temple establishment in terms of moral defilement should not automatically lead us to assume that MMT held the same opinion. The former documents were completed after the split with the Jerusalem establishment was final,⁸³ and as such they display the language and tone of full blown sectarian antagonism. These documents, colored by a sense of rejection and deep animosity, express perceptions of the Qumranites toward the schism with the temple establishment after the fact. As such, while they do pick up on the motif of moral defilement of the temple present in such proto-sectarian texts as *Jubilees*, 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C, and the Temple Scroll, they may not give accurate

⁷⁹ Cf. 1QS 3:4–9.

⁸⁰ See Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst*, 329, n. 260.

⁸¹ Schwartz, "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees," 79–80, identifies the ריב העם as the Sadducees. H. Eshel, "4QMMT and the History," 60, suggests that it was constituted by the followers of the Hellenized priests that later led the Sadducean party.

⁸² Schwartz, "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees," 77. On the tendency of sectarians to take pride in their detachment from the larger group, see A. Baumgarten, "Qumran and Jewish Sectarianism during the Second Temple Period," in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 142–143 (Hebrew).

⁸³ To be sure, parts of the Damascus Document, particularly the purity laws, appear to derive from a period prior to the split. See Hempel, *The Laws*, 26. She refrains from dating these laws precisely, noting only that they "lack explicit references to a particular organized community."

information regarding the *origins* of the schism.⁸⁴ Rather, their focus on moral defilement reflects the later, starkly dualistic worldview of the community according to which all outsiders were deemed part of Belial's lot and were considered not only morally perverse but also ritually impure. According to this system of thought, the true significance of impurity lies in its spiritual implications.⁸⁵ Both immorality and "filthy ways in unclean worship" characterize Belial and his lot (1QS 4:9–11), which is engaged in the constant cosmic struggle against God's lot, defined by "glorious purity" and "constant goodness" (1QS 4:2–8). The sectarian claims regarding separation from the defiled temple and all sinful outsiders thus have at their root the conviction that the current temple establishment and its followers are under the sway of Belial and the forces of darkness and are therefore permeated by a spirit of immorality and impurity. From this perspective ritual defilement and immorality are barely distinguishable, both symptomatic of the forces of darkness, and their "fierce struggle" (קִנְיַת רֵיב; 1QS 4:17–18) against the forces of light.

MMT on the other hand, represents a time when reconciliation with the establishment was still possible. The opponents of the authors are by no means portrayed as sons of deceit fated for destruction, but simply as misguided brethren who must reform a few aspects of their legal thinking. Furthermore, MMT shows no signs of lumping matters of ritual purity together with matters of immorality.⁸⁶ It thus provides a far less tainted view of the problems at the root of the Qumran community's schism with Jerusalem. From MMT it is clear that the dispute emanated from a disagreement over the interpretation of biblical rules of ritual

⁸⁴ This judgment includes the probable reference in 4Q177 5–6, 7–10 to the need of the community to separate "because of impurity that destroys with a grievous destruction" (Mic 2:10). See Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 277–285. As Steudel shows (*Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 207–210), 4Q177 may be dated precisely to somewhere between 71 and 63 BCE. Thus, the community's separation from the Jerusalem establishment had long since occurred.

⁸⁵ In this connection, it is instructive to observe the application of technical biblical purity language to spiritual states and processes in the description of the eschatological purification of humanity in the Treatise of the Two Spirits: "God will purify by his truth all the works of man and purge for himself the sons of man. He will utterly destroy the spirit of deceit from the veins of his flesh. He will purify him by the holy spirit (לְטָהֵר) (בְּרוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ) from all ungodly acts and sprinkle upon him the spirit of truth like waters of purification (וַיִּזְרֵם עָלָיו רוּחַ אֱמֶת כַּמֵּי נֹדָה), (to purify him) from all the abominations of falsehood and from being polluted by a spirit of impurity (מִכּוֹל תּוֹעֵבוֹת שֶׁקֶר וְהַתְּגַלְלִל בְּרוּחַ) (1QS 4:20–22)."

⁸⁶ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 90.

impurity.⁸⁷ The fact that MMT not only shares its intense concern with ritual purity with but also lies in the same stream of legal tradition as such early proto-sectarian texts as the Temple Scroll and some of the legal portions of the Damascus Document,⁸⁸ lends weight to the notion that these concerns were at the root of a second century schism.

Ritual Impurity

As with moral defilement, the charge that the Second Temple was ritually defiled may be traced back to the Persian period. For the most part, this type of accusation was focused either on disobedience to the rules of cultic service or the invasion of sources of ritual impurity (such as those defiled by menstruation, seminal discharge, skin disease, etc.) into the temple. For example, in the fifth century Malachi rails against the priests who despise God's name and defile his altar and table with unfit animal sacrifices and polluted bread (Mal 1:6–14). Some generations later, the *Animal Apocalypse*, alluding to Malachi's words, condemns the Second Temple cult, probably from its inception, stating that "all of the bread" on the Lord's table was "polluted and not pure" (1 En. 89:73).⁸⁹ More generally, the Damascus Document complains about a failure to "distinguish (להבדיל) between the pure and impure and make known (להודיע) (the difference) between the holy and the profane" (CD 12: 19–20).⁹⁰ Thanks to the discovery and publication of MMT, we can now

⁸⁷ So Qimron, DJD X, 175–176; H. Harrington, "Purity," EDSS 2:724; J. VanderKam, "Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 134; L. Schiffman, "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, 268. If the 364-day sectarian solar calendar of section A was original to the document, then it is possible that a calendaric dispute was also at issue. However, Strugnell (DJD X, 203) offers persuasive reasons to view it as a later appendage. I tend to agree with Schiffman's view ("The Place of 4QMMT," 82–86) that Section A is a later insertion by a Qumranite scribe who wished to attribute the acceptance of a 364-day solar calendar to the original authors of MMT. Strugnell's view (DJD X, 203) that the appendage is non-polemical in nature is also possible.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Schiffman, "The Place of 4QMMT," 86–94. For the all-Israel laws of D, see Hempel, *The Laws*, passim, esp. 26–72.

⁸⁹ Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses*, 182, sees it as a quote, as does Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 395.

⁹⁰ As Davies (*The Damascus Covenant*, 129–130) notes, the pairing of להבדיל and להודיע betrays a reference to Ezek 22:26: להבדיל בין קדש לחל לא להודיע. Significantly, that verse refers only to priests, whereas here in CD, the whole community, rather than the priesthood, is regarded as the true guardian of cultic purity.

affirm that the issue of ritual purity played a major role in the boycott of the temple by the early leadership of the Qumran community. The obsession with the purity status of the temple, its cult, and personal and communal purity throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls confirms that extreme concern for the temple and ritual purity continued to play a central role in the contemplative life at Qumran until the community's demise.⁹¹

Recent years have witnessed a welcomed trend in Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship to recognize the crucial importance of halakhah, particularly that pertaining to ritual purity, for the understanding of the Qumran community and its relationship to contemporaneous Jewish society.⁹² As such, much has been written recently regarding the halakhic matters found in MMT and related documents. Presently, I will limit myself to comments on the nature of the complaints about the laws of ritual impurity leveled by the Qumranites, and what they can tell us about the community. Then I will turn to the intimately related topics of sectarian attitudes toward the temple and the practice of ritual purity at Qumran.

MMT and Related Texts

As I have pointed out above, several of the rulings of MMT are paralleled by laws found in the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document. The parallels have been noted elsewhere and I shall not rehearse them here. However, it is worth noting that when they do occur, there is no demonstrable literary dependence of one text on the other.⁹³ The common legal tradition underlying these texts is characterized by a heightened strictness (in comparison with Pharisaic-rabbinic law) in matters of

⁹¹ For a broad list of Qumran writings related to purity, see H. Harrington, "The Halakah and Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 74–89. See also, I. Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

⁹² To be sure, the centrality of legal issues in the Scrolls was recognized early on by some scholars. See esp. S. Lieberman, "Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 395–404; idem, "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *JBL* 71 (1951): 199–206; C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957); idem, *The Zadokite Documents*. More recently, the work of J. Baumgarten and L. Schiffman has been especially important. See also the collections of articles edited by M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, and by S. Fraade, A. Shemesh, and R. Clements, *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003* (STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

⁹³ For a convenient survey, see Schiffman, "The Place of 4QMMT," 86–94.

ritual purity and sacrifice, and is thus often termed “priestly.”⁹⁴ With the full publication of MMT in the 1990’s, it became widely recognized that some of its rulings, such as the declarations that the red heifer must be burned by a completely pure priest (as opposed to a partially-pure *טבול יום*), that the bones of unclean animals are impure, and that the liquid stream poured from a pure vessel into an impure one renders the former impure, indeed coincide with Sadducean opinions recorded in the Mishnah that oppose those of the Pharisees and later Tannaim.⁹⁵ Similar rulings regarding the *טבול יום* and the impurity of the bones of unclean animals also appear in the Temple Scroll.⁹⁶ Mostly on the basis of these parallels, Sussmann and Schiffman argued that the Qumranites followed the legal system of the Sadducees.⁹⁷ Schiffman developed the argument further, claiming that the Qumranites had roots in Sadducean priestly circles.⁹⁸ However, as Regev, and more recently Heger, have shown, a fuller comparison of Sadducean and Qumranite halakhah reveals more important differences than similarities between the two groups.⁹⁹ Most

⁹⁴ See, e.g., D. Schwartz, “Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 229–240. For a case where rabbinic purity law is apparently more stringent than sectarian law, and a criticism of Schwartz, see Y. Elman, “Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition: or, When Is a Parallel Not a Parallel,” in *Reading 4QMMT*, 99–128.

⁹⁵ See other possible examples brought by Y. Sussmann, “The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in DJD X, 186–190 (Appendix 1). To be sure, even before the full publication of MMT, similarities between this “priestly” Qumran halakhah and that of the Sadducees reported in rabbinic literature were observed. See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:400–401; J. Baumgarten, “The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 157–160, 167; idem, “Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” 396–397.

⁹⁶ *טבול יום*: 11QT 45:9–10; 49:19–29; 51:2–5. Impurity of bones: 11QT 47:7–15.

⁹⁷ Sussman, “The History of the Halakha,” 195–196; L. Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period,” in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987* (ed. G. Brooke; *JSPSup* 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 239–255; idem, “The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 35–49. Cf. the discussion of Kister, “Studies,” 325–330.

⁹⁸ Schiffman, “The New ‘Halakhic Letter,’” 64–73.

⁹⁹ Regev, “Were All the Priests the Same?” 158–188, counts seven points of agreement and five points of disagreement between the two systems. See his chart on p. 182. See also the comments of Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst*, 296–302. For further statements against the location of Qumranite roots with the Sadducees, see J. Baumgarten, “Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 27–36; D. Dimant, “The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*, (ed. R. Kugler and E. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 55; eadem, “The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*,

significantly, it appears that the Sadducees accepted the luni-solar calendar observed by the Pharisees, whereas the Qumranites rejected it in favor of the 364-day solar calendar. This difference would have constituted a fundamental rift between the two groups in day to day life. It is thus more prudent to conclude that the overlaps between Sadducean and Qumranite halakhah represent the common conservative exegetical approach of similar groups that both came into conflict with and responded to the liberal exegetical techniques of the Pharisees in the Maccabean period and perhaps earlier.¹⁰⁰ Pending a thorough investigation of the scant material relating to pre-Qumran halakhah, it is presently difficult to say more than this.¹⁰¹

Parenthetically, it should be noted that the notion that a single “priestly” halakhic system was preserved at Qumran is difficult to maintain. It is true that beyond their shared rulings, there is a common interest in 11QT, 4QMMT, and 4QD in extending the purity laws of the Torah to make them more severe, with the result that protection against ritual defilement of the temple is increased and priestly holiness is, in a sense, extended to all Jews.¹⁰² However, as noted above, the phrasing of the laws in each document reveals no literary dependence from one to another. There are important differences in style, emphasis, and exegetical approach

174; Grabbe, “4QMMT and Second Temple Jewish Society,” 104–107; O. Betz, “The Qumran Halakhah Text *Miqsat Maasê ha-Tôrâh* (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition,” in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*, (ed. D. Beattie and M. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 179–182; Hempel, *The Laws*, 7.

¹⁰⁰ For an argument that the lack of the *טבול יום* concept in the Qumran texts does not constitute an anti-Pharisaic polemic, see M. Himmelfarb, “The Polemic against the *Tebul Yom*: A Reexamination,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, January 9–11 2005* (ed. E. Chazon, R. Clements, and B. Halpern-Amaru; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming). (Many thanks to Professor Himmelfarb for sharing this article with me prior to its publication.) However, due to the inordinate amount of space given to the instruction of waiting until evening after immersion to become fully pure in the Qumran purity texts, I am convinced that it is indeed intended as a polemic against the *טבול יום* concept. See further, Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 23.

¹⁰¹ A good start in this direction has recently been offered by Schiffman, with his proposed method of “triangulation.” See idem, “Pre-Maccabean Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 348–361. For further discussion of pre-Maccabean halakhah, see Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 296–303.

¹⁰² With regard to the extension of priestly holiness to the people in the Temple Scroll, see Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* 1:277–280, who follows the work of G. Alon. For the extension of priestly holiness in both the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document, see Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 85–114.

as well.¹⁰³ Most importantly, some of their purity laws appear to be at variance. One striking example concerns the purification of a man who has had a seminal emission, a form of impurity that is relatively mild and easy to remedy according to biblical standards. Leviticus 15:16–17 states that “when a man has an emission of semen” he merely needs to bathe his body in water and wait until evening to become pure. The discharge itself is a source of impurity, therefore clothing or leather which it has touched must be washed and remain impure until evening. However, the man who had the emission is not himself a source of impurity. A similar ruling occurs in Deut 23:11–12 regarding a man who has had a nocturnal emission in the camp. The mild ruling is maintained even though we are told that God moves about in the camp’s midst (23:15): “If one of your men is unclean because of a nocturnal emission, he is to go outside the camp and stay there. But as evening approaches he is to wash himself, and at sunset he may return to the camp.”

Both the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document are enormously concerned about defilement caused by seminal emission and each goes beyond the ruling of the Torah. In fact, each document goes to the extreme of forbidding sexual relations in the entire city of the temple.¹⁰⁴ However, they have much different approaches to the question of purification from seminal emission. According to the Temple Scroll, both the man who has had a nocturnal emission (45:7–10) and one who has had an emission in the course of marital relations (45:11–12) remains impure

¹⁰³ Stylistically, the Temple Scroll may be viewed as a “divine halakhic pseudepigraphon.” See Schiffman, “The *Temple Scroll* and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period,” in *The Courtyards*, 163–174. Its ritual purity laws (cols. 45–51) are expressed in a non-polemical manner. In contrast, the purity laws of 4QD are formatted as an apodictic list of rulings, which also betray no connection to any sectarian community. (See Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, 18; J. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the ‘Damascus Document’ in Current Research,” in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* [ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992], 55–56; M. Knibb, “The Place of the Damascus Document,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 149–162, esp. 153.) 4QMMT, on the other hand, is an overtly polemical list presented in an “us versus them” format composed by the early leadership of the Qumran community.

¹⁰⁴ See CD 12:1–2 and 11QT 45:11–12. While the CD passage explicitly forbids sex in the Temple City, the Temple Scroll extends the prohibition by barring entrance to the city for three days after sexual intercourse. We may infer, therefore, that the act of sex in the Temple City is unimaginable for the author. See the discussion of White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 45–49; Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:288. The equation of the holiness of the “camp,” i.e., the wilderness camp of Numbers, with the holiness of the entire city of the sanctuary appears in 11QT (47:4) as well as in 4QMMT (B 29–33).

for three days and must wash and launder his clothes on the first¹⁰⁵ and third days of his impurity.¹⁰⁶ Presumably, the duration of impurity and the added stringency of laundering clothes are modeled on the three-day encampment at Sinai (Exodus 19), in which the Israelites are told to sanctify themselves, wash their garments, and stay away from women. Thus the Temple Scroll applies the laws of the Sinai encampment to the Temple City (cf. 1QSa 1:25–26).¹⁰⁷

4QD, on the other hand, takes a far more stringent approach based on a unique exegesis of Leviticus 15. A very fragmentary passage (4Q272 1 II, 3–7) states the **משפט הזב** apodictically:¹⁰⁸

	3
[משפט הזב את זון] בוכ [גל איש]	4
[אשר יזוב מבשרו או אשר יעלה עליו מ] חשבת זמה או אשר	5
[מגעו כמגע ה	6
[וכבס בג[ד]יו [ורחץ במים	7
[בו הנוגע בו ור[חץ	
[משפט הזובה	

3 And the rule concerning one who has a discharge: Any man
 4 with a discharge from his flesh or one who brings upon himself lustful
 thoughts or who
 5 [] his contact is like that of [
 6 he shall launder his clo[th]es and [bathe in water]
 7 him, who touches him shall ba[the And] the law [of a woman who
 has a discharge

I believe that Himmelfarb is correct to detect in this passage a radical rereading of the Torah's laws regarding male genital discharge.¹⁰⁹ As she points out, Leviticus 15 distinguishes between male abnormal and

¹⁰⁵ As Milgrom has shown, the Temple Scroll views impurity as layered. The purpose of the first day ablution is to remove the first layer of impurity, which would prevent contact with ordinary items (and, vitally, ordinary food). Only with the removal of the second layer of impurity can the subject resume contact with sancta. See Milgrom, "Studies in the Temple Scroll," 512–518; idem, "First Day Ablutions at Qumran," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:561–570.

¹⁰⁶ To be sure, 11QT 45:11–12, only specifies the duration of impurity and does not mention bathing or laundering. However, it seems obvious that those requirements are to be assumed on the basis of the analogy with the man who had a nocturnal emission (45:7–10).

¹⁰⁷ See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:288–289. On the dynamic relationship between Sinai and Zion in biblical tradition, see Levenson, *Sinai and Zion*; B. Ollenburger, *Zion, the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult* (JSOTSup 41; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

¹⁰⁸ Text and translation follow Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 190–191. Reconstructed with parallels from 4Q266 6 I, 14–16 (underlined).

¹⁰⁹ For her full argument, see Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 100–103.

normal (i.e., seminal) genital discharge with the words **זב** and **שכבת זרע** respectively. But in the summation of the laws that appears at the conclusion of the chapter (v. 33), the word **זב** is employed as an umbrella term referring to any type of genital discharge, irregular or regular. In accordance with this latter meaning of **זב**, the author of 4QD has included both the man “who brings upon himself lustful thoughts” in line 4, who is no doubt to be understood as a man who has had a seminal emission due to his own lascivious thoughts,¹¹⁰ and the man with an irregular flux in the same stringent category. This would entail an extraordinary extension of the mild impurity ordained by Lev 15:16–17 and Deut 23:11–12 for the man defiled by seminal emission.¹¹¹ Instead of waiting one day to become pure, he would be required to wait seven. Moreover, like the man with an irregular flux, he would have to launder his clothes, and he himself would become a highly contagious source of impurity (Lev 15:4–12).¹¹² This reading is confirmed by the allusion to “his contact” (**מגעו**) in line 5, which refers to derivative uncleanness contracted by people or objects touched by the **זב**.¹¹³

Both the rulings of 11QT and 4QD thus clearly share an expansive view of seminal impurity and a concern for protecting the Temple City from it. But their differing exegetical approaches and legal conclusions indicate that more than one system of “priestly” halakhah was known to the Qumranites.¹¹⁴ Such discrepancies may be explained as the result

¹¹⁰ Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 191, compares this case to the **הרהר** of *m. Zab. 2:2*.

¹¹¹ It is true that 4QD only preserves the case of a seminal emission outside of sexual relations, but it is likely that the third type of **זב** introduced by the words **או אשר** in l. 4, but missing from the beginning of l. 5, is a man who has had a seminal emission in the course of marital relations. See Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 101.

¹¹² Cf. the rabbinic position in *b. Naz. 66a*; *m. Zab. 5:11*, where semen does not defile except by direct contact.

¹¹³ See Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 191. He compares the **מגעו זבים** of *y. Pes. 34d*. This ruling is paralleled in 4QTohorot A (4Q274 1 I, 8): “And when [a man has] an emiss[ion] of semen his touch is defiling.” (Translation from Baumgarten, DJD XXXV, 101.)

¹¹⁴ Himmelfarb (*A Kingdom of Priests*, 113) notes that this conclusion is further corroborated by the single case in which the book of *Jubilees* pays attention to one of the laws of ritual purity in Leviticus 1–16. In its treatment of the law pertaining to the impurity of the parturient in Leviticus 12, *Jub. 3:8–14* appears content to provide an etiology for the differing periods of the mother’s impurity depending on the sex of the child without expansion or intensification of her uncleanness. On the other hand, the Temple Scroll (48:14–17) decrees the exclusion of women from cities after childbirth, and 4QD (4Q266 6 II, 11) prohibits them from nursing their babies. Cf. the comparative chart of Werrett, *Ritual Purity*, 289–290. For a possible example where the Qumranites might have accepted a view very similar to the Pharisees in regard to the half-sheqel payment and the purchase of the tamid sacrifice, see E. Eshel and H. Eshel, “4Q471 Fragment 1 and ‘Ma’amadot’

of origination in related but separate groups, or of historical development.¹¹⁵ In any case, the Qumran community continued to copy these pivotal texts and to read them side by side.¹¹⁶ It is impossible to know what relationship the variant laws in these texts had to actual Qumran practice, but they were likely viewed as the common heritage of the community and at any rate, along with MMT, they shared the perspective that the holiness of the temple must be protected by adherence to strict interpretations of the Bible's laws of ritual purity. This perspective may plausibly be said to spring from the concern that the temple, if not presently defiled, was in profound danger of becoming so. Indeed, against the backdrop of the traumatic defilement of the temple during the Hellenistic crisis and the sudden takeover of the temple establishment by the Hasmonians, the common anxiety of these second century texts comes as no surprise.¹¹⁷ After the Qumranite split from the temple establishment was final, the sectarian literature testifies to intense and extended meditation on this very anxiety within the framework of a starkly dualistic and fatalistic sectarian theology.

SECTARIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD THE TEMPLE

It is often noted that the Qumran community's intense concern with purity must be understood in the light of its feelings toward the temple. Therefore, before discussing sectarian ritual purity practices it will be necessary to take note of the complex attitudes of the Qumranites toward the temple. In fact, beyond the Second Temple that stood in Jerusalem we may speak of a few different temples with reference to the community's religious imagination.¹¹⁸

in the War Scroll," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:619–620. See further Schiffman's conclusions regarding the sacrificial halakhah of *ALD* in idem, "Sacrificial Halakhah."

¹¹⁵ See L. Schiffman, "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30, 3–16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 214. For a detailed consideration that the discrepancies are due to historical change, see Werrett, *Ritual Purity*, 294–305.

¹¹⁶ For a physical description and suggested dates for the Temple Scroll manuscripts, see White Crawford, *The Temple Scroll*, 12–16. For the Damascus Document manuscripts from Qumran, see Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 21–24.

¹¹⁷ For the increased emphasis on purity as a result of the Hellenistic crisis, see García Martínez and Treballe Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 140.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Schiffman's distinction (*Reclaiming*, 385–394) between three different portrayals of Jerusalem in the Scrolls, "the Jerusalem of history, experienced by the authors of our texts; the Jerusalem consonant with the ideals of Jewish law; and the Jerusalem of the future" (p. 385).

The Future Restored Jerusalem Temple

In the face of the tragedy of the pollution of the present temple, the community remained deeply devoted to the fundamental biblical principle which reveres the Jerusalem temple as the holy and proper dwelling place of God and views sacrificial worship there as the ideal. Indeed, we have seen from 4QMMT that from earliest times they aspired to rejoin the temple cult. Even after years of alienation from Jerusalem, the Qumranites awaited a time when they would once again participate in and indeed control the temple service,¹¹⁹ albeit in far more dramatic terms (1QM 2; cf. 7:11–12; 4Q491 1–3 18).¹²⁰ This final temple was to be created by God himself in the era following the current period of wickedness (11QT 29:9; 4QFlor 1 I, 2; cf. 1 En. 90:28–29). From the preservation of seven copies of the Aramaic “New Jerusalem” text, which describes the architectural plans of an eschatological Jerusalem of gargantuan measure, its temple, and the cult that will operate there, it is apparent that the Qumranites were interested in visualizing this future reality in great detail.¹²¹ It must be noted that while the themes and some of the details regarding the temple in New Jerusalem are related to the Temple Scroll,¹²² the temple envisioned in the latter document is not eschatological in nature.¹²³ Rather,

¹¹⁹ See Schiffman, “Community without Temple,” 276.

¹²⁰ Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. B. and C. Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 223–228, who hypothesizes that the unpreserved ending of the War Scroll contained various prayers and songs of thanksgiving to be recited by the community upon its triumphant return to the Jerusalem temple after the eschatological battle.

¹²¹ The eschatological nature of the scroll is confirmed by the final preserved column of New Jerusalem^a (4Q554), which refers to the final battle against the nations. Although the original text was probably composed in the early second century BCE, all of the Qumran manuscripts date to the Herodian period. See M. Chyutin, *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction* (JSPSup 25; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 33–69. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 180–213; L. DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts* (TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994) 13–95.

¹²² The names of the city and temple gates in each document are the same. Wise, *A Critical Study*, 64–86, identifies New Jerusalem as one of the sources for the Temple Scroll. But the presentation of the temple and city in each document is not compatible, and their precise relationship remains unclear. See further F. García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” *EDSS* 2:609.

¹²³ Pace B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 21–24. This of course excludes the temple that God will create according to 11QT 29:9.

as noted above, it pertains to the author's ideal for the current period, which he wished to see carried out in the present.¹²⁴

In line with their deep-seated hope to return to Jerusalem, the array of proto-sectarian works preserved at Qumran indicates that sacrificial law continued to be studied, even though sacrifices were never actually performed there.¹²⁵ Several copies of *ALD* and *Jubilees*, each of which contains detailed traditions regarding procedures for sacrificial offerings, were preserved at Qumran. Almost all of columns 13–30 of the Temple Scroll is dedicated to the sacrificial procedures connected with the scroll's ideal temple, and column 60 treats the sacrificial dues owed to the priests.¹²⁶ As we have noted, the New Jerusalem texts describe cult procedures, and MMT lays down several rulings pertaining to sacrifice. Additionally, the Damascus Document includes laws pertaining to the disqualification of various categories of priests from service¹²⁷ and laws that imply participation in the official sacrificial cult.¹²⁸ The fact that each of the above-mentioned documents was preserved in multiple copies at Qumran provides powerful evidence that the community continued to

¹²⁴ As L. Schiffman (“‘ôlâ and ḥaṭṭâ’t in the *Temple Scroll*,” in *The Courtyards*, 363) notes with regard to the author of 11QT’s Sacrificial Calendar: “He sought to reform the entire temple and the conduct of its ritual, aiming to return to what in his view was the true intent of the Torah.”

¹²⁵ There is no archaeological evidence that would point to the performance of sacrifices at Qumran. Against J.-B. Humbert (“L’espace sacré à Qumrân: propositions pour l’archéologie,” *RB* 101–102 [1994]: 199–203), there are no archaeological remains of an altar at Qumran. Cross’ claim that the animal bones found under ceramic jars at Qumran provide evidence that animal sacrifice was performed at Qumran (*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 85–86) is equally unconvincing. See G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 41–43, and discussion below.

¹²⁶ See also 4Q365a 2; 3. On the difficult question of the identification of this text, see S. White, DJD XIII, 319–333.

¹²⁷ See 4Q266 5 II, 1–16; 4Q267 5 III, 1–8; 4Q273 2 1–2; 4 I, 5–11.

¹²⁸ See CD 11:17–12:2, 16:13–17a. To be sure, the Damascus Document contains more than one view on the purity status of the temple. See Davies, “The Ideology of the Temple,” 287–301. Hempel, *The Laws*, 37–38, posits that the laws which take participation in the temple for granted do not refer to a particular community. On the other hand, Schiffman (*Reclaiming*, 282) argues that the community continued to legislate on the topic of sacrifice because it expected to participate once again in the reformed temple cult in the imminent age to come. J. Baumgarten (“Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea [Qumran] Scrolls,” in *Studies in Qumran Law*, 43–46) claims that these laws either go back to a time before the community severed from the cult or a time when some members began to participate again after a rift. For the Essene approach to temple sacrifice, which bears some similarities to CD 11:18–21, see A. Baumgarten, “Josephus on the Essene Sacrifice,” *JJS* 45 (1994): 169–183, and bibliography.

engage in intensive study of sacrificial law even after it was fully separated from Jerusalem. The topic of sacrifice probably took up a substantial percentage of time in the sectarian legal study sessions, which, the Rule of the Community tells us, lasted one-third of each night of the year (1QS 6:6–7).¹²⁹ Analogous to the intensive study of sacrificial and purity laws by the Rabbis after the destruction of the Second Temple, we may attribute the Qumranite focus on these topics to the belief that they would one day return to worship God at his holy dwelling place.¹³⁰

One further group of documents must be mentioned in this discussion, the *mishmarot* texts (4Q319; 4Q320–330; 4Q337; 4Q394 1–2). In these calendrical documents, the dates of Sabbaths, festivals, and periods of service for the priestly courses are incorporated into the community's 364-day solar calendar system. Why would a group that was physically and ideologically separated from the Jerusalem temple go through the trouble of correlating the priestly watches with other entries on their calendar? As VanderKam notes,

the covenanters worked with this institution because they anticipated a return to the Jerusalem sanctuary and to service in it according to what they believed was the divine will. The group seemed to have been confident that their exile from the temple was only temporary.¹³¹

The Community as Temple and the Imago Templi

The Qumran community's separation from, but continued reverence for the Jerusalem temple created a peculiar religious situation. As many scholars note, the tension confronted the community with a religious deficit, for which it compensated in various ways. Among the most important strategies that it employed in this regard was to view and treat itself as a substitute temple.¹³² As Bertil Gärtner puts it:

¹²⁹ R. Kugler, "Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 90–112, proposes that such study partially compensated for the religious deficit that inevitably resulted from boycotting the sacrificial cult. See also L. Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (ed. L. Levine; Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), 35.

¹³⁰ See Schiffman, "Community without Temple," 274–276.

¹³¹ VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 112. For a similar conclusion, see S. Talmon, "Calendars and Mishmarot," *EDSS* 1:110.

¹³² See Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 50–93; D. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage a Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas, and J. Riaud; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 165–189.

They transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem temple to the community. This undoubtedly meant that some measure of “spiritualization” had taken place, since the idea of the temple was now linked with the community.¹³³

The term “spiritualization” must be qualified. According to Gärtner, this does not mean that the community temple was conceptualized as any less realistic than the Jerusalem temple. Rather, spiritualization refers to the “transference of the concrete entity, the temple building, to a more ‘spiritual’ realm in the living community, and of the sacrifices to deeds in the life lived according to the Law.”¹³⁴

The community’s awareness of itself as an entity separated from yet substituting for the Jerusalem temple was determined largely by its conception of holiness.¹³⁵ Numerous texts indeed attest to the notion that the Qumran community viewed itself as a holy temple and its members as holy personnel. The sectarian authors refer to the community as a “house of holiness [consisting] of Israel and a most holy congregation [consisting] of Aaron” (1QS 8:5), “a most holy dwelling for Aaron” (1QS 8:8), “a holy house for Aaron” (1QS 9:6), “a sanctuary of man / Adam” (4Q174 1–2 I, 6),¹³⁶ “holy among the peoples” (1Q34 3 II, 6), and “congregation of the men of perfect holiness” (CD 20:2–7; 1QS 9:20). Each member is deemed an *איש הקדוש* (1QS 5:13, 18; 8:17, 23; 9:8), and the community itself is viewed as fulfilling the atoning function reserved for the temple (1QS 5:1–7; 8:6–7, 10).¹³⁷ In addition, 4QpIsa^d (4Q164) interprets Isa 54:11–12, which speaks of the restoration of Jerusalem, as referring specifically to the “council of the community,” including priests and laymen (cf. 1QS 8:1). The priests constitute the foundation of the house of God, while the laymen are the stones, or superstructure of the building.¹³⁸

¹³³ B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 18. See also Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 88–93.

¹³⁴ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 19. For further concerns regarding the term “spiritualization” with regard to the Qumran community, see E. Schüssler-Fiorenza, “Cultic Language in Qumran and the New Testament,” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159–177, esp. 160–161; R. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 47; Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 143–147.

¹³⁵ J. Naudé, “Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *DSSAFY*, 2:197–199.

¹³⁶ See above, pp. 90–91.

¹³⁷ Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 15.

¹³⁸ See Horgan, *Pesharim*, 125–131. See also Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 42–44. He also considers the interpretation of “Lebanon” as the council of the community in 1QpHab 12 as a possible allusion to the notion of the community as temple.

Moreover, as shall be seen below, it has been suggested recently that the spatial layout of Qumran physically expresses a notion of sacred temple space, similar to that found in the Temple Scroll.¹³⁹

Commensurate with the spiritual transference of the temple and its holiness to the community, it is often noted that the vital significance of sacrifices was transferred to liturgical offerings and the living of the righteous life at Qumran.¹⁴⁰ 1QS 9:3–6 states explicitly, if tersely, that “offerings of the lips” (תְּרוּמַת שִׁפְתַיִם) and “perfection of way” (תְּמִימֵי דֶרֶךְ) are like a “soothing (odor) of righteousness” (נִיחוּחַ צְדָקָה) and “an acceptable freewill offering” (מִנְחַת רִצּוֹן) in place of the flesh of burnt-offerings and the fat of sacrifice.¹⁴¹ According to 4QFlorilegium 1–2 I, 6–7, God has commanded that “a sanctuary of man / Adam be built for himself, that there they may send up the smoke of incense (מִקְטִירִים), the works of thanksgiving” (מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹרָה).¹⁴² It is possible that the Qumranites scheduled these acts of praise and prayer to coincide with the key liturgical rites of the temple cult.¹⁴³

This data may be read together with the evidence analyzed above in chapter four. There, we observed how by means of liturgical transport, the Qumranites escaped the confines of linear history, currently dominated by Belial and his lot, and participated with the קְדוּשִׁים, the celestial priests, in or even as the ideal temple. In order for the Qumranites to participate

¹³⁹ See Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 105–133, esp. 127–129. See further, pp. 251–252.

¹⁴⁰ For praise and prayer as a substitute for sacrifice, see Schiffman, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy,” 33–48, esp. 34–35.

¹⁴¹ See Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung*, 64–66, 68–74; Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 138–139. For the term נִיחוּחַ without רִיחַ, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 171–172.

¹⁴² The reading מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹרָה, accepted by Brooke (*Exegesis at Qumran*, 108), Steudel (*Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 44), H.-W. Kuhn (“Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Paris, 1992 [ed. G. Brooke with F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 1994], 205), and Puech (*La Croyance*, 578, n. 34) has been challenged recently by Milgrom, *Pesharim* (PTSDSSP 6B), 248, who finds the reading מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹרָה to be superior both paleographically and logically. Whichever reading is accepted, it must be admitted that either works of thanksgiving or works of law here acquire the character of sacrifice. According to Brooke (“Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community,” 288), it is likely that מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹרָה was a play on the phrase מַעֲשֵׂי תוֹרָה, and both meanings were intended. If he is correct, this would parallel the comparison of both “offerings of the lips” and “perfection of way” to sacrifices in 1QS 9. For the interweaving of the themes of temple and Eden in sectarian and proto-sectarian literature, see Brooke, *ibid.*; and Swarup, *The Self-Understanding*, *passim*.

¹⁴³ See, e.g., 4Q409. See further, E. Qimron, “Time for Praising God: A Fragment of a Scroll from Qumran (4Q409),” *JQR* (1990): 341–347; Kugler, “Rewriting Rubrics,” 91.

in this remarkable experience, it was essential for them to possess the very same divine qualities that characterized the angelic priests, namely holiness (קדושה) and righteousness (צדק). In sharing these qualities with the angels, community members not only became priests in the cosmic temple, but they also gained access to the knowledge of God, who himself is the source of all holiness and righteousness. Thus, the ubiquitous self-designation of the community in terms of holiness and righteousness in sectarian writings is to be seen in connection with its religious deficit vis-à-vis the Jerusalem temple. It is apparent that the performance of liturgy was a fundamental means by which the community activated and actualized its own qualities of holiness and righteousness. This, in turn, helped it recover something of the religious deficit caused by the very real loss of access to the concrete temple.¹⁴⁴ However, it is worth recalling that the notions of cosmic temple and otherworldly priesthood did not originate at Qumran. Rather, the Qumranites adapted older traditions in response to the unique circumstances that led them to the Judean desert.

PRIESTLY IMAGINATION AND THE PRACTICE OF RITUAL PURITY AT QUMRAN

Just as impurity posed a serious threat to the Jerusalem temple, it did also to the temple community of Qumran. With the invasion of impurity, the holiness characterizing the presence of God and the angels would be driven away, leaving the Qumranites to suffer the vilest of fates. From the sectarian viewpoint, such a disaster had already occurred in Jerusalem. Thus, the protection of holiness by means of adherence to strict standards of ritual purity at Qumran actually had cosmic significance—the continued presence of God and his angels in Israel depended on it. It is in this context that the repeated emphasis on the practice of ritual purity at Qumran must be understood.¹⁴⁵

Dimant typifies the community's existence as an attempt to recreate the "congregation of priests' officiating in the holy enclosure of the

¹⁴⁴ As we observed from the case of 11QMelchizedek, a similar statement may be made with regard to inspired biblical exegesis, through which the Qumranites also gained access to divine knowledge. For the study of Scripture as a medium of "religious expression and experience" at Qumran, see Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 46–69.

¹⁴⁵ The Scrolls explicitly remind us several times of the relationship between communal purity and the presence of the angels: 1QM 7:6; 1QSa 2:8–9; 4QD^a 8 I, 9; 4QFlor 1–2 I, 4. As B. Bokser notes ("Approaching Sacred Space," *HTR* 78 [1985]: 283), the presence of the angels at Qumran is representative of the divine presence.

Tabernacle of the Temple city.”¹⁴⁶ Indeed, although the community most likely included both priests and laymen (see, e.g., 1QS 8:1), we have observed in several texts that the *entire* community acquired priestly status in liturgical time.¹⁴⁷ This priestly self-image is illustrated well by CD’s midrash on Ezek 44:15 (CD 3:21–4:4), which metaphorically interprets the sons of Zadok, the priests, and the Levites mentioned in that verse as referring to groups of community members.¹⁴⁸ In concert with this self-image, membership in the community was defined by priestly regulations. Thus, the ruling that judicial and military service are to be carried out by men who are at least twenty five years of age, found in CD 10:6–7 and 1QM 7:3 / 1QSa 1:12–13¹⁴⁹ respectively, is to be connected to Num 8:24, where the minimum age of service for the Levites is twenty five. As Schiffman observes, this adoption of Num 8:24 by the community suggests that “the sect sought to elevate all its members to the highest status of Levitical sanctity and, in so doing, to ensure the holiness of their courts and military camps.”¹⁵⁰

In a similar vein, the legislation regarding admission into the community states that

no light-minded [f]ool shall come (into the congregation). Neither shall any simple minded or errant man, nor one with dimmed eyes who cannot see (וְכַהֵן עֵינָיִם לְבַלְתִּי רְאוּת), [nor] a limping or lame or deaf person (וְחִגְרָה), nor a young boy, none of these shall [come] into the congregation, for the hol[*y*] angels [are in their midst] (אֵל לִיבְאָה אִישׁ מֵאֱלֹהִים) [אל תוך העדה כי מלאכי ה] הקד [ש בתוכם].¹⁵¹ (4QD^a 8 I, 6–9 = CD 15:15–17)

¹⁴⁶ Dimant, “4QFlorilegium,” 188; cf. Schwartz, “Temple and Desert,” 38.

¹⁴⁷ We shall observe the tension between the various Qumran texts that assume the hierarchical distinction between priests, Levites, and Israelites, and those that seem to undermine that distinction more fully in chapter seven.

¹⁴⁸ To be sure, in the MT Ezekiel was originally speaking of one group, הכהנים והלויים. CD’s exegesis was made possible, by the reading וְכַהֵן עֵינָיִם לְבַלְתִּי רְאוּת. For detailed reflection on the significance of this midrash in relation to the question of the community’s identity, see Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 53–55.

¹⁴⁹ For this passage as referring to military rather than cultic service, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 257, followed by L. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 30–32.

¹⁵⁰ Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 34. To be sure, the maximum age limit of fifty given in Num 8:25 was not accepted by the Qumranites. Instead, a maximum age of sixty was derived from Lev 27:3, which concerns the monetary valuation of people dedicated to the Lord. As Schiffman notes, the Qumranites would have used Lev 27:3 in a “legal midrash” to interpret Num 8:25. See also Yadın, *The Scroll of the War*, 65–79.

¹⁵¹ Text and translation follow Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 63–64.

This passage is based on the laws of Lev 21:16–24, which exclude priests with certain physical defects from serving in the temple. Although the language is not identical with that of Leviticus 21 in all cases, and the classes of excluded people differ somewhat,¹⁵² the implications of this passage are striking. Those who are considered unfit for priestly service in the temple are to be denied admission to the covenant of the community.¹⁵³ Similar interpretations of the restrictions of Leviticus 21 are utilized in 1QSa 2:4–9 and 1QM 7:4–6 in order to bar such defective classes of people from the eschatological assembly and the eschatological war camp respectively.¹⁵⁴ In all of these texts, the motivating anxiety is that the angels dwelling amidst the temple community, who represent God's presence itself, might be exposed to impurity.¹⁵⁵

If the community viewed itself as a temple and its members as priests, it is no surprise to find that it also submitted to priestly purity regulations.¹⁵⁶ This is most evident in the rules pertaining to the *טהרת הרבים* and the *משקה הרבים*, which most likely refer to the ritually clean food and drink of the community respectively.¹⁵⁷ It appears that the Qumranites

¹⁵² Some of these differences may be explained as a result of exegetical processes. For example, Schiffman (*The Eschatological Community*, 45) points out that the inclusion of the *הרש* and the *אלם* in the comparable list of 1QSa 2 is likely a result of an exegesis of Exod 4:11, which mentions both of those classes along with the *עור*. The same could apply to the mention of the *הרש* here, but the lack of reference to the *אלם* makes this possibility less likely.

¹⁵³ Both Davidson (*Angels at Qumran*, 185–186) and Schiffman (*The Eschatological Community*, 47–48) understood the present passage as denying access only to the communal assembly (*מושב הרבים*). Now that the full Hebrew text of 4QD^a is available, it appears more likely that the passage is restricting access to the covenant community in general. This is in line with the opinion expressed by Milik decades ago (*Ten Years of Discovery*, 114). See further, Hempel, *The Laws*, 85–86, esp. n. 51.

¹⁵⁴ Noting the numerous occurrences of lists of categories for exclusion based on Leviticus 21 in the Scrolls, Hempel (*The Laws*, 85–86) observes that “the exclusion rule was a tradition that circulated widely” and could be crafted to suit the purposes of the author of a particular work. Yadin (*The Temple Scroll*, 1:289–290 and 2:193) argues that the Temple Scroll's exclusion of the blind man from the city of the sanctuary (45:12–14) implicitly restricts the rest of the classes of people mentioned in the Leviticus passage. See, however, the criticism of Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 48–49.

¹⁵⁵ For a more extensive discussion of these passages and their relationship to rabbinic halakhah, see A. Shemesh, “The Holy Angels Are in Their Council: The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 193–202.

¹⁵⁶ See Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 38: “Levels of purity in the community parallel levels of purity required in the Temple and in the holy city.”

¹⁵⁷ See Lieberman, “The Discipline,” 199–206; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 294–303; idem, “Some Terms and Concepts of Ritual Purity in the Qumran Writings,” in *Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal* (ed. J.M. Grintz and J. Liver; Publica-

conceived of the purity of their food and drink by analogy with the consecrated food of the temple. They thus harvested (see 4Q274 3), stored, and ate their food in a state of priestly purity.¹⁵⁸ Indeed, just as the temple priests were required to purify themselves before eating the consecrated portions (Lev 7:19–21; *b. Ber.* 2b), members could not touch the טהרה unless purified.¹⁵⁹ In order to partake in the ordinary food of the community, members were required to take a ritual bath (1QS 5:13).¹⁶⁰ The fact that about fifteen percent of the entire area of Qumran was occupied by *miqva'ot* would surely have facilitated this requirement, as would have the location of a large *miqveh* just outside the dining hall.¹⁶¹

It is worth noting that the prohibition of contact with Qumran's pure food, while certainly applying to those who were considered ritually impure (4Q514 l. 4; cf. 4Q274 2 I; 4Q512 II 9), is expressed in terms of moral impurity in 1QS. Outsiders thus could not "enter the water in order to touch the pure food of the men of holiness (טהרת אנשי קדש), for men cannot be cleansed unless they turn away from their wickedness" (1QS 5:13–14).¹⁶² The fact that moral uprightness was a prerequisite for

tions of the Israel Society for Biblical Research 17; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964), 300–309; C. Hempel, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in *DSSAFY*, 2:85. For a list of differing interpretations, see F. Avemarie, "'Tohorat Ha-Rabbim' and 'Mashqeh Ha-Rabbim': Jacob Licht Reconsidered," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 220–222. For Avemarie's proposal that טהרה in the penal code and admission legislation refers to a member's purity that may be violated by any personal contact with a penitent or novice, see pp. 226–227.

¹⁵⁸ In this respect, they are comparable to the Pharisaic הבוררות, who ate their ordinary food in levitical purity. See G. Alon, *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 219. See also H. Harrington, "Did the Pharisees Eat Ordinary Food in a State of Ritual Purity?" *JSJ* 26 (1995): 42–54.

¹⁵⁹ See 4Q514 l. 4; cf. 4Q274 2 I; 4Q512 II 9.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Josephus, *War* 2.129. For ritual immersion before communal meals, see VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 85; Hempel, "Community Structures," 85. For the requirement of ritual immersion before individual meals, see J. Baumgarten, "The Purification Rituals in DJD 7," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 203–206.

¹⁶¹ Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 31. On the spatial distribution of *miqva'ot* at Qumran, see J. Magness, "Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran," in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology* (ISACR 4; Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 107–109. The approximately two hundred fragments of stone vessels discovered at Qumran are also to be seen in the context of concern for ritual purity. See H. Eshel, "CD 12:15–17 and the Stone Vessels Found at Qumran," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, 45–52; E. Regev, "Non-Priestly Purity and Its Religious Aspects according to Historical Sources and Archaeological Findings," in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus* (ed. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 2; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 229–234.

¹⁶² Cf. 1QS 3:4–6. Interestingly 4QS^b and 4QS^d each lack reference to entering the water.

the ritual purity necessary to touch the community's food explains why the novice, before being granted access to it, was tested with respect to "his spirit and his deeds" (רוחו ומעשו; 1QS 6:17). Similarly, full members who transgressed the sectarian interpretation of the law and way of life lost access to the pure food:

No man of the men of the community of the covenant of the community who strays from any one of the ordinances deliberately may touch the pure food of the men of holiness (טהרת אנשי הקודש) nor know any of their counsel until his deeds have become purified from all deceit by walking with those perfect of the way.¹⁶³ (1QS 8:16–18)

Indeed, according to the penal code of the Rule of the Community (1QS 6:24–7:25), even such moral offences as lying about property (6:24–25), speaking against a priest in anger (7:2–3), insulting a fellow member (7:15–16), and dealing treacherously with the truth (7:18–21) were considered defiling enough to prohibit members from touching the טהרה for measured periods of time.¹⁶⁴ These examples underscore the extent to which moral impurity was equated with ritual impurity at Qumran.¹⁶⁵ From the fact that some texts view ritual impurity as cause for moral repentance, it is clear that the reverse was true as well.¹⁶⁶ Since moral and ritual impurity were both characteristics of Belial and his lot, it was a necessity of cosmic significance to remain morally and ritually pure.

There is little doubt that the same purity restrictions that applied to touching the food of the community determined who was able to partic-

These manuscripts simply read: לא יגעו לטהרת אנשי הקודש. This prohibition is followed by another: ואל יוכל אחר ביחד. See further Metso, *The Textual Development*, 81.

¹⁶³ Cf. CD 9:21, 23.

¹⁶⁴ Since other transgressions within the penal code do not specifically delineate the punishment of exclusion from the pure food it is unclear whether such a punishment was intended also for those cases. According to Schiffman (*Sectarian Law*, 159–161), no such exclusion is implied, since the penal code stipulates punishments with consistent precision. On the other hand, Klawans (*Impurity and Sin*, 82–85), following Licht and Newton, argues that the penal code employs ellipsis, but intends the punishment of exclusion from pure food for every transgression.

¹⁶⁵ For more on the equation of moral and ritual impurity at Qumran, see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 67–91; Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 27–30; J. Baumgarten, "The Law and Spirit of Purity at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:93–105.

¹⁶⁶ See, e.g., the purification liturgy preserved in 4Q512 29–32 VII, 8–9 (Baillet, DJD VII, 265–266), which includes a petition for repentance in a blessing to be recited upon purification, apparently from menstrual impurity. See also 4QTohorot^a (4Q274) 1 I, 1–4. See further the comments of Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 86–88. For a criticism of Klawans, see Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 132–133. See also J. Baumgarten's comments pertaining to the Essenes in, DJD XXXV, 97.

ipate in the communal meals described in 1QS 6:4–6.¹⁶⁷ This is particularly significant because participation in these meals, which served as a foretaste of the eschatological banquet described in 1QSa 2:17b–22,¹⁶⁸ may be seen as the “primary expression of full membership in the community.”¹⁶⁹

According to the Rule of the Community, communal meals were to include at least ten men who sat according to rank before a presiding priest:

When the table has been prepared for eating (יערוכו השולחן לאכול), or the new wine for drinking (או התירוש לשתות), the priest shall be the first to stretch out his hand, in order to bless the first (produce of) the bread and the new wine. (1QS 6:4–6)

Much debate has surrounded the issue of whether these meals were sacral or non-sacral in character. I see no evidence to support the claim that the meal functioned in a sacramental manner, similar to the Christian Eucharist, “mediating salvation from God.”¹⁷⁰ On the other hand, while Schiffman is correct that all the motifs of the meal, “purity, benedictions, bread and wine, and the role of the priest—can be explained against the background of contemporary Jewish ceremonial and ritual practice,”¹⁷¹ I do not believe that it follows that the meals of the Qumranites were conceptually divorced from the temple. The parallel practices of other Jewish groups of the time, such as the Pharisaic Haburot, can be illuminating, but they must not be valued over the testimony of the Scrolls themselves. In line with the pervasive priestly self-image of the community,

¹⁶⁷ On the distinction between the טהרת הרבים and the communal banquets at Qumran, see L. Schiffman, “Communal Meals at Qumran,” *RevQ* 10 (1979): 45–56, esp. 52–53; Avemarie, “‘Tohorat Ha-Rabbim’ and ‘Mashqeh Ha-Rabbim,’” 227.

¹⁶⁸ See Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 74–78; Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 53–58, 70.

¹⁶⁹ P. Bilde, “The Common Meal in the Qumran-Essene Communities,” in *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World* (ed. I. Nielsen and H.S. Nielsen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998), 153. See also, D. Smith, “Meals,” *EDSS* 1:531. For the archaeological evidence relating to the practice of communal meals at Qumran, see de Vaux, *Archaeology*, 11–14; Magness, “Communal Meals,” 90–112.

¹⁷⁰ H.G. Kuhn, “The Lord’s Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran,” in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957), 68; cf. 77, 85, 92–93. See also J. Gnillka, “Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener,” *BZ* 5 (1961): 43; S. Hooke, “Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *SE* (1959): 607; J. Allegro, *The Mystery of the Dead Sea Scrolls Revealed* (New York: Gramercy, 1981), 130–131, 164–165.

¹⁷¹ Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 193–194. For his full argument that the communal meals were non-sacral, see *ibid.*, pp. 191–201; *idem*, *The Eschatological Community*, 59–67.

it is indeed probable that the Qumranites would not have eaten their communal meals without temple sacrifices in mind.

In fact, several scholars agree that the meals had a cultic character and substituted for the sacrificial meals held in the temple.¹⁷² Several pieces of evidence may be seen as pointing in this direction. We have already noted that Qumranites were required to purify themselves in ritual baths before meals. It is possible that this act recalled that of priests who were to be purified prior to performing sacrifices and eating sanctified portions.¹⁷³ Yadin notes that the term שולחן, here used to describe the table upon which the communal meal was served, refers to the sacrificial altar in 1QM (2:5–6), as well as in the Bible. In this connection, he cites *b. Ber.* 55a, “As long as the temple existed, the altar atoned for Israel. Now, a man’s table (שולחן) atones for him.” Matthias Delcor observes further that the drinking of non-alcoholic new wine (תירוש) would comply with the requirement that priests were to remain sober during temple service.¹⁷⁴

Further support for this hypothesis is often drawn from Josephus’ relatively detailed description of the communal meals of the Essenes, which contains many striking points of contact with the meals described in the Scrolls:¹⁷⁵ The Essenes take ritual baths prior to meals. Only full

¹⁷² See G. Vermes, *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (New York: Desclee Company, 1956), 56; M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1958), 367; Kuhn, “The Lord’s Supper,” 260, n. 15; Gnllka, “Das Gemeinschaftsmahl,” 42–43; Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 10–13; M. Delcor, “Repas cultuels Esséniens et Thérapeutes, Thiasés et Haburoth,” *RevQ* 6 (1967–1969): 401–425; Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 200–201; B. Bokser, “Philo’s Description of Jewish Practices,” in *Protocol of the Thirtieth Colloquy: 4 June 1977* (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1977), 1–11; Bilde, “The Common Meal,” 161; Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 191–192; cf. 259–260; Magness, “Communal Meals,” 86–112.

¹⁷³ See Burrows, *More Light*, 372; Kuhn, “The Lord’s Supper,” 68.

¹⁷⁴ Delcor, “Repas cultuels,” 407. J. Baumgarten (“The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity,” *RevQ* 6 [1967–1969]: 192, n. 42) claims that, if it was squeezed from the grapes only shortly before the priestly blessing, the תירוש had the added advantage of purity over wine.

¹⁷⁵ Josephus, *War* 2.129–131 reads as follows: “Then, after working without interruption until the fifth hour, they reassemble in the same place and, girded with linen loin-cloths, bathe themselves thus in cold water. After this purification they assemble in a special building to which no one is admitted who is not of the same faith; they themselves only enter the refectory if they are pure, as though into a holy precinct (ἅγιόν τι τέμενος). When they are quietly seated, the baker serves out the loaves of bread in order, and the cook serves only one bowlful of one dish to each man.” Translation from G. Vermes and M. Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 41. For a careful comparison of the testimony of Josephus and the Scrolls with regard to communal meals, see T. Beall, *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 52–64.

initiates are allowed to participate. They sit in hierarchical order. Before anyone partakes in the food a priest blesses. According to Delcor, these and other details provided by Josephus indicate that the meals of the Essenes were characterized by the same acts required of or performed by the priests in the Jerusalem temple. This is the case with the pronouncing of blessings by the priest, the donning of white robes, ritual immersion prior to the meal, and the election of priests for the preparation of the food (*Ant.* 18.22).¹⁷⁶ Moreover, according to Stegemann, the restrictions on participation in Essene meals mirror the Torah's requirement that only men over the age of twenty who are free of all physical handicaps and in a state of ritual purity may participate in the ritual meals in the temple on the occasion of the pilgrimage festivals.¹⁷⁷

The conceptual connection of the Essene meals to the temple appears to be confirmed by the language used by Josephus to describe the refectory: "After this purification they assemble in a special building to which no one is admitted who is not of the same faith; they themselves only enter the refectory if they are pure, as though into a holy precinct (ἁγιόν τι τέμενος)." If, as many scholars assume, the meals of the Essenes may be related to Qumran, then this provides further evidence that the communal meals of the Qumranites were meant to substitute for temple sacrifice.

Even if the connection between the communal meals of the Essenes and the Qumranites were to be denied, there is archaeological evidence that at least some of the meals of the latter were ritualistic or quasi-ritualistic in character. Roland de Vaux reported the discovery at Qumran of

laid bare animal bones deposited between large sherds of pitchers of pots, or sometimes placed in jars left intact with their lids on . . . As a rule these deposits have hardly been covered with earth. They are flush with the level of the ground . . . they appear with varying frequency in almost all the open spaces of the Khirbeh.¹⁷⁸

These remains relate mostly to period Ib, but also to period II.¹⁷⁹ Analysis of the bones shows that interred animal species included mostly sheep

¹⁷⁶ Delcor, "Repas cultuels," 406–408.

¹⁷⁷ Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 191–192.

¹⁷⁸ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 12–13.

¹⁷⁹ De Vaux (*Archaeology*, 5–41) dates these periods to ca. 100 BCE to 31 BCE and ca. 4–1 BCE to 68 CE respectively. Magness (*The Archaeology of Qumran*, 47–72) criticizes his overall chronology, but maintains very similar dates for these two periods. She divides period Ib into a pre-earthquake phase (100–50 BCE to 31 BCE) and a post-earthquake

and goat, but also lamb, ox/cow, and calves.¹⁸⁰ Since these are edible species and the bones show signs that their meat was boiled or roasted on a spit,¹⁸¹ it is most likely that they are the remains of communal meals. However, it is unlikely that they were actual sacrifices. As noted above, no remains of a sacrificial altar were discovered at Qumran and some texts testify that liturgy was perceived as a substitute for sacrifice. Furthermore, Deuteronomy, the most popular biblical book at Qumran, limits the performance of sacrifices to the central place of worship, namely the Jerusalem temple.¹⁸²

Scholars have sought to explain the mysterious animal bone deposits at Qumran in various ways. One of the major obstacles for any such explanation has been that there is no literary evidence for the burial of bones in any Jewish sacrificial or religious ritual. As such, it has been proposed that the bones were not deposited but rather represent the remains of meals being eaten at the time that Qumran was attacked and destroyed.¹⁸³ However, this suggestion is directly contradicted by the fact that most of the deposits contained bones on which there was no edible flesh.¹⁸⁴ The proposal that the bones deposits include the remains of red heifers burnt at Qumran¹⁸⁵ is equally implausible since most of the animals buried were sheep or goat.

phase (31 BCE to 9/8 BCE or some time thereafter). Her dates for period II are the same as de Vaux's.

¹⁸⁰ See F.E. Zeuner, "Notes on Qumrân," *PEQ* 92 (1960): 28–30. He counts the remains of a minimum of sixty two animals, thirty six of which were sheep or goat. Additional deposits of animal bones were apparently discovered by Y. Magen in his excavation of the southern end of the site in the early 1990's. See Magness, "Communal Meals," 98–99, n. 83.

¹⁸¹ De Vaux, *Archaeology*, 14.

¹⁸² See Deuteronomy 12. M. Weinfeld (*The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect* [NTOA 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], 46) notes one of the major differences between the codes of Hellenistic pagan guilds and the code of the Qumran community as follows: "In the various associations we find ordinances concerning sacrifice and oblations and convocations in temples on holidays, a matter which is completely absent from scrolls of the Sect. This situation can be understood in view of the fact that the sect members were cut off from the Temple in Jerusalem."

¹⁸³ See E.-M. Laperrousaz, "A propos des depots d'ossements d'animaux trouvés a Qumrân," *RevQ* 9 (1978): 569–573.

¹⁸⁴ See Zeuner, "Notes on Qumrân," 29: "The fact that it was considered worth while to place in a pot and then to bury scraps of a meal that were useless for human consumption strongly points to a ritual character of the custom. More than that, it suggests that the ritual had already become a matter of form, the original sacrificial effort having been replaced by a symbolic act."

¹⁸⁵ See E. Sutcliffe, "Sacred Meals at Qumran?" *Heythrop Journal* 1 (1960): 57–58. For the red heifer rite at Qumran, see J. Bowman, "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?" *RevQ* 1 (1958): 73–84.

Schiffman has suggested that the practice may be understood in light of 4QMMT. B 58–60 relates that “one must not let dogs enter the holy camp (למחני הק[ו]דש), since they may eat some of the bones of the sanctuary (ע[צ] צמות המק[דש]) while the flesh is (still) on them. For Jerusalem is the camp of holiness (מחנה הקדש).”¹⁸⁶ Apparently, the authors were disturbed that dogs in Jerusalem were scavenging the bones of sacrifices. Elsewhere in 4QMMT animal bones are considered a source of impurity.¹⁸⁷ Thus, the burial of bones at Qumran may have been intended as a precautionary measure against scavenging dogs who might scatter them about the settlement, putting community members at risk.¹⁸⁸

Jody Magness has recently questioned Schiffman’s conclusion on two grounds. First, if the Qumranites saw these bones as a source of ritual defilement, why would they keep them within the area of the settlement? Why not discard them somewhere in the wilderness (such as throwing them over the edge of the cliff into the wadi)? Such a solution would have been particularly easy at the relatively secluded site of Qumran. Secondly, if they felt obliged to keep the bones in the settlement for ritual reasons but were concerned with scavenging dogs and the threat of defilement, why not bury them in deep pits inaccessible to dogs?¹⁸⁹ As de Vaux reports, the deposits were for the most part flush with ground level, and in some instances do not appear to have been covered with dirt at all.¹⁹⁰ According to Magness, the solution lies in the fact that just as the Qumranites treated their meals as a substitute for participation in the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple (although they were not actually sacrifices), they disposed of the remains of their meals on analogy with the disposal of the remains of those sacrifices:

This explanation seems best in light of the following characteristics of the animal bone deposits at Qumran: 1) the species represented correspond in type and proportions with those sacrificed in the Jerusalem Temple; 2) the fact that the meat was boiled or roasted corresponds with the treatment of Temple sacrifices that were consumed; 3) the manner in which these bones were carefully placed on the ground around the buildings . . . is otherwise

¹⁸⁶ Qimron and Strugnell, DJD X, 52–53.

¹⁸⁷ 4QMMT B 18–23; cf. 11QT 47:7–15. Although the word “bones” never appears in the fragmentary MMT text, the restoration of it in B 21–22 is almost certain. See DJD X, 52–53, 154–156.

¹⁸⁸ Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 338. Cf. J. van der Ploeg, “The Meals of the Essenes,” *JSS* 2 (1957): 173, who also explains the bone deposits in terms of purity concerns.

¹⁸⁹ Magness, “Communal Meals,” 96–97; eadem, *The Archaeology of Qumran*, 120.

¹⁹⁰ See de Vaux, *Archaeology*, 13.

difficult to explain; 4) the fact that these deposits include meatless bones and bones that had been lying in a fire (which means they had not been eaten as part of a meal) is also otherwise inexplicable.¹⁹¹

Magness supports her case by considering the disposal of types of sacrifices, such as the זבה and the פסה, which were wholly or partly eaten by the priests and the people in ancient Jerusalem. It appears that after the meat had been consumed at the sacrificial banquet, any remains, including the bones, were burned. Since 4QMMT claims that dogs had access to these bones, they “were not buried in deep *favissae* (sacred pits), but must have been buried in shallow pits or piled on the ground.”¹⁹² This, of course, would correspond to the physical evidence at Qumran. Magness notes a further analogy with the disposal of the remains of the חטאת sacrifices belonging to priests.¹⁹³ These were considered holy and were brought outside of the camp (i.e., outside the temple enclosure) to a pure ash dump (as opposed to other disposal sites, which were considered impure) and burned. The procedure also involved the breaking of pottery. According to Magness, this is comparable to the disposal of burned animal bones in or under potsherds (at times, intentionally broken) in two clusters outside the main buildings at the fringes of the Qumran settlement. While the buildings corresponded to the temple enclosure, the space just outside would have been considered part of the less pure, but holy “sacred camp.” Indeed, partially on the basis of the location of the bone deposits in relation to the layout of the settlement, Magness concludes that the disposition of space at Qumran corresponds to the concept of sacred space of graded holiness found in the Temple Scroll.¹⁹⁴

To date, Magness’ explanation of the animal bone deposits of Qumran remains the most plausible and, barring the discovery of further evidence, should be accepted. Her conclusion further bolsters the notion

¹⁹¹ Magness, “Communal Meals,” 96.

¹⁹² Magness, “Communal Meals,” 97.

¹⁹³ Here she depends on the work of D.P. Wright, *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

¹⁹⁴ See Magness, “Communal Meals,” 98–112. To be sure, the discovery of an animal bone deposit in the open courtyard of the center of the main building of the settlement (L. 23) away from the two “fringe” clusters presents a problem for Magness. She explains this by hypothesizing that the eastern part of the main building “was considered an impure space” because it was occupied by workshops and other installations which were associated with some degree of impurity (pp. 108–109).

that the community viewed itself as recreating the “‘congregation of priests’ officiating in the holy enclosure of the Tabernacle of the Temple city.”¹⁹⁵

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The above survey provides important political and religious historical background for the development of the notion of eschatological priesthood at Qumran. The Second Temple period witnessed a shift in governing authority from palace/king to temple/priest. Naturally, as the temple and its priesthood became the most important power institutions of Judahite society, they attracted passionate and consistent criticism. As the visible manifestation of God’s presence in the land and primary mechanism for the maintenance of the covenant, it was vital that the temple be managed in accordance with God’s will. As Ezekiel had prophesied, defilement of the temple could only lead to its catastrophic abandonment by God.

In the Torah, the defilement of God’s sanctuary is brought about in two different ways. According to Leviticus 1–16 and other passages, it is strictly connected to invasion of sources of ritual impurity. But in the Holiness Code, the sanctuary, and indeed the entire land, may be defiled due to grave moral sin as well. We have seen that both of these approaches appear often in Second Temple literature. Especially in the wake of the traumatic defilement of the temple during the Hellenistic crisis, it is no surprise that many traditional Jews, including the ancestors of the Qumran community, scrutinized and expanded the laws pertaining to both ritual and moral purity. Clearly, this trend reflects a profound anxiety about the dangers of temple defilement. During the Hasmonean period, with the temple back in Jewish hands, these pious Jews wished to prevent a repetition of the defilement of the temple by adhering to stringent ritual and moral purity strictures, which, by means of learned biblical interpretation, they presented as the will of God in such works as *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll. Significantly, many Jews, including the temple establishment itself, disagreed with or simply ignored these interpretations. This legal-religious tension lies at the foundation of the development of the Qumran community.

¹⁹⁵ Dimant, “4QFlorilegium,” 188.

While the evidence at Qumran reveals a deep concern with respect to both ritual and moral purity, 4QMMT has shown that the tension at the root of the community's original schism with the temple authorities was mainly an issue of ritual halakhah. According to the authors of 4QMMT, if the temple had adopted their halakhic opinions, which matched many of the proto-sectarian rulings found in the Temple Scroll and legal portions of the Damascus Document, the conflict would have ended. The fact that sectarian documents such as Peshier Habakkuk, Rule of the Community, and the Admonition of the Damascus Document see the separation with Jerusalem and Jewish society in general largely in terms of moral corruption does not alter this judgment. We have noted that these texts were completed after the schism with Jerusalem was final and therefore display radical dualistic tendencies which equate both moral corruption and ritual impurity with the cosmic forces of evil.¹⁹⁶ Thus they provide more information about the later radicalized Qumranite religious mental-map than they do about the origins of the schism.

In passing, it is important to note one argument that does not appear in the polemics of the Dead Sea Scrolls—that of the hereditary illegitimacy of the Jerusalem priests. Since the early days of Scrolls research, the dominant trend has been to assume that a major trigger to the schism between the Qumran community (or its parent group) and Jerusalem was Zadokite resistance to the usurpation of the high priesthood by the Hasmoneans, who did not possess the proper Zadokite pedigree. But the Scrolls never question the legitimacy of the priests or even that of the Wicked Priest. To the contrary, Peshier Habakkuk explains that the latter was “called by the true name at the beginning of his term of service” (8:9). In fact, Alison Schofield and James VanderKam have recently argued that the Hasmoneans did indeed come from Zadokite lineage.¹⁹⁷ In any case, if the Qumranites did in fact have this gripe, we should surely expect them to have expressed it clearly—but they never did.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, as

¹⁹⁶ Cf. the conclusion of Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst*, 311, n. 192: “Halakhic issues were at the root of the disputes and the theological differences followed later, as a second stage in the developmental process of religiously-founded schisms.”

¹⁹⁷ A. Schofield and J. VanderKam, “Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites?” *JBL* 124 (2005): 73–87.

¹⁹⁸ See J. Liver, “The ‘Sons of Zadok the Priests,’” *RevQ* 6 (1967–1969): 27–29; Kister, “Studies,” 323. D. Schwartz’s ingenious claim (“On Two Aspects,” 163–165) that there are genealogically oriented polemics against the Hasmoneans in Peshier Habbakuk is unconvincing.

Kugler notes, we may state confidently that “practice, not validity, was the sticking-point.”¹⁹⁹

For the Qumranites as well as for all Jews of the period, the temple and the rites associated with it were the primary means for righting wrongs committed against God and maintaining the desired relationship with him, which would guarantee their well-being. Indeed, the sins of individuals and the nation were most properly atoned for there. With the loss of access to the temple, the Qumranites thus encountered a major religious dilemma parallel to the one encountered by the Rabbis after them. How can the relationship of the Jewish people with God be made right without a concrete temple? As we have seen, in attempts to overcome this problem, the Qumranites employed a powerful religious imagination which transformed the desert settlement into a virtual temple and its inhabitants into virtual priests. Members lived according to rules of priestly purity as if present in the temple enclosure itself. The righteous life lived at Qumran as well as the liturgical offerings and most likely the study of Scripture, served an atoning function. Our study of the Qumranite liturgical texts illustrates that community members entered and even became the material of the most important temple, the imaginal temple. There they joined the angels in perfect praise of God, which was of cosmic importance.

But another group of texts testifies that these answers, however helpful, were ultimately insufficient, for the religious dissonance caused by the separation from Jerusalem was too great to overcome. These are the eschatological texts which express the profound sectarian thirst for empowerment—military victory over all the sons of Belial’s lot, a triumphant return to a restored Jerusalem, and a purified cult subject to an eschatological priest who would no doubt teach and conduct the temple in line with sectarian halakhic rulings. It is precisely the lack of power expressed in the numerous eschatological texts at Qumran which provides the historical lens through which the expectation of a priestly messiah at Qumran must be viewed. It follows that in the days in which 4QMMT was composed, when reconciliation with Jerusalem was still possible, the early leaders of the Qumran community would have had little interest in a priestly messiah concept. The notion would have grown after the schism was complete as something of a compensation for the group’s lack of power and religious deficit vis-à-vis Jerusalem. The priestly

¹⁹⁹ Kugler, “Priesthood at Qumran,” 2:113. The point was also made by Hauer, “The Priests of Qumran,” 165.

messiah's association with the proliferation of the new law in the age to come undoubtedly underscores sectarian frustration with the rejection of their legal findings, especially as they pertained to the purity of the temple.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE TRADITIONAL ROOTS OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PRIESTHOOD

Based on the scant information provided in the sectarian scrolls, we noted in chapter five that the eschatological priesthood was associated with four, or possibly five, different general roles or characteristics: (1) teaching and the proliferation of the law for the new age, (2) leadership of the eschatological military camp, (3) leadership of the reconstituted cultic community, and, possibly, (4) atonement on behalf of the people. (5) At times the priestly messiah appears alongside another figure of authority who is often identified as the lay or royal messiah. The precursors to these roles and characteristics are to be found throughout the Hebrew Bible. Indeed, in several biblical passages, we learn of the cultic, atoning, martial, and didactic / judicial functions of the priests.¹ Moreover, scriptural antecedents may be found for the notions of the division of power between lay and sacerdotal authorities (e.g., Jer 33:14–26; 1 Chr 29:22) and “anointed” priests (e.g., Lev 4:3; Dan 9:25–26).

However, as we have noted above, no biblical passage refers to a priest in the sense of a *future* messianic figure. We must therefore seek to supplement the traditional roots of sectarian portraits of the eschatological priesthood from elsewhere. But the evidence is slim. It is often noted that beyond the Hebrew Bible, the most fertile grounds for such an attempt are to be found in the pre-sectarian “authoritative pseudepigraphic” traditions, so popular at Qumran, which employ intricate biblical exegesis in order to portray the patriarch Levi as an ideal figure of priestly wisdom, zealotry, and purity.² These traditions appear mainly in

¹ For numerous important citations, see M. Haran, “Priests and Priesthood,” *EncJud* 13:1076–1080. He divides the functions of the priesthood in the Hebrew Bible into four major categories, “specifically cultic functions; mantic functions, i.e., functions concerned with the solution of mysteries of the future or the past and the making of decisions in uncertain cases through the revelation of divine will; treatment of impurities and diseases with the special ceremonies involved; and judging and teaching people.”

² See, e.g., Collins, *The Scepter*, 83–95; VanderKam, “Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran,” 353–365. For the term “authoritative pseudepigraphy,” see M. Bernstein,

Jubilees and *ALD*, both of which were certainly of great interest to and probably even authoritative for the Qumranites.³

THE MAGNETIC QUALITY OF PRIESTHOOD IN SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE

In light of the magnified political and religious importance of the priesthood in the Second Temple period and the critical eyes under which it operated,⁴ it is no surprise to encounter several texts from that era reflecting a range of fervent opinions regarding the proper behavior and role of priests in society. With the support of scriptural exegesis, such texts craft ideal patterns of priestly conduct and exemplary priestly figures. In doing so, they often expand the traditional biblical portrait of the priest, which includes mostly cultic, but also judicial, instructional, and other responsibilities,⁵ and attribute to him the key social roles of external figures (such as king or sage / scribe)—a literary phenomenon which may be termed “priestly magnetism.”⁶ It is safe to assume that this literary practice reflects the value systems of the authors, as well as their polemical or apologetic reactions to their particular historical settings. The study of instances of priestly magnetism therefore serves as a good basis “for discovering which ideals were considered central to people’s world views.”⁷

In attempting to clarify the traditional roots of priestly messianism at Qumran, it will thus be instructive to investigate the priestly magnetism of *ALD* and *Jubilees*. To be sure, the portraits of Levi in these works do not

“Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 1–26.

³ Indeed, the Damascus Document cites the book of *Jubilees* as an authoritative source (CD 16:3–4) and quotes the “words of Levi” from an unknown Levi apocryphon similar to *ALD* (CD 4:15–18). See further, chapter six, n. 35.

⁴ See above, chapter six.

⁵ See Haran, “Priests and Priesthood,” 1076–1080.

⁶ M. 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. P. Miller, P. Hanson, and S. McBride; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 582, defines the literary phenomenon of magnetism generally as “the tendency of certain ideal figures to attract broad and significant characteristics.”

⁷ On this methodological assumption, see Stone, “Ideal Figures and Social Context,” 575–586. For several examples of its application, see the collection of essays in J.J. Collins and G. Nickelsburg eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (SCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).

necessarily have eschatological import. However, they do provide idealized paradigms of priestly leadership that are far closer to Qumranite notions of end-time priesthood than the biblical texts. The Qumranites were surely interested in these paradigms, and, even if they were not utilized consciously, they constituted an important element of the Qumranite religious imagination responsible for the propagation of the notion of priestly messianism. In addition, it will be illuminating to compare the priestly magnetism of these works with that of a roughly contemporary non-sectarian document also known at Qumran, Hebrew Ben Sira.⁸

Hebrew Ben Sira

As we have seen, Ben Sira was a steadfast proponent of the Jerusalem temple establishment, who showed great concern and respect for the priesthood, especially the Zadokite high priesthood. In the “Praise of the Fathers,” the long panegyric dedicated to the patriarchs of Israel at the end of the work, Aaron receives more attention than Moses, David, or any other figure from Israel’s past (45:6–22). The attention devoted to Aaron is surpassed only by the verses describing Simon, the high priest of Ben Sira’s own days (50:1–21).

Although it has been argued that Ben Sira advocates a diarchic model of government,⁹ it is more likely that the book envisions the priesthood as the ideal governing authority, while demoting the importance of the royal monarchy. This view is substantiated by the fact that in addition to normal cultic functions, royal qualities are consistently and deliberately attracted to the idealized high priestly figures. For example, as John Snaith observes, the reference to a “golden crown” (עטרת פז) in addition to Aaron’s high priestly head-dress (מצנפת) in 45:12 recalls the עטרת פז of Ps 21:4. There, the crown is placed by God on the head of the king, not the priest.¹⁰ According to 45:15, Aaron and his seed (זרעו) will enjoy an eternal covenant “as the days of heaven” (כימי שמים). The phrases זרעו and כימי שמים also appear in the context of a covenantal blessing in Ps 89:30, but there the subject is the Davidic dynasty. The fact that the context of the Psalm is a lament about the failure of the promise of an

⁸ On the provenance of these three texts, see chapter two.

⁹ See, e.g., Olyan, “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood,” 283–286, and, more cautiously, Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 60–61. Cf. J. Priest, “Ben Sira 45, 25 in the Light of the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 5 (1964–1966): 111–118.

¹⁰ J. Snaith, “Biblical Quotations in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus,” *JTS* 18 (1967): 7, n. 3.

eternal Davidic dynasty makes Ben Sira's use of this language for Aarons' descendants all the more incisive.¹¹

It has been noted that the high priest of Ben Sira's day, Simon, likewise attracts royal qualities.¹² Indeed, in 50:21, Simon receives the same royal blessing earlier granted to Aaron: "May his love abide upon Simon and may he keep in him the covenant of Phinehas; may one never be cut off from him; and as for his offspring, (may it be) as the days of heaven (לו ולורעו כימי שמים)." ¹³ Like kings before him, especially Hezekiah, Simon is responsible for fortifying the city from the enemy and digging a reservoir. In addition, he renovates and fortifies the temple, which is termed, strikingly, היכל המלך (50:1–4). In the concluding hymn of blessing, the author prays that הכמה and שלום will permeate society (50:23). In the Hebrew Bible, these two qualities are mentioned as present in Israel only during the time of King Solomon (see, e.g., 1 Kgs 5:26). It is thus clear that Ben Sira intended for his readers to recognize that the primary functions of the king were to be associated with the high priest.¹⁴

A further notable example of priestly magnetism appears in 45:25, where the praise of Phinehas is interrupted with references to David and Aaron:

וגם בריתו עם דוד בן ישי למטה יהודה
נחלת אש לפני כבודו נחלת אהרן לכל זרעו

Admittedly, the passage is difficult to render and many scholars detect textual corruption, especially in the second half of the verse.¹⁵ Stadelmann translates, "Und auch Sein Bund mit David, dem Sohne Isais vom Stamme Juda, ist das Erbe eines Mannes vor dem Angesicht Seiner Herrlichkeit, das Erbe Aarons für alle seine Nachkommen." He argues that the "Mannes vor dem Angesicht Seiner Herrlichkeit" must refer to the high priest who, as we have seen, is so closely associated with God's glory in Ben Sira 45 and 50. Moreover, he claims that this passage reflects the

¹¹ So Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 35.

¹² B. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 35–36; Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 36.

¹³ The translation is from the notes of the *Oxford Annotated Apocrypha, Expanded Edition Containing the Third and Fourth Books of the Maccabees and Psalms 151* (ed. B. Metzger; New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 196.

¹⁴ Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic*, 35. Cf. the comments of Menahem Kister on the description of Samuel in Sir 47:31 in "Metamorphoses of Aggadic Traditions," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 205 (Hebrew).

¹⁵ For various proposals and bibliography, see Olyan, "Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," 285–286.

transference of the Davidic covenant to the seed of Aaron.¹⁶ While this interpretation is questionable on many grounds,¹⁷ it remains compelling in light of the above examples of priestly magnetism as well as the literary context of the verse. The verse appears just after the praise of Phinehas and his eternal covenant of high priesthood (vv. 23–24), and just before a hymn in which Ben Sira prays for other high priests, especially the contemporary Simon (vv. 25–26), who, as we have seen, is portrayed in royal terms.¹⁸ The introduction of David here may indeed indicate that Ben Sira viewed monarchic rule by high priests as the ideal. At the very least, we may conclude that Ben Sira views the ruling power of the high priesthood as comparable with that of the Davidic dynasty.

Further support for this hypothesis may be adduced from Ben Sira's penchant to downplay the monarchy. Indeed, kingship is portrayed as a flawed institution: "Besides David, Hezekiah, and Josiah, they were all corrupt. They abandoned the law of the Most High; the kings of Judah until their end" (49:4). As Stadelmann points out, in Ben Sira's praise of David, there is no reference to an eternal covenant, like that guaranteed for Phinehas. Rather, God only gives David "the law of kingship" (חק ממלכת יירם קרנו) (לעולם).¹⁹ Himmelfarb has noted that the prestige of the monarchy is demoted also in Ben Sira's discussions of the only other kings mentioned by name in the Praise of the Fathers—Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah. Josiah is praised highly, but in cultic terms which recall the power of the priesthood: "The memory of Josiah is like a blending incense (כקטרת סמים) prepared by the art of the perfumer" (49:1). Hezekiah's acts are largely overshadowed by those of Isaiah (48:20–25), who is given credit for the failure of Sennacherib's siege. Solomon is a particularly important case because as the ideal biblical figure of wisdom, he might have been thought to illustrate the correctness of the notion of rule by kings. This

¹⁶ Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schrifgelehrter*, 159: "Das zeigt an, dass er auch für die zukunfft keinen Davididen an der Spitze des Volkes erwartet, sondern diese Position als bleibendes Privileg der Hohenpriester betrachtet."

¹⁷ For one, as L. Perdue (*Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East* [SBLDS 30; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977], 193) notes, the word **אש** should most likely be translated "fire," since Hebrew Ben Sira usually utilizes plene orthography. Cf. the vocalization of M. Segal, *Sefer Ben Sira ha-Shalem* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1976), 312. But with either reading, the Hebrew remains extremely difficult.

¹⁸ See Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 514.

¹⁹ Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schrifgelehrter*, 161. Cf. Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 36.

is especially true considering Ben Sira's belief that more than anyone else, the sage possesses the tools necessary to govern society (see 38:24–39:11). However, echoing Deuteronomy's Law of the King (Deut 17:17), Ben Sira criticizes Solomon as a sinner whose wisdom was corrupted by his royal powers (47:18–21).²⁰

As we might expect, it is rather the idealized high priestly figure whose personality attracts the ideal quality of wisdom. Since Ben Sira emphatically identifies wisdom with Torah (see esp. 24:23),²¹ Aaron's position as arbiter of statutes and judgment in Israel (45:17) is to be viewed not only as an expression of the instructional role of the priesthood known from such scriptural passages as Deut 33:8–11 and Mal 2:6–7, but also as an outgrowth of his role as sage. The priestly connection with wisdom is even stronger in the case of the high priest of Ben Sira's day, Simon. This is made clear by a comparison of the description of personified wisdom's service in the temple (chapter 24) with that of Simon's service in the temple (chapter 50). As Hayward has shown in detail, there is a deliberate parallelism in the accounts that aims to identify Simon with wisdom.²² It follows that according to Ben Sira, the high priest, not the king, possesses the authority of wisdom which best suits a political governor.

We may thus speak of two aspects of priestly magnetism in Ben Sira, the attraction of the king's qualities and the attraction of the sage's qualities to the figure of the high priest. Although Israel had been a monarchy in the past, this certainly was not the ideal. Rule by high priest was preferable and, indeed, scripturally supported. The idealized high priest's possession of wisdom also made him an authority in matters concerning God's law. There is no doubt that in making these assertions, Ben Sira reflects the historical circumstances of the early second century BCE. As noted above, in the wake of the dissolution of the monarchy, the local power vacuum in the Second Temple period was filled by the concurrent rise of priestly and scribal authority.²³ By Ben Sira's day the priestly establishment certainly held temporal authority. Since many, if not most,

²⁰ See Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 36–37.

²¹ For Ben Sira's identification of wisdom with the Torah, see G. Sheppard, "Wisdom and Torah: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy Underlying Sirach 24:23," in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor* (ed. G. Tuttle; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 166–176. See also A. Di Lella, "The Meaning of Wisdom in Ben Sira," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (ed. L. Perdue, B. Scott, and W. Wiseman; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 133–148.

²² Hayward, "Sacrifice and World Order," 23–24; idem, "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira," 127.

²³ See pp. 210–212.

scribes were priests at this time,²⁴ the establishment also exercised a good measure of control over the interpretation of the Torah. Ben Sira thus represents a powerful endorsement of the status quo when he argues, by means of reworking Scripture, that both royal authority and the authority of the Torah most naturally rested in the idealized high priestly figure of his day, Simon.

Before moving forward it is worth noting that Ben Sira was not alone in his sentiments regarding the priesthood. In an excerpt preserved by Diodorus Siculus, the Hellenistic ethnographer Hecataeus of Abdera describes the religious and political status of Judean priests and high priests as follows:

He [Moses] picked out the men of most refinement and with the greatest ability to head the entire nation, and appointed them priests; and he ordained that they should occupy themselves with the temple and the honours and sacrifices offered to their God. These same men he appointed to be judges in all major disputes, and entrusted to them the guardianship of the laws and customs. For this reason (διό) the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call this man the high priest, and believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. It is he, we are told, who in their assemblies and other gatherings announces what is ordained, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the high priest when he expounds the commandments to them. And at the end of their laws there is even appended the statement: "These are the words that Moses heard from God and declares unto the Jews."²⁵

(*Bibliotheca Historica* 40.3)

Despite the obvious influence of Greek ethnographical tradition and political utopianism on this passage, most scholars agree that it is historically reliable.²⁶ Since it cites two biblical verses, it appears that Hecataeus is using information supplied by Jewish informants.²⁷ The broad correspondence of this passage with the ideology of Ben Sira is noteworthy. The high priest is a figure of supreme wisdom and virtue. Priests not only govern the nation, but also hold the authority of sages / scribes as judges

²⁴ Fraade, "They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob," points out the lack of evidence for the existence of non-priestly scribes in Second Temple period sources.

²⁵ Translation from F.R. Walton in the LCL edition, reproduced by M. Stern ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, Volume One: from Herodotus to Plutarch* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976), 26–29.

²⁶ See Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 11, and bibliography in nn. 19–20.

²⁷ Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 11, 32–33; H. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran*, (JSJSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 72.

of “all major disputes” and guardians of “the laws and the customs.” Furthermore, it is *because* (διό) of the priestly leadership that the Jews do not have a king. This state of affairs is viewed as stemming from Moses, and thus as God ordained. Since Hecataeus may be dated to the late fourth century BCE,²⁸ we may conclude that the attraction of royal and scribal qualities to the priesthood in Judahite thought preceded Ben Sira by at least a century.

A famous passage from Josephus indicates that this perspective remained popular for centuries:

Some peoples have entrusted the supreme political power to monarchies, others to oligarchies, yet others to the masses. Our lawgiver, however, was attracted by none of these forms of polity, but gave to his constitution the form of what—if a coerced expression be permitted—may be termed a “theocracy,” placing all sovereignty and authority in the hands of God.²⁹

(Ag. Ap. 2.164–165)

A few lines later he describes this “theocracy” in further detail:

Could there be a finer or more equitable polity than one which sets God at the head of the universe, which assigns the administration of its highest affairs to the whole body of priests, and entrust to the supreme high-priest the direction of the other priests? These men, moreover, owed their original promotion by the legislator to their high office, not to any superiority in wealth or other accidental advantages. No; of all his companions, the men to whom he entrusted the ordering of divine worship as their first charge were those who were pre-eminently gifted with persuasive eloquence and discretion. But this charge further embraced a strict superintendence of the Law and of the pursuits of everyday life; for the appointed duties of the priests included general supervision, the trial of cases of litigation, and the punishment of condemned persons.³⁰

(Ag. Ap. 2.185–187)

As Goodblatt has illustrated, it appears that Josephus’ testimony is independent from that of Hecataeus.³¹ Once again, priests are portrayed as virtuous sages exercising royal authority and custodianship of the law. This form of government is traced back to Moses, and thus to the will of God himself. The testimonies of Josephus and Hecataeus thus provide evidence that the characteristics of king and sage continued to be viewed as appropriate to the priesthood throughout the Second Temple period.

²⁸ See Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, 20.

²⁹ Translation from H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus: Against Apion*, (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1927), 359.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 367.

³¹ Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle*, 34.

But in altogether ignoring the existence of monarchy in Israel, these two passages go beyond Ben Sira, who felt obliged to deal with the undeniably entrenched tradition of the monarchical covenant.

Aramaic Levi Document

It has often been observed that *ALD* takes an extreme position with regard to the centrality of the priesthood.³² As in Ben Sira, the idealized priest attracts the characteristics of the king and the sage. But more in line with the passages from Hecataeus and Josephus cited above, there is no acknowledgement of a separate royal governmental paradigm. *ALD* differs from all of these sources in removing its ideal priest far from contemporary times and placing him even before the time of any of the great priestly figures of the Bible. Indeed, it expends considerable exegetical effort in order to justify the elevation of the patriarch Levi to the high priesthood.³³ When the author of *ALD* does appear to refer to the priestly establishment of his own day, his judgment is far from positive:

You will darken (תחשכין) ... and upon whom will be the guilt (ועל מן תהוה) (חובתא) ... is it not upon me and you, my sons, for they will know it ... w]ays of truth you will abandon and all the paths of (א]רהת קשטא תשבקון) ... you will be lax (תמחלון) and you will walk in it ... that d[ar]kness will come upon you (ח[ש]וכה תתא עליכון) ... now, at ti[m]es you will be lowly (כען זמ[נין] תהוין לשפלין).³⁴ (4QLevi^a frg. 4)

According to some scholars, this prophetic warning delivered by Levi to his sons is aimed at a group of priests contemporary with the author with whom he was at odds. The sentiment expressed in this passage has helped convince them that *ALD* arose in anti-temple establishment priestly circles.³⁵ However, there are reasons to doubt this conclusion. We shall return to the question of the document's provenance below. First, we turn to the priestly magnetism of *ALD*.

There are several examples of the attraction of royal roles to the priesthood in *ALD*. Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of the text does not allow for certainty in all of the following cases:

³² See, e.g., Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 20–21.

³³ Of course, this portrait differs considerably from the rather ill-tempered and violent character presented by Genesis. For an exemplary demonstration of the exegetical strategies employed in the rehabilitation of Levi by both *ALD* and *Jubilees*, see Kugel, "Levi's Elevation."

³⁴ Text and translation follow Stone and Greenfield, DJD XXII, 21–23.

³⁵ Kugel, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 130, 136–137; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 74.

First, in *ALD* 99–100, Levi tells his children that they will be chiefs, judges, priests, and kings (4QLevi^a 2 13–15). The same fragment also contains a tantalizing reference to “your [i.e., Levi’s children’s] kingdom” (מלכותכן; l. 16).³⁶

Second, according to a passage preserved only in the Greek Mt. Athos manuscript, Levi’s son Qahat “and his seed will be the beginning of kings, priesthood for Israel.” Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel make a compelling argument that this passage originally existed in the Aramaic text.³⁷

Third, as we have already noted above, the application of the title כהין לאל עליון to Levi in *ALD* 9 and 13 is most likely a deliberate allusion to Melchizedek, the priest-king of Gen 14:18–20.³⁸

Fourth, another mysterious Qumran fragment, 1QLevi 1, claims that “the kingdom of the priesthood is greater than the kingdom[. . . ” (מלכות מלכות רבא מן מלכות (כהונתא רבא מן מלכות). Based on thematic and linguistic similarities, Milik placed this fragment next to *ALD* 4–6,³⁹ which refers to two kingdoms, an unnamed positive kingdom and a negative “kingdom of the sword” (מלכות הרבא), characterized by fighting, battle, chase, toil, conflict, killing, and hunger. By contrast the former kingdom is characterized by “peace, and all choice first-fruits of the whole earth for food.”

If the references to “peace” and “first-fruits” refer respectively to Phinehas’ covenant of peace (Num 25:12) and the first fruits owed to priests (Num 18:13),⁴⁰ then it is possible that the kingdom of priesthood in Milik’s fragment is the one here being contrasted with the kingdom of the sword.⁴¹ Indeed, this passage may represent a unique understanding of the notion of ממלכת כהנים found in Exod 19:6. However, since the text is fragmentary this conclusion remains speculative.⁴²

Fifth, and finally, perhaps the best known example of the priesthood assuming royal qualities concerns the naming of Levi’s second son Qahat in *ALD* 66–67:

[And I cal]led his name Qa[hat. And] I [sa]w that to him [would] be an assembly of all [the people and th]at he would have the high priesthood

³⁶ See Stone and Greenfield, *DJD* XXII, 16–18.

³⁷ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 186–187.

³⁸ See above, p. 157.

³⁹ Milik, *DJD* I, 88–89.

⁴⁰ Suggested by Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 49. Cf. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 242–243.

⁴¹ Assumed by Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 213, 242–243.

⁴² On the ambiguous import of this verse in the proposed context of *ALD* in which it appears, see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 139–140.

for [all Is]rael (יקרא) תי שמה ק[הת וחזי] ת די לה [תהו] ה כנשת כל [עמא וד] י לה [עמא]
 (תהוה כהנותה רבתא] לכל יש[ראל].⁴³

As Greenfield and Stone have shown, this “name midrash” transfers Jacob’s royal blessing of Judah in Gen 49:10 to Qahat, the second son of Levi through whom the high priestly line passed.⁴⁴ It does this by deriving the name קהת from the strange Hebrew word יקהת of Gen 49:10 (ולו יקהת) (עמים). In *ALD*, as in several other ancient Jewish traditions, the word יקהת is interpreted in the sense of “assembly.”⁴⁵ Thus *ALD* explains of Qahat, [עמא] כל [עמא] ל. Since Gen 49:10 was used as a prediction of the Davidic messiah in antiquity,⁴⁶ some scholars believe that *ALD* is here attributing to the priesthood the role of the royal messiah.⁴⁷ This view might be thought to gather support from *ALD*’s employment of another biblical text classically used to predict the arrival of the royal messiah, Isaiah 11.⁴⁸ In his prayer, Levi asks that God show him “the holy spirit” (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) and grant him “counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength” (עצה וחכמה ומנדע וגבורה; *ALD* supp. 8). As several scholars have noted, this echoes Isa 11:2: רוח ה’ רוח חכמה ובינה רוח עצה וגבורה.⁴⁹ However, since in the context of *ALD* the allusion to Isaiah 11 is not utilized to refer to a future messianic figure, it cannot be said with certainty to possess eschatological import. This same judgment applies to the application of Gen 49:10 to Qahat, also an idealized figure from the distant past.⁵⁰ On the other hand, inasmuch as 4Q541 9 lies in the same stream of tradition as *ALD* and the other Aramaic apocryphal Levi

⁴³ Text, translation, and reconstruction basically follow Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 94–95.

⁴⁴ Greenfield and Stone, “Remarks,” 223–224.

⁴⁵ M. Stone (“The Axis of History at Qumran,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 134) cites Aquila’s translation (σύστημα λαῶν), 4Q252 5:6, and *Gen. Rab.* 99 as examples of this interpretive tradition. See also Greenfield and Stone, “Remarks,” 223; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 184–186.

⁴⁶ For an example from the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus, see 4Q252 5. For further examples, see Onkelos to Gen 49:10; *Gen. Rab.* 98:8; *b. Sanh.* 98b. As Collins (*The Scepter*, 62) points out, in these instances, the word שילה is interpreted as a name for the messiah.

⁴⁷ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 20–21, 186.

⁴⁸ E.g., 4QpIsa^a 8–10 III, 15–29; 4Q285 7; *Pss. Sol.* 17:21–25; 18:6–8; cf. Rom 15:12; 4 *Ezra* 13:2–10.

⁴⁹ See D. Flusser, “Qumran and Jewish ‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 196; Stone and Greenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” 261. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 214–215, points out an additional parallel with Solomon’s prayer for wisdom in 1 Chr 1:9. See also Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 73, n. 48, who sees a reference here to Prov 8:10–14 as an equally attractive possibility.

⁵⁰ See Collins, *The Scepter*, 87–88.

literature discovered at Qumran,⁵¹ its portrait of a future eschatological high priest does indicate that the notion was not far off in this branch of pre-sectarian literature.

Regardless of whether Levi and Qahat attract messianic qualities in *ALD*, it is clear that they attract royal ones. In my opinion, the evidence cited above is enough to illustrate at least that like Ben Sira, the author of *ALD* envisioned priestly monarchy as the ideal governmental form.⁵²

ALD also shows a pronounced tendency to associate the wisdom of the sage/ scribe with the priesthood. This is most evident in Levi's parenetic speech to his children appended to the end of *ALD*:⁵³

(82) And in the [hundred and ei]ghteenth ye[ar] of my life, that is the ye[ar] in which my brother Joseph died, I called my child[ren and] their children and I began to instruct them (לפקדה הנון) concerning all that was on my mind. (83) I spoke up and said to my chil[dren: List]en to the word of your father Levi and pay attention to the instructions of God's friend (ידיד אל). (84) I instruct you, my sons, and reveal the truth to you, my beloved. (85) May truth (קושטא) be the essence of all your acts and it will be with you forever. (86) If you s[ow] righteousness and truth, you will bring in a blessed and good harvest ... (88) And now, my sons, teach reading and writing and teaching of wisdom to your children (וכען בני ספר ומוסר וחוכמה) ותהוי חכמתא עמכון) and may wisdom be eternal glory for you (אליפו לבניכון ליקר עלם). (89) For he who learns wisdom will (attain) glory through it, but he who despises wisdom will become an object of disdain and scorn. (90) Observe, my children, my brother Joseph [who] taught reading and writing and the teaching of wisdom, for glory and for majesty; and kings he advised (מאלפא ספר ומוסר חכמה ליקר ולרבו ולמלכין יעט הוא) ... (91) do not be lax in the study of wisdom ... (97) a man who studies wisdom, all

⁵¹ Puech, "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi," 2:449–501, regards 4Q540–541 as part of *ALD*. His position has been rejected by M. de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and the Testament of Levi," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 77–78, and Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 31–32.

⁵² See Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 71; Greenfield and Stone, "Remarks," 219, 223–224; de Jonge, *The Testaments*, 42.

⁵³ Scholars have long noted that a natural ending for *ALD* appears at the end of the autobiographical section in par. 81, where Levi announces, "and all the days of my life were one hundred [and thir]ty-seven years and I saw my thi[rd] generation before I died." See Becker, *Untersuchungen*, 94–95; D. Haupt, "Das Testament des Levi: Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Überlieferungsgeschichte," (PhD. diss., Halle-Wittenberg, 1969), 84; J.H. Ulrichsen, *Die Grundschrift der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung zu Umfang, Inhalt und Eigenart der ursprünglichen Schrift*, (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 10; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991), 186. However, as Kugler (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 129) points out, it is not necessary to assume that the appended speech was an external written source. Rather, it could well be "a fresh composition constructed from existing resources by the author of Aramaic Levi." Cf. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 324–325.

[h]is days are l[ong] and hi[s reputa]tion grows great . . . (98) And now, my sons, reading and writing and the teaching of wi[sdo]m which I lea[rned] (ספר ומוסר ח[כ]מתה ׀ אלפ[ת]) . . .⁵⁴ (82–98)

In this passage, which is among the best preserved Aramaic poems from the Second Temple period, Levi exhorts his children to act righteously (85–87) and strongly emphasizes their charge to teach reading, writing,⁵⁵ and instruction (88–89; cf. 90; 98). The poem also details the benefits of teaching and seeking wisdom (90–93; 97) and describes the priceless and eternal nature of wisdom (94–96), two well-known motifs in sapiential material.⁵⁶

Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel maintain that the attribution of the vocation of wisdom instruction to Levi and his descendants may be traced to the instructional role attributed to priests in Deut 33:10 and Mal 2:7.⁵⁷ The biblical instructional aspect of the priesthood is thus imbued with sapiential motifs.⁵⁸ In the case of *ALD*, this assumption is unconvincing. Deuteronomy 33 and Malachi 2 portray the teaching of Torah by priests to all of Israel. By contrast, the teaching of wisdom in *ALD* is directed to Levites alone: ספר ומוסר וחוכמה אליפו לבניכון ותהוי חוכמתא עמכון ליקר עלם (88). This “selfish” concern is mirrored by the fact that the priestly instructions transmitted by Isaac, which comprise about one-third of the extant document (14–61),⁵⁹ are exclusively connected to Levi and his descendants. Additionally, whereas Deuteronomy 33 and Malachi 2 refer to the Torah as the subject of instruction, *ALD* never comes close to identifying wisdom with the Torah.⁶⁰ Rather, the wisdom in Levi’s speech is

⁵⁴ Following composite text and translation of Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 104–107.

⁵⁵ Following Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel’s translation of ספר (p. 208). Drawnel (329–331) prefers to translate “scribal craft” since the term also probably included “all the aspects of Levitical education in the document . . . linked to, and dependent upon, the knowledge of writing,” including metrological and mathematical instruction.

⁵⁶ For parallels in Jewish and Mesopotamian literature, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 333–341.

⁵⁷ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 34.

⁵⁸ See Stone, “Ideal Figures and Social Context,” 580.

⁵⁹ For this figure, see Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 93 and n. 115.

⁶⁰ Interestingly enough, the Christian redactor of *T. Levi* does associate the Torah with wisdom. Adapting the word חוכמה in *ALD*, he renders it “law of God”: “And do you, too, teach your children letters that they may have understanding all their life, reading unceasingly the law of God. For everyone who knows the law of God will be honoured, and he will not be a stranger wherever he goes” (13:2–3). It remains a mystery why a supposedly Christian redactor would place such an emphasis on the law.

more akin to the “recipe wisdom” of the book of Proverbs.⁶¹ This contrasts strikingly with Sir 45:17, where Aaron teaches God’s law [= wisdom] to all of Israel. It thus appears that rather than sapiential motifs being attracted to the priestly role of instruction, the author of *ALD* “began with an interest in sapientializing the priesthood.”⁶² This conclusion appears to be substantiated by the fact that it is Joseph, not Levi, who is held up as the paradigmatic wise man in a poem addressed to priests. This surprise indicates that the author did not view the qualities of the sage / scribe as inherent to the priesthood, but rather as an ideal that required effort to attain—Levi’s descendants were to follow the example of a layman, Joseph, in their quest to acquire wisdom. Just as Joseph’s wisdom brought him to the height of power in Egypt, the acquisition of wisdom by priests would put them in proper position to govern, and to sit on a “throne of glory” (כורסי די יקר).⁶³

One further role attracted to the priesthood in *ALD* should be noted—that of the warrior. In *ALD* 78, Levi admits that “I was eighteen when I killed Shechem and destroyed the workers of violence.” In the very next verse Levi announces that “I was nineteen when I became a priest.” The juxtaposition of these two statements does not necessarily illustrate a causative relationship, but in light of the violent zeal for purity associated with the covenant of the priesthood in the Bible and in Second Temple times,⁶⁴ it is certainly suggestive.⁶⁵ Levi’s passion for righteousness and purity is explicitly stated in Levi’s prayer: “End lawlessness from the face of the earth, purify my heart, Lord, from all impurity” (* 5).⁶⁶ By killing Shechem, Levi eradicates doers of lawlessness (וגמרת לעבדי המסא) and shows just how far his passion for justice and purity goes. Thus, when it comes to matters of justice and purity, the ideal priest of *ALD* takes to the sword.⁶⁷

⁶¹ Consider, e.g., *ALD* 87: “If you s[o]w righteousness and truth, you will bring in a blessed and good harvest. He who sows good brings in a goodly (harvest), and he who sows evil, his sowing turns against him.” For the phrase “recipe wisdom,” see Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 32.

⁶² So Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 129, n. 234.

⁶³ Cf. Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 48–49.

⁶⁴ For several examples, see above, chapter two, nn. 25–26.

⁶⁵ Cf. *T. Levi* 5, where Levi is first appointed to the priesthood and then immediately given the charge to wage revenge against Shechem.

⁶⁶ The correspondence of the ideal of purity with Levi and the priesthood is underscored when Isaac finds out about Levi’s appointment to the priesthood. There (*ALD* 13–16), he emphasizes the ideal of priestly purity by warning against impurity and sexual sin.

⁶⁷ Noting this motif, P. Grelot (“Notes sur le Testament araméen de Lévi [Fragment de la Bodleian Library, colonne a],” *RB* 63 [1956]: 396) suggests that the kingdom of

Who created the ideal portrait of priesthood found in *ALD*? Despite a flurry of study in recent years, the precise provenance of the document remains shrouded in mystery. Since *ALD* assigns the roles of priest, king, and warrior to a single figure, some scholars have seen it as a second century work composed in favor of the Hasmonean dynasty.⁶⁸ However, while it may indeed have been used as pro-Hasmonean propaganda, there are several good indications that *ALD* predates the Hasmonean period. For one, it served as a source for *Jubilees*,⁶⁹ which was most likely written between 160 and 150 BCE.⁷⁰ On the basis of this datum, as well as a consideration of *ALD*'s non-polemical use of a solar calendar, two-spirit dualism, concern for purity, and other factors, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel locate it in "the wing of Judaism in the third century BCE of which the Qumran sectarians were one group of descendants."⁷¹ It is very difficult to arrive at a more precise identification.⁷²

Of particular interest for our purpose is the debate whether the document derives from a group friendly to the temple establishment or from an opposition group of some kind. Kugler takes the latter opinion and claims that *ALD* was crafted with two aims in mind, "to polemicize against a priesthood that its author perceived to be inadequate, and to promote a more pure model of the office."⁷³ He finds support for his first assertion not only in the bitter condemnation of Levi's descendants cited above, which he takes as directed against the priests of the author's own

the sword mentioned above should be attributed to Levi. He is followed by Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texten*, 188–209. As we have seen, this does not fit the evidence. It is interesting to note that in ancient Babylonia, the role of destroying evildoers was assigned to the king. See M. Weinfeld, *Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations: Equality and Freedom in Ancient Israel in Light of Social Justice in the Ancient Near East* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985), 25–31 (Hebrew).

⁶⁸ See Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texten*, 188–209; Grelot, "Notes sur le Testament araméen de Lévi," 406.

⁶⁹ For arguments in favor of direct dependence, see C. Werman, "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 4 (1997):220–221; M. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins," 159, n. 2. However, Kugel has made a case for the priority of *Jubilees*. See idem, "Levi's Elevation," esp. 52–58; and, more recently, idem "How Old is the 'Aramaic Levi Document'?"

⁷⁰ See p. 37.

⁷¹ See Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 19–22. The quote appears on p. 22. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 134–135, argues for a similar dating.

⁷² For more on *ALD*'s provenance, see above, pp. 46–48. For previous scholarship on the matter, see the helpful surveys of Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 63–66, and Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 131–134.

⁷³ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 110, followed by Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 74.

day, but also in the narrative and thematic patterns of *ALD*. He points out that rooting the ideal priesthood in a figure more ancient than Aaron who was heir to authoritative ancestral priestly tradition predating the cultic rules given to Moses implicitly undermines the sons of Aaron currently in power.⁷⁴ Moreover, he detects in the cultic laws transmitted from Isaac to Levi, especially those pertaining to cleansing ablutions, an intentional intensification of the standards of purity found in the Pentateuch. Kugler thus concludes that *ALD* speaks of two types of priests, those

who do not realize the ideal evinced by Levi with his passion for purity and attachment to the roles of scribe and sage ... and ... priests who accept the norms established in Levi, the most ancient priest of all; they are the adherents to the author's views, those who prize purity, wisdom, and learning as traits proper to the priesthood. *Aramaic Levi* is a rejection of the former kind of priest, and a plea for acceptance of the latter type.⁷⁵

Against Kugler, most scholars do not detect a polemic against the contemporary priesthood in *ALD*. As Drawnel points out, Levi's prediction of a dark future for his sons is addressed to all of them, and does not exclude any particular group. Thus, we cannot simply assume that *ALD* pits one group of priests against another. Moreover, the reinterpretation of the Shechem incident (and hence the selection of Levi as speaker) and the emphasis on endogamy may have been influenced by the defection of Manasseh, the brother of the Jewish high priest Jaddua from the Jerusalem priesthood to Samaria (*Ant.* 11.302–347),⁷⁶ as well as by the background of priestly exogamy mentioned in Ezra-Nehemiah. Himmelfarb has shown that where Isaac's cultic instructions differ from those of the Pentateuch, they do not represent intentional diversions but rather supplementation to the rather sparse rules of the Torah.⁷⁷ Supporting her hypothesis, analysis of *ALD*'s sacrificial halakhah has shown that it does not fit the proto-sectarian legal mold of 4QMMT, the Temple Scroll, and the Damascus Document. Rather, the laws of *ALD* "are as close to rabbinic laws as they are to sectarian ones."⁷⁸ Drawnel views the divergent cultic laws mostly as an expression of increased purity

⁷⁴ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 110. Compare the Christian use of Melchizedek in Hebrews 7. Contrast Ben Sira's extended praise of Aaron.

⁷⁵ Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 136–137.

⁷⁶ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 84.

⁷⁷ M. Himmelfarb, "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in *Aramaic Levi* and *Jubilees*," in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 103–122.

⁷⁸ Schiffman, "Sacrificial Halakhah," 202.

standards, Babylonian influence, and presentation of metro-arithmetical exercises.⁷⁹ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel likewise detect no polemical characteristics in *ALD* and remain undecided as to whether the document derives from a group friendly to or opposed to the temple.⁸⁰

Whatever the original purpose of the document, it is clear that when it was brought to and studied at Qumran, it was incorporated into an ideological environment hostile to the temple. The clearest evidence of this conclusion is found in CD 4:15–18, which, as noted above, quotes words of Levi that derive from a Levi apocryphon similar to *ALD* in a context highly critical of the temple establishment. As we shall see below, this view is complemented by other Qumran traditions that tend to elevate Levi and the Levites above their normal biblically mandated roles.

The fact that *ALD* combines the qualities of the ideal priest and the king in a single figure brings to mind the argument, noted above, that CD's "messiah of Aaron and Israel" refers to a single figure with priestly and royal characteristics. Did *ALD*'s ideal image of Levi contribute to CD's image of a "messiah of Aaron and Israel"? Unfortunately, the Damascus Document does not provide enough information for a positive conclusion.

Jubilees

It is widely held that *ALD* or something very close to it served as a source for the accounts pertaining to Levi in the book of *Jubilees* (30:1–32:9).⁸¹ It is therefore unsurprising to find comparable instances of priestly magnetism.⁸² For instance, the warrior-like role of Levi at Shechem is mentioned in tandem with the elevation of Levi and his descendants to the priesthood. In contrast to *ALD*, the author of *Jubilees* makes clear that Levi's violent zeal for purity and justice is related to his reception of the gift of the priesthood:

Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as Levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. (30:18)

⁷⁹ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 84.

⁸⁰ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 22.

⁸¹ See above, n. 69.

⁸² For the unique aims of *Jubilees*, see J. VanderKam, "The Origins and Purposes of the Book of *Jubilees*," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1997), 3–24.

The phrase “revenge on all who rise against Israel” hints at the paradigmatic nature of Levi’s warrior role—his wrath is not only properly directed at Shechem but at all of Israel’s enemies, the doers of injustice and impurity. For the author then, this violent passion for purity underscores Levi’s ideal candidacy for the sacerdotal office.

As we have noted above, the biblical instructional and judicial roles of the priesthood are emphasized in Isaac’s blessing of Levi in *Jub.* 31:15.⁸³ While there is nothing in *Jubilees* comparable to *ALD*’s wisdom poem, *Jub.* 45:16 does mention the transmission of “books” in connection with Levi and his children: “He [Israel] gave all his books and the books of his fathers to his son Levi so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today.” Presumably, these books were filled with the primordial priestly instructions passed first in oral form, and then, from the time of Noah, in written form from father to favorite son.⁸⁴ These written instructions may have resembled those passed from Isaac to Levi in *ALD* 14–61. The Testament of Qahat also makes tantalizing mention of “writings” passed from Levi to Qahat to Qahat’s children “which contain great value in their being carried on with you” (זכו רבה באתהילכותהון בהון) (עמכך; 1 II, 11–13). While it is difficult to ascertain the precise nature of these writings, it is clear that the transmission of written tradition by Levi and his descendants assumes a priestly scribal function. This association is evident also in *Jubilees*’ linking of priestly and scribal roles in the figure of Enoch. Enoch is both the inventor of writing, the first man to “learn writing and knowledge and wisdom” (4:17), and a cultic functionary who burnt “incense of the sanctuary” before God (4:25).⁸⁵

Finally, like *ALD* and Ben Sira, *Jubilees* attributes political responsibilities to the priesthood. We have seen above that, like *ALD*, *Jub.* 32:1–2 intentionally refers to Levi with language reminiscent of the priest-king Melchizedek: They have been “appointed and made into the priesthood of the Most High God forever.” Returning to *Jub.* 31:15, Isaac refers to Levi’s descendants as “princes, judges, and leaders of all the descendants

⁸³ “They will be . . . judges . . . They will declare the word of the Lord justly and will justly judge all his verdicts. They will tell my ways to Jacob and my paths to Israel. The blessing of the Lord will be placed in their mouths, so that they may bless all the descendants of the beloved.” On the biblical sources of this passage, see above, p. 43.

⁸⁴ See *Jub.* 7:38–39; 10:14; cf. 12:27; 21:10; 39:6–7.

⁸⁵ Enoch’s role as priest-scribe appears in *BW* as well. See above, p. 32. The image of Enoch as esoteric priest-scribe may be compared to that of the priest-scribe Ezra in 4 *Ezra*, esp. 12:37; 14:6, 24–26, 44–48. For further instances of Enoch’s scribal activities, see 2 *En.* 53:2, and *T. Abr.* B 11:3, where, as in *Jub.* 4:24, he records human deeds for the purpose of the final judgment.

of Jacob's sons." The fact that Isaac goes on to curse any "nation" that curses Levi (31:17) reinforces the view of the priesthood as an ideal governing institution in Israel. However, throughout, *Jubilees* keeps the royal and priestly offices distinct. Thus *Jub.* 16:18, playing on Exod 19:6, divides the descendants of Jacob into "a kingdom, a priesthood, and a holy people" (cf. *Jub.* 33:20).⁸⁶ Moreover, while in *ALD* Isaac blesses Levi alone, in *Jubilees* 31 he blesses both Levi and Judah, giving primacy to the former.⁸⁷ The descendants of Judah are granted an "honorable throne that is rightly yours," (31:20) but strikingly, they are never called "kings." In fact, the word translated by VanderKam as "princes" with reference to the children of Levi is applied also to the descendants of Judah in 31:18. This equation of political power shows that, in its present form at least, *Jubilees* argues for a Levi-Judah diarchy.⁸⁸ The exalted position of Levi, the priority of his blessing, and his association with Isaac's right hand all indicate that supremacy in this diarchy was granted to the priesthood.

One is led to wonder why the author of *Jubilees*, who utilized the same solar calendar as the author of *ALD* and many of his traditions idealizing Levi, did not also follow *ALD*'s view of the priest as the ideal ruler of the Jewish polity. Considering the later dating of the book of *Jubilees* (mid-second century BCE), we may relate its diarchic ideology to the rise of the Hasmonean state. The call for the separation of powers in *Jubilees* is best seen as a response to the combination of priestly and royal power in a single Hasmonean figure.⁸⁹ A similar *Sitz im Leben* most likely underlies the Temple Scroll's marked interest in the division of royal and priestly powers and its attribution of primacy to the priesthood.⁹⁰ Although both

⁸⁶ Cf. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 137, n. 147. For an alternate view of the use of Exod 19:6 in *Jubilees*, see Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 53.

⁸⁷ Just as Jacob illustrates the primacy of Ephraim over Menasseh by taking the former by his right hand and blessing him first (Genesis 48), Isaac illustrates Levi's primacy over Judah (*Jub.* 31:12).

⁸⁸ Goodblatt (*The Monarchic Principle*, 47–48) speculates that in its original context Isaac's blessing of Levi (*Jub.* 31:13–17) expressed a notion of priestly monarchy similar to that found in *ALD*. Later on, a redactor inserted a blessing for Judah, which left the division of labor between the Levi "princes" and the Judah "princes" unclear.

⁸⁹ The first Hasmonean to take the title "king" was either Aristobulos I or his brother Alexander Jannaeus at the end of the second century BCE. See Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, 1:216–217. Even though these figures came to rule decades after the composition of *Jubilees*, various sources indicate that prior Hasmonean rulers already exercised great political powers. See, e.g., 1 Mac 13:42; Josephus, *War* 1.68; *Ant.* 13.299.

⁹⁰ See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:345–346; M. Delcor, "Le Statut du roi d'après le 'Rouleau du Temple,'" *Henoch* 3 (1981): 47–68; M. Hengel, J. Charlesworth and

Jubilees and the Temple Scroll are proto-sectarian and are not necessarily speaking in an eschatological sense, their ideal visions of leadership represent the polemical seedbed out of which Qumranite conceptions of dual messiahship grew. Among the sectarian texts, this is best illustrated by 4QTestimonia, which has been convincingly interpreted as a polemic against the Hasmoneans, who merged royal and priestly (and perhaps prophetic⁹¹) roles in single figures.⁹²

Summary: Priestly Magnetism and Eschatological Priesthood

In the above survey we have observed several examples of the tendency of Second Temple literature to craft ideal patterns of priestly conduct and exemplary priestly figures. In addition to the traditional cultic, judicial, instructional, and other responsibilities of the priesthood known from the Hebrew Bible, the literature variously attributes the characteristics of king, sage, scribe, and warrior to the model priest. Since these ideal portrayals occur in such a wide variety of sources as Ben Sira, Hecataeus, Josephus, *ALD*, *Jubilees*, 4Q541 9, and the Temple Scroll, it is clear that they are not a product of sectarian imagination. Rather, they must be related in general to the rise of priestly and scribal powers in Second Temple society described above. The differing pictures of ideal priestly figures in the above texts must be seen either as attempts to legitimize the contemporary roles of priests (as in Ben Sira, Hecataeus, Josephus) or as polemics that present an alternative to the present establishment (as in *Jubilees*, Temple Scroll, and perhaps *ALD*). It is striking that even in the

D. Mendels, "The Polemical Character of 'On Kingship' in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple," *JJS* 37 (1986): 28–38; L. Schiffman, "The King, His Guard and the Royal Council in the *Temple Scroll*," in *The Courtyards*, 487–504; idem, "Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community," in *Emanuel*, 413–427; S. Fraade, "The Torah of the King (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers From an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001* (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 31.

⁹¹ Cf. *War* 1.68; *Ant.* 13.299, where, along with the government of the nation and the privilege of the high priesthood, Josephus attributes the gift of prophecy to John Hyrcanus.

⁹² The correspondence between Josephus' description of John Hyrcanus cited in the previous note with the biblical verses cited in 4QTestimonia has been pointed out by numerous scholars. See for example, Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 318; D. Flusser, *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*, (trans. C. Glucker; Tel Aviv: MOD Books, 1989), 87–88; H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of the Peshar Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 418–419; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*, 63–87.

polemical cases, priestly powers and abilities are expanded far beyond biblical parameters. This indicates that in general the association of the priesthood with the realms of civil government and wisdom / scribalism was deemed as a given and indeed as scripturally authorized by most if not all of Jewish society in the Second Temple period.

Qumranite images of eschatological priesthood are best understood within this intellectual milieu. In most general terms, they may be said to reflect the inflated significance of the priesthood. To narrow it down, we might expect the proto-sectarian texts, so close to the hearts of the Qumranites, such as *ALD*, *Jubilees*, and the Temple Scroll to be most influential in this regard. The models of priesthood contained in them provided the world of ideas which nurtured Qumranite visions of the future priest. This is readily seen in sectarian texts such as 1QSa, 4QFlorilegium, and 4Q285, which envision a diarchic eschatological leadership that gives priority to the priest. These texts are to be related with the anti-Hasmonean polemics of *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll, which insist on the separation of priestly and royal powers, and the primacy of the former.⁹³ If CD's messiah of Aaron and Israel is taken as a single figure combining priestly and royal attributes, then it is possible that this expectation was influenced by *ALD*'s portrait of Levi. The martial role attributed to Levi in *ALD* and *Jubilees* (cf. Michael's role in *BW*) may also have had reflexes in the Qumran community. In 11Q13, the celestial high priest Melchizedek is pictured as leading his armies, violently administering justice and exacting God's vengeance on Belial and his lot. According to the War Rule, the eschatological war effort is to be led by priests. However, unlike Levi and Melchizedek (and Michael in *BW*), these priests are not to participate directly in the carnage for fear of corpse impurity. Appar-

⁹³ From the almost complete lack of reference in *Jubilees*, the Temple Scroll, and the sectarian corpus to the relevant passages in the books of Haggai and Zechariah, the duumvirate of Joshua and Zerubbabel apparently did not serve as an important biblical model for the Qumranite expectation of a priestly messiah accompanied by a royal counterpart. See Vanderkam, "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah," 365. S. Talmon ("Types of Messianic Expectation at the Turn of the Era," in *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986], 214–215, 220–221) explains this phenomenon as a result of the community's self-identification with the returnees from Babylonian captivity. Since they themselves were the returnees, they could not make use of Zechariah's or Haggai's prophecies. However, with the publication of 4QCommentary on Genesis C (4Q254), which does contain a reference to Zech 4:14 in an extremely broken context (fig. 4), these suggestions must be reevaluated. G. Brooke, DJD XXII, 224, tentatively suggests that the Zechariah verse may have been utilized in this case as a messianic interpretation of Gen 49:8–12.

ently, the purity concerns of the community made the attribution of such a bloody role to its own priesthood unthinkable. Finally, the important judicial and didactic roles ascribed to the priests in *ALD*, *Jubilees*, and the Temple Scroll are mirrored by the association of Qumran's eschatological priest with teaching and the proliferation of the law for the new age. However, it should be noted that no literary dependence can be shown in these cases, and while some form of conceptual influence is probable, it is not possible to demonstrate direct influence.

Finally, 4Q541 9 contains the only straightforward reference to an eschatological priest in a non-sectarian and pre-Qumran text. This exception is of utmost importance for it provides unequivocal evidence that the notion existed before the formation of the community. Based on the fragment's discovery at Qumran and its close relationship to the *ALD*-Testament of Qahat-Visions of Amram literary complex so popular there, we may assume that it exerted some influence on the way in which the Qumranites imagined the priestly messiah. Indeed, the overall dualistic framework of the fragment and the report that its unnamed figure will possess wisdom (l. 2), atone for all the children of his generation (l. 2) and teach the will of God (l. 3) aligns quite nicely with sectarian pictures of the eschatological priest as teacher and interpreter of the Law, and perhaps as making atonement in the age to come.

Ultimately, the flourishing of priestly messianic speculation in sectarian literature may be said to reflect the unique historical circumstances and apocalyptic worldview of the Qumran community. The Qumranites were profoundly disturbed by what they perceived as the corruption of the contemporary priestly leadership in Jerusalem and the pollution of the temple. Marginalized and isolated at their settlement in the desert, they yearned for the day when they would come to power and return to a restored Jerusalem temple. In this context, they crafted the image of a grand future priest who would rise to power, purge the temple, and enforce the community's utopian vision of the new age. For the pious traditionalists of Qumran, this expectation was not perceived as an innovation, but as a reflection of the true meaning of traditional written sources.

LEVI AND LEVITES IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Beyond *ALD* and *Jubilees*, several other texts scattered around the Qumran corpus elevate Levi as progenitor of all priests and/or as a paragon of priestly virtue. Still others, most notably the Temple Scroll, exhibit a

high regard for the Levites, at times elevating them above their biblically mandated inferior positions vis-à-vis the priests. What can the attraction of such traditions to Qumran tell us about the community? Can this phenomenon further illuminate the traditional roots of priestly messianism at Qumran?

The Evidence

Recent surveys of the Dead Sea Scrolls traditions relating to Levi and the Levites by Stallman, Brooke, and Kugler are now available.⁹⁴ Thus, I will presently limit myself to a brief summary of the evidence, which may be divided into traditions pertaining to the patriarch Levi and those pertaining to the Levites.

Levi Traditions

Even a cursory perusal of the Scrolls reveals that the tradition which rehabilitated the figure Levi from his troublesome biblical personality into a model priest is not limited to *ALD* and *Jubilees*. For example, 4QPseudo-Jubilees^{a+b} (4Q225 2 II, 11–12; 4Q226 7:4) names Levi as fourth in a genealogical list that also includes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. These four heroes are clearly not characterized by first-born status, but rather, in line with *Jubilees* (see 21; 33:13–17; 45:16; etc.), as bearers of the priesthood itself or as transmitters of the priestly writings.⁹⁵ A similar picture is provided by the Aramaic papyrus 4QBiblical Chronology (4Q559 I 1 and 3), which includes the same four patriarchs as well as Levi's descendants Qahat, Amram, and Aaron in its priestly genealogy.⁹⁶ In 4QApocryphon of Joshua^b (4Q379 1 2), Levi is mentioned before Reuben in a list of the tribal patriarchs and is called “beloved of God” (יְדִיד אֱלֹהִים); cf. *ALD* 83), a name that in biblical tradition is only applied to Benjamin (Deut

⁹⁴ R. Stallman, “Levi and Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran Questions* (ed. J. Charlesworth; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 164–190; G. Brooke, “Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 115–139, esp. 115–126; R. Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites,” in *The Provo International Conference*, 465–479. See also Werman, “Levi and Levites,” 211–225.

⁹⁵ J. VanderKam, DJD XIII, 153.

⁹⁶ Cf. the probable reconstruction of Levi's name in the priestly genealogy of 4QPseudo-Daniel^c (4Q245 1 I, 5). See J.J. Collins and P. Flint, DJD XXII, 159.

33:12).⁹⁷ According to 5QRule (5Q13 2:7–8), God has designated Levi for some special service and chosen the sons of Levi to go out [and come in]. 4QInstruction^g (4Q423 5 1a) refers to “Levi the prie[st],” probably as a representative of the quasi-priestly elect to be rewarded by God.⁹⁸ Although it is too fragmentary to be of much use, 3Q7 mentions “the angel of the presence” (5 3) as well as the word “Levi” (6 2).⁹⁹ In addition to these texts, we have noted that Testament of Qahat and Visions of Amram extend the tradition by assigning to Levi’s son and grandson the duty of carrying on his sacred role.

It is notable that with the exception of 5QRule, none of these texts may definitely be classified as sectarian. This means that while Qumranites imported such traditions about the patriarch Levi from abroad and hence valued them highly, as a rule they did not compose them. On the other hand, as we have noted above, the Qumranites did compose a work idealizing the otherworldly figure Melchizedek.¹⁰⁰ In this connection, it is intriguing to recall the tension between Melchizedek and Levi in Hebrews 7. There, Levi is demoted from his genealogically based priestly privileges because he, in the person of Abraham, has already paid a tithe to Melchizedek, the superior priest-king who lacks any genealogical claim. It is tempting to speculate that the Qumranite preference for Melchizedek derives partially from a similar polemical matrix. However, as we shall see, the common insistence on the traditional distinctions between priests, Levites, Israelites, and, at times, proselytes in sectarian literature argues against the complete abandonment of the genealogical principle at Qumran.

Levite Traditions

There are some sixty references to *בני לוי* or *לויים* in the non-biblical corpus.¹⁰¹ These references appear in works of multiple genres stemming from both sectarian and non-sectarian origins. Parallel to the contradictory and even incoherent statements about the Levites in the Bible,¹⁰² the evidence of the Scrolls pertaining to the status and role of Levites is

⁹⁷ Newsom, DJD XXII, 264–265.

⁹⁸ See above, pp. 71–73.

⁹⁹ See Baillet, Milik, and de Vaux, DJD III, 99.

¹⁰⁰ See pp. 146–164.

¹⁰¹ Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 1:414–415.

¹⁰² For a convenient review of differing presentations of Levites in biblical sources, see Werman, “Levi and Levites,” 213–215.

uneven. However, there appears to be a general tendency to elevate them above the privileges granted to them in the biblical record.¹⁰³ Kugler has made a good start at clarifying the muddled evidence. Employing the sociological role concept as a heuristic device, he divides the data mostly according to the differing portrayals of Levites in comparison with priests relative to the Bible.¹⁰⁴ For our purposes, four of his five categories will be useful.¹⁰⁵ In addition, I will include a fifth category of my own.

1. *Passages which elevate Levites above priests*

These appear explicitly only in non-sectarian texts. Especially notable in this category are certain treatments of the Levites in the Temple Scroll.¹⁰⁶ In the assignment of temple chambers to the tribes, the priests, and the Levites in column 44, the tribes each receive one section, the priests receive two, and the levitical families receive three.¹⁰⁷ This is especially striking for the biblical record accords the Levites no chambers in the temple at all.¹⁰⁸ From column 22, which describes the feast of the new oil, as well as from the enumeration of the levitical dues in column 60, it is clear that the Levites were to be assigned gifts from the altar, even though there is no biblical warrant for such a privilege. Most significantly, according to 11QT 22:11–12 and 60:6–7, the shoulder (שכֹּם) of the well-being offering is to be allotted to the Levites. This ruling comes as a surprise, for, as Milgrom observes, in the Bible “neither is the shoulder ever considered a sacred portion nor are the Levites ever awarded sacrificial flesh.”¹⁰⁹ Milgrom claims that the assignment of the shoulder to the Levites depends on an interpretation of the foreleg (הזרע) allotted to the priests in Deut 18:3 as referring only to the lower part of the

¹⁰³ Brooke (“Levi and the Levites,” 116) notes an especial affinity of the Qumran traditions with elements of Deuteronomy and the book of Chronicles, which bolster the powers of Levites.

¹⁰⁴ Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 467–472. While I disagree with his categorization of a few specific passages, I believe that he is for the most part correct.

¹⁰⁵ I have slightly altered Kugler’s categories in step with my own view of the evidence. His fifth category, “Passages in which Levi is Exalted as the Ideal Priestly Figure” has been dealt with above.

¹⁰⁶ Milgrom noted the prominence of the Levites in the Temple Scroll in “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 501–506. See also G. Brooke, “The Temple Scroll: A Law unto Itself?” in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (ed. B. Lindars; Cambridge: J. Clarke, 1988), 38–39.

¹⁰⁷ See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:264–268; Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 501; Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 166–167; Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 468.

¹⁰⁸ Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran” 468, n. 9, observes that temple chambers are granted only to the priests in Ezek 42:1–14.

¹⁰⁹ Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 502.

leg.¹¹⁰ Whether or not he is correct, it is certain that the Levites are here granted a superior portion. As Stallman notes, “one need only consider a cow’s anatomy to realize that the Levites would enjoy the choicest cuts . . . that the priests would also receive the ‘jowls and the inner parts’ (Deut 18.3) could hardly have been very reassuring to them.”¹¹¹

An additional case of the elevation of Levites over priests in the Temple Scroll is pointed out by Milgrom. He notes that in the new wine and new oil feasts, each tribe, including the Levites, is to receive one pair of the fourteen rams and fourteen lambs. Since in 21:[1] the Levites receive another portion, their share is double that of the priests or that of any other tribe.¹¹²

The *Words of Moses* (1Q22), which is a rewritten version of the farewell address of Moses in the concluding chapters of Deuteronomy, may preserve another example.¹¹³ According to I, 1–3, which preserves the opening of the composition, God calls on Moses to ascend Mount Nebo with Eleazar and to interpret the law “[for the heads of the fa]milies of the Lev[i]tes and all the [priests].”¹¹⁴ By contrast, the Israelites are simply to be charged with the commandments (ll. 3–4). It is interesting to note that while in Deut 31:9, Moses delivers the law to “the priests the sons of Levi,” here, if Milik’s reconstruction is correct, the Levites are given priority over the priests and are recognized as the supreme possessors of the correct Mosaic interpretation of the Law.¹¹⁵ A similar motif likely occurs in fragment 5 of 4QOrdinances^a (4Q159), which mentions the “sons of Le[vi]” (l. 2), “to in]terpret the Torah” (l. 6), “when Moses took” (l. 4), and “Moses spoke” (l. 7).¹¹⁶ As Brooke notes, the fact that so many key phrases survive in such a small fragment is “enough to enable us to see that somehow the Levites are involved in the interpretation of what

¹¹⁰ See Milgrom, “The Shoulder of the Levites,” in Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:169–176. Cf. L. Schiffman, “Priestly and Levitical Gifts in the ‘Temple Scroll,’” in *The Provo International Conference*, 490–492.

¹¹¹ Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 170. So too Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 468.

¹¹² Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 501. For the reconstruction and justification see Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 2:93.

¹¹³ See Strugnell, “Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran,” 221–256, esp. 246–247, who, on the basis of style and pseudepigraphic setting, identifies it with 4Q375, 4Q376 and 1Q29.

¹¹⁴ Following the reconstruction of Milik, DJD I, 92.

¹¹⁵ See Brooke, “Levi and the Levites,” 119–120.

¹¹⁶ For some suggestions as to the reconstruction and interpretation of this fragment, see M. Bernstein, “4Q159 Fragment 5 and the ‘Desert Theology’ of the Qumran Sect,” in *Emanuel*, 43–56.

Moses said.”¹¹⁷ The centrality of the exalted role of the Levites as interpreters of the words of Moses is further seen in 4QTestimonia’s use of Deut 33:8–11 with reference to the priestly messiah.

2. *Passages which elevate the Levites, but not above the priests*

Passages in this category come from both non-sectarian and sectarian compositions.¹¹⁸ 11QT 61:8–9 contains a striking example. There, the author reworks Deut 19:17’s *לפני הכהנים והשופטים אשר יהיו בימים ההם* to read *לפני הכהנים והלויים ולפני השופטים אשר יהיו בימים ההמה*. He thus insists that Levites be included as judges alongside priests.¹¹⁹ In 11QT 57:12, twelve Levites are placed on the royal council along with the twelve priests and twelve lay leaders.¹²⁰ According to 11QT 60:12–14, Levites from the countryside are apparently entitled to serve (*לשרת*) at the altar like fellow priests (cf. Deut 18:6–8).¹²¹ 11QT 22:4 relates that the Levites are to slaughter the sacrifices of the new oil festival, and the closely related New Jerusalem contains the phrase “the Levites sacrifice” (*לויא דבח[י]ן*); 11Q18 30:2). The attribution of this function to the Levites may be viewed as a polemic against contemporary temple practice, according to which only priests performed the slaughtering.¹²² Stallman points out that this is no innovation, but rather “a reestablishment of the Levitic right to slaughter according to the precedents set during the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah (2 Chr 30:17, 22; 35:11–14).”¹²³

Further instances may be gleaned from the War Rule. For example, 4QM^c (4Q493) assigns the blowing of trumpet signs for battle to both priests and Levites. This contrasts with 1QM 7:12–15, where, in line with Num 1:50 and 4:15, the Levites are assigned the menial role of

¹¹⁷ Brooke, “Levi and the Levites,” 120.

¹¹⁸ For an interesting example from Josephus, see *Ant.* 20.216–218, where he recounts that the Levite singers petitioned and were allowed to wear the same robes as the priests, thereby blurring the distinction, set by “ancestral law,” between priest and Levite.

¹¹⁹ See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:352; Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 501–502.

¹²⁰ See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:349–353.

¹²¹ With Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 469. Cf. Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 171. Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 503, believes that *לשרת* here means only “to assist.” However in n. 11 he does recognize the possibility that the term includes the right to officiate at the altar.

¹²² Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 502–503. He makes the same argument with regard to the Temple Scroll’s assignment of the first tithes to the Levites (60:6), since historical evidence indicates that the priests had usurped that privilege in Second Temple times. He cites *b. Yeb.* 86b and *Jub.* 13:24–26 as evidence of this.

¹²³ Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 171.

porters; they are to carry the ram horns while only the priests are allowed to blow them for the purpose of directing the troops.¹²⁴ According to 1QM 13:1 and 18:5–6, Levites are permitted to bless God together with the priests.¹²⁵ And in 4QM^a (4Q491) 1–3 9–10, Levites join the priests in checking the purity status of the warriors.¹²⁶ Notably, in these last two examples, honored lay groups, termed “elders of the rule” (1QM 13:1), “chiefs [of the formation and elders] of the rule,” (1QM 18:6)¹²⁷ and “camp commanders” (4QM^a 1–3:9), are permitted to participate as well.

Still other examples are preserved in CD, 1QS, and 1QSa. According to CD 13:2–4, wherever there is a group of ten community members, a priest learned in the Book of Hagi must serve as the group’s authority. But when no such priest is available, a Levite with the proper knowledge is to serve as a substitute. In the covenant ceremony described at the beginning of 1QS, the priests and the Levites together bless God and all the works of his truth (1:18–20) and curse those who enter the covenant without fully repenting (2:11–17). Finally, while 1QSa 1:22–27 envisions the Levites of the messianic age as under the authority of the priests, it assigns them a special administrative role as keepers of the sectarian roster and those who muster the members of the eschatological community.¹²⁸ It is possible that the positions of “commanders, judges, and officials” mentioned in 1QSa 1:24 are envisioned as best filled by Levites, but the language remains ambiguous.¹²⁹ Moreover, in the event of a “convocation for war” we are told in 1QSa 1:26 that “they shall sanctify them for three days” (קדשום שלושת ימים). The object of sanctification is surely the entire congregation, but the subject is ambiguous. Since the subject of the previous sentence is the Levites, it is reasonable to suggest that they are also the subject here.¹³⁰ If so, as in 4QM^a 1–3:9–10, the

¹²⁴ Noted by Baillet, DJD VII, 53. See Brooke’s discussion, “Levi and the Levites,” 118–119. The Levites appear with trumpets also in 4Q285 3 2. P. Alexander and G. Vermes (DJD XXXVI, 234) comment on that text as follows: “The reference here is probably to the Levites blowing trumpets during the battle in order to signal the soldiers which manoeuvre they were to make.”

¹²⁵ See Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 469.

¹²⁶ Baillet, DJD VII, 13.

¹²⁷ For this reconstruction, see Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 344–345.

¹²⁸ See Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 28. Licht (*Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 247, 260) suggests that the expanded civil roles of the Levites in 1QSa reflect those attributed to them in such passages as 1 Chr 23:4 and 2 Chr 34:12.

¹²⁹ See Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 29.

¹³⁰ Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 263. His suggestion is taken up cautiously by Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 342. Other scholars prefer to interpret the text less literally, proposing that the sanctification in question is self-imposed (translating: “they shall

Levites would here be assigned the task of monitoring the purity of the congregation (this time, apparently without the assistance of the priests and the camp commanders).

3. *Passages in which Levites are exalted as a tribe among the twelve*

These passages appear in both non-sectarian and sectarian works. The Temple Scroll provides a couple of famous examples. In 11QT 39:12 and 40:14–15 the central gate of the eastern sides of the middle and outer courts is named after Levi. This is significant, for that position is the most prestigious. According to Num 3:38, Moses and Aaron and his sons camp to the east of the tent of meeting, but the biblical record never grants Levi that position.¹³¹

According to 11QT 23:9–10 and 24:11, at the wood offering festival, the priests must offer the burnt-offering of the Levites before that of any other tribe. Interestingly, Levi's offering is to be followed by Judah's (and then the rest of the tribes), recalling the priority of his blessing in *Jubilees* 31. According to 4Q365 23, a text closely related to the Temple Scroll,¹³² an offering of wood is brought by the tribes on consecutive days, and Levi is once again given priority (l. 10).¹³³

Kugler includes in this category two texts already mentioned above, 1Q22 and 5Q13. He notes that in 1Q22, the Levites are elevated not only vis-à-vis the priests but also in relation to the rest of the tribes of Israel, who are dependent on their knowledge of God's law. Moreover, 5Q13 2:7–8 may be interpreted as an “announcement that the Levites are a specially chosen tribe from among the others.”¹³⁴ I would add 1QM 5:1, in which the names of “Israel and Levi and Aaron” are to be written on the shield¹³⁵ of the Prince of the Congregation. Only after these names are the “names of the twelve tribes of Israel” to be written. In this connection, it is also worth considering the very beginning of 1QM, which states that “the

sanctify themselves”). So Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community*, 30 n. 9; Barthélemy, DJD I, 115–116; Carmignac, “Règle de la Congrégation,” 22.

¹³¹ Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 167; Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 471; Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 501.

¹³² See E. Tov and S. White, DJD XIII, 290–296. For a recent discussion of the identification of 4Q365 23, see M. Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 37–38.

¹³³ In fact, the order of the tribes is identical with the order given in 11QT with respect to the wood festival. As Tov and White note (DJD XIII, 293), this order has not been discovered elsewhere in ancient Jewish literature.

¹³⁴ Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 471–472.

¹³⁵ For this word, the text only contains an initial *mem*. I follow the suggested reconstruction of Yadin, *The Scroll of the War*, 54.

sons of Levi, the sons of Judah, and the sons of Benjamin, the exiles of the wilderness shall wage war against them [the Sons of Darkness]" (1:2).¹³⁶ The priority of Levi among these special tribes appears to be significant.

4. *Passages in which Levites remain second to priests without elevated status*

Examples are found in both non-sectarian and sectarian works. Once again, the Temple Scroll provides a couple of passages of interest. According to 11QT 58:13, the Levites and the priests receive the same portions of spoil recovered after a military victory as those guaranteed to them in the Bible (Num 31:30).¹³⁷ 11QT 21:4 relates that the Levites are to drink the wine of the new wine festival only after the priests.¹³⁸

Among the sectarian texts, examples are provided by 1QM, 1QS, and CD. We have noted already that in 1QM 7:12–14, the Levites serve as porters in line with their menial assignments given in the book of Numbers. Moreover, according to the description of the reconstituted cultic community in 1QM 2:2, the Levites are to serve under the high priest and his deputy as well as the other priests (cf. 4QM^d [4Q494] 2–6).¹³⁹ In 1QS 2:19–22, the biblical hierarchical division priests-Levites-Israelites is maintained and applied to the totality of the community. At the annual covenant ceremony, the priests are to enter first, followed by the Levites, followed by the people “so that each Israelite may know his standing in God’s community.” Similarly, CD 14:4–6 records the “rule for the settlement of the camps,” according to which priests are mustered first, followed by Levites, laymen, and finally proselytes. According to this passage, these hierarchical divisions were integral to communal organization: “Thus shall they sit and thus shall they inquire about any (matter).”

¹³⁶ Cf. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^b (4Q372) 1:14, which states that “they (probably proto-Samaritans) spoke to provoke Levi and Judah and Benjamin with their words.” See the edition and comments of E. Schuller and M. Bernstein in D.M. Gropp et al., *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4.28: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 165–178.

¹³⁷ Cf. 11QT 60:7–11. See the mathematical discussions of Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:360–362; Milgrom, “Studies in the Temple Scroll,” 520–521; Stallman, “Levi and the Levites,” 170–171.

¹³⁸ Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:109–110.

¹³⁹ Kugler (“The Priesthood at Qumran,” 471) sees further examples of the secondary, non-elevated status of the Levites in 1QM 8:9, 16:7, and 15:4. According to the first two passages, the Levites and the entire horn band support the battle directions given by the priests’ horns. According to the final passage, the Levites gather with the high priest, other priests, and the elders to listen to the prayer of a designated priest who prays for the warriors.

5. *Passages which lack reference to Levites*

More often than not, 1QS and CD eschew the tripartite or quaternarian divisions of the community just observed in favor of divisions that omit reference to Levites altogether. CD 1:7 thus compares the origins of the community to a root of planting grown “out of Israel and Aaron.” Similarly, CD 6:2–3 describes God’s involvement in the establishment of the community as follows: “He raised up from Aaron men of discernment and from Israel wise men.” According to 1QS 8:1, the council of the community is to be composed of “twelve men and three priests, perfect in everything that has been revealed from all the law.” A few lines later the entire community is characterized as a “house of holiness [consisting] of Israel and a most holy congregation [consisting] of Aaron” (בית קודש) (לישראל וסוד קודש קדשים לאהרון). A similar bipartite division occurs in 1QS 9:6. The description of the seating arrangement of the session of the many (מושב הרבים) in 1QS 6:8 likewise lacks mention of Levites: “The priests will sit down first, the elders next and the remainder of all the people will sit down in order of rank.”

Two further cases may be noted, although they may refer to Levites obliquely. First, in 1QS 5:6, the community is described as “those who devote themselves for a sanctuary in Aaron and for a house of truth in Israel, and for those who join them for a community” (והגלויים עליהם) (ליחד). The Hebrew root used for “those who join them” (לוי) is the same as that used for “Levites.” However, as commentators observe, the reference here is not to Levites, but more likely to novices, members who have joined the movement but not yet formally joined its ranks (cf. CD 4:3).¹⁴⁰ Second, according to CD 10:4–6, the community’s judicial body must be composed of ten men, “four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron, and from Israel six.” The strange phrase “from the tribe of Levi and Aaron” has caused a certain amount of confusion among scholars. Milik has suggested that these four judges can be understood based on the organization of the tribe of Levi according to the three families of Qahat, Gershon, and Merari presented in the War Scroll (and in Numbers).¹⁴¹ If so, one representative from each levitical family as well as an Aaronite priest might be seen as filling the four “priestly” judicial slots. However, I believe it more likely that the phrase “from the tribe of Levi and Aaron” refers simply to priests who descend from both Levi and Aaron. If there

¹⁴⁰ See A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 168–169; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 125.

¹⁴¹ See Milik’s review of Yadin, *The Scroll of the War* in *RB* 64 (1957): 588–589.

was a requirement to include Levites, the author surely could have said so more clearly.¹⁴² We might note further that according to 4QOrdinances^a 2-4 4, a twelve person judicial body is made up of ten laymen and two priests. No Levites are included.¹⁴³

Finally, it is necessary to note the principle of organization put forward in 1QS 5:23-24:

They shall register them in order, each before his companion, according to his insight and his works (לפי שכלו ומעשיו). They shall all obey one another; the lower one (in rank obeying) the higher one (in rank). In order to examine their spirit and their works year after year, so as to elevate each according to his insight and the perfection of his way (להעלות איש לפי שכלו), or to keep him back according to his perversion. (והורם דרכו),

Here a person's rank is dependent solely on his merits (שכלו ומעשיו). It has been noted that this system of organization stands in tension with the traditional genealogical hierarchical divisions observed above.¹⁴⁴ Some scholars seek to resolve the difficulty by suggesting that the two systems are supplemental in some way.¹⁴⁵ Others posit a development over time, whereby one system overtook the other in response to the community's historical circumstances.¹⁴⁶ Further investigation is necessary to fully understand these tensions. For now, it suffices to note that the Levites once again do not appear in the organizational pattern of this sectarian text.

Explaining the Evidence

How are we to understand this garbled mess of data? It will be helpful to consider some recent proposals. Cana Werman suggests that the key to unraveling the data lies in the anti-priestly polemics of the Second Temple period and her claim that in that era there were no Levites:

¹⁴² So too Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 122.

¹⁴³ On the court system of Qumran, see Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 23-40.

¹⁴⁴ See Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran*, 178; Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 121.

¹⁴⁵ See Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran*, 178; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*; Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 114, 91; Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 53-54.

¹⁴⁶ For the genealogical system as prior to the merit-based "democratic" system, see D. Schwartz, "On Two Aspects," 167; idem, "Qumran between Priestliness and Christianity," in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research*, 179 (Hebrew). For the merit-based system as preceding the genealogical system (on the basis of the differences with regard to communal leadership between the earlier and later S material), see Baumgarten, "The Zadokite Priests," 142-153; Hempel, "Interpretative Authority," 74-80.

Opponents of the priestly trend could employ the dearth of Levites to their advantage, pointing to Jacob's curse of Levi in Genesis 49 as sufficient reason for the disappearance of the Levites and hence, also for the rejection of the priests' (also part of the clan of Levi) claim to power. The answer of the priests was two-fold. Genesis 34, which describes the massacre of the Shechemites by Levi and Simon, became a point of departure for the proclamation of Levi's elevation to the priesthood with no mention of Jacob's disapproval; Jacob's curse (Gen. 49:5-7) was ignored and the absence of the Levites was obscured ... by two different explanations.¹⁴⁷

The first "answer of the priests" to which Werman alludes is clearly a reference to *ALD* and *Jubilees* 30, both of which rework the events of Genesis 34 in order to elevate Levi into a model of priestly zeal and purity. The second answer of the priests mentioned by Werman includes two explanations by which "the absence of Levites was obscured." Here, she refers to both the non-sectarian texts that elevate Levi to the priesthood and the sectarian texts portraying the Levites. In the former, the absence of Levites is obscured by the claim that there is no priest who is not a descendant of Levi. Put another way, all Levites are priests and all priests are Levites. In the latter body of evidence, "a fictive existence for the Levites, a literary creation designed to camouflage their scarcity" is crafted.¹⁴⁸

There are several problems with Werman's interpretation. We have already noted that the provenance of *ALD*, which served as a source for *Jubilees*, is unclear. She posits that "the Sages are the group to whom the priests [responsible for *ALD*] directed their apologetic answer." But in fact, it has been shown that *ALD*'s halakhah agrees with that of the Rabbis in many cases.¹⁴⁹ It is hazardous at best to assume that *ALD* represents a priestly apologetic to proto-rabbinic circles. More importantly, her claim regarding the absence of Levites in the Second Temple period is unconvincing. If this were truly the case, it would be exceedingly difficult to understand the ruling of CD 13:3-4, noted above, that in the case of the unavailability of a priest learned in the Book of Hagi, a learned Levite must substitute as the authority in a communal quorum. This passage makes it all but clear that for the community not only did Levites exist, but they also had a defined and very real role to play.¹⁵⁰ The explanation of the sectarian references to Levites as crafting a fictional

¹⁴⁷ Werman, "Levi and Levites," 212.

¹⁴⁸ Werman, "Levi and Levites," 212.

¹⁴⁹ See Schiffman, "Sacrificial Halakhah," 177-202.

¹⁵⁰ See further the suggestions of Hempel, *The Laws*, 111-114.

existence designed to obscure the absence of Levites is untenable for another reason. Were this the case, we might expect the sectarian texts to show some agreement with respect to the role and status of these fictional Levites. However, as we have seen above, no such agreement exists; the evidence thus suggests a far more complex situation.

Brooke provides a more appealing explanation. Contrasting the Qumran library's sporadic tendency to promote Levi and the Levites with the strands of sectarian tradition which do not do so, he suggests that at a certain point in the history of the community (probably the mid-first century BCE) "certain Levites became prominent in the Qumran community in such a way that older materials needed to be adjusted to take account of their position."¹⁵¹ In other words, certain community traditions were altered to promote the Levites in accordance with the power of this group of newcomers. Brooke makes this comment in the context of a comparison of the status of the Levites in the War Scrolls of Caves 1 and 4 (see above), but it could also apply to the status of Levites in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.¹⁵² (As for the promotion of the Levites in the Temple Scroll, Milgrom has convincingly argued that the phenomenon is best explained as a reflection of the Scroll's commitment to a specific harmonistic method of scriptural exegesis ["homogenization"]). In this case, it is therefore not to be seen as ideologically motivated in its inception.¹⁵³ However, this does not preclude the possibility that later on the community might have received these Temple Scroll traditions as further support for the elevated status of the Levites at Qumran.)

While Brooke's suggestion is in many ways attractive, there is no evidence to confirm such an influx of Levites, nor is there evidence that Levites ever actually exercised much power at Qumran. As Stallman notes, the fact that Levites are at times portrayed in striking prominence in the literature does not necessarily mean that they were actually represented there in large numbers or that they really possessed power. Indeed, three of the witnesses observed above, 11QT, 1QM, and 1QSa, envision

¹⁵¹ Brooke, "Levi and the Levites," 119.

¹⁵² For the suggested application of Brooke's hypothesis to CD 13:3-4, see Hempel, *The Laws*, 111-114.

¹⁵³ J. Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 176-177. This opinion represents a reversal of his original conclusion ("Studies in the Temple Scroll," 504) that the evidence "provides grounds for investigating the tensions and struggles among priestly families and between priests and Levites at the end of the Second Temple period."

ideal or future existence, not present community life.¹⁵⁴ Moreover, in the communal rule books, the Levites are given quite limited roles. In the Rule of the Community, their most important assignment is the administration of the covenant ceremony. And in the Damascus Document, the only definite role for a Levite is his substitution for a priest learned in the book of Hagi (CD 13:2–4).¹⁵⁵ Nevertheless, despite the dearth of evidence for the actual power of Levites at Qumran, it is obvious that they were highly esteemed by the community and were the subject of extensive theological reflection.¹⁵⁶ This may in fact reflect a reality in which the community at some point promoted the status and power of a group of Levites, but it is impossible to be certain. It is safer to conclude that at a certain point in the community's history there was a theological shift characterized by an increased interest in traditions elevating the patriarch Levi to the priesthood and the promotion of the status of Levites.

What was the source of the Qumranite fascination with Levi and the Levites? I believe that the answer lies in the alienation of the community from the Jerusalem cultic establishment. Regardless of the original intentions of the pre-Qumranite authors of *ALD* and *Jubilees*, the rooting of the priesthood in the patriarch Levi, a figure more ancient than Aaron and Zadok, may have been interpreted at Qumran as a jab at the Jerusalemite priests.¹⁵⁷ Moreover, the promotion of the power and status of the Levites, a traditionally marginalized priestly group (see, e.g., Ezek 44:10–14), could have been seen as lending legitimacy to their own identity as a congregation of marginalized priests officiating in the holy temple enclosure in the wilderness of Qumran. This opinion has already been expressed eloquently by Kugler:

¹⁵⁴ Stallman, "Levi and the Levites," 190.

¹⁵⁵ Although, several scholars, including Vermes (*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [2d ed.; London: Penguin Books, 1968], 23–25), Brooke ("Levi and the Levites," 120–121), and Fraade ("They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob;") have suggested that the מִבְּקָר was a Levite, the evidence is slim, and such an identification is hazardous. (Indeed, the dearth of evidence led Vermes to change his opinion. See idem, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 96–97).

¹⁵⁶ Stallman, "Levi and the Levites," 190.

¹⁵⁷ It is interesting to note that Aaron is never mentioned in *ALD* or *Jubilees*. In the case of *Jubilees* at least, Himmelfarb (*A Kingdom of Priests*, 57–58) interprets this as a possible polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood. On the other hand, Ben Sira pays special attention to Aaron and his descendants, but never mentions Levites. This has been interpreted by Olyan ("Ben Sira's Relationship to the Priesthood," 275) as a polemic in the opposite direction.

[The community appreciated] the ability of Levi and his descendants to embody the dissidence of those who rejected the legitimacy of the incumbent priesthood . . . They developed an empathy with the long-marginalized Levites, and they adopted communal practices that expressed that empathy (as well as their dissidence from the temple priesthood) by elevating Levi's descendants in relationship to the priests. Moreover they came to appreciate and identify with an existing literature that reminisced about Levi as the ancestral ideal priest and that magnified his descendants in their temple role; this move also expressed the community's discomfort with the incumbent priesthood.¹⁵⁸

Kugler finds precedent for this understanding of Levi in the Hebrew Bible. Malachi 2:4–7 pits the ideal, pure figure of Levi against the incumbent Jerusalem priests, who are rejected for their abominable behavior in Mal 1:6–2:3 and 2:8–9. Moreover, he posits that at Qumran *ALD* would be interpreted as an extension of the tradition of Malachi, according to which “Levi and his descendants could be the literary figures that bear the freight of dissatisfied, dissident priests by representing an alternative ideal priesthood.”¹⁵⁹ Some have objected that such an understanding of the Levi and Levite traditions at Qumran requires a better historical imagination than a pious ancient Jew was likely to have had.¹⁶⁰ However, considering the high esteem in which the Qumranites held *ALD*, *Jubilees*, and dozens of other creative reworkings of Israel's past, as well as the tendency of the community to see itself at the center of God's plans for humanity as revealed by his prophets, it is best not to confine the Qumranite historical imagination so strictly.

The most plausible explanation of the data is indeed that the Qumranites at some point became attracted to the Levi and Levite traditions because, within their own polemical context, they identified with the second-class status of the Levites vis-à-vis the priests. Moreover, in such a context, the traditions elevating the patriarch Levi to the priesthood would be read as proof of the true primacy of his marginalized descendants and hence a support for the superiority of the Qumranites over their opponents in Jerusalem. While Kugler views this explanation as supplemental to Brooke's hypothesis, it should be pointed out that such ideological tendencies do not require genealogical identity. Indeed, as noted above, there is no evidence for large numbers of Levites, let alone their exalted status, at Qumran. The kinship that the Qumranites felt with

¹⁵⁸ Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 478.

¹⁵⁹ Kugler, “The Priesthood at Qumran,” 478.

¹⁶⁰ So Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 122.

Levi and his descendants may thus just as well have been a symbolic manifestation of their underdog status brought about by theological contemplation.

CONCLUSION

The evidence of the traditions pertaining to Levi and the Levites in the Scrolls provides an important supplement to the conclusions regarding the literary trend of priestly magnetism reached above. A quick review of the latter is in order: In our study of the attraction of external social roles to idealized priestly figures, we noted how the absorption of royal and scribal functions to the priesthood, justified by scriptural exegesis and/or appeal to Mosaic authority, occurs in a wide range of non-sectarian and proto-sectarian texts. This trend no doubt reflects the rise of priestly and scribal power in Second Temple society and provides the most general background for the notion of priestly messianic leadership in sectarian writings. More particularly, we have seen that the portrayals of ideal priests in the proto-sectarian texts *ALD*, *Jubilees*, and the Temple Scroll, although never explicitly eschatological, take us even closer to Qumran's priestly messianic beliefs. But the closest precursor to the Qumran notion of the priestly messiah is to be found in 4Q541 9. That fragment's caricature of an ideal future figure who will atone for his contemporaries and teach the will of God mirrors the association of Qumran's priestly messiah with teaching and the proliferation of the law for the new age, and possibly with atonement. Moreover, the association of 4Q541 9's protagonist with the shining of eternal light and the dispersion of darkness from the earth recalls the dualistic eschatological framework characteristic of Qumran's messiahs, the emergence of whom signals the demise of the present age of darkness and the advent of the new age of light.¹⁶¹ As the only pre-Qumranite text to clearly refer to an eschatological priest, 4Q541 9 provides a significant link between the non-sectarian complex of Levi traditions and sectarian priestly messianism.

The popularity of the Levi and Levite traditions at Qumran further enhances our understanding of the traditional milieu out of which the community's notion of the priestly messiah arose. Even though it is

¹⁶¹ Note the observation of VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," 229: "The messianic function is . . . to define a unit of time."

unclear whether *ALD*'s tradition of the elevation of Levi and his descendants to the priesthood originated in circles friendly or hostile to the temple establishment, it is certain that at Qumran it, as well as various other manifestations of it, were incorporated into a system of thought extremely hostile to the temple. We are thus justified in seeking to explain the large quantity of texts in the Qumran library that exalt Levi and the Levites in harmony with the community's polemical priestly ideology.

In the previous chapter, we noted that the community's bitter break with the Jerusalem establishment led to some powerful and imaginative compensatory responses. The community viewed itself as a congregation of priests servicing a temple of its own. In a sense, they replaced the Jerusalem temple by means of the perfect life of purity, study and true understanding of sacred writings, and liturgical communion with the angels, which entailed immortalizing participation in supernal knowledge. On the other hand, the harsh reality of life in isolation in the wilderness engendered an enduring thirst for real empowerment at Qumran. The community eagerly awaited the eschaton, the day of military victory over all the sons of Belial's lot, a triumphant return to a restored Jerusalem, and a purified cult. Of course, the eschatological congregation would be subject to an anointed priest who would teach and conduct the temple in line with sectarian halakhic rulings.

We may understand the popularity of the Levi and Levite traditions at Qumran in concert with the thirst for empowerment represented by these eschatological expectations. Non-Qumranite texts characterizing Levi as progenitor of all priests and paragon of priestly virtue were likely interpreted at Qumran as undermining the authority of the Aaronite/Zadokite establishment in Jerusalem. (The same may be said for the sectarian composition 11QMelchizedek, where the ideal priest is pushed back even farther in time to a figure with dubious genealogical origins.) The sporadic elevation of Levites in the sectarian corpus reflects a time in the history of the community when it began to identify with the traditionally marginalized levitical priestly class. Since the Qumran community understood itself as an oppressed, yet ideal alternative priesthood, the development of a feeling of kinship with the Levites would have been especially fitting. Indeed, such a strategy is already employed by Malachi, who pits the corrupt incumbent priesthood of Jerusalem against an idealized Levi figure. From this angle of vision, the Qumranite projection of an idealized priestly figure into the future may be seen as part of a "levitical ideology"—an expression of the community's hope

that it would one day overcome its second-class priestly status vis-à-vis the Jerusalem establishment.

It remains unclear whether the elevation of the status of Levites in the Qumran Scrolls was the result of an actual influx of Levites or merely a symbolic theological shift brought about by other unknown causes. At any rate, it is clear that the community's identification with the Levites was never a complete one. We have seen that some sectarian texts maintain the normative secondary status of Levites below the priests, while others describe the community in terms of an Aaron/Israel dichotomy without any reference to Levites. Still others divide the community in terms of merit with no apparent concern for genealogy at all. The coexistence of some of these seemingly incompatible divisions in the sectarian corpus have been explained by some scholars as the result of historical development. However, even if this is indeed the case, these divergent systems need not have been seen as mutually exclusive from the perspective of the community. The Qumranites had a propensity for extensive theological contemplation about their own place in the history of Israel and God's secret plans for the world, and they constantly reinterpreted traditional material to such ends. Depending on the context and the associations in mind, it was possible for Qumranites to identify with Levites, Aaronites, Sons of Light, and other groups simultaneously. Since all of these self-conceptions were rooted in authoritative tradition, they were all considered accurate. The tension that we sense in them today was apparently not so bothersome to the ancient Qumran community and thus was allowed to stand.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The present inquiry began with the observation that the current trend in the study of Qumran priesthood has been to peruse the Dead Sea Scrolls for evidence of socio-historical realities. Considering the cryptic, clichéd, and theologically charged nature of the Scrolls corpus, the difficulty of obtaining such historical information was duly noted. Following the suggestion of Kugler, I proposed a shift in focus away from the historical realities of priesthood at Qumran, and toward a more approachable topic given the nature of the evidence: the portrayal of priesthood throughout the community's literature. As such, this study focused on central and pervasive literary representations of priesthood in the Qumran library, with the primary objective of illuminating the theological notions implied by them. As expected, this line of inquiry has not revealed much about the socio-historical realities of priesthood at Qumran. However, since the texts examined encode something of the nature of their authors as well as that of the people who read and revered them, much was learned about the character of the Qumran community.

Part one treated representations of otherworldly priesthood, defined as one or both of two distinct conceptions: angels as priests serving before God in the cosmic temple, and elevated human priests likened to angels. Comparison of non-sectarian and sectarian portrayals of otherworldly priesthood served as a window into the distinct nature of the Qumran community and its relationship with broader segments of Second Temple Judaism.

In the non-sectarian collection, such depictions occur in works of differing provenance and genre, but often exhibit close thematic and linguistic affinities. Angelic priests are envisioned as cultic ministers serving before God in the celestial temple. In addition, they sometimes serve as intercessors, and bring about the purification of the cosmos by means of their violent eradication of sin. Elevated human priests are frequently

portrayed as separated from “all flesh.” They may access and distribute supernal knowledge, and they emanate a brilliant radiance / glory. This dazzling light represents a manifestation of the divine presence on earth and underscores the human priest’s exalted status, as well as his role as intermediary between celestial and terrestrial realms. The fact that these portrayals appear in several non-sectarian documents of varying origins and character testifies to the prevalence of the notion of otherworldly priesthood beyond the confines of Qumran and in the broader stream of Second Temple Judaism. This conclusion is supported by the appearance of related motifs in Hellenistic Jewish works not preserved at Qumran.

The liturgical depictions of otherworldly priesthood in SSS may well be of non-sectarian origins, but they relate closely to those found in surely sectarian documents. Indeed, the existence of at least nine copies at Qumran indicates that it was utilized by community members. The composition may thus be studied as a reflection of Qumranite religious belief and practice.

SSS exhibits a notable tension in its conception of otherworldly priesthood. On the one hand, the language used to describe the angelic priests parallels that used elsewhere in sectarian literature to describe the earthly Qumran community, resulting in an ontological proximity between heavenly and earthly sacerdotalists. On the other hand, at least one passage (4Q400 2 6–7) shows an acute awareness of the disparate natures of the angelic and human priests. This tension is explained by consideration of the epistemological mechanism implicit in SSS’s vision of otherworldly priesthood and the cosmic temple. The experience of the cosmic temple provided by SSS may well have served a compensatory function for Qumranite priests who found themselves distanced from their earthly source of power and legitimacy. However, it is a mistake to explain the origins of the celestial temple vision of SSS solely as a fanciful projection into heaven by earthly priests in crisis. Indeed, the symbol of the unprophane temple existing beyond the plane of history goes back to Ezekiel and may be found in prominent non-sectarian works such as the Temple Scroll and New Jerusalem. A similar image of the temple lies at the mythic roots of the vision of SSS. As such, it appears that rather than projecting earthly realities into heaven, SSS envisions the archetypal image of the temple as the blueprint for construction of the terrestrial community. It is this imaginal mechanism which infuses the earthly temple and priesthood at Qumran with vitality, nourishing the imperfect fallen temple below with the image of the ideal temple above.

The experience of sacred liturgical time implied by SSS brought about a realized eschatology whereby human worshippers repeatedly escaped linear historical existence and participated with the angels. In addition, a parallel spatial transformation was experienced. The participation of humans and angels occurred beyond the boundary of physical space in the archetypal image of the temple. Although the language of SSS does not explicitly refer to a traversal between heaven and earth, the opportunity of joint action is implied by the parallel descriptions of the heavenly and earthly worshippers. Qumranite worshippers repeatedly became earthly replicas of the angels and gained access to the cosmic temple through the recitation of the liturgy. But this remarkable experience did not completely obscure their awareness of earthly realities. Indeed, community members remained acutely aware of their lowly human nature.

Sectarian representations of otherworldly priesthood owe much thematically and terminologically to their non-sectarian predecessors and SSS. Like the non-sectarian compositions, sectarian works depict angels as fulfilling priestly duties and human priests as enjoying otherworldly status. Elevated human priests are seen as conveyors of light and heavenly knowledge, and as distinguished from “all flesh.” However, two notable points distinguish sectarian portrayals.

First, as opposed to the numerous genres that witness the notion of otherworldly priesthood in the non-sectarian texts, the sectarian depictions appear only in liturgical contexts.¹ As with SSS, the recitation of these works granted access to the cosmic temple where elevated earthly priests ministered before God with the angels. In some cases this transformation is envisioned as the experience of an elect group of priests, while in others an exalted individual priest who brings about the enlightenment of an entire community is portrayed.

The streamlining of depictions of otherworldly priests into liturgical contexts in sectarian documents highlights an important development in the spirituality of the Qumran community that distinguishes it from broader segments of Second Temple society. The Qumranites directed the notion of otherworldly priesthood specifically to themselves (or to their selected intermediary) as an expression of their attainment of the peak of human experience—joint service with the angels before God and par-

¹ For the exceptional case of 11QMelchizedek, see above, pp. 146–147.

participation in the mysteries of divine knowledge. By means of the liturgy, they lived this “immortalizing” temple-centric experience repeatedly.

Second, both non-sectarian and sectarian texts consistently apply the image of radiant light in association with the otherworldly priesthood. In the former, the notion of light emanating from an elevated human priest is mainly linked to his embodiment of divine glory. Similar notions about the brilliance of the otherworldly priesthood and the sacerdotal garments were inherited and employed by the Qumranites. However, there is an additional outstanding aspect of the light imagery in the sectarian portrayals of otherworldly priesthood, namely the unique access of community members to divine knowledge. By participating in the mysteries of God’s knowledge, the Qumranites became illuminated like the angels. For community members, this enlightenment was also representative of the righteousness they had acquired. They shared this attribute with the divine beings and with God himself.

These developments do not, in themselves, require that the Qumranites were, entirely or largely, a community of hereditary priests. However, they do underscore the centrality in the Qumranite religious imagination of the *imago templi* as a symbol of both God’s eternal sovereignty and the pinnacle of the community’s spiritual achievement. Therefore, the unique sectarian application of the notion of otherworldly priesthood is to be seen not simply as an indication of the priestly lineage of the visionaries, but as an appropriate symbolic offshoot of the temple model. The ideal role of community members, and indeed, of all humanity, is as priests offering eternal praise with the angels before God in the ideal temple, or as the embodiment of that temple itself.

The second part of this study grappled with images of the priestly leadership of the eschatological age. Such portrayals appear almost exclusively in the sectarian corpus. Various roles are attributed to the priestly messiah and other priestly eschatological figures. From the differing epithets and functions attributed to these figures, it appears that there was a degree of fluidity in eschatological speculation and that no single notion of eschatological priesthood was regnant at Qumran. Taken together, depictions of Qumran’s end-time priesthood are associated with the following different general roles or characteristics: (1) teaching and the proliferation of the law for the new age, (2) leadership of the eschatological military camp, (3) leadership of the reconstituted cultic community, and, possibly, (4) atonement on behalf of the people. (5) At times a single eschatological priest/priestly messiah appears alongside another figure of authority identified as the lay/royal messiah.

There is an important distinction to be made between Qumran portraits of eschatological priesthood and the liturgical representations of otherworldly priesthood. While the latter involve a circular and repetitive experience of sacred time, the former are always dictated by a linear view of time, whereby the present period of evil will soon give way to a blissful messianic age, frequently envisioned as preceded by an eschatological war. This difference may account for the fact that the liturgical works never mention a priestly messiah, but rather speak of the exalted priest as an intermediary through whom the community might become enlightened and experience the eternal rewards of the righteous. Moreover, portrayals of the priesthood as the military leadership or as the leadership of the reconstituted hierarchical congregation do not appear in the liturgical works depicting the otherworldly priesthood. As is to be expected, such representations are unique to texts that periodize history and await the eschatological battle and the final victory.²

The most general historical roots of Qumranite representations of eschatological priesthood are to be found in the Second Temple period shift in governing authority from palace/king to temple/priest. As the temple and priesthood became the most important power institutions in Judahite society, it was natural for them to attract vociferous criticism. The temple served as the visible representation of God's presence in the land and the primary mechanism for the maintenance of the bilateral covenant. As such, it was vital for the temple to be maintained in line with the will of God. The proper behavior of priests was of paramount importance, and defilement of the temple could lead to a national disaster of colossal proportions.

In the wake of the Seleucid defilement of the temple in the middle of the second century BCE, the sources indicate that many pious Jews, including the predecessors of the Qumran community, extended the biblical laws pertaining to both moral and ritual purity. This trend reflects a deep-seated anxiety regarding the dangers of temple defilement. In the Hasmonean period, with the temple once again under native control, these Jews adhered to stringent ritual and moral purity strictures as a means to prevent a repeated defilement of the temple. They justified their rigorous practices by means of learned biblical interpretation, which they presented as the will of God in such works as *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll. However, many Jews, including the temple establishment itself,

² See above, chapter five, n. 143.

rejected or simply ignored these interpretations. This tension, centered on the practice of purity, lies at the root not only of the Qumranite portrayals of eschatological priesthood, but also of the origins of the Qumran community itself.

While the sectarian texts are concerned with matters relating to both ritual and moral purity,³ the original catalyst for the separation of the Qumran community from the temple and Judean society likely relates specifically to the realm of halakhah pertaining to ritual purity. This conclusion is supported by the evidence of 4QMMT, which outlines the conflict between the founders of the Qumran community and the temple establishment in a list of disagreements relating to ritual purity and sacrificial practices. While key sectarian documents, such as Peshet Habakkuk, the Admonition of the Damascus Document, and the Rule of the Community envision the community's separation from Jerusalem largely in terms of moral purity, since these texts were finished after the schism with Jerusalem was complete, they more accurately reflect the later radicalized Qumranite religious mental-map than they do the historical origins of the schism. On the other hand, the conciliatory tone and the earlier date of 4QMMT, as well as its halakhic links with the proto-sectarian Temple Scroll and portions of the Damascus Document, give its testimony as to the ritual-legalistic matrix of the origins of the dispute a ring of authenticity.

The community's boycott of the temple brought about a major religious predicament for its members—they were denied the primary traditional means for righting wrongs committed against God and maintaining the covenantal equilibrium. In order to overcome this spiritual deficit, the community employed a vigorous religious imagination, transforming the desert encampment into a virtual temple and its inhabitants into virtual priests. The Qumranites lived according to rules of priestly purity as if present in the temple enclosure itself. The righteous lifestyle lived at Qumran, and most likely the study of Scripture, served an atoning function and compensated for the lack of access to the Jerusalem temple. In addition, as we saw in part one, sectarian liturgical offerings granted community members access to the truest and most important temple, where they served God alongside the angels.

³ The line between the two was often blurred by the Qumranites. See above, pp. 245–246.

On the other hand, the numerous texts depicting the eschatological priestly leadership indicate that the Qumranites were not entirely satisfied with their experience of temple and priesthood in the desert. These texts express a yearning for the day when the community would come to power and return to a restored Jerusalem temple under the direction of a grand eschatological priesthood. The profound desire for power implicitly expressed in such depictions provides the historical lens through which the portrayals of eschatological priesthood in the Qumran library is to be viewed. As such, the functions of the eschatological priesthood, and particularly its association with the proliferation of the new law in the age to come, are to be understood as underscoring sectarian irritation with the rejection of their legal findings, especially as they pertained to the purity of the temple. Therefore, in the days of the composition of 4QMMT, when a resolution to the conflict with the Jerusalem authorities was still on the horizon, there would have been less interest in speculation about eschatological priesthood. The concept would have gained importance after the schism was complete as something of a reaction to the group's lack of power and religious deficit vis-à-vis the Jerusalem temple.

Given the thorough centrality of Scripture for the Qumranites, one might expect to find the traditional antecedents for the community's notions of eschatological priesthood in the Hebrew Bible. Yet biblical sources do not sufficiently account for the portraits of the idealized figures sketched in sectarian literature. The traditional roots of Qumran's eschatological/ messianic priesthood are found instead in the numerous non-sectarian documents that craft ideal patterns of priestly conduct and exemplary priestly figures, such as Ben Sira, *ALD*, *Jubilees*, 4Q541 9, and the Temple Scroll.

In addition to the traditional roles of the priesthood known from the Bible, this non-sectarian literature variously attributes the characteristics of king, sage/ scribe, and warrior to the model priest. Since these ideal portrayals occur in such a wide variety of non-sectarian and non-Qumran documents they are not to be viewed as a peculiar product of sectarian imagination. Rather, they may be related generally to the rise of priestly and scribal powers in Second Temple society. Attributions of royal, scribal, and/or martial roles to the ideal priestly figures in these texts may be seen either as attempts to legitimize the contemporary roles of priests or as polemics presenting an alternative to the present establishment. However, common to either position, priestly powers are imagined as expanded far beyond scriptural parameters. This point indicates that,

in general, the association of the priesthood with the realms of civil government, wisdom / scribalism, and holy warfare was deemed as a given and, indeed, as scripturally authorized by broad sections of Jewish society in the Second Temple period.

Almost none of the non-sectarian texts clearly refer to the notion of an ideal *future* priest and it is therefore difficult to demonstrate direct influence on the sectarian portrayals of eschatological priesthood. Nonetheless, the idyllic models provided by *Jubilees*, the Temple Scroll, and *ALD* likely supplied the world of ideas that fostered Qumranite images of eschatological priesthood. 4Q541 9 is exceptional, for it provides the only explicit allusion to an eschatological priest in a non-sectarian document. This case illustrates that the notion existed prior to the formation of the community. Moreover, the fragment exhibits close links to sectarian eschatological speculation, and likely influenced the way the Qumranites imagined the end-time priesthood.

The traditional roots of sectarian images of eschatological priesthood are further illuminated by the large quantity of manuscripts in the Qumran library attributing elevated roles to Levi and the Levites. Several texts promote Levi as the progenitor of all priests and/or as a paragon of priestly virtue. Several others exhibit a high regard for the Levites, at times raising them above their biblically mandated inferior positions vis-à-vis the priests.

The attraction of large numbers of exemplars of these traditions to the Qumran collection is to be seen in harmony with the community's polemical priestly ideology. First, even though it remains unclear whether *ALD*'s tradition of the elevation of Levi and his descendants to the priesthood originated in circles friendly or hostile to the temple establishment, it is certain that at Qumran it was incorporated into a religious system unfriendly to the temple establishment. In such a context, it is possible that this portrayal of Levi and his children was read as undermining the authority of the Aaronite / Zadokite establishment in Jerusalem. Second, following the suggestion of Kugler, it was proposed that the sporadic elevation of Levites in the sectarian corpus reflects a time in the history of the Qumranites when they began to identify with the traditionally marginalized levitical priestly class. As a class of rejected priests, the community identified with the ideal alternative priesthood represented by Levi and his descendants and projected their priestly hero into the future as an expression of their devout belief that they would soon gain power over their opponents and serve God at his residence in Jerusalem in accordance with his will. This levitical self-conception

coexisted with several other seemingly conflicting ones, which were viewed as equally valid by community members.

CONCLUSIONS

Liturgical and Messianic Eschatology

The images of the priesthood treated in parts one and two of this study may be tied to two respective types of eschatology, “liturgical” and “messianic.” According to the former, the Qumranites envisioned themselves as participating with angelic priests in service before God, sharing in supernal knowledge, and in a sense becoming immortal. Although the notion of otherworldly priesthood has pre-Qumranite roots, community members employed the concept for their own sectarian ends—they utilized it especially in liturgical contexts as a means of superseding the corrupt Jerusalem temple. Thus, in liturgical time members escaped the confines of mundane history and repeatedly became priests in the truest temple, the archetypal image of the cosmic temple.

On the other hand, from the numerous sectarian documents espousing messianic eschatology, it is apparent that the religious deficit caused by the alienation from Jerusalem was too severe to allow the community to fully supersede the temple at Zion. Despite the compensatory effects of the life of perfect priestly purity, inspired study of Scripture, and the experience provided by liturgical offerings, the community still harbored a profound thirst for empowerment. It eagerly awaited the eschaton—the day of the military victory over all the sons of Belial’s lot, a triumphant return to a restored Jerusalem, and a purified cult subject to an eschatological priest who would teach the righteous congregation and conduct the temple in line with sectarian halakhic rulings.

Both liturgical and messianic eschatology may be seen as compensatory responses to the community’s alienation from the Jerusalem temple, but there is a fundamental distinction to be made between the two. The former is an innovative expression of confidence inasmuch as it argues that the community no longer has a need for the Jerusalem temple (cf. the muted role of the Jerusalem temple in early Christianity and rabbinic Judaism). But the latter, bound to the traditional notion that Jerusalem is the only true dwelling place of God, is an expression of frustration and powerlessness. Portrayals of the eschatological priesthood reflect at their core the devout hope that the Qumranites would soon gain power over their opponents in Jerusalem.

The coexistence of these two types of eschatology in the Qumran library reveals a tension that pulled the community between innovation and tradition, power and powerlessness throughout its turbulent existence. On the one hand, the Qumranites were confident of their superiority vis-à-vis the temple establishment. On the other, they were infuriated by their second class status, of which they were constantly reminded by the harsh everyday reality of life in the desert. Such an understanding of Qumranite priestly imagination adds complexity to the commonly encountered vague description of the community as “priestly.”

Broadening the Scope

In many ways, the findings of this study resonate beyond the confines of the Qumran community. To be sure, the images of priesthood in the sectarian scrolls largely reflect how the community itself managed to sustain a pious Jewish life in the absence of the temple. However, the community’s ability to do so is emblematic of larger contemporary trends. Indeed, the period of the Second Commonwealth witnessed a general move away from cult and toward prayer and liturgy.⁴ Moreover, Second Temple Judaism was comprised of several competing religious factions, including the broader movement that gave rise to the Qumran community, that put the images of the priesthood and the temple at their center. For such groups, priestly behavior, boundaries, and self-identity served as a platform for claims to power and ownership of the authentic covenantal tradition. Employing different methods, they sought to export the experience of the temple and its divine presence beyond the temple building. Thus, the priestly representations of the sectarian corpus are not to be seen simply as the wild speculations of an isolated fringe group, but rather as an authentic expression, however radical, of Second Temple society’s most basic religious principles.⁵ This observation is born out by the various points of contact between the priestly ideologies of the Qumran library and those of two contemporary Jewish groups that survived the Roman destruction and eventually flowered into world religions, namely, the Pharisees and the Jesus movement.

⁴ See Schiffman, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy,” 34–35; R. Levitt Kohn and R. Moore, *A Portable God: The Origin of Judaism and Christianity* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007), 109–116.

⁵ Cf. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing*, 34–35.

Even before the loss of the temple in 70 CE, the Pharisees and the Jesus movement, like the Qumran community, sought to bring the experience of the temple, and thus the presence of God, outside the temple walls.⁶ For the Pharisees, this was accomplished, in large part, by the transference of temple purity into their own homes. By eating their meals in a state of priestly purity, their tables replaced the altar. In the absence of a hereditary claim, they became metaphoric priests serving God outside of the temple precincts. However, unlike the Qumranites, they did not reject the temple establishment, and there is no evidence that they imagined themselves as a substitute embodiment of the temple.

Thanks to their predecessors, the Rabbis were not completely unprepared for life without the temple after the catastrophe of 70 CE. Indeed, like the Pharisees (and, apparently, the Essenes and the Qumranites), the Sages brought the ritual of the altar to the table: “R. Yohanan and R. Eleazar both said: As long as the temple existed, the altar atoned for Israel. Now, a man’s table atones for him” (*b. Ber.* 55a; *Hag.* 27a; *Men.* 97a). However, in the radically different post-70 environment, the Rabbis went a step beyond the Pharisees. While the latter desired to replicate the temple sacrifices outside as the building still stood, the Rabbis sought to *replace* sacrifice after the temple was no longer available. As such, reminiscent of the “offerings of the lips” (תרומת שפתים) presented by the Qumran community in the absence of the temple, they envision correct prayer (according to rabbinic norms) as a fulfillment of the biblical commandment of sacrifice (*b. Ber.* 14b–15a). The times of the daily offering of the Eighteen Benedictions are explicitly related to the times of the תמיד daily offerings. As we have observed, it is possible that the Qumranites also scheduled acts of praise and prayer to coincide with the key liturgical rites of the temple cult.⁷

For the Rabbis, the study of the Torah’s laws of sacrifice is seen as the equivalent of actual sacrifice:

Whoever engages in the study of the Torah portion regarding the burnt offering is as if he sacrificed a burnt offering . . . the Torah portion regarding the sin offering, as if he sacrificed a sin offering, the Torah portion regarding the guilt offering, as if he sacrificed a guilt offering.

(*b. Men.* 110b)

⁶ See Levitt Kohn and Moore, *A Portable God*, esp. 73–118.

⁷ See 4Q409, and Qimron, “Time for Praising God,” 341–347; Kugler, “Rewriting Rubrics,” 91.

As noted above, the analogous intensive study of sacrificial law evidenced in the Scrolls may have served a comparable function for the Qumran community. Similarly, according to *m. Abot* 3:3 the synchronization of Torah study with eating serves to elevate the meal to sacral status:

R. Simon said: Three who ate at a single table and did not say words of Torah over it, it is as if they ate from sacrifices of the dead . . . But three who ate at a single table and said words of Torah over it, it is as if they ate from the table of God, blessed be he, as it says: "And he told me, this is the table that is before the Lord." (Ezek 41:22)

These few examples illustrate how, in the absence of the temple, the Sages redefined priestly service altogether, not only by means of liturgical practice, but also by stressing the study of the Torah. While nominal honorific functions for hereditary priests were preserved by rabbinic Judaism, in general, priestly service was extended beyond the hereditary claim and transferred to all of Israel.⁸ This allowed for the proximity of the divine presence to every Jew, regardless of geographical location or heredity.

At the same time, like the Qumranites, the Sages could not or did not desire to fully compensate for the loss of the temple. Rabbinic Judaism instituted communal prayer for the arrival of the royal messiah, the rebuilding of the temple, and the reinstatement of sacrificial offerings. To this day, these prayers are uttered by Jews daily in synagogues all over the world. The Qumran corpus shows that the above developments should not be seen simply as unique innovations of the Rabbis, but largely as outgrowths of a common Second Temple cultural heritage.

The Dead Sea Scrolls also provide background for the treatment of the notions of priesthood and temple in the writings of the New Testament. For the early Christians as well, the traditional institutions of temple and priesthood were transformed. As with the Qumran community, believers were portrayed as both temple and priests. For example, in the midst of a passage with striking links to Qumranite theology, 2 Cor 6:15 relates: "What agreement has the temple of God with idols? For we are the temple of the living God."⁹ As Gärtner observes,

⁸ Cf. Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 160–173.

⁹ New Testament translations follow NRSV. For the suggestion that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 represents "a Christian reworking of an Essene paragraph which has been introduced into the Pauline letter," see J. Fitzmyer, "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in II Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1," *CBQ* 23 (1961): 271–280 (quote appears on pp. 279–280).

“the image of the temple appears to have been used here as it was used in Qumran, to show that the ‘presence’, *Shekinah*, of God had removed from the official Jerusalem temple to the ‘new’ people of God, the Christian Church.”¹⁰ Similarly, in 1 Cor 3:16–17, Paul asks the believers, “Do you not know that you are God’s temple and that God’s spirit dwells in you? If anyone destroys God’s temple, God will destroy that person. For God’s temple is holy, and you are that temple.” Once again, the heart of Paul’s statement appears to relate to the Qumranite notion that the chosen community serves as surrogate temple and new home to God’s presence.

Later New Testament literature portrays the chosen community as priests in addition to temple. For example, 1 Pet 2:4–6 calls its Christian addressees not only “living stones . . . a spiritual house” but also “a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.” Scholars have noted the close relationship of this imagery to the description of the Qumran community in 1QS 8:4–10.¹¹ Revelation 1:6 labels Jesus’ followers “a kingdom, priests serving his God and father” (cf. 1 Pet 2:9). In a similar vein, Rev 20:6 declares: “Blessed and holy are those who share in the first resurrection . . . They will be priests of God and of Christ, and they will reign with him a thousand years.” Analogous to the Qumran corpus, the New Testament expands the traditional notion of temple and priesthood as an expression of its chosen community’s own proximity to the divine presence.

However, there is a vital distinction to be made between Qumranite and Christian priestly self-conceptions. On the one hand, the Qumranite notion was envisioned as a temporary development. Community members claimed the roles of priest and temple only in the age of Belial, while the building in Jerusalem remained in a state of defilement. However, in the messianic age, the physical institutions of temple, priesthood, and sacrifice would resume their positions at the heart of Jewish life, as well as God’s cosmic plan. On the other hand, Christians had already experienced the arrival of the messiah, and eternal atonement had already been made for all mankind through the person of Jesus. In this context, the traditional temple and priesthood ceased to have any significance. Parallel to his faithful followers, Jesus himself is envisioned as cosmic temple and

¹⁰ Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community*, 50.

¹¹ See, e.g., D. Flusser, “The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity,” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 233–236.

priest, and even as cosmic sacrifice.¹² Jesus thus supplants the traditional temple and priesthood as the perfect and ultimate institution of divine mediation.

The numerous shared concerns of the Qumran library and both the writings of rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity testify to the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the reconstruction of the religious world of the late Second Temple period. However, it is important to note that evidence of the direct influence of the Scrolls on either of those religious systems is rare. As such, the vast majority of similarities between these corpora are to be seen as a reflection of common Second Temple Jewish heritage. As we have observed, that heritage placed images of temple and priesthood at its very core. From this angle of vision, even if the Qumranites are understood as a “marginal, radical group,”¹³ the representations of priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls provide rich testimony about the foundations of the religious context surrounding the emergence of both rabbinic Judaism and Christianity.

¹² See, e.g., John 2:19–22; Rev 21:22; Heb 9:11, 14.

¹³ So G. Stemberger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (trans. A.W. Mahnke; Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary.* Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973.
- Abegg Jr., Martin G. "1Q5b and the Elusive High Priest." Pages 3–16 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?" Pages 136–147 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by J. Reeves and J. Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 325–358 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 125–144.
- . "Messianic Hope in 4Q285: A Reassessment." *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91.
- . "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pages 61–73 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Abegg Jr., Martin G., James E. Bowley and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Abegg Jr., Martin G., Craig A. Evans, and Gerbern S. Oegema. *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.
- Alexander, Philip S. *Mystical Texts*. LSTS 61. London: T. & T. Clark International, 2006.
- . "The Redaction History of Serekh Ha-Yahad: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–456.
- Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. DJD XXVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Allegro, John M. "Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrašim*," *JBL* 77 (1958): 350–354.
- . "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75 (1956): 182–187.
- . *The Mystery of the Dead Sea Scrolls Revealed*. New York: Gramercy, 1981.
- . *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101–150*. WBC 21. Waco: Word Books, 1983.
- Allison, Dale C. "The Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 189–197.
- Alon, Gedalyahu. *Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish His-*

- tory in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977.
- Altmann, Alexander. "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends." *JQR* 35 (1945): 371–391.
- Aptowitzer, Victor. "The Celestial Temple as Viewed in the Aggadah." Translated by A. Rubinstein. Pages 1–29 in *Binah: Studies in Jewish Thought*. Edited by J. Dan. Binah: Studies in Jewish History, Thought, and Culture 2. New York: Praeger, 1989.
- Arnold, Russell C.D. "Qumran Prayer as an Act of Righteousness." *JQR* 95 (2005): 509–529.
- Aschim, Anders. "Melchizedek and Jesus: 11QMelchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 129–147 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Edited by C. Newman, J. Davila, and G. Lewis. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Melchizedek and Levi." Pages 773–788 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Museum, 2000.
- . "Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?" *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 243–258.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. JSJSup 84. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Attridge, Harold W., T. Elgvin, J.T. Milik, S. Olyan, J. Strugnell, E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam, and S. White, in consultation with J.C. VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4. VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Avemarie, Friedrich. "'Tohorat Ha-Rabbim' and 'Mashqeh Ha-Rabbim': Jacob Licht Reconsidered." Pages 215–229 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 M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumran grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Baillet, Maurice, Josef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux. *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Bar-Ilan, M. "Scribes and Books in the Late Second Commonwealth and Rabbinic Period." Pages 21–38 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. Mulder. CRINT 2.1. Assen: Van Gorcum. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Barker, Margaret. *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox; London: SPCK, 1992.

- . “The High Priest and Worship of Jesus.” Pages 93–111 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *The Older Testament: The Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1987.
- Barthélemy, D., and Josef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Bauckham, Richard J. “The Messianic Interpretation of Isa. 10:34 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2 Baruch and the Preaching of John the Baptist.” *DSD* 2 (1995): 202–216.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. JSJSup 55. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Josephus on the Essene Sacrifice.” *JJS* 45 (1994): 169–183.
- . “Qumran and Jewish Sectarianism during the Second Temple Period.” Pages 139–151 in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by M. Broshi et al. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Israel Exploration Society, 1992 (Hebrew).
- . “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 142–153.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. “The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, the Apocalypse, and the Sanhedrin.” Pages 145–171 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . “The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity.” *RevQ* 6 (1967–1969): 183–192.
- . “The Exclusion of ‘netinin’ and Proselytes in 4QFlorilegium.” *RevQ* 8 (1972): 87–96.
- . “Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4.” Pages 390–399 in *Biblical Archaeology Today*. Edited by J. Amitai. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985.
- . “The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Šedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic.” *ANRW* 2.19.1:219–239.
- . “The Law and Spirit of Purity at Qumran.” Pages 93–105 in vol. 2 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 3 vols. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- . “The Laws of the ‘Damascus Document’ in Current Research.” Pages 51–62 in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by M. Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.
- . “Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19 [4Q266 10 I 12–13].” Pages 537–544 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts.” *JJS* 31 (1980): 157–170.
- . “The Purification Rituals in DJD 7.” Pages 199–209 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.

- . *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- . “Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls.” Pages 39–56 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- . “Sadducean Elements in Qumran Law.” Pages 27–36 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . “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 C. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S. Paul. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004.
- . “The ‘Sons of Dawn’ in CDC 13:14–15 and the Ban on Commerce among the Essenes,” *IEJ* 33 (1983): 81–85.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., T. Elgvin, E. Eshel, E. Larson, M.R. Lehmann, S. Pfann, and L.H. Schiffman. *Qumran Cave 4.XXV Halakhic Texts*. DJD XXXV. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Beall, Todd S. “History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah.” Pages 125–146 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B.D. Chilton. HdO 57. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . *Josephus’ Description of the Essenes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*. AGJU 8. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew*. VTSup 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in their Ancient Context*. STDJ 78. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. “כִּלְכִּלִי שִׁמְשִׁמְעוֹתוֹ יִכְלִי.” *Leš* 67 (2004): 45–48.
- . “4Q159 Fragment 5 and the ‘Desert Theology’ of the Qumran Sect.” Pages 43–56 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations.” Pages 29–51 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “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 E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch.” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49.

- . “Peshar Habakkuk.” Pages 647–650 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bernstein, Moshe J., F. García Martínez and J. Kampen, eds. *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. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Berrin, Shani. “Pesharim.” Pages 644–647 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Peshar Nahum.” Pages 653–655 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Betz, Otto. “Göttliche und menschliche Gerechtigkeit in der Gemeinde von Qumran und ihre Bedeutung für das Neue Testament.” Pages 1–18 in *Ethik und Lebenswirklichkeit: Festschrift für Heinze-Horst Schrey zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by C. Günzler. Darmstadt, 1982.
- . *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. WUNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1960.
- . “The Qumran Halakhah Text Miqsat Maasê ha-Tôrah (4QMMT) and Sadducean, Essene, and Early Pharisaic Tradition.” Pages 176–202 in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in Their Historical Context*. Edited by D. Beattie and M. McNamara. JSOTSup 166. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungband*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Bickerman, Elias J. *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Postbiblical Judaism*. New York: Schocken, 1962.
- . *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Bilde, Per. “The Common Meal in the Qumran-Essene Communities.” Pages 145–166 in *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Edited by I. Nielsen and H.S. Nielsen. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.
- Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- . *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. New York: Scribner, 1961.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- , ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . “Qumran and the Enoch Groups: Revisiting the Enochic-Essene Hypothesis.” Pages 37–66 in vol. 1 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 3 vols. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Bokser, Baruch M. “Approaching Sacred Space.” *HTR* 78 (1985): 279–299.
- . “Philo’s Description of Jewish Practices.” Pages 1–11 in *Protocol of the Thirtieth Colloquy: 4 June 1977*. Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1977.

- Bowman, J. "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?" *RevQ* 1 (1958): 73–84.
- Boyce, Mark. "The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 615–628.
- Brin, Gershon. "Wisdom Issues in Qumran: The Types and Status of the Figures in 4Q424 and the Phrases of Rationale in the Document." *DSD* 4 (1997): 297–311.
- Brooke, George J. "4QTestament of Levi^d(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest." Pages 83–100 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by M.C. de Boer. JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran." Pages 201–222 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger. BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- . "Body Parts in *Barkhi Nafshi* and the Qualifications for Membership of the Worshipping Community." Pages 79–94 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- . "Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 105–129 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 215–230.
- . "Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community." Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by E. von Beate, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- . "The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 339–370 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M.O. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D.G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- . "The Temple Scroll: A Law unto Itself?" Pages 34–43 in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of Law in Israel and Early Christianity*. Edited by B. Lindars. Cambridge: J. Clarke, 1988.
- . "Florilegium." Pages 297–298 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Brooke, George, J., J.J. Collins, P.W. Flint, J.C. Greenfield, E. Larson, C. Newsom, É. Puech, L.H. Schiffman, M.E. Stone, and J. Trebolle Barrera, in consultation with J.C. Vanderkam, partially based on earlier transcriptions by J.T. Milik and J. Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

- Broshi, Magen, E. Eshel, J.A. Fitzmyer, E. Larson, C. Newsom, L.H. Schiffman, M. Smith, M.E. Stone, J. Strugnell, and A. Yardeni, in consultation with J.C. VanderKam. *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. "J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development." *CBQ* 28 (1966): 51-57.
- . "The Messianism of Qumran." *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53-82.
- Brownlee, William H. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament." *NTS* 3 (1956-1957): 12-30.
- . *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Bryan, Steven M. *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration*. SNTSMS 117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Büchler, Adolf. *Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century*. London: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- Burrows, Millar. *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1958.
- Callaway, Philip R. "Methodology, the Scrolls, and Origins." Pages 409-426 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D.G. Pardee. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 722. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- Caquot, André. "Le Messianisme qumrânien." Pages 231-247 in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. BETL 46. Paris: Duculot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978.
- . "Le service des anges." *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 421-429.
- . "Les textes de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire)." *RHPR* 76 (1996): 1-34.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédék." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 343-378.
- . "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumrân." *RevQ* 10 (1979-1981): 3-34.
- Carmignac, Jean, P. Guilbert, and E. Cothenet, *Les Textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés*. 2 vols.; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961-1963.
- Charles, Robert H. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS)." Pages 120-134 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.
- , ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. PTSDSSP. 6 vols. to date. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck). Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1994-.
- , ed. *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

- . “The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel.” Pages 135–151 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. SBLSCS 12. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
- . “Community Organization: Community Organization in the Rule of the Community.” Pages 133–136 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Righteousness.” Pages 781–783 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Brent A. Strawn. “Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yahad Found in Cave IV.” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403–435.
- Chazon, Esther G. “Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Qumran.” Pages 95–105 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Chazon, Esther G., T. Elgvin, E. Eshel, D. Falk, B. Nitzan, E. Qimron, E.M. Schuller, D. Seely, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, M. Weinfeld in consultation with J.C. VanderKam and M. Brady. *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Christiansen, E.J. “The Consciousness of Belonging to God’s Covenant and What It Entails according to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule.” Pages 69–97 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290. CIS 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Chyutin, Michael. *The New Jerusalem Scroll from Qumran: A Comprehensive Reconstruction*. JSPSup 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Clark, D.G. “Elijah as Eschatological Hight Priest: An Examination of the Elijah Tradition in Mal. 3:23–24.” PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1975.
- Cody, Aelred. *A History of Old Testament Priesthood*. Rome: PBI, 1969.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.
- . “The Temple and the Synagogue.” Pages 151–174 in *The Temple in Antiquity: Ancient Records and Modern Perspectives*. Edited by T. Madsen. Provo: Brigham Young University, 1984.
- Collingwood, Robin G. *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. JSJSup 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “The Seven Heavens in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.” Pages 59–93 in *Death, Ecstasy, and Otherworldly Journeys*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1995.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . “The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers.” *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111.

- . “Asking for the Meaning of a Fragmentary Qumran Text: The Referential Background of 4QAaron A.” Pages 579–590 in *Texts and Contexts; Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts; Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by T. Fornberg and D. Hellholm; Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- . “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 49–65 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001*. Edited by J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 97–111 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “He Shall Not Judge by What His Eyes See’: Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *DSD* 2 (1995): 145–164.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- . “Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 213–227 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M.O. Wise et al. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- . “Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P.D. Hanson and G.W.E. Nickelsburg.” *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 315–322.
- . “The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 199–217 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. Lim; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- . “The Origin of the Qumran Community.” Pages 239–260 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . “The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence.” *JBL* 122 (2003): 3–21.
- Collins, John J., and Devorah Dimant. “A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller.” *JQR* 85 (1994): 151–155.
- Collins, John J., and George W.E. Nickelsburg, eds. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. SCS 12. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Corbin, Henry. *Le paradoxe du monothéisme*. Bibliothèque des mythes et des religions 1. Paris: L’Herne, 1981.
- . *Temple and Contemplation*. Translated by Philip Sherrard. London: KPI in association with Islamic Publications, 1986.
- Cothenet, Edouard. “Influence d’Ézéchiël sur la spiritualité de Qumrân.” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 431–439.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *The Temple Scroll and Related Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

- Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- . *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- . “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” Pages 170–264 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G. Ernest Wright. Garden City: Anchor Books, 1965.
- . “Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse [4Q246].” Pages 1–13 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks. STDJ 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms*. 3 vols. AB 16–17A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965–1970.
- Danby, H. *The Mishnah*. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Davidson, Maxwell. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. JSPS 11. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Davies, Philip R. *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*. Biblica et Orientalia 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- . *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BJS 94. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . “The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is ‘Damascus?’” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 503–519.
- . *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document.”* JSOTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- . “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism.” Pages 70–84 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by J. Reeves and J. Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994. Repr. in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. SFSHJ 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran.” *BA* 51 (1988): 203–207. Repr. in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document.” *JJS* 33 (1982): 287–301.
- . “Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah.” Pages 219–232 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T. Lim; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
- . “The Prehistory of the Qumran Community.” Pages 116–125 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- . “Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls.” Pages 152–163 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst and C.J. Labuschagne. VTSup 49. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days.’” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–317.

- Davies, William D. "‘Knowledge’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25–30." *HTR* 46 (1953): 113–139.
- . *Torah in the Messianic Age and/or Age to Come*. JBLMS 7. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
- Davila, James. "Heavenly Ascents in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 461–485 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . *Liturgical Works*. Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . "Melchizedek, Michael, and War in Heaven." *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 259–272.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand. "Reflections on the Relationship between Qumran and Samaritan Messianology." Pages 83–99 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.
- Delcor, Mathias. "Repas culturels Esséniens et Thérapeutes, Thiasés et Haburoth." *RevQ* 6 (1967–1969): 401–425.
- . "Le Statut du roi d’après le ‘Rouleau du Temple.’" *Henoch* 3 (1981): 47–68.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. "The Meaning of Wisdom in Ben Sirā." Pages 133–148 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by L.G. Perdue, B. Scott, and W. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Dimant, Devorah. "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective." *SBLSP* (1978): 323–339.
- . "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple." Pages 165–189 in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage a Valentin Nikiprowetzky*. Edited by A. Caquot, M. Hadas, and J. Riaud. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- . "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua." Pages 105–134 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance." *RevQ* 22 (2006): 615–630.
- . "The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character." Pages 170–176 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Museum, 2000.
- . "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community." Pages 93–103 in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by A. Berlin. Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 1996.
- . *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD XXX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- . "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance." Pages 23–58 in *Time to Prepare a Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism." Pages 43–59 in *The Dead*

- Sea Scrolls at Fifty*. Edited by R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- . “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B.” *JQR* 85 (1994): 157–162.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts*. TSAJ 110. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Donner, H. “Der verlässliche Prophet: Betrachtungen zu 1 Makk 14, 41 ff. und zu Ps. 110.” Pages 213–223 in *Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten*. BZAW 224. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1994.
- Doran, Robert. “The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context.” *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1–11.
- Doudna, Gregory L. “Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis.” Pages 430–471 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran*. JSJSup 86. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Driver, G.R. *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Duguid, Iain M. “Putting Priests in Their Place: Ezekiel’s Contribution to the History of the Old Testament Priesthood.” Pages 43–59 in *Ezekiel’s Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality*. Edited by S. Cook and C. Patton. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Duhaime, Jean. “The War Scroll from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises.” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 133–151.
- . *The War Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 6. London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*. New York: Macmillan, 1952.
- . *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1962.
- Eisenman, Robert. *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran*. Studia Post-Biblica 34. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Eisenman, Robert, and Michael O. Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*. Rockport: Element, 1992.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. “The Promises of Grace to David in Isaiah 55, 1–5.” Pages 196–207 in *Israel’s Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor James Muilenburg*. Edited by B.W. Anderson and W. Harellson; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- Elgvin, Torleif. “An Analysis of 4QInstruction.” PhD diss., The Hebrew University, 1997.
- . “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation.” Pages 113–150 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290. CIS 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . “Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 1Q/4QInstruction.” Pages 67–87 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the*

- Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001*. Edited by J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: The Evidence of 4QInstruction.” Pages 226–247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Museum, 2000.
- . “Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing.” *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 440–463.
- . “Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic.” Pages 15–38 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Elgvin, Torleif, et al., in consultation with J.A. Fitzmyer. *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1*. DJD XX. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Elman, Yaakov. “Some Remarks on 4QMMT and the Rabbinic Tradition: or, When Is a Parallel Not a Parallel.” Pages 99–128 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Eshel, Esther. “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn.” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 175–203.
- . “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’ of the Self-Glorification Hymn.” Pages 619–635 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel. “4Q471 Fragment 1 and ‘Ma‘amadot’ in the War Scroll.” Pages 611–620 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11, 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Eshel, Esther, H. Eshel, C. Newsom, B. Nitzan, E.M. Schuller, and A. Yardeni, in consultation with J.C. VanderKam and M. Brady. *Qumran Cave 4. VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Eshel, Hanan. “4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period.” Pages 53–65 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “CD 12:15–17 and the Stone Vessels Found at Qumran.” Pages 45–52 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Edited by J.M. Baumgarten, E. Chazon, and A. Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “The Historical Background of the Peshar Interpreting Joshua’s Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho.” *RevQ* 15 (1992): 409–420.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2008.

- Evans, Craig A. "Qumran's Messiah: How Important is He?" Pages 135–149 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "Prince of the Congregation." Pages 693–694 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Evans, Craig A., and Peter W. Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Falk, Daniel. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Fearghail, Fearghus Ó. "Sir 50, 5–21: Yom Kippur or the Daily Whole-Offering?" *Bib* 59 (1978): 301–316.
- Fishbane, Michael. "The Well of Living Water: A Biblical Motif and Its Ancient Transformations." Pages 3–16 in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*. Edited by M. Fishbane and E. Tov. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament." Pages 59–89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Edited by W. Meeks. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- . "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11." Pages 245–267 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971. Repr. from *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41.
- . "The Gathering in of the Teacher of the Community." Pages 261–265 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in II Cor. Vi. 14–vii. 1." *CBQ* 23 (1961): 271–280.
- . "Qumran Messianism." Pages 73–110 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. "4Q374: A Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: The Deification of Moses and Early Christology." *DSD* 3 (1996): 236–252.
- . *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 367–399.
- . *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. WUNT 2, 94. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997.
- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity." *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 215–266.
- . *The Jewish Roots of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes / Hebrew University, 1988.
- . "Qumran and Jewish 'Apotropaic' Prayers." *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194–230.
- . *The Spiritual History of the Dead Sea Sect*. Translated by C. Gucker. Tel Aviv: MOD Books, 1989.

- Fraade, Steven D. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69.
- . "They Shall Teach Your Statutes to Jacob': Priest, Scribe, and Sage in Second Temple Times." Unpublished paper.
- . "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)." *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–526.
- . "The Torah of the King (Deut 17:14–20) in the Temple Scroll and Early Rabbinic Law." Pages 25–60 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers From an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by J.R. Davila. STDJ 46. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Fraade, Steven D., A. Shemesh, and R.A. Clements, eds. *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003*. STDJ 62. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Freedman, David Noel. "Temple Without Hands." Pages 21–30 in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times: Proceedings of the Colloquium in Honor of the Centennial of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Jerusalem, 14–16 March 1977*. Edited by A. Biran. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981.
- Frennesson, Björn. "In a Common Rejoicing": *Liturgical Communion with Angels in Qumran*. SSU 14. Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1999.
- Frey, Jörg. "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts." Pages 367–404 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Fujita, S. "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature in the Intertestamental Period." *JSJ* 7 (1976): 30–45.
- . "The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries BC" PhD diss., Princeton University, 1970.
- Fuller, Russell. "The Blessing of Levi in Dtn 33, Mal 2, and Qumran." Pages 31–44 in *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by R. Bartelmus, T. Krüger, and H. Utzschneider. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Gammie, John. *Holiness in Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "L'interprétation de la Torah d'Ézéchiél dans les mss. de Qumrân." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 441–452.
- . *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Tigchelaar. STDJ 64. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns." Pages 105–125 in *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Edited by E. Tigchelaar. STDJ 63. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis." *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–142.
- . "The Temple Scroll and the New Jerusalem." Pages 431–460 in vol. 2 of

- The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts.” Pages 14–40 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks. STDJ 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . “New Jerusalem.” Pages 606–610 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Temple Scroll.” Pages 927–933 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Adam S. van der Woude. “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History.” *RevQ* 56 (1990): 521–541.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. *Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 11 (11Q2–18, 11Q20–30)*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and J. Trebolle Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices*. Translated by W.G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Garnet, P. “Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5.1–7: Towards a Serek Text History,” *JSP* 15 (1997): 67–78.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gaster, Theodor H. “A Qumran Reading of Deuteronomy XXXIII 10.” *VT* 8 (1958): 217–219.
- Gianotto, Claudio. *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia: Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche (sec. II a.C.-sec. III d.C.)* Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 12. Brescia: Paideia, 1984.
- Giblet, J. “Prophétisme et attente d’un messie prophète dans l’ancien Judaïsme.” Pages 85–130 in *L’Attente d’un Messie*. Edited by L. Cerfaux. RechBibl 1. Bruges: Desclés de Brouwer, 1958.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976.
- Glessmer, Uwe. “Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls.” Pages 213–278 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- Gnilka, Joachim. “Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener.” *BZ* 5 (1961): 39–55.
- Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Goldstein, Jonathan. “The Date of the Book of Jubilees.” *PAAJR* 50 (1983): 63–86.

- . “The Testament of Moses: Its Content, Its Origin, and Its Attestation in Josephus.” Pages 44–52 in *Studies on the Testament of Moses*. Edited by G.W.E. Nickelsburg. SCS 4. Cambridge (Mass.): SBL, 1973.
- Goodblatt, David. *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*. TSAJ 38. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1994.
- Gordon, Robert P. “Standing in the Council: When Prophets Encounter God.” Pages 190–204 in *The God of Israel*. Edited by R.P. Gordon. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Grabbe, Lester. “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 M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Gray, George B. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice*. New York: Ktav, 1971.
- Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1–20*. AB 22. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. “The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15–19.” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 319–322.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., and Michael E. Stone, “Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza.” *RB* 85 (1979): 214–230.
- . “Two Notes on the Aramaic Levi Document.” Pages 153–161 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T. Tobin. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Grelot, P. “Notes sur le Testament araméen de Lévi (Fragment de la Bodleian Library, colonne a).” *RB* 63 [1956]: 391–406.
- . “Sur Isaïe LXI: La première consécration d’un grand prêtre.” *RB* 97 (1990): 414–431.
- Gropp, D.M., et al. *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4.28: Miscellanea, Part 2*. DJD XXVIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Grossman, Maxine. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. STDJ 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . “Reading 4QMMT: Genre and History.” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 3–22.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism: Studies in Apocalypticism, Merkavah Mysticism and Gnosticism*. BEATAJ 14. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu A.G. Strousma, eds. *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. TSAJ 32. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1993.

- Hadas, Moses. *Aristeas to Philocrates*. JAL. New York: Ktav, 1973.
- Hanneken, Todd. "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses." *Hen* 28 (2006): 11–25.
- Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- . "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–233.
- Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Did the Pharisees Eat Ordinary Food in a State of Ritual Purity?" *JSJ* 26 (1995): 42–54.
- . "The Halakah and Religion of Qumran." Pages 74–89 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Purity Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5. London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004.
- . "Purity." Pages 724–728 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hauer, Christian. "The Priests of Qumran." PhD diss., Vanderbilt University, 1959.
- Haupt, D. "Das Testament des Levi: Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Überlieferungsgeschichte." PhD diss., Halle-Wittenberg, 1969.
- Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. SBLMS 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
- Hayes, Christine Elizabeth. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from Bible to the Talmud*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Hayward, C.T.R. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- . "The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira." *SJOT* 6 (1992): 123–138.
- . "Sacrifice and World Order: Some Observations on Ben Sira's Attitude to the Temple Service." Pages 22–34 in *Sacrifice and Redemption: Durham Essays in Theology*. Edited by S.W. Sykes; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- . "Phinehas- the Same Is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition." *JJS* 29 (1978): 22–34.
- Heger, Paul. *Cult as the Catalyst for Division*. STDJ 65. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Comments on the Translation of 4QSD I, 1." *JJS* 44 (1993): 127–128.
- . "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures." Pages 67–92 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . *The Damascus Texts*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- . "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa." *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–269.

- . “Interpretative Authority in the Community Rule Tradition.” *DSD* 10 (2003): 74–80.
- . *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society.” Pages 43–53 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans. JSPSup 26. Roehampton Institute London Papers 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by J. Bowden. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- . “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Jes 53 in vorchristlicher Zeit.” Pages 49–91 in *Der leidende Gottesknecht: Jesaja 53 und seine Wirkungsgeschichte*. Edited by B. Janowski and P. Stuhlmacher. FAT 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996.
- Hengel, Martin, James H. Charlesworth, and Doron Mendels. “The Polemical Character of ‘On Kingship’ in the Temple Scroll: An Attempt at Dating 11QTemple.” *JJS* 37 (1986): 28–38.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. “‘A Kingdom of Priests’: The Democratization of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism.” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 6 (1997): 89–104.
- . *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- . *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . “Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in Aramaic *Levi* and *Jubilees*.” Pages 103–122 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . “The Polemic against the *Tebul Yom*: A Reexamination.” In *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, January 9–11 2005*. Edited by E. Chazon, R.A. Clements, and B. Halpern-Amaru. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- . “The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira.” Pages 63–78 in *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces; Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by J. Scott and P. Simpson-Housley. Contributions to the Study of Religion 30. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Hollander, Harm W., and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Hooke, S. “Symbolism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *SE* (1959): 600–612.
- Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM Press, 1998.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Horton, Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century AD and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTSMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

- Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community*. STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Humbert, Jean-Baptiste. "L'espace sacré a Qumrân: propositions pour l'archéologie." *RB* 101–102 (1994): 161–211.
- Hurowitz, Victor Avigdor. "True Light on the Urim and Thummim." *JQR* 88 (1998): 263–274.
- Hurtado, Larry. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.
- Hutchesson, Ian. "The Essene Hypothesis After Fifty Years: An Assessment." *QC* 9 (2000): 17–34.
- Janzen, Waldemar. *Old Testament Ethics: A Paradigmatic Approach*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Jassen, Alex P. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. STDJ 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jefferies, Daryl F. *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*. Gorgias Dissertations 3. Near Eastern Studies 3. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2004.
- Jenson, Philip Peter. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. JSOTSup 106. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. SUNT 2. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Translated by F. and C. Cave. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Jonge, Marinus de, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi." Pages 71–89 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: 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 E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Levi, the Sons of Levi and the Law in *Testament Levi* X, XIV–XV and XVI." Pages 180–190 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. NovTSup 63. Leiden: Brill 1991.
- . "Levi in Aramaic Levi and the Testament of Levi." Pages 121–131 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 E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII." Pages 132–145 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*. Edited by M. de Jonge. SVTP 3. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . "The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future According to the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 28–47 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. NovTSup 63. Leiden: Brill 1991. Repr. from

- Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Edited by O. Michel et al. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.
- . “The Testament of Levi and ‘Aramaic Levi.” Pages 244–262 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. NovTSup 63. Leiden: Brill 1991.
- . *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Text, Composition, and Origin*. Van Gorcum’s Theologische Bibliotheek 25. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1953.
- . “Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs?” Pages 150–162 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. NovTSup 63. Leiden: Brill 1991.
- Jonge, Marinus de and Adam S. van der Woude. “XIQMelchizedek and the New Testament.” *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–326.
- Jonge, Marinus de, et al., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG 1, pt. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Kampen, J. “4QMMT and New Testament Studies.” Pages 129–144 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kister, Menahem. “Metamorphoses of Aggadic Traditions.” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 179–244 (Hebrew).
- . “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar.” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317–371 (Hebrew).
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism.” *AJSR* 20 (1995): 285–312.
- Klinzing, G. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Knibb, Michael. “Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 379–402 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . “Messianism in the Pseudepigrapha in the Light of the Scrolls.” *DSD* 2 (1995): 165–184.
- . “The Place of the Damascus Document.” Pages 149–162 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M.O. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D.G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- . *The Qumran Community*. CCWJCW 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . “The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?” Pages 51–65 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by P.R. Davies and R.T. White. JSOTSup 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

- . “Teacher of Righteousness.” Pages 918–921 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Interpreter of the Law.” Pages 383–384 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Knohl, Israel. “Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship Between Prayer and Temple Cult.” *JBL* 115 (1996): 17–30.
- . *The Messiah before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by D. Maisel. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000.
- . *Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Kobelski, Paul. *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*. CBQMS 10. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Kohn, Risa Levitt, and Rebecca Moore. *A Portable God: The Origin of Judaism and Christianity*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Kugel, James. “How Old Is the ‘Aramaic Levi Document?’” *DSD* 14 (2007): 291–312.
- . “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings.” *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–64.
- Kugler, Robert A. “A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok?” *DSD* 3 (1996): 315–320.
- . *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. SBLEJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- “Halakic Interpretive Strategies at Qumran: A Case Study.” Pages 131–140 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 M.J. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . “Priesthood at Qumran.” Pages 93–116 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . “The Priesthood at Qumran: The Evidence of References to Levi and the Levites.” Pages 465–479 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Priests.” Pages 688–693 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Testaments.” Pages 933–936 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Rewriting Rubrics: Sacrifice and the Religion of Qumran.” Pages 90–112 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament." Pages 169–221 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by G.J. Brooke with F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindefiedern von Qumran mit einem Anhang über Eschatologie und Gegenwart in der Verkündigung Jesu*. SUNT 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," Pages 65–93 in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. Edited by K. Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
- Laato, Antti. *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations*. USF International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1–8*. WBC 47. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.
- Lange, Armin. "The Determination of fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature." Pages 39–48 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel." Pages 113–159 in *Kohelet in the Context of Wisdom*. Edited by A. Schoors. BETL 136. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1998.
- . *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Laperrousaz, Ernest-Marie. "A propos des depots d'ossements d'animaux trouvés a Qoumrân." *RevQ* 9 (1978): 569–573.
- Leaney, A.R.C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*. NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.
- . "The Temple and the World." *JR* 64 (1984): 275–298.
- . *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*. HSM 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Levine, Baruch. "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character." *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5–23.
- Licht, Jacob. "Mataat Olam ve-Am Pedut El." Pages 1–27 in *Mehqarim ba-Megillot ha-Genuzot: Sefer Zikaron le-Eliezer Lipa Sukeinik*. Jerusalem: Heikhal Hasefer, 1961.
- . *Megillat ha-Hodayot: mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957.

- . *Megillat ha-Serakhim: mi-Megillot Midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965.
- . “Some Terms and Concepts of Ritual Purity in the Qumran Writings.” Pages 300–309 in *Studies in the Bible Presented to Professor M.H. Segal*. Edited by J.M. Grintz and J. Liver. Publications of the Israel Society for Biblical Research 17. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964.
- Lieberman, Saul. “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline.” *JBL* 71 (1951): 199–206.
- . “Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources.” *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 395–404.
- Liver, Jacob. “The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature of the Second Commonwealth.” *HTR* 52 (1959): 149–187.
- . “The ‘Sons of Zadok the Priests.’” *RevQ* 6 (1967–1969): 3–30.
- Loader, William. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Lübbe, John. “A Reinterpretation of 4Q Testimonia,” *RevQ* 12 (1986): 187–197.
- Lueken, Wilhelm. *Der Erzengel Michael in der Überlieferung des Judentums*. Göttingen: E.A. Huth, 1898.
- Lust, Johan. “Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran.” Pages 90–100 in *Ezekiel and His Book*. Edited by J. Lust. BETL 74. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Lyons, William Jean. “Possessing the Land: The Qumran Sect and the Eschatological Victory.” *DSD* 3 (1996): 130–151.
- Mach, Michael. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992.
- Mack, Burton. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira’s Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- . “Communal Meals and Sacred Space at Qumran.” Pages 81–112 in *Debating Qumran: Collected Essays on Its Archaeology*. ISACR 4. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Maier, Johann. “‘Shirê ‘Ôlat hash-Shabbat’: Some Observations on Their Calendric Implications and on Their Style.” Pages 543–560 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11, 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der “jüdischen Gnosis”: Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkâbâh*. Kairos Religionswissenschaftliche Studien 1. Salzburg: O. Müller, 1964.
- . “Rule of the Blessings.” Pages 791–792 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Religious Beliefs, Qumran Sect.” Pages 753–757 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Mansoor, Menahem. "The Nature of Gnosticism in Qumran." Pages 389–400 in *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13–18 Aprile 1966*. Edited by U. Bianchi. SHR 12. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Manzi, Franco. Melchisedek e l'angelologica nell'epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran. AnBib 136. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1997.
- Martola, Nils. "The Priest Anointed for Battle." *Nordisk Judaistik: Scandinavian Jewish Studies* 4 (1983): 21–40.
- Mason, Eric. "You Are a Priest Forever": *Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. STDJ 74. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- McKelvey, R. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Metso, Sarianna. "The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS^e." *JJS* 44 (1993): 303–308.
- . *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "The Use of Old Testament Quotations." Pages 217–231 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Metzger, Bruce, ed. *Oxford Annotated Apocrypha, Expanded Edition Containing the Third and Fourth Books of the Maccabees and Psalms 151*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "First Day Ablutions at Qumran." Pages 561–570 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11, 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray." *RB* 83 (1976): 390–399.
- . *Leviticus, 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. Doubleday: New York, 1991.
- . "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles." Pages 165–180 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . "Studies in the Temple Scroll." *JBL* 97 (1978): 501–523.
- Milik, Josef T. "4QVisions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène." *RB* 79 (1972): 77–99.
- . *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- . *Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1957.
- . "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- . Review of Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. *RB* 64 (1957): 585–593.
- . *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by J. Strugnell. SBT 26. London: SCM, 1959.
- . "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen." *RB* 62 (1955): 398–406.

- Milikowsky, Chaim. "Again: *Damascus* in *Damascus* Document and in Rabbinic Literature." *RevQ* 41 (1982): 97–106.
- Murray-Jones, Christopher R.A. "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources." *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 400–431.
- Mullen, E. Theodore. *The Assembly of the Gods*. HSM 24. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII, 3–19)." *RB* 79 (1972): 200–216.
- . "The *Damascus Document* Revisited." *RB* 92 (1985): 223–246.
- . "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14–VI, 1." *RB* 77 (1970), 201–229.
- . "The Essenes and Their History." *RB* 81 (1974): 215–244.
- . "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté." *RB* 76 (1969): 529–549.
- . "A Literary Analysis of *Damascus Document* VI, 2–VIII, 3." *RB* 78 (1971): 210–232.
- . "A Literary Analysis of *Damascus Document* XIX, 33–XX, 34." *RB* 79 (1972): 544–564.
- . "The Original Text of CD 7:9–8:2 = 19:5–14." *HTR* 64 (1971): 379–386.
- . "The Translation of *Damascus Document* VI, 11–14." *RevQ* 7 (1971): 553–556.
- Naudé, J. "Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 171–199 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- Neufeld, D. "And when that one comes': Aspects of Johannine Messianism." Pages 120–140 in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Newman, Carey, James Davila, and Gladys Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. JSJSup 63. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Newsom, Carol. "He Has Established for Himself Priests': Human and Angelic Priesthood in the Qumran Sabbath Shiroṭ." Pages 101–120 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "Knowing as Doing: The Social Symbolics of Knowledge at Qumran." *Semeia* 59 (1992): 139–153.
- . "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shiroṭ." *JJS* 38 (1987): 11–30.
- . "The 'Psalms of Joshua' from Cave 4." *JJS* 39 (1988): 56–73.
- . "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–187 in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters*. Edited by W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D.N. Freedman. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, A Critical Edition*. HSS 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Newsom, Carol and Y. Yadin. "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77–88.

- Nickelsburg, George W.E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11.” *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405.
- . “The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About.” Pages 99–113 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum; Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1999.
- . “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600.
- . *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . “The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH^a 4:29–40).” Pages 649–659 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11, 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E., and Michael E. Stone. *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Niditch, Susan. “Ezekiel 40–48 in a Visionary Context.” *CBQ* 48 (1986): 208–224.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. “Benedictions and Instructions for the Eschatological Community (11QBer; 4Q285).” *RevQ* 61 (1993): 77–90.
- . *Biblical Influence in Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. PhD diss., Tel Aviv University, 1989.
- . “Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran.” *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–183.
- . “Hymns from Qumran, 4Q510–4Q511.” Pages 53–63 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- . *Megillat Peshet Habakkuk*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986.
- . *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Translated by J. Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- O’Brien, Julia. *Priest and Levite in Malachi*. SBLDS 121. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. JSPSup 27. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Ollenburger, Ben C. *Zion, the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult*. JSOTSup 41. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Olyan, Saul. “Ben Sira’s Relationship to the Priesthood.” *HTR* 80 (1987): 261–286.
- Orton, David E. *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal*. JSNTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Parry, Donald, and Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Vol. 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Pearson, Birger. “Melchizedek in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism.”

- Pages 176–202 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. M.E. Stone and T. Bergren. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Perdue, Leo G. *Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East*. SBLDS 30. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Peurson, W. van. "Qumran Origins: Some Remarks on the Enochic/Essene Hypothesis." *RevQ* 20 (2001): 241–253.
- Pfann, Stephen J. *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*; Philip S. Alexander, in consultation with J.C. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Philonenko, Marc. "Son soleil éternel brillera (4QTestLévi d(?) 9 i 3)." *RHPR* 73 (1993): 405–408.
- Ploeg, Johannes van der. "The Meals of the Essenes." *JSS* 2 (1957): 163–175.
- Poirier, John C. "The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses at Qumran." *DSD* 10 (2003): 221–242.
- Pomykala, Kenneth. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism*. SBLEJL 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press 1995.
- Pouilly, Jean. *La règle de la communauté de Qumran. Son évolution littéraire*. Paris: Gabalda, 1976.
- Priest, John. "Ben Sira 45, 25 in the Light of the Qumran Literature." *RevQ* 5 (1964–1966): 111–118.
- Puech, Émile. "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 475–519.
- . *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle*. 2 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993.
- . "Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le 'Royaume de Dieu.'" *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131.
- . "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)." *RevQ* 15 (1992): 475–522.
- . "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa." Pages 449–501 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11, 1–2. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Messianisme, Eschatologie et Résurrection dans les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 255–298.
- . "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235–256 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . "Notes sur le Manuscrit de 11QMelkî-šédeq." *RevQ* 12 (1987): 483–513.
- . *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549*. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- . *Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579): Qumran Cave 4.XVIII*. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Qimron, E. "Time for Praising God: A Fragment of a Scroll from Qumran (4Q409)." *JQR* (1990): 341–347.

- Qimron, E., and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*. DJD X. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Rabin, Chaim. *Qumran Studies*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957.
- . *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Rad, G. von. *From Genesis to Chronicles: Explorations in Old Testament Theology*. Edited by K.C. Hanson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- . "‘Gerechtigkeit’ und ‘Leben’ in der Kultsprache der Psalmen." Pages 418–437 in *Festschrift, Alfred Bertholet zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet von Kollegen und Freunden*. Edited by W. Baumgartner. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1950.
- Rappaport, Uriel. "The Coins of Judea at the End of the Persian Rule and the Beginning of the Hellenistic Period." Pages 7–21 in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Edited by O. Oppenheimer, U. Rappaport, and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Yitzhak ben-Zvi, Ministry of Defense, 1980 (Hebrew).
- Ratzlaff, Richard. "Peleg, House of." Pages 641–642 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Regev, Eyal. "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Notions of Purity and Impurity in Qumran." *DSD* 10 (2003): 243–278.
- . "Non-Priestly Purity and Its Religious Aspects according to Historical Sources and Archaeological Findings." Pages 223–244a in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*. Edited by M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "On Blood, Impurity and Body Perception in the Halakhic Schools in the Second Temple and Talmudic Period." *AJSR* 27 (2003): 1–23 (Hebrew section).
- . "The Temple Impurity and Qumran's 'Foreign Affairs' in the Early Hasmonean Period." in *Zion* 64 (1999): 135–156.
- . "Were All the Priests the Same? Qumranic Halakhah in Comparison with Sadducean Halakhah." *DSD* 12 (2005): 158–188.
- . "Yose ben Yoezer and the Qumran Sectarrians on Purity Laws: Agreement and Controversy." Pages 95–107 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*. Edited by J.M. Baumgarten, E. Chazon, and A. Pinnick. STDJ 34. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Rengstorff, Karl H. *Hirbet Qumrân and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by E.T. Sander. New York: Crossroad, 1995.
- . "Qumran and Gnosticism." Pages 379–388 in *Le Origini dello Gnosti-*

- cismo: Colloquio di Messina 13–18 Aprile 1966*. Edited by U. Bianchi. SHR 12. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Rofé, Alexander. "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran." Pages 1–11 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001*. Edited by J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Rooke, Deborah W. *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Translated by W.J. Short. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988.
- Sanders, E.P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Vol. 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. New York: Ktav, 1970.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple." Pages 267–284 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by E. von Beate, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1999.
- . "Communal Meals at Qumran." *RevQ* 10 (1979): 45–56.
- . "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy." Pages 33–48 in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. L. Levine. Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987.
- . *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . "Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran." Pages 89–100 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001*. Edited by J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "The King, His Guard and the Royal Council in the Temple Scroll." Pages 487–504 in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30, 3–16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 199–214.
- . "Merkavah Speculations at Qumran: The 4Q *Serek Shirot Olat ha-Shabbat*." Pages 15–47 in *Mystics, Philosophers and Politicians, Festschrift for A. Altman*. Edited by J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski. Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 5. Durham: Duke University Press, 1982.

- . “Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls.” Pages 116–129 in *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect.” *BA* 53 (1990): 64–73.
- . “‘ôlâ and ḥaṭṭâ’t in the *Temple Scroll*.” Pages 353–363 in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “The Place of 4QMMT in the Corpus of Qumran Manuscripts.” Pages 81–98 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . “Pre-Maccabean Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition.” *DSD* 13 (2006): 348–361.
- . “Priestly and Levitical Gifts in the ‘Temple Scroll’” Pages 480–496 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. ABRL. Garden City, Doubleday, 1995.
- . “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 E. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . “The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 35–49 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by H. Shanks. New York: Random House, 1992.
- . *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. BJS 33. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- . “The *Temple Scroll* and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period.” Pages 163–174 in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “The *Temple Scroll* and the Nature of its Law: The Status of the Question.” Pages 33–52 in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “The Law of the *Temple Scroll* and its Provenance.” Pages 3–18 in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll*. Edited by F. García Martínez. STDJ 75. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “The *Temple Scroll* and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period.” Pages 239–255 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- . “Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community.” Pages 413–427 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Schmidt, Francis. *La pensée du Temple: de Jérusalem à Qoumrân*. Paris: Les Éditions du Seuil, 1994.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the *Damascus Document*." Pages 523–536 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schofield, Alison, and James C. VanderKam, "Were the Hasmonians Zadokites?" *JBL* 124 (2005): 73–87.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description." *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–150.
- Schultz, Brian. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC – AD 135)*. Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979.
- Schüssler-Fiorenza, E. "Cultic Language in Qumran and the New Testament." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 159–177.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Law and Truth: On Qumran-Sadducean and Rabbinic Views of Law." Pages 229–240 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- . "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees." Pages 67–80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein. SBLSymS 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran." Pages 157–179 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "Priesthood, Temple, Sacrifice: Opposition and Spiritualization in the Late Second Temple Period." PhD Diss., Hebrew University, 1979.
- . "Qumran between Priestliness and Christianity." Pages 176–181 in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by M. Broshi et al. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and Israel Exploration Society, 1992 (Hebrew).
- . "Temple and Desert: On Religion and State in Second Temple Period Judaea." Pages 29–43 in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. WUNT 60. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1992.
- . "The Tribes of As. Mos. 4:7–9." *JBL* 99 (1980): 217–223.
- Scott, James. "Korah and Qumran." Pages 182–202 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by P.W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Segal, Moshe Zvi. *Sefer Ben Sira ha-Shalem*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1976.
- Sekki, Arthur E. *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran*. SBLDS 110. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Shavit, Yaacov. "The 'Qumran Library' in the Light of the Attitude towards Books

- and Libraries in the Second Temple Period." Pages 299–317 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M.O. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D.G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "'The Holy Angels Are in Their Council': The Exclusion of Deformed Persons from Holy Places in Qumranic and Rabbinic Literature." *DSD* 4 (1997): 178–206.
- Sheppard, Gerald T. "Wisdom and Torah: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy Underlying Sirach 24:23." Pages 166–176 in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*. Edited by G. Tuttle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smith, Dennis. "Meals." Pages 530–532 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Smith, Mark S. "Biblical and Canaanite Notes to the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Qumran." *RevQ* 12 (1987): 585–588.
- Smith, Morton. "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a." Pages 181–188 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491." Pages 290–301 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Snaith, John G. "Biblical Quotations in the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus." *JTS* 18 (1967): 1–12.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. "Abraham and the Eastern Kings: On Genesis 14." Pages 283–291 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Souza Nogueira, Paolo de. "Ecstatic Worship in the Self-Glorification Hymn." Pages 385–394 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.
- Stadelmann, Helge. *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum*. WUNT 2,6. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1980.
- Stallman, R. "Levi and Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 164–190 in *Qumran Questions*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Starcky, Jean. "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân." *RB* 70 (1963): 481–505.
- Stegemann, E., ed. *Messiasvorstellungen bei Juden und Christen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1993.

- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: 1971.
- . *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: ein Sachbuch*. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- . “The Origins of the Temple Scroll.” Pages 235–256 in *Congress Volume, Jerusalem, 1986*. VTSup 40. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- . “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism.” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505.
- Stegemann, Hartmut, Eileen Schuller, and Carol Newsom. *1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{a,f}*. DJD XL. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes*. Translated by A.W. Mahnke. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Stern, Menahem., ed. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, Volume One: from Herodotus to Plutarch*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976.
- Stuedel, Annette. “אהרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran.” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–246.
- . *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde [4QMidr-Eschat^{a,b}]*. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . “The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM).” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 507–519.
- . “Testimonia.” Pages 936–938 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Melchizedek.” Pages 535–537 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Stone, Michael E. “Apocalyptic Literature.” Pages 383–442 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period; Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Edited by M.E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- . “The Axis of History at Qumran.” Pages 133–149 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 E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins.” *JSJ* 19 (1988): 159–170.
- . “Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age.” Pages 575–586 in *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Edited by P.D. Miller, P. Hanson, and S. McBride. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . “Levi, Aramaic.” Pages 486–488 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Amram.” Pages 23–24 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Stone, Michael E. and Jonas C. Greenfield. "The Prayer of Levi." *JBL* 112 (1993): 247–266.
- Strugnell, John. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works." Pages 221–256 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition." Pages 57–73 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.
- Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, in consultation with J.A. Fitzmyer. *Sapiential Texts, Part 2: Cave 4.XXIV*. DJD XXXIV. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2, 70. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995.
- . "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions." *DSD* 7 (2000): 354–377.
- . "'Angels' and 'God': Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism." Pages 45–70 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNTSup 263. Edited by L. Stuckenbruck and W. North. London: T. & T. Clark International, 2004.
- . *The Book of Giants from Qumran*. TSAJ 63. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997.
- Sukenik, Eliezer L. *Megillot Genuzot: Seqira Rishonah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948.
- Sussmann, Yaakov. "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 179–200 (Appendix 1) in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. "Sacred Meals at Qumran?" *Heythrop Journal* 1 (1960): 48–65.
- Suter, David. "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16." *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–135.
- Swarup, Paul. *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness*. Library of Second Temple Studies 59. London: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
- Tabor, J. "Pierced or Piercing Messiah?—The Verdict Is Still Out." *BAR* 18/6 (1992): 58–59.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 3–24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by

- E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. *CJAS* 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . “The Concept of Māšīah and Messianism in Early Judaism.” Pages 79–115 in *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- . “Types of Messianic Expectation at the Turn of the Era.” Pages 202–224 in *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1986.
- . “Calendars and Mishmarot.” Pages 108–117 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1966.
- Tedesche, Sidney S. *The First Book of Maccabees*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- Teeple, Howard Merle. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. JBLMS 10. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.
- Teicher, J.L. “The Dead Sea Scrolls—Documents of the Jewish Christian Sect of Ebionites.” *JJS* 2 (1951): 67–99.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *Josephus: Against Apion*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1927.
- Thiering, Barbara E. “The Biblical Source of Qumran Asceticism.” *JBL* 93 (1974): 429–444.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “The Addressees of 1Q/4QInstruction.” Pages 62–75 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “The Imaginal Context of the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem.” Pages 257–270 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden, Brill, 2007.
- . *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*. Oudtestamentische Studiën 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Tiller, Patrick A. “The ‘Eternal Planting’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *DSD* 4 (1997): 312–335.
- Toorn, Karel van der. *Family Religion in Babylonia, Syria and Israel: Continuity and Change in the Forms of Religious Life*. SHCANE 7. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Tournay, R.J. “À propos du Psaume 16, 1–4.” *RB* 108 (2001): 21–25.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. SVTP 10. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Ulrich, Eugene, Frank M. Cross. *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. DJD XII. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Ulrichsen, Jarl Henning. *Die Grundschrift der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*:

- Eine Untersuchung zu Umfang, Inhalt und Eigenart der ursprünglichen Schrift.* Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia Religionum 10. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991.
- Urbach Efraim E. "Matai Pasqah ha-Nevuah?" Pages 1–11 in *The World of the Sages: Collected Studies*. 2d ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2002.
- Van Dam, Cornelis. *The Urim and Thummim: A Means of Revelation in Ancient Israel*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–393.
- . "Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 113–134 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 511. *Scriptores Aethiopici* 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- . *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . "The Demons in the 'Book of Jubilees.'" Pages 339–364 in *Die Dämonen; die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K.F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003.
- . *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- . "Identity and History of the Community." Pages 507–523 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . "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 D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . "Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 359–373.
- . "Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 353–365.
- . "Messianism in the Scrolls." Pages 211–234 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . "The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 3–24 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. TSAJ 65. Edited by M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1997.

- . *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Van de Water, Rick. "Michael or Yhwh? Toward Identifying Melchizedek in 11Q13." *JSP* 16 (2006): 75–86.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- . "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân." *RB* 61 (1954): 83–106.
- . "Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân." *RB* 63 (1956): 533–577.
- . "Les manuscrits de Qumrân et l'archéologie." *RB* 66 (1959): 87–110.
- Vermes, Geza. *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- . *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 5th ed. New York: Allen Lane / Penguin Press, 1997.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 2d ed. London: Penguin Books, 1968.
- . *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . *Discovery in the Judean Desert*. New York: Desclee Company, 1956.
- . "The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok-Priests-Congregation." Pages 375–384 in vol. 1 of *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer. 3 vols. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1996.
- . *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda*. Paris: Desclée, 1954.
- . "The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285)." *JJS* 43 (1992): 85–94.
- . "Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4." *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–255.
- . *Scripture and Tradition*. *Studia Post-Biblica* 4. 2d ed. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Vermes, Geza, and Martin Goodman. *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- Villalón, J.R. "Sources vétero-testamentaires de la doctrine qumranienne des deux messies." *RevQ* 29 (1972): 54–69.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–165 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts." Pages 257–281 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. *JSPSup* 8. *JSOT / ASOR Monographs* 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- . *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
- . "Does Qumran Record the Death of the Moreh? The Meaning of *he'aseph* in *Damascus Covenant* XIX, 35, XX, 14." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 323–330.
- . "Ezekiel and Ezekielianism as Progenitors of Essenianism." Pages 186–196 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. *STDJ* 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Angelic Song Over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts." Pages 131–157 in *Time to Prepare a Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew*

- University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990. Edited by D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . “The Heavenly Praise in Unison.” Pages 427–437 in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. LSTS 54. T. & T. Clark International: New York, 2005.
- . *Justice and Righteousness in Israel and the Nations: Equality and Freedom in Ancient Israel in Light of Social Justice in the Ancient Near East*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985 (Hebrew).
- . *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect*. NTOA 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- . “Prayer and Liturgical Practice in the Qumran Sect.” Pages 241–258 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.
- . “Traces of *Kedushat Yozer* and *Pesukey De-Zimra* in the Qumran Literature and in Ben-Sira.” *Tarbiz* 45 (1975–1976): 15–26 (Hebrew).
- Weissenberg, Hanne von. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. STDJ 82. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Werman, Cana. “Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Inter marriage.” *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.
- . “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period.” *DSD* 4 (1997): 211–225.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Werrett, Ian C. *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 72. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Winter, Paul. “Notes on Wieder’s Observation on the *dwrš htwrh* in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus.” *JQR* 45 (1954): 39–47.
- Wise, Michael O. “מי כמוני באלים: A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^A 25:35–26:10.” *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219.
- . *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*. SAOC 49. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.
- . “The Teacher of Righteousness and the High Priest of the Intersacerdotium: Two Approaches.” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 587–618.
- . “The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness.” Pages 121–147 in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*. Edited by Z J. Kapera. Krakow: The Enigma Press, 1991.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
- Wise, Michael O., and James Tabor. “The Messiah at Qumran.” *BAR* 18 / 6 (1992): 60–65.
- Wold, Benjamin. *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and Its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. WUNT 2, 201. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2005.
- Wolfson, Elliot. “Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response.” *JQR* 85 (1994): 185–202.
- . “Seven Mysteries of Knowledge: Qumran E / sotericism Recovered.” Pages

- 177–213 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by H. Najman and J. Newman. JSJSup 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. "Fifty Years of Qumran Research." Pages 1–45 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.
- . "Fragmente einen Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11Q SirSabb)." Pages 311–337 in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala; Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres*. Edited by W.C. Delsman, et al. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1982.
- . Review of M. Baillet, *DJD VII. TRu* 55 (1990): 256–257.
- . "Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI." *OTS* 14 (1965): 354–373.
- . *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957.
- Wright, 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 P.C. Beentjes. BZAW 255. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.
- . "One 'Methodological Assumption' of the Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins." Pages 286–290 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . "Putting the Puzzle Together: Some Suggestions Concerning the Social Location of the Wisdom of Ben Sira." *SBLSP* 35 (1996): 133–149.
- . *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint*. JSJSup 131. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Wright, David P. *The Disposal of Impurity: Elimination Rites in the Bible and in Hittite and Mesopotamian Literature*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Wright, J. Edward. *The Early History of Heaven*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library*. STDJ 47. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Yadin, Yigael. "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran." *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–154.
- . *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by B. and C. Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- . *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, 1983.
- Zeuner, F.E. "Notes on Qumrân." *PEQ* 92 (1960): 27–36.
- Zimmermann, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. WUNT 2,104. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1998.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M., 1n, 108n, 113n, 135–136, 138, 160n, 172n, 174n, 182n, 199n, 280n
- Alexander, P., 11n, 12n, 13n, 85n, 97n, 99–100, 101n, 140n, 173n, 198n, 199–200, 284n
- Alexander, P.H., 1n
- Allegro, J., 181n, 186n, 247n
- Allen, L., 151n
- Allison, D., 100n
- Alon, G., 232n, 245n
- Altmann, A., 121n
- Aptowitz, V., 24n
- Arnold, R., 160n
- Aschim, A., 152n, 154, 156n, 157n, 158, 159n
- Atkinson, K., 217n, 218n
- Attridge, H., 140n
- Aune, D., 181n
- Avemarie, F., 244n, 247n
- Baillet, M., 25n, 91, 124n, 127, 128n, 129, 131, 133n, 134–135, 137, 246n, 280n, 284n
- Bar-Ilan, M., 211n
- Barker, M., 90n, 150n, 155n
- Barthélemy, D., 108n, 202n, 284n
- Bauckham, R., 199n
- Baumgarten, A., 13n, 178n, 227n, 238n, 288n, 306n
- Baumgarten, J., 52n, 89, 90n, 119n, 150n, 160n, 161n, 163n, 164n, 166, 190n, 195n, 196n, 204n, 205n, 217n, 223n, 230n, 231n, 233n, 234n, 235n, 238n, 243n, 245n, 246n, 248n
- Beall, T., 182n, 248n
- Becker, J., 49n, 268n
- Beentjes, P., 58n
- Ben-Dov, J., 36n
- Bergman, J., 197n
- Bernstein, M., 14n, 124n, 226n, 230n, 257n, 282n, 285n, 286n
- Berrin, S., 14n, 146n
- Betz, O., 160n, 181n, 231n
- Beyer, K., 53n, 79n, 159n, 270n, 271n
- Bickerman, E., 211n
- Bilde, P., 247n, 248n
- Black, M., 6n, 28n
- Boccaccini, G., 5n, 6, 7n, 10, 17, 18n, 265n, 271n
- Bokser, B., 242n, 248n
- Bowley, J., 1n, 113n, 160n, 199n, 280n
- Bowman, J., 250n
- Boyce, M., 192n
- Brin, G., 64n
- Brooke, G., 4, 14, 67n, 69n, 78n, 90n, 91n, 106n, 174n, 182n, 183n, 188n, 189, 241n, 277n, 279, 281n, 282, 283n, 284n, 290, 291n, 292
- Broshi, M., 162n, 163
- Brown, R., 174n, 182n
- Brownlee, W., 181n, 220
- Bryan, S., 189n
- Büchler, A., 215n
- Burrows, M., 248n
- Callaway, P., 4n
- Caquot, A., 70n, 129n, 187n, 209n
- Carmignac, J., 97n, 146n, 147n, 149n, 181n, 284n
- Charles, R., 29n, 38n, 42n, 48n, 95n, 156n, 157n
- Charlesworth, J., 12n, 14n, 83n, 109n, 110n, 113n, 115, 122n, 160n, 172n, 173n, 176n, 177n, 202n, 275n
- Chazon, E., 100n, 105, 133n
- Christiansen, E., 195n
- Chyutin, M., 237n
- Clark, D., 189n

- Clements, R., 230n
 Cody, A., 30n, 67n
 Cohen, S.J.D., 211n
 Collingwood, R., 4n
 Collins, A., 48n
 Collins, J.J., 5, 6n, 11n, 15n, 30n,
 33n, 34n, 47n, 58n, 62n, 63–64,
 71n, 74, 77n, 79n, 83n, 88n, 121n,
 136n, 138, 139n, 140–143, 172n,
 173n, 174n, 175n, 176, 180n,
 182n, 185n, 190n, 192n, 193,
 204n, 207n, 209n, 210n, 257n,
 258n, 267n, 279n
 Cook, E., 1n, 113n, 136n, 160n,
 199n, 280n
 Corbin, H., 80n, 101, 102n, 103–104,
 105n, 106
 Cothenet, E., 6n
 Cross, F.M., 2, 12n, 23n, 91n, 147n,
 174n, 175n, 181n, 182n, 184n,
 190n, 195n, 202n, 238n, 247n
- Dahood, M., 58
 Danby, H., 213n
 Davidson, M., 83n, 94n, 96n, 127,
 129n, 130, 244n
 Davies, P., 4–5, 8n, 10n, 12n, 13–15,
 18n, 174n, 175n, 178, 179n, 180n,
 186n, 187n, 190n, 191–192, 218,
 219n, 223n, 229n, 238n, 243n
 Davies, W., 120n, 180n
 Davila, J., 74n, 88n, 95n, 117n, 128n,
 129n, 130n, 146n, 150n, 153
 Delcor, M., 248–249, 275n
 Dexinger, F., 182n
 Di Lella, A., 59n, 60n, 261n, 262n,
 270n
 Dimant, D., 1n, 12n, 13n, 16n, 17,
 29n, 54n, 83n, 136n, 137, 138n,
 216n, 218n, 222n, 231n, 239n,
 242, 243n, 253n
 DiTommaso, L., 237n
 Donner, H., 151n
 Doran, R., 45n, 156n
 Doudna, G., 198n
 Drawnel, H., 263n, 266n, 267n,
 268n, 269n, 271n, 272, 273n
- Driver, G., 181n
 Duguid, I., 102n
 Duhaime, J., 91n, 133n, 197n
 Dupont-Sommer, A., 120n, 181n,
 182n, 276n
- Eisenman, R., 160n, 198n
 Eissfeldt, O., 70n
 Elgvin, T., 61n, 62n, 63n, 64, 65n,
 68–70, 71n, 72n, 75n, 77, 86n
 Elman, Y., 231n
 Eshel, E., 46n, 53n, 59n, 133n, 136,
 138, 139n, 141–142, 143n, 157n,
 216n, 235n, 265n, 266, 267n,
 268n, 269, 271, 273, 275n
 Eshel, H., 14n, 226, 227n, 235n,
 245n, 276n
 Evans, C., 172, 175n, 187n
- Falk, D., 86n, 87, 97n
 Fearghail, F., 57n
 Fishbane, M., 76n
 Fitzmyer, J., 147n, 149n, 150n, 152n,
 171n, 176n, 182n, 191n, 308n
 Fletcher-Louis, C., 6n, 29n, 32n, 43–
 44, 55n, 58n, 61n, 67, 68n, 71,
 72n, 74, 88n, 93n, 95n, 96n, 97n,
 99–100, 105, 114n, 115, 116n,
 118n, 119–120, 127n, 129n, 131n,
 132, 139, 142, 146n, 151n, 153n,
 163n
 Flint, P., 172n, 279n
 Flusser, D., 151n, 267n, 276n, 309n
 Fraade, S., 32n, 146n, 211n, 224n,
 230n, 242n, 263n, 275n, 288n,
 291
 Freedman, D., 24n
 Frennesson, B., 83n, 117n, 128n
 Frey, J., 70n
 Fujita, S., 69n, 102n
 Fuller, R., 183n, 189n
- Gammie, J., 221n
 García Martínez, F., 1n, 5n, 6n, 10,
 16n, 55n, 57n, 124n, 128n, 131n,
 133n, 136n, 137n, 147n, 149n,
 151n, 152n, 160n, 161n, 174n,

- 181n, 182n, 187n, 189n, 204n,
 205n, 230n, 236n, 237n
 Garnet, P., 12n
 Gärtner, B., 239–240, 248n, 308,
 309n
 Gaster, T., 119n
 Gianotto, C., 159n
 Giblett, J., 181n
 Ginzberg, L., 174n, 218n, 219n
 Glessmer, U., 36n
 Gnillka, J., 247n, 248n
 Goff, M., 61n, 65n, 69n, 74n, 76n,
 77n
 Golb, N., 1n
 Goldstein, J., 45n, 213n
 Goodblatt, D., 209n, 211n, 259n,
 263n, 264, 275n
 Goodman, M., 248n
 Goppelt, L., 24n
 Gordon, R., 23n
 Grabbe, L., 210n, 216n, 231n
 Gray, G., 41n
 Gray, R., 211n
 Greenberg, M., 59n
 Greenfield, J., 46n, 47n, 52n, 53n,
 59n, 157n, 216n, 218n, 265n, 266,
 267, 268n, 269, 271, 273, 275n
 Grelot, P., 152, 270n, 271n
 Grossman, M., 15n, 224n
 Gruenwald, I., 120n, 172n
 Guilbert, P., 178n

 Hadas, M., 45n
 Hanneken, T., 37n
 Hanson, P., 29n, 102n
 Haran, M., 51n, 60n, 257n, 258n
 Harrington, D., 62n, 63, 64n, 65n,
 66n, 69n, 73n
 Harrington, H., 213n, 214n, 229n,
 230n, 232n, 240n, 244n, 245n,
 246n
 Hauer, C., 5n, 255n
 Haupt, D., 268n
 Hay, D., 151n
 Hayes, C., 216n
 Hayward, C., 41n, 45n, 57n, 58n,
 60n, 90n, 189n, 262

 Heger, P., 218n, 227n, 231, 254n
 Hempel, C., 5, 7n, 10, 12n, 13n,
 14n, 15n, 108n, 109n, 202n,
 218n, 227n, 229n, 231n, 236n,
 238n, 244n, 245n, 288n, 289n,
 290n
 Hengel, M., 137n, 138n, 211n, 275n
 Himmelfarb, M., 24, 27n, 28n, 29n,
 32n, 33n, 35n, 38n, 39n, 47n, 48n,
 49, 50n, 53, 69n, 90n, 210n, 212n,
 214n, 216n, 221n, 222n, 232n,
 234, 235n, 246n, 260n, 261, 262n,
 266n, 270n, 272, 275n, 288n,
 291n, 292n, 308n
 Hollander, H., 47n, 49n
 Hooke, S., 247n
 Horbury, W., 172n
 Horgan, M., 119n, 185n, 240n
 Horton, F., 147n, 150n, 160n
 Hultgren, S., 219n, 223n, 225n,
 228n, 232n
 Humbert, J.-B., 238n
 Hurowitz, V., 115n
 Hurtado, L., 74n
 Hutchesson, I., 3n

 Janzen, W., 30n
 Jassen, A., 151n, 178n, 180n, 182n
 Jefferies, D., 61n
 Jensen, P., 221n
 Jeremias, G., 8–9, 181n, 193n
 Jeremias, J., 211n
 Jonge, M. de, 46n, 47n, 48n, 49–
 50, 53n, 79n, 147n, 151, 152n,
 153n, 154n, 155n, 191n, 193n,
 194, 268n

 Kampen, J., 216n, 230n
 Kister, M., 164, 225n, 231n, 254n,
 260n
 Klawans, J., 213n, 214n, 215n, 219,
 220n, 221n, 222n, 225n, 228n,
 246n
 Klinzing, G., 238n, 239n, 240n, 241n
 Knibb, M., 79n, 173n, 174n, 178,
 181n, 186n, 192n, 233n, 241n,
 288n

- Knohl, I., 39n, 97n, 100n, 138, 139n, 140, 215n
- Kobelski, P., 53n, 147n, 149n, 150n, 151n, 152, 153n, 155n, 156, 160n
- Kohn, R., 306n, 307n
- Kugel, J., 40n, 41n, 46n, 51n, 116, 157n, 158n, 226n, 265n, 271n
- Kugler, R., 2n, 12n, 15, 36n, 46n, 51n, 52n, 54n, 79n, 157, 164n, 183, 184n, 216n, 239n, 241n, 255, 265n, 267n, 268n, 269n, 270n, 271–272, 279, 281, 282n, 283n, 284n, 285, 286n, 291–292, 297, 304, 307n
- Kuhn, H.-W., 28n, 77n, 241n, 247n, 248n
- Kvanvig, H., 31n, 32n
- Laato, A., 172n
- Lane, W., 140n
- Lange, A., 61n, 62n, 63n, 64, 65n, 66–67, 70n, 93n, 118n
- Laperrousaz, E., 250n
- Larson, E., 217n
- Leaney, A., 287n, 288n
- Lehmann, M., 217n
- Levenson, J., 90n, 102n, 234n
- Levine, B., 204n
- Lewis, G., 74n
- Licht, J., 69n, 104, 108n, 112n, 114–115, 118n, 120n, 178n, 202n, 241n, 243n, 244n, 284n, 287n, 288n
- Lichtenberger, H., 172n
- Lieberman, S., 230n, 244n
- Liver, J., 190n, 254n
- Loader, W., 39n
- Lübbe, J., 182n
- Lueken, W., 155n
- Lust, J., 6n
- Lyons, W., 198n
- Mach, M., 83n
- Mack, B., 260n
- Magen, Y., 250n
- Magness, J., 37n, 241n, 245n, 247n, 248n, 249n, 250n, 251–252
- Maier, J., 83n, 85n, 97n, 99, 110n
- Mansoor, M., 120n
- Manzi, F., 150n
- Martola, N., 201n
- Mason, E., 140n
- Mayer, G., 66n
- McKelvey, R., 240n
- Mendels, D., 275n
- Metso, S., 11–12, 13n, 173n, 245n
- Metzger, B., 260n
- Milgrom, J., 204n, 221, 234n, 241n, 281–282, 283n, 285n, 286n, 290
- Milik, J., 2, 8, 26n, 27n, 28n, 37n, 47, 48n, 53, 55, 108n, 110n, 111, 113n, 114, 117n, 147n, 150n, 151n, 155n, 174n, 198n, 202n, 244n, 266, 280n, 282, 287
- Milikowsky, C., 187n
- Moore, R., 306n, 307n
- Murray-Jones, C., 6n, 87n, 90n, 91n, 97n
- Mullen, E., 23n
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., 8–9, 10n, 177n, 187n, 190n, 192n
- Naudé, J., 240n
- Neufeld, D., 175n
- Newman, C., 74n
- Newsom, C., 26n, 50, 61n, 85–87, 88n, 90n, 91n, 93n, 94–95, 96n, 97n, 98, 99n, 106, 112n, 117n, 118, 120n, 121n, 146n, 153, 182n, 280n
- Nickelsburg, G., 26, 27n, 28n, 29n, 31n, 32, 34n, 47n, 50n, 69n, 70n, 79n, 214n, 229n, 258n
- Niditch, S., 102n
- Nitzan, B., 85n, 91n, 98n, 108n, 109, 122n, 124, 125n, 126n, 128, 131n, 160n, 198n, 220n
- O'Brien, J., 215n
- Oegema, G., 172n, 176n
- Ollenburger, B., 234n
- Olyan, S., 56n, 259n, 260n, 291n
- Orton, D., 211n

- Parry, D., 128n, 131n
 Pearson, B., 150n
 Perdue, L., 261n
 Peurson, W. van, 10n
 Pfann, S., 164
 Philonenko, M., 80n
 Ploeg, J. van der, 251n
 Poirier, J., 176n, 181n
 Pomykala, K., 172n, 175n, 205n
 Pouilly, J., 10n
 Priest, J., 30n, 155n, 259n
 Puech, E., 53n, 54, 55n, 76n, 77–79, 80n, 138, 143n, 147n, 150n, 151n, 152n, 171n, 172n, 182n, 204n, 241n, 268n

 Qimron, E., 88n, 89n, 177n, 216n, 224n, 226, 229n, 241n, 251n, 307n

 Rabin, C., 179n, 181n, 230n
 Rappaport, U., 210n
 Ratzlaff, R., 219n
 Reed, A., 25n, 27n
 Regev, E., 218n, 221n, 222n, 223n, 224n, 225n, 226, 231, 245n
 Rengstorf, K., 1n
 Rey, J.-S., 61n
 Ringgren, H., 120n, 150n, 160n
 Roberts, J., 147n
 Rofé, A., 76n
 Rooke, D., 210n

 Sacchi, P., 157n
 Saldarini, A., 211n
 Sanders, E.P., 211n
 Schechter, S., 187n, 233n
 Schiffman, L., 7–8, 63, 80n, 99n, 108, 115, 122n, 175, 177n, 178, 180n, 187, 188n, 190n, 197n, 198n, 199n, 202n, 204n, 216n, 217n, 225n, 229n, 230n, 231, 232n, 233n, 235n, 236n, 237n, 238n, 239n, 241n, 243, 244n, 246n, 247, 251, 272n, 275n, 282n, 284n, 288n, 289n, 306n
 Schmidt, F., 224n
 Schniedewind, W., 175n
 Schofield, A., 11n, 18n, 254
 Schuller, E., 26n, 120n, 133n, 136, 137n, 143n, 144n, 145, 146n, 286n
 Schultz, B., 136n, 197n, 284n
 Schürer, E., 211n, 275n
 Schüssler-Fiorenza, E., 240n
 Schwartz, D., 13n, 190n, 213n, 215n, 218n, 224n, 226n, 227n, 231n, 243n, 254n, 288n
 Scott, J., 63n, 72n
 Segal, M., 96n, 261n
 Sekki, A., 65n
 Shaked, S., 172n
 Shavit, Y., 16n
 Shemesh, A., 230n, 244n
 Sheppard, G., 262n
 Shutt, R., 45n
 Skehan, P., 59n, 60n, 261n, 270n
 Smith, D., 247n
 Smith, M., 134–135, 137, 141
 Smith, M.S., 24n
 Snaith, J., 259
 Soggin, J., 151n
 Souza Nogueira, P. de, 144n, 145n
 Stadelmann, H., 56n, 260–261
 Stallman, R., 279, 281n, 282–283, 285n, 286n, 290, 291n
 Starcky, J., 173n, 174n, 189n
 Stegemann, E., 172n
 Stegemann, H., 8–9, 26n, 62n, 108n, 109n, 114n, 115n, 119n, 120n, 138, 174n, 190n, 193n, 198n, 202n, 204n, 248n, 249
 Stemberger, G., 310n
 Stern, M., 263n, 264n
 Steudel, A., 109n, 138n, 147n, 174n, 182n, 186n, 197n, 228n, 241n
 Stone, M., 27n, 46, 47n, 52n, 53n, 54n, 59n, 79n, 157n, 216n, 258n, 265n, 266–267, 268n, 269, 271, 273, 275n
 Strawn, B., 12n
 Strousma, G., 172n
 Strugnell, J., 62n, 63, 64n, 65n, 66n, 69n, 73n, 85n, 88n, 94n, 119n,

- Strugnell, J. (*continued*) 176n, 181n,
224n, 226, 229n, 251n, 282n
- Stuckenbruck, L., 26n, 37n, 65n,
70n, 74–76, 77n, 110n, 113n,
202n
- Sukenik, E., 3n
- Sussmann, Y., 231
- Sutcliffe, E., 250n
- Suter, D., 27n, 33n, 34
- Swarup, P., 69n, 241n
- Tabor, J., 174n, 198n
- Talmon, S., 7n, 175n, 209n, 239n,
277n
- Tcherikover, V., 211n
- Tedesche, S., 3n
- Teeple, H., 180n, 181n
- Teicher, J., 193n
- Thackeray, H.St.J., 73n, 264n
- Thiering, B., 6n
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C., 27n, 55n, 61n,
63n, 64, 65n, 66n, 70n, 73n, 101n,
124n, 128n, 131n, 147n, 149n,
151n, 152n, 160n, 161n
- Tiller, P., 69n, 77n, 229n
- Toorn, K. van der, 70n
- Tournay, R., 70n
- Tov, E., 128n, 131n, 285n
- Trebolle Barrera, J., 236n
- Tromp, J., 213n, 229n
- Ulrichsen, J., 268n
- Urbach, E., 212n
- Van Dam, C., 115n
- VanderKam, J., 2n, 7n, 27n, 31, 32n,
36n, 37, 43, 44n, 47n, 156n, 157n,
172n, 174n, 182n, 189, 190n,
195n, 210n, 229n, 239, 245n,
254, 257n, 273n, 275, 277n, 279n,
293n
- Van de Water, R., 150n
- Vaux, R. de, 1n, 5, 247n, 249, 250n,
251, 280n
- Vermes, G., 2, 8, 11n, 12n, 13n, 89n,
128n, 171n, 173n, 181n, 183n,
198n, 199–200, 248n, 284n, 291n
- Villalón, J., 209n
- Von Rad, G., 70n
- Wacholder, B.Z., 6–8, 54n, 101n,
191n, 237n
- Walton, F., 263n
- Weinfeld, M., 84n, 98n, 104n, 250n,
270n
- Weissenberg, H. von, 224n
- Werman, C., 158n, 271n, 279n,
280n, 288–289
- Wernberg-Møller, P., 188n
- Werrett, I., 230n, 235n, 236n
- White Crawford, S., 204n, 233n,
236n, 238n, 285n
- Winter, P., 181n
- Wise, M., 10n, 133n, 134n, 136n,
144n, 145, 174n, 180n, 181n,
192n, 193n, 194, 198n, 237n
- Wold, B., 67n, 73n, 75n, 76n, 83n
- Wolfson, E., 85n, 98n, 101n, 103n,
104–105, 109n, 117n, 118n, 120n,
122n, 131n, 146n, 150n
- Worrell, J., 118n
- Woude, A. van der, 1n, 10, 16n, 57n,
97n, 137n, 147n, 149n, 150n, 151,
152n, 153n, 154n, 160n, 161n,
181n, 182n, 189n, 202n
- Wright, B., 35n, 56n, 57n
- Wright, D., 252n
- Wright, J., 48n
- Xeravits, G., 78n, 147n, 173n, 174n,
182n, 183n, 190n, 191n, 194n,
198, 199n, 200n, 202n
- Yadin, Y., 86n, 147n, 185n, 201n,
205n, 231n, 232n, 233n, 234n,
237n, 243n, 244n, 248, 275n,
281n, 282n, 283n, 284n, 285n,
286n, 287n
- Zeuner, F., 250n
- Zimmermann, J., 78n, 80n, 109n,
115n, 119n, 139n, 147n, 172n,
181n, 186n

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Hebrew Bible

GENESIS

1:14	56		
1:16	127		
5:24	31		
8:20	40		
9:27	212n		
12:3	42n		
12:7	40		
14	157-158		
14:10	174n		
14:14-16	154		
14:18-20	147, 151, 154,		
	266		
14:19	152		
26:25	40		
27:29	42n		
28:20-22	157n		
34	183n, 289		
48	275n		
49:8-12	277n		
49:10	267		

EXODUS

36n			
4:11	244n		
4:16	55n		
15:17	24n		
15:20	199n		
16:7	59n		
19	234		
19:6	38, 266, 275		
20:21	181		
23:25-26	200		
24:10	24n		
24:16-17	59n		
25:9	24n		
25:40	24n		
26:30	24n		
28:2	60n		
28:29	29n		
28:36	40n		

28:40		60n	
29:6		115	
29:18		49n	
30:7-8		32	
32:25-39		183n	
32:26-29		30n	
34:15-16		214n	
35:18		59n	
39:30		115	
40:34-35		59n	

LEVITICUS

1-16		214-215, 221,	235n, 253
1:9		49n	
4:3		209, 257	
4:5		209	
4:16		209	
5:15		226	
6:3		51n	
6:15		209	
7:19-21		245	
8:9		115	
9:4		59n	
9:6		44n, 59n	
9:23		59n	
9:23-24		44n	
10:3		44n	
12		235n	
15		214, 215n, 234	
15:4-12		235	
15:16-17		233, 235	
15:19-24		220	
15:31		217	
15:33		235	
16		29	
16:4		51	
16:6		195n	
16:11		195n	
16:16		195n	
16:17		195n	
16:32-34		195n	

LEVITICUS (<i>continued</i>)		DEUTERONOMY	36n, 281n
17-26	214	5:28-29	181
18	214	6:5	56n
18:13	219	7:3	214-215
18:19	219	7:26	226
18:24-25	39n, 215	10:9	70, 149n
20:21	215	11:14-15	200
21:6	88n	12	250n
21:9	39n	12:31	226n
21:10	176n	15	147
21:16-24	244	17:8-13	204
25	147	17:14-20	204
25:9	152	17:17	262
26:3-7	200	17:20	204
27:3	243n	18:2	149n
		18:3	281-282
		18:6-8	283
		18:18-19	182
NUMBERS		19:17	283
1:50	283	20:2-4	197
3:38	285	23:11-12	233, 235
4:15	283	23:15	233
6	43n, 74, 108, 119n	28:11-12	200
6:24-26	111-112, 118	31:9	282
6:27	222	32:9	149
8:24	243	32:43	155n
8:25	243n	33:8	119n, 189
12:6-8	194	33:8-11	119n, 182-183, 189, 205, 209, 262, 283
14:10	59n	33:9-11	43
16	67n, 72	33:10	119n, 184-185, 189n, 195, 269
18:13	266	33:12	144n, 280
18:17	49n		
18:20	66, 70, 72	JOSHUA	
19:20	219n	6:26	182
21:18	190	18:7	149n
24:9	42n		
24:15-17	182, 183n, 189	JUDGES	
24:17	58n, 183n, 187, 189, 209	7:25	174n
24:17-19	197	11:34	199n
25:6-13	158, 183n		
25:7-8	30n	1 SAMUEL	
25:11	67	10:1	149
25:12	266		
25:13	30n		
31:30	286		

2 SAMUEL		JEREMIAH	
7:11-14	186	18:20	67
22:17	128n	23:5	186
23:4	58n	33:14-26	209, 257
1 KINGS		EZEKIEL	44n, 101, 106
3:6-14	68n	1:28	59
4:2	197n	9:2-3	24, 51
5:26	260	9:4	213n
6:3	28	9:11	24, 51
6:5	28	10:2	24, 51
6:17	28	11:14-16	102
8:11	44n	16:19	49n
19:15-16	189	22:1-12	220
22:19-22	23	22:10	220
		22:26	229n
2 KINGS		23:12	113n
11:9	197n	27:24	113n
16:10	197n	28:12-14	102
22:10	197n	36	215n
ISAIAH	36n	38:4	113n
6:1	23	39:3-4	198
9:14	193n	39:11-16	200
10:34-11:1	198	40-44	28n, 33
11	185n, 267	40-48	7, 102, 166
11:1	185	40:48	28
11:2	267	41:1	28
11:3	185	41:4	28
11:9	81	42:1-14	281n
26:21	155n	44:7	213n
27:11	95	44:10-14	291
33:7	151n	44:15	243
42:1-9	138	47:1	66n
49:1-6	138	HOSEA	
49:2	125n	5:14	201n
50:4-11	138	10:12	193n
52:7	147, 150	JOEL	
52:13-53:12	138	2:23	193n
54:11-12	119n, 240	AMOS	
55:1-5	70	5:25-27	190n
61:1-2	150	5:26	209n
61:1-3	147		
61:1-10	152		
61:2	149, 152		
61:3	161n		

MICAH		2:7	68n
1:3	155n	7:8-9	147
		12:7	128
HABAKKUK		16:5-11	70
1:5	193n	18:27	128n
2:2	193n	21:4	259
2:4	164	36:10	66n
2:17	220	37:23-24	193
2:20	155n	46:5	66n
		50:2	113n
ZEPHANIAH		65:10	66n
3:4	213n	73:23-28	70
		78:67-69	24n
ZECHARIAH	277n	78:71	149
1:12	29n	79:1	213n
3	52n	82	23, 29n
3:1-10	23, 29n	82:1	149, 153
4	209	82:1-2	147
4:14	277n	89:25	68n
6:13	140n	89:28	68n
		89:29	68n
HAGGAI	277n	89:30	259
2:3	212	89:31	68n
		89:34	68n
MALACHI		89:38	58n
1-2	215n	91	125n
1:6-14	229	103:20-21	59
1:6-2:3	292	104:4	59
2	111n	105:15	151
2:2	116	106:23	67
2:3	117n	106:29-31	30n
2:4	116n	109:6	67n
2:4-7	183, 292	110	140, 141n
2:5	43, 117n	110:1-3	154
2:6	43, 116n	110:4	68n, 147,
2:6-7	116, 185, 262		151-152, 157-
2:7	43, 82, 96, 112n,		158
	195, 269	148:3	58
2:8	43		
2:8-9	292	PROVERBS	62n
2:11	43, 215	8:10-14	267n
3:3	128n		
3:20	80	JOB	
		1:6-12	23, 29n
PSALMS	36n	2:1-6	23, 29n
2	202n	5:1	29n
2:2	209n	24:14	58

33:23	29n	ROMANS	
38:7	58	15:12	267n
DANIEL	154	1 CORINTHIANS	
7	141n, 142	3:16-17	309
9:25	147, 150	2 CORINTHIANS	
9:25-26	209, 257	6:14-7:1	308n
10:5	24, 51n	6:15	308
10:13	30	EPHESIANS	
10:21	30	2:6	142
11:31	213n	COLOSSIANS	
12:1	30	3:1-4	142
12:3	121, 127	HEBREWS	
12: 6-7	24, 51n	7	151n, 272n, 280
EZRA		7:3	156n
3:12	212	8:1-2	140
7:25-26	211	9:11	310n
9:10-12	215	9:14	310n
10:18	214	10:12	140
10:18-44	34	1 PETER	
NEHEMIAH		2:4-6	309
13	212n	2:9	309
13:8-9	213n	JUDE	
13:29	34, 214	9	156
1 CHRONICLES	281n	REVELATION	53
16:22	151	1:6	309
23:4	284n	3:21	141n
29:22	209n, 257	8:3	29n
2 CHRONICLES	281n	12:7-9	155n
7:1-6	44n	20:6	309
19:5-11	205n	21:22	310n
22	283	22:6	183n
30:17	283	Apocrypha	
34:12	284n	TOBIT	
35:11-14	283	12:12	29n
36:14	213n	14:5	212
New Testament			
JOHN			
2:19-22	310n		

ADDITIONS TO ESTHER		50:3	58, 117
D 15:6	60n	50:5	113
		50:6	58
WISDOM OF SOLOMON		50:6-7	155n
18:15-16	67n	50:7	58, 82n, 117
18:21	67n	50:11	59, 60, 82n, 113, 165
BEN SIRA	25, 56-62, 82, 259-265, 276	50:12	61, 66
1:19-20	56n	50:14	58, 130
3:21-24	56	50:17	61, 66, 139n
6:14-15	56n	50:17-22	112
7:29-31	56n	50:19	58
20-31	56n	50:20	43n, 60
24	58n, 262	50:21	260
24:1-12	80n, 195	50:23	260
24:23	262	51:12	166
34:1-8	56	51:13-19	56n
36:19	212	1 MACCABEES	
38:24-33	211	2:26	67
38:24-39:11	262	2:42	3
39-43	56n	2:54	67
43:1-8	56	3:8	67
45	165, 185n, 260	4:46	178
45:4	43, 61, 66	7:14	3n
45:5-7	195	13:42	275n
45: 6-12	61	14:41	159, 178
45:6-17	113n	2 MACCABEES	
45:6-22	60, 66, 82n, 259	4:11-15	221n
45:8	113	4:32-33	221n
45:12	259	4:39	221n
45:15	259	4:42	221n
45:17	262, 270	6:2	213n
45:23-26	261	8:5	67
45:25	260		
47:18-21	262		
47:31	260n		
48:20-25	261	Pseudepigrapha	
49:1	261		
49:4	261	ARAMAIC LEVI DOCUMENT	
49:16	60n		25, 26n, 31n, 35, 36, 39n, 41n, 45, 46-53, 54-55, 79, 80, 82, 85n, 112, 116, 156, 183, 236n, 238, 258, 265-273,
50	44, 61, 66, 82n, 119, 163, 260, 262		
50:1	60		
50:1-4	57, 260		
50:1-21	57, 259		

- 276–278, 289, 39, 49, 50, 56,
293 81n, 82, 154,
214, 274n, 277
- 4–6 266
- 4–7 51
- *5 270
- *8 267
- 9 157, 266
- 13 157n, 266
- 13–16 270n
- 14–18 35
- 14–61 269, 274
- 15–17 35n, 214n
- 16–17 214, 216, 218n
- 18 52, 159
- 66–67 266
- 78 270
- 78–79 41n, 81n
- 81 268n
- 82–98 268–269
- 83 144n, 279
- 87 270n
- 88 269
- 88–89 82n
- 99–100 266
- ASCENSION OF ISAAH
- 9:24–26 141n
- ASSUMPTION OF MOSES
- 4:8 213
- 5:3 221n
- 5:3–4 213
- 5:5–6 221n
- 6:1 159
- 10:1–2 30n
- 10:1–3 155, 201n
- 10:2 95n
- 3 BARUCH
- 11–16 29n
- 11:4 155n
- BOOK OF GIANTS 25, 26
- 1 ENOCH 36, 106
- Book of the Watchers (BW)
- 25, 26–35, 37,
- 39, 49, 50, 56,
81n, 82, 154,
214, 274n, 277
- Similitudes of Enoch 140, 141n
- Astronomical Book 36n
- Book of Dreams 37
- Animal Apocalypse 229
- 6–11 31
- 9:1 28
- 9:2–3 29
- 10 29, 31, 81n, 96n,
201
- 10:9 34n
- 10:11–11:2 29
- 10:11–16 30, 155, 201n
- 10:16 69n
- 10:20–21 29, 154
- 10:21 26
- 11:2 30
- 12–16 31, 214n
- 12:1–2 31
- 12:3 32
- 12:3–6 31
- 12:4 28, 32
- 13:2 47
- 14:4–7 31
- 14:8–23 28
- 14:9 33
- 14:13 33
- 14:20 48n
- 14:20–15:1 31n
- 14:24 52
- 14:24–25 33
- 15:1 32
- 15:2 29, 33
- 15:2–16:4 31
- 15:3 28
- 15:3–4 33, 217
- 15:4 33
- 16:3 47
- 40:5–7 29
- 47:2 29
- 69 125n
- 72–82 36n
- 84:6 69n

1 Enoch (<i>continued</i>)		2:2	38
89:73	229	2:9	38
90:18	72n	2:31	38
90:22-23	29, 155, 201n	2:18	38, 41
90:28-29	237	3:8-14	235n
90:28-42	30	3:15	96n
90:37-38	26	4:15	96n
91:11	213n	4:15-26	36
91:14	26	4:17	274
93:5	69n	4:22	216n
93:10	69n	4:24	274n
93:9-10	213n	4:25	32, 274
99:2	72n	6:18	41
99:3	29n	6:22	41
99:16	29n	7:21-22	216n
104:1	29	7:38-39	274n
108:12	141n	8:3	96n
		10:10	96n
2 ENOCH	32	10:14	274n
53:2	274n	12:27	274n
		13:24-25	157n
3 ENOCH	32, 140	13:24-26	283n
12	60n	15:27	38
		15:30	38
EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN'S <i>EXAGOGÉ</i>		16:18	38, 73n, 275
68-69	141n	20:3-5	216n
		21	279
4 EZRA		21:10	32n, 274n
12:37	274n	21:21	220n
13:2-10	267n	23:14	220n
14:6	274n	23:20	221n
24-26	274n	23:21	221n, 222
44-48	274n	30	39, 81n, 289
		30-32	40, 41, 55, 73n
JOSEPH AND ASENETH		30:1-32:9	36, 46n, 273
15:7-8	96n	30:3	216n
22	67n	30:7	39
22:13	116n	30:13-17	42
		30:15-16	39, 216
JUBILEES	25, 26n, 31n,	30:17-20	158
	36-45, 46, 48,	30:18	41, 52n, 273
	50, 51, 82, 85,	30:18-21	183
	131-132, 159,	31	61, 114n, 139,
	215, 227, 238,		285
	253, 258, 273-	31:12	275n
	278, 293	31:12-17	43n, 183
1:16	69n	31:13-17	275n

31:14	43, 44, 52n, 60, 66, 80, 81n, 82n, 112, 116, 130– 131, 139n, 159, 165	8:9–13	35
		8:12	221n
		8:13	217, 219
		8:26	217n
		17:8	221n
31:14–20	111	17:26	221n
31:15	43, 73, 82n, 111, 112n, 195, 274	17:46	221n
		17:21–25	267n
31:16	111	18:6–8	267n
31:16–17	52n		
31:17	73n, 275	TESTAMENT OF ABRAHAM	
31:18	130n, 275	B 11:3	274n
31:20	275		
32	116	TESTAMENT OF JOB	
32:1–2	156–157, 274	33:2–9	142
33:7	216n		
33:13–17	279	TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE	
33:18–20	216n	PATRIARCHS	46n
33:20	39, 275	Testament of Dan	
36:6	69n	6	151n
39:6–7	274n	Testament of Judah	
45:16	40n, 54n, 274, 279	24:1	58n
46:10–11	54n, 159n	24:1–6	189
		Testament of Levi	32, 39n, 46, 48, 53, 55, 79, 82, 85
LETTER OF ARISTEAS		2	116
	53, 82	2–3	48
96–99	44–45, 59, 60n, 80, 82n, 113n, 119, 165, 185n	2:2–3	41n, 81n
		2:10	52
		3	81n, 96n
LIBER ANTIQUITATUM BIBLICARUM		3:2	52
25:6	60n	3:2–3	49, 81n
26:15	60n	3:4	48
28:3	43n	3:5	29n
		3:5–8	49
LIVES OF THE PROPHETS		3:6	50
16:1–2	43n	4:2	59n
		4:3	59n, 183
		4:6	183
ORPHICA		5	116, 270n
33–34	142	5:1	48
		5:3	41n
PSALMS OF SOLOMON		5:6	49n
1:8	217n	5:6–7	29n
2:3	217n	8	51
2:11–13	35	8:1	51
8	219n		

Testament of Levi (<i>continued</i>)		5:6-7	35
8:17	183	5:6-8	218
9:7	53n	5:16	95
9:9-10	35	5:20-6:11	190
12:5	41n, 81n	6	192
13:2-3	269n	6:2-3	287
14-17	51	6:2-11	190
14:4	47	6:5	190n
14:5	221n	6:7	186n, 187-188,
14:5-15:1	217		192
14:6	35, 214, 218n	6:10	179
15:1	218n	6:11	141, 176, 180,
17:11	218n, 221n		181n, 190
18	79n, 82n, 119,	6:11-17	223
	155n, 161-163	6:14	179
18:2-8	78	6:14-15	223n
18:3	58n, 189	6:15	220n
18:3-4	59n	6:15-16	221n
18:4	39n, 82n	6:18	221n
		7	187-189, 192,
			195
Dead Sea Scrolls		7:16-17	209n
		7:18	186
CD (Damascus Document)		7:18-19	189
1	15, 192	7:18-21	182, 183n
1:7	69n, 287	7:20-21	108
1:11	192, 193n	9:21	246n
2:5	195n	9:23	246n
2:12	151	10:4-6	287
2:15-16	94n	10:6-7	243
3:17	220n, 223n	11:17-12:2	238n
3:18	195n	11:18-21	238n
3:19-20	90, 121	11:20-21	220n
3:20	60n	12:1-2	233n
3:21-4:4	7n, 243	12:19-20	229
4	191, 219	12:21	100n
4-5	217	12:23	174n, 176n
4:3	287	12:23-13:1	178, 180, 191,
4:6	195n		205n
4:7-9	178	13:2-4	284, 291
4:8	179	13:3-4	289, 290n
4:9	195n	13:22	100n
4:10	195n	14:4-6	286
4:12-19	35	14:18-19	179-180, 205n
4:15-18	217, 219n, 258n,	14:19	174n, 176n, 191,
	273		195, 206
4:20-5:2	218	15:15-17	243

16:3-4	258n	1Q16 (Peshar Psalms)	
16:3-5	36	1-10 II, 2-11	69n
16:13-17	238n		
19:10	174n	1Q21 (1QLevi)	
19:10-11	176n, 191, 196	1	266
19:35-20:1	191n	3	47
20:1	174n, 176n, 191	4 1	157
20:2-7	240	4-7	51
20:14	191n		
20:22-23	219	1Q22 (Words of Moses)	
20:28	179n	I, 1-4	282, 285
20:31	179		
20:31-32	178	1Q27 (Mysteries)	
20:32	193n	1 I, 1-12	80-81
20:32-33	179n	1 I, 5-8	162
20:34	195n		
1QpHAB (Peshar Habakkuk)		1Q29 (Liturgy of the Three Tongues of Fire)	119n, 120n, 282n
	56, 193n		
1:12	1n, 164	1Q34 (LitPr ^a)	
2:2	193n	3 II, 6	240
2:2-3	194		
2:8-9	194	1QS (Rule of the Community)	
2:8-10	193n	1:18-20	284
7	193n	2	108
7:4-5	1n, 194	2:2	94n, 95
8:1-3	164	2:3	119n
8:8	1n	2:11-17	284
8:8-13	222	2:19-22	286
8:9	254	3-4	26
8:9-13	221n	3:2	118n
8:10	221n	3:4-6	220n, 245n
8:12-13	220	3:9	94
9:4-6	221n	3:9-10	94n
9:9	1n	3:13	100n, 120
11:4	1n	3:13-4:26	84
11:4-6	221n	3:15	120
12	240n	3:16	121
12:6	221n	3:20	94, 154, 160
12:7-9	220	3:22	94, 160
12:7-10	222	3:24	154
12:10	221n	4:2	119n
1QapGEN	26n	4:2-8	228
		4:3-8	96n
1Q14 (Peshar Micah)		4:6	121
	193n	4:7	113n

1QS (*continued*)

4:7-8	121	8:9-10	94
4:9-11	228	8:10	94n, 153n, 196, 240
4:10	220n, 223n	8:11-12	188
4:17-18	228	8:13	224
4:18	121	8:15-9:11	173
4:20-22	228n	8:16-18	246
4:21	220n	8:17	240
4:21-23	95	8:18	94n, 95
4:22	94n, 119n, 223n	8:23	224n, 240
4:22-23	121, 126	9	180, 241n
4:23	60n, 90	9:3-5	177
4:26	118n	9:3-6	89n 241
5	202n	9:3-10:8	177n
5:1-7	240	9:4	153n, 196
5:2	1n, 11n, 110, 123, 166, 203	9:4-5	94
5:6	287	9:5	94n
5:9	1n, 11n, 123, 166, 203	9:6	177, 240, 287
5:10	224n	9:7	1n
5:10-20	223	9:7-8	177
5:13	240, 245	9:8	240
5:13-14	245	9:9	94n, 95
5:18	240	9:9-11	177-180, 191
5:19	223n	9:11	151, 171, 173- 174, 176n, 183, 188, 191, 205n
5:23-24	288	9:12	100n
6:4-6	203, 247	9:14	164
6:5-6	203	9:20	240
6:6-7	188, 239	11	76n, 104
6:8	11, 287	11:3	77
6:16-17	224n	11:7-8	84n
6:17	246	11:7-9	77
6:24-25	246	11:8	69n, 118n, 131n
6:24-7:25	246	11:8-9	90
7:2-3	246	11:14	223n
7:15-16	246	11:20-22	160
7:18-21	246		
8-9	88, 129n, 224	1QSa (Rule of the Congregation)	277
8:1	240, 243, 287	1:1	109, 202
8:1-16	177n	1:2	1n, 11n, 123, 166, 203
8:4-10	89, 309	1:6-2:11	202
8:5	88, 240	1:12-13	243
8:5-6	69n	1:22-27	284
8:6	153n, 196	1:24	1n, 11n, 123, 166, 203
8:6-7	240		
8:8	240		

1:25-26	234	1QM (War Scroll)	
1:26	118n	1	27
2	206	1:2	286
2:3	123, 166, 203	1:3	224
2:4-9	244	1:8	94, 160, 162
2:8-9	84n, 242n	1:10-11	84n
2:11-22	202-203	2	196n, 237
2:17-22	247	2:1	196, 197n, 198
		2:1-3	205
1Qsb (Rule of the Benedictions)		2:1-5	206
	107-123	2:1-6	91n, 224, 225n
1:1	100n, 109, 110n	2:2	286
3	139, 160, 165	2:5	153n, 196
3:20-5:17	114	2:5-6	248
3:22	100n, 109	3:13-14	197n
3:22-28	110-113, 116	5:1	108, 197n, 285
3:22-4:21	110	7:3	243
3:23-24	110-111, 195	7:4-6	244
3:24	161	7:6	84n, 242n
3:25	144, 166	7:10-12	185n
3:25-26	84n, 111, 113	7:11-12	237
3:25-27	161	7:12	197n
3:26	110n	7:12-14	286
3:27	112	7:12-15	283
3:28	110n, 111-112, 139n	8:9	286n
4	87, 125, 131- 132, 139, 161- 162, 165	9:7-8	199
4:6-19	110	9:8-9	176n
4:22-25	115n	10:2	197n
4:22-28	110, 113-123, 141	10:2-3	197
4:23	74n, 116	11:1-3	197
4:24-26	84n, 117	11:6-7	197
4:24-28	111n	11:7-8	197n
4:25	130, 144	12:1-9	84n
4:25-26	111, 116	12:7	161n
4:25-28	115	12:8	74n, 95, 129n
4:26-27	118	13:1	284
4:26-28	166	13:9-10	118n
4:27	116n, 120, 122, 124, 195	13:10	161n
4:27-28	113, 116, 119	14-17	135
4:28	117	14:7	94n
5:20	100n, 109	15:4	197, 286n
		15:6	197n
		15:7	201n
		16:7	286n
		16:13-15	197
		16:15	201
		17	197n

1QM (*continued*)

17:5-8	30, 155n	2Q18 (Sir)	56n
17:6	29n, 134, 161n		
17:6-8	154, 156n, 201n	3Q7 (TJud?)	
18:5	197	5-6	25n
18:5-6	284	5 3	280
19:11	197	6 2	280
1QH ^a (Hodayot)		3Q8	
4:27	60n	1 2	151n
4:29-40	27n		
4:31	223n	4Q159 5 (Ordinances ^a)	
7:16-17	112n		282
9:21-23	122n	2-4 4	288
9:24	223n		
9:27-28	97n	4Q161 (Peshier Isaiah ^a)	
9:38	94n		198, 206n, 207
10:21	95	5-6 3	108
11:20-23	84n	8-10 III, 15-29	267n
11:22-23	93n	8-10 III, 22-29	185
11:22-24	103	8-10 III, 28	200
11:24-26	97n	8-10 III, 28-29	199
12:7	120n		
12:24	120n	4Q164 (Peshier Isaiah ^d)	
12:30-41	26n, 27n		205, 240
12:31-32	160	1 4-5	119n
13:18	128		
13:23-24	94n	4Q167 (Peshier Hosea ^b)	
14:15-16	84n	2 2-3	201n
14:15-18	77		
14:16	117n	4Q169 (Peshier Nahum)	
14:18	69n		4n, 6n
15:29-30	122n	3-4 I, 2	201n
16:5-28	69n	3-4 I, 11-12	221n
18:29	122n	3-4 II, 9	221n
18:29-30	62		
19:4-6	104	4Q171 (Peshier Psalms ^a)	
19:10-14	104	1-10 III, 15-16	1n, 193
19:13-14	93n	1-10 IV, 7-10	1n
19:14	223n	3-10 IV, 21	149
19:31	122n		
20:14	100n	4Q173 (Peshier Psalms ^b)	
20:14-16	122n		193n
21:15	120n		
25:31	145	4Q174 (Florilegium)	
25:34-27:3	133		141, 147n, 192,
26:33	160		277

1-2 I, 2	237	1 1	44n
1-2 I, 2-6	90n	4-6	157
1-2 I, 4	84n, 242n		
1-2 I, 6	90, 240	4Q216 (Jub ^a)	37
1-2 I, 6-7	241		
1-2 I, 19	209n	4Q225 (psJub ^a)	
2 I, 10-13	186	2 II, 11-12	279
5 2	189		
6-7	189	4Q226 (psJub ^b)	
		7:4	279
4Q175 (Testimonia)			
	181-184, 276,	4Q228	
	283	1 I, 8	151
1-8	188		
5-6	189	4Q245 (psDan ^c)	
5-8	151	1 I, 5	279n
14-20	119n, 183-184		
		4Q246 (apocrDan)	174
		1:6	174n
4Q177 (Catena A)	147n		
4 14	154	4Q251 (Halakha A)	
5-6 7-10	228n	17 7	217
12-13 I, 7	161n		
II 5	186n	4Q252 (CommGen A)	
			172, 174
4Q180-181	26n, 27n	5	267n
		5 3-4	186
4Q180	147n		
		4Q254 (CommGen C)	
4Q181	147n	4	277n
1 II, 5	118n		
		4Q255 (papS ^a)	12, 100n
4Q201 (En ^a)			
1 IV, 6-22	29	4Q256 (S ^b)	11, 12, 13n,
1 IV, 7	28n		223n, 245n
4Q213 (Levi ^a)		4Q257 (papS ^c)	
1 II, 11-18	48n	III, 3	118n
2 13-16	266		
3-4	47	4Q258 (S ^d)	11, 12, 13n,
4	35, 265		223n, 245n
4Q213A (Levi ^b)		4Q259 (S ^e)	173
2 15-18	51, 116		
		4Q266 (D ^a)	
4Q213B (Levi ^c)	51	3 II, 21	223n
1	61, 66, 82n, 112,	5 II, 1-16	238n
	139n		

- 4Q266 (D^a) (*continued*)
- | | |
|-------------|------|
| 6 I, 14-16 | 234n |
| 6 II, 11 | 235n |
| 8 I, 6-9 | 243 |
| 8 I, 9 | 242n |
| 10 I, 12 | 176n |
| 11 I, 12-13 | 196n |
- 4Q267 (D^b)
- | | |
|------------|------|
| 5 III, 1-8 | 238n |
|------------|------|
- 4Q269 (D^d)
- | | |
|-----------|------|
| 9 III, 15 | 100n |
|-----------|------|
- 4Q270 (D^e)
- | | |
|----------|-----|
| 6 II, 17 | 36n |
|----------|-----|
- 4Q272 (D^g)
- | | |
|-----------|---------|
| 1 II, 3-7 | 234-235 |
|-----------|---------|
- 4Q273 (papD^h)
- | | |
|-----------|------|
| 2 1-2 | 238n |
| 4 I, 5-11 | 238n |
- 4Q274 (Tohorot A)
- | | |
|----------|------|
| 1 I, 1-4 | 246n |
| 1 I, 8 | 235n |
| 2 I | 245 |
| 3 | 245 |
- 4Q285 (Sefer ha-Milḥamah)
- | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| 172, 198, 277 | |
| 3 2 | 284n |
| 4 | 198 |
| 5 4 | 187n |
| 7 | 198-199, 267n,
206 |
| 7 5 | 200, 206n |
| 7 5-6 | 200 |
| 8 | 200, 206 |
| 8 1-2 | 201 |
- 4Q286-290 (Berakhot)
- | | |
|--|---------|
| | 86, 104 |
|--|---------|
- 4Q286 (Ber^a)
- | | |
|------|-----------|
| 12 3 | 94n, 160n |
|------|-----------|
- 4Q287 (Ber^b)
- | | |
|-------|-----------|
| 2 13 | 94n, 160n |
| 12 11 | 117n |
- 4Q298 (cryptA Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn)
- | | |
|-------|-------------|
| 1-2 I | 164
100n |
|-------|-------------|
- 4Q299 (Myst^a)
- | | |
|-------|-------|
| 1 1-9 | 80-81 |
|-------|-------|
- 4Q300 (Myst^b)
- | | |
|-------|-------|
| 3 1-6 | 80-81 |
|-------|-------|
- 4Q319 (Otot)
- | | |
|--|-----|
| | 239 |
|--|-----|
- 4Q320-330
- | | |
|--|-----|
| | 239 |
|--|-----|
- 4Q322 (Mishmarot A)
- | | |
|--|----|
| | 4n |
|--|----|
- 4Q324A (Mishmarot D)
- | | |
|--|----|
| | 4n |
|--|----|
- 4Q324B (papCal. Doc.? A)
- | | |
|--|----|
| | 4n |
|--|----|
- 4Q337 (Cal. Doc. F)
- | | |
|--|-----|
| | 239 |
|--|-----|
- 4Q365 (RP^c)
- | | |
|----|-----|
| 23 | 285 |
|----|-----|
- 4Q365A
- | | |
|-----|------|
| 2-3 | 238n |
|-----|------|
- 4Q372 (apocrJoseph^b)
- | | |
|------|------|
| 1:14 | 286n |
|------|------|
- 4Q375 (apocrMoses^a)
- | | |
|--------|-----------|
| | 120n, 282 |
| 1 I, 9 | 176b |
- 4Q376 (apocrMoses^b?)
- | | |
|--------|----------------|
| | 120n, 172, 282 |
| 1 I, 1 | 119n, 176n |

1 I, 9	176n	106, 107, 109–
1 II, 1–2	119n	111, 115, 118,
		120, 123, 125–
4Q379 (apocrJosh ^b)		126, 132, 137n,
1 2	144n, 279	146, 164–165,
22 II, 7–14	182	167, 298–299
4Q381 (Non-Canonical Psalms B)		4Q400 (ShirShabb ^a)
	172	85
4Q382 (pap paraKings)		1 I
	172	1 I, 3–4
		1 I, 4
4Q387		1 I, 6
2 III, 6	221	1 I, 10
		1 I, 12–20
		1 I, 13
OLIM 4Q387 5 (Unidentified Fragment A)		1 I, 15
	218n	1 I, 16
		1 I, 17
		195
4Q390 (apocrJer C ^c)		1 I, 19
I 3	221	2
2 I, 8–9	221n	2 1
2 I, 8–10	222	2 2–5
2 I, 9–10	216	2 6
2 I, 10	221n	2 6–7
		2 7
4Q392 (Works of God)		2 8
1	120n	
5	120n	4Q401 (ShirShabb ^b)
		11
4Q394–399 (MMT)		22 3
	224–225	
A	229n	4Q402 (ShirShabb ^c)
B 18–23	251n	1–4
B 29–33	233n	4 8
B 58–60	251	4 12–13
B 75–82	35n, 214, 216	
B 79	88	4Q403 (ShirShabb ^d)
C 4–9	226	1 I
		1 I, 10–27
4Q394 (MMT ^a)	239	1 I, 20
		1 I, 22
		1 I, 26
4Q400–407, 11Q17, MAS1K (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice)		1 I, 27
	6, 19, 33n, 48n,	1 I, 32–33
	50, 61n, 82, 83–	1 I, 38
		94, 160
		94n
		94
		94
		103n
		94, 160

4Q403 (<i>continued</i>)		4Q418 (Instruction ^d)	
1 I, 40-41	131	55 8-11	73n
1 I, 41	90	55 8-12	76
1 I, 45	120n	55 10	62n
1 II, 1	120n	69	75
1 II, 19	111n	69 II, 10-13	76
1 II, 23	111n	69 II, 12-14	76
1 II, 24	153	69 12b-15	73n
1 II, 35	117, 122	81	61-77, 80, 82n, 122n, 165n, 166
4Q404 (ShirShabb ^e)		81 1	66, 69, 73, 74, 75n
5 4	120n	81 1-2	44n, 82n, 112, 139n
4Q405 (ShirShabb ^f)		81 1-4	65
8-9 3	111n	81 1-14	61, 64, 68n, 71, 72
20 II-22, 3	122n	81 2	66, 72
23 II, 11	117n	81 3	66, 67, 72, 73
46 2	122n	81 4	66, 68n, 69, 73, 74, 92, 93, 96
4Q408 (apocrMoses ^g)	120n	81 5	66, 68n, 80, 92, 93, 118n, 165
4Q409 (Liturgical Work A)	241n	81 6	68n
		81 7	67, 68n
4Q415-418, 4Q418A, 4Q418C, 4Q423, 1Q26 (1Q/4QInstruction)	25, 44, 57, 61, 62, 63, 82	81 8	67, 68n
		81 9	67, 68n, 73
		81 10	67, 68n
		81 10-14	68
		81 11	69, 73, 74, 75
		81 12	68n, 69, 73, 74, 75
		81 13	66, 113
		81 14	68n, 69
		81 15	71
		126 II, 8-11	73n
		206 5	71n
4Q416 (Instruction ^b)			
2 II, 4	71n		
2 II, 14	71n		
2 II, 19	71n		
2 II, 20	71n		
2 III	75		
4 IV, 5	71n		
4Q417 (Instruction ^c)		4Q420 (Ways of Righteousness ^a)	
1 I	75	1aii-b 5	160
1 I, 14-18	73n		
1 I, 17	74		
2 I, 10b-12	73n	4Q423 (Instruction ^g)	
2 I, 17	71n	1-2	68n
2 II, 10-12	76n	5	63n, 72, 73n
2 II + 23 6	71n	5 1a	280
		5 1a-4	71

4Q427 (H ^a)			84n, 132-146
6 2	143n	11 I, 8-11	134
7	133	11 I, 8-18	143
7 I, 10	139n, 144	11 I, 11	144n
7 I, 11	139n	11 I, 11-12	140n, 145n
7 I, 13	144	11 I, 12	137, 144
7 I, 14-15	144	11 I, 13	112n, 139
7 I, 18-20	145n	11 I, 14	138, 139n
7 II, 2-7	145	11 I, 14-15	144
7 II, 8-9	144n	11 I, 15	139
7 II, 9	144	11 I, 16	144n
7 II, 16-18	112n, 143	11 I, 16-17	138, 139n, 195
		11 I, 18	139
4Q428 (H ^b)		11 I, 19	134n
17 3	151n	11 I, 20	144, 160
		11 I, 20-24	134, 143
431 (H ^c)		11 II, 11	197n
1	133		
1 6	144	4Q493 (M ^c)	283
		4-6	199
4Q448 (Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer)	57n	4Q494 (M ^d)	
		2-6	286
4Q458 (Narrative A)		4	197n
	172		
2 II, 4	72n	4Q496 (papM ^f)	
		15	199
4Q468B (Unidentified Fragments C)	162-163, 165-166	4Q503 (papPrQuot)	
			104
		13 1	87n
4Q471B (Self-Glorification Hymn ^a)	133	37 + 28 14	87n
1a 3-4	139n		
1a 5	139n	4Q510-511 (Songs of the Sage)	86, 87, 91, 123-
1a 6	139n		132
1a-d 3	144n	4Q510 (Songs of the Sage ^a)	
1a-d 3-4	195, 144n	1 2	124
1a-d 7-8	139n	1 4	100n
1b 3	143n	1 4-6	125
		1 7	127
4Q491 (M ^a)	134-135	1 8-9	125
1-3	72n		
1-3 9-10	284	4Q511 (Songs of the Sage ^b)	
1-3 18	237	1 6-8	124
10 II, 13	197n	2 I, 1	100n
11 I (Self-Glorification Hymn ^b)			

4Q511 (<i>continued</i>)			278, 293
2 I, 6	126n, 129n	9 2	79, 80, 196
2 I, 7-10	126-127, 130-	9 2-5	78
	131	9 3	79, 82n, 122
8	125, 142	9 3-4	116
8 8-9	126n	24	79n
10 7-8	125-126		
10 11	126	4Q542 (Testament of Qahat)	
18 II, 7-8	124, 125n		46, 54, 78
28-29 3	124	1 I, 5-9	217
35 1-5	93, 123-124,	1 II, 11-13	274, 278
	127-132, 165-	2 II, 4	153n
	166		
35 2-3	130	4Q543-548 (Visions of Amram)	
35 2-5	91		25, 45, 46, 53-
35 3	131		55, 78, 82, 278
35 4	160		
35 4-5	129-131	4Q543 (Visions of Amram ^a)	
143 2	124	1 1-2	54
		2a-b	54-55
		2a-b 2	80
4Q512 (papRitPur B)		4Q544 (Visions of Amram ^b)	
II 9	245	1 10-15	156
29-32 VII, 8-9	246n	2 3-6	156
		3 1-2	156
4Q513 (Ordinances ^b) 2 II			
	217n, 218n		
4Q514 (Ordinances ^c)		4Q545 (Visions of Amram ^c)	
4	245	1 I	54-55
		1 I, 1-2	54
4Q521 (Messianic Apocalypse)		1 I, 8	55
	141n, 172, 174		
4Q537-539	78	4Q547 (Visions of Amram ^e)	
		9 7	55
4Q540-541	268n	9 8	55n
4Q541 (Apocryphon of Levi ^{b?})		4Q549	78
	25, 77-81, 174		
2 I, 6-9	80n	4Q554 (New Jerusalem ^a)	
2 II, 6	80n		237n
7 4	80n	4Q559 (Biblical Chronology)	
9	81, 82, 119, 131,	I 1-3	279
	139, 141, 161-		
	163, 165n, 166n,	5Q13 (Rule)	
	185-186, 195,	2:7-8	280, 285
	206, 267, 276,		

11Q5 (Ps ^a)	56n	22:11-12	281
26:11	81n, 162	23:9	204n
		23:9-10	285
11Q13 (Melchizedek)		24:11	285
	29n, 81n, 140,	25:16	204n
	146-164, 201n,	26:3	204n
	206, 207n, 242n,	29	102
	277, 294, 299n	29:9	237
2:5	149	39:12	285
2:6	152n	40:14-15	285
2:6-8	196	44	281
2:7-9	152	45-51	233n
2:8	94, 149, 161	45:7-12	233
2:9	149	45:9-10	231n
2:10	149, 153	45:11-12	233n, 234n
2:12-14	30	45:12-14	244n
2:13	149-150	47:4	233n
2:14	94n, 153, 160n,	47:7-15	231n, 251n
	161	48:14-17	235n
2:15-16	150	49:19-29	231n
2:18-20	150	51:2-5	231n
		51:14-15	222
11Q14 (Sefer ha-Milhamah)		56:6-11	204, 206n
1 II, 2-15	200	57:11-15	204, 206n
1 II, 5-6	74	57:12	283
		58:13	286
11Q17 (ShirShabb)	85	58:18-19	204, 206n, 207n
2-3	50	60	238, 281
8-7	50, 96	60:6	283n
		60:6-7	281
11Q18 (New Jerusalem)		60:7-11	286n
30:2	283	60:12-14	283
		61:8-9	283
11Q19 (Temple Scroll)			
	103, 106, 203-	MASIK	85
	205, 227, 229-	2-3	122n
	231, 232n, 233-		
	234, 237-238,		
	241, 252-254,	Josephus	
	272, 275-278,		
	293	WAR	
3-48	204	1.68	275n, 276n
13-30	238n	2.129-131	248n
21:[1]	282	2.140	73n
21:4	286	6.438	156n
22	281		
22:4	283		

AGAINST APION			ŠEQALIM	
2.164-165	264		1:4	221n
2.185-187	264			
ANTIQUITIES			TAMID	
1.180	156n		6:4-7:3	58n
1.341	157n		YOMA	
3.184-187	60n, 113n, 166, 185n		3:6	51n
			6:2	222
3.214-215	119n		ZABIM	
3.216-217	60n, 113n, 166, 185n		2:2	235n
			5:11	235n
11.302-347	272, 276n		<i>Tosefta</i>	
11.326-338	60n		MENAĤOT	
12.414	9n		13:18-20	221n
12.419	9n		ZEBAĤIM	
12.434	9n		11:16	221n
13.299	272, 276n		<i>Jerusalem Talmud</i>	
16.163	159n		BERAKHOT	
18.22	249		2:5	186n
20.216-218	283		MEGILLAH	
20.237	9n		1:11	40n
20.8.8	221n		PESAĤIM	
20.9.2	221n		34d	235n
			TA‘ANIT	
Philo of Alexandria			68d	183n
			<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>	
LEGUM ALLEGORIAE			BEKHOROT	
3.79	156n		24a	193n
			BERAKHOT	
Rabbinic Literature			2b	245
<i>Mishnah</i>			12b	117n
’ABOT			55a	248
3:3	308			
‘EDUYOT				
8:3	221n			
GIṬṬIN				
5:4	221n			
SANHEDRIN				
9:6	213n			

ḤAGIGAH		15:39–40	40n
12b	29n, 154n	24:17	183n
MENAḤOT		FRAGMENTARY TARGUM	
110a	154n	Gen	
110b	307	48:22	40n
NAZIR		Num	
66a	235n	24:17	183n
PESAḤIM		TARGUM NEOFITI	
54b	40n	Gen	
57a	221n	14:19	183n
85a	221n		
		<i>Midrash and Other Texts</i>	
ROŠ HAŠŠANAH		GENESIS RABBAH	
18b	159n	20:12	40n
		38:8	60n
SANHEDRIN		63:13	40n
98b	267n	81	157n
		97:6	40n
SUKKAH		99	267n
52b	152n	98:8	267n
YEBAMOT		LEVITICUS RABBAH	
62b	218n	13:5	60n
86b	283n		
YOMA		NUMBERS RABBAH	
9b–10a	212n	4:8	40n
69a	60n		
ZEBAḤIM		LAMENTATIONS RABBAH	
62a	154n	1:16	186n
		ʾABOT DE RABBI NATHAN	
<i>Targums</i>		34	152n
		PESIQTA DE RAB KAHANA	
TARGUM ONKELOS		14:15	60n
Gen		15:14/15	152n
9:27	212n		
49:10	267n		
TARGUM PSEUDO-JONATHAN		PIRQE RABBI ELIEZER	
Gen		24	40n
27:15	40n	37	49n, 116n
32:25	49n	TANḤUMA	
Num		<i>Bereshit</i> 9	40n
		<i>Toledot</i> 12	40n

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| TANḤUMA (<i>continued</i>) | | | |
| <i>Toledot</i> 67 | 40n | | |
| MIDRASH ḤAZITA | | | |
| 2, 13 par. 4 | 152n | | |
| YALQUṬ ḤADASH | | | |
| 115.3.19 | 155n | | |
| ZOHAR ḤADASH | | | |
| 22, 4 | 155n | | |
| 41, 3 | 155n | | |
| SEFER HARAZIM | 95n | | |
| | | Ancient Near Eastern Sources | |
| | | ENUMA ELISH | |
| | | v, 119–130 | 24n |
| | | Classical Sources | |
| | | DIODORUS | |
| | | <i>Bibliotheca Historica</i> | |
| | | 40.3 | 45n, 263 |
| | | PSEUDO-CALLISTHENES | |
| | | <i>Alexander Romance</i> | |
| | | 2:24 | 60n |