

BEING JEWISH IN THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA
SCROLLS: ANCESTRAL PROFILES OF IDENTITY

By
MATTHEW HAMA

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
September 2022

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

This study explores the notion of Jewish identity in the Aramaic DSS through the lens of the individual figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, and their associated traditions. It traces previous trends in Jewish identity research, recognizing a notable interest in understanding both the nature and contours of Jewish identity, as well as a sense of underlying unity and diversity across various literary expressions. This investigation explores Jewish identity from a figure-focused perspective, building upon past research on foundational figures and developing impressions on the nature and significance of traditions outside of the modern Hebrew Scriptures. The Aramaic DSS offer an ideal departure point for these questions given their relatively recent publication and their inclusion of a wider complex of understudied ancient Jewish figures. This work explores the earliest and most concentrated portraits of each figure in the Aramaic DSS, strategically concentrating around the intersections that each develops in relation to the concepts of kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space. This investigation both adds precision to our understanding of Jewish identity for the three figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram and contributes to wider conceptions of Jewish identity. It underscores the present value and future potential of related figure-based investigations.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	IV
ABBREVIATIONS	VI
SIGLA FOR PRIMARY TEXT TRANSCRIPTIONS AND TRANSLATIONS	VI
1 INTRODUCTION	8
1.1 “JEWS,” “JUDAEANS,” AND “ISRAELITES”	8
1.2 “BEING JEWISH”: PREVIOUS EXPLORATIONS OF JEWISH IDENTITY	13
1.2.1 <i>Primary Lenses: The Nature of Jewish Identity via Method and Approach</i>	13
1.2.2 <i>Primary Research Interests: The Underlying Makeup of Jewish Identity</i>	17
1.2.3 <i>Navigating Challenges of Jewish Identity: Unity and Diversity</i>	21
1.3 THE PRESENT APPROACH: A QUEST FOR GREATER PRECISION.....	45
2 LEVI	52
2.1 THE ANCIENT JEWISH FIGURE OF LEVI	52
2.1.1 <i>Levi’s Polarizing Profile in the Hebrew Scriptures</i>	52
2.1.2 <i>Levi’s Wider Genealogical Profile in the Hebrew Scriptures</i>	56
2.1.3 <i>Levi’s Broader Profile in the Second Temple Period and Beyond</i>	58
2.2 AN INTRODUCTION TO ALD	59
2.2.1 <i>The Text and Its Publication</i>	59
2.2.2 <i>Previous Research</i>	64
2.2.3 <i>Content Overview</i>	67
2.2.4 <i>The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Levi</i>	77
2.3 LEVI’S PROFILE OF JEWISH IDENTITY IN ALD	82
2.3.1 <i>Kinship</i>	82
2.3.2 <i>Tradition</i>	91
2.3.3 <i>Revelation</i>	108
2.3.4 <i>Time</i>	125
2.3.5 <i>Space</i>	134
2.4 SYNOPSIS	151
3 QAHAT	153
3.1 THE ANCIENT JEWISH FIGURE OF QAHAT	153
3.1.1 <i>Known Yet Unknown: Qahat’s Profile in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures</i>	153
3.1.2 <i>Qahat’s Broader Profile in the Second Temple Period and Beyond</i>	154
3.2 AN INTRODUCTION TO 4Q542.....	155
3.2.1 <i>The Text and Its Publication</i>	155
3.2.2 <i>Previous Research</i>	158
3.2.3 <i>Content Overview</i>	161
3.2.4 <i>The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Qahat</i>	168
3.3 QAHAT’S PROFILE OF JEWISH IDENTITY IN WQ	170
3.3.1 <i>Kinship</i>	171
3.3.2 <i>Tradition</i>	196
3.3.3 <i>Revelation</i>	231
3.3.4 <i>Time</i>	237
3.3.5 <i>Space</i>	241
3.4 SYNOPSIS	248
4 AMRAM	251

4.1	THE ANCIENT JEWISH FIGURE OF AMRAM.....	251
4.1.1	<i>The (Un)Popular Profile of Amram in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures</i>	251
4.1.2	<i>The Broader Profile of Amram in the Second Temple Period and Beyond</i>	253
4.2	AN INTRODUCTION TO VA.....	256
4.2.1	<i>The Text and Its Publication</i>	256
4.2.2	<i>Previous Research</i>	258
4.2.3	<i>Content Overview</i>	260
4.2.4	<i>The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Amram</i>	264
4.3	AMRAM’S PROFILE OF JEWISH IDENTITY IN VA.....	268
4.3.1	<i>Kinship</i>	269
4.3.2	<i>Tradition</i>	280
4.3.3	<i>Revelation</i>	289
4.3.4	<i>Time</i>	308
4.3.5	<i>Space</i>	317
4.4	SYNOPSIS.....	321
5	CONCLUSION	324
5.1	IN REVIEW: A QUEST FOR GREATER PRECISION	324
5.2	ANCESTRAL PROFILES: LEVI, QAHAT, AND AMRAM.....	328
5.3	BEING JEWISH IN THE ARAMAIC DSS: OUTCOMES AND OUTLOOKS	333
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	342

Acknowledgments

The following project represents many hours of work. It represents many individual moments and many tears. It represents many restless nights and many early mornings. It is the culmination of many things. Through it I encountered my limits and edges and on many occasions it nearly broke me. It taught me how to live in extended silence. It taught me the value of a good long walk. Amidst all of that, it represents the love and support of a whole host of people to whom I owe my deepest thanks. I want to express my gratitude to the following:

To Charlotte Hempel. Thank you for constantly calling me onwards and upwards in this project. Your supervision has been a profound gift. Thank you for your humility, kindness, wisdom, unceasing support.

To Andrew Perrin. Your invitation into the world of the DSS has forever changed me. Thank you for the ways you have modelled for me scholarship that is both erudite and accessible. Thank you for your example of what it means to be a good husband and a good scholar; in that order. Thank you for your guidance and support over these past years.

To the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. To be a recipient of your generous funding was a profound honour. Your support allowed me to focus my attention on my research undistracted by the major financial burdens often faced by PhD students. Thank you.

To my external and internal examiners, Daniel Machiela and Karen Wenell. Thank you in advance for the investment of your time. Your willingness to partner with me in this project is meaningful and deeply appreciated.

To George Brooke, Eileen Schuller, and Loren Stuckenbruck. Thank you for your example of humility and your willingness to invest in early career scholars. I have learned much from our interactions at various conferences over the past four years.

To my colleagues at the University of Birmingham, Michael DeVries, Charlie Comerford, Joseph Scales, Ellie Vivian, and Anna Shirav. Thank you for your friendship, support, and willingness to walk this PhD road together even from a distance.

To my colleagues at Trinity Western University's Dead Sea Scrolls Institute, Brandon Diggins, Kyle Young, Shelby Bennett, Brian Felushko, and Kyung Baek. Thank you for your friendship and for providing me with a local scholarly community.

To my colleagues at STECA. Thank you for your commitment to equipping and supporting early career scholars.

A special thank you to Jordash Kiffiak. Your willingness to journey with me and support me throughout this project has been an absolute gift.

To Kent Clarke. Over a decade ago you saw something in me and breathed it into life. Never did I realize that an introduction to the New Testament would lead me to where it has. Thank you.

To my late mother, Dodie Hama. Thank you for your unending support. For your prayers. For your profound courage. I will forever miss you.

To my friends. Evan and Kendall Allnutt, Matt and Val Myers, Mark and Tracey Thiessen, Matt and Katie Splinter, Goran Vitic, Riley and Liz Dornian, Chris and Jody King, Peter and Jodi Reek, Janice Miller, and Darren Young. Thank you for the gift of your support these last four years.

To my family, Patrick and Yvonne Hama, Tim and Branette Richards, Brad and Lei Hama, Tim Hama, Michael Richards, David and Christina Richards, and Matthew Richards. Thank you for your support and longsuffering throughout my academic journey.

To Angela. Your kindness to me over this journey has been profound. I cannot begin to express my gratitude for the ways you have carried me these past four years. Your steadiness. Your support. Your patience. Your wisdom. You have endured far more conversations on the Aramaic DSS and the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram than any wife ever should. Your love has changed me. Thank you. Thank you. For everything. Thank you.

Abbreviations

I use the following abbreviations in addition to the standard abbreviations included in the Second edition of *The SBL Handbook of Style*.¹

Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: AJEC
Ancient Jew Review: AJR
 Companion to the Qumran Scrolls: CQS
The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: DSSSP
Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies: DJTS
El Olivo: Documentación y Estudios Para el Diálogo entre Judíos y Cristianos: EO
 Key Words in Jewish Studies: KWJS
 Herders Biblische: HB
 Jewish Culture and Contexts: JCC
Jewish Social Studies: JSSt
Journal of Ancient Judaism: JAJ
 Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements: JAJSup
Journal of Jewish Identities: JJI
 Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement: JSSSup
Judaïsme Ancien/Ancient Judaism: JAAJ
 Meghillot: MG
 Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls: OHDSS
Revue des Études Juives: REJ
Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa
 Scripta Antiquitatis Posterioris ad Ethicam Religionemque Pertinentia: SAPERP
 Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: SDSSRL
 Studien zu Judentum und Christentum: StJC
 Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism: SJSJ
 S. Mark Taper Foundation Imprint in Jewish Studies: SMTFIJS
 Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies: TLJS
 The Bible and Women: An Encyclopedia of Exegesis and Cultural History Series: BWEECH
Tradition: TR

Sigla for Primary Text Transcriptions and Translations

(?) Uncertain reading or reconstruction
 [] Text inside brackets reconstructed
 { } Text inside brackets erased
 ⋈ Possible character

¹ Billie Jean Collins, Bob Buller, and John F. Kutsko, eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2014).

- § Probable character
- § Certain character
- Traces of unrecoverable character

1 Introduction

1.1 “Jews,” “Judaean,” and “Israelites”

What does it mean to be a “Jew?” What does it mean to be “Judaean?” What does it mean to be an “Israelite?” The fact that we begin this study with these three questions is perhaps emblematic of some of the considerable complexity and controversy surrounding the conception of what we will call Jewish identity.¹ In what follows, we will trace this question of Jewish identity towards an important intersection with the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS hereafter). En route to and at this intersection we will highlight several notable gaps in research and use these to orient our present investigation on Jewish identity in the Aramaic DSS.

That in view, when it comes to the identity designations of Jew, Judaean, or Israelite, especially the former two in our present case, there is much to be said. Questions of identity and these related terminologies have generated considerable scholarly discussion and debate over the years.² Much of this engagement has centered on the perceived meanings of each of the above terminologies.

A developing impression in scholarship is that the makeup of Jewish identity has shifted over time. Many scholars argue that each of the above terminologies reflects a distinct historical period, which held to a different fundamental makeup of what it meant to be included within this group. While the designation “Israelite” perhaps offers somewhat of a “simpler” means of delineation in view of major political shifts related to the exile and the loss of

¹ I will subsequently explain this present choice of terminology.

² For an extensive survey of the history of this discussion in research, see, David Marvin Miller, “The Meaning of Ioudaios and Its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient ‘Judaism,’” *CurBR* 9.1 (2010): 98–126; David Marvin Miller, “Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for Ioudaios,” *CurBR* 10.2 (2012): 293–311; David Marvin Miller, “Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of Ioudaios in Ancient ‘Judaism,’” *CurBR* 12.2 (2014): 216–65.

nationhood/monarchy, the impression is that the subsequent notions of “Judaean” and “Jew” seemingly carry with them greater complexity.³

The predominant understanding is that “Judaean” primarily represents an ethnic/geographic designation determined by an ancestral or kinship connection, alongside shifting forms of association with a geographic location. A common impression of “Jew” on the other hand is that it represents a “religious” or “cultural” designation determined by certain beliefs and/or practices. Where exactly scholars land within this terminological spectrum and how they understand these distinctions has often centered on where they historically locate this transition. To get a sense of some of the nuance and variety of perspectives within this conversation, the following is a brief survey of a few prominent voices from the mix.

Cohen, for example, argued that the shift from a primarily ethnic/geographic identity to a religious/cultural identity took place during the Maccabean period. He located this shift primarily in view of the development of the notion of religious conversion.⁴ Blenkinsopp similarly recognized this transition, yet he located it earlier in Ezra/Nehemiah’s post-exilic context.⁵ Bar-Asher alternatively understood this transition as beginning to occur between the pre-exilic and post-exilic periods based upon his reading of Esther.⁶ D. Schwartz interpreted the shift as

³ I recognize that the designation “Israelite” also carries with it its own historical complexities in view of related issues of historiography and scholarly interpretations of sources. See, for example the recent study, Jason A. Staples, *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism: A New Theory of People, Exile, and Israelite Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021). My reference to the designation “Israelite” as “simpler” than the terms “Jew” or “Judaean,” therefore, is not meant to suggest that those types of complexities do not exist in relation to the term “Israelite.” As Staples study demonstrates, that is far from the case. Rather, my observation of simplicity is meant in relative relation to the other two terms within the confines of our present investigation. As I will subsequently demonstrate, distinctions between the notions of “Jew” and “Judaean” have arguably been a more prominent fixture in the history of study and with that have seemingly carried with them a greater degree of “complexity” within modern conversations on identity.

⁴ Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, SMTFIJS 31 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 69–108.

⁵ Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children of Abraham,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 461–81.

⁶ Moshé Bar-Asher, “Il y Avait à Suse Un Homme Juif,” *REJ* 161.1/2 (2002): 227–31.

gradually taking place during the Hellenistic Diaspora.⁷ Others such as Mason recognized a similar transition from an ethnic/geographic based identity to a religious/cultural based identity. Yet in Mason's case, he specifically argued that the development of the religious/cultural notion of "Jewish" identity was a type of later Christian construct. He suggested that this was largely the result of a Christian systematization of Judaism in contrast to Christianity that became increasingly in vogue during the third and fourth centuries.⁸

Overall, scholars developed varying perceptions of this division across a wide range of studies.⁹ Yet amidst these developments, others argued that these types of proposals were problematic in that they represented an overly "clean" or swift transition in the fundamental makeup of Jewish identity.¹⁰

Goodblatt, for example, argued against positing such a distinct historical point of transition. Instead, he suggested that ancient Jewish identity was always both ethnic and cultural/religious. He did this through a revamped engagement with the notion of "nationalism."¹¹ S. Schwartz too pushed back on this mutually exclusive identity division and the

⁷ Daniel R. Schwartz, *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History*, KMTSJS (Toronto; Buffalo, NY; London: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 86–87.

⁸ Steve Mason, "Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38.4/5 (2007): 457–512.

⁹ In addition to the above examples, see also, Marc Zvi Brettler, "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism," *CBQ* 61.3 (1999): 429; Philip F. Esler, "Judean Ethnic Identity in Josephus' *Against Apion*," in *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*, ed. Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley, *SJSJ* 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 73–74; Solomon Zeitlin, "The Jews: Race, Nation or Religion: Which? A Study Based on the Literature of the Second Jewish Commonwealth," *JQR* 26.4 (1936): 313–47; Bob Becking, "Yehudite Identity in Elephantine," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 414. For perceptions of a similar transition from ethno-geographic to cultural/religious in terms of Greek identity, see, Jonathan M. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Jonathan M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, IL; London: University of Chicago Press, 2002). The importance of Hall's exploration of Greek ethnicity for understanding both Jewish ethnicity and the larger notion of Jewish identity is apparent in that it is an oft-cited source within many of the abovementioned studies.

¹⁰ For the description of this shift as "clean" see, John J. Collins, *The Invention of Judaism: Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul*, *The Invention of Judaism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017), 19.

¹¹ David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); David Goodblatt, "Varieties of Identity in Late Second Temple Judah (200 b.c.e.–135 c.e.)," in *Jewish Identity and*

sharp turn from one to the next. Although S. Schwartz himself recognized some apparent notable shifts in ancient Jewish thinking regarding the makeup of identity, he continually reiterated the considerable limitations of conclusions that hold to such extreme dichotomies.¹²

Baker was also among those to acknowledge the problematic nature of these terminological distinctions. As part of a larger survey of some of these binary proposals pertaining to an ethnic/religious point of transition, she contended that “there was no evolution from ‘ethnic Judaeans’ to ‘religious Jews.’”¹³ Like S. Schwartz, she too recognized notable points of transition and influence, and maintained that suggestions of a relatively quick and smooth transition from an ethnic to a religious/cultural identity remained problematic.¹⁴ In Collins’s exploration of Jewish identity in connection to Torah, he did well in capturing this problematic impression. He conveyed that “the terminological debate about the translation of *Ioudaios*, then, is ultimately misleading, insofar as it suggests that a clean distinction can be made between the views of Judaism as an *ethnos* and as a religion.”¹⁵

Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals, ed. Benedikt Eckhardt, SJSJ 155 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 11–28; David Goodblatt, “Ancient Jewish Identity,” *AJR* (2018), <https://www.ancientjewreview.com/articles/2018/10/24/ancient-jewish-identity>.

¹² Seth Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms Were There?: A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization,” *JAJ* 2.2 (2011): 208–38.

¹³ Cynthia Baker, “A ‘Jew’ by Any Other Name?,” *JAJ* 2.2 (2011): 178. See also, Cynthia M. Baker, *Jew*, KWJS (New Brunswick; New Jersey; London: Rutgers University Press, 2017).

¹⁴ Baker, “A ‘Jew’ by Any Other Name?,” 153–80.

¹⁵ Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*, 19. For wider responses to some of these ethnic/religious engagements, see the online forum discussion “Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts,” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014, <https://themarginaliareview.com/jew-judean-forum/>. See especially within this discussion the following contributions: Adele Reinhartz, “A Response to the Jew and Judean Form,” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014, <https://themarginaliareview.com/response-jew-judean-forum-adele-reinhartz/>; Daniel R. Schwartz, “The Different Tasks of Translators and Historians,” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014, <https://themarginaliareview.com/different-tasks-translators-historians-daniel-r-schwartz/>; Annette Yoshiko Reed, “*Ioudaios* before and after ‘Religion,’” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014, <https://themarginaliareview.com/ioudaios-religion-annette-yoshiko-reed/>; and Steve Mason, “Ancient Jews or Judeans? Different Questions, Different Answers,” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014, <https://themarginaliareview.com/ancient-jews-judeans-different-questions-different-answers-steve-mason/>.

One of the lasting impressions that has come out of this body of research, therefore, is of the increasing need to maintain an awareness of the limitations and challenges of creating clean terminologies, systems, and definitions.¹⁶

In the case of the terms “Jew” and “Judaean,” as is evident in my title, I have chosen to adopt the former term “Jew” as well as “Jewish” within the present investigation. In view of the abovementioned historical debates within scholarship, I do so with an awareness of some of the notable limitations and challenges of translated terms.¹⁷ As the above summary demonstrates there are clear camps when it comes to choices in terminology. My adoption of the terms “Jew” and “Jewish” in part reflects my reading of the evidence and relative standing amidst the above debates. My impression is that despite the limitations of terminologies and designations, adopting the terms “Jew” and “Jewish” wholesale will provide helpful continuity within the present investigation. While these terms create challenges and broad sweeping designations are often problematic, my impression is that the value of adopting these terms in the present investigation outweighs the alternative of constantly trying to hold different terminologies in the balance. While those types of balancing efforts have their place in certain studies, in view of the limited scope of this project I have intentionally chosen to direct my attention beyond the underlying terminological debates. Some may consider this an oversight. Yet I prefer to see this as a decision of resource management for the purpose of concentrating our energy and attention on other specific aspects of identity.

¹⁶ See, for example, S. Schwartz, who poignantly remarks: “we must struggle to remember that the exiguous fragments of information that survive, which are sometimes easily reducible to simple patterns, do not tell the whole story, because they were necessarily produced by societies whose complexity is not reflected in the evidence” (“How Many Judaisms,” 231–2).

¹⁷ As my title further indicates and which we will discuss in greater detail below, my work will also center on the Aramaic DSS, which largely develop around pre-exilic, largely pre-Mosaic literary contexts. While the figures in question would perhaps better fit into an “Israelite” classification, I have chosen to maintain the language of “Jew”/“Jewish” in view of both impressions of the universal applicability of these terms across time, and in view of the later Second Temple compositional context in which such terms would have been increasingly common.

1.2 “Being Jewish”: Previous Explorations of Jewish Identity

“Being Jewish” is fundamentally a question of identity. To situate our present investigation, which focusses on this question of “being Jewish,” we will trace a few major threads within the history of Jewish identity studies. We will explore this conversation on three levels. First, we will look at some of the primary lenses through which scholars have understood the overall nature of Jewish identity. Within this we will consider some of the prominent approaches and methodologies scholars have consequently adopted in the history of study. Second, we will consider some of the primary research interests that these different approaches and methodologies have generated. And third, we will consider some notable challenges created by those various approaches as well as some resulting opportunities.

1.2.1 Primary Lenses: The Nature of Jewish Identity via Method and Approach

Throughout the history of Jewish identity studies, scholars have adopted various lenses for understanding the overall nature of Jewish identity. Among these, scholars have approached Jewish identity through lenses such as race, ethnicity, religion, nationalism, and more recently through notions of group or social identity.

Notions of race appeared in early engagements of Jewish identity, often developing out translations and understandings of terms such as *genos* as they appeared at different points within the ancient Jewish literary context.¹⁸ In the years following World War II, however, scholars became increasingly aware of some of the considerable issues surrounding approaches related to

¹⁸ Following, Esler’s observation, the Loeb translators in their 1926 translation of Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* repeatedly translated the term *γενος* as “race” (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.*, trans. Henry St. J. Thackeray et al., LCL [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926]). For more on Esler’s perceptions on this translational preference, see, Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity”, 78.

the conception of race.¹⁹ Esler, for example, presented a rather scathing critique of investigations of Jewish identity upon the foundation of the notion of “race” within a larger survey of Jewish identity and ethnicity in Josephus.²⁰

As Esler’s study itself demonstrates, racial approaches increasingly gave way to a considerable and ongoing emphasis on understanding Jewish identity through the alternative lens of ethnicity.²¹ Ethnic approaches to Jewish identity commonly developed out of baseline definitions from wider ethnic studies including the works of Barth, Weber, Smith and Hutchinson, as well as the *observations* of more ancient thinkers such as Herodotus and the *actions* of ancient figures such the high priest Jason and Antiochus Epiphanes during the Maccabean period.²² Within these ethnic studies, scholars commonly traced conceptions of

¹⁹ Gruen captures this scholarly shift, noting, “scholars have strained, often ingeniously, to conceptualize ethnicity as something different from race. ‘Race’ can have disturbing implications, especially in the wake of events of the mid-twentieth century, and too often since” (“Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe,” *Phoenix* 67.1/2 [2013]: 2). Amidst these observations, he recognizes some of the challenges in smoothly transitioning to alternative approaches and terminology. For a historical survey of some of the notable developments in Jewish identity studies, particular in relation race, see, Salo W. Baron, “Problems of Jewish Identity from an Historical Perspective: A Survey,” *PAAJR* 46–47 (1979): 33–67.

²⁰ Esler writes, “The whole notion of ‘race’ stems from the proponents of nineteenth century pseudo-science who believed that genotypic differences between peoples could be the basis of group classification and, inevitably, that some ‘races’ (‘white’ ones, typically) were superior to others. The denial of ‘race’ as a category does not mean that some genotypic features are not more common in some human populations than others (brown eyes, for example), but that such features cannot be the basis of any sensible system of classification” (“Judean Ethnic Identity,” 78). For similar observations on the challenges of racial approaches to Jewish identity, see also, Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” 1–22, esp. 2, 13–17; Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 27; or Perrin, who pushes back strongly again past translations of the Aramaic DSS that reflect “unsettling racial connotations in post-colonial contexts” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance: Commentary on the Levi, Qahat, and Amram Qumran Aramaic Traditions*, LSTS 100 [New York: T & T Clark, 2022], forthcoming).

²¹ See, for example, Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children,” 461–81; Shaye J. D. Cohen, “Ioudaios to Genos and Related Expressions in Josephus,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*, ed. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 23–38; Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*; Mason, “Jews, Judaean, Judaizing, Judaism,” 457–512; Brettler, “Judaism in the Hebrew Bible?,” 429; Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity,” 73–91; Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” 1–22; Erich S. Gruen, *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*, (De Gruyter, 2016); Michael L. Satlow, “Jew or Judaean?,” in *The One Who Sows Bountifully: Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers*, ed. Caroline Johnson Hodge, Saul M. Olyan, Daniel Ullucci, and Emma Wasserman, BJS 356 (Atlanta: Brown Judaic Studies, 2013), 165–76; Kenton L. Sparks, *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).

²² Frederik Barth, ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference* (Bergen: Universitetsforlaget Press, 1969), 14; Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* (New

Jewish identity not only in ethnic terms, but often alongside developing ideas of “religion” and/or “culture.”

As we mentioned above, the works of individuals such as Cohen and Blenkinsopp, among others traced the chronological developments of the underlying features of Jewish identity. As we also noted, one of their primary goals was to identify a precise moment in which Jewish identity shifted from a primarily ethnic conception to a primarily cultural/religious conception. We also noted the work of Mason. As part of Mason’s perception of a transition in the fundamental makeup of Jewish identity, he criticized anachronistic applications of “religion” to Jewish identity and opted for treating it ongoing in ethnic terms.

Others, however, suggested that notions of “ethnicity” were also not without problems. Scholars noted various issues with “ethnicity” as it related to the ancient context.²³ This multiplicity of ethnic/religious/cultural engagements further built into and overlapped with a host of studies that explored the definitive feature(s) of Jewishness or Jewish identity. The perception of a definitive feature(s) of identity at specific historical moments became central to many of the debates regarding the ethnic or religious/cultural nature of Jewish identity.²⁴ We will explore this matter further below.

In the wake of growing interest in interdisciplinary approaches, and increased movements in religious studies beyond traditional methodological frames, scholars have moved to consider Jewish identity through a series of wider humanities-based methods and approaches. While these

York: Bedminster Press, 1968), 389; Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 66; John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 3–14; Herodotus, *Hist.* 8.144.2–3. For Antiochus Epiphanes actions, see, 2 Macc 5:11–6:11; for Jason’s actions, see, 2 Macc 4:10–25.

²³ Satlow, “Jew or Judaeon?,” 165–76. For other critiques of the application of “ethnicity” to the ancient Jewish context, see, Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” 1–22.

²⁴ See, for example, Sparks, *Ethnicity and Identity*; Gruen, *The Construct of Identity*; Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” 1–22; Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity,” 73–91.

engagements maintain an awareness of and intersection with the above ethnic/religious/cultural conversations, they often extend the conversation in additional directions.

Jokiranta's work, for example, has demonstrated the considerable value of understanding Jewish identity through the lens of wider sociological theories and notions of social identity.²⁵ Newsom's exploration of community identity formation in the DSS adopted a series of wider literary, linguistic, and anthropological approaches.²⁶ Eckhart's recent volume invited explorations of Jewish identity through more concentrated political lenses.²⁷ Raup Johnson's study developed the importance of wider literary approaches pertaining to historical fictions as a basis for understanding Jewish identity formation.²⁸

In addition to these types of studies, scholars in recent years have also increasingly moved to explore Jewish identity from various wider theoretical angles. These include notions such as gender, memory, and trauma, as well as important investigations that integrate wider theoretical frameworks pertaining to time and space.²⁹ These and the abovementioned types of

²⁵ See, for example, Jutta Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Jutta Jokiranta, "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 85–109; Jutta Jokiranta, "Social Identity Approach: Identity-Constructing Elements in the Psalms Peshet," in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 63–84; Jutta M. Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes," *RevQ* 20.2 (2001): 223–39.

²⁶ Carol A Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

²⁷ Benedikt Eckhardt, ed., *Jewish Identity and Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*, SJSJ 155 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

²⁸ Sara Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

²⁹ On gender, see, for example, Lawrence M. Wills, "Challenged Boundaries: Gender and the Other in Periods of Crisis," in *Women and Exilic Identity in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Martien A. Halvorson-Taylor and Katherine E. Southwood, LHBOTS 631 (New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018), 24–40; Joshua Ezra Burns, "Gendered Language and the Construction of Jewish Identity in 2 Maccabees," *JJI* 11.1 (2018): 5–16; Joan E. Taylor, "Real Women and Literary Airbrushing: The Women 'Therapeutae' of Philo's De Vita Contemplativa and the Identity of the Group," in *Early Jewish Writings: Perspectives on Gender and Reception History*, ed. Eileen M. Schuller and Marie-Theres Wacker, BWEECH 3.1 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017); Thomas Scott Cason, "Creature Features: Monstrosity and the Construction of Human Identity in the 'Testament of Solomon,'" *CBQ* 77.2 (2015): 263–79; Ellen Juhl Christiansen, "Judith: Defender of Israel—Preserver of the Temple," in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the*

wider humanities-based studies have generated and continue to generate a host of insights into understanding Jewish identity, especially the nature of its formation and its ongoing maintenance.

1.2.2 Primary Research Interests: The Underlying Makeup of Jewish Identity

As I suggested above, scholars have often demonstrated within many of these different methodologies and approaches a considerable interest in understanding the specific underlying makeup of Jewish identity. Whether from the perspective of race, ethnicity, religion and/or culture, or from wider humanities-based theoretical perspectives, scholars have commonly

Book of Judith, ed. Géza Xeravits, DCLS 14 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 70–84; Maxine L. Grossman, “Rethinking Gender in the Community Rule: An Experiment in Sociology,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011); Gerbern S. Oegma, *Early Judaism and Modern Culture: Literature and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011), 80–96. On memory, see, for example, Ehud Ben Zvi, “On Social Memory and Identity Formation in Late Persian Yehud: A Historian’s Viewpoint with a Focus on Prophetic Literature, Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic Historical Collection,” in *Social Memory among the Literati of Yehud*, BZAW 509 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019); Russell E. Fuller, “Cultural Memory, the Qumran Library, and Identity,” *Hen* 40.1 (2018): 70–79; George J. Brooke, “Praying History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Memory, Identity, Fulfilment,” in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*, ed. Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner, BZAW 486 (Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2017), 305–19; Steven D. Fraade, “The Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity Before and After 70 CE: The Role of the Holy Vessels in Rabbinic Memory and Imagination,” in *Legal Fictions: Studies of Law and Narrative in the Discursive Worlds of Ancient Jewish Sectarians and Sages*, SJSJ 147 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 523–54; Tim Langille, “Old Memories, New Identities: Traumatic Memory, Exile, and Identity Formation in the Damascus Document and Peshar Habakkuk,” in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, SSS (SBL Press, 2014); Timothy Langille, “Reshaping the Persistent Past: A Study of Collective Trauma and Memory in Second Temple Judaism” (University of Toronto, PhD, 2014). On trauma, see, for example, Langille, “Old Memories, New Identities; Langille, “Reshaping the Persistent Past.” On time, see, for example, Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Time and Identity: The Hellenistic Background of the Calendar Treatise in Jubilees 6,” in *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, MG 10 (Jerusalem: Haifa University Press and Bialik Institute, 2013), 31–56; Dulcinea Boesenberg, “Construction of Jewish Identity in Philo’s Sabbath Explanations,” *JSQ* 26.2 (2019): 99–116. On space, see, for example, Eyal Ben-Eliyahu, ed., *Identity and Territory: Jewish Perceptions of Space in Antiquity*, 1st edition. (Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2019); Karen J. Wenell, *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism* (London; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2007). For a recent adoption of various aspects of spatial theory into an investigation of Jewish identity, see the recent work of Joseph Scales, “Religious Identity and Spatiality in Hasmonean and Herodian Galilee” (University of Birmingham, 2020). For a recent introduction on notions of “space” and “place” in connection to biblical studies, see, for example, Patrick Schreiner, “Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends,” *CurBR* 14.3 (2016): 340–71.

engaged questions such as: what does it specifically mean to be Jewish? Or what essentially constitutes Jewishness?

One notable way in which scholars have attempted to answer these types of questions, is by identifying and distinguishing between different individual underlying identity features. In this process of identification and distinction, scholars have often classified these individual features under ethnic, cultural and/or religious, or oppositional frameworks.

Under an ethnic framework, scholars highlighted notions such “descent,” “genealogy,” “ancestry,” or “kinship,” alongside various other related concepts pertaining to purity and relational practices.³⁰ Other proposed primary ethnic features included aspects of geography and/or origin.³¹ These perceived features forced scholars to grapple with a series of conceptual realities including notions such as “real” vs. “imagined” kinship or ancestry.³²

The cultural and/or religious category perhaps played host to the most diverse suite of proposed features. To name a few, these included explorations of things such as perceptions

³⁰ On “descent,” “genealogy,” “ancestry,” or “kinship,” see, for example, Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, 473; Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*, 2; Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity,” 76; David Goodblatt, “Population Structure and Jewish Identity,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, 2010, 116. On wider notions of purity or relational practices, see especially, Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*.

³¹ See, for example, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 14, 70. See also, for example, Becking, who picks up on the importance of geography for Jewish identity within a specific Elephantine context (“Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 403–19).

³² For more on “imagined”/“fictive” vs. “real” notions of kinship, see, for example, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 100; Goodblatt, “Ancient Jewish Identity,” <https://www.ancientjewreview.com/articles/2018/10/24/ancient-jewish-identity>; Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 18; Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” 1–22. Esler as part of an investigation of ethnic Jewish identity in Josephus picks up on these alternative conceptions of kinship, capturing the underlying the nature and values of “imagined” or “fictive” notions of kinship. He writes, “it was enough that a group believed it sprang from a common ancestor or ancestors, not that such a claim was historically correct” (“Judean Ethnic Identity,” 80–81).

towards apostasy,³³ notions of ancestral law or torah,³⁴ shared trauma,³⁵ various expressions of circumcision,³⁶ priestly identity,³⁷ language,³⁸ narrative traditions,³⁹ group association,⁴⁰ interpretive knowledge,⁴¹ calendar,⁴² collective will,⁴³ distinct conceptions of wisdom,⁴⁴ names,⁴⁵ purity,⁴⁶ shared issues,⁴⁷ notions of education,⁴⁸ life cycles,⁴⁹ dietary features,⁵⁰ state loyalty,⁵¹

³³ Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 175.

³⁴ See, especially, Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*. See also, Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B. C. E. to 640 C. E.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 62–80; Manfred Oeming, “Jewish Identity in the Eastern Diaspora in Light of the Book of Tobit,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*, ed. Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbruans, 2011), 550.

³⁵ See, for example, Gruen, *The Construct of Identity*, 311, who picks up on the shared significance of traumatic events for Jewish communities in the Hellenistic context.

³⁶ Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 40–49, 67, 123–25, 137–38, 157–58, 218–21.

³⁷ Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 71–107.

³⁸ For the role of Hebrew as a language, see, for example, Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 49–70. For wider notions of language as a feature of Jewish identity, see, for example, Carol A. Newsom, “Constructing ‘We, You, and Others’ through Non-Polemical Discourse,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 13–22; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 23–32.

³⁹ Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*; Baker, “‘A’ Jew’ by Any Other Name?,” 173–76; Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children,” 471–75.

⁴⁰ Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 403–5; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 53–58.

⁴¹ Maxine L. Grossman, “Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and ‘Insider’ Status,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 1–12; Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children,” 476–8.

⁴² See, for example, Collins, who picks up on the significance of the calendar in connection to the Torah and various points of emphasis across the ancient Jewish context (*The Invention of Judaism*, 97–113). On the overall significance of the notion of calendar and an exploration of its contours in the ancient Jewish context, see, Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*, STDJ 78 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008).

⁴³ See, for example, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 7.

⁴⁴ See, for example, Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*, 66–69.

⁴⁵ See, for example, Blenkinsopp, “Judaean, Jews, Children,” 469–70.

⁴⁶ See, for example, Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*.

⁴⁷ See, for example, Sparks, *Ethnicity and Identity*, 2–3.

⁴⁸ See, for example, Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 179–81.

⁴⁹ See, for example, Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 409–10.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 175.

⁵¹ See, for example, Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, 179.

Jerusalem as a cultic center and Davidic support,⁵² as well as a host of wider beliefs including those related to conceptions of both space and time.⁵³

Amidst this above complex of features, scholars also recognized that not all aspects of identity come from within.⁵⁴ Developing perceptions regarding oppositional conceptions of identity helped reconcile some of the notable gaps in previous approaches. Investigations on Jewish identity formation through “othering,” the “outsider,” notions of foreign threat, or perceptions of a common enemy have all provided important contributions to our understanding of the makeup of Jewishness.⁵⁵

Within this shifting complex of proposals, scholars further worked to distinguish and delineate the exact relationship of these different proposed features to Jewish identity. They developed various additional frameworks and terminologies that allowed them to differentiate and weigh the different aspects of this developing suite of ideas.⁵⁶ These frameworks and

⁵² See, for example, Oeming, “Jewish Identity,” 545, 550.

⁵³ See, for example, Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 404.

⁵⁴ See, for example, Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 404–405, 408.

⁵⁵ See, for example, Jean Duhaime, “La Règle de la Guerre (1QM) et la construction de l’identité sectaire,” in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović, STDJ 70 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008), 131–46; Antonios Finitsis, “The Other in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8,” in *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, ed. Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, and Matthew Goff (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2011), 116–31; Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 411–12; Gruen, *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism*; Steven Weitzman, “On the Political Relevance of Antiquity: A Response to David Goodblatt’s Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism,” *JSS* 14.3 (2008): 165–72.

⁵⁶ This included, for example, notions of “essentialist” or “primordial” identity and/or so-called “cultural” or “instrumentalist” conceptions of identity, in which scholars distinguished between “naturally” occurring features of identity vs. culturally conditioned or constructed notions of identity. For more on these distinctions, see, for example, Avi Sagi, *Reflections on Identity: The Jewish Case* (Boston: Academic Studies Press). See also, Hall, *Hellenicity*, 17. Scholars further considered the idea of “expressed” or “intentional” features of identity and explored Jewish identity through frameworks pertaining to identity “criteria” vs. “indicia” or “diagnostic” vs. “determinative” aspects of identity. For wider adoptions of these distinctions originally proposed by Horowitz (“Ethnic Identity,” in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, ed. Nathan Glazer, Daniel P. Moynihan, and Corinne Sapos Schelling [Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1975], 111–40, esp. 119–20), see, Hall, *Hellenicity*, 20–21; David Konstan, “Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity,” *DJTS* 6.1 (2011): 98. For an application of these categories specifically to Jewish identity, see, Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity,” 73–91; Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 66. Scholars also proposed models of “monothetic” vs. “polythetic” identity which looked to provide ample space for diversity of Jewish identity expression. For more on this terminology, see, for example, Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms,” 217–19.

terminologies allowed scholars to hierarchically classify features. Through this, scholars could isolate what they considered to be *the* definitive feature(s) of Jewish identity. Over the years, this has resulted in an apparent sea of proposals including but not limited to certain aspects of kinship or ancestry,⁵⁷ geography or origin,⁵⁸ or other distinct beliefs and practices related to concepts such as purity,⁵⁹ torah,⁶⁰ or circumcision.⁶¹

1.2.3 Navigating Challenges of Jewish Identity: Unity and Diversity

Scholars, however, also commonly recognized the ongoing need to allow for variety, nuance, and complexity amidst these differing proposals. Baron, for example, demonstrated this in his historical survey of Jewish identity. He argued that there remains a wide diversity of perceived definitive features when we consider the diachronic conception on Jewishness from ancient to modern.⁶² Baker in her assessment of previous attempts to distinguish ethnic vs. cultural/religious conceptions of Jewishness noted the ways in which the underlying features and expressions of Jewish identity have never “been static phenomena, and so are always being developed, transformed, adapted, and negotiated.”⁶³ Or as Cohen simply stated, “there was no single or simple definition of a Jew in antiquity.”⁶⁴ Thus, while impressions of certain definitive features of Jewish identity remain, there simultaneously exists an ongoing impression that Jewish

⁵⁷ See, for example, Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 227–31; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Bar-Asher, “Il y Avait à Suse Un Homme Juif,” 227–31; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*.

⁵⁹ See, for example, Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*.

⁶⁰ See, for example, Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*.

⁶¹ See, for example, Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*.

⁶² Baron, “Problems of Jewish Identity,” 33–67. For other surveys as to the diversity of these features, see also, Becking, “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine,” 403–19; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*.

⁶³ Baker, “A ‘Jew’ by Any Other Name?,” 176.

⁶⁴ Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 3.

identity has consisted of a diversity of expressions that have at times overlapped and at other times diverged.

The reasons for this impression are many, but perhaps one of the primary contributors is a growing awareness of the problems associated with overly organized conceptions of identity. As in the above case of terminologies and translations, scholars have also increasingly recognized limitations when it comes to historiography.⁶⁵ The growing impression in view of wider interdisciplinary explorations, is that there often exists—to varying degrees—a gulf between description and reality. Scholars have identified and accounted for this dissonance in recent years through engagements with wider theoretical studies of memory or trauma, as well as through a growing awareness of the limitations of textual evidence.⁶⁶

As a result, treatments of Jewishness have increasingly made space for diversity of expression. One of the ways in which scholars attempted to do this was by developing the notion of “Judaism” as a multifaceted concept. This line of inquiry led scholars to approach parts of the ancient Jewish world through the lens of so-called “Judaisms.”⁶⁷ While the positive outcomes of

⁶⁵ See, for example, Raup Johnson, who in her treatment of historical fictions, notes a range in which text resemble the traditional notion of historiography (*Historical Fictions*, esp. 90–110, 218). See also, for example, Philip R. Davies, “What History Can We Get From The Scrolls, And How?,” ed. Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 31–46; Philip R. Davies, “Historiography,” in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018), 228–36.

⁶⁶ For an impression of the limitations of textual evidence, Schwartz’s above comment is worth repeating. Again, he noted, that “we must struggle to remember that the exiguous fragments of information that survive, which are sometimes easily reducible to simple patterns, do not tell the whole story, because they were necessarily produced by societies whose complexity is not reflected in the evidence” (“How Many Judaisms,” 231–2). See, also Hempel’s volume on the Qumran Rule Texts, which draw out some of the notable distinctions between the content of texts and their underlying contexts and realities (*The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013)).

⁶⁷ For an overview and assessment of both the notion of a diverse Judaism in the form of “Judaisms” and a so-called later notion of a “Judaismless” history, see, Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms,” 208–38. Schwartz describes how, “The origins of “Judaisms,” . . . , arose out of several dynamics: primarily, developments in post-World War II American Jewish life and Christian theology; but also general tendencies in social theory and in fields of scholarship cognate to Jewish studies, such as Christian studies and the study of Indian religions (in the 1970s and following); and, internally, through the adoption of methods of reading long since common currency among New Testament scholars, but little practiced among Judaic scholars before the 1960s” (“How Many Judaisms,” 211). He goes on to locate the early forms of this thinking in the works of both Neusner (*Formative Judaism: Religious, Historical and*

this approach were many, this investigative route also drew attention to problems associated with overemphasizing diversity. Many scholars worked to temper this perception by emphasizing the ongoing need for an awareness of the larger whole of which underlying expressions form parts.⁶⁸ This pushback against conceptions of so-called “Judaisms,” was not a wholesale rejection of the need to account for diversity. Rather, this response emphasized the ongoing need to manage a proper tension, one that both recognized diversity but also maintained an awareness of common ground.

1.2.3.1 Exploring Diversity: From Texts towards Figures and Traditions

An interest in accounting for diversity within Jewish identity, therefore, has certainly not evaporated in recent years. Scholars have continued to work to bring awareness to the variety of Jewish identity expression throughout history, especially within the ancient Jewish context. One way in which scholars have engaged this interest is in explorations of Jewish identity through the lens of individual compositions. In other words, they have asked how Jewish identity distinctly shows up in individual literary works. Raup Johnson’s study on historical fictions, for example, surveyed a series of Second Temple writings to draw out the diversity of individual expressions of Jewish identity.⁶⁹ Duhaime, in an article on identity formation in 1QM, also worked to capture the distinct underlying expression of Jewish identity contained therein.⁷⁰ Oeming as part of an

Literary Studies, BJS 37 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982]) and Smith (*Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982], 1–18).

⁶⁸ Himmelfarb, for example summed up this growing impression well as part of her own investigation on Jewish identity. She noted: “There can be no doubt that the emphasis on diversity had some salutary effects, encouraging careful attention to the significance of the specifics of individual texts that might once have been too quickly assigned to a larger category. But it also raised questions of its own, most importantly, the problem of the connections among the various individual strands on which attention was now being lavished (“Judaism in Antiquity: Ethno-Religion or National Identity,” *JQR* 99.1 [2009]: 65).

⁶⁹ Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*.

⁷⁰ Duhaime, “La Règle de la Guerre (1QM),” 131–46.

exploration of Jewish identity in the Persian period explored select chapters in Tobit to map out its particular silhouette of Jewish identity.⁷¹

These and other similar approaches to Jewish identity at the level of individual textual compositions are valuable, especially when it comes to capturing a sense of the underlying diversity of expression. Yet recent Second Temple studies attest to a growing awareness of the limitations of textual boundaries.⁷² Although the textual boundaries handed down to us in material culture often provide a helpful way of delimiting materials, they have at times impeded our ability to see the literary world beyond the text. Scholars are increasingly aware that what Mroczek dubbed “The Ancient Jewish Literary Imagination,” represents much more than what has come down to us in material culture.⁷³

Considering this, scholars have started to move beyond textual boundaries as they work to uncover a wider ancient Jewish literary landscape. One way they have done this is through a developing interest in individual figures as departure points for investigation. Najman, for example, in her work on the figure of Moses and the concept of “Mosaic discourse,” was an early advocate of this shift. In her study, Najman engaged some of the problematic applications of modern notions of “authorship and attribution” to the ancient Jewish literary world. Beyond significant contributions towards reconsidering the function of named ancient authorial attribution, she emphasized the importance of individual personas. She demonstrated how individual personas or famed figures, rather than fixed written texts, functioned as critical locus points for the development of successive traditions within the ancient Jewish context.⁷⁴

⁷¹ Oeming, “Jewish Identity,” 545–61.

⁷² See, for example, Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016).

⁷³ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*.

⁷⁴ Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, SJSJ 77 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003).

Najman's move from a focus on fixed texts to the importance of individual figures seemingly catalyzed a series of subsequent figure focused investigations. Mroczek, for example, picked up on the figure of David and his "voice" in her reconsideration of the ancient Jewish literary world.⁷⁵ Davis traced Jeremiah and his "reputation" in an exploration of the Jeremianic DSS materials.⁷⁶ Peters explored portraits of Noah in the Second Temple context.⁷⁷ Tervanotko investigated ancient Jewish formations of the figure of Miriam.⁷⁸ And most recently, Perrin looked at Daniel and a growing complex of traditions related to him as a figure in the DSS.⁷⁹

From these studies, there is a growing impression of a need to move beyond the modern primary emphasis on fixed texts and tracing different notions of textual development. In Perrin's investigation, he stressed the need for this pivot going forward in view of the figure of Daniel and related DSS materials. Yet Perrin's work carries critical implications for engagements with the ancient Jewish literary world at large. He noted:

Forward movement means accounting for the complexity and vitality of Danielic traditions without insisting on determining their textual relation or diachronic development. In this case, the outline of the tradition should focus on the figure of Daniel and his formations and transformations across the many traditions that contributed to this Danielic zeitgeist in antiquity.⁸⁰

⁷⁵ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*.

⁷⁶ Kipp Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions: Prophetic Persona and the Construction of Community Identity*, STDJ 111 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014).

⁷⁷ Dorothy M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

⁷⁸ Hanna K. Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice: The Figure of Miriam in Ancient Jewish Literature*, JAJSup 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

⁷⁹ Andrew B. Perrin, "Redrafting the Architecture of Daniel Traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures and Dead Sea Scrolls," *JTS* 72.1 (2021): 44–71.

⁸⁰ Perrin, "Redrafting," 71.

Similarly, Davis stressed the importance of figure-focused explorations in his abovementioned engagement. He captured this in his observation that “the Jeremianic traditions are not primarily textually based, but rather draw authority, significance, and function from their attachment to the reputation of Jeremiah the prophet.”⁸¹ In other words, Davis located the significance and function of the Jeremianic traditions in the wider imagined figure of Jeremiah and not primarily in a written record.

As Perrin’s above comments indicate, this move is not about dismissing the importance of material culture. Material culture remains central to our investigative attempts in that it functions as our primary knowledge base for these traditions and figures.⁸² Instead, the emphasis is on adjusting the point of investigative focus.

1.2.3.2 *Exploring Diversity: Previous Figure-Based Investigations*

A shift from a primary focus on texts towards a more expansive world of figures and traditions—represented in part by those texts—is a developing area of investigation. Yet studies on individual ancient Jewish figures are certainly not a novel venture. Introductory articles on individual figures have been a common fixture within ancient Jewish studies. These types of

⁸¹ Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*,” 44.

⁸² The importance of primary engagements with material culture have been increasingly apparent in recent years. For an introduction to material culture in relation to the DSS, see, for example, Ingo Kottsieper, “Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture,” in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T & T Clark, 2018), 167–77. Recent close studies of material culture have resulted in a growing awareness of important issues such as authenticity and provenance and have offered critical correctives to how we understand and engage the ancient Jewish literary world. See, for example, Dennis Mizzi and Jodi Magness, “Provenance vs. Authenticity: An Archaeological Perspective on the Post-2002 ‘Dead Sea Scrolls-Like’ Fragments,” *DSD* 26.2 (2019): 135–69; Årstein Justnes, “Fake Fragments, Flexible Provenances: Eight Aramaic ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ from the 21st Century,” in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*, ed. Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegmund, STDJ 131 (Leiden: Brill, 2019); Torleif Elgvin, Michael Langlois, and Kipp Davis, eds., *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*, LSTS (London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016).

explorations are commonplace across encyclopedias, companion volumes, or dictionaries.⁸³

Further, specific investigations on ancient Jewish figures as ideals or models have appeared and reappeared with relative frequency. Collins, for example, edited a collected essays volume on ideal figures in the 80s. Various similar studies followed his work, such as that of Gruen, Najman, and more recently a volume edited by Edelman and Ben Zvi.⁸⁴

The impression from these and related studies of individual figures as “models” or “ideals” is that individual figures can function as critical locus points for storing and transmitting certain meaning and value(s). More specifically, individual figures act among other things, as an effective scribal medium for endorsing, championing, and perpetuating a particular complex of meaning and values. While these and other similar figure-based studies have considerable potential for understanding Jewish identity and while they have contributed to understandings of Jewish identity in different ways, they have often done so either indirectly or to a limited extent due to alternative primary investigative interests.

Furthermore, despite the contributions of previous figure-based investigations to both wider scholarship in general and ancient Jewish identity in particular, with a few exceptions, these investigations have generally tended to concentrate around more prominent figures from

⁸³ See, for example, John C. Reeves, “Enoch,” *EDSS* 1:249; Craig A. Evans, “Abraham,” *EDSS* 1:2–4; Daniel K. Falk, “Moses,” *EDSS* 1:576–77; Roger Blythe Good, “Jacob,” *EDSS* 1:395–96; Roger Blythe Good, “Joseph,” *EDSS* 1:425–26; Roger Blythe Good, “Judah,” *EDSS* 1:438–39; Michael E. Stone, “Amram,” *EDSS* 1:23–24; Michael E. Stone, “Levi,” *EDSS* 1:485–86; Michael E. Stone, “Qahat,” *EDSS* 1:731–32.

⁸⁴ John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, SCS 12 (Scholars Press, 1980); Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Rejuvenation of Jewish Tradition*, HCS 30 (Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1998), esp. 110–188; Hindy Najman, *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation, and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*, SJSJ 53 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010); Diana Vikander Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi, *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); J. T. Milik, “Les Modèles Araméens Du Livre D’esther Dans La Grotte 4 De Qumrân,” *RQ* 15.3 (1992): 321–406. See also, Uusimäki’s recent investigation on Qahat as a virtue figure (“In Search of Virtue: Ancestral Inheritance in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542),” *BibInt* 29.2 (2020): 206–28). As will soon become apparent, Uusimäki’s investigation is highly relevant for our present study.

the Hebrew Scriptures.⁸⁵ Edelman and Ben Zvi's volume for example, although engaging with some perhaps more understudied Jewish and non-Jewish figures, largely focuses on figures with a more prominent footprint in the Hebrew Scriptures. In this regard, as much as these studies offer in terms of figure-based investigations, they have generally focused on a limited choir of voices. Many ancestral figures with lower profiles in the Hebrew Scriptures have yet to feature with any notable prominence in these types of studies.

1.2.3.3 Exploring Diversity: Canonical Centrality

This concentration in research on more prominent figures from the Hebrew Scriptures is perhaps in many ways emblematic of the central position scholars have given these “canonical” writings in the history of study.⁸⁶ In large part this was seemingly the result of previously held perceptions regarding notions of canonization and canon within the ancient Jewish context.⁸⁷ In recent years, however, scholars have increasingly challenged many of these long-held assumptions and perceptions regarding canonicity and the ancient Jewish literary landscape.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ While Edelman and Ben Zvi's volume picks up on select figures that we might consider less prominent in the Hebrew Scriptures, these figures are generally non-Jewish in nature (i.e., Nabodinus, Cyrus, Sennacherib) (*Remembering Biblical Figures*). Among wider exceptions in scholarship that focus on lesser-known figures, see, for example, Tervantko, *Denying Her Voice*. Uusimäki's recent engagement of Qahat also represents a notable exception, yet the article nature of her contribution means that its content is relatively limited in scope (“In Search of Virtue,” 206–28). Further, while both Tervantko and Uusimäki engage lesser-known figures from the Hebrew Scriptures, both do some with primary interests other than those pertaining to Jewish identity. While both studies certainly intersect with and remain relevant for understanding Jewish identity, they often do so either indirectly or to a limited extent.

⁸⁶ By “canonical” I refer to writings that fall within the traditional corpus of the modern Hebrew Scriptures (MT).

⁸⁷ These previous impressions of an initial move towards a so-called “closed canon” often developed out of internal readings of the Hebrew Scriptures. Cohen, for example, connects this impression to the writings of Malachi, Ezra, and Nehemiah, in their apparent attribution of specific authoritative content to Moses. He notes that these initial impressions, however, maintained a notable sense of diversity as to in fact represented the “canon.” He suggests that a more formal sense of a closed collection instead occurred by the second century BCE, albeit with an ongoing but lesser degree of fluidity (*From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014], 181–82). For more on canon fluidity, see, also, Armin Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 21–30.

⁸⁸ See, for example, Satlow, who traces the development of the notion of “Bible” and its authority. In his investigation, he conceives of the process of so-called “canonization” extending all the way into the third century

The 1947 discovery of the DSS in the Judean desert in large part catalyzed this shift.⁸⁹ Questions arose as scholars increasingly identified notable differences between the basic makeup of the library of writings attributed to Qumran and the corpus of materials contained in the traditional Hebrew Scriptures. Some writings familiar to the modern Hebrew Scriptures were notably absent among the DSS, while other previously unknown ancient Jewish writings surfaced among this collection of materials.⁹⁰ As scholars worked to make sense of this collection in the years that followed, they found themselves increasingly grappling with a series of anomalies among these writings when compared to the writings of the traditional Hebrew Scriptures. A notable outcome of this grappling process was that it led researchers to develop a series of literary categories as part of an effort to engage these materials more effectively. This included categories such as *peshet* (פֶּשֶׁט), “pseudepigrapha,” “rewritten Bible,” or the subsequently refined terms “parabiblical,” or “rewritten Scripture.”⁹¹

CE. Even then he recognizes that there was still yet some way to go until anything developed with any close resemblance to the modern framework of “Bible” (*How the Bible Became Holy* [New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014]). VanderKam similarly recognizes the ongoing fluidity of the writings ancient Jewish thinkers considered authoritative into the late Second Temple period (“The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov [London: British Library, 2002], 41–56, esp. 51–52). See also, Mroczek, who recognizes that “fewer and fewer scholars would now argue that ‘Bible’ and ‘canon’ were operative ideas in Second Temple Judaism” (*The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*, 6).

⁸⁹ For a full history of research, see Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Full History* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009). For a critical assessment of the initial discovery and the fabled characters involved, see also Eva Mroczek, “True Stories and the Poetics of Textual Discovery,” *BSR* 45.2 (2016): 21–31.

⁹⁰ How scholars previously accounted for/gauged the presence of individual compositions among the DSS has been problematized in recent years. See, for example, Perrin, “Redrafting,” 44–71, esp. 63–70.

⁹¹ The latter terms “rewritten Scripture” reflected efforts to correct apparent canonical anachronism regarding usage of the term “bible.” On the initial phrasing “rewritten Bible,” see, Géza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961). On the early use of the term “pseudepigrapha,” see, Johann Albert Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (Hamburgi & Lipsiae: Sumptu Christiani Liebezeit, 1713). For more on the history of Fabricius’s publication of this volume, see, Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*, 128–30. On the later shift from “Bible” to “Scripture,” see, for example, VanderKam, who suggests that the DSS attest to the perception of authoritative writings, but also to an ongoing sense of the fluidity of which writing were considered authoritative. In view of this he suggests against the presence of the modern sense of “Bible” (*From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, JSJSup 62 [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 1–30). For a helpful overview and assessment of these classifications and categories in the history of study, see, for example, Daniel A. Machiela, “Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism—A Review of Recent Developments,” *JJS* 61.2 (2010): 308–20.

Despite the considerable developments around these terminologies in the history of research, scholars continue to identify the need for further refinement.⁹² While these and related classifications have offered and still offer heuristic value, scholars have continued to raise issues with how these classifications seemingly (mis)represent how ancient Jewish thinkers understood their literary landscape.⁹³ Davis captured well some of these challenges to past approaches, stating:

These disputes concerning the limits of the term “rewritten Bible,” its distinction from other terms such as “parabiblical,” and the determination of whether it is best construed as a literary genre or only part of a more complex process of scripture transmission have produced a lingering sense of dissatisfaction with their usefulness as classificatory devices.⁹⁴

Mroczek’s abovementioned work seemingly picked up on some of this “lingering sense of dissatisfaction.” She engaged some of these apparent issues and offered several correctives. In her work she suggests that notions such as “rewritten scripture” convey the sense of a particular literary framework with a specific hierarchy of textual importance.⁹⁵ She goes on to say that “the

⁹² On the problems/challenges of the notion of “pseudepigrapha,” see, for example, Perrin, “Redrafting,” 70–71; Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 22–28; Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 130–7. On the problems/challenges with the categories “rewritten bible” and/or “rewritten Scripture,” see, for example, Machiela, “Once More, with Feeling,” 308–20; Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 118–22, 128–89; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 7–8.

⁹³ For more on this, see, for example, Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 118–22, 128–89; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 7–8.

⁹⁴ Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, 25.

⁹⁵ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 118. For recent reconsideration of the notion of “rewritten Scripture” or “rewriting,” a summary of past research and the value of these classifications for future research, see, Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

assumption that the texts we call biblical are necessarily hierarchically superior, primary, or central—and the demotion of other materials to secondary, derivative, or auxiliary status—is based on their privileged place in later, normative Jewish and Christian traditions.”⁹⁶ While she identifies some of the origins or at least the catalyzation of these canonical perceptions as a consequence of the nature of the modern publishing process, she invites scholars towards reading “synchronically and synoptically, rather than hierarchically with the (proto)biblical at the top.”⁹⁷

The work of Mroczek and others has helped bring to light a previous overemphasis on canonical writings in research. Their work further helps explain the previous lack of interest in seemingly more peripheral figures and traditions within those writings. In view of these correctives, there is seemingly an increased need for further exploration of the wider ancient Jewish literary world which is now increasingly accessible through the discovery of the DSS and contemporary efforts of digitization.⁹⁸

1.2.3.4 A Shift in Approach: “On Their Own Terms”

In addition to challenging modern assumptions about a perceived ancient Jewish textual hierarchy, Mroczek’s work simultaneously raised questions as to the purpose and nature of the wider ancient Jewish literary world beyond the “biblical” writings. Mroczek, however, was not the first to consider or engage these types of questions.

The extensive history of study on “pseudepigrapha,” “rewritten Bible,” and other similarly categorized types of literature, reflects a widespread interest in questions pertaining to the

⁹⁶ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 120.

⁹⁷ Mroczek, *The Literary*, 128–9, here 122.

⁹⁸ See, for example, “The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library,” https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/?locale=en_US; “The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha,” <http://pseudepigrapha.org>; “The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls,” <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/>.

purpose and nature of these materials.⁹⁹ Since the early investigation of Vermes, the work of those such as White Crawford, Falk, and most recently Zahn among others have been foundational in shedding greater light on the nature and purpose of this wider body of literature.¹⁰⁰ These investigations have invited considerable reimagination as to how ancient Jewish thinkers, particularly scribes, understood and engaged their literary world.

Alongside the above foundational investigations, Mroczek's study has helped further push back against the impression that these wider ancient Jewish compositions were simply aimed at offering interpretations of materials found within the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁰¹ In this she suggested that scholars have assumed that "the purpose of nonbiblical texts is to fill in the gap or explain the inconsistencies in Scripture, making the nonbiblical both derived from and in the service of the biblical."¹⁰²

The implications of these developing perceptions as to the nature and purpose of the wider ancient Jewish literary world are considerable. As scholarship has historically orientated its investigations in primary relation to the Hebrew Scriptures this has consistently resulted in investigations where the underlying consideration is how so-called "non-canonical" writings

⁹⁹ For a review of some of the contributions and developments in this area of research, see especially, Moshe J. Bernstein, *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, STDJ 107 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 39–62. See also, Machiela, "Once More, with Feeling," 308–20.

¹⁰⁰ Sidnie White Crawford, "The 'Rewritten' Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts," in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies*, ed. Baruch A. Levine et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 1–8; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans, 2008); Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls*, LSTS 63; CQS 8 (London: T & T Clark, 2007); Molly M. Zahn, "Parabiblical Texts/Rewritten Scripture," in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T & T Clark, 2018), 378–86; Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism*; Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," *JBL* 131.2 (2012): 271–88.

¹⁰¹ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 119–20.

¹⁰² Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*, 119–20. For similar observations, see also, Davis, who notes, "despite efforts to distinguish certain texts by virtue of their dependency upon prominent biblical themes, significant events or characters, careful study of most of these so-called 'parabiblical' compositions rarely escape textualised, exegetical treatments." He further draws out this reality in regard to the Jeremianic traditions, arguing that "because the primary witnesses in the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah c* have been classified as 'parabiblical' there is a tendency to appreciate them exclusively in terms of how they functioned exegetically, in their treatment and relationship to other texts" (*The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, 14–15).

might inform different aspects of our understanding of the traditional Hebrew corpus, or the writings contained within.¹⁰³

Although investigations that privilege the writings of the Hebrew Scriptures have resulted in considerable insights over the years, this shift in approach has demonstrated an increasing need not only to categorize wider ancient Jewish writings differently, but to *engage* them differently. There is an increasing call for researchers to approach these writings as individual and independent compositions in their own right, rather than simply treating them primarily as a means to answer questions regarding a core set of writings.

Reed in her recent volume on angels and demons in the Second Temple context further emphasizes the need for this shift. She describes it as moving away from an overemphasis on looking at “what is behind the texts.”¹⁰⁴ Within the introduction of her study, she provides a helpful overview of the previous value of past research, but also the necessity for a change in our approach in present and future studies. While she directs her words specifically to explorations of angels and demons and her investigation in particular, their relevance for wider methodologies remains. She writes:

Diachronic perspectives on Second Temple literature have yielded a wealth of important findings concerning the afterlives of biblical traditions and the Jewish contexts in which Christianity took form. As a result of their dominance, however, there is no dearth of insightful books and articles that interpret Second Temple texts and traditions about angels and demons in relation to biblical ideas about God, Christian ideas about Jesus, or contemporary theological concerns like the Problem of Evil. Effective studies mining

¹⁰³ See also a summary of this overemphasis in the recent study by Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 7–8.

¹⁰⁴ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 10.

“pseudepigrapha” for exegetical and mythic motifs abound. So too with fascinating inquiries into their rich points of connection with the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament. My interest in this book, however, is in recovering some of what is missed when the rise of Jewish interest in angels and demons in Second Temple times is investigated within teleologically diachronic frameworks that center and privilege currently canonical scriptures and the theological categories and concerns of present-day religious communities.¹⁰⁵

Reed further goes on to convey the notable value of this alternative approach and the considerable investigative opportunities that lie ahead. Again, while she orients her words around her present project on angels and demons, they remain hugely relevant for wider related studies. She continues:

Much remains to be discovered from and about these sources, understood on their own terms and in their own contexts. Toward this aim, this book experiments with “reversing the gaze” by placing the earliest “pseudepigrapha” at the center of the analysis and bringing in biblical and other comparanda primarily to illumine them.¹⁰⁶

1.2.3.5 The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls as a Departure Point

Reed’s repeated emphasis on treating these wider materials “on their own terms” and “reversing the gaze” represents an important challenge for future scholarship.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 20–21.

¹⁰⁶ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 36.

¹⁰⁷ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*, 8 n. 31; 14, 20, 36.

As I noted above, the discovery of the DSS opened modern eyes towards a much more expansive literary landscape that existed in the ancient Jewish world: one beyond the materials contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. The Aramaic DSS were among those material finds. While investigations of the DSS in general began in the early 1950s, the publication of the majority of the Aramaic texts happened only within the last twenty years. Although select Aramaic texts were published early on, these preliminary editions remained largely incomplete throughout the early decades of research largely due to issues of access.¹⁰⁸ Further publications occurred in the 1970s, but these were again partial editions based off earlier work.¹⁰⁹ The deficient nature of these publications and the limited number of texts published, resulted in issues of availability up until their recent full publication in 2009.¹¹⁰ Since then, scholars have recognized the ongoing need to refine and improve upon the initial full publications.¹¹¹ In view of these factors, we are

¹⁰⁸ See Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*, (Jerusalem: Magness, 1956); J. T. Milik, “The Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments of the Book of Enoch,” *Bib* 32 (1951): 393–400; J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 62.3 (1955): 398–406; J. T. Milik, “‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel: Fragments araméens de Qumrân 4,” *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15.

¹⁰⁹ These editions worked off J. T. Milik’s earlier work. See J. T. Milik, with the collaboration of Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976); Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Daniel J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts: Second Century B. C.–Second Century A. D.*, *BibOr* 34 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2002); Bastiaan Jongeling, C. J. Labuschagne, and A. S. van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations*, SSS 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976).

¹¹⁰ Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens première partie: 4Q529–549*, DJD 31 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001); Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens deuxième partie: 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587*, DJD 37 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2009).

¹¹¹ See, for example, Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*, CBQMS 10 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-arämaische Wortliste, Register: Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-arämaische Wortliste, Register: Band 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004); Robert H. Eisenman and Michael Owen Wise, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for over 35 Years* (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1993); Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden; Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000); Joseph A. Fitzmyer and Daniel J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts: Second Century B. C.–Second Century A. D.*, *BibOr* 34 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio

still in the process of gaining a sense of the full contours and contents of the Aramaic DSS.

Despite modern efforts to digitize manuscripts, the burgeoning world of digital humanities, and the ways in which technology is increasingly connecting scholars and fostering collaborative research across the globe, these Aramaic materials have still had relatively limited exposure in research.

Scholarly explorations of and engagements with these materials are therefore still only in their early phases, relative to engagements with other similar wider material finds. The Aramaic DSS thus represent an exciting prospect for future scholarly investigation in general.¹¹² The abovementioned interest in reallocating efforts towards independent explorations of the wider ancient Jewish literary world—specifically in terms of individual figures and traditions—makes them an increasingly appealing subject of study. This is largely due to the underlying contents of the Aramaic corpus.¹¹³ While the Aramaic corpus contains select materials more closely related

Istituto Biblico, 2002); Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Genesis Apocryphon and Related Documents*, ed. James Hamilton Charlesworth, Henry Wolfgang Morisada Rietz, and Loren L. Johns, PTSDSSP 8A (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018); Robert R. Duke, *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)*, StBibLit 135, (New York: Peter Lang, 2010); Andrew B. Perrin and Matthew Hama, “4Q548 (Dualistic Fragments in Aramaic),” in *The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha*, ed. Ian W. Scott, Ken M. Penner, and David M. Miller (Society of Biblical Literature, 2017), <http://pseudepigrapha.org/docs/intro/4Q548>; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*.

¹¹² Reed underscores the Aramaic DSS as an intriguing departure point for future research in that her study centers on the Aramaic DSS. She specifically emphasizes their considerable prospects of investigation in her introduction (*Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*, esp. 14–18).

¹¹³ Throughout the history of research scholars have often wrestled with the question of the unity of the Aramaic materials, particularly whether we should treat these materials as a corpus. Over the years, however, scholars have increasingly affirmed this perception. For more on the bases for treating these materials as a corpus, see, for example Daniel A. Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts,” *JAAJ* 2 (2014): 113–34, here 117; Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, SJSJ 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–205; Devorah Dimant, “Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 15–45; Daniel A. Machiela, “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Coherence and Context in the Library of Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016), 250; Daniel Machiela, “Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Settings,” in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism: Engaging with John Collins’ The Apocalyptic*

to writings contained in the Hebrew Scriptures including various Daniel traditions (1Q71–72; 4Q112–116; 6Q7; 4Q243–245; 4Q551), a Translation of Leviticus (4Q156), and a Translation of Job (4Q157; 11Q10), most of the Aramaic materials largely fall outside of that traditionally conceptualized camp.¹¹⁴ The Aramaic DSS primarily concentrate around seemingly more “fringe” figures within the Hebrew Scriptures. While scholars have classified some of the materials in which these figures appear under the notion of “rewritten Scripture” they have also designated a large contingent under the alternative category of “pseudepigrapha.” These materials capture distinct portraits of lesser-known figures including Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Batenosh, Emzera, Sarai (Sarah), Miriam, Levi, Qahat, Amram, Raguel, Edna, Anna, Tobit, Tobias, and Sarah (daughter of Raguel) among others.

What makes this emphasis on lesser-known ancient Jewish figures further appealing, is that the Aramaic DSS commonly preserve portraits of these figures from a first-person literary perspective. Scholars have noted the significance of the use of first-person perspective on various occasions and as having a series of different potential functions.¹¹⁵ For figure-based investigations this concentration of first-person voice is notable in that it offers perhaps a closer,

Imagination, ed. Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018), 90; Andrew B. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*, JAJSup 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 24–25; Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 18.

¹¹⁴ Hempel previously challenged long held perceptions regarding how we classify DSS Daniel materials. She notes, “whereas it used to be taken for granted that the Qumran Daniel-cycle presupposes the Book of Daniel, current thinking allows for the possibility that it includes independent traditions related to Daniel” (*The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 233–34). Perrin recently followed Hempel’s earlier proposal and further pushed back on assumptions that the DSS Daniel materials all similarly map cleanly onto the content preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures. In doing so, he challenged scholars towards a more nuanced handling of these materials through the lens of both “figures” and “traditions,” (“Redrafting,” 44–71).

¹¹⁵ See, for example, Stuckenbruck, who explores the prominent usage of first person discourse in the Aramaic and some of its potential functions (“Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the Yahad,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*, ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 295–326. See also, Machiela, “Situating the Aramaic Texts,” 91; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

more personalized engagement with individual figures. As readers, we gain important insights into the inner processing and thinking of these individual figures within the specific narrative events in which they appear.

Another quality of the Aramaic DSS that makes them an enticing prospect for study, is their compositional date. Although there is debate around the specific compositional dating of the Aramaic materials, scholars tend to locate it between the fourth and first centuries BCE.¹¹⁶ This range of compositional dates is significant for numerous reasons, of which I will highlight a couple. First, this date range places the Aramaic DSS among our earliest available material witnesses to the ancient Jewish literary world. The Aramaic DSS therefore provide us access to the earliest available portraits of these figures and traditions in material culture. This is not to dismiss the value of later portraits, but it does give us notable insight into early representations of individual figures and later developing impressions among ancient scribal thinkers. Second, this specific date range is also significant in view of how it maps onto the wider ancient Jewish literary world. These dates indicate that the Aramaic DSS likely represent scribal perspectives from the late Persian and Hellenistic periods. In view of growing impressions of much later dates for the “final” formations of many of the writings of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Aramaic materials likely represent an alternative contemporary witness to that scribal moment in time.¹¹⁷ While we have grown accustomed to exploring the portraits of ancient Jewish figures from the

¹¹⁶ See, for example, Georges Bonani et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Radiocarbon* 34.3 (1992): 843–49. For an overview/reassessment on the specific dating of many of the individual Aramaic texts, see also, Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*. For a general observation as to this compositional date range, see, Daniel A. Machiela, “The Compositional Setting and Implied Audience of Some Aramaic Texts from Qumran: A Working Hypothesis,” *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*, ed. Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, STDJ 131 (Leiden; Boston, 2020), 170.

¹¹⁷ See, for example, Najman, who observes, that despite perceptions of a “fixed biblical text as early as the Persian period” that there is the common acknowledgement of the ongoing “fluidity of biblical traditions” (*Seconding Sinai*, 8).

perspective of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Aramaic materials offer an exciting alternative viewpoint.

In terms of Jewish identity, the abovementioned contours make the Aramaic DSS an especially intriguing departure point for research. In view of our earlier emphasis on the considerable potential for using individual figures for exploring Jewish identity, the presence of a robust portfolio of understudied ancient Jewish figures from a distinctly informative first-person perspective makes the Aramaic DSS especially attractive for our present study of identity. This in combination with the fact that the Aramaic materials capture some of the most concentrated portraits of many of these figures in the earliest available material evidence, further elevates their potential for understanding Jewish identity. By investigating identity through the frame of individual figures in the Aramaic DSS, we have an opportunity to develop a distinct understanding of ancient Jewish scribal perspectives on what it meant to be Jewish.

1.2.3.6 Narrowing the Focus: The Figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram

The Aramaic DSS capture a broad spectrum of figures within various contexts. Scholars have often classified this division as representing two general groups. Tigchelaar, for example, conceived of a “dual division” representing either “pre-Mosaic” or “Eastern Diaspora” contexts.¹¹⁸ To manage the scope of the present investigation, we will focus on figures from the

¹¹⁸ Eibert Tigchelaar, “The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar, SJSJ 122 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007), 261. García Martínez similarly noted that “we can assert that the Aramaic literature found at Qumran is characterized by a predominant interest in ‘pre-Mosaic’ protagonists or by a setting in the diaspora” (“Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010], 437).

“pre-Mosaic” period. This means we will not engage later figures within a diaspora context such as Daniel, Tobit, Edna, Anna, Tobias, or Sarah (daughter of Raguel).

The above distinction between pre-Mosaic and diaspora contexts is helpful to some extent in orienting readers to the Aramaic DSS. Yet this division, particularly the “pre-Mosaic” classification perhaps reflects an overly broad classification of the materials. Dimant previously offered a helpful additional qualification to this grouping. To provide greater precision to this category, she alternatively divided these “pre-Mosaic” figures into either “antediluvian generations” or “biblical patriarchs.”¹¹⁹

If we consider the “antediluvian generations” in the Aramaic materials, among the lesser-known figures from the Hebrew Scriptures that we encounter include those such as: Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Batenosh, Emzera, and Sarai (Sarah). While this grouping represents an intriguing opportunity for investigation, many of these figures, especially Enoch, have featured either prominently or recently within the history of study.¹²⁰ In view of this and in view of our

¹¹⁹ Devorah Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 18.

¹²⁰ The prominence of Enoch in research is perhaps unsurprising in that he appears with a relatively high frequency in the Aramaic DSS. He shows up as central figure in 1 Enoch (4Q201–202; 4Q204–207; 4Q208–211; 4Q212; 7Q4; 7Q8; 7Q11–14), Book of Giants (1Q23; 1Q24; 2Q26; 4Q203; 4Q206 2–3; 4Q530; 4Q531; 4Q532; 4Q556; 6Q8), as well as seemingly in the writing known as “Words of Michael” (4Q529; 4Q571; 6Q23). He makes a cameo appearance in other writings, such as Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). Further, as in the likely case of Words of Michael, the fragmentary nature of the Aramaic DSS does not allow us to rule out his possible appearance in additional writings where the identity of the first-person speaker remains concealed. Beyond his wide appearance in these materials, we can perhaps explain his prominence in research as a result of scholarly awareness of and engagement with Enochic materials prior to the discovery of the DSS. The Enochic materials alternatively survived in wider Ethiopic traditions. Through these means of access in addition to the DSS, scholars have explored Enoch and so-called “Enochic Judaism” at considerable length as exemplified in long standing existence of dedicated initiatives such the “Enochic Seminar.” For more on the Enoch Seminar, see, “Enoch Seminar Online: International Scholarship on Second Temple Judaism and Christian, Rabbinic, and Islamic Origins,” <http://enochseminar.org/>. See, also, Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich: William B. Eerdmans, 1998); Gabriele Boccaccini, “The Rediscovery of Enochic Judaism and the Enoch Seminar,” in *The Origins of Enochic Judaism*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Hen* 24.1/2 (Turin: Zamorani, 2002), 9–13; Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., “Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 1–13. See, also, John C. Reeves and Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018). As per the wider figures among this group, recent studies include, Peters, *Noah Traditions*; Pieter W. van der Horst, *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, AJEC 87 (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014), 6–20; 30–36; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Lamech Narrative in the Genesis Apocryphon

present interest in exploring wider, understudied figures, I have chosen to focus our attention elsewhere.

Following Dimant, alongside these antediluvian portraits, the Aramaic materials preserve a considerable concentration of traditions centered on what she termed “biblical patriarchs.”¹²¹ Among this ancestral group there are a surprising number of individuals related to or brought into the purview of priestly lineage, priestly stories, or priestly knowledge. In view of this notable concentration of priestly related figures, as well as the limited treatment of many of these figures within the history of study, my analysis will focus on a core cluster of priestly figures. The Aramaic materials attest to a wide network of priestly personas. Some, such as the figure of Aaron and his subsequent generations, have received notable attention in research in recent years.¹²² Many others, however, remain unidentifiable due to the fragmentary nature of the

(1QapGen) and Birth of Noah (4QEnochc Ar): A Tradition-Historical Study,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, STDJ 94 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 253–75; Stuckenbruck, “The Lamech Narrative in the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen) and 1 Enoch 106–107: A Tradition-Historical Study of Two Accounts about Noah’s Birth,” in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Moshe J. Bernstein, “From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*, STDJ 107 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 151–74; Ida Fröhlich, “Medicine and Magic in Genesis Apocryphon. Ideas on Human Conception and Its Hindrances,” *RevQ* 25.2 (98) (2011): 177–98; Laura Quick, “Lamech’s Change of Mind: The Hellenistic Philosophy behind the Use of אָשׁ in the Genesis Apocryphon and the Book of Daniel,” *AS* 11.1 (2013): 53–66; Laura Quick, “Bitenosh’s Orgasm, Galen’s Two Seeds and Conception Theory in the Hebrew Bible,” *DSD* 28.1 (2021): 38–63.

¹²¹ Devorah Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 18. In view of the broader gender representation within this group as well as anachronistic nature of the term “bible” for the period in question, I opt for the language of “ancestral figures.”

¹²² On Aaron and his descendants, see, for example, Heinz-Josef Fabry, “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran,” in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments: Festschrift für Erich Zenger*, ed. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, HB 44 (Freiberg: Herder, 2004); Liora Goldman, “Between Aaron and Moses in 4QVisions of Amram,” *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (2019): 101–18; Charlotte Hempel, “Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If so Was It Mutual?,” *RevQ* 24.1 (2009): 135–53; Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 195–210; 211–27; Charlotte Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, SJSJ 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); Koji Osawa, “Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Whitewash or Criticism,” *JISMOR* 15 (2020): 34–50; Julio Trebolle Barrera, “Moisés y Aarón,” *EO* 89–90 (2019): 5–22.

material culture.¹²³ In view of this, I am interested in alternatively focussing on materials that preserve portraits of *known* and *named* priestly ancestors.

Miriam appears among the known and named priestly figures in these materials. Her presence in the Aramaic DSS maps onto a notable scribal interest in this corpus for developing lore around wider female figures who appear largely veiled in the traditions preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures.¹²⁴ The work of Tervanotko and others in recent years have given important attention to these wider understudied female figures including Miriam, who makes appearances in writing such as Visions of Amram (VA hereafter) (4Q543–547) or the so-called composition of “Miriam and Hur” (4Q549).¹²⁵ While there remains considerable work to be done in terms of exploring the presence of Miriam and other similar female personas in the Aramaic DSS, in view of these recent contributions, I wish to direct our primary investigation elsewhere.

Another named figure who has a notable presence in the Aramaic materials is Levi. Studies of Levi have appeared with relative frequency throughout the history of research particularly in view of later Christian writings such as Testament of Levi, as well as the preservation of Levi traditions in Greek, Syriac, and wider Aramaic materials apart from the

¹²³ Scholars have conjectured as to the presence of different priestly personas in these materials, as in the case of 4Q540–541, the writing commonly known as “New Jerusalem” (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a, 5Q15, 11Q18), or the writing commonly known as “Words of Michael” (4Q529). For early observations of 4Q540–541 as pertaining to Levi, see, Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 213–16. For proposals for Jacob as the seer in the New Jerusalem materials, see, Eibert Tigchelaar, “The Imaginal Context,” 257–70, esp. 268. For proposals as to the identity of the first-person speaker in 4Q529 as Enoch, see, for example, Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 1. Despite these proposals, the material evidence unfortunately inhibits us from being certain of any such conclusions. For an emphasis on the uncertainties, challenges, and complexities of the identities of these figures in question, see, Stuckenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse,” 314–15; 318–19.

¹²⁴ For example, Emzera (1Q20), Sarai (1Q20), Edna (1 En. 85:3), Anna (Tob 2:11), Sarah (daughter of Raguel) (Tob 3:7), Edna (wife of Raguel) (Tob 7:2). For more on the notable inclusion of named female figures in the Aramaic DSS, see, for example, Machiela, *Coherence and Context*, 252.

¹²⁵ Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice*; Hanna Tervanotko, “Members of Levite Family and Ideal Marriages in Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram and Jubilees,” *RevQ* 106 [2015]: 155–76. See also, Sidnie White Crawford, “Women in Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2010), 123–51; Sidnie White Crawford, “Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Women and Judaism*, ed. L. J. Greenspoon, R. Simkins, and J. Cahan, SJC 14 (Omaha: Creighton University Press, 2003), 33–44. See also, the recent MA thesis by Shelby Bennet (“Silenced Voices: Hearing Biblical Women Through the Genesis Apocryphon” [Trinity Western University, MA, 2021]).

DSS. Despite the influx of Levi research over the years, his limited portrait in the Hebrew Scriptures and his rather enigmatic profile in those materials makes him an interesting case for exploring Jewish identity. The discovery of a considerable complex of first-person Levi traditions associated with the writing commonly known as Aramaic Levi Document (ALD hereafter) (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q213b, 4Q214, 4Q214a, 4Q214b) among the DSS makes the prospect of exploring the figure of Levi increasingly intriguing. Levi's notable intersections with the additional named figures of Qahat and Amram in the Aramaic DSS compound those prospects. Unlike Levi, the figures of Qahat and Amram, both close descendants of Levi, have received far less attention in scholarship over the years. This is likely due to a combination of some of the abovementioned realities.¹²⁶ This consequently makes explorations of Qahat and Amram as individual figures alongside Levi, particularly enticing.

As I already noted regarding Levi, each of these three figures appears in a writing in which they operate as the first-person speaker: Levi in ALD; Qahat in Words of Qahat (WQ) (4Q542); and Amram in VA (4Q543–547).¹²⁷ Each of them also appears as a named figure in the writings attributed to the other figures. Scholars have observed these intersections at various points throughout the history of research, often at a compositional level.¹²⁸ Some have previously

¹²⁶ As noted above, those realities include their highly limited profiles in the Hebrew Scriptures and the more recent publication of the Aramaic DSS.

¹²⁷ Machiela recently raised questions as to the nature of 4Q542 as an independent composition (“Is the Testament of Qahat Part of the Visions of Amram? Material and Literary Considerations of 4Q542 and 4Q547,” *JSJ* 52.1 (2020): 27–38). For more on this proposal, see chapter three in the present work, entitled “Qahat.”

¹²⁸ In Milik's early engagement with the Aramaic DSS materials, he seemed to pick up on this ancestral grouping of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in view of his reading of Apos. Con. VI 16.3 (J. T. Milik, “4Q Visions de 'Amram et Une Citation D'origène,” *RB* 79.1 (1972): 96). In the years that followed, scholars seemingly built upon Milik's early impression under the notion of a “trilogy.” See, for example, Henryk Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*, SJSJ 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 245; Henryk Drawnel, “The Literary Form and Didactic Content of the Admonitions (Testament) Of Qahat,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 63–70; Duke, *Social Location*, 4; Hanna Tervanotko, “A Trilogy of Testaments: The Status of the Testament of Qahat versus Texts Attributed to Levi and Amram,” *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures: Contributions of the 61th Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense that took place from July 26–28, 2012 in the Maria-Theresia College and Paus Adrianus VI College of the KU Leuven*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA:

challenged the extent of continuity amongst this group (primarily at a textual level between ALD, WQ, and VA).¹²⁹ Yet, as Perrin notes, the overarching perception in scholarship regarding this group of figures or more commonly their associated texts or traditions, is largely one of “cogency, coherence, and continuity.”¹³⁰

Both scholarly precedent for engaging these figures (or their related material culture) as a group, as well as the underlying literary intersections between these figures as briefly noted above, offer a compelling basis for further exploration along these lines.

In view of ongoing perceptions of Levi, Qahat, and Amram and their underlying traditions as a distinct grouping, my intention, however, is not to entrench them further within this frame. Rather my hope is that by exploring a complex of related figures rather than a single figure, my investigation will internally provide natural points of comparison. This will allow us to develop a more nuanced perception of each of their distinct profiles of Jewish identity. Additionally, as we look at both similarities and differences among this group, we will be better positioned to understand how they fit within a wider and more expansive network of ancestral

Peeters, 2014), 41–59; Elisa Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue: Ancestral Inheritance in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542),” *BibInt* 29.2 (2020): 210; Sidnie White Crawford, “Exodus in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr [Leiden: Brill, 2014], 314; Andrew D. Gross, “Testament of Kohath,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1869; Émile Puech, “Le Testament de Qahat en Araméen de La Grotte 4 (‘4QTQah’),” *RevQ* 15.1/2 (57/58) (1991): 50). Perrin’s recent study, however, reengaged Milik’s early work, arguing that this impression of a “trilogy” was not entirely representative of Milik’s proposal. In a wider exploration of Milik, Perrin suggests that “to my knowledge, Milik never used the term ‘trilogy’ to refer to *ALD*, *WQ*, and *VA* in his published works” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). While Perrin recognizes Milik’s perception of a grouping amongst these figures, he argues that this grouping was only one among other ancestral groupings that he perceived (see, for example, J. T. Milik, “Écrits Préesséniens de Qumrân: D’Hénoch à Amram,” in *Qumrân: Sa Piété, Sa Théologie et Son Milieu*, ed. M. Delcor [Paris: Duculot, 1978], 91–106, esp. 106.) In view of this, Perrin suggests the alternative language of a “constellation” of figures as more appropriately reflecting Milik’s initial perceptions (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; see, also, Andrew B. Perrin, “Charting Constellations of Aramaic Jewish Pseudepigrapha at Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Hellenistic Judea: Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies [Aberdeen, 5–8 August, 2019]*, ed. Barry Hartog, Andrew B. Perrin, and in collaboration with Shelby Bennet and Matthew Hama, STDJ 142 [Leiden: Brill, 2023], forthcoming)].

¹²⁹ See, for example, Tervanotko, “A Trilogy of Testaments.”

¹³⁰ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

figures within the ancient Jewish literary context. This will also help us to rethink some of the other non-priestly figures that appear in the Aramaic DSS.¹³¹

1.3 The Present Approach: A Quest for Greater Precision

As Eckhardt observed in his volume of collected essays on Jewish identity and politics, “it can hardly be claimed that Jewish identity in the Second Temple period is a neglected field of research.”¹³² Eckhardt’s volume as one example among many, came out in 2012. And despite a further influx of ancient Jewish identity research in the past ten years, here is “another” study on Jewish identity.¹³³

Given Eckhardt’s own volume centered on ancient Jewish identity, his comments were admittedly a bit tongue in cheek. His apparent impression at the time was that there was still work to be done on the subject. I am convinced that that remains true at present.

In view of the abovementioned shifts in investigative focus and the opportunities presented by the discovery of the DSS, my work will explore Jewish identity through the lens of individual

¹³¹ I.e., Daniel, Tobit, Batenosh, etc.

¹³² Benedikt Eckhardt, “Introduction: Yet Another Book on Jewish Identity in Antiquity,” in *Jewish Identity and Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*, ed. Benedikt Eckhardt, SJSJ 155 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 1–10, here, 1.

¹³³ Among the sea of explorations on identity in the last decade, a few recent studies include, Marieke Dhont, “Jewish Poets, Greek Poetry: Language and Identity in the Hellenistic Jewish Poetic Tradition,” *BN* 189 (2021): 65–86; Ari Mermelstein, *Power and Emotion in Ancient Judaism: Community and Identity in Formation*. (Cambridge: University Press, 2021); William M. Schniedewind, “Language and Group Identity in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case for an “Essene Hebrew”,” in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Fifth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Jointly Sponsored by the Eliezer Ben-Yehuda Center for the Study of the History of the Hebrew Language, 29–31 December, 2008*, ed. Steven Ellis Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher, and Ruth Clements, STDJ 108 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 280–91; Rainer Albertz and Jakob Wohrle, eds., *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013). Staples, *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism*; Daniel Daley, “Inheritance, Inclusion, and Identity in Tobit and the Jewish Diaspora,” *Bib* 102.3 (2021): 321–34. Jonathan R. Trotter, “Jewish Identity and the Intercommunal Links between Diaspora Jewish Communities in the Second Temple Period,” *JAJ* 12.1 (2021): 71–93; Elisa Uusimäki, “Wisdom, Scripture, and Identity Formation in 4QBeatitudes,” in *Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Samuel Byrskog, Raimo Hakola, and Jutta M. Jokiranta, SUNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 175–86.

figures. I will do this through close textual readings, philological analysis, and literary critical investigation, building upon recent research on the importance of foundational figures and developing impressions as to the nature and purpose of traditions preserved in materials beyond the Hebrew Scriptures. Taking up the three figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, my investigation will proceed as follows. I will approach each figure individually. I will begin by introducing the figure in question through a survey of their portrait in the traditional Hebrew and Greek Scriptures and explore their broader portrait in wider Second Temple literature and beyond. I will then shift our attention towards the earliest and most concentrated portrait of that figure contained in material culture. For this, I will turn to the Aramaic DSS for the abovementioned reasons.

In this engagement I will make use of the textual boundaries of material culture as a natural way to delimit the content which I engage. My adoption of textual boundaries in this way will merely function to delimit content. My analysis will therefore maintain a distinct concern for the world beyond those textual boundaries by placing primary focus on the individual figure in question in the specific material culture rather than on exploring Jewish identity wholesale in a specific “text.”

With this emphasis on individual figures at the forefront of the investigation, I will then introduce the specific material culture of the Aramaic DSS in which the figure in question most predominantly appears. I will orient the investigation by looking at certain notable trends in research for the material culture in question. I will then shift our attention towards exploring the distinct profile of identity for that given figure.

The exploration of a distinct profile of identity for each of the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, will center on five primary concepts. I will explore how each figure develops various

distinct features of identity in relation to the concepts of *kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space*.

I developed this specific suite of concepts in view of two primary considerations. First, I identified a shared list of concepts through various preliminary surveys of the primary portraits of these three figures in the Aramaic DSS. Among that list, these five concepts appeared to have a special shared currency among this group of individual figures. Although these concepts are shared among these figures, my exploration will pay careful attention to their independent significance for each of them. In this sense I will leave space for both continuity and variety of expression. Second, I adopted these concepts in view of some of the notable precedents in previous research. Each of these items appears to register with notable importance within broader conversations on Jewish identity. In this sense, while the nature of my study will diverge from many of the apparent interests of other previous identity investigations, I will maintain several critical intersections with them. This will allow clear access points so that future scholarship can engage my work within wider research frameworks and conversations.

For the present study, I understand/engage each of the above items as follows:

- ***Kinship***: *The genealogical connections (real or imagined) that exist between individuals or groups.*
- ***Tradition***: *The transmission of a core set of virtues from one generation to the next, often catalyzed by an appeal to some form of lore.¹³⁴*

¹³⁴ I adopt the language of “virtue” from Uusimäki’s recent engagement with WQ (“In Search of Virtue,” 206–28). In the article, she defines virtue as “qualities perceived as good and thus desirable,” (“In Search of Virtue,” 207) building off Swanson’s earlier exploration of virtue (Virtue Ethics: A Pluralistic View [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003]). In my estimation, the language of “virtue” through this lens will offer a more precise way to engage some of the specific “beliefs” of Levi, Qahat, and Amram. This impression comes from the limitations or challenges of language such as “belief” and occasionally with the term “practice.” In the case of the language of “belief” I will attempt to limit my usage of this term in favour of virtue. I do so since “belief” is at times overly vague or often

- **Revelation:** *The reception of otherworldly knowledge from an otherworldly source.*¹³⁵
- **Time:** *The conceptualization and engagement with temporal aspects of reality.*
- **Space:** *The conceptualization and engagement with physical or imagined dimensional aspects of reality.*

I will explore how each of the figures in question develops each of the above concepts as a notable feature of their individual identity profile. Although I will engage each concept on an individual basis, there does appear at times notable *interplay* and *overlap* between select concepts (i.e., *time* and *space*; *tradition* and *revelation*). While these intersections are at times important to recognize and investigate, the extent to which figures develop individual aspects of these concepts seems to warrant treating them on an individual basis.

carries forward meaning from heavily charged confessional notions of “faith.” The language of “practice,” while remaining functional in select circumstances seems to necessitate a type of embodied expression. Virtue on the other hand seems to be more inclusive, neutral, and functional in terms of capturing deeply held values as “qualities perceived as good and thus desirable.” With this awareness in mind, I will adopt both the language of “virtue” and “practice” throughout the present study with a preference on adopting “virtue” when context conveys more than a specific embodied notion of practice.

¹³⁵ The concept of revelation has considerable intersections with the notion of “apocalyptic” and the apocalyptic genre. This area of study has generated considerable scholarly interest and debate throughout the history of study. While we will occasionally draw on some of these intersections and past related research, for our present engagement with the concept of revelation, in view of the considerable ongoing complexity and debate surrounding the language of “apocalypse” and “apocalyptic” its associated genre, I will intentionally abstain from adopting it into our present study. While we could perhaps profitably integrate this language and wider research frame into our present approach, my impression is that doing so may at times blur the focus of our engagement. In view of this we will proceed with the concept of “revelation” as defined above. For comprehensive introduction to apocalypses, apocalyptic, and the apocalyptic genre and its history of study, see, Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I),” *CurBS* 5.2 (2007): 235–86; Lorenzo DiTommaso, “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity: (Part II),” *CurBS* 5.3 (2007): 367–432; John Joseph Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Routledge, 1997); John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2016); . For more on the intersections between the apocalyptic and the Aramaic DSS, see, for example, Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought,” 113–34; Daniel A. Machiela, “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview: The First Enoch Seminar Nangeroni Meeting Villa Cagnola, Gazzada (June 25–28, 2012)*, LSTS 88 (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 147–56.

Further, while this investigation will focus on the distinct representation of each of these concepts in relation to the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, these concepts are not unique to them within ancient Jewish context. These concepts and many of their underlying features have considerable representation in the broader Aramaic DSS and in wider Second Temple literature. Although we will consider some of these touch points with wider materials within our engagement, the limited scope of this project will inevitably force us to overlook others.

Moreover, by limiting my investigation to these five primary concepts, this admittedly places notable limits on our engagement with identity. This is intentional. My goal is not to create an exhaustive catalogue of every possible feature of identity for each figure in question. Rather, I want to consider a few key frames that will allow us to identify and appreciate the contours of each individual figure's profile of Jewish identity most fully within a limited investigation.¹³⁶

My hope in compiling individual profiles of identity for Levi, Qahat, and Amram is not to convey my findings as a definitive portfolio of these five conceptual parts of their identity. As always, we must leave room for alternative interpretations, whether in view of new discoveries, or simply as different perspectives on the content. Rather, I hope that the present study can

¹³⁶ The importance of the notion of otherness and outsider language has become a notable area of investigation for Second Temple studies. Although notions of otherness and othering appear in various regards in connection with the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in the Aramaic materials, and in do so potentially contribute important contours to their developing identity profiles, I have intentionally chosen to exclude an exploration of these features from my present investigation. This is not to suggest that notions of otherness are not important for their profiles of identity, rather in view of the limited scope of this project, my impression is that our present analysis is best served by focussing on the aspects of their identities that might be considered to some extent "internal" or "self-contained." For more on the importance of otherness and the other for identity formation in the MT, DSS, and in wider Second Temple literature, see, for example, Jean Duhaime, "La Règle de la Guerre (1QM), 131–46; Finitsis, "The Other in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8," 116–31; Nickelsburg, "Polarized Self-Identification," 22–31; Konstan, "Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity," 97–110; Gruen, "Did Ancient Identity," 1–22; Susan Niditch, "Defining and Controlling Others Within: Hair, Identity, and the Nazirite Vow in a Second Temple Context," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, ed. Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky (Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2011), 67–85; Steven Weitzman, "On the Political Relevance," 165–72.

function as a foundation for future reassessments and reanalyses of Jewish identity in the Aramaic DSS and beyond, particularly in terms of a question of “precision.”

Generally speaking, the common scholarly aim of “thinking better” about a given topic represents an ongoing quest for greater precision: *a quality of accuracy or exactness*. While often a relative or subjectively perceived sense of precision, it is a pursuit of “precision” nonetheless. The figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, as we will observe, have featured to varying degrees in previous scholarship. Through those past studies we have grown in acquaintance with each of these individual figures and perhaps developed a sense of what constitutes each of their profiles of identity, often through canonical or text-centric frames. These past text-centric or canonical frames, however, typically generated either broad or limited portraits of these figures. This is not a reflection of the quality of past scholarship, but a result of their primary aims or focuses. In view of shifting trends in research and new opportunities for interacting with material culture, as I have outlined above, there is opportunity for greater precision, especially in thinking about the present question of the profiles of Jewish identity for these three figures.

While past observations certainly exist in terms of the intersections between these figures and the above concepts of *kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space*, there exists new opportunities in terms of precisely locating these figures alongside these concepts and mapping out more detailed identity profiles. In other words, when we talk about Levi’s intersections with space as a feature of his identity in the Aramaic DSS, what do we specifically mean? Can we add greater exactness or precision to our understanding of these connections? Similarly, can we speak with greater accuracy when we talk about Amram’s intersections with the concept of revelation, or Qahat’s intersections with the notion of kinship in these same materials? My impression ongoing, is yes. We can and should build upon and refine past understandings and

observations to add greater precision to how we understand Jewish identity in relation to the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram.

Within this idealized vision of scholarship there arise distinct opportunities and circumstances that make these pursuits more accessible and their prospects more intriguing. In view of past and shifting trends in research, my sense is that for understanding Jewish identity, the Aramaic DSS represent just that type of distinct coming together of opportunity and circumstance. In view of that, let us now turn to consider Jewish identity through figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in the Aramaic DSS.

2 Levi

2.1 The Ancient Jewish Figure of Levi

2.1.1 Levi's Polarizing Profile in the Hebrew Scriptures

Perhaps the most well-known modern portrait of the ancient Jewish figure of Levi comes from the traditions preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures. Our initial introduction to Levi in those materials comes as part of a narrative about his conception and birth. This narrative falls within a larger account pertaining to Levi's father, Jacob and his attempts to escape family discord—largely of his own creation (i.e., Gen 25:19–34; 27:1–28:9)—, journey to and settle in a new land (Gen 28:10–29:8), attempt to start a family of his own (Gen 29:9–22), navigate an array of subsequent relational complexities that develop within his own immediate family unit (Gen 29:23–32:3), and reconcile the initial family discord that he first set out to escape (Gen 32:4–33:18). Amidst this, we read of Levi's conception and birth (Gen 29:34).¹

Within the short depiction of Levi's conception and birth, Leah, Levi's mother, conveys her hope that her son's entrance into the world might improve her own troubled relational realities (Gen 29:34). She alludes to this as part of an onomastic presentation of Levi's name (לוי), acknowledging its connection with the term לֹוּה ("to join").

Following this initial depiction, Levi does not reappear in the narrative until many years later when his family arrives in the land of Shechem (Gen 33:18). At this point, Levi has seemingly grown into a young man. His family's arrival follows on the heels of his father Jacob's long anticipated reconciliation with his brother, Esau (Gen 33:1–16).

¹ Levi's conception and birth occur as part of a developing rivalry between two sisters named Rachel and Leah. In addition to being sisters, these two both happen to be wives of Levi's father, Jacob; a reality which largely contributes to their developing rivalry.

Upon arriving in Shechem, Levi takes up a notable role within an account pertaining to his sister, Dinah (Gen 33:19–34:31). This account captures a brutal episode in which a local man named Shechem, a son of Hamor, sees Dinah, takes her against her will, and rapes her (Gen 34:1–2). Following Shechem’s egregious actions, he expresses his “affections” for Dinah, and seeks to take her as his wife (Gen 34:3). Eventually, Levi, among the “sons of Jacob” (בני יעקב), returns from working in the fields, and hears the news of the victimization of his sister (Gen 34:7). Both him and his brothers are enraged. The account captures the ways in which Levi and his brothers navigate the aftermath of this event, which includes a marriage proposal from Shechem. Levi and his brothers, most notably Simeon, respond to Shechem with a counter proposal. They suggest that Shechem and all his local compatriots undergo a mass circumcision to reconcile some of their key group differences in support of his proposed marriage with Dinah (Gen 34:13–17).² Shechem and his father relay this counterproposal to their group, who reluctantly agree to it (Gen 34:18–24).

Amidst these events, we learn that Levi along with his brother, Simeon have ulterior motives in their proposal to Shechem and his family (Gen 34:13). We see this following the circumcision event, as Levi and Simeon go on to slaughter all the Shechemites by sword and rescue Dinah from Shechem’s house (Gen 34:25–26). The account further depicts how Levi’s other brothers subsequently plunder the town of its remaining inhabitants and possessions (Gen 34:27–28).

The narrative has little to say on what follows these events, apart from a brief address from Jacob to Levi and Simeon. Though Jacob’s words are limited, we get a clear impression of disapproval. In this moment, the core of Jacob’s frustration appears to be a concern about the

² Gen 34:14^{LXX} specifically captures Levi and Simeon as the spokesmen for the group, rejecting Shechem’s proposal in view of their uncircumcised state and presenting a counterproposal of circumcision.

ways in which his sons' actions have tarnished his local reputation and created an unwanted prospect of retaliatory action (Gen 34:30).³ Yet Levi's and Simeon's response to Jacob seems to give the impression that they feel their actions are justified. They offer a blunt response, stating: "should our sister be treated like a whore?" (Gen 34:31).

Years later, at the time of Jacob's death, we seem to gain a greater understanding of Jacob's disapproval of his two sons' actions at Shechem (Gen 49:5–7). Among his final words, Jacob addresses each of his sons, including Levi, as to what he envisions for their futures (Gen 49:1–28). In this episode, Jacob offers a combined address to Levi and Simeon, seemingly singling them out in view of their actions at Shechem. He appears to indicate this event as his point of reference through his description of them as bearing "weapons of violence" (כלי חמס) (Gen 49:5), as well as in his pronouncements that follow (Gen 49:6–7).⁴ Jacob's words convey a sense of his two sons being careless and impulsive. He appears to focus in on the nature of their "anger" (אנף) and "wrath" (עבר) as a basis for pronouncing over them a less than favorable future marked by division and scattering.⁵

The Levi traditions in Genesis thus leave us with a limited but notable portrait of him as a figure. He initially appears as representing a mother's hope for unity. He resurfaces as a protective brother, proactive in his efforts to guard his family and bring forth justice by his own hands. Yet the lingering impression of Levi seems to come through the pronouncements of his

³ The description of Jacob address to his two sons reads as follows: "Then Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, "You have brought trouble on me by making me odious to the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites and the Perizzites; my numbers are few, and if they gather themselves against me and attack me, I shall be destroyed, both I and my household" (Gen 34:30). All translations of the MT throughout are from the NRSV.

⁴ Jacob states: "May I never come into their council; may I not be joined to their company—for in their anger they killed men, and at their whim they hamstrung oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel! I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel" (Gen 49:6–7). Cf. Jub. 39:13–17, in which Jacob addresses Levi on his own and offers a more favorable outlook on his son's future.

⁵ This emphasis on Levi in relation to division and scattering appears with a certain degree of irony in view of Leah's initial pronouncement of Levi as representing a hope for unity.

father Jacob, who casts him as vindictive, rash, divisive. We later learn of Levi's death at one hundred and thirty-seven years old as part of a tradition preserved in Exodus (Ex 6:16; cf. T. Levi 19:4).

Alongside this Pentateuchal portrait of Levi, Malachi preserves a tradition that seems to capture Levi in rather different light (Mal 2:4–6, 8). Instead of vindictive, rash, and divisive, Malachi portrays Levi as a type of exemplary figure, using him as part of his larger depiction of a model priest (Mal 2:1–9).⁶ He picks up on Levi as one who had a specific covenant with the Lord (Mal 2:4). He describes that covenant as divine in origin and as “a covenant of life and well-being” (Mal 2:5). Malachi indicates this covenant's requirement of “reverence” (מורא) and seems to suggest that Levi adhered to this requirement. In apparent contrast to Jacob's depiction, Malachi describes Levi's covenantal relationship with the Lord as follows: “he revered me and stood in awe of my name. True instruction was in his mouth, and no wrong was found on his lips. He walked with integrity and uprightness, and he turned many from iniquity” (Mal 2:5–6).

If we consider the figure of Levi both in the Pentateuchal materials and in the tradition preserved in Malachi, we are left with what seems to be somewhat of a polarizing portrait. On the one hand, Levi carries a series of negative connotations. He appears in connection to vengeance, violence, recklessness, and divisiveness. On the other, he appears as an example to follow, representing priestly ideals of reverence, uprightness, and integrity.

⁶ For more on Levi's intersections with Malachi, see, for example, James L Kugel, “How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?,” *DSD* 14.3 (2007): 306; James Kugel, “Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings,” *HTR* 86.1 (1993): 1–64, esp., 30–32.

2.1.2 Levi's Wider Genealogical Profile in the Hebrew Scriptures

Beyond the narrative depictions of Levi in the Hebrew Scriptures, we gain a sense of his wider profile through the considerable genealogical records preserved in these writings.⁷

Levi is a son to Leah and among a larger group of twelve sons to Jacob (Israel) (Gen 29:34; 35:23–26; Ex 1:2; 1 Chr 2:1). These include Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, Benjamin, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, and Asher. Reuben, Simeon, Judah, Issachar, and Zebulun are Levi's full siblings, born to Leah (Gen 35:23). Joseph and Benjamin are sons of Rachel (Gen 35:24), Dan and Naphtali are sons of Rachel's servant Bilhah (Gen 35:25), and Gad and Asher are sons of Leah's servant Zilpah (Gen 35:26).

Levi becomes a father to Gershon, Qahat, and Merari (Gen 46:11; Ex 6:16; Num 3:17; 1 Chr 6:1). Among the subsequent generations of his descendants, Levi appears as a grandfather to Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (Ex 6:18; Num 3:17–20; 16:1; 26:58; 1 Chr 6:2). And through Amram's line, Levi becomes a great grandfather to Miriam, Aaron, and Moses (Ex 2:1–10; Ex 6:16–27; Num 26:58–60).

We could continue to trace Levi's descendants in several different directions across these genealogical records. Yet in addition to his genealogical connections to the figures of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses, one of the most notable features of Levi's profile in the Hebrew Scriptures comes through his status as figurehead for the group known as the "Levites." As with each of his brothers, Levi comes to represent one of the twelve tribes of Israel. These "tribal," "household," or "clan" divisions function as a primary means of ordering Jacob's (Israel's) subsequent lineage.

⁷ I.e., Gen 35:23–26; 46:11; Ex 1:2–5; 2:1; 6:16–27; Num 3:17–20; 16:1–2; 26:58–60; 1 Chr 2:1; 6:1–15, 16, 38, 43, 47; Ezra 8:18.

Although the Levites represent one of twelve Israelite households, they take on particular significance in connection to their distinct role as ministers unto the Lord.⁸ Throughout the Hebrew Scriptures the Levites play a critical role in the maintenance of Israel's relationship with the Lord through various cultic practices.⁹ While the Levites wholesale operate in general service to the Lord, they come to function as assistants to a specific line within the Levite household who operate as priests (Num 3:6, 9; 8:19, 22; 1 Chr 23:27–32). Most notably, the Levitical line of Aaron represents this priestly division (Ex 27:21; 28:1–31:10; Num 3:10; Chr 6:49; 23:13; Ps 1). The specific Aaronic line of Zadok, however, eventually takes over the priestly ministry (1 Chr 29:22; Ezek 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11).

The basis for the Levitical appointment as ministers unto the Lord has been a point of considerable scholarly interest.¹⁰ The Pentateuchal traditions seem to offer a variety of apparent bases for their appointment rooted in the actions of this specific group during the Mosaic period (i.e., Ex 32:25–29; Deut 10:8–9; 33:8–10). Yet the tradition in Malachi seems to hint at this appointment in connection to the specific actions and disposition of the individual figure of Levi (Mal 2:4–7).

Although we gain a certain acquaintance with the figure of Levi through these few narrative reports, the later reference in Malachi, and the wider portrayal of a priestly group of descendants, the portrait of Levi in the Hebrew Scriptures is relatively limited.

⁸ Although the tradition in Malachi perhaps hints at a wider basis for Levi's descendants' distinct ritual service role, the Pentateuchal traditions seem to offer a series of alternative bases for their appointment (i.e., Ex 32:25–29; Deut 10:8–9; 33:8–10).

⁹ See, for example, Num, 3:6; Deut 10:8; 18:1–8; 21:5; 31:9; 33:8; 1 Chr 6:1–48; Neh 10:38–39; Ps 135:20.

¹⁰ For an exploration of Levi's elevation to priesthood, and the basis for his selection among Jacob's sons, see, Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 1–64. For wider proposals as to the basis for Levi's priestly appointment, see, for example, Martha Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 25; Martha Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6.1 (1999): 14–15; Cana Werman, "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 4.2 (1997): 216.

2.1.3 Levi's Broader Profile in the Second Temple Period and Beyond

Levi's profile, however, takes on contour in various Second Temple writings beyond those contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. These writings provide a broader portrait of the figure of Levi.

Jubilees, for example, offers one of the most substantial portraits of Levi. Its contents capture Levi's conception and birth in relation to seasons and dates (Jub. 28:14; cf. Gen 29:34); his genealogical connections (Jub. 28:17; 32:22; 44:14); an expanded account of Levi and Simeon's actions towards the Shechemites and as a basis for his priestly appointment (Jub. 30:1–26); an account of Isaac offering a blessing over Levi in which he forecasts for him a favorable future (Jub. 31:5, 9–17); Jacob as having a much more hopeful outlook on his son's future (Jub. 31:31; cf. Gen 49:5–7); Levi's otherworldly dream-vision appointment to the priesthood (Jub. 32:1); Jacob setting apart Levi as priest (Jub. 32:3); Levi's subsequent operation as priest (Jub. 32:8–9); Levi's military exploits (Jub. 34:3; 38:6); Levi's marriage to Melcha (Jub. 34:20); and Levi's reception and engagement in scribal activity (Jub. 45:16).

In addition to Jubilees, Levi also appears to varying degrees in several other writings from the DSS. These writings capture Levi in relation to his priestly profile and exemplary status (3Q7 6 2?; 4Q175 1 14; 4Q245 1 i 5?; 4Q365 23 10; 4Q379 1 2; 4Q542 1 i 8, 11; 4Q547 8 2; 5Q13 2 7?); notions of eschatological warfare (1QM 5:1); his intersections with otherworldly rooted human vices (CD 4:5); genealogies (4Q225 2 ii 11–12; 4Q226 7 4); scribal activity (4Q542 1 ii 11); and a series of references to his later descendants (CD 10:5; 1QSa 1:22; 1QM 1:2; 4Q159 5 2; 5Q13 2 8; 11Q19 63 3).

The later writings of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs also capture several substantial snapshots of Levi that contribute in various ways to his broader profile.¹¹ Perhaps the most significant among these, however, is T. Levi, which offers an extended account of Levi's life.¹²

While the above writings from the DSS and later testamentary content positively contribute to Levi's broader priestly profile, not all wider Levi traditions were aligned on this matter. Four Maccabees, for example, captures Levi similar to Jacob's final negative pronouncement in the Hebrew Scriptures (Gen 49:5–7), casting Levi as demonstrating a lack of reason and restraint during his exploits at Shechem (4 Macc 2:19). Additionally, 4Q372 associates Levi with anger (4Q372 1 21).

Despite the notable contributions of these writings and the Levi traditions contained therein, perhaps the most significant portrait of Levi comes from the writing known as Aramaic Levi Document (ALD), to which we now turn.

2.2 An Introduction to ALD

2.2.1 The Text and Its Publication

ALD appeared in modern scholarship approximately half a century before the discovery of the DSS.¹³ Copies of ALD first surfaced near the close of the nineteenth century with the discovery

¹¹ See, for example, T. Reu. 6:5, 7–8; T. Sim. 5:4–6; 7:1–2; T. Jud. 5:2; 21:1–5; 25:2; T. Iss. 5:7–9; T. Dan 5:4; T. Naph. 5:1–5; 6:6, 8; 8:2; T. Gad 8:1; T. Jos. 19:11. For other developing perceptions of Levi as an exemplary figure see also, Heb 7:9. For further genealogical records of Levi, see, for example, 1 Esd 8:47; Aristob. 48. For wider portrayals of Levi's Levitical descendants, see, for example, Tob 1:7; Sir 45:6; 2 Esd 1:3; T. Reu. 6:5; T. Dan 5:6–7, 10; T. Benj. 11:2; As. Mos. 9:1; Heb. 7:5; Rev 7:7.

¹² For more on T. Levi and my present engagement or lack thereof, see comments in the subsequent section entitled, "The Text and Its Publication."

¹³ The name of this composition has evolved throughout the history of research. For an overview of this evolution, see especially Henryk Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics of the Visions of Levi (so-Called Aramaic Levi Document)," *JAJ* 1.3 (2010): 303–19. See also Kugel, "How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?," 291; Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, eds., *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation,*

of the Cairo Genizah fragments.¹⁴ This discovery, yielded two tenth century fragments of ALD (T-S 16.94 [ms A Cambridge]; ms Heb c 27 f. 56 [ms A Bodleian]). Scholars soon identified these materials as an Aramaic version of the Greek Testament of Levi from the later pseudepigraphical collection Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, briefly alluded to above.¹⁵ Alongside these Cairo Genizah materials, scholars also published a ninth century fragment from a British Museum Syriac manuscript (ms Add. 17,193 [MS B]) which they saw as being from the same composition.¹⁶ Less than a decade later, investigators published two additional sections of

Commentary, SVTP 19 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 1; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*. Drawnel, in particular, makes a case for renaming this composition again in light of a literary re-assessment. He proposes the name “Visions of Levi” in view of what he sees as a similar literary shape to VA. While Drawnel’s literary re-assessment is helpful, and despite his criticisms at previous naming attempts and the generic nature of the title “Aramaic Levi Document,” I have chosen to maintain this common designation in the present study. Although Drawnel’s literary reassessment points to a lack of previous literary consideration as part of the naming process, in my opinion his proposed title overemphasizes the visionary material at the cost of minimizing other important themes and content.

¹⁴ Recent scholarship has raised awareness to some of the issues in associating this discovery wholesale with “the Cairo Genizah” as well as the need for increasing nuance in tracing the provenance of material culture. See, for example, Rebecca J. W. Jefferson, “Deconstructing ‘the Cairo Genizah’: A Fresh Look at Genizah Manuscript Discoveries in Cairo before 1897,” *JQR* 108.4 (2018): 422–48. Although I am aware of this issue, in view of the scope the present discussion I have maintained the “Cairo Genizah” designation as it relates to the ALD manuscripts.

¹⁵ H. Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen, “Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi,” *JQR* 12.4 (1900): 651–61. See also R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), 245–56; R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, “An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs,” *JQR* 19.3 (1907): 566–83; J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Lévi En araméen: Fragment de La Grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 62.3 (1955): 398–406. Although ALD was likely an earlier source for the Greek Testament of Levi, I will intentionally limit my engagement with the Greek Testament of Levi in the present discussion. As I highlight below, previous research dedicated considerable effort to understanding the relationship between these two documents. Knibb summarized this well and the need to consider broader areas of investigation when he stated, “during the past century it has seemed at times as if scholars concerned with the Testament of Levi have believed that the only important thing was the recovery of some intermediate Jewish Levi text between the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Levi.... It seems to be that the uncertainties are so great as to make it very questionable whether such reconstructions have value and perhaps the time has come to concentrate on the understanding of the Testament in light of what we clearly possess” (*Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*, SVTP 22 [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009], 270). My research, while occasionally engaging with T. Levi, aims to move beyond this previous focal point towards a greater emphasis on ALD as an independent literary unit, and towards Levi as individual figure as I highlighted in my introduction. For further discussion on the relationship between ALD and T. Levi, see for example, Marinus de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Michael E. Stone, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 31 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 71–89; Knibb, *Essays*, 255–70, esp. 260, 262.

¹⁶ H. Leonard Pass and J. Arendzen, “Fragment of an Aramaic Text,” 651–61. See also J. T. Milik, “Le Testament de Lévi,” 398–406.

ALD from an eleventh century Greek manuscript from the Mount Athos Koutloumous monastery (ms Koutloumoussiou 39 [ms E]).¹⁷

The eventual discovery of the DSS resulted in the identification of three additional ALD manuscripts preserved in the following fragmentary materials: 1Q21; 4Q213; 4Q213a; 4Q213b; 4Q214; 4Q214a; 4Q214b.¹⁸ As noted in the introduction, the manuscripts attributed to Qumran represent the earliest available stratum of the ALD tradition, with most scholars dating the oldest manuscripts between the third and early-second century BCE.¹⁹ The ALD materials attributed to

¹⁷ R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 245–56; R. H. Charles and A. Cowley, “An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs,” 566–83. For more on the discovery and publication of these wider ALD materials, see Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, esp. 14–16, 29–32. See also, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (W. B. Eerdmans, 2000), esp. 237–9; Vered Hillel, “Aramaic Levi,” in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T & T Clark, 2018), 261–63; Stig Norin, “The Aramaic Levi—Comparing the Qumran Fragments with the Genizah Text,” *SJOT* 27.1 (2013): 118–30.

¹⁸ Over the course of the history of study there has been shifting impressions as to how many manuscripts these fragmentary materials represent. Hanneke van der Schoor’s recent assessment of the variation in scribal hands, in which she explores notions of “formal” and “informal” manuscripts and manuscript copies, convincingly argues that these materials represent not six ALD manuscripts as commonly recognized, but rather three manuscripts at most (“The Assessment of Variation: The Case of the Aramaic Levi Document,” *DSD* 28.2 [2021]: 179–206). Further, Drawnel’s recent reassessment of Milik’s initial work on the DSS Aramaic Levi materials further affirms this impression. He suggests that Milik ultimately considered these fragmentary remains as only representing three manuscripts (1Q21; 4Q213; 4Q214) (“Józef Tadeusz Milik and the Publication of the Qumran Fragments of the Aramaic Testament of Levi,” *RevQ* 33.1 (2021): 93–119). In addition to these three ALD DSS manuscripts, Puech proposed that 4Q540–41 also represented portions of ALD. Scholars have since dismissed this proposal (“Fragments d’un Apocryphe de Lévi et Le Personnage Eschatologique. 4QTestLévi^{c-d}[?] et 4QAJa,” *The Madrid Qumran Congress [2 Vols.]: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991 Vol. II*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, STDJ 11 [Leiden; New York; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992], 449–501). See for example, de Jonge, who pointed out that Puech identified these materials as part of ALD on the basis of parallels with small portions of T. Levi. He goes on to say that “these parallels are not all that striking” and “should therefore, not be adopted” (“Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 77–8, here 78). See also Robert A Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, EJS 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 51–52; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic Levi Document,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999), 457–8; Joseph L. Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 86 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 79; Knibb, *Essays*, 265–7; Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel, “Aramaic Levi Document,” in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*, ed. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013), 1490.

For a recent survey of the DSS ALD manuscripts, see, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*.

¹⁹ See for example, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 63–71; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 19–22; Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 134; Knibb, *Essays*, 261.

Qumran provided critical evidence for further understanding the nature of ALD as an early independent composition as well as the relationship of ALD to wider literary works.

Despite the variety of ALD manuscript traditions, none of the available texts provided a complete version of the work. This created both limitations and opportunities. On the one hand, this limited scholars to what they could say and not say about these materials. Gaps in textual materials and the uncertain order of fragments often impacted the ability of scholars to offer definitive readings and interpretations. On the other hand, this created a plethora of investigative opportunities. The history of research attests to scholarly interest in filling in gaps in fragmentary texts and determining the original order of ALD's narrative sequence.²⁰

In 2008, Bohak identified a previously unrecognized fragment among the Cairo Genizah ALD materials (P 1185) in the University of Manchester's Rylands library collection. This discovery represented an important addition to the available ALD materials.²¹ It filled in some of

²⁰ The question of compositional order has in many ways dominated ALD research. Scholars have wrestled with how best to reconstruct ALD's narrative sequence. Much of this conversation has centered on the relationship between ALD and T. Levi. As ALD and T. Levi bear considerable resemblances, scholars generally agree that ALD (or a very similar composition) acted an earlier source for T. Levi (See, for example, de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," 79). As a result, many scholars in addition to using overlapping ALD fragments as a reference, propose using T. Levi (to varying degrees) to support reconstructing the order of ALD's narrative sequence. See for example, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 32; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 11–19; Knibb, *Essays*, 261–4; de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," 79–83. Not all scholars, however, find this approach to order reconstruction as satisfactory. See for example, Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, 28–33, 171–4. For the present investigation, I follow Drawnel's (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*) ordering of ALD which uses overlapping ALD materials, internal literary cues, and T. Levi as a means to reconstruction, as well as Bohak's ("A New Genizah Fragment of the 'Aramaic Levi Document,'" *Tarbiz* 79 [2011]: 373–83 [Hebrew]; "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," in *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Genizah Fragments*, ed. Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander, JSSSup 31 [University of Oxford Press, 2013], 101–14) proposal for the Rylands fragment placement, which Drawnel acknowledges as possible but recognizes its need for further vetting. I will offer further discussion on the Rylands fragments immediately hereafter.

²¹ In 2008, Bohak identified P 1185 as part of ALD's account of the Shechem/Dinah event portrayed in Genesis 34. For more on Bohak's discovery of the Rylands fragment, see, Gideon Bohak, "A New Genizah Fragment of the 'Aramaic Levi Document,'" 373–83 (Hebrew); Gideon Bohak, "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," 101–14.

the narrative gaps and catalyzed additional conversation on notions of influence, sourcing, and textual order.²²

Despite ALD's broad representation across these manuscript traditions, there appears to be limited textual variety among the manuscripts. Recent textual comparison of overlapping sections across ALD manuscript traditions primarily evidenced minor semantic variations.²³ This seems to suggest that we can reasonably use the available portions of later ALD manuscript traditions to reconstruct what was presumably in the earlier Qumran texts and appeal to a composite version of the composition for our readings.²⁴ In light of the fragmentary nature of the ALD materials, we admittedly cannot be certain that a composite text will not result in overreading or misreading the evidence. In my opinion, however, and in view of current trends in ALD research, the benefits of a composite reading seemingly outweigh the drawbacks. Aware of this tension, I cautiously adopt a composite reading of ALD in the present investigation.²⁵ While

²² See, for example, Dorothy M. Peters and Esther Eshel, "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Kipp Davis, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint, STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 237–59; Drawnel, "The Cairo Genizah Fragment," 75–108.

²³ Perrin's proposal pushed back against previous suggestions that the Qumran ALD materials represented alternative literary editions ("The Textual Forms of Aramaic Levi Document at Qumran," in *Reading the Bible in Ancient Traditions and Modern Editions: Studies in Memory of Peter W. Flint*, ed. Andrew B. Perrin, Kyung S. Baek, and Daniel K. Falk, Early Judaism and Its Literature [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017]). For proposals of literary editions of ALD, see for example, Robert A. Kugler, "Whose Scripture? Whose Community? Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, by Way of Aramaic Levi," *DSD* 15.1 (2008): 5–23, esp. 22; Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Levi Document," 462. See also, Norin, "The Aramaic Levi," 118–30.

²⁴ Drawnel's observations on these different manuscripts traditions underscores the perceived textual unity and supports a composite reading. He states that "all these manuscripts preserve the same document with textual variants that shed light on the process of manuscript transmission but do not warrant the opinion that they contain developed redactions of different compositions. Thus, the reconstruction of most of the *Document's* textual form has been possible..." ("Priestly Education in the 'Aramaic Levi Document [Visions of Levi]' and 'Aramaic Astronomical Book' [4Q208–211]," *RevQ* 22.4 [88] [2006]: 548). De Jonge further states: "Notwithstanding this diversity of provenance these fragmentary texts are witnesses to one single underlying text. When arranged in parallel columns, they show numerous cases of overlap. There is clearly no direct literary dependence one way or the other between the existing witnesses. Yet they may be used to correct and to supplement each other and to reconstruct the underlying text..." ("Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi, 78).

²⁵ Transcriptions and translations of the Rylands fragment comes from Drawnel, "The Cairo Genizah Fragment," 75–108. Transcriptions or translations of the Aramaic DSS fragments come from ALD from Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*. I am grateful to Dr. Perrin for generously providing me pre-publication access to his work on ALD. I will occasionally adopt transcriptions or translations of the Aramaic DSS from Drawnel, *An Aramaic*

I will aim to prioritize the Aramaic DSS (1Q21; 4Q213; 4Q213a; 4Q213b; 4Q214; 4Q214a; 4Q214b) in my analysis, my readings will therefore also at times include readings from the Aramaic Cairo Genizah materials (T-S 16.94 [ms A Cambridge]; ms Heb c 27 f. 56 [ms A Bodleian]; P 1185 [Rylands Recto/Verso]), the Syriac British museum fragment (ms Add. 17,193 [ms B]), and the Greek Mt. Athos Koutloumous monastery manuscripts (ms Koutloumoussiou 39 [ms E]).

With the above textual framework in mind and an awareness of some of its notable intricacies, we will now turn to consider some of the previous engagements with ALD in the history of study.

2.2.2 Previous Research

Since the discovery of ALD, both the content and material culture have catalyzed several notable research trends and conversations. The preceding discussion on the material discovery and publication of ALD highlights the notable scholarly interest in understanding the diversity of its fragmentary remains.

Beyond the many questions generated by the diversity of material culture, there has been no dearth of discussion on the underlying contents of ALD. Scholars have grappled with many questions regarding the sources for ALD as well as ALD as a source for other compositions.²⁶

Wisdom Text. I will indicate those occasions in the footnotes. All remaining transcriptions and translations of ALD come from Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*. An additional challenge in working with ALD is the wide range of manuscript traditions represented by this single document. The diversity of manuscript traditions has created ongoing issues of consistency for ALD citations across publications. To maintain consistency in my treatment of ALD, when citing the Aramaic texts of the DSS I will follow Perrin's treatment (*Aramaic Commentary ALD*) of the fragments. When referencing wider non-Aramaic materials, I will follow Drawnel's treatment (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*) of the materials. In the case of the Rylands fragment, I will cite content based upon the manuscript name and Drawnel's line numbering from his recent edition ("The Cairo Genizah Fragment").

²⁶ Scholars have explored questions of sourcing in relation to ALD and Jubilees. For those who suggest ALD as a source for Jubilees, see, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 46, 53; Werman, "Levi and Levites," 219; Michael E. Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts," *JQS* 9.4 (2002): 318. See also, Greenfield,

The question of sources has numerous intersections with conversations on ALD's wider literary intersections and its influence/influences. This area of study has also garnered considerable attention over the years.²⁷ As with the wider Aramaic DSS, ALD's compositional context remains uncertain, although scholars have put forward various proposals over the years.²⁸ The fragmentary nature of the material culture has added many complexities to understanding the contents of ALD. This in turn has created additional challenges in attempts to interpret ALD's literary nature, narrative structure, as well as other aspects such as genre.²⁹ Despite these

Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 19. They posit either ALD as a source for Jubilees or something very similar to it. For those who alternatively suggest Jubilees as a source for ALD, see, for example, Knibb, *Essays*. See also, Kugel, who suggests ALD to be dependent on Jubilees in that it demonstrates a simplification on content ("How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?," 298). In my estimation, however, while Kugel may be right in terms of sourcing, this argument seems to run contrary to wider text critical thinking that suggests more complex readings tend to be later attempts to explain or develop earlier content. Beyond questions of sourcing in relation to Jubilees, perhaps the most notable conversation pertains to the later writing of the T. Levi. While there is generally a consensus that ALD functioned as a source for T. Levi, much of the conversation has pertained to the viability of using the more complete writing of T. Levi for the reconstruction of the highly fragmentary ALD narrative, as I noted above. For more on this intersection between T. Levi and ALD, see, for example, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 14; Hillel, "Aramaic Levi," 261–63; Knibb, *Essays*, 262; Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 55.

²⁷ Wider conversations of intersection and influence often pertain to Malachi (see, for example, Kugel, "How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?," 291–312; Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 30, 32), 1 Enoch 1–36 (Book of Watchers) (see, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 47; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 213; Henryk Drawnel, "Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts from Qumran and Late Mesopotamian Culture," *RevQ* 26.2 [2013]: 146; Peters and Eshel, "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem," 252), WQ and VA (see, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*; Tervanotko, "A Trilogy of Testaments," 41–59; de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," 71–89, here, 84), Ezra/Nehemiah (Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*, 72, 90), and 4Q540–1 (Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 79; de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," 77–78; Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts," 307–26), among others.

²⁸ On a possible Samaritan compositional context of ALD, see, for example, Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi," 398–406; Robert A. Kugler, "Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi (1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi)," *RevQ* 17.1–4 (1996): 351–58. On the priestly nature of the compositional context, see, for example, Ariel Feldman, "Patriarchs in Aramaic Traditions," in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (T & T Clark, 2019), 473; Hillel, "Aramaic Levi," 262; Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 44; Machiela, "The Compositional Setting," 168–202. On Babylonian influence in the compositional context, see, for example, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*; Drawnel, "Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts," 145–67.

²⁹ Questions in research around genre have largely centered on whether to designate ALD as a testament. Despite numerous attempts at genre classification, a definitive genre designation for ALD has proven to be elusive. ALD's similarities and apparent connection with the later Greek T. Levi seemingly influenced initial testament genre associations. ALD includes various features such as a generational passing down of instruction from a father figure to his descendants as well as an apparent flyover of Levi's life reminiscent of wider testamentary literature. Yet the fragmentary nature of the composition, which lacks both a definitive beginning and end, has impeded any attempts at a clear genre designation. For a review of this developing debate see, Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics of the Visions Levi," 304–7; Jörg Frey, "On the Origins of the Genre of the 'Literary Testament': Farewell Discourses

challenges, ALD has featured in numerous thematic studies over the years on notions such as priesthood and priestly identity, cultic practice, scribalism, purity, and ancient learning, among others.³⁰

While this previous work generated critical insights for our understanding of ALD, much of this work trended towards considering ALD primarily in view of its relationship to wider literary works.³¹ As I generally noted to in the introduction regarding “non-canonical” materials, scholars have often adopted ALD as a lens through which to understand ancient exegetical practices related to the Hebrew Scriptures.³² Again, while this has enabled us to advance our

in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010), 345–70, esp. 364–6; de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 79). Additionally, increasing awareness in scholarship of the problems and complexities of genre and category classification have invited alternative approaches to understanding the literary nature of compositions such as ALD. On the issues of categories, see, for example, Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Textuality between Death and Memory: The Prehistory and Formation of the Parabiblical Testament,” *JQR* 104.3 (2014): 381–412, esp. 385–9; 409–12. See also Will Kynes, *An Obituary for “Wisdom Literature”: The Birth, Death, and Intertextual Reintegration of a Biblical Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Molly Zahn, “Avoiding the Category Trap: A Multivariable Approach to Second Temple Literature” (paper presented at the Categories and Boundaries in Second Temple Jewish Literature Conference [virtual], University of Birmingham, UK, 4 March 2021).

³⁰ On questions of priesthood and priestly identity see, for example Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 46–53. On the nature of cultic practice and issues of purity, see, for example, Hannah K. Harrington, “How Does Intermarriage Defile the Sanctuary?,” in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*, ed. George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Molly M. Zahn, STDJ 103 [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012], 177–95; Martha Himmelfarb, “Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in Aramaic Levi and Jubilees,” in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*, ed. Ra’anan S. Boustán and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). On scribalism in the ancient Jewish context, see, for example, Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 11–16, 45–51. On ancient learning, see, for example Drawnel, “Priestly Education,” 547–74; Drawnel, “Some Notes,” 146; Drawnel, “The Literary Characteristics,” 311, 316–17; Drawnel, “The Literary Form, 63–64; Stone and Eshel, “Aramaic Levi Document,” 1490).

³¹ Drawnel underscores the need to look beyond comparison with the Greek T. Levi for interpreting and understanding ALD. He purports that “the comparison of the Visions of Levi with the Greek Testament of Levi may be fruitful for the history of the redaction of the Greek Testament, but *it is fruitless for an understanding of the Visions*, whose text and literary forms are much different” (*The Literary Characteristics of the Visions of Levi*, 303) (*italics mine*).

³² For ALD, this has commonly resulted in researchers developing an understanding of its relationship to a specific Second Temple work, such as Jubilees, with the primary purpose of identifying similarities or diversities between those authors engagements with the Hebrew Scriptures. See, for example, Harald Samuel, “Levi, the Levites, and the Law,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 215–30; Martha, “Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage,” 1–24, esp. 3–12; Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood,” 1–64; Werman, “Levi and Levites,” 211–25.

knowledge of ALD and some its possible intersections with wider literary traditions, it has also resulted in a limited primary engagement of ALD as an independent literary unit.³³

In view of these notable emphases in ALD research, which commonly demonstrate primary canonical interests, our subsequent engagement will take up Reed's abovementioned invitation towards primarily engaging the ALD Levi materials on "their own terms."³⁴

En route to our analysis, we will now take a closer look at the content of the ALD materials.

2.2.3 Content Overview

One of the primary challenges in capturing an overview of the content of ALD is the fragmentary state of the material culture in which it is preserved. As noted above, the diversity of textual traditions from which we have drawn our present version of ALD, representing multiple languages, assorted provenance, and different historical moments in the textual transmission process, further compounds these challenges. Yet from the available material culture, we can seemingly gain a strong sense of some of the main movements in the composition, along with some of their underlying details.³⁵ These include the following:

³³ For more on the limited engagement of ALD as a literary unit, see for example Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics of the Visions Levi," 303–19. Drawnel points out that "the history of interpretation of the *Visions of Levi* shows that scholars have paid little attention to the literary form of the whole composition...." He further adds that "the Aramaic text of the *Visions* has been constantly compared with the Greek *Testament of Levi*, to the extent that all interpretive efforts have concentrated on the relationship between these two compositions" (The Literary Characteristics of the Visions of Levi, 303).

³⁴ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 36.

³⁵ In view of the abovementioned challenges, there remains considerable debate as to the sequence of the narrative of ALD. The following proposal to some extent, therefore, remains in the realm of conjecture. In my reading, however, as I noted above, I largely side with the sequences proposed by Drawnel (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*) and Bohak ("A New Genizah Fragment of the 'Aramaic Levi Document,'" 373–83 [Hebrew]; "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document," 101–14). Cf., for example, the alternative sequence proposed by Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, which, for example places Levi's prayer sequence following his encounter with the Shechemites and his installation into the priesthood (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 18, 110).

- 1) Levi's Journey to Priestly Ordination: Personal Piety, Dream-Visions, and Family Matters (ALD 1–7)
- 2) Levi's Ordination and Priestly Learning (ALD 8–61)
- 3) The Beginning of Levi's Family and Its Subsequent Growth (ALD 62–80)
- 4) Transmitting Priestly Tradition to Future Generations (ALD 81–104)

In what follows we will look at the content of each of these four movements in turn.

2.2.3.1 Levi's Journey to Priestly Ordination: Personal Piety, Dream-Visions, and Family Matters (ALD 1–7)

ALD 1–7 seems to capture select events from Levi's life pre-priesthood and various events in his journey leading up to his establishment into the priesthood.³⁶ This section of content begins with a scene in which Levi undertakes some type of purification process (ALD 1a 1–2) and presents an extended prayer of petition (ALD 1a 3–19). As several scholars have noted, Levi's purification perhaps reflects wider Levitical purity prescription (cf. Lev 15:13).³⁷

After this apparent ritual washing, Levi begins to pray (ALD 1a 3–4).³⁸ Throughout the course of Levi's prayer, he makes a variety of different requests pertaining to things such as

³⁶ For more on travel in the ancient Jewish context, and particularly the importance of Levi's journey in relation to learning, see, for example, Elisa Uusimäki, "Rethinking the Boundary between Jewish and Greek Writings: The Case of Educational Travel" (paper presented at the Categories and Boundaries in Second Temple Jewish Literature, University of Birmingham, 5 March 2021).

³⁷ Drawnel suggested that Levi's prayer functions as "an introductory commentary to all the successive events described in the composition" ("The Literary Characteristics of the Visions of Levi," 309). Others have either argued or subtly indicated that this passage fits better at a later stage in the compositional sequence (see, for example, Michael E. Stone and Jonas C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112.2 [1993]: 247–66, esp. 248–52; Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 52–59).

³⁸ Levi captures his prayer as follows: "Then I raised my eyes and my face towards heaven and opened my mouth and spoke; and I spread out faithfully the fingers of my hands and my hands in front of the sanctuary and I prayed and said" (ALD 1a 3–4) (τότε τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἤρα πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὸ μου ἤνοιξα καὶ

The content preserved in ALD 1c and the Rylands fragments appear to capture the narrative events that follow this dream-vision episode.⁴⁴ These portions of material seem to capture content pertaining to the Dinah/Shechem tradition also found in both Genesis 32 and Jubilees 30.⁴⁵

In ALD 1c, Levi appears to describe a scene following the Dinah/Schemem incident. Following this, ALD captures Shechem's attempt to take Dinah as a wife (ALD 1c 19–20).⁴⁶ In view of Shechem's proposal, Levi appears as part of group of family members who craft and present a counter proposal (ALD 1c 18–19; 2).⁴⁷

The Rylands fragments appear to supplement this partial Dinah/Shechem scene somewhat considerably. They capture various additional aspects of Levi's participation in the event. Beyond offering further indications that the scene in question pertains to the Dinah and Shechem incident (Ryland Recto 3–4) and providing additional insight into Levi and his family's immediate response to Shechem's actions (Rylands Recto 7–9), these materials perhaps also expand the nature of Levi's role within this event. Levi further appears as thoughtfully engaging this complex reality.⁴⁸ Additionally, the Rylands fragments also seem to capture various aspects

Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 146; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 51, n. 117; de Jonge, "Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi," 83; Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics," 309.

⁴⁴ For more on questions of narrative order, see, n. 35 in the present chapter.

⁴⁵ For a larger comparison of Second Temple Levi traditions and commentary on their intersections, see, for example, Knibb, *Essays*.

⁴⁶ Levi describes how "they desired our daughter, so that we all would become b[rothers]" (ALD 1c 19–20) (ה[וי]) [עקב אבי ורא]ובן אחי על (ms A, Cambr. a 6, 20).

⁴⁷ We get an impression of this counter-proposal in the following phrases: "Jacob my father and Re[uben my brother on (this?) matter] we said to them with [wisdom and under]standing" (ALD 1c 18–19) (עקב אבי ורא]ובן אחי על (ms A, Cambr. a 6, 18–19); "Circumcise []the foreskin of your flesh and appear like [us] and you will be sealed like us with the circumcision of tr[u]th. And we will be for y[ou]" (ALD 2) (גזזור] [עורלת ב]ישרכון והתחמיון כו[אתן] ותהון חתימין כואתן במילת ק[ו]ש ונהוי לכ[ו]ן) (ms A, Cambr. a 6, 21–23). For an overview of the different presentations of Levi's actions in this Dinah/Shechem tradition in wider Levi traditions, see, Peters and Eshel, "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem, 258.

⁴⁸ Levi seems to convey the subjects as Dinah/Shechem with the reference to defilement in the phrase, "our [father] [] knew that she had been defiled (?) by their sons" (Ryland Recto 3–4) (אבו]גא ידע די טמאת לבניהון) (P1185 Recto 3–4). Levi offers a more substantial impression of his family's response, describing, "[And] they went a[ls]o to]Hamor and spoke in the words of [wisdom with the]men of their city // [al]l of them to circumcise and do it"

preceding Shechem/Dinah narrative in view of its combined interest in the town of Shechem (ALD 3 16, 18) and the “do]ers of violence” (ALD 3 19) (עב[די חמסא) (ms A, Cambr. b, 7, 19), who Levi later appears to confirm as referring to the Shechemites (ALD 78).⁵³

Following this portrayal of the Shechem/Dinah event, Levi experiences a second dream-vision.⁵⁴ The initial portion of this dream-vision seems to maintain some type of connection with the preceding Shechem/Dinah episode in that it appears to deal with illicit sexual activity.⁵⁵ In view of this, it seems to offer otherworldly perspective on this event or this type of reality and capture some of its broader negative implications (ALD 3a 3–6).⁵⁶ Yet at least part of the primary importance of this depiction, seems to be in the perception of some type of connection between illicit sexual action and Levi’s priestly appointment. This is apparent in that the content

military exploits of Jacob’s sons, see, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 18, 117–18. In my reading, I lean towards interpreting this content as an alternative depiction of the Joseph sale in view of the thematic and contextual parallels with Gen 37. Yet the alternative proposals remain intriguing in view of ALD’s notable intersections with some of the wider traditions preserved in Jubilees.

⁵³ These multiple references to Shechem and the apparent reference to Joseph’s death at the apparent “hand of the do]ers of violence” (ALD 3 19) (עב[די חמסא) (ms A, Cambr. b, 7, 19) perhaps function to capture some of the subsequent fallout from the preceding Dinah/Shechem event. If this is the case, this passage perhaps captures some of the perceptions of retributive action from the Shechemites. This may build into the tradition in Gen 34:30, in which Jacob expresses his concern for possible relational fallout from Levi and Simeon’s actions.

⁵⁴ There has been considerable discussion over the number of dream-visions contained within the narrative of ALD. For the most part, scholars generally agree on ALD containing at least two-dream visions, although Milik initially seemed to perceive up to three. On Milik’s possible perception of three dream-visions in ALD, see, Ursula Schattner-Rieser, “J. T. Milik’s Monograph on the Testament of Levi and the Reconstructed Aramaic Text of the Prayer of Levi and the Vision of Levi’s Ascent to Heaven from Qumran Caves 4 and 1,” *QC* 15 (2007): 141. For more on an apparent two-vision consensus, see, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 51, n. 117; de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 83; Drawnel, “The Literary Characteristics,” 309. Kugler, represents somewhat of an outlier, proposing a one dream-vision schema (*From Patriarch to Priest*, 45–50). His proposal has since received considerable pushback. See, for example, Knibb, *Essays*, 262–65.

⁵⁵ For wider support in reading this scene as connected with the Dinah/Shechem event, see, for example, de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 79. Cf. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, who despite recognizing notably similarities in content, dismiss this section as specifically pertaining to Dinah (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 17–18, 200).

⁵⁶ These impressions appear in the following phrases: “a woman and she ruins her name and the name of her father” (ALD 3a 3) (אנתה ותהלל שמה ושם אבוה) (4Q213a 3–4 13); “[virg]in who corrupted her name and the name of her father and the ancestors for all her brothers [...] her father and the name of her reproach will not be wiped out from all her people forever” (ALD 3a 3–6) (אבוה[א]) [...] חבלת שמה ושם אבהתה ואבהתה ואבהתת לכל אחיה [...] אבוה[א]) (4Q213a 15–16). For more on the otherworldly nature of this section, see, de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 83. For more on the concentration of these familial concerns in this section of material, see the subsequent section entitled “Kinship.”

connects a discussion on illicit sexual action with a priestly reference regarding “a holy tithe” (ALD 3a 8) (קודש קרבן) (4Q213 a 3–4 8).⁵⁷

In the subsequent dream-vision, Levi appears in ALD 3b–c and ALD 4–7 to gain various insights into otherworldly conceptions of the priesthood.⁵⁸ Seven otherworldly figures appear to provide this insight (ALD 7).⁵⁹ This includes a comparison of the priesthood in royal terms, emphasizing its supremacy (ALD 3c 2; 4), as well as some perspective on the general natures of these contrasting kingdoms (ALD 4–5).⁶⁰ At the close of this dream-vision episode, there is an announcement of Levi’s elevated status among men, which seems to convey this episode as representing Levi’s otherworldly priestly ordination (ALD 6).⁶¹ Levi then depicts the end of the dream-vision and his experience upon awakening (ALD 7).⁶² As Levi moves out of this dream-

⁵⁷ This tithe reference is perhaps in relation to Levi’s priestly status in view of him numbering tenth among his siblings. For more on Levi as a priestly tithe, see, for example Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 238. Kugel further points to the possible intersections between this and Jacob’s reverse counting out of his children in Jubilees, in which Levi falls as the tenth son, prior to Benjamin’s birth (“Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood,” 5).

⁵⁸ For more on this section as part of the Levi’s otherworldly dream-vision, see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 142.

⁵⁹ The presence of seven otherworldly figures appears in the phrase, “those seven departed from me” (ALD 7) (נגדו שבעתון מן לותי) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 9). For more on the identification of these figures, see, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 50; de Jonge, “Levi in Aramaic Levi and in the Testament of Levi,” 71–89, here, 81; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 247; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 15, 145.

⁶⁰ The comparison of kingdoms appears in the following phrases: “the kingdom of the priesthood is greater than the kingdom[]” (ALD 3c 2) ([מלכות כהנותא רבא מן מלכות] (1Q21 1 2) over “the kingdom of the sword” (ALD 4) (מלכות חרבא) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 2). Werman further notes the possible connection between the mention of the “kingdom of the sword” and the Dinah/Shechem scene in view of the importance of the sword within that event (“Levi and Levites,” 216).

⁶¹ The sense of otherworldly ordination appears in the phrases, “Now see how we have made you greater than all, and how we have given you the greatness of eternal peace” (ALD 6) (כען חזי לך הכין רבינד מן כולה והיד יהבנא לך) (כׇּה רבינד מן כל בשר[א...]) ([...] (ms A, Bodl. a 8 7–9) (“how I made you greater than all fles[h...].”) (4Q213b 1 1; cf. 4Q214b 7 1; 1Q21 3 3). For wider support for this as representing Levi’s priestly appointment, see, for example, Drawnel, who notes, “Levi’s second vision is not only revelatory in character but it probably accomplishes his priestly elevation” (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 248). See also, Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood,” 52.

⁶² Levi describes his awakening as follows: “and I arose from my sleep. Then I said, ‘This is the vision and I wonder that the whole vision like this one will come true’” (ALD 7) (ואנה אתעירת מן שנתי אדין אמרת חזוא הוא דן וכדן אנה) (מתמה די יהוי לה כל הזזה) (4Q213b 1 2).

vision sequence, he steps into a phase of this-worldly ordination and induction into the priesthood.

2.2.3.2 *Levi's This-Worldly Ordination and Priestly Learning (ALD 8–61)*

Levi's this-worldly ordination and priestly learning begins as he receives an initial blessing from his grandfather, Isaac (ALD 8). After this, Levi has a notable engagement with his father, Jacob, in which he receives his father's tithe and a set of priestly garments (ALD 9).⁶³ Levi then participates in a reciprocal family blessing in which he blesses his father and his brothers, and they in turn bless him (ALD 9–10).⁶⁴ Levi then presents an offering on behalf of his father (ALD 10).⁶⁵ Overall, this family event, particularly the reception of priestly garments, appears to mark Levi's this-worldly ordination as priest.⁶⁶

After Levi's this-worldly ordination into the priesthood, the narrative pivots to the period of his priestly instruction and formation (ALD 11–61). Levi travels with his family to his grandfather Isaac.⁶⁷ There, his grandfather offers him extended priestly instruction (ALD 13).⁶⁸

⁶³ For wider perceptions about Jacob's tithing as a fulfillment of a tradition preserved in Gen 28:22, see, Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 3; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 15.

⁶⁴ Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel previously observed the way in which the inverted nature of this blessing as a son blessing his father is further indication of Levi's priestly status. They note, "Levi's act of blessing here, following as it does on his offering of sacrifices on behalf of his father and brothers, serves to assert and confirm his priestly status" (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 150).

⁶⁵ For more on the priestly significance of Levi's reception of Jacob's offering, see, Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts," 323; Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 13, 15.

⁶⁶ For perceptions on Levi's reception of priestly garments as symbolic of his priestly investiture, see, Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 54. For mentions of priestly garments in the Aramaic DSS, see, for example, 11Q18 14 ii 5.

⁶⁷ Levi's travels throughout the ALD include several complexities or logical challenges, for more on the complexity of Levi's travel itinerary in ALD, see, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 40.

⁶⁸ Reference to Levi's priestly instruction under Isaac appears in the phrase, "And when he learned that I was a priest of God the most high, the Lord of heavens, he began to instruct me and to teach me the law of the priesthood" (ALD 13) (וכדי ידי די אנה כהין לאל עליון למארי שמיא שארי לפנקדה יתי ולא לפא יתי דין כהנותא) (ms A, Bodl. b 8 5–8) (καὶ ὅτε ἔγνων ὅτι ἐγὼ ἱεράτευσα τῷ κυρίῳ δεσπότῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἤρξατο διδάσκειν με τὴν κρίσιν ἱερωσύνης) (ms E 18,2 12 5–8). Various scholars have noted the curious reality in which Isaac functions as priestly instructor for Levi, rather than his father, Jacob. Proposals as to the rationale for this choice of instructor include things such as Isaac being the oldest living patriarch (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 41). Although Isaac's age likely factored into this decision, scholars have increasingly observed and developed the idea that Jacob's lack

Isaac’s instruction to Levi begins with a series of appeals and warnings related to various purity concerns (ALD 14–18). Isaac extensively details for Levi various sacrificial prescriptions (ALD 19–61) pertaining to things such as the processes of purification (ALD 19–21, 26), sacrificial materials (ALD 22–25b), sacrificial procedure (ALD 25b–30), and sacrificial measurements (ALD 31–47).⁶⁹ Throughout, Isaac consistently anchors his instruction to Levi in previous ancestral tradition from his father, Abraham (ALD 22, 50, 57), as well as its connections to the antediluvian figure of Noah (ALD 57).⁷⁰

2.2.3.3 *The Beginning of Levi’s Family and Its Subsequent Growth (ALD 62–80)*

At the close of Isaac’s instruction to Levi, there is again a notable shift in the narrative. The composition moves from a primary concern for Levi’s formation and development as a priest and his role in the priesthood, to an interest in Levi’s “seed” (ALD 61) (*σπέρμα*) (ms E 18,2 13–15 61) and his future generations and their relation to the priesthood.⁷¹

Levi begins this shift by outlining the nature of his own marriage (ALD 62).⁷² Levi then spends much of this section detailing various contours of his growing family. This includes information pertaining to the respective conceptions of his children (ALD 63, 66, 68, 69a, 71), the natures of their births (ALD 63, 66, 69a, 70, 71, 76, 77), details as to their subsequent

of priestly status perhaps represented the primary basis for this selection. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel note regarding Isaac’s appearance as instructor: “It also shows that while Isaac had priestly status, Jacob did not” (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 150). For wider support for the non-priestly status of Jacob, see also, Kugler, “Some Further Evidence,” 353.

⁶⁹ Drawnel identified the significance of ALD’s sacrificial prescription, particularly in terms of its relationship to Babylonian metrology. See for example, Drawnel, “The Literary Form,” 63–70; Drawnel, “Priestly Education,” 548–50.

⁷⁰ For more on the significance of the ancestral connections, see the sections below, entitled “Kinship” and “Time.”

⁷¹ For more on the significance on the language of “seed,” see the section below entitled “Space.”

⁷² Levi describes the nature of his marriage as follows: “I took a wife for myself from the family of Abraham my father, Melcha, a daughter of Bathuel, son of Laban, brother of my mother” (ALD 62) (*ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ πατρός μου, Μελχάν, θυγατέρα βαθουήλ, υἱοῦ Λάβαν, ἀδελφοῦ μητρός μου*) (ms E 18,2 13–15 62).

marriages and children, as well as various forecasted details regarding their future realities and endeavors (ALD 64, 67, 71, 76).⁷³

2.2.3.4 Transmitting Priestly Tradition to Future Generations (ALD 81–104)

As the narrative transitions through different stages of Levi's life, Levi moves out of the role of apprentice into the seat of instructor. In ALD 81–104, Levi appears to offer a multi-layered instructional discourse to his descendants. Unlike Isaac's instruction to Levi, which largely pertained to ritual practice, Levi's primary instructional emphasis appears to differ. Although Levi places similar emphasis on select values, such as "truth" (קוֹשֵׁט) (ALD 84–86) (cf. ALD 15), as well as perhaps a shared interest in things such as scribal and instructional practices (ALD 88, 90, 98, 99) (cf. ALD 57), he centers the lion's share of his teaching around the notion of "wisdom" (ALD 88–97).⁷⁴

In addition to his sapiential emphasis, Levi also provides additional insight into the futures of his descendants. In particular, he forecasts a series of negative realities in which his descendants will fail to uphold the priestly office and orients these expectations in connection to a series of otherworldly realities (ALD 102–3). The final portion of extant material appears to capture some final endorsement to his descendants in view of some type of connection to his sister, Dinah (ALD 104).

Across each of these sections of narrative, Levi develops a distinct profile of identity. An awareness of these events will help orient our subsequent exploration of his identity profile. In

⁷³ For more on the nature of both Levi's marriage and the marriages of his children, see the section below entitled "Kinship."

⁷⁴ The concept of "wisdom" represents a considerable area of debate in Second Temple scholarship. For more these debates and the use of "wisdom" within the present study, see, n. 109 in the subsequent section 2.3.2.1.3, entitled, "Wisdom" under the larger section titled "Levi's Distinct Virtues."

addition to an awareness of these various narrative movements, however, it is also important to recognize that within these events Levi's identity develops in relation to a considerable cast of characters. To appreciate the significance of these wider characters and their contributions to the formation of Levi's identity and to orient our investigation further, we will briefly consider them below.

2.2.4 The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Levi

The following table captures the wider cast of named characters in ALD, records their named appearances, categorizes their primary connection to Levi, acknowledges their notable contributions to Levi's developing profile, and occasionally provides a few additional noteworthy features of the character in question.

Table 2.1

Named Figure	Appearance(s) in ALD	Connection to Levi	Notable Contributions to Levi's Profile	Other Noteworthy Features
Abraham	1a 15b–16; 11; 17; 22; 50; 62	- Great Grandfather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basis for Petition (1a 15b–16) - Exemplar of Ritual Aspects of Tradition (22) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promise of a Seed of Righteousness (1a 15b–16) - Named Location for Priestly Instruction (11) - Ritual Exemplar (22) - Past Priestly Instructor (22, 50) - Interest in Ongoing Transmission of Priestly Tradition (50) - Adherent of Written Materials (57)

Amram	74–77	- Grandson	- Demonstrates Levi's Effectiveness in Maintaining Endogamous Value in Priestly Line (76)	- Exemplar of Endogamy (76) - Shared Birth Date with Yochebed (76)
Bathuel	62	- Father-in-Law		
Dinah	1c 15?, 20; Rylands Recto 4?; Rylands Verso 9?	- Sister	- Basis for Levi's Violent Action (Rylands Verso 9?)	- Defiled/Defiler (1c 15)
Dan	3 17–19	- Brother		
Gershom	63–64; 65; 74	- Son	- Contributes to Levi's Revelatory Profile (64) - Allows Levi to Develop Endogamy Commitment (73–74)	- Demonstrates the Mutability of the Priestly Status (64) - Commitment to Endogamy (73–74)
Isaac	8; 12–62	- Grandfather	- Blesses Levi (8, 12) - Priestly Instructor for Levi (13–62) - Helps Levi understand the Full Nature of Priesthood	- Priestly Figure (13–61) - Adherent of Ancestral Tradition (22, 50, 62) - Advocate of Kinship/Endogamy (14, 16–18)
Jacob	1a 15a, 19; 1b 12; 1c 15, 18–23; 9–10; Recto 3–4?	- Father	- Basis for petition (1a 15, 19) - Levi not Alone in Shechemite Actions (1c 18) - Recognizes Levi's Priestly Status (9–10)	- Servant of the Lord (1a 15a, 19) - Apparent Co-Collaborator in Shechemite Action (1c 18; Recto 3–12?) - Fulfills Tithe (9)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gives Levi Tithe (9) - Clothes Levi in Priestly Garments (9) - Blesses Levi (10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transmits Priestly Garments (9) - Seemingly Plays a Key Role in the Dinah/Shechemite Event (1c 18; Recto 3–4) - Apparent Association with Wise Speaking (Recto 7)
Joseph	3 15?; 82; 90	- Brother	- Supports Wisdom Value (82, 90)	- Exemplar of Wisdom (82, 90)
Judah	3 19–23	- Brother	-	- Notably Active in Apparent Joseph scene (3 19–23)
Hamor	Recto 7	- Neighbor	- Additional Basis for Levi's Zealous Action (Recto 7)	
Hebron	74	- Grandson	- Contributes to Growing Kinship Network (74)	
Laban	62	- Great Uncle	- Contributes to Growing Kinship Network (74)	
Libni	74	- Grandson	- Contributes to Growing Kinship Network (74)	
Mahli	74	- Grandson	- Contributes to Growing Kinship Network (74)	
Melcha	62–64; 66; 69a; 70–71, 79	- Wife	- Ensures Levi's Endogamous Union (62, 79)	- Exemplar of Endogamy (62, 79)

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mother of Priestly Line (66)
Merari	69a–70; 74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Son 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contributes to Levi’s Priestly Function of Intermediary (69b) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commitment to Endogamy (73–74)
Mushi	69a–70; 74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grandson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contributes to growing kinship network (74) 	
Noah	57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distant Ancestor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exemplar of Ritual Practice (57) - Exemplar of Scribal Practice (57) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ritual Exemplar (57) - Scribal Association (57)
Qahat	66–68; 74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Son 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possibly Contributes to Levi’s Revelatory Profile (67) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elevated Status within the Priestly Line (67)
Reuben	1c 18–23; 3 21–22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brother 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Levi not Alone in Shechemite Actions (1c 18) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apparent Co-Collaborator in Shechemite Action (1c 18) - Apparent Consistent Presence Alongside Levi
Sarah	1a 15b–16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great Grandmother 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basis for Petition (1a 15b–16) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promise of a Seed of Righteousness (1a 15b–16)
Shechem	78; Verso 4–7; 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neighbor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basis for Levi’s Zealous Action (78) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Defiler of Priestly Family (Verso 13)
Shimei	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grandson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contributes to Growing Kinship Network (74) 	

Simeon	3 20–22; 74	- Brother	- Apparent Co-Collaborator in Levi’s Violent Action Against the Shechemites (Verso 8–13) - Perhaps Supports Levi’s Revelatory Profile (Verso 4–7, 10, 12)	- Commitment to Justice for His Sister (Verso 8–13) - Possible Notable Presence in the Dinah/Shechem Scene (8–13)
Uzziel	74	- Grandson	- Contributes to growing kinship network (74)	
Yizhar	74	- Grandson	- Contributes to growing kinship network (74)	
Yochebed	71–72; 75; 77	- Daughter	- Ensures ongoing Endogamous Priestly Line (76)	- Exemplar of Endogamy (76) - Shared Birth Date with Amram (76)

As the above table illustrates, Levi intersects with a wide network of characters across the narrative of ALD. These individuals and Levi’s interactions with them provide notable contour to various aspects of his developing profile. Over the course of our subsequent exploration of Levi’s profile of identity in ALD, we will at times pick up on the significance of select figures from the above table and use some of the above observations as departure points in further elucidating aspects of Levi’s developing identity profile.

Working off the above introductory content, we will now turn to our primary exploration of the figure of Levi in ALD and his distinct profile of Jewish identity.

2.3 Levi's Profile of Jewish Identity in ALD

Across the various movements in ALD, the figure of Levi takes on a distinct profile of identity through the various ways he is portrayed as engaging or developing an association with different ideas and concepts. We see this particularly in his actions, his words, and his interactions with other figures and realities. As I outlined in the introduction, my intention is not to create an exhaustive catalogue of every possible feature of Levi's identity profile that he develops through this process.⁷⁵ Rather, I have chosen to focus on features pertaining to the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space* as previously defined.⁷⁶

In what follows, we will consider the figure of Levi in ALD in relation to each of these concepts. We will focus on identifying and exploring some of the notable ways in which Levi intersects with these concepts. We will look to build upon past observations and provide greater precision as to the nature and contours of these intersections towards developing for him a more comprehensive profile of Jewish identity. We will begin with the concept of *kinship*, to which we now turn.

2.3.1 Kinship

As I noted in the introduction the concept of kinship captures *the genealogical connections (real or imagined) that exist between individuals or groups*.⁷⁷ In larger explorations of ALD, scholars

⁷⁵ As I noted in the introduction, the importance of the notion of otherness and outsider language has become a notable area of investigation for Second Temple studies. Although notions of otherness and othering appear in various regards in ALD, and represent an important contour of Levi's developing profile, I have intentionally chosen to exclude an exploration of these features from my present investigation. This is not to suggest that notions of otherness are not an important aspect of Levi's profile, rather in view of the limited scope of this project, I decided our present analysis is best served by focussing on the aspects of Levi's identity that might be considered to some extent "internal" or "self-contained." For more on the importance of otherness and the other for identity formation in the MT, DSS, and wider Second Temple literature and related studies, see, n. 136 in the introductory chapter.

⁷⁶ For more on my bases for selecting these concepts, see the introductory chapter.

⁷⁷ For more on "real" vs. "imagined" notions of kinship, see, for example, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 100; Goodblatt, "Ancient Jewish Identity," <https://www.ancientjewreview.com/articles/2018/10/24/ancient-jewish->

have hinted at the importance of kinship or related aspects of kinship and its underlying significance for Levi as a figure on various occasions throughout the history of study.⁷⁸ We will pick up on some of these previous perceptions in more detail over the course of our subsequent analysis.

For Levi, the notion of kinship develops in a series of different ways across the composition. If we consider Levi's basic relational identity in ALD, we quickly develop an impression of the importance of kinship for him. At a relational level, Levi's identity primarily develops around kinship connections. Among these connections we see Levi appear as a *son* (i.e., ALD 1a 15a; 1a 15b; 1a 18; 1a 19; 3c 2; 8; 9–10; 58), as a *brother* (i.e., ALD 1c 18; 1c 20; 3 15; 3 17; 3 21–22; 9–10; 58; 82; 90; Ryland Verso 9), as a *grandson* (i.e., ALD 1a 15b–18; 11; 14; 15; 22; 48; 50–51; 57; 61–62), as a *nephew* (i.e., ALD 62), as a *cousin* (i.e., ALD 62), as a *husband* (i.e., ALD 62; 79), as a *father* (i.e., ALD 1a 6; 1a 18; 49; 63; 65–67; 69a; 71–73; 75; 82–84; 88; 90; 98; 102), as a *father-in-law* (i.e., ALD 73), as an *uncle* (i.e., ALD 1a 6?; 81), and as a *grandfather* (i.e., ALD 1a 6?; 73; 81–82).⁷⁹ These primary features of Levi's relational identity seem to offer an initial indication of the significance of kinship for him as a figure.⁸⁰

identity; Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*, 18; Gruen, "Did Ancient Identity," 1–22. Esler as part of an investigation of ethnic Jewish identity in Josephus picks up on these alternative conceptions of kinship, capturing the underlying the nature and values of "imagined" or "fictive" notions of kinship. He writes, "it was enough that a group believed it sprang from a common ancestor or ancestors, not that such a claim was historically correct" ("Judean Ethnic Identity," 80–81).

⁷⁸ As we will subsequently see, scholars hint at the importance of the concept of kinship in ALD and its connections with Levi in a series of different ways, including: priestly genealogies and families (Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 206; Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics," 313; Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 17); specific marriage practices (Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Inter-marriage," 1–24; Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, esp. 23–27; Tervanotko, "Members of Levite Family," esp. 6–11; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 21, 196); the transmission of priestly tradition (Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 261; Drawnel, "The Literary Form," 64); or the notion of circumcision (Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 123–24).

⁷⁹ For a helpful breakdown of the kinship connections in ALD, see the family trees developed by Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 181–2).

⁸⁰ When we consider Levi's kinship based relational identity alongside the wider Aramaic DSS, we can identify a series of analogous kinship emphases. We see this in the case of Tobit, whose initial introduction (Tob 1:1) in the tradition in which he appears and his sense of ongoing identity (1:24; 4:2–3, 13) throughout that tradition,

Beyond this basic picture of Levi as entrenched within a tightly defined kinship network of relationships, we also see the importance of kinship for Levi develop in his notable endorsement of kinship boundaries.⁸¹

2.3.1.1 *Endorsing Kinship Boundaries: Endogamy*

Levi's endorsement of kinship boundaries happens especially through the notion of endogamy. Scholars have picked up on the significance of Levi's engagement with endogamy on a variety of occasions. One of the primary ways in which scholars have explored endogamy in ALD and in connection with Levi is by working to distinguish his particular expression of endogamy among wider endogamous practices in ancient Jewish literature.⁸² Although we will draw out some of those specific distinctives in our analysis, we will primarily focus on capturing a more comprehensive portrait of the ways in which Levi as a figure develops the notion of endogamy as a feature of his profile. We will consider three primary ways he does so.

consistently takes shape in light of kinship connections. Similarly, Tobias consistently casts the identity of the angelic figure of Raphael in the Tobit tradition in connection to kinship connections (Tob 5:5, 9, 11–14).

⁸¹ Levi appears as part of a larger developing trajectory of kinship concerns in the Ancient Jewish literary world. Although kinship boundaries and interests appear in the Pentateuchal traditions preserved in the MT, these kinship concerns demonstrate a notable evolution across the Ancient Jewish literary landscape. One place in which scholars have extensively explored this shift is between the pre-exilic period and the post-exilic periods strongly evidenced in the writings of Ezra/Nehemiah. For more on the development of these kinship concerns, particularly in relation to notions of endogamy, see, for example, Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*; Carmen Palmer, *Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Gēr and Mutable Ethnicity*, STDJ 126 (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2018); Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*; Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage," 1–24.

⁸² Himmelfarb, for example, considers endogamy in ALD as capturing an elevated endogamy standard for priestly figures alongside several other writings such as MMT and 1 Enoch. She notes its two-fold nature, suggesting, "Aramaic Levi moves from endogamy as a standard for all Israel in its account of the aftermath of the rape of Dinah to a more restrictive definition of appropriate marriage for Levi and his descendants" ("Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage," 12). For more proposals as to the distinct nature of endogamy in ALD, see, for example Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 25–27; Kugler, "Some Further Evidence," 353. For wider perceptions on the notion of endogamy in the Aramaic DSS, see, Esther Eshel, "The Proper Marriage According to the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts / על פי המגילה החיצונית לבראשית ועל פי מקורות קרובים לה," MG ט/ח (2010): 29–51 (Hebrew); Devorah Dimant, "Tobit and the Qumran Aramaic Texts," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Brill, 2017), 385–406.

clearly convey the endogamous nature of this union. His wife, Melcha hails from the family of Abraham and so belongs to the wider Israelite people. Yet Levi's description does not end there. Rather he identifies her as also a part of his more immediate family. He seems to present her as his cousin. In this way, Levi demonstrates his adoption of an endogamous marriage practice and with that an elevated interest in the notion of kinship.⁸⁴

Levi's endorsement of kinship boundaries further extends beyond his own personal practice. We see him seek to ensure this practice is adhered to in the lives of others. Perhaps the first indication of this appears in the case of his sister, Dinah.

As part of the Dinah/Shechem tradition (cf. Gen 34; Jub. 30)—which we will return to on a number of occasions throughout the present analysis—Levi takes on a prominent and active role in ensuring that Shechem's attack on his sister does not result in their marital union. We seem to get an initial indication of this in ALD 1c 15–23, as well as in the more recently published Rylands fragments (Rylands Recto [P1185 Recto]; Ryland Verso [P1185 Verso]). Within these sections, Levi participates in strategic action against the Shechemites, to prevent the possibility of his sister succumbing to an exogamous union. We will subsequently explore in greater detail how Levi approaches these specific circumstances as well as the nature of his strategy as it pertains to revelation and wisdom. For our present purposes, however, the fact that Levi attempts to counter Shechem's marriage proposal seems to convey a commitment to kinship boundaries for a few reasons.

While the context of this union as part of an atrocious rape event (Rylands Recto 4; P1185 Recto 4) perhaps contributes to Levi's disapproval of the marriage in question (Rylands Verso; P1185 Verso), the fact that he focusses in on the non-kinship status of Shechem and his

⁸⁴ Tervanotko as part of larger investigation on idealized Levitical marriage practice, noted the ways in which ALD's depiction of Melcha functions to emphasize her Levitical pedigree ("Members of Levite Family," 160–61).

family through a counterproposal of circumcision (ALD 2; ms A, Cambr. a, 6 21, 23; Rylands Recto 9, 12; P1185 Recto 9, 12), seems to suggest that kinship boundaries feature among the primary bases for his disapproval.⁸⁵ The kinship interest in this event is even more apparent in view of wider warnings/concerns for illicit sexual practice and exogamy/endogamy that occur in the wider composition.⁸⁶

In addition to Levi's concerns for his sister, Dinah, we see him also extend his concern for kinship boundaries in the case of his children and his wider descendants. He first does this by ensuring his children's own commitment to kinship boundaries through a practice of endogamy. When the season comes for his children to be married, Levi describes how "for my sons I to[ok wives] from the daughters of my brothers" (ALD 73) (לְבָנַי נָסְתָּם בְּתוֹת נְשֵׁי אֶחָיו) (ms A, Cambr. d, 7 2–3). His description underscores the endogamous nature of the unions of his children. Further, the personalized language of "I to[ok wives]" (נָסְתָּם בְּתוֹת נְשֵׁי) perhaps nods to his active role in orchestrating those endogamous marriages, and with that seems to broaden the contours of his commitment to kinship boundaries.⁸⁷ The fragmentary nature of the term נָסְתָּם, however, inhibits us from confirming this for certain.

Levi again appears to hint at his value for kinship in his subsequent instruction to his descendants. During this instruction, particularly the wisdom discourse section, he describes one of the benefits of a commitment to wisdom as follows: "Whichever la[nd] or province he enters,

⁸⁵ For more on the possible significance of circumcision as an expression of kinship, see, for example, Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion*. See also, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 40–49. While the concern for circumcision seems to indicate the kinship interest in the present passage, the language Levi uses in the offer of circumcision to the Shechemites in ALD compared to the tradition in Genesis seems to suggest that circumcision itself was not a basis for kinship identity. For more on the insufficiency of circumcision alone for Jewish identity, see, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 114–15; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 123. Cf. Drawnel, who reads Levi's words here as synonymous with Jacob's sons' proposal to the Shechemites in Genesis (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 91, 230).

⁸⁶ See, for example, ALD 1a 7; 3a 2–7; 14; 16; 17; 18; 62; 73.

⁸⁷ Cf. Amram's similar approach in 4Q545 1a i 5 (cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5; 4Q546 1 2). For more on Amram's active endorsement of endogamy, see the section entitled, "Kinship" in Chapter 4.

he is a brother or a companion in it, [and he is not] considered a stranger in it, and he is not simil[ar to] a stranger [in it], and he is not similar in it to a half-bree[d], for they all give him glory in it” (ALD 91) (לכל מא[ת] [ומדינה] [די] עֵלֵל לֵה אַח או חִבֵר הוּי בֵה [ולא מ]תנכר הוא בֵה וְלֹא) (ms A, Cambr. f, 6 6–11) (דמ[ה] בֵה [לנכרי ולא דמה בֵה לכילא] [י] מִן די כולהון יהבין לֵה בֵה יקר (“[...to] him to any land or nation that he goes about [...]... in it he will not be like a stranger in it and will not [...] will give him in it honor” [ל...]לֵה לְכָל מַת וּמְדִינָה דִי יֵהֶךְ לֵה [...] בֵה וְלֹא דְמָא []בֵה לְנַכְרֵי וְלֹא [...] הֵבִין לֵה בֵה יקר [4Q213 1 i 15–17]). Although Levi’s words fall as part of his larger endorsement of wisdom, and not directly in relation to endogamy or larger kinship concerns, his choice of language is perhaps telling. Here, Levi seems to praise to some extent the notion of kinship and deride alternative non-kinship statuses. In this sense, Levi perhaps further encourages his descendants towards maintaining kinship boundaries and towards the notion of endogamy albeit indirectly as an offshoot of wisdom.

Beyond the above observations, we can perhaps draw out some of the distinctiveness of Levi’s endogamous practice and directives a bit further in view of similar expressions in wider figures across the Aramaic DSS. A similar emphasis on endogamous practice appears in the cases of Noah (1Q20 6.8), Abram (1Q20 19.14–23; 20.11–34), Tobit (Tob 1:9; 4:12–13), Sarah (Tob 3:14–17), and Tobias (Tob 3:17) among others. In the case of each of these figures, their commitment to endogamy has certain parallels with that of Levi’s. Abram, Tobit, and Sarah (daughter of Raguel) all attest to their own personal adoption of an endogamy practice for their own marriages. Noah similarly demonstrates an active participation in orchestrating the endogamous unions of his children. Tobit demonstrates a similar commitment to endogamy instruction with his son. Amidst these similarities, however, what perhaps most distinguishes Levi’s commitment to kinship boundaries, is the extent he shows himself willing to go to ensure

the adherence of endogamy. Although much of his commitment maps onto wider expressions, as we noted in the case of his sister Dinah, his violent engagement in that case remains distinct.

Levi's primary relational identity, as well as his strict commitment to maintaining kinship boundaries through the practice of endogamy, therefore, seem to offer an initial indication of the significance of kinship for his identity profile. Beyond these primary expressions of the importance of kinship for him, we also see the concept of kinship play a prominent role in additional aspects of his identity, which we will briefly consider.

2.3.1.2 *Levi's Wider Kinship Filter*

The importance of the concept of kinship also becomes apparent in the case of the wider concepts of *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space*.⁸⁸

In terms of tradition, kinship appears to function as a primary basis for determining the legitimate recipients of tradition in ALD. For Levi, in his own reception of tradition from his grandfather, Isaac, his named status as “son” (בר) (τέκνον)—or more specifically, grandson—appears to be of considerable importance.⁸⁹ Leading up to and during this exchange, Levi describes himself or is described in terms of the kinship titles of “son” or child” on numerous occasions.⁹⁰ Kinship appears to play an important role in Levi's engagement of tradition.⁹¹

Kinship also seems to have notable bearing on the concept of revelation. Throughout ALD, the revelatory content that Levi engages has considerable intersections with notions of

⁸⁸ We will subsequently explore the nature and contours of these aspects of Levi's identity in greater detail. For our present purposes, as we noted in the introduction, each of these concepts have notable points of overlap and intersection as demonstrated here in the case of kinship with Levi.

⁸⁹ Drawnel previously noted the term “my son” as phrasing common in biblical wisdom material (“Priestly Education,” 549, 557). Yet in view of the kinship emphasis throughout ALD, this language also seems to contribute to the development of Levi's status as part of a kinship group.

⁹⁰ See, ALD 11; 14; 15; 22; 48; 50; 51; 58; 61.

⁹¹ For wider impressions on the importance of kinship for the transmission of tradition in ALD, see, for example, Drawnel, “The Literary Form,” 261.

kinship. We perhaps see this in that the revelatory content Levi receives consistently pertains to kinship figures. Levi seemingly obtains revelation pertaining to his sister Dinah regarding her circumstances with Shechem and the Shechemites.⁹² Levi learns of various realities pertaining to his children and his grandchildren through revelation.⁹³

The notion of time seems to have a notable intersection with kinship in that Levi's elevated interest in the past seems to center on exemplary *kinship* figures and their related realities.⁹⁴ Further, his interest in the future largely appears to center around his children and projections related to their futures.⁹⁵

Finally, space seems to intersect with the notion of kinship on various levels. This is perhaps most apparent in the case of the human body as a sacred space, which we will explore in greater detail below.

2.3.1.3 *Levi and Kinship*

As I alluded to in the introduction, the concept of kinship or an elevated sense of its importance is not unique to the figure of Levi or the Levi traditions preserved in ALD. As I previously noted, the wider Aramaic DSS attest to various figures and traditions that similarly emphasize the importance of basic kinship connections. Many of the figures within these traditions similarly seem to develop primary relational identities through genealogical connections. Further, Levi's emphasis on the importance of kinship through his endorsement of kinship boundaries in a practice of endogamy also has several wider analogues in the Aramaic DSS. Yet while Levi

⁹² ALD 1c 19; Rylands Recto 13; Ryland Verso 5–8, 12.

⁹³ On realities pertaining to his children, see, ALD 64, 98, 102–3. On realities pertaining to his grandchildren (i.e., Amram), see, ALD 76. For more on the revelatory nature of these references, see the subsequent section entitled “Revelation.”

⁹⁴ See, for example, ALD 1a 15a–19; 9; 13; 22; 50; 57; 76; 78; 90.

⁹⁵ See, for example, ALD 64, 67, 98, 102, 103.

shares this endogamy value among related figures, his endorsement arguably stands distinct in view of the violent lengths he is willing to go to ensure its adherence in others. We will now shift to the second concept for Levi's identity profile: *tradition*.

2.3.2 Tradition

Tradition, as *the transmission of a core set of virtues from one generation to the next, often catalyzed by an appeal to some form of lore*, represents another important aspect of Levi's identity profile. Across the composition, Levi develops a significant association with this conception of tradition in several ways. Three ways we can perhaps see this include: 1) Levi's formation of or formation in relation to a distinct set of virtues; 2) Levi's participation in an intergenerational transmission process of those virtues; and 3) the dynamic nature of Levi's participation in that process.

2.3.2.1 Levi's Distinct Virtues

Across ALD, the narrative portrays Levi in relation to a robust suite of specific virtues. The specific nature of these virtues is apparent in Levi's opening prayer (ALD 1a 6–19), in which he repeatedly conveys his interest in understanding and engaging virtues in a certain manner and avoiding others that are seemingly incongruent with the former. This interest seems to filter across ALD and is apparent in the different experiences and realities in which Levi appears.

We have already noted above the importance of certain aspects of kinship for Levi. In addition to the importance of kinship, we will also explore the significance of features pertaining to the larger concepts of *revelation*, *time*, and *space*, which appear to be of particular importance to Levi's identity.

In addition to those core concepts, however, Levi also seems to emphasize several additional virtues that have notable intersections with the notion of tradition. These include:⁹⁶

- Ritual Practice
- Truth
- Wisdom⁹⁷

2.3.2.1.1 Ritual Practice: Purity, Sacrifice, and Prayer

Levi demonstrates the importance of virtues pertaining to the notion of ritual practice. As I noted above, ALD includes extensive content on ritual practice.⁹⁸ The instructional episode between Levi and Isaac on ritual practice (ALD 13–61), for example, dominates a considerable portion of the narrative.

⁹⁶ We could perhaps fruitfully explore these additional virtues as larger, individual categorical investigations. I have chosen, however, to explore these virtues in a more limited fashion. This is not to dismiss their importance for Levi's profile, in that they do seem to offer notable contour to his identity. This decision to engage this content on a sub level may therefore raise certain questions. For example, it might appear puzzling not to include ritual practice as a primary feature of Levi's identity in view of the prominence of related content across the composition. Despite the prominence of content on ritual practice, however, my impression is that our analysis is best served by considering ritual practice, as well as the wider abovementioned virtues under the larger rubric of tradition. On one hand, this is in view of the natural limitations of the present project and our initial delimiting of our five primary concepts. Extending our investigation into these wider categories would considerably extend our analysis well beyond what we are presently able to undertake. On the other hand, my impression is that by engaging these features as a sub-set of tradition-based virtues, we can effectively develop some of the broader features of Levi's identity profile.

⁹⁷ For more on the use of this term in the present study, see, n. 109 of the present chapter below.

⁹⁸ For more on the nature of ritual practice in ALD, refer to the recent work of Feldman, who unpacked select aspects of the distinct nature of sacrifice in the composition (Liane M. Feldman, "Sanitized Sacrifice in Aramaic Levi's Law of the Priesthood," *JAJ* 11.3 [2020]: 343–68; Liane Feldman, "Perspective and Perception: Sacrifice in the Aramaic Levi Document," [paper presented at the University of Birmingham Biblical Studies Seminar [virtual], University of Birmingham, UK, 16, December 2020]). See also, Hillel Mali, "Priestly Instructions in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Order of the Morning Daily Sacrifice / עבודת התמיד וסדר הארמי בכתב לוי הארמי וסדר עבודת התמיד," *MG* 7 (2018): 119–138. For a wider comparison of ritual practice in ALD with those found in the traditions of the Torah and its wider significance, see Himmelfarb, "Earthly Sacrifice," 103–22.

In Isaac's instruction to Levi, he develops a series a different ritual related virtues. These include protocols on *ritual ablutions* (ALD 19–21, 26, 53–55),⁹⁹ *sacrificial materials* (ALD 25a),¹⁰⁰ *sacrificial measurements* (ALD 27–8),¹⁰¹ and *sacrificial proceedings* (ALD 27–8, 31).¹⁰²

Levi's opening prayer may further demonstrate his wider commitment to ritual practice in that he precedes his petition with a series of ablutions. He describes how “I washed my garments and having purified them in pure water, I also bathed myself completely in running water, and I made straight all my ways” (ALD 1a 1–2) (ἐγὼ ἔπλυνα τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ καθάρισας αὐτὰ ἐν ὕδατι καθαρῷ καὶ ὄλος ἐλουσάμην ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι· καὶ πάσας τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐποίησα εὐθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 1–2) (לְבָנִי וְכָל [עַרְוַת...] וְכָל [עַרְוַת...]) (“[...]I [...]I [washed] and all”) (4Q213a 1 6–7).¹⁰³

⁹⁹ Levi's reception of virtues related to ritual ablutions appears, for example, in the phrases: “whenever you arise to enter the temple of God bathe in water” (ALD 19) (כְּדִי תִהְיֶה קִאִים לְמִיעַל לְבֵית אֱלֹהִים הָיִי סַחֵי בְּמֵיִא) (ms A, Bodl. a, 9 1) (ὅταν εἰσπορεύῃ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις λούου ὕδατι πρῶτον) (ms E 18,2 12 1); to “repeat (it) again and wash your hands and your feet before you sacrifice on the altar all this” (ALD 20) (הַיֵּיב הַאִיב תּוֹב וְרַחֵץ יָדַיךָ וְרַגְלֶיךָ עַד דְּלֹא תִקְרַב לְמִדְבַּחַח כָּל) (ms A, Bodl. a, 9 4–6) (νίπτου πάλιν τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ τοὺς πόδας σου πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει τρὸς τὸν βωμὸν προσενέγκαι ὀλοκάρπωσιν) (ms E 18,2 12 4–6); “whenever you take to sacrifice everything that is fitting to offer on the altar, repeat (it) again and wash your hands and feet” (ALD 21) (כְּדִי תִהְיֶה נֹסֵב לְהַקְרִיבָה כָּל דִּי חוּזָה לְהִנְסָקָה לְמִדְבַּחַח) (ms A, Bodl. a, 9 6–8) (ὅταν μέλλῃς προσφέρειν ὅσα δεῖ ἀνεύγειν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν, πάλιν νίπτου τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ οὖς πόδας σου) (ms E 18,2 12 6–8); “again wash your hands and your feet from the blood” (ALD 26) (עוֹד רַחַץ יָדַיךָ וְרַגְלֶיךָ מִן דְּמָא) (ms A, Bodl. a, 9 2–3) (πάλιν νίψαι σου τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος) (ms E 18,2 12–13 2–3); “each time wash the hands and the feet, when you approach the altar; and when you exit from the sanctuary, let no blood adhere to your garment” (ALD 53) (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὥραν νίπτου τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας, ὅταν πορεύῃ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον· καὶ ὅταν ἐκπορεύῃς ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων, πᾶν αἷμα μὴ ἀπτεσθῶ τῆς στολῆς σου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 53); “the hands and feet wash continually from all flesh and let not any blood and any soul appear on you” (ALD 54–55) [τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας νίπτου διὰ παντὸς ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκός. καὶ μὴ ὀφθῆτω ἐπὶ σοὶ πᾶν αἷμα καὶ πᾶσα ψυχὴ] (ms E 18,2 13–15 54–55).

¹⁰⁰ Levi's reception of virtues related to sacrificial materials appears, for example, in the phrase: “these are the ones that he told me that are fitting to offer” (ALD 25a) (ταῦτα εἶρηκεν ὅτι ταῦτα ἐστὶν ἃ σε ἀναφέρειν) (ms E 18,2 12 20) (אֵינִן דִּי אָמַר לִי דִּי חוּזָה לְהִנְסָקָה) (ms A, Bodl. c, 9 20).

¹⁰¹ Levi's reception of virtues related to sacrificial measurements, for example, in the phrase: “do not fall short of the adequate calculation of wo[o]d” (ALD 31) (לֹא תַחְסֹר מִן חוּשְׁבֵן חוּזָה דְּ[י] אֵ[י] אֵ[י] אֵ[י]) (ms A, Bodl. d 9 19).

¹⁰² Levi's reception of virtues related to sacrificial proceedings appears, for example, in the phrases: “first offer up the head and cover it with fat ... and after this the neck” (ALD 27–8) (רְאִשָּׁה הָיִי מִהִנְסָק לְקַדְמִין וְעִלּוּהִי חֲפֵי תִרְבָּא) (ms A, Bodl. d 9 4–5) (τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνάφερε πρῶτον καὶ κάλυπτε αὐτὴν τῷ στέατι ... καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο τὸν τράχηλον) (ms E 18,2 12–13 4–5); “do it by order, [by measure] and by weight” (ALD 31) (עֲבִיד בְּסֹרֶךְ הָיִי עֲבִיד בְּמִשְׁחָה וּבְמִתְקָל) (ms A, Bodl. d 9 17–18) (ἐν τάξει ποίει ἅ ποιῆς ἐν μέτρῳ καὶ στάθμῳ) (ms E 18,2 12–13 17–18).

¹⁰³ Greenfield and Stone previously suggested that this practice of washing seems to reflect a Levitical bathing practice. They use this to recast the narrative order of ALD suggesting that this washing is perhaps an event that takes place after Levi's slaying of the Shechemites (The Prayer of Levi,” 249). Drawnel rejects this as a post-Shechemite washing, and instead suggests that these ablutions seem to reflect moral purity concerns. Drawnel argues against Greenfield's and Stones' suggestion that there is no precedent for this type of bathing practice prior to

Regardless of the specific nature of Levi's ablutions in the opening scene, the importance of virtues pertaining to ritual action in terms of bathing and sacrificial procedure are apparent. Beyond ritual practices of purity and sacrifice, Levi perhaps alludes to the importance of an intermediary type of cultic role through the notion of prayer. While much of the content of Levi's opening prayer concentrates on personal interests and concerns, he also perhaps showcases its intermediary nature.¹⁰⁴ This role is somewhat muted in this scene in view of Levi's wider apparent interests, but we perhaps get a sense of Levi's intermediary function with his mention of the presence of his children in the scene (ALD 1a 6) (καὶ νῦν τέκνα μου μετ' ἐμοῦ) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6). Additionally, in Levi's prayer he includes a request on behalf of his children, asking that the Lord grant "true judgment" (ALD 18) (טשק רן) (4Q213a 2 9) (κρίσιν ἀληθινῆν) for both "me and my sons" (ALD 18) (ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς μου) (ms E 2,3 10–11 18).

In this sense, Levi appears to develop a notable suite of virtues related to ritual practice and its various contours.

2.3.2.1.2 Truth

Within Levi's prayer, he demonstrates a concern for the notion of "truth" (ἀληθείας) as one of the underlying virtues of tradition.¹⁰⁵ Among the first phrases he utters to the Lord, he includes a petition that the Lord grant him "all the ways of truth" (ALD 1a 6) (πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀληθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6) (אִרְחֵי אֱמֶת) (4Q213a 1 12). The presence of this item at the outset of his prayer,

prayer. He states that "the connection between washing of the entire body and correcting Levi's ways implies a moral, not cultic, interpretation of the cleansing. This particular perspective that conjoins ablutions with moral purification is well attested in the prophetic writings" (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 210).

¹⁰⁴ Drawnel notes this heightened personal focus in this prayer. He describes Levi's prayer as "rather self-centred and concerns his separation from evil..." (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 212).

¹⁰⁵ Levi's interest in truth bears notable similarity to Qahat's interest in truth. Cf. 4Q542 1 i 4, 10, 12; 1ii 1, 8. For more on this connection with WQ as well as similar connection in 4Q541, see, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 207.

seems to suggest it to be in some way foundational for Levi. His subsequent request for “true judgment” (ALD 1a 18) (κρίσιν ἀληθινήν) (טש קש) (4Q213a 2 9) perhaps reflects this underlying foundational sense. Levi seeks to operate within a type of judicial sphere, specifically one that aligns with this principle of “truth.”

In Levi’s subsequent instruction from Isaac, this sense of truth appears to continue. As Isaac announces to Levi his instructional aims and the nature of his instruction, he describes it as follows: “And now, my son, the law of truth I will show you, and I will not conceal from you anything to teach you the law of the priesthood” (ALD 15) (וכען ברי דין קושטא אחזינד ולא אטמר) (מינד כל פתגם לאלפותך דין כהנותא ἀναγγεῶ σοι, καὶ οὐ μὴ κρύψω ἀπό σου πᾶν ῥῆμα. διδάσξω σε) (ms A, Bodl. 8 11–14) (καὶ νῦν τὴν κρίσιν τῆς ἀληθείας) (ms E 18,2 12 11–14). For Isaac, truth appears to be the foundational value of his instruction, intrinsically tied to the “law of the priesthood” and what it means to be a priest.

In Levi’s later instruction to his descendants, he reaffirms truth as a foundational feature of the priestly tradition he seeks to transmit. He captures the essence of his own instruction with the idea of “showing” his descendants the truth (ALD 84).¹⁰⁶ Following this, he further confirms the sense of truth as a type of principle. His appeal to his descendants is for them to “let the principle of all your actions be truth” (ALD 85) (ראש עובדיכון יהוי קושטא) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 11–12) (רש... כל עבדכון) (4Q213 1 i 6). He follows this by outlining the anticipated positive implications of adhering to this foundational principle. He conveys to them that “[if you s]ow tru[th], you will reap a blessed and [go]od harvest” (ALD 86) (וקדושטא [א הן] חזן [ר]עון תנהעלון) (ms A, Cambr. e 6 7–10) (אנה לבן) (4Q213 1 i 4–5).

¹⁰⁶ In this instance, Levi describes how “I myself show you the truth” (ALD 84) (ואנה קושטא לבון מהחוי) (ms A, Cambr. e 6 7–10) (אנה לבן) (4Q213 1 i 4–5).

בא[טא] וְ[עללה בריכה ו] (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 13–14) (“He who sews goodness brings goodness”) (דזרע טב טב מעל) (4Q213 1 i 8).¹⁰⁷

Levi’s emphasis on truth maps onto a wider interest in truth in the Aramaic DSS. The concept of truth as a virtue plays a prominent role in Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), 1 Enoch, Book of Giant (BG) (4Q530), Tobit, and WQ (4Q542) among others. As we will explore in greater detail below in WQ, perhaps the foundational sense of truth across these writings is that of a basic ordering principle.¹⁰⁸ Within these wider writings, however, truth seems to build out from that foundational sense into various expressions. Among these, there appears a common interest in appealing to the notion of truth to ensure the quality of an individual’s testimony. In 1Q20, Lamech repeatedly engages his wife, Batenosh with the language of truth, regarding the conception of their son, Noah (1Q20 2:5–6, 10; cf. 1 En. 106). Similarly, Tobit questions his wife Anna with the language of truth regarding how she attained enough money to purchase a goat (Tob 2:11–14). Alternatively, we see figures themselves take on the quality of truth within these writings. Enoch (1Q20 2:22; 3:13; 1 En. 107:2–3; 4Q530 2 ii 23–24) and Noah (1Q20 6:1, 6, 23) appear as both possessing truth and subsequently acting as conduits of truth.

If we consider Levi’s adoption of truth in ALD alongside these wider analogues, he appears to develop a similar impression of its value and significance. Levi seeks to ensure its integration in himself in his opening prayer, demonstrates his ongoing adoption of it during his instruction from Isaac, and seeks to ensure its reception in his descendants.

¹⁰⁷ Note variant with 4Q213 1 i 8 compared to ms A Cambr. e, 6 13–14.

¹⁰⁸ For more on this understanding of truth, see, the subsequent section 3.3.2.3.1, entitled, “Truth (קושט): A Baseline Principle for Ordering Reality.

In view of the above examples, truth becomes an additional concept that gives shape to Levi's profile, and one which becomes a notable aspect of the tradition he seeks to preserve and transmit to the next generation.

2.3.2.1.3 Wisdom¹⁰⁹

Wisdom seems to represent another notable virtue for Levi.¹¹⁰ We see the importance of wisdom for Levi as early as his opening prayer, in which he asks that the Lord “give me counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength” (ALD 1a 8) (βουλήν καὶ σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ἰσχὺν δός μοι) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8) (חכמה ומנדע וגבורה) (“[...w]isdom and knowledge and might”) (4Q213a 1 14).¹¹¹

There are then several other instances in which Levi appears to model this value of wisdom in his embodied actions. This is perhaps the case in his engagement in the Dinah/Shechem episode, where he appears to operate with “under]standing” (ALD 1c 19) (בי[נה) (ms A, Cambr. a, 6 19). Although the specific term “wisdom” (חוכמה), does not appear in the extant materials, the possible reading of “under]standing” and the seemingly shrewd nature of Levi's actions in this context perhaps reflect an underlying sense of wisdom.

¹⁰⁹ As I hinted at above, the notion of “wisdom” represents a notable area debate in scholarship. Questions abound as to the nature of “wisdom,” including its viability as a category and genre of literature. For more on these debates, see, for example, Will Kynes, *An Obituary for “Wisdom Literature”: The Birth, Death, and Intertextual Reintegration of a Biblical Corpus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Mark Sneed, “Is the ‘Wisdom Tradition’ a Tradition?,” *CBQ* 73.50 (2011): 50–71. With an awareness of some the considerable challenges in adopting the language of “wisdom” within the present study, my impression is that it remains functional for our present purposes. That being said, for the present study I understand the notion of “wisdom” as reflecting *a sense of conventional knowledge*.

¹¹⁰ Various scholars have noted that the emphasis on “wisdom” in ALD represents the continued evolution of the priestly office. Himmelfarb previously noted the absence of wisdom from the priestly repertoire in earlier traditions such as those preserved in Deuteronomy and the development of additional features such as wisdom in the Second Temple period (*A Kingdom of Priests*, 14–15).

¹¹¹ Italics mine.

The importance of wisdom for Levi, as a core virtue becomes fully apparent in his instruction to his children where he encourages the ongoing study and perpetuation of the study of wisdom (ALD 88–89).¹¹² He points to the example of the figure of Joseph and calls them to look to his modelling of wisdom for their own lives (ALD 91–93).¹¹³

When we consider the above examples, wisdom becomes an increasingly apparent feature of the tradition which Levi seeks to transmit.

Levi also appears to demonstrate significant virtues in terms of the notion of instruction, which I will develop in greater detail below as part of my exploration of the transmission process for tradition that Levi adopts and his use of various mediums of transmission.

2.3.2.2 *Participating in the Tradition Process: Roles and Responsibilities*

Beyond the formation of a substantial suite of virtues, the importance of tradition for Levi also shows up through his participation in the process of intergenerationally transmitting those virtues. One way we see this is in the different instruction related roles and responsibilities that Levi takes on, which further attest to a variety of expressions of the intergenerational transmission of tradition.

¹¹² Levi, for example, states: “And now, my sons, teach scribal craft, instruction, *wisdom* to your children, and let *wisdom* be with you for eternal glory. Whoever studies *wisdom* will [attain] glory through her, but the one who despises *wisdom*, becomes an object of disdain” (ALD 88–89) (עמכון ליר עלם די אליף חוכמתא לבשרון מתיהב וכען ספר ומוסר וחכמה [...] ליקר עלם די) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 17–22) (4Q213 1 i 9–11).

¹¹³ Levi’s appeals to his brother Joseph and his example of wisdom include phrases such as: “Consider, my sons, Joseph my brother [who] taught scribal craft and the instruction of *wisdom*, to glory, and to greatness, and to kings [on their thrones he was joined]” (ALD 90) (חזו בני ליוסף אחי [ד]מאלפא ספר ומוסר חכמה [ליקר לרבו ולמלכין על] (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 17–23) (4Q213 1 i 11–12); “[Whoever teaches wisdom] (to) a man wh[o] studies [wisdom, all] his days are [ong] and hi[s] fame spreads” (ALD 91) (די [...] ר”ס גב”ד די אליף) (מאל חוכמ[ה] גבר ד[י] א[ל]ף [חכמה כל י]ומוהי א[ר]יכין [וסגה] [ה שמ]ע[ה] כל) (ms a, Cambr. f, 6 4–6) (4Q213 1 i 14); “Hi[s] friends are many, and his well-wishers are great ones. And they seat him on the throne of glory in order to hear the words of his wisdom” (ALD 92–93) (ר[חמוה] [י] סגיאין ושאלו שלמיה רברבין ועל) (כורסי ייקר מהותבין לה בדיל למשמע מילי חוכמתה [...] ר[חמו]הי שגיאין ושאלו שלמה רברבין) (ms A, Cambr. f, 6, 12–15) (4Q213 1 i 18–19).

2.3.2.2.1 Receiving Tradition: Levi the Student

Perhaps the first role that Levi develops in relation to the intergenerational transmission of tradition is as a student or a recipient of tradition. The primary place this seems to occur in ALD, is in Levi's engagement with his grandfather, Isaac.

Following Levi's otherworldly dream-vision in which he receives otherworldly confirmation of his priestly status, he appears to have an initial engagement with his family including his brothers, his father, Jacob, and his grandfather, Isaac. In this scene immediately following his dream-vision, Levi receives a series of blessings, an investiture of priestly garments, and his father's offerings.¹¹⁴ On the heels of these initial events, Levi again engages Isaac, yet this time at "the fortress of Abraham" (ALD 11) (בבירת אברהם) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 2) (τῆ ἀύλῃ Ἀβραάμ) (ms E 18,2 12 2). While the initial family event following Levi's dream-vision perhaps reflects an aspect of his reception of tradition, it is here that Levi takes up his formal position as student. Of Isaac in this scene, Levi states, "when he learned that I was a priest of God the most high, the Lord of heavens, he began to instruct me and to teach me the law of the priesthood" (ALD 13) (וכדי ידי די אנה כהין לאל עליון למארי שמיא שארי לפנקדה יתי ולא לפא יתי דין) (כהנותא) (ms A, Bodl. b 8 5–8) (καὶ ὅτε ἔγνων ὅτι ἐγὼ ἱεράτευσα τῷ κυρίῳ δεσπότῃ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἤρξατο διδάσκειν με τὴν κρίσιν ἱερωσύνης) (ms E 18,2 12 5–8). Isaac too affirms the instructional nature of this engagement and Levi's position as student, when he states, "And now, my son, the law of truth I will show you, and I will not conceal from you anything to teach you the law of the priesthood" (ALD 15) (וכען ברי דין קושטא אחזינד ולא אטמר מינד כל פתגם לאלפותך דין כהנותא) (ms

¹¹⁴ For more on proposals as to why Isaac functions as Levi's priestly instructor and not Jacob, see above n. 68 in the present chapter.

A, Bodl. 8 11–14) (καὶ νῦν τὴν κρίσιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀναγγεῖλῶ σοι, καὶ οὐ μὴ κρύψω ἀπὸ σου πᾶν ῥῆμα. διδάσξω σε) (ms E 18,2 12 11–14). Following this, Levi undergoes extensive priestly training from his grandfather (ALD 14–61) which seemingly captures all pertinent facets of the priestly tradition, but which preserves in writing various essential virtues pertaining to kinship, purity, ritual practice, present and future instruction, and the overall importance of the transmitted ancestral tradition. Here we see the importance of tradition for Levi emerge through his role as a student.

2.3.2.2.2 Embodying Tradition: Levi the Adherent and Exemplar of Tradition¹¹⁵

As most teachers can attest, instruction represents only one part of this type of transmission process. Reception is equally as important in the transmission process. While good instruction helps ensure reception, it does not guarantee it. In the case of Levi, his role as student in the transmission process bears notable fruit. In the surrounding narrative of ALD, we see Levi move out of his role of student into the role of adherent. Levi appears as an exemplary adherent of underlying tradition-based virtues.¹¹⁶ Three primary instances in which we witness Levi as adherent and exemplar pertain to purity, kinship, and instruction.

Levi demonstrates his commitment to aspects of tradition related to purity on several occasions, one of which intersects with his commitment to kinship. For our present purposes, we

¹¹⁵ For more on the notion of “exemplar” or “exemplarity,” see, for example, Hindy Najman, “Reconsidering Jubilees: Prophecy and Exemplarity,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, with the collaboration of Jason von Ehrenkrook, James Waddell, and Jason Zurawski (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 229–43; Hindy Najman and Tobias Reinhardt, “Exemplarity and Its Discontents: Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom Texts and Greco-Roman Didactic Poetry,” *JSJ* 50.4–5 (2019): 460–96; Annette Yoshiko Reed, “The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection: Abraham and Exemplarity in Philo, Josephus, and the Testament of Abraham,” *JSJ* 40.2 (2009): 185–212.

¹¹⁶ For wider perceptions of the importance of Levi’s exemplary practice in terms of knowledge transmission, see, for example, Drawnel, “The Literary Characteristics,” 312.

will focus on his apparent reception and adherence to ritual aspects of purity. One of the more clear-cut examples of Levi's adherence to and exemplarity of tradition appears in relation to the concept of kinship. Since we explored kinship in considerable detail above, I will limit my comments here. If we look at Levi's depiction of the growth of his family in ALD 62–80, there is a clear sense of his adherence to tradition-based kinship values, and with that, related virtues pertaining to purity. As Levi offers an account of his own marriage, he is careful to convey its compliance to an endogamy ethic (ALD 62). In his subsequent account of his own children and grandchildren, he reiterates an ongoing commitment to this practice (ALD 73–75). I have detailed the contours of this commitment in greater detail in the above section on kinship. For our present purposes, however, it is enough to note that Levi seemingly demonstrates himself to be an exemplary adherent of the tradition-based virtue of endogamy originally passed down to him from his grandfather, Isaac, at the time of his youth (ALD 14, 16–17).

In Levi's engagement with his descendants in the latter portion of ALD, he also demonstrates himself to be an exemplary adherent of tradition through his commitment to instruction.¹¹⁷ He describes how, "I called [my] sons [and] their sons and began to command them everything that I had intended. I spoke and said to my sons: [Hear] the words of Levi, your father, and obey the commands of God's beloved. I myself command you, my sons, and I myself show you the truth, my beloved" (ALD 82–84) (קריתי לבנִי וְ[ו]לבניהון ושריתי לפקדה הנון כל די הווה) (קושטא לכוּן מפקד בני ואנה עם לבבי ענית ואמרת לבני [שמ]ע[ו] למאמר לוי אבוכון והציתו לפקודי ידיד אל אנה לכוּן מפקד בני ואנה עם לבבי ענית ואמרת לבני [שמ]ע[ו] למאמר לוי אבוכון והציתו לפקודי ידיד אל אנה לכוּן מפקד בני ואנה קריתי לבנִי וְ[ו]לבניהון ושריתי לפקדה הנון כל די הווה) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 5–6) ("[...]. . .them [...]to my sons [...]I to you")

¹¹⁷ Scholars have previously noted the way in which Levi's adoption of instruction represents a further extending of the roles of the priestly office. The inclusion of an instructional element to the priestly office is noteworthy, in that instruction was previously part of the scribal office. They make these observations in view of the considerable historical division between priestly and scribal camps. For more on the significance of Levi's instructional role as a priest, see, for example, Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 11–16.

(אָנה לִבְנֵי [...] לִבְנֵי [...] אָנוּן [...] (4Q213 1 i 3). By doing this, Levi appears to receive and adhere to the earlier instruction of Isaac to instruct his children (ALD 49–50). Further, Levi demonstrates a wider commitment to the ancestral practice modelled by Abraham (ALD 22, 48, 50, 57), and seemingly far before him, by the antediluvian figure of Noah (ALD 57).¹¹⁸

Levi's adherence and commitment to instruction as a tradition-based virtue further appears in his encouragement to his descendants to continue in this practice. He tells them, "and now, my sons, teach scribal craft, instruction, wisdom, to your children" (ALD 88) (וְכַעַן בְּנֵי סֹפֵר) (מוֹסֵר חֹכְמָה אֵלֵינוּ לְבְנֵינוּ (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 17–18) (וְכַעַן סֹפֵר וּמוֹסֵר וְחֹכְמָה) ("And now, scribal craft, instruction, and wisdom") (4Q213 1 i 9).

In view of each of the above examples, Levi demonstrates the importance of tradition for his identity profile through various expressions of adherence and exemplarity. Let us now move from Levi the adherent to Levi the teacher.

2.3.2.2.3 Perpetuating Tradition: Levi the Teacher

Levi's instruction of his descendants showcases his commitment to tradition by ensuring its ongoing perpetuation in the generations to come through his role as a teacher. As, Drawnel observes, "the transmission of priestly tradition and history to the next priestly generations is one of the most important preoccupations of this literature, for which the glorious future depends on the proper contacts with the heavenly realm, continuation of the priestly tradition, and the study of priestly and scribal matters."¹¹⁹ These examples capture an additional way in which Levi

¹¹⁸ We perhaps get hints of Levi's adherence to instruction in his leading of his children into endogamous unions in ALD 73–75, yet his instructional profile comes into full view in this latter event.

¹¹⁹ Drawnel, "The Literary Characteristics," 317.

participates in the transmission of tradition, one that looks beyond his own personal reception and ongoing adherence.

Alongside the different roles and responsibilities that Levi takes on to transmit tradition, he also underscores its importance by the mediums through which he either receives or transmits tradition. These include *verbal*, *modelled*, and *written* mediums of transmission.

2.3.2.3 *Levi's Transmission of Tradition: Verbal, Modelled, Written*

Levi participates in the verbal transmission of tradition in a variety of ways.¹²⁰ Perhaps the first notable example of this in ALD appears in Isaac's instruction of Levi. Levi describes how Isaac "began to instruct me and to teach me" (ALD 13) (יְהוָה לְפָנַי לְתוֹרָה וְלִדְבָר יְהוָה) (ms A, Bodl. b 8 6–7) (ἤρξατο διδάσκειν με) (ms E 18,2 12 6–7). Within this transmission, Isaac repeatedly conveys the verbal nature of his instruction. During his instruction, he urges Levi to "*listen* to my words and *hearken* to my commandments, and let these words not leave your heart all your days" (ALD 48) (ἀκουσον τοὺς λόγους μου καὶ ἐνωτίσαι τὰς ἐντολάς μου, καὶ μὴ ἀποστήτωσαν οἱ λόγοι μου οὗτοι ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας σου ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις σου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 48). Isaac's description seemingly underscores the audible nature of his transmission. Isaac further conveys that the teaching he offers Levi derives from his father Abraham's similar practice of verbal instruction. He appears to acknowledge this on two occasions with the phrases, "for thus father Abraham *commanded* me to do and to *command* my sons" (ALD 50) (οὕτως γὰρ μοι ἐνετείλατο ὁ πατὴρ Ἀβραάμ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐντέλλεσθαι τοῖς υἱοῖς μου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 50) and "for thus my

¹²⁰ For more on the importance of speech as medium for the transmission of tradition, see, Reed, "Textuality between Death and Memory," 393.

father Abraham *ordered* me” (ALD 57) (οὕτως γὰρ μοι ἐνετείλατο ὁ πατήρ μου Ἀβραάμ) (ms E 18,2 13–15 57).

The importance of a verbal medium of transmission again shows up in Levi’s own subsequent instruction to his descendants. He describes that “I began to *command* them” (ALD 82) (וּשְׂרִיתִי לַפְקֹדָה) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 6) and that “I *spoke* and *said* to my sons [] the word of Levi, your father, and obey the commands of God’s beloved. I myself *command* you, my sons and I myself show you the truth, my beloved” (ALD 83a–84) ([] לְמַאמֵר לֹוֹי אֲבוּכֹן) אִמְרַת לְבִנֵי בְנֵי לְבִנֵי [...] אֲנִי לְכֹן (וְהִצִּיתוּ לַפְקֹדֵי יָדִיד אֵל אֲנִי לְכֹן מִפְקֹד בְּנֵי לְבִנֵי [...] (4Q213 1 i 4–5).

In view of these examples, Levi’s persona develops in notable relation to a verbal means of transmitting tradition.

Alongside a verbal or spoken medium, Levi also underscores modelling as another important means for the transmission of tradition. Levi perhaps hints at this in the scene of his purification and prayer. Amidst the different purificatory and petitionary actions he takes in the scene, he acknowledges how “my children are with me” (ALD 1a 6) (τέκνα μου μετ’ ἐμοῦ) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6). Scholars have puzzled at the presence of his children in this scene for various reasons. Much of this puzzlement stems from questions pertaining to the chronological order of events within the composition especially as it pertains to Levi’s investiture as priest.¹²¹ Scholars have often recognized that the reason for the basic presence of Levi’s children within this scene is unclear.¹²² In view of Levi’s apparent interest in the transmission of tradition, and his apparent

¹²¹ On the challenges of ordering the chronological sequence of the narrative flow, see, for example, Cana Werman, “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 4.2 (1997): 217. On the timing of Levi’s priestly appointment, see, for example, Kugel, “Levi’s Elevation to the Priesthood,” 24–26.

¹²² Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 123.

value for a modelled transmission, it is possible that the presence of Levi's children here is a case of Levi practicing a modelled means of transmitting tradition. In this case, he perhaps functions as the model of the tradition he seeks to transmit.

Levi's emphasis on modelling is not isolated to this event. Levi appears to underscore the importance of his own practice of a modelled transmission of tradition in later instruction to his descendants, which I hinted at above. At one point in his teaching, in addition to verbal instruction to his descendants, he conveys how "I myself *show* you the truth, my beloved" (ALD 83a–84) (אנה קושטא לכוּן מהחוי הביבי) (ms A, Cambr. e 6 7–10) (אנה לכוּן [...] לבני [...] (4Q213 1 i 4–5).

Levi's value for modelled instruction appears to stem from previous practitioners of the tradition. In particular, we see this in the case of Isaac, who functions as a model of tradition for Levi. During Isaac's instruction to Levi, as part of a preface as to the nature of his teaching, he describes how "I will *show* you" (ALD 15) (אחזינד) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 11) (ἀναγγελω σοι) (ms E 18,2 12 11). He reiterates this as one means of transmitting tradition to Levi, as he later reminds Levi to instruct his own children, "as I have *shown* you" (ALD 49) (ὡς σοι ὑπέδειξα) (ms E 18,2 13–15 49).¹²³ Isaac in turn notes that his modelled instruction originates with Abraham. He notes that his modelling comes from what he "*saw* Abraham" do (ALD 22) (חזיתי לאברהם) (ms A, Bodl. c, 9 12) (חזית לאברהם) (4Q214 b 2–6 i 2).

¹²³ Drawnel, argues that the חזי ("to see" or "to show") functions on a metaphorical/figurative level ("Priestly Education," 558–9). While Drawnel's proposed didactic context for ALD perhaps fits this notion of חזי as a metaphorical/figurative expression of teaching or learning, I sense that there may also be a value in reading this term as expressing literal notions of "showing" and "seeing" for understanding the nature of the instruction.

Finally, writing as a medium for the transmission of tradition appears a third notable feature of Levi's profile.¹²⁴ Perhaps the first example of this appears in the teaching that Levi receives from Isaac. As part of Isaac's instruction to Levi, he acknowledges that he derived his instruction on the handling of blood from Abraham, whose knowledge of this tradition came from "the writings of the Book of Noah" (ALD 57) (τῆς γραφῆς τῆς βίβλου τοῦ Νῶε) (ms E 18,2 13–15 57).¹²⁵

In Levi's subsequent instruction to his own descendants, he himself demonstrates an ongoing adoption of commitment to this transmissional medium. On at least three occasions Levi encourages his children towards the practice of perpetuation of scribal craft (ספר) (ALD 88, 90, 98). He tells his sons to "now teach scribal craft, instruction, wisdom to your children" (ALD 88) (כען ספר ומוסר וחכמה אליפו לנהיכון) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 17–18) (כען ספר ומוסר וחכמה) (4Q213 1 i 9). He subsequently anchors the importance of scribal practice in his exemplary portrait of the figure of Joseph (ALD 90).¹²⁶ He further mentions "scribal craft" (ספר) (ALD 98)

¹²⁴ This emphasis on written materials as a means of knowledge transmission in ALD likely functioned on various levels. For example, Reed argues, as part of a larger discussion on testamentary materials, that written content as a means of knowledge transmission likely functioned to guard against the limitations of oral transmission. She further argues that oral transmission represents an ideal within these materials yet suggests that the use of written materials "simultaneously points to the limits of this ideal to fit a more complex reality—where lines of succession can be broken or contested, wisdom might have to run along lines other than genealogical descent, and writing might have to stand in or vouchsafe, what lineage can no longer preserve" ("Textuality between Death and Memory," 381–412, here 400). For more on the importance of scribal craft in ALD, see the recent work of Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

¹²⁵ Scholars have previously noted, the appeal to the figure of Noah (and other ancestral figures) and his writings in ALD perhaps functions as an authority claiming strategy. The appeal to Noah extends the origin of the knowledge tradition beyond near ancestral figures into the distant ante-diluvian past. See Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 133–49, esp. 143–48; Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts," 307–26, esp. 326. See also, Florentino García Martínez, "Parabiblical Literature from Qumrân and the Canonical Process," *RevQ* 25.4 (2012): 545–56, esp. 545. For more on "the Book of Noah," see, n. 171 below.

¹²⁶ Levi calls his descendants to "consider, my sons, Joseph my brother [who] taught scribal craft" (ALD 90) (חזו לבן בני) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 22–23) (בני ליוסף אחי [ד]מאלפא) (4Q213 1 i 11).

(4Q213 1 ii–2 8; 4Q214a 2–3 ii 5) and includes the phrase “also in the books” (ALD 99) (אף בספריא) (4Q213 1 ii–2 12) as part of a larger discourse on the value of wisdom.

2.3.2.4 *Levi and Tradition*

As we hinted at above, the concept of tradition as *the transmission of a core set of virtues from one generation to the next, often catalyzed by an appeal to some form of lore*, appears as a prominent feature in the wider Aramaic DSS. In this sense, like the concept of kinship, Levi’s emphasis on tradition maps onto a larger world of figures and traditions in which tradition seems to function as a notable feature of identity. Many of the core virtues that Levi seeks to transmit appear in relation to various figures and within a variety of literary contexts, yet the specific makeup of this core and its points of emphasis remain distinct to Levi. Further, the nature of Levi’s participation in the tradition process and how he transmits tradition have various intersections with wider figures in the Aramaic materials. Like the figures of Tobias (Tob 5:1) or Methuselah (1 En. 82:1; 91:1) Levi takes on the role of student. Like the figure of Enoch (1 En. 82:1), Levi adheres to and embodies the tradition he seeks to transmit. Further, similar to Enoch (1 En. 82:1–2; 91:1–3) or Tobit (Tob 5:1; 14:8), Levi takes on a distinct instructional role. While each of these figures share similar roles with Levi, Levi seems to particularly function in all three roles. In this sense he demonstrates a more comprehensive participation in the tradition process.

As in the case of kinship, scholars have recognized Levi’s distinct concern for tradition and its transmission within ALD. Again, however, our present work aims to draw out Levi’s individual portrait and move it beyond primary compositional frameworks. Here in the case of tradition, we can see how Levi as an individual figure with the ALD materials, distinctly

operates in relation to tradition, and develops it as another aspect of his identity profile. Let us now turn to the concept of *revelation*.

2.3.3 Revelation

Returning to our introductory definition, revelation for Levi represents *an otherworldly disclosure to humanity of certain previously inaccessible knowledge*.¹²⁷ We see Levi's identity take shape in relation to this sense of revelation in a series of ways across ALD.¹²⁸

Perhaps an initial indication of the developing significance of revelation for Levi as a figure shows up in his various connections with revelatory terminology. Levi appears in reference to dream-visions on several occasions (ALD 1b 15–16; 7; 64; 98). He shows up in relation to various otherworldly revelatory figures (ALD 1a 18; 7).¹²⁹ The narrative supplements those references by couching Levi in connection to various verbal actions pertaining to revelation including “seeing” (ALD 1b 16; 64; 67?; 98) and being “shown” (1a 8; 1b 15).¹³⁰ We also perhaps see revelatory intersections in the mention of him in connection to notions of “under]standing” (ALD 1c 19) (בי[נה) (ms A, Cambr. a, 6 19) and as perhaps reflecting on

¹²⁷ Conceptions of otherworldly knowledge developed in considerable ways during the Second Temple Period. Ancient Jewish thinkers increasingly began to conceive of notions of revelatory knowledge beyond that accessible in the Torah. For more on the development of revelatory access, see, for example, Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2002); Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*.

¹²⁸ Scholars have previously pointed out that Levi's revelatory profile likely developed out of the traditions preserved in writings such as Mal 2:5–6 and 1 Sam 2:27. For more on this proposal, see, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*.

¹²⁹ Among these instances, Levi references his encounter with “a single angel” (ALD 1a 18) (מלאך ה') (4Q213a 2 18) and on another occasion as part of his dream-vision how “those seven departed from me” (ALD 7) (ונגדו שבעתון) (מן לותי) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 9).

¹³⁰ Although Drawnel suggests that the language of “seeing” is metaphorical in nature, this language also appears important on a literal level in terms of visual observation (“Priestly Education,” 559). For more on this language in ALD as revelatory terminology, see, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*. For more on the wider impression of “seeing” as part of the revelatory repertoire, see, Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 92.

revelatory knowledge (Ryland Recto 13).¹³¹ Each of these references seems to contribute to a growing complex of revelatory language related to Levi as a figure in ALD.

2.3.3.1 *Levi's Revelatory Profile: Seeking, Receiving, Responding*

Beyond a basic connection to revelatory language, however, Levi's revelatory profile in ALD seems to develop in three apparent stages. First, Levi appears as someone who actively *seeks* out revelation. Second, he appears as someone who *receives* revelation. And third, he appears as someone who *responds* to revelation. We will explore some of the contours of each of these below.

The initial stage of formation of Levi's revelatory profile seems to occur during what appears to be the outset of the composition, as part of a purification/prayer sequence. During his prayer, Levi seems to allude to his desire for revelation on several occasions. He asks that the Lord “give me all the ways of truth” (ALD 1a 6) (δός μοι πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀληθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6) (טש קשר[...]) (4Q213a 1 12). He further pleads, “let the holy spirit, o Master, be shown to me and give me counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength to do what pleases you and find grace before you and praise your words with me, o Lord” (ALD 1a 8–9) (δειχθήτω μοι, δέσποτα, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποιῆσαι τὰ ἀρέσκοντά σοι καὶ εὐρεῖν χάριν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ αἰνεῖν τοὺς λόγους σου μετ’ ἐμοῦ) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8–9). Again, he asks the Lord to “draw me near to be your servant and to serve you properly” (προσάγαγέ με εἶναι σοῦ δοῦλος καὶ λατρεῦσαί σοι καλῶς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 11).¹³² Finally, he repeats his request for nearness to the Lord in order to operate

¹³¹ As I alluded to earlier, this perhaps occurs in his utterance, “I considered” [Ryland Recto 13] [וחשבתי] [P1185 Recto 13] in relation to the Dinah/Shechem event. For more on these terms as expression of revelation see, for example, Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*, 91–119.

¹³² Cf. 4Q213a 1 18, which Perrin translates as “draw me near to become for you” (קרבני למהוא לכה).

from a place of “true judgment,” (κρίσιν ἀληθινήν) (ALD 1a 18) (ms E 2,3 10–11 18) (טקשין) (4Q213a 2 9) which seems to represent a further plea pertaining to revelation.¹³³ With each of these phrases, Levi increasingly seems to position himself as someone who *seeks* otherworldly disclosure.¹³⁴

In what appears to follow Levi’s initial petition, we seem to encounter a second stage of the development of Levi’s revelatory profile. In this second stage, Levi not only seeks revelation, but *receives* revelation.¹³⁵ He goes from being a revelatory hopeful, to a genuine seer. While the exact extent of Levi’s revelatory experiences in ALD remains an open question, we encounter Levi experiencing or alluding to a series of revelatory episodes/content throughout the composition.¹³⁶

In ALD 1b 14–18, for example, Levi describes the initial portion of a dream-vision episode. He conveys his experience of lying down (“I lay down and I stayed” [ALD 1b 14] [שכבת ויחבת אנ על]) [4Q213a 2 14]). He goes on to describe how “I saw a vision” (ALD 1a 15) (חזיון אחזית) (4Q213a 2 15). The extent of our understanding of this dream-vision experience is

¹³³ Levi’s appeal to “true judgment” falls within a larger section of his opening prayer in which his petition reads as follows: “Listen also to the voice of your servant Levi, to be near to you, and make (him) participate in your words to do a true judgment for all eternity (that is) me and my sons for all the generations of the ages. And do not turn aside the son of your servant from before your countenance” (ALD 1a 17–19) (εἰσάκουσον δὲ καὶ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδός σου Λευὶ γενέσθαι σοὶ ἐγγύς καὶ μέτοχον ποιήσον τοῖς λόγοις σου ποιεῖν κρίσιν ἀληθινήν εἰς πάντα τὸν αἰῶνα, ἐμὲ καὶ τοὺς υἱούς μου εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τῶν αἰώνων. καὶ μὴ ἀποστήσης τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ παιδός σου ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου πάσας τὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος. καὶ ἐσιώπησα ἔτι δεόμενος) (ms E 2,3 10–11 17–19) (לבדך עבדך [ל...ל] טקשין [עבדך] צלות [מך] (“prayer of [your] serv[ant...] true judgment for al[...] the son of your servant from be[fore...]”)) (4Q213a 2 8–10).

¹³⁴ For more on how some of these phrases are perhaps emblematic of revelatory requests, see, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 222.

¹³⁵ Drawnel notes how Levi’s initial petition functions as the basis for his subsequent access to the otherworldly context, and with that otherworldly knowledge (“Priestly Education,” 548).

¹³⁶ See, for example: ALD 1b 14–18; 3a 1–8; 3b 1–3; 3c 1–3; 4–6; 7; 64; 67; 98; 102?; 103?

unfortunately limited to a few initial images (ALD 1b 16–19). Yet regardless of its contents, Levi appears here as a receiver of otherworldly revelation.¹³⁷

Again, following the depiction of the Dinah/Shechem event, Levi conveys his experience of what appears to be a second dream-vision. In this case the specific contours and content of the dream-vision are somewhat fuzzy due to the fragmentary nature of the material culture. This dream-vision, however, appears to extend from ALD 3a–7. We will explore the possible contents of this dream-vision below. For our present purposes, however, it is simply notable that Levi again appears here as revelatory recipient. He confirms this by stating, “and I arose from my sleep. Then I said, ‘This is the vision and I wonder that the whole vision like this one will come true.’ And I hid also this one in my heart and I did not reveal it to anybody” (ALD 7) (ואנה אתעירת מן שנתי אדין אמרת חזוא הוא דן וכדן אנה מתמה די יהוי לה כל הזוה וטמרת אף דן בלבי ולכל (אינש לא נליטה) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 10–12) (“And] I awoke from my sleep. Then [...and I hi]d this too in my heart and did not to anyone”) (אנא אתעירת מן שנתי אדין [וטמר...] ת אף דן בלבבי ולכל (אנש לא (4Q213b 1 2–3)).¹³⁸ Levi, thus conveys the hidden nature of the dream-vision content, as well as his intention not to disclose it to others.

Later, following Isaac’s instruction to Levi, Levi further casts himself as a recipient of revelation. Regarding a negative forecast for his son Gershom’s future, Levi describes how his knowledge of this came through a dream-vision. He states, “and concerning the child I saw in my

¹³⁷ Several scholars have picked up on this initial dream-vision as perhaps the instance in which Levi became a recipient of wider otherworldly knowledge not specifically related to the priestly office. See, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 51. In view of the fragmentary nature of the materials, however, much of these observations seem to build off wider readings of T. Levi materials and therefore should be cautiously adopted.

¹³⁸ While the exact contents of this dream-vision are somewhat scattered (ALD 3a 1–8; 3b 1–3; 3c 1–3; 4–6; 7), and whether the subsequent reference pertains to the initial dream-vision reference or whether this content reflect more than one dream-vision, as I noted above, is a matter of ongoing debate.

vision” (ALD 64) (*καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παιδαρίου εἶδον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὀράματι*) (ms E, 18,2 13–15 64).¹³⁹

Whether this refers to one of Levi’s earlier referenced dream-vision in ALD is uncertain.

Levi’s apparent reception of revelatory knowledge does not end with Gershom, however. There are hints of his reception of additional revelation during his instruction to his descendants in which he again references the reception of revelation through a dream-vision (ALD 98)¹⁴⁰, and makes certain projections pertaining to his son, Qahat (ALD 67).¹⁴¹ The latter reference, however, falls within a highly fragmentary context, and is therefore relatively uncertain. Yet there seem to be further hints of his reception in the case of both ALD 101 and ALD 102, although in these two cases there is no explicit reference to Levi’s reception of this content. Nonetheless, through each of the above examples, Levi’s revelatory profile takes on additional contours through his formation as a basic recipient of otherworldly revelation.

In the third stage of the development of Levi’s revelatory profile, in addition to seeking revelation and receiving revelation, Levi also *responds* to revelation. ALD alludes to this on a series of occasions.

One instance in which Levi seems to operate from a position of revelation is during the process of his priestly ordination. There is ongoing debate as to what exactly constitutes Levi’s priestly ordination, that being his otherworldly investiture (ALD 6) or his this-worldly

¹³⁹ Drawnel makes the interesting suggest that this reference to “seeing” in relation to Gershom builds into a wider tradition in which Levi in and of himself possesses the ability to know the future (“The Literary Characteristics,” 313). While this may be possible, in my reading, it seems much more likely that this content pertains to Levi’s wider profile as dreamer/visionary. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, alternatively suggest that this “seeing” phrase may be less about a dream-vision source and more about establishing the authority of the observation (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 186). Again, while this may be the case, as things stand, I do not see any reason to look for alternative explanations for this language beyond Levi’s dreamer/visionary profile.

¹⁴⁰ Levi describes here how “I saw in visions th[at]” (ALD 98) ([חזית בחזוין ד]י) (4Q214a 2–3 ii 6).

¹⁴¹ Levi describes regarding his son, “and I sa]w that to him” (ALD 67) (וחזי[ת די לה) (ms A, Cambr. c, 7 67).

Drawnel similarly reads this language as indicative of a dream-vision source (“The Literary Characteristics,” 313).

experience of Jacob giving to him priestly garments (ALD 9).¹⁴² Regardless of what exactly constitutes Levi's priestly instalment, the impression that Levi gives following his dream-vision is that he is responding in accordance with revelation contained therein. When Levi awakens from his dream-vision, he describes how he said to himself, "this is the vision and I wonder that the whole vision like this one will come true." I hid also this one in my heart and did not reveal it to anybody" (ALD 7) (חזוא הוא דן וכדן אנה מתמה די יהוי לה כל הזזה וטמרת אף דן בלבי ולכל אינש) (לא גליתה (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 9–12) (אנה אתעיררת מן שנתי אדין) (4Q213b 1 2). We could perhaps construe his actions here as the opposite of responding to revelation, in that he hides its content away and "did not reveal it to anybody." Yet the way in which Levi expresses an initial sense of "wonder" ("I wonder" [ALD 7] [אנה מתמה] [ms A, Bodl. a, 8 11]), combined with his subsequent actions seem to demonstrate his response to its content.¹⁴³ We see this in his this-worldly confirmation by Jacob, and the subsequent instruction he receives from Isaac. Levi appears to move into a place of this-worldly installment into the priesthood based upon the revelation he received in his dream-vision.

A second instance in which Levi seems to respond to revelation is during his instruction of his descendants. Levi's references to revelatory content are rather limited during this section of material. Yet as we noted above, in what appears to be the latter section of Levi's instruction, he seems to allude to one or more dream-vision experiences. Levi informs his descendants how "I saw in the visions that" (ALD 98) ([חזית בחזוין ד...] (4Q214a 2–3 ii 6).

¹⁴² In this instance of this-worldly investiture, Levi describes how "he clothed me in priestly clothes and he filled my hands" (ALD 9) (ואלבשי לבוש כהונתא ומלי ידי) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 19–20). For more on the moment that constitutes Levi's appointment to the priesthood, see, for example, Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 12–13, 15, 17, 40; Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 52; Stone, "Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts," 323. For the importance of priestly garments for the priesthood, see also, Kugel, who describes the priestly garments as "a necessity of the office" ("Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood," 17).

¹⁴³ For a similar sense of "wonder," cf. 11Q10 4 5; 6Q8 1 6.

The material surrounding this phrase is somewhat fragmentary. Yet in what remains of the surrounding materials, Levi appears to go on to instruct his descendants as to their future realities. This is apparent with his repeated adoption of future verbiage (ALD 97, 98, 100).¹⁴⁴ This content captures a variety of interests, roles, and circumstances. He precedes this phrase with a mention of “scribal craft and instruction wi[sdom that...” (ALD 98) (סֵפֶר וּמוֹסֵר הַכְּבוֹד) (4Q213 1 ii–2 8) ([...] (סֵפֶר וּ) (4Q214a 2–3 ii 5); and follows it with references to the giving of something “great” (ALD 98) (רַבָּה) (4Q213 1 ii –2 10]), “g]lory” (ALD 98) (יְקָרָה) (4Q213 1 ii–2 11]), “the books” (ALD 99) (סֵפֶרִיא) (4Q213 1 ii–2 12]), as well as what appear to be a series of political terms and figures (ALD 99–100).¹⁴⁵ All of which seem to be in some apparent relation to his descendants (ALD 98, 100).¹⁴⁶ In this sense, Levi seems to anchor his instruction in his revelatory experience(s).

While the subsequent material in ALD 101–103 does not include any explicit indications of a basis in revelatory content, as I alluded to above, in my reading, the ongoing future focus and the second person address directed specifically at his descendants seem to suggest continuity with the preceding section.¹⁴⁷ In view of this, Levi’s instruction pertaining to what appears be

¹⁴⁴ See, for example: “you will inherit” (ALD 97) (דִּי תִרְתָּן אֲנִי) (4Q213 1 ii–2 9; “great you will give” (ALD 98) (רַבָּה תִתְּנוּן) (4Q213 1 ii –2 10); “it will be” (ALD 100) (תְּהוּיָא) (4Q213 1 ii–2 17); “will pass from you until every” (ALD 100) (תְּעַבֵּר מִנְּכֶן עַד כָּל) (4Q213 1 ii–2 18).

¹⁴⁵ These terms include: “heads and judges” (ALD 99) (רֵאשִׁין וְשֹׁפְטִין) (4Q213 1 ii–2 13); “servants” (ALD 99) (עַבְדִּין) (4Q213 1 ii–2 14); “priests and kings” (ALD 99) (כַּהֲנָן וּמַלְכִין) (4Q213 1 ii–2 15); “your kingdom” (ALD 100) (מַלְכוּתְכֶן) (4Q213 1 ii–2 16); “without end” (ALD 100) (לֹא אֵיתִי סוּף) (4Q213 1 ii–2 17); “with great glory” (ALD 100) (בְּיָקָר רַב) (4Q213 1 ii–2 19).

¹⁴⁶ References to his descendants appear in the following phrases (italics mine): *you* will inherit them” (ALD 98) (תִּרְתָּן אֲנִי) (4Q213 1 ii–2 9); “*you* will give” (ALD 98) (תִּתְּנוּן) (4Q213 1 ii–2 10); “*your* kingdom” (ALD 100) (מַלְכוּתְכֶן) (4Q213 1 ii–2 16); “will pass from *you*” (ALD 100) (תְּעַבֵּר מִנְּכֶן) (4Q213 1 ii–2 18).

¹⁴⁷ Future emphasis appears in the phrases: “you will become dark” (ALD 102) (תַּחֲשׁוּן) (4Q213 4 1); “will come guilt” (ALD 102) (תְּהוּא חוּבְתָא) (4Q213 4 3); “they will know it” (ALD 102) (יִדְעוּנָה) (4Q213 4 4); “you will leave” (ALD 102) (תִּשְׁבְּקוּן) (4Q213 4 5); “will come over you” (ALD 102) (תַּתָּא עֲלֵיכֶן) (4Q213 4 7); “you will proceed” (ALD 102) (תִּהְיוּן) (4Q213 4 7); “you will become” (ALD 102) (תְּהוּיָן) (4Q213 4 8). Second person address directed at Levi’s sons appears in the phrase “upon you, my sons” (ALD 102) (עֲלֵיכֶן בְּנֵי) (4Q213 4 4).

some type of future, perhaps eschatological, division among humanity catalyzed by some type of malevolent being (ALD 103) again comes through him operating out of a position of revelatory knowledge.¹⁴⁸

Another instance in which Levi seems to respond to revelation—and this may represent the most significant example, especially in terms of outward expression—occurs within ALD’s depiction of the Dinah/Shechem tradition. In this case, Levi does not explicitly reference a dream-vision or revelatory content during this event. Yet there seem to be a few indications that he responds to revelation on this occasion.

As part of the above overview, I noted that the content ALD initially preserved of this tradition was somewhat limited. While the Genizah and DSS materials appear to depict what seem to be related surrounding realities and content (ALD 3; ALD 3a), the material specifically pertaining to the event seems to be restricted to ALD 1c. The identification and inclusion of the Rylands fragments among the ALD materials, however, considerably extended its depiction of the event.

Within this preserved episode in ALD, Levi takes on a considerable role. As in Gen 34, Levi appears among a group seeking to navigate the complex realities resulting from a combination of things including a recent rape event and a subsequent marriage proposal both which take place amidst deeply held ancestral tradition-based values and community politics. As several scholars have observed, however, ALD seems to cast Levi’s activity in a distinctly favorable light compared to the Genesis account of the tradition, especially compared to Jacob’s later engagement with his sons in chapter 49.

¹⁴⁸ Reference to a malevolent being may appear with the phrase “by the evil one” (ALD 103) (בְּ[רָ]שָׁע) (4Q213 5 1), although the highly fragmentary nature of this phrase makes it uncertain.

Among the more positive aspects of ALD's portrayal of Levi is the sense that his response in this scene is undertaken with a notable degree of thoughtfulness. One possible place we see this is in ALD 1c 19, particularly in the case of Drawnel's partial reconstruction of this portion of text. In his reconstructed version, Drawnel captures Levi's response to Shechem's proposal of marriage to Dinah as conducted "with [wisdom and under[standing]" (ALD 1c 19) (ב[חוכמה ובינה]) (ms A, Cambr. a, 6 19).¹⁴⁹ This possible—albeit largely reconstructed—phrase, perhaps represents an initial allusion to Levi as responding to revelation. Regarding Levi, Drawnel states, "in his vision he must have received God's instruction concerning the fate of the Shechemites who became 'doers of violence.'" He further explains, "Levi, who already knows God's sentence from his first vision, advises his father and brother how to execute it."¹⁵⁰

Drawnel, however, based his reconstruction largely off later Targumic and Rabbinic materials. Given that the extant materials only preserve the scant lettering ב[]נה, from which Drawnel goes to reconstruct ב[חוכמה ובינה], the reading extends well beyond the available text as Drawnel himself recognizes.¹⁵¹ Yet Drawnel's reconstruction remains intriguing in view of the wider portrait of Levi in the Rylands Fragments.

In the Rylands fragments, there seem to be at least three indications that Levi responds to revelation particularly regarding the circumstances related to Dinah and Shechem. The first indication of this appears in the moments seemingly following Levi's family's discussion with Hamor (Rylands Recto 7–13) in which his family presents a counter proposal to Shechem's

¹⁴⁹ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 106.

¹⁵⁰ Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 228. Perrin also notes Levi's second dream-vision, despite its "fleeting" content, as likely contributing revelation regarding the handling of the Dinah/Shechem event. He notes, "it is likely that the revelation in some way related to forecasting and endorsing Levi's rage at the rape of Dinah" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

¹⁵¹ Drawnel further reconstructs this notion of "wisdom" into the actions of Levi and his brothers with Shechem in his treatment of the Rylands fragment. See especially his reconstruction of Rylands Recto 8 (P1185 Recto 8) in Drawnel, "The Cairo Genizah Fragment," 85, 87.

request for Dinah’s hand in marriage. Either amidst this conversation or directly on the heels of it, the phrase “and I considered” (וַחֲשַׁבְתִּי) (Rylands Recto 13; P1185 Recto 13) appears. Based upon the wider context of ALD, it seems likely that the subject of this phrase in question is Levi.¹⁵² In Drawnel’s interpretation of this phrase, he suggested that the reading “and I considered” perhaps casts Levi as simply considering “the appropriateness of the proposal addressed to the Shechemites to circumcise.”¹⁵³ Drawnel’s comments push back on the suggestion offered by Peters and Eshel, who alternatively translated this phrase “I contemplated,” reading this language as having a closer connection to the specific details of his family’s conversation.¹⁵⁴ While both are intriguing, Perrin’s more recent proposal that this phrase perhaps connects Levi’s engagement with this situation to revelatory knowledge is especially noteworthy.¹⁵⁵ If Perrin’s reading is correct, this would offer further indication of Levi as responding to revelation.

My impression is that Perrin’s reading fits well within the wider depiction of Levi in the Rylands materials. When the apparent figure of Levi describes his plans to kill the Shechemites, he states how “today he has given th[em] up, and at this time God has handed all of them over into [our] hands to kill them and to execute [against the]m righteous [judg]m[ent]” (Rylands Verso 5–7) (יומא הדין יהב איִנִּי וְעִידנָא דִּין סַגְר כּוּלְהוֹן אֵל בִּידִי [נָא] לְמַקְטֵל אִינוּן וְלַמְעַבְדִּי מְנַהוּ [דִּי] [זִן]) (P 1185 Verso 5–8). Simeon subsequently affirms Levi’s words, conveying their plan to “execute [righteous] judgment” (Rylands Verso 12) (נְעַבְדִּי [זִן] דְּקִשׁוּט) (P 1885 Verso 12).¹⁵⁶

¹⁵² For wider confirmation of the speaker in question in this Recto portion of text as Levi, see, for example, Drawnel, “The Cairo Genizah Fragment,” 93.

¹⁵³ Drawnel, “The Cairo Genizah Fragment,” 93.

¹⁵⁴ Peters and Eshel, “Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem,” 249.

¹⁵⁵ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

¹⁵⁶ For wider perceptions of the primary speaker in the Verso section as Simeon, see, Drawnel, “The Cairo Genizah Fragment,” 101.

These statements are notable for a few reasons, especially as it pertains to the nature of Levi's actions.

First, Levi's words seem to convey the sense that he speaks from a position of otherworldly revelation. Levi does not simply hope for the destruction of the Shechemites, but rather he seems to anticipate their certain destruction. The reason for this certainty comes from an apparent knowledge that God "has given th[em] up, and at this time God has handed all of them over into [our] hands." In this sense, Levi seems to convey the sense that he and his brother are responding to revelation. Or in other words, that he is aware of an alignment between his proposed violent actions against the Shechemites and the desires of God.¹⁵⁷ Secondly, both Levi and Simeon's apparent description of the proposed action as "righteous judgment" further seems to convey the sense that they are responding to an otherworldly disclosure. Although the term "righteous" is reconstructed by Drawnel, the combined gap in the fragmentary space in the material culture and the wider divinely appointed nature of their actions, makes the inclusion of this specific adjective increasingly convincing.

In view of these above examples, Levi's revelatory profile becomes increasingly robust. Levi aspires to be a recipient of revelation, this aspiration becomes actualized, and finally here we see him fully embrace and embody this revelatory profile as he repeatedly operates out of positions of revelation.

2.3.3.2 The Content of Levi's Revelation (or Revelatory Interests)

Thus far, the importance of revelation for Levi is apparent in both his connection to a complex of revelatory verbiage, as well as in how he subsequently cultivates a considerable revelatory

¹⁵⁷ For similar observations as to this as representative of otherworldly knowledge, see, Drawnel, "The Cairo Genizah Fragment," 79, 90, 96–98.

profile through his developmental engagement with revelation. In addition, the nature and extent of Levi's revelation or revelatory interests within ALD further drive home its significance for him as a figure.

As per our opening definition all the revelatory content that Levi receives originates from an otherworldly source. Yet the substance of that content captures a variety of different interests and subjects. By considering this variety we can perhaps best begin to grapple with the nature and extent of his revelation or revelatory interests.

While Levi certainly receives revelation pertaining to this-worldly realities as we observed in relation to his descendants and Dinah, some of the most developed aspects of Levi's revelatory repertoire pertain to otherworldly realities. On several occasions throughout ALD, Levi receives revelation or demonstrates an interest in revelation related to understanding the nature and contours of otherworldly reality.

Perhaps the first indication of this appears in his prayer scene.¹⁵⁸ As Levi expresses himself before the Lord, he initially keys in on a particular concern for developing his acquaintance with otherworldly reality in the form of a deeper understanding of otherworldly figures or beings. In his prayer, Levi demonstrates a keen interest first in gaining revelation pertaining to the "holy spirit" (ALD 1a 8) (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8)). He petitions for the Lord to "let the holy spirit, o Master, be shown to me" (ALD 1a 8) (δειχθήτω μοι, δέσποτα, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8), as well as through his request that the Lord

¹⁵⁸ While Levi's prayer largely seems to capture Levi's revelatory interests rather than actual revelation, scholars have underscored the importance of this prayer for his larger revelatory profile. Drawnel, for example, notes how Levi's prayer in many ways functions as the basis for his subsequent revelatory experiences ("Priestly Education," 548; *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 207). Further Drawnel, notes how the prayer functions as providing the framework for all the subsequent events in the narrative. He notes, "one can therefore safely conclude that Levi's petitionary prayer, situated at the beginning of the whole text, serves as an introductory commentary to all the successive events described in the composition" ("The Literary Characteristics," 309).

“not allow any satan to rule over me” (ALD 1a 10) (μὴ κατισχυσάτω με πᾶς σατανᾶς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 10) (לֹא תִשְׁלַט בִּי כָל שַׁטָּן) (4Q213a 1 17). The nature of Levi’s understanding of the “holy spirit” (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) is not immediately clear. Yet Levi’s preceding request for the removal of “the unrighteous spirit” (ALD 1a 7) (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄδικον) (ms E 2,3 10–11 7) and later interest in divisions of light/darkness may suggest this reference plays into a larger cosmic framework akin to what surfaces in other Aramaic DSS traditions such as VA (4Q543–547). Further, what exactly Levi means with the phrase “be shown to me” is also not immediately clear, although his coupling of this request with an interest in notions of “counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength” (ALD 1a 8) (δείχθήτω μοι) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8), perhaps indicates that this acquaintance might function in some way to support his efforts to gain the latter qualities. Yet the sense of division between the “showing” of the holy spirit and the “giving” of those latter qualities may indicate that the two groupings represent separate, unrelated requests. Regardless of Levi’s perception of this force/figure and its specific significance, its position within the otherworldly realm is clear, in that expanding his acquaintance with it is beyond his human control, thus its inclusion within his prayerful petition. In this sense Levi demonstrates through this reference an initial interest in revelation pertaining to aspects of otherworldly reality.

Alongside this phrase, Levi demonstrates in his prayer a much more substantial interest in revelation regarding the figure of the Lord. When we look at his prayer, Levi primarily expresses this desire for revelation in terms of proximity.¹⁵⁹ Levi asks for the Lord to “draw me near”

¹⁵⁹ This notion of proximity to the Lord perhaps also intersects with certain aspects of Levi’s conception of spatial identity. In view of its primary intersection with otherworldly reality and the otherworldly figure of the Lord, we will investigate it here. For more on the importance of space and spatial aspects of Levi’s identity, see the section below entitled “Space.”

(ALD 1a 11) (προσάγαγέ με) (ms E 2,3 10–11 11) and to “listen also to the voice of your servant Levi to be near to you” (ALD 1a 17) (εἰσάκουσον δὲ καὶ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ παιδός σου Λευὶ γενέσθαι σοι ἐγγύς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 17) ([...דב]עב לות צ) (“prayer of [your] serv[ant...]”) (4Q213a 2 8). He asks for purification in order that he might “raise myself to you” (ALD 1a 14) (προσαροῦμαι πρὸς σε αὐτός) (ms E 2,3 10–11 14). He petitions against the prospect of distance, asking the Lord to “not turn your face away” (ALD 1a 15a) (μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου (ms E 2,3 10–11 15a) and to “not turn aside the son of your servant from before your countenance” (ALD 1a 19) (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ παιδός σου ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου σου) (ms E 2,3 10–11 19) ([...דם]מן קדדך לבר) (“the son of your servant from be[fore...]”) (4Q213a 2 8–10).¹⁶⁰

He further expresses his desire for nearness in terms of “participation” (“make [him] participate in your words” [ALD 1a 18] [ποίησον τοῖς λόγοις σου] [ms E 2,3 10–11 18]). This sense of participation in the “words” of the Lord, seems to capture much of the essence of Levi’s underlying interest in the revelation of the figure of the Lord; that being a close understanding of the mind and thoughts of the Lord. For Levi, participation in the “words” seems to represent a sense of seeing and engaging the world rightly. His additional emphasis on “true judgment” κρίσιν ἀληθινῆν] [ms E 2,3 10–11 18] [טשק דין] [4Q213a 2 9], seems to build into this desire for revelation of the otherworldly figure of God and with that otherworldly perspective.

Levi’s interest in the otherworldly perspective of God also seems to extend into a series of specific revelatory allotments. Levi requests that the Lord “give me all the ways of truth” (ALD 1a 6) (δός μοι πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀληθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6) (טשק תרהר[...]) (4Q213a 1 12).¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ Drawnel previously picked up on these phrases as petitions for priestly status (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 215–18).

¹⁶¹ For more on the significance of this “ways” language, see the subsequent section entitled “Space.”

He conveys his desire to “serve you properly” (ALD 1a 11) (λατρεῦσαί σοι καλῶς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 11). And as already mentioned, he asks that the Lord grant him “counsel and wisdom and knowledge and strength” (ALD 1a 8) (βουλὴν καὶ σοφίαν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ἰσχὺν) (ms E 2,3 10–11 8) (הַבֹּרָה וְגִבּוֹרָה וְיָדְעָה וְחָכְמָה[ח...]) (“[...w]isdom and knowledge and might”) (4Q213a 1 14). The combination of these different requests seems to build out Levi’s desire for otherworldly revelation that encapsulates a series of specific allotments. Although revelation of otherworldly figures certainly reflects an interest in specific revelation, here Levi seems to capture a concern for precise revelation regarding how he is to live.

Overall, Levi’s desire for revelation of the Lord, his ways, and perspectives, especially in relation to a sense of proximity, captures an additional expression of his desire to understand and gain revelation of otherworldly reality.

In view of Levi’s interest in the “holy spirit” and the figure of God, it is perhaps noteworthy that Levi seems far less interested in revelation regarding malevolent figures or realities. Whereas Amram, as we will see in chapter four, develops a notable repertoire of revelation pertaining to Melchiresa, a malevolent figure of darkness, Levi’s interest in this type of reality is far more muted. Levi does refer to malevolent figures and realities including “the unrighteous spirit and evil intention” (ALD 1a 7) (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄδικον καὶ διαλογισμὸν τοῦ πονηροῦ) (ms E 2,3 10–11 7), “any satan” (ALD 1a 10) (πᾶς σατανᾶς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 10) (כָּל שָׂטָן) (4Q213a 1 17); and certain references to malevolent expressions of “darkness” (ALD 102) (חֹשֶׁךְ) (4Q213 4 6, 7). Yet unlike Amram, Levi seems less directly concerned with revelation regarding these figures or realities.

Alongside Levi's interest in revelation of otherworldly figures, he demonstrates an interest in revelation pertaining to otherworldly space.¹⁶² In what ALD preserves of Levi's initial dream-vision, Levi exhibits a particular interest in spatial aspects of otherworldly reality. While the extant portion of this initial dream-vision only captures a few opening images, it is perhaps notable that Levi's observations center on spatial features of the otherworldly realm. He describes how "in the display of the vision and I saw the heaven[s...] beneath me, high until it reached the heave[ns...] to me the gates of the heavens and a single angel" (ALD 1b 16–18) ([בחזות חזיוא וחזית שם]א יא [...] תחותי רם עד דבק לשמי]א [...] לי תרעי שמיא ומלאך חד]) (4Q213a 2 16–18). Within this depiction, Levi seems to gain several revelatory insights into the spatial contours of the otherworldly realm. Levi gains revelation of the otherworldly realm in terms of elevated space. He seems to gain knowledge as to the nature of otherworldly movement into that elevated space, although the fragmentary nature of the text limits our understanding of his specific means of transportation.¹⁶³ And he learns of some of the apparent spatial boundaries within the otherworldly context in the form of "gates" (ALD 1b 19) (תרעי) (4Q213a 2 19). In view of this, Levi seems to extend his revelatory knowledge to include aspects of otherworldly space.

¹⁶² Once again, while this content pertains to notions of space and Levi's identity, its prominent intersection with otherworldly reality seems to justify its inclusion here. We will, however, reflect further on some of these references more directly with notions of space in the subsequent section entitled "Space."

¹⁶³ The later writing of T. Levi suggests Levi as a type of mountain rider, in which a mountain grows up under him transporting him into the heights. While this notion seems to fit well within this present depiction, with Levi's mention of something apparently rising up "beneath me, high until it reached the heave[ns...] (ALD 1b 17) (תחותי) [...] רם עד דבק לשמי]א) (4Q213a 2 17), the fragmentary limits of the text inhibit us from confirming this as such.

2.3.3.3 *Levi and Revelation*

In this section we worked to understand more precisely the contours of Levi's revelatory profile. We looked to consider the underlying realities that built into this perception in scholarship and draw out further the importance of revelation for his profile of identity.

To do this, we built on select previous perceptions of Levi's revelatory interests, identifying the specific nature of Levi's revelatory intersections in three layers. First, we looked at a series of ways in which he actively *seeks* revelation. We noted some of the contours of the otherworldly disclosure that he sought out, pertaining to specific insights into living in congruence with otherworldly values, most notably, truth. We then explored how Levi *receives* revelation. We saw the ways in which Levi transitioned from a revelatory hopeful to a genuine seer. We highlighted the different dream-vision events and allusions through which this facet of his revelatory profile takes shape. We noted some of the key realities to which his revelatory knowledge pertained. This included knowledge about his sister Dinah and her tragic encounter with Shechem and knowledge pertaining to his children. In the final stage we considered ways in which Levi's *response* to revelation further bolstered his revelatory profile. We considered his response to revelation in the case of his this-worldly priestly appointment, in which he responds to the events of his preceding dream-vision. We then looked at the ways in which he seems to respond to revelatory content in the instruction of his descendants. We surveyed some of considerable content that Levi transmits in apparent response to revelation. We further suggested the possibility that Levi's revelatory-based instruction also captured some notable eschatological content. Finally, we considered the Dinah/Shechem event as arguably the most substantial instance in which Levi demonstrates a response to revelatory content.

Following this exploration of Levi's active engagement with revelation, we explored the content of Levi's revelation or his revelatory interests. Through this we developed a considerable complex of revelation pertaining to otherworldly realities including otherworldly figures or beings, otherworldly perspective, and otherworldly space.

Through this process we developed a sharper sense of the revelatory facet of Levi's identity profile. We built upon several previous engagements with Levi's revelatory profile as part of more general compositional explorations and were able to locate Levi more precisely within the concept of revelation. Equipped with a better understanding of revelation as a notable feature of his profile of identity, let us now turn to the concept of *time*.

2.3.4 Time

The notion of time appears to be another notable feature of Levi's developing profile in ALD.¹⁶⁴ Across the composition, Levi as a figure develops in relation to select temporal realities, particularly pertaining to notions of the past and the future.¹⁶⁵ Admittedly, Levi's interests here will have notable intersections with some of the wider concepts in our present study, such as kinship. As I noted in the introduction, however, given the distinct contributions of these interests to wider aspects of his identity profile, in this case temporal aspects, it is worth further considering them within this separate temporal frame. With that in mind we will first consider the notion of "the past."

¹⁶⁴ Hillel previously noted the importance of time in ALD. As part of a short article on ALD, Hillel suggested that ALD strategically shapes its narrative in layers pertaining to past, present, and future ("Aramaic Levi," 261). While I agree with Hillel as to these interests, my impression is that aspects of the past and future seem to overshadow the notion of the present.

¹⁶⁵ As I indicated in the introduction, my investigation focusses on close textual readings, philological analysis, and literary critical investigation and in view of those priorities intentionally limits its engagement with wider modern theoretical approaches. This is especially apparent in my engagement with the notion of time. For more a more expansive theoretical treatment of the notion of time within the ancient Jewish context and the DSS, see, for example, Gershon Brin, *The Concept of Time in The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 39 (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

2.3.4.1 *The Past: Ancestral Precedents and Ancient Artefacts*

For Levi, the importance of the past seems to show up primarily in his interest in the former actions or realities of ancestral figures or in specific antique items.¹⁶⁶ Levi's interest in these actions, realities, or items largely seems to center on their value for directing present action or justifying future expectations. On several occasions, Levi seems to demonstrate an understanding that these aspects of the past represent an important and legitimate basis for present and future appeal.¹⁶⁷

One place this shows up is in Levi's opening prayer. As Levi makes his petitions known to the Lord, he grounds his appeal first in relation to his father. He describes himself as "the son of your servant Jacob" (ALD 1a 15a) (τοῦ υἱοῦ παιδός σου Ἰακώβ) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15a) and "the son of your servant" (ALD 1a 19) (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ παιδός σου) (ms E 2,3 10–11 17–19) (בר עבדך) ("the son of your servant") (4Q213a 2 10). In this sense, Levi appears to appeal to the antecedent status of his father before the Lord as the basis for his present petition and future hope of a positive response.

Alongside this reference to his father, he also cites the ancestral figures of Sarah and Abraham as an additional basis of appeal. He states that "You, o Lord, blessed Abraham my father and Sarah my mother, and you said you would give them a seed of righteousness, blessed

¹⁶⁶ Becking observed a similar emphasis on the importance of connections with the past for the formation of Jewish identity in the writings from Elephantine ("Yehudite Identity in Elephantine," 405).

¹⁶⁷ The importance of the past extends beyond the figure of Levi into questions pertaining to scribal strategy and approach. Various scholars have recognized how claimed connections to the past are an important authority claiming strategy. For more on authority claiming strategies, including appeals to ancestral figures, see, García Martínez, "Parabiblical Literature," 525–56. On authority claiming strategies specifically in ALD, see Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. On the wider importance of appeals to ancestral figures, see, for example, Najman, *Seconding Sinai*. On the importance of past figures and past narrative for identity formation, see, for example, Blenkinsopp, "Judeans, Jews, Children," 473.

for ever” (ALD 1a 15b–16) (σύ, κύριε, εὐλόγησας τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατέρα μου καὶ Σάρραν μητέρα μου, καὶ εἶπας δοῦναι αὐτοῖς σπέρμα δίκαιον εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15b–16) ([...שט]זרע דק[...רכת]ב[מרי] (“My Lord, [you] b[lessed...][a] seed of tr[uth...]”)) (4Q213a 2 6–7). In this case, Levi seems to ground his present appeal in the past event in which the Lord made a covenant with Abraham and Sarah as to the nature of their future lineage (cf. Gen 12:1–3; 17:4).

Later during Isaac’s instruction to Levi, Levi receives a series of directives, which again repeatedly find their justification in additional ancestral precedent. The figure of Abraham is especially significant in this case, functioning as a consistent anchor point throughout. We see this in Levi’s endogamous directives and warnings against defilement (ALD 17), as well as on several occasions in his reception of sacrificial instruction from Isaac (ALD 22, 50, 57).¹⁶⁸

Within Levi’s instruction of his descendants, as we previously noted, he further reinforces this practice of appealing to ancestral precedent, when he cites his brother Joseph as an exemplary figure (ALD 91]) to support and justify a certain set of virtues.¹⁶⁹

Alongside this interest in ancestral precedent as an important basis of appeal for the present and future, Levi as a figure also develops in relation to the importance of ancient artefacts. Perhaps the most apparent example of this also occurs during Isaac’s instruction to Levi on sacrificial matters. At one point during this event, Isaac couches the authority of his

¹⁶⁸ Hints of the importance of the past figure of Abraham for endogamous directives, appears in the phrase, “you are called for all the seed of Abraham” (ALD 17) (קדישי אנת מתקדי לכל זרע אברהם) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 20–21) (ἄγιος κληθήσεται τῷ σπέρματι Ἀβραάμ) (ms E 18,2 12 20–21). The past figure of Abraham appears as a basis for sacrificial directives in the following phrases: “I saw Abraham” (ALD 22) (חזיתי לאברהם) (ms A, Bodl. c, 9 12) (חזית לאברהם) (4Q214 b 2–6 i 2); “For thus father Abraham commanded me to do and to command my sons” (ALD 50) (οὕτως γάρ μοι ἐνετείλατο ὁ πατήρ Ἀβραάμ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐντέλλεσθαι τοῖς υἱοῖς μου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 50); “For thus my father Abraham ordered me” (ALD 57) (οὕτως γάρ μοι ἐνετείλατο ὁ πατήρ μου Ἀβραάμ) (ms E 18,2 13–15 57).

¹⁶⁹ Levi appeals to his descendants to “consider, my sons, Joseph my brother” (ALD 90) (חזו בני ליוסף אחי) (ms A, Cambr. e, 6 22–23) (חזו לכנ בני) (4Q213 1 i 11).

instruction “in the writings of the Book of Noah” (ALD 57) (ἐν τῇ γραφῇ τῆς βίβλου τοῦ Νῶε) (ms E 18,2 13–15 57).¹⁷⁰ We could perhaps take this as an additional appeal to an ancestral figure in that it includes the named figure of Noah. Yet the focus on the “Book of Noah” as a specific item from antiquity seems to distinguish this appeal from the preceding interest in ancestral precedent.¹⁷¹

Further, Levi in his own instruction to his descendants on topics including “scribal craft” (ספר) (ALD 88, 90, 98), includes the phrase “also in the books” (ALD 99) (אִם בְּסִפְרֵי אֲנִי) (4Q213 1 ii–2 12). While the fragmentary nature of the wider context impairs us from gaining a sense of the exact meaning of this phrase, this reference may represent a similar appeal to antique items similar or related to the “Book of Noah.”

¹⁷⁰ Scholars have previously noted the appeal to the figure of Noah (and other ancestral figures) and his writings in ALD perhaps functions as an authority claiming strategy. The appeal to Noah extends the origin of the knowledge tradition beyond near ancestral figures into the distant ante-diluvian past. For more on these observations, Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” 133–49, esp. 143–48; García Martínez, “Parabiblical Literature,” 545. On the specific significance of Levi’s connection with the figure of Noah, on a separate occasion Stone notes how Levi’s authority is “anchored in prior tradition and recognition by the patriarchs rather than Levi’s consecration to the priesthood, or in the Mosaic revelation” (“Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts,” 326). While I agree with the importance of this connection to Noah for Levi’s developing profile, we should not overlook the importance of dream-visions as also significantly bolstering Levi’s authority as a figure.

¹⁷¹ “The Book of Noah” represents an important area of discussion in past scholarship. For more on “The Book of Noah,” see, for example, Florentino García Martínez, “4Q Mes. Aram. y el Libro de Noé,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*, STDJ 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1–44; Devorah Dimant, “Noah in Early Jewish Literature,” in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore Bergren (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 123–50; Cana Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January 1997*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–81; Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” 133–49; Moshe J. Bernstein, “Noah and the Flood at Qumran,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231; Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3–4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, ed. Peter W. Flint, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam, VTSup 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230–49; Michael E. Stone, “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah,” *DSD* 13.1 (2006): 4–23; Wayne Baxter, “Noachic Traditions and the Book of Noah,” *JSP* 15.3 (2006): 179–94; Darrel D. Hannah, “The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch,” in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*, ed. Gabrielle Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 469–77; Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls*; Ariel Feldman, “1Q19 (‘Book of Noah’) Reconsidered,” *Hen* 31.2 (2009): 284–306. See also, the essays volume dedicated to this topic, Michael E. Stone, Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, eds., *Noah and His Book(s)*, EJL 28 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010).

In view of these above examples, Levi seems to develop in relation to a variety of emphases on the past. These associations with the past appear as an important means of making sense of and engaging with the present as well as shaping expectations for future; all of which underscore the importance of the past for his identity profile.

2.3.4.2 The Future: Future Figures and Future Realities

Levi also appears to demonstrate a notable interest in matters related to the future across the narrative of ALD. One way we perhaps see this is in the type of interest Levi shows in the surrounding figures that appear across the composition. When Levi considers the ancestral figures of Sarah and Abraham, he does so through a future oriented lens. As he looks back on those figures, he demonstrates a particular interest in matters related to their future. He first considers the past, noting that “you, o Lord, blessed Abraham my father and Sarah my mother” (ALD 1a 15b) (σύ, κύριε, εὐλόγησας τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατέρα μου καὶ Σάρραν μητέρα μου) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15b) ([...טש]דק זרע [...רכת.ב] מרי) (“My Lord, [you] b[lessed...]”) (4Q213a 2 6). Yet his focus quickly pivots to their future. In relation to the Lord, he states, “you said you would give them a seed of righteousness, blessed for ever” (ALD 1a 16) (εἶπας δοῦναι αὐτοῖς σπέρμα δίκαιον εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15b–16) ([...טש]דק זרע) (“[a] seed of tr[uth...]”) (4Q213a 2 7). While we could perhaps conceive of this as less reflecting the future and more reflecting Levi’s interest in the present moment, the way in which Levi couches this content with the temporal phrase “blessed for ever” (ALD 1a 16) (εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15b–16), emphasizes its future tenor.

This future interest carries forward into Levi’s later engagements with his children. As he details various aspects related to each of his childrens’ conceptions and births, he quickly fixes

his interest on their future realities. For his son Gershom, he projects a less than positive future. Regarding Gershom, he notes, “my seed will be sojourners in the land where I was born. We are sojourners as it (will be) in the land which is considered ours.’ And concerning this child I saw in my vision that he and his seed will be thrown out from the chief priesthood, his seed will be” (ALD 63–64) (μου ἐν γῆ, ἣ ἐγεννήθην · πάροικοί ἐσμεν ὡς τοῦτο ἐν τῇ γῆ ἡμετέρα νομιζομένη. καὶ ἐπι τοῦ παιδαρίου εἶδον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὄραματί μου ὅτι ἐκβεβλημένος ἔσται αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἱερωσύνης ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ) (ms E 18,2 13–15 63–64). For Qahat, he perceives a much more favorable forecast. Of Qahat, he notes “and I sa]w that to him [would belo]ng the congregation of all the [people and th]at to him would belong the high priesthood (He and his seed will be a supreme kingship, a priesthood) for [all Is]rael” (ALD 67) (וְיָחִיזוּ תְּחִלָּתוֹ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי יִהְיֶה לְהוֹרָתוֹ וְלְבָרְכָתוֹ וְלְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלְכָל הַקְּהִלָּה וְלְכָל הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִים וְלְכָל הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִים וְלְכָל הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִים וְלְכָל הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִים) (ms A, Cambr. c, 7 5–6) (καὶ ὅτε ἐγεννήθη, ἐώρακα ὅτι ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔσται ἡ μεγάλη· αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἔσονται ἀρχὴ βασιλέων, ἱεράτευμα τῷ Ἰσραὴλ) (ms E 18,2 15 5–6). He offers limited comment as to the future of his son, Merari, which is perhaps due to the perception of his impending death (ALD 69a–69b). Yet with the following birth of his daughter, Yochebed, Levi again demonstrates a notable interest in her future. Regarding Yochebed, he notes, “when she was born to me, for the glory she was born to me, for the glory of Israel” (ALD 71) (כַּדִּי יָלִידָתָ לִּי לִיקָרְ לִי לְכַבֹּד יִשְׂרָאֵל) (ALD 71) (ms A, Cambr. c, 7 20–21). We also see Levi’s interest in the future appear in his engagements with his wider descendants. In the specific case of Amram, his grandson, he observes how “this one will {exalt} <lead> the people <out> of the land of E[gy]pt” (ALD 76) (דָּנָה יִרְיֵם <פָּק> עַמָּא מִן אֲרֻעַ מִצְרַיִם [כִּי] דִּן יִתְקַרָּא [שְׂמָה <עַמָּא> רַאמָא) (ms A, Cambr. d, 7 12–13).

Later, in Levi’s more general instructional engagement with his descendants, his interest in the future continues to emerge. As he instructs, he does so repeatedly in view of future

possibilities and realities. For example, as he emphasizes the value of embracing ancestral tradition and its various underlying core virtues, which we discussed more extensively above, he orients much of it around future projections and possibilities. As he talks about the importance of practices of truth and goodness, he does so in view of the future harvest that such practices promise to provide and the type of harvest they help avoid.¹⁷² Of wisdom, he notes, “whoever studies wisdom, will (attain) glory through her, but the one who despises wisdom, becomes an object of disdain” (ALD 89) (די אליף חוכמתא ויקר היא בה ודי שאיט חוכמתא לבשרון מתיהב) (“The one who teaches wisdom attains glory [...] is given [to dis]dain and to scorn”) (די אלף חכמה יקר) (4Q213 1 i 10–11). This emphasis on the future implications of wisdom continues in much of the remainder of his instruction (ALD 90–97), as he accounts to his descendants the wider contours of what this future wisdom-based form of “glory” could entail.

Alongside these future focused endorsements of various virtues, Levi also plainly conveys to his descendants a series of projected future realities. He speaks to them of some type of anticipated inheritance, noting, “[I saw in visions that] you will inherit them” (ALD 98) (חזית בחזית) (4Q214a 2–3 ii 6) (“I saw in visions th[at]”) (חזית בחזית ד[י]) (4Q213 1 ii–2 9) (בחזוין די תרתון אנון). This inheritance appears to pertain to a complex of what seems to be intersecting scribal, cultic, and political realities (ALD 98–100). These projected future realities also capture various aspects of an anticipated downfall of some of his descendants (ALD 102). Levi describes the future nature of this event with phrases such as “you will become dark” (ALD 102) (תחשכון) (4Q213 4 1), “they will know it” (ALD 102) (ידעונה) (4Q213 4 4), and “all the paths of

¹⁷² Levi notes, for example: “And [if you s]ow tru[th], you will reap a blessed and [go]od harvest. Whoever sows good, reaps good, and whoever sows evil, his seed returns upon him” (ALD 86) (הן חזוין עון תנהעלון עללה בריכה) (ms A, Cambr. e 6 13–16) (בריי כה דזרע טב טב מעל) (ו[טא] בא די זרע טאב טאב מהנעל ודי זרע ביש עלוהי תאיב זרעה [...]) (4Q213 1 i 8) ([...].bless]ed. He who sew goodness brings goodness [...].his [se]d”).

otherworldly figures in his dream-vision seemingly confirm him as a priest, they do so with a strong emphasis on the importance of this designation in relation to the distant future. They describe how “we have given you the greatness of *eternal* peace” (ALD 6) (שלם עלמא) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 8–9) (“etern[al...]”) (עלמא) (1Q21 3 3), which seems to couch his priestly status in future related interests.¹⁷³

In addition to a future focus pertaining to named ancestors, a specific group of descendants, or himself, Levi’s interest in the future also seems to show up in the tradition related concern for perpetuating content through ongoing instructional practices, which we discussed in considerable detail above. This interest is in large part rooted in an ongoing concern for future generations and their future realities.

2.3.4.3 *Levi and Time*

In this section we worked to understand more precisely the temporal features of Levi’s identity profile by considering the underlying realities that build into this perception in scholarship and drawing out further the importance of time for Levi as a figure.

We considered the notion of “the past” and Levi’s distinct interest in ancestral precedents and ancestral artefacts such as past writings. We then turned to consider the importance of “the future” for Levi including his emphasis on past figures and their associated future realities, the future of his descendants, and his notable concern for himself and the future frames he would come to inhabit. We then concluded with a few brief notes on some of Levi’s wider future related interests such as his concern for ongoing instructional practices. Through this process we

¹⁷³ As de Jonge observes as part of a larger comparison of ALD and T. Levi, the eternal nature of the priesthood here in ALD is particularly interesting in view of the alternative temporary conception of the priesthood in T. Levi. He further recognizes some of the ways in which this difference intersects with alternative portrayals of the figure of Judah, and the later apparent Christian authorship behind T. Levi (“Levi in Aramaic Levi,” 74).

developed a more distinct sense of the ways in which Levi's identity profile develops around the notion of time. We alluded to select previous engagements in the process, as well as select intersections with wider contemporary figures. In this we were able to offer greater precision to the temporal nature of Levi's identity profile. Let us now consider the related concept of *space* and its importance for Levi's developing identity.

2.3.5 Space

At first glance, some of the more notable spatial aspects that appear in relation to Levi in ALD pertain to locational or geographic references.¹⁷⁴ Among these references Levi describes how he experienced an initial dream-vision on the way to or at the location of “Abel Mayin” (ALD 1b 13) (אבל מין) (4Q213a 2 13). Levi refers to the Dinah/Shechem incident as occurring in Canaan (ALD 78), more specifically in the town of Shechem (Rylands Recto 8; Rylands Verso 4?; 13?).¹⁷⁵ Alongside or following the Dinah episode, Levi further describes an event in which his brothers are tending sheep in Shechem (ALD 3 16; 3 18).¹⁷⁶ Levi describes his ordination to the priesthood—otherworldly (ALD 3a–6) and/or this worldly (ALD 9)—in some relation to the location of Bethel (ALD 10). Levi subsequently refers to arriving at the so-called “fortress of Abraham” (ALD 11) (בירת אברהם) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 2) (τη ἀύλη Ἀβραάμ) (ms E, 18,2 12 2) to undergo priestly training from his grandfather, Isaac. During Isaac's instruction to Levi, he refers to the “Temple of God” or “House of God” (ALD 19) (בית אל) (ms A, Bodl. c, 9 1) (τοῖς ἁγίοις)

¹⁷⁴ The exact relationship between the following geographic references and Levi is complicated by at least a couple factors. First, the fragmentary nature of the material text often blurs or completely hides the connection between an apparent geographic reference and Levi. Second, Levi's movements are part of various wider conversations regarding the movements of other ancestral figures, especially, Jacob and Rebekah's nurse Deborah (cf. Gen 35:8).

¹⁷⁵ Cf. Gen 33:18; Jub. 30:1–2.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Gen 34:7.

(ms E, 18,2 12 1) as the location of sacrifice.¹⁷⁷ Levi makes mention of his place of birth as a future location of sojourn, which following later tradition, is perhaps a reference to Haran.¹⁷⁸ Levi also mentions Egypt on several occasions to contextualize various life events (ALD 72–73; 80) as well as while making future projections regarding his grandson, Amram (ALD 76).

These different named geographic references within ALD perhaps contribute to Levi's identity to some extent. These references may function to situate Levi in connection to wider ancestral movements, such as those Isaac or Jacob, and in that sense develop his identity portrait in relation to antecedent figures.¹⁷⁹ Yet my impression is that the compositional context of ALD may encourage us to look beyond those named geographic locations when considering Levi's conceptions of spatial identity.

The later compositional context of ALD within the Second Temple period, on the other side of the Babylonian exile, yet under continued foreign rule, represented a point of ongoing reimagination for Jewish conceptions of geographic identity.¹⁸⁰ In a space of ongoing political turbulence, there were increasing challenges to geographic-based conceptions of identity for the Jewish people. As I noted in the introduction, spatial-based identity claims required increasing creativity and innovation. Earlier geographic-based conceptions of identity were commonly tied to the formation of the formal land of Israel and the temple institution. Yet as the Jewish people succumbed to a reality in exile and the loss of the temple, geographic identity claims faced new

¹⁷⁷ As Drawnel suggests, as an alternative to a temple reference, this reference could also conceivably reference a proper city name (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 128).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. T. Levi 2:1; Jub. 27:3; 35:10.

¹⁷⁹ For perceptions on the importance of named geographic locations in relation to ancestral figures in the Aramaic DSS, see the work of Høgenhaven, for example, who reads named geographic locations in VA as significant in the scribal formation of the figure of Amram ("Geography in the Visions of Amram Texts [4Q543–547]," in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*, ed. Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegismund, STDJ 131 [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020], 119–36).

¹⁸⁰ For more on the shifting nature of geographic identity between the pre/post exilic periods and into the late Second Temple context, see, for example, Bar-Asher, "Il y Avait à Suse Un Homme Juif," 71–79.

challenges. Upon their return to the Yehud province following their time in exile, there was some renewed opportunity for traditional geographic claims for spatial identity, especially with the eventual restoration of the temple space—albeit in a lesser form. Yet traditional geographic based expressions of spatial identity were becoming increasingly more complex. In view of this, the Second Temple period represented a time in which notions of spatial identity required ongoing reimagination. The Second Temple period, therefore, attests to a growing interest in developing spatial identities beyond those based upon formal, named geographic locations.

The figure of Levi in ALD seems to attest to this interest in developing wider expressions of spatial identity. When we consider his portrait in ALD, the figure of Levi seems to appear at the center of a growing complex of wider real or imagined spatial concepts that act as a basis for aspects of identity.

2.3.5.1 Vertical Space: Ascending the Heights

The notion of vertical space seems to represent one way by which Levi develops a sense of spatial identity in ALD. Perhaps the most apparent way this happens is through an idealization of elevated vertical space or places of height across the composition.¹⁸¹

The primary way that Levi seems to idealize vertical space is through his depiction of the divine figure of God. Across the composition Levi repeatedly casts the figure of God in terms of elevated vertical space. This is evident, for example, in the posture that he adopts in his opening prayer. He describes how, “I raised my eyes and my face towards heavens” (ALD 1a 3) (τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἤρα πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν) (ms E 2,3 10–11 3) (לְשָׁמַיִם תִּלְטַל) (“I

¹⁸¹ For a previous classification of the content of ALD in terms of a “vertical axis,” see, for example, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom*, 226). Although Drawnel picks up on the significance of a “vertical axis” in ALD, his observations of its significance are largely limited to a classification of Levi’s dream-vision and the “vertical axis of his experience.”

lifted to the heavens”) (4Q213a 1 8), indicating that he conceives of God as existing in an elevated position.¹⁸² He reiterates this perception in that he calls on God to respond to lawlessness from a vertically superior location. He petitions, “remove and efface lawlessness from under the heavens, and eliminate lawlessness from the face of the earth” (ALD 1a 13) (παράδος διὸ δὴ καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ἐξάλειψσον ὑποκάτωθεν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ συντελέσαι τὴν ἀνομίαν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς) (ms E 2,3 10–11 13).

The later sacrificial instruction that Levi receives from Isaac also seems to reinforce this perception of the divine as existing in elevated vertical space. Feldman recently observed this regarding the handling of blood in ALD. She noted that the instruction seems to prioritize an overhead perspective in that Isaac’s prescription to cast blood onto the sides of the altar demonstrates a primary interest in God’s apparent aerial view of the sacrificial proceedings, since casting blood onto the sides of the altar results in the blood being out of the sightline of the overhead observer (ALD 25b).¹⁸³

Further Levi’s intersections with the names of God across the composition also seem to emphasize this perception. God appears in relation to Levi as “God most high” (ALD 3c, 9, 13, 30) (אֱלֹהֵי עֶלְיוֹן) (1Q21 1 3; ms A, Bodl. a, 8 20; 4Q213b 1 6; ms A, Bodl. b 8 5–6; ms A, Bodl. d, 9 16), “Lord most high” (ALD 30, 51, 58) (κυρίου ὑψίστου) (ms A, Bodl. d 9 16; ms E, 18,2 13–15 51, 58) and “Lord of heaven” (ALD 13) (δεσπότη τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) (ms E 18,2 12 5–6).¹⁸⁴ All of which situate God in elevated space.

¹⁸² For similar vertically focussed postures in prayer, see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 123.

¹⁸³ I.e., “you shall sprinkle the blood on the walls of the altar” (ALD 25b) (תשרא למורק דמא על כותלי מדבחה) (ms A, Bodl. d 9 1–2) (ἀρξῆ κατασπένδειν τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὸν τεῖχον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) (ms E, 18,2 12–13 1–2) (על [דמא...] כותלי מדבחה) (4Q214b 2–6 i 8). Feldman, “Perspective and Perception.”

¹⁸⁴ 1Q21 1 3 transcription from Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 111.

When Isaac instructs Levi as to the process of going to the temple to undertake ritual sacrifice, he also does so with ascent language (ALD 19), which may further contribute into this developing vertical conceptualization.¹⁹¹

The value of ascent or heights is perhaps also apparent in Levi's treatment of the names of select figures. Levi mentions Amram, for example, and emphasizes the significance and meaning of his name as “‘this one will {exalt} <lead> the people <out> of the land of Egypt.’ [Th]us [his name] will be called: ‘<the> exalted [<peopl]e>’” (ALD 76) (דנה י' {ריים} <פק> עמא מן) [Th]us [his name] will be called: ‘<the> exalted [<peopl]e>’ (ALD 76) (אֲרַעַ מְצַרִים [כ]דן יִתְקַרָא [שמה <עמ]אֲ) (ms A, Cambr. d, 7 12–13). While Amram's name in relation to leading the people out of Egypt is clear, its etymological undertones in relation to ascent perhaps underlines Levi's wider spatial conceptions of identity in relation to the vertical axis.

2.3.5.2 *Discerning and Navigating Horizontal Space*

Horizontal space seems to represent another spatial feature that contributes to Levi's developing identity profile in ALD. One of the primary ways this seems to happen is through Levi's apparent conceptualization of the world in terms of “ways” and “paths.”¹⁹² Levi attests to this basic framework as part of his understanding of the world both leading up to and within his opening prayer. Prior to the opening prayer and following a process of bathing, Levi describes how “I made straight all my ways” (ALD 1a 2) (πάσας τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐποίησα εὐθείας) (ms E 2,3

expected to undergo as a result of his repentance, purification and prayer. Indeed, following this prayer he receives a vision of the heavens on a height (see 4:4–6)” (*The Aramaic Levi Document*, 132–33).

¹⁹¹ Isaac uses the vertically oriented phrase, “whenever you *arise* to enter the temple of God” (ALD 19) (ἄταν εἰσπορεύη ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις) (ms E 18,2 12 1) (כדי תהוי קאים למיעל לבית אל) (ms A, Bodl. c, 9 1).

¹⁹² On the wider significance of this imagery in the DSS, see, for example, Daniel Machiela, “Tending the Paths of Truth: Two Ways in the Hebrew Bible, Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Christianity,” (n.d.). For more on the significance of this imagery for ALD, see, for example, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, 125–26; *The Aramaic Levi Document*; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

10–11 2) ([...]וכל) (4Q213a 1 7). During his prayer, he further petitions for the Lord to “give me all the ways of truth” (ALD 1a 6) (δός μοι πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀληθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 6) (תרחם[...] קשט) (4Q213a 1 12) and requests that the Lord “not allow any satan to rule over me to lead me astray from your way” (ALD 1a 10) (μὴ κατισχυσάτω με πᾶς σατανᾶς πλανῆσαι με ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου) (ms E 2,3 10–11 10) (י[ע...]ל) (4Q213a 1 17).

Later, as part of what appears to be an extension of his instruction to his children, the apparent figure of Levi describes some type of future reality in which his descendants have notable shortcomings and failures in adhering to a righteous standard. Here, Levi again describes this reality in relation to the notion of ways and paths. He informs his descendants that “all the paths of [...]neglect and proceed in darkness[...]...dar[k]ness will come over you[...]...and you will proceed” (ALD 102) (א[חח קשטא תשבקו]כל שבילי [...]תחלון) (4Q213 4 5–7). (ותהכון בחשוך [ש]תק ה[ש]זכה תתא עליכון [] ותהכון

In view of each of these examples, Levi’s demonstrates a clear interest in conceptualizing horizontal space in terms of distinct ways and paths and with that the need to intentionally navigate these specific spaces. This interest seems to represent another way in which he builds out an alternative sense of spatial identity as part of his identity profile. In this case, spatial identity develops through a distinct vision of life that includes ensuring one’s ways are “straight”, attaining “all the ways of truth,” maintaining one’s course within “your way”, and seemingly avoiding a reality in which they walk in “darkness.”

2.3.5.3 *The Human Body as a Sacred Space*

Another means by which Levi seems to develop a sense of spatial identity in ALD comes through his apparent understanding of the human body as a type of space. In particular, Levi

seems to develop or develop in relation to this notion of the human body, especially his body as a sacred space.¹⁹³ This perception seems to take shape for him in a few different ways.

One way we perhaps see this is through his repeated use of or appearance in connection to holiness language. In what appears to be part of one of Levi's dream-vision episodes, the phrase "holy tithes" (ALD 3a 8) (קודש קרבן) (4Q213a 3–4 18) appears.¹⁹⁴ During Isaac's instruction of Levi, he repeatedly describes him in terms of holiness language. He tells him "you are a holy seed" (ALD 17) (זרע קדיש אנת) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 18) (σπέρματος γὰρ ἁγίου εἶ) (ms E 18,2 12 18) and "holy is your seed like the Holy One, for a holy priest" (ALD 17) (קדיש זרעך) (קדיש ארו בהין קדיש ארו) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 19–20) (το σπέρμα σου ἁγίασον καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ σου ἐστὶν ἱερεὺς ἅγιος) (ms E 18,2 12 19–20) and that "you are close to God and close

¹⁹³ The idea of the body as a sacred space has notable intersections and important context with the notion of halakha with its emphasis on ablutions and purity. Past scholarship has generated a vast body of research on this topic. While I recognize the importance of these potential intersections, in view of the limited scope of this project, we will intentionally limit our engagement with this wider conversation. For overview engagements with the topic, see, for example, Aharon Shemesh, "Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature," *OHDSS* 1:595–616; Noam Vered, "Halakhah," in *T & T Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018), 395–405. For past surveys of halakha scholarship, see, for example, Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship," in *Jüdische Geschichte in Hellenistisch-Römischer Zeit*, ed. A. Oppenheimer and E. Müller-Luckner (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999), 205–19; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship," in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 63–78. For early impressions on its significance in the DSS, see, for example, Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Threat to Halakhah?," *TR* 1.2 (1959): 209–21. For more wider more comprehensive engagements of halakha, see, for example, Noam Vered, "From 4QMMT to the Rabbinic Halakhah," in *Interpreting and Living God's Law at Qumran: Miqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah, Some of the Works of the Torah (4QMMT)*, SAPERP 37 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 137–60; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, SJLA 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); Aharon Shemesh, *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis*, TLJS 6 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009); Phillip R. Davies, "Halakhah at Qumran," in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*, SFSHJ 134 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996); Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction*, STDJ 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1998). For wider explorations of the human body as sacred space in ALD, see, for example, Harrington, who explores the human body in relation to the notion of a sanctuary and an extension of the Jerusalem temple ("How Does Intermarriage Defile the Sanctuary?," 177–95). For previous perceptions of the importance of the spatial nature of the sacred/profane divide for Jewish identity, see, for example, Becking, "Yehudite Identity in Elephantine," 403–19.

¹⁹⁴ Although the exact nature of the phrase in ALD is not preserved in the text, in view of the wider narrative of ALD, it is likely that the notion of "holy tithes" here is a reference to an otherworldly designation for Levi's priestly status. Whether or not this reference does in fact pertain to Levi and his connection to holiness language, his holy or sacred profile continues to develop across the composition on several different occasions.

to all his holy ones” (ALD 18) (קריב אנת לאַל וְקריב לכל קדישוהי) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 21–22) (ἐγγύς εἶ κυρίου καὶ σὺ ἐγγύς τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ) (ms E, 18,2 12 21–22).¹⁹⁵ As Isaac’s instructions unfold, he continues to embolden this perception, repeatedly reminding Levi of his holy quality. He states, “you are a holy priest of the Lord” (ALD 48) (ἱερεὺς συ ἅγιος κυρίου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 48). As he arrives at the end of his instruction, Isaac again observes Levi as having “been chosen for the holy priesthood” (ALD 51) (ἐξελέχθης εἰς ἱερωσύνην ἁγίαν) (ms E 18,2 13–15 51) and how he is “a holy one of the Lord Most High” (ALD 58) (ἅγιος κυρίου ὑψίστου) (ms E 18,2 13–15 58).

During Levi’s otherworldly dream-vision, otherworldly beings also announce to Levi that “we have made you greater than all, and how we have given you the greatness of eternal peace” (ALD 6) (לך הכין רבינד מן כולה והיד יהבנא לך רבות שלם עלמא) (ms A, Bodl. a, 8 7–9) (“[...]how I made you greater than all fles[h]”) ([...]כֹּה רְבִיתְךָ מִן כָּל בִּשְׂרֵי אֱ] [4Q213b 1 1]; (“etern[al...]”) (עלמ[א]) (1Q21 3 3). This perhaps represents a further indication of Levi’s distinct quality of holiness.

Through the above references, Levi emerges with a general quality of holiness or sacredness. When we look closer at Levi’s holiness portrait, we begin to see this sense of holiness emerge in notable connection to the physical body.

One way we perhaps see this develop for Levi, is through the notion of “seed.” The usage of the concept of “seed” intersects with a series of wider related plant traditions across the Hebrew Scriptures and the Second Temple period.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁵ For analysis on the wider background to the language of “holy seed” particularly in relation to the reforms of Ezra/Nehemiah, see, for example, Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*, 267; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

¹⁹⁶ See, for example, Ps 1:3; Isa 5:7; 6:13; 60:21; 61:3; Jer 2:21; 11:17; 12:2; 17:8; 24:6; 32:41; 42:10; Hos 9:13; Amos 9:15; 2 Macc 1:29; 1QSb 3 2; 1Q20 14; 1 En. 10:16, 18–19.

Levi first points to the importance of seed in connection to the ancestral figures of Abraham and Sarah. He describes the promise that the Lord “would give them a seed of righteousness, blessed for ever” (ALD 1a 16) (δοῦναι αὐτοῖς σπέρμα δίκαιον εὐλογημένον εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 15b–16) ([...טש]ךד ערז) (“[a] seed of tr[uth...]”) (4Q213a 2 6–7). In this instance, Levi seems to demonstrate a hope that he might carry forward this promise. As the narrative develops, Levi’s association with the idea of “seed” grows. Isaac describes Levi in terms of a “seed” or a “holy seed” or carrying a “holy seed” on several occasions (ALD 17, 59).¹⁹⁷

In the case of Levi, the idea of an innate connection between holiness and “seed” seems to invite us as readers to locate the idea of holiness specifically within the physical body. Holiness is not simply an external quality that Levi assumes. Rather it is something that exists within him, within his physical body. Through the notion of seed, the body becomes a sacred space that he is to maintain and cultivate. This idea perhaps contributes in large part to the development of a broad complex of body related practices centered around the maintenance and cultivation of the body as a sacred space.¹⁹⁸

Perhaps one place we see this is in Levi’s interest in physical ablutions or ablutions of garments worn upon the physical body. At the outset of the extant text of ALD, Levi undertakes a series of bathing practices. He cleanses both his body and the garments he wears upon his body (ALD 1a 1–2).¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ I.e., “you are a holy seed” (ALD 17) (σπέρματος γὰρ ἁγίου εἶ) (ms E 18,2 12 16–18) (תנא ורע קדיש ארז) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 16–18); “holy is your seed” (ALD 17) (τὸ σπέρμα σου ἁγίασον) (ms E 18,2 12 18) (ךדיש רעך) (ms A, Bodl. b, 8 18); “there will be blessing by your seed” (ALD 59) (τῷ σπέρματί σου εὐλογηθήσεται)

¹⁹⁸ For more on these halakhic practices, see, n. 193 above.

¹⁹⁹ I.e., “Then I washed my garments and having purified them in pure water, I also bathed myself completely in running water, and I made straight all my ways” (ALD 1a 1–2) (τότε ἐγὼ ἔπλυνα τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ καθάρισας αὐτὰ ἐν ὕδατι καθαρῷ καὶ ἕλος ἐλουσάμην ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι· καὶ πάσας τὰς ὁδοὺς μου ἐποίησα εὐθείας) (ms E 2,3 10–11 1–2) (ובל ת[חרתע...] הנה[...]) (“[...I [...I [washed] and all”) (4Q213a 1 6–7).

As part of Levi's priestly instruction, Isaac also underscores the importance of the practice of repeatedly bathing the body and clothing worn upon the body prior to and throughout the course of sacrificial action. He states:

And whenever you arise to enter the temple of God bathe in water, and then put on the priestly clothing. And when you are clothed repeat (it) again and wash your hands and your feet before you sacrifice on the altar all this. And whenever you take to sacrifice everything that is fitting to offer on the altar, repeat (it) again and wash your hands and feet" (ALD 19–21)

וכדי תהוי קאים למיעל לבית אל הוי סחי במיא ובאדין תהוי לביש לבוש כהנותא וכדי תהוי
לביש הוי תאיב תוב ורחיע ידיך ורגליך עד דלא תקרב למדבחה כל דנה וכדי תהוי נסב
להקרבה כל די חזה להנסקה למדבחה הוי עוד תאב ורחע ידיך ורגליך

(ms A, Bodl. c, 9 1–8)

καὶ ὅταν εἰσπορεύῃ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, λούου ὕδατι πρῶτον καὶ τότε ἐνδιδύσκου τὴν στολὴν τῆς
ἱερωσύνης· καὶ ὅταν ἐνδιδύσκη, νίπτου πάλιν τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ τοὺς πόδας σου πρὸ τοῦ
ἐγγίσει τρὸς τὸν βωμὸν προσενέγκαι ὀλοκάρπωσιν· καὶ ὅταν μέλλῃς προσφέρειν ὅσα δεῖ
ἀνενέγκαι ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν, πάλιν νίπτου τὰς χεῖράς σου καὶ οὐς πόδας σου

(ms E 18,2 12 1–8)

throughout the Dinah/Shechem episode (ALD 1c–3a; Ryland Recto; Ryland Verso). Isaac reaffirms this value on several instances in his instructions to Levi, expressing this specific relational concern as of first importance. He communicates the following:

First of all, beware, my son, of every fornication and impurity of every harlotry. And you, take for yourself a wife from my family so that you may not defile your seed with harlots, because you are a holy seed. And holy is your seed like the Holy One, for a holy priest you are called for all the seed of Abraham. You are close to God and close to all his holy ones, now be pure in your flesh from every impurity of any man (ALD 16–23)

לקדמין היזדהר לך נרי מן כל פחז וטמאה ומן כל זנו{ת} ואנת אנתתא מן משפחתי סב לך ולא
תחל זרעך עם זניאן ארי זרע קדיש אנת וקדיש זרעך היך קודשא ארו כהין קדיש אנת מתקרי
לכל זרע אבר'הם קריב אנת לאֵל וְקריב לכל קדישוהי כען {הווי׳ א״הר} זכי בבשרך מן כל
טומאת כל גבר

(ms A, Bodl. b, 8 16–23)

πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ ἀπὸ παντὸς συνουσιασμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης
πορνείας σὺ ἴπρωτος† ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος λάβε σεαυτῷ καὶ μὴ βεβηλώσης τὸ σπέρματος γὰρ
γὰρ ἁγίου εἶ, καὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ἁγιάσον καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ σου ἐστίν· ἱερεὺς ἅγιος
κληθήσεται τῆ σπέρματι Ἀβραάμ. ἐγγὺς εἶ κυρίου καὶ σὺ ἐγγὺς τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ. γίνου
καθαρὸς ἐν τῷ σώματί σου ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας παντὸς ἀνθρώπου) (ms E 18,2 12 16–23)

Through these different examples, therefore, Levi seems to develop his identity profile in considerable relation to the idea that the body represents a sacred space. It is a space of elevated importance and value, and Levi demonstrates a notable interest in the ongoing care and maintenance of its sacred quality.

2.3.5.4 *Wisdom as a Spatial Concept*

Perhaps one other notable means by which Levi develops the importance of space as a feature of his identity profile is through the notion of wisdom, which I highlighted in the above section on tradition.²⁰⁵

Amidst Levi's endorsement of wisdom to his children, he appears to develop it in spatial terms. In this case, he describes wisdom in terms of a metaphorical kingdom.²⁰⁶ Levi describes it as follows:

Great wealth of glory is wisdom, and a good treasure for all who acquire her. If mighty kings come and a great army, and soldiers and horsemen and numerous chariots with them, then they will carry away the possessions of the land and province, and they will plunder everything that is in them, and treasuries of wisdom they will not plunder and they will not find her hidden places and (they will) not enter her gates, and [they will] not [and] they will [not] be able to conquer her walls, []and not[and] they will [not] see her treasure.

²⁰⁵ Scholars have previously picked up on the importance of wisdom for Jewish identity, see, for example, Collins, *The Invention of Judaism*, 66–69.

²⁰⁶ Scholars have previously noted the unusual nature of this city/kingdom metaphor for wisdom (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document*, 203). The novelty of this metaphor perhaps maps onto a wider reimagining of wisdom taking place in ALD. Scholars have observed the distinct nature of wisdom in comparison to wider wisdom expressions in the Ancient Jewish literary world. For more on this shift, see, for example, Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests*, 13.

Her treasure c[orresp]onding to it (?) [] and [n]o price is adequate for it and [not every] ma[n who] looks for wisdom, [wis]dom he will [find] th[]her hidden place from it/him p[]' l[] and not la[c]k[]n all who see[k] truly [] (ALD 94–97)

עותר רב די יקר היא חוכמתה וסימא טאבא לכל קינאה הן יאתון מלכין תקיפין ועם רב וחיל
 ופרשין ורתיכין סגיאיין עמהון וינסבון נכסי מאת ומדינה ויבוזון כל די בהון אוצרי חוכמתא לא
 יבוזון ולא ישכחון מטמוריה ולא
 (ms A, Cambr. f, 6 16–23)

◦ []◦ה[...]◦ ועם []◦קשיטא[...]◦ טבה []◦ ידיעה ושימה טבה []◦
 (4Q213 1 i 20–21)

מטמוריה ולא יעלון תרעיה ולא []◦ ישכחון למכבש שוריה []◦ ולא []◦ יחזון שימתה שימתה
 ◦ []◦ד[...]◦ ולא איתי כ[]◦ []◦ מחור נגדה []◦ בעא חכמה []◦מת[...]◦ []◦ מטמרה
 מנה []◦ אל[...]◦ ולא חס[...]◦ []◦ כל בעל וקשט
 (4Q213 1 ii 1–8)²⁰⁷

For Levi, wisdom comes to represent a type of impenetrable kingdom. While I accept the underlying metaphorical nature of this depiction, which bears similarities to wider metaphorical portrayals of the concept of “wisdom” in wider Second Temple materials and the Hebrew

²⁰⁷ Cf. 4Q214a 2–3 ii 1–4; 4Q214b 8 1–2.

Scriptures, the spatial nature of this depiction seems important for our present purposes. By capturing wisdom in spatial terms, and not merely as a desirable or functional human quality, Levi seems to expand his complex of spatial realities. For Levi, wisdom becomes not only an important quality for his identity profile, but it also develops into space from which he cultivates identity. In this case, it is a space that he encourages his descendants to foster, maintain, and shelter within.

2.3.5.5 Levi and Space

In our above consideration of space, we acted to draw out a sharper impression of its role for Levi's identity.

We did this by first observing some of Levi's intersections with traditional named geographic references in ALD. We then moved beyond these references to engage with what seemed to be important alternative spatial conceptions across the narrative. We looked at the notion of vertical space pertaining specifically to conceptualizations of the figure of God, dream-related experiences, and ritual practice. We then looked at horizontal space depicted in Levi's adoption of the "ways" and "paths" motif. We also explored how Levi develops the body in relation to spatial imagery and ideas, and how this conception shapes some of Levi's wider priestly concepts pertaining to clothing and ritual practice. Finally, we considered Levi's development of the notion of wisdom in spatial terms.

Our explorations of Levi's engagement of space brought us towards a more precise understanding of space as a feature of his identity. We were able to build upon several earlier observations at a compositional level regarding Levi and space, add additional detail, and more precisely locate them in Levi as an individual figure.

2.4 Synopsis

Through the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space* in the above analysis, we drew out more distinctly some of the contours of Levi's profile of Jewish identity. We built upon select past impressions of the intersections between Levi and these concepts, as well as wider analogues in the Second Temple literary world.

In this we more precisely identified some of the distinctives of Levi's kinship-related aspects of his identity as an individual figure. We mapped out Levi's kinship emphasis and noted select similar expressions in wider figures, yet recognized important distinctives, such as the lengths Levi was willing to go to endorse and ensure adherence to kinship boundaries. In terms of tradition, we worked to consider more precisely Levi's engagement in the tradition process, particularly noting the comprehensive nature of his participation. As a revelatory figure, we considered and added additional precision to Levi's intersections with the concept of revelation. In this we identified select distinctives, such as his limited interest in malevolent aspects of otherworldly reality beyond select general observations. We moved to locate more specifically Levi's interests in the concept of time. We saw his interests concentrate around notions of past and future, akin to various wider ancient Jewish figures. Yet within this we captured his notable interest in figures and artefacts connected with the antediluvian past and a concern for future projected realities pertaining to both him and his descendants. Finally, in terms of space, we catalogued some of Levi's primary interests, picking up on his specific development of an association/engagement with alternative spatial concepts including vertical space through ritual practice and dream-visions; horizontal space through ways and paths conceptualizations; the

human body as a sacred space with an awareness of some of its wider halakhic intersections; and wisdom as a spatial concept.

From the above analysis, we come away with a greater awareness of:

- 1) Some of the notable intersections between Levi's engagement with these concepts and those of other figures in the wider Second Temple world
- 2) A more precise knowledge of the contours and expressions of these concepts for Levi as an individual figure

This awareness improves our ability to locate Levi as a figure within the ancient Jewish literary landscape and moves us towards a more nuanced understanding of his distinct profile of Jewish identity.

3 Qahat

3.1 The Ancient Jewish Figure of Qahat

3.1.1 Known Yet Unknown: Qahat's Profile in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures

The figure of Qahat (Kohath; Kaath) is a largely undeveloped character in the Greek (LXX=Κααθ) and Hebrew (MT=קהק) Scriptures. The available contours of Qahat's profile come primarily through genealogical association, named attribution to a group, or the mention of his death. Accordingly, Qahat is the son of Levi (i.e., Gen 46:11; Exod 6:16; Num 3:17; 16:1; 25:57–8^{LXX}; 1 Chron 5:27; 6:1, 23; 23:6) and part of a priestly family. He is the father of Amram, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (i.e., Exod 6:18; Num 3:19; 16:1; 26:58; 1 Chron 5:28; 6:3, 23; 23:12). He is the grandfather of Aaron, Moses, and Miriam (i.e., Exod 6:20; Num 26:59; 1 Chron 5:29; 15:4–5; 23:13). A priestly group known as the “Kohathites” or “the sons of Kohath” bear his name (i.e., Exod 3:19; Num 3:27; 3:29–30; 4:2, 4, 15, 18, 34, 37; 7:9; 10:21; 26:57–8; Josh 21:5, 20, 26; 1 Chron 6:46; 2 Chron 20:19; 29:12; 34:12). And we learn of Qahat's eventual death at the age of 133 (Exod 6:18). Beyond these few features, the lines of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures tell us relatively little about the profile of Qahat.

In recent studies related to the figure of Qahat, various scholars have emphasized this limited profile. Uusimäki labels Qahat in these traditions as “a marginal character.”¹ Tervanotko notes that (beyond the abovementioned details) “the texts of the Hebrew Bible contribute virtually nothing to the story of this figure.”² Perrin describes the profile Qahat, as well as that of Amram in these writings, as “near blank canvases.”³ Yet despite the limited profile of Qahat in

¹ Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 209.

² Tervanotko, “A Trilogy of Testaments,” 50.

³ Perrin, “Charting Constellations,” forthcoming.

the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, or as some scholars have argued, *in view of* this particularly limited profile, various Second Temple writings adopt and develop the character of Qahat.⁴

3.1.2 Qahat's Broader Profile in the Second Temple Period and Beyond

The figure of Qahat makes some type of appearance in the following Second Temple writings: ALD (66, 74); T. Levi (11:4–6; 12:2); 4Q245 (1 i 5); 4Q365 (27 2); VA (4Q544 [1 1]; 4Q545 [1a i 1]; 4Q546 [2 3]); 11Q19 (44 14); and Jubilees (44:14).⁵ Qahat's profile takes on broader contour through these specific materials. While many of these writings capture similarly limited profiles of Qahat as those found in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, many of them provide a broader portrait. For example, in ALD 66 and 72, Levi recounts Qahat's birth and speaks with notable anticipation of both Qahat's future and his future children. T. Levi 11:4–6 appears to echo ALD, expressing similar insights regarding Qahat. VA (4Q544 1 1; 4Q546 2 3) includes materials portraying Qahat as participating in an ancestral burial event. While each of these writings contribute to Qahat's profile to varying degrees, as Perrin points out, "in all of these traditions, Qahat is "a voiceless figure."⁶

In addition to the above Second Temple writings, Qahat also appears in the text of 4Q542.⁷ As we noted in the introduction, 4Q542 offers a distinct depiction of Qahat in that it

⁴ See for example, Uusimäki, who proposes that the limited portrait of Qahat in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures made him an ideal candidate for some of the specific aims of the Second Temple authors. She suggests, regarding Second Temple conceptions of virtue, that "as a spotless figure available from the ancestral writings, [Qahat] was suitable for portraying a model-teacher," ("In Search of Virtue," 211).

⁵ For a more extensive survey of Qahat's appearances in Second Temple materials, see Tervanotko, "A Trilogy of Testaments," 51–55. See also, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; Uusimäki, "In Search of Virtue," 209; Michael E. Stone, "Qahat," *EDSS* 2:731.

⁶ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁷ In Puech's pre-publication analysis, he set 4Q542 within the literary genre of testament, referring to it as "4QTQah" or "Le Testament de Qahat en araméen" (Puech, "Le Testament de Qahat En Araméen," 23–54). Puech's classification was apparently based off an association between 4Q542 and the composition known as Aramaic Levi Document (ALD). Since the DJD publication of 4Q542 in 2001, however, scholars have increasingly identified issues with classifying 4Q542 as a testament. Drawnel has been among the most vocal in raising issues with 4Q542's testamentary designation. He argued that 4Q542 lacked sufficient testamentary criteria and that any

records his first-person voice for apparently the first time.⁸ 4Q542's depiction of Qahat, therefore, offers a unique encounter with Qahat relative to his other Second Temple appearances.

3.2 An Introduction to 4Q542

3.2.1 The Text and Its Publication

4Q542 was among the early manuscript discoveries from the Judaean desert and was fully published in 2001.⁹ This text consists of a single two-column fragment that makes up most of the available extant materials, along with two smaller fragments that round out its written content.¹⁰ Although the first fragment of the composition has notable areas of damage, particularly in column two, it is relatively well preserved. Fragments two and three of the composition,

such designation relied far too much on assumed content no longer available in the extant text. He alternatively designated the composition, "Admonitions of Qahat," in order to reconcile this perceived issue ("The Literary Form," 55–73). Based upon my reading of 4Q542, and in view of the proposals put forward by Drawnel and others (see for example, Frey, "On the Origins," 345–70), I am also inclined to believe that Puech's earlier title and designation require reform. While Drawnel's approach provided a helpful alternative, I prefer Perrin's more recent proposal. Perrin picked up on the ongoing issues of 4Q542's title and argued that the more generic title "Words of Qahat" was more appropriate. In his estimation, the title "Words of Qahat" avoids overemphasizing select features in the composition as in the previous cases of "Testament of Qahat" or "Admonitions of Qahat," while still capturing the pseudepigraphic nature of the composition (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). In view of the ongoing issues with the title of 4Q542 and its testament affiliation, I will adopt Perrin's designation "Words of Qahat" (WQ) in my subsequent handling of 4Q542.

⁸ Perrin observed, "some Jewish scribes writing in Aramaic saw to it that Qahat was given a voice from the past with apparent words for the present" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). For more on the importance of the first-person voice in the Aramaic DSS, see, for example, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Pseudepigraphy," 295–326.

⁹ For a full history of discovery, see Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jean Starcky was initially responsible for the publication of 4Q542. 4Q542 apparently came to him as a part of a larger lot of Aramaic compositions from the initial discovery of the DSS ("Le Travail d'Édition Des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63.1 [1956]: 49–67). Starcky's engagement with 4Q542 was quite limited, however, and following his death, Puech took to the task of putting together an edition 4Q542. He fully published an official edition of 4Q542 in 2001 as part of a DJD project covering a series of Aramaic manuscripts. For a more comprehensive overview of the text's paleographic date, material culture, publication, and contents, see Puech, "Le Testament de Qahat," 23–54; Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 262–64; Drawnel, "The Literary Form," 55–73.

¹⁰ As Perrin observes, although scholars have generally accepted the primary two-column fragment 4Q542 1 i–ii as a single unit, it actually represents three separate fragments. He writes, "*Words of Qahat* is now studied as three fragments (4Q542 1 i–ii, 2, 3) even though the photographs indicate the main fragment is comprised of three fragments of various sizes" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

however, only preserve small sections of text. As a result of considerable damage, especially to the latter two fragments, the ordering of the fragments remains uncertain.

Since the discovery of 4Q542, the scholarly consensus has been that this collection of fragments represents an independent composition.¹¹ From these observations, scholars have consistently engaged 4Q542 through that lens.¹² They granted 4Q542 an independent title, which, as we will briefly explore below, resulted in its fair share of challenges especially regarding the genre of 4Q542.

Recently, however, Machiela, challenged this long-held belief. He raised questions as to the validity of treating 4Q542 as a separate composition and suggested the possibility that 4Q542 represents an additional section of VA (4Q543–547). In his investigation, Machiela highlights various scribal and physical similarities between 4Q542 and 4Q547 as well as a series of wider contextual and literary items that support his proposal.¹³ Although Machiela’s proposal is not certain, as he himself recognizes, it is at the very least intriguing to consider as a possibility and in my view, rather compelling.

If Machiela’s proposal is correct, it raises certain questions regarding our present approach of treating 4Q542 independently from VA (4Q543–547). If we were primarily interested in engaging 4Q542 from a compositional perspective, I would be hesitant to proceed in treating 4Q542 independently from VA. Yet because our primary interest is in the *figure* of Qahat and the traditions related to him, and not in 4Q542 as an independent composition or “text,” approaching this material independently seems to me reasonable for a few reasons.

¹¹ Puech’s early engagement of these materials as an individual composition set the tone for subsequent research and have carried forward until recently. For these initial impressions, see, Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 257–82.

¹² See, for example, Puech, “Le Testament de Qahat,” 23–54; Drawnel, “The Literary Form,” 55–73; Gross, “Testament of Kohath,” 1869–71; Ken M. Penner, “Testament of Qahat,” *T & T Clark Companion to Second Temple Judaism*, 454–55.

¹³ Machiela, “Is the Testament of Qahat,” 27–38.

Perhaps the most apparent reason pertains to our earlier discussion in the introduction on the ancient Jewish literary world. We previously noted the growing scholarly interest in revisiting the notion of the ancient Jewish “literary imagination.”¹⁴ Mroczek in particular, has begun to point out some of the ways in which the ancient Jewish literary world represents much more than what has been passed down to us in material culture.¹⁵ In view of this, ancestral traditions, such as the present tradition pertaining to the figure of Qahat, while represented in the material culture of 4Q542, extend well beyond them, as is evident in Qahat’s wider—albeit limited—appearances across other ancient Jewish writings.¹⁶ In view of this, even if 4Q542 represents part of the compositional framework of VA, that does not negate the fact that it simultaneously represents only one part of a larger ancestral tradition pertaining to the figure of Qahat.

Since ancestral traditions, such as the present tradition about Qahat are not limited to the physical boundaries of material culture, it seems therefore appropriate to engage 4Q542 independently when done so from this wider figure/tradition focussed perspective.¹⁷

We will therefore proceed with an engagement of Qahat in 4Q542 independent from the wider composition of VA. While I will continue to use the compositional designation Words of Qahat (WQ hereafter), I do so primarily to simplify our engagement and not as commentary on the independent compositional status of 4Q542.

¹⁴ As previously noted, I borrow the idea of “literary imagination” from Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*.

¹⁵ Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination*. For more on the wider contours of the ancient Jewish literary world, see, also, Najman, *Seconding Sinai*; Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah*; Perrin, “Redrafting,” 44–71. For more on these developments refer to “Introduction” in the present investigation.

¹⁶ For an overview of these wider writings see the above introduction to the figure of Qahat.

¹⁷ Further, as we noted in the introduction, approaching 4Q542 independently in the present investigation is advantageous in that the material culture of 4Q542 has its own natural physical boundaries. Again, while those boundaries may be merely a product of circumstance, they nonetheless provide a helpful means to delimit the content we engage in drawing out Qahat’s profile of identity in the present investigation.

3.2.2 Previous Research

Over the history of research, scholars have demonstrated a notable interest in exploring WQ for its potential contributions towards developing understandings around the notion of dualism in Second Temple materials.¹⁸ WQ seemingly attests to ideas commonly connected to dualism such as a juxtaposition between the righteous and the wicked (4Q542 1 ii 8) and an opposition between light and darkness (4Q542 2 11–12).¹⁹

The concept of dualism has featured prominently in conversations on ancient identity, particularly around the notion of sectarianism. Investigations into notions of sectarianism have fostered much conversation on the formation of identities in antiquity. While these conversations represent important inroads into understanding Jewish identity, the Aramaic DSS, and WQ in particular, attest to a more expansive and nuanced vision of identity.

Previous WQ research has alluded to and at times captured some of these wider frames of identity that extend beyond the traditional dualism motif. One place we have seen this take place is in thematic explorations. WQ has featured in a wide range of studies that trace the appearance of select themes and motifs across a variety of compositions. This avenue of investigation has brought awareness to the significance of things such as knowledge transmission, the priesthood, conceptions of marriage, and the role of ancestral figures in WQ, all of which presumably map onto some of the wider features of ancient Jewish identity represented in the composition.²⁰

¹⁸ See, for example, Jörg Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, ed. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 316–19; Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 320–29.

¹⁹ I.e., “in the [gen]erations of the truth, but all [the] sons of wickedne[ss] shall pass away” (בְּ[ד]רֵי קוֹשְׁטָא וְיַעֲדוֹן כּוֹל) (4Q542 1 ii 8); “darkness and to d[arkness ...] and light for them [...]” (חֹשֶׁכַּ וְלַח [שׁוֹכֵא...][...] וְנִהִיר לְהֵן) (4Q542 2 11–12).

²⁰ On knowledge transmission, see, for example: Drawnel, “Priestly Education,” 547–74; Reed, “Textuality between Death and Memory,” 381–412; Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” 133–49, esp. 133–36. In relation to knowledge transmission also note thematic treatments of the testament genre that engage WQ. See, for example, Frey, “On the Origins,” 345–75, esp. 361. On the priesthood, see, for example: Angel, *Otherworldly and*

These thematic investigations have done well to point to and inform some of the distinct contours of Jewish identity in WQ. While the intertextual nature of this scholarship means that this material reaches across a wide variety of writings, it also means that its findings related to Jewish identity in WQ are largely limited in scope.

On the other hand, there are a growing number of studies in which WQ represents a more central feature of discussion and as a result have helped to increase our acquaintance with the notion of Jewish identity in WQ. A notable expression of this heightened engagement with WQ appears in different types of introductory analyses. This includes both general introductory essays on WQ, as well as articles that focus on the intertextual orientation of WQ among other contemporary writings. Although WQ is either central or of notable prominence in these investigations, and while these investigations highlight and unpack key thematic clusters and motifs in WQ that presumably map onto questions of Jewish identity, their introductory or orienting nature once again means that their contributions remain generally limited in scope.²¹

Beyond these introductory/orienting materials, there are select investigations in which WQ represents a primary point of departure and offer a more in-depth investigation that moves beyond introductory analysis. Drawnel's investigation, for example, on the literary form and content of WQ is one such investigation. His work explores some of the deeper underlying

Eschatological Priesthood, 279–80. On conceptions of marriage, see, for example, Hannah K. Harrington, "Intermarriage in Qumran Texts: The Legacy of Ezra-Nehemiah," in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Christian Frevel, LHBOTS 547 (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 251–79, esp. 277. On ancestral figures, see, for example: Moshe J. Bernstein, "Where Are the Patriarchs in the Literature of Qumran?," in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, BZAW 439 (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 51–76, esp. 70; Ariel Feldman, "Patriarchs in Aramaic Traditions," 469–80.

²¹ For general introductions to WQ, see, for example: Stone, "Qahat," 731–32; Gross, "Testament of Kohath," 1869–71; Penner, "Testament of Qahat," 454–55. For investigations on the intertextual orientation of WQ in relation to select contemporary writings, see, for example: Perrin, "Charting Constellations," forthcoming; Andrew B. Perrin, "Tobit's Context and Contacts in the Qumran Aramaic Anthology," *JSP* 25.1 (2015): 23–51; Machiela, "Is the Testament of Qahat," 27–38; Tervanotko, "A Trilogy of Testaments," 41–59.

frameworks in the composition and captures some of its key didactic features, much of which seemingly map onto questions of Jewish identity.²² A recent article by Uusimäki explores the notion of virtue in WQ. Her analysis repeatedly points to the importance of virtue within WQ's conceptual world, as well as the significance of related themes pertaining to ancestral figures, marriage practices, knowledge transmission, and purity, all of which maps onto questions of Jewish identity in WQ.²³ Finally, Perrin's forthcoming commentary on select Aramaic DSS writings includes a substantial section dedicated to WQ. His study offers an in-depth engagement with WQ in which he identifies and unpacks some of its significant themes and motifs. Occasionally in his work, Perrin explicitly alludes to the importance of some of these features for conceptions of ancient Jewish identity.²⁴

While each of these closer engagements with WQ offer important potential contributions to questions of ancient Jewish identity, each has notable limitations. In the cases of Drawnel and Uusimäki's investigations, both by design are highly focussed on specific compositional features. This intentionally narrow focus means that although they make potential contributions to questions of Jewish identity, those contributions limited in nature. Perrin's commentary, perhaps represent an alternative reality. Where Drawnel and Uusimäki's investigations have a highly specialized focus, Perrin's work as a commentary on WQ necessarily approaches the composition with a wide lens. Although Perrin's work offers rich, in-depth analysis of the material, and subsequently provides valuable insights and contributions related to questions of Jewish identity in WQ, the wide-lens nature of his work means that those contributions have notable limitations in terms of their depth.

²² Drawnel, "The Literary Form," 55–73.

²³ Uusimäki, "In Search of Virtue," 206–228.

²⁴ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. For previous similar commentary approaches to WQ that pick up notable themes and features, see, Puech, "Le Testament de Qahat," 23–54.

The above review of WQ identity research seems to suggest at least two things. First, our previous explorations of Jewish identity in relation to WQ are relatively limited in scope and thus there is a need for further study. Second, our primary understanding of identity that we have gathered in relation to WQ has primarily focussed on understanding identity from a compositional perspective. In other words, it has focussed on what WQ wholesale tells us about Jewish identity.

Our present interest is in exploring Jewish identity from the perspective of figures and traditions. In the present chapter, I will therefore provide an extended exploration of Jewish identity through the specific lens of the figure of Qahat. We will build upon many of these past impressions towards a more precise portrait of his identity. Before we do so, however, let us first consider the contents of WQ.

3.2.3 Content Overview

The primary challenge of capturing an overview of the content of 4Q542 is its fragmentary state. The physical text contains significant gaps in content. Drawnel previously underscored this challenge as part of his investigation on the literary form and didactic content of 4Q542.²⁵ Despite the fragmentary nature of the text, however, the text preserves notable and coherent sections of material that allow us to propose a provisional high-level content overview.

In my estimation extant material of 4Q542 captures three main scenes, with the possibility of additional unplaced scene(s).²⁶ This possibility is reflected in the fragmentary material in 4Q542 2–3 i–ii, which may reflect additional compositional frames or perhaps

²⁵ Drawnel, “The Literary Form,” 57. See also, Stone, “Qahat,” 731.

²⁶ For previous proposals on the literary structure of 4Q542, see Drawnel, “The Literary Form,” 57–60, who also identifies three distinct scenes within 4Q542.

extensions on the established scenes. Yet their highly fragmentary condition means that such determinations remain beyond our reach. From the available text, I conceive of the following basic schema for the content of 4Q542:²⁷

- 1) Paternal Blessing (4Q542 1 i 1–4)
- 2) Instructive Appeal to Inheritance and Vision for the Future (4Q542 1 i 4–1 ii 8)
- 3) Intimate Father/Son Instruction (4Q542 1 ii 9–13)
- 4) Unplaced Fragmentary Materials (4Q542 2–3 i–ii)

In what follows we will look at the content of each layer of this schema in turn.

3.2.3.1 Paternal Blessing (4Q542 1 i 1–4)

The apparent opening scene unfolds in 4Q542 1 i 1–4, beginning with a partial line of text. Although the words preceding this opening line are missing in the damaged fragment, the available content seems to reflect some type of spoken blessing. This spoken blessing, undertaken by a figure who will later reveal himself to be Qahat, has two main layers.²⁸ The first layer (4Q542 1 i 1–3) contains an announcement of some of Qahat’s perceptions regarding the divine features of God. Qahat identifies God as the preeminent divine being (4Q542 1 i 1),²⁹ a

²⁷ The transcription and translation of 4Q542 come from Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. I would like to thank Andrew Perrin for generously providing access to his pre-publication transcription and translation of 4Q542.

²⁸ The speaker later reveals himself to be Qahat as he identifies Amram as his son (4Q542 1 ii 9) and Levi as his father (4Q542 1 ii 11).

²⁹ I.e., “God of gods for all eternity” (אל אלִין לכול עולםִין) (4Q542 1 i 1). Perrin previously observed the language of “God of gods” in 4Q542 1 i 1 as reflecting WQ perception of the existence of a multiplicity of divine being alongside the Jewish figure of God. He notes that 4Q542 seems to demonstrate “a view of an otherworldly throne room, populated with large numbers of divine attendants, over whom God is supreme (*I En.* 14:22; 4Q530 2 ii + 6–12[?] 17; Dan. 7:10).” He goes on to say, “for these traditions, heaven was hardly a home to but one divine being.... the reference to the “God of gods” in 4Q542 shares this understanding: the ancestral deity of Israel is chief among a

type of revealer of hidden knowledge (4Q542 1 i 1–2),³⁰ one who possesses some form of overarching rule over time and action (4Q542 1 i 2–3),³¹ and one who gives joy and gladness (4Q542 1 i 3).³²

Mixed within this announcement of divine character, we encounter the second layer of this initial blessing scene. While Qahat’s blessing announces God as possessing certain divine features, his appeal centres on the outpouring of those features onto his addressees, whom he identifies as his descendants (“my sons” [בני] [4Q542 1 i 4]). Qahat appeals to the revealer of hidden knowledge to grant his descendants revelation (4Q542 1 i 1–2).³³ Qahat appeals to the one who gives joy and gladness to perpetually pour out joy and gladness onto his addressees (4Q542 1 i 3–4).³⁴

3.2.3.2 *Instructive Appeal to an Inherited Ancestral Tradition and Vision for the Future (4Q542 1 i 4–1 ii 8)*

After the initial blessing scene, the writing transitions to a two-part scene that captures an instructive appeal regarding an inherited ancestral tradition and various details of a vision for the future. Several scholars have identified the phase in 4Q542 1 i 4, “And now, my sons” (ובענ בני)

presumably larger population of unidentified but implied or angelic divine beings” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

³⁰ I.e., “may he shine his light upon you and make you know his great name so that you may know him” (וְנָהַר נְהִירָהּ) (עליכון ויודענכון שמה רבא ותנדעונה) (4Q542 1 i 1–2).

³¹ I.e., “he is the God of the ages, lord of all labors, and ruler over, making them according to his will” (הוא אלה) (עלסיה ומרא כול סעבדיא ושליט בכלא למעבד בהון כרעותה) (4Q542 1 i 2–3).

³² I.e., “may he make for you joy and gladness” (יעבד לכון חדוא ושמחא) (4Q542 1 i 3).

³³ I.e., “may he shine his light upon you and make you know his great name so that you may know him” (וְנָהַר נְהִירָהּ) (עליכון ויודענכון שמה רבא ותנדעונה) (4Q542 1 i 1–2).

³⁴ I.e., “may he make for you joy and gladness for your descendants, in the generations of truth for eternity” (יעבד) (לכון חדוא ושמחא לבניכון בדרי קושוט לעלמין) (4Q542 1 i 3–4).

as representing a transition marker in the narrative sequence.³⁵ This scene appears to span 4Q542 1 i 4–1 ii 8.

Qahat's instructive appeal on the inherited ancestral tradition unfolds in a few specific, at times overlapping, movements. Qahat's first aim is to make clear the importance of carefully handling the ancestral tradition in question. Before providing any detail as to the nature of the featured ancestral tradition, Qahat tells his descendants to "be careful with the inheritance" (אזדהרו בירותתא) (4Q542 1 i 4). This refrain of careful handling seems to anchor the entirety of his subsequent instruction. From here, Qahat is intent on making sure his descendants understand the specific nature of this ancestral tradition. He speaks to its handed-down, ancestral quality (4Q542 1 i 4–5, 12)³⁶ and its specific contours (4Q542 1 i 12–13).³⁷ He offers more specific handling instructions (4Q542 1 i 5–10).³⁸ Finally, Qahat conveys to his descendants the positive implications of properly handling the tradition (4Q542 1 i 10–12),³⁹ as well as the negative implications of its mismanagement.⁴⁰

³⁵ See for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming, who situates this use in 4Q542 1 i 4 alongside similar uses of this type of phrasing in wider ancient Jewish writings to underscore its common transitional function. See also Drawnel, who describes this phrasing as "a stylistic device that marks it off from the preceding context" ("The Literary Form," 58), as well as Edward M. Cook, "Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 44.2 (1993): 205–19.

³⁶ I.e., "the inheritance that has been bequeathed to you and that your ancestors gave to you" (ירותתא די משלמא לכו) (4Q542 1 i 4–5); "[the] inheritan[ce...] that your ancestors left for you" (ירותתא...די שבקו) (לכו אבהתכו) (4Q542 1 i 12).

³⁷ I.e., "[truth, upright practice, integrity, perfection, pur[ity, ho]liness, and the pri[est]hood" (קושטא וצדקתא) (4Q542 1 i 12–13).

³⁸ I.e., "Neither give your inheritance to strangers nor your heritage to assimilators" (אל תתנו ירותתכו לנכראין) (4Q542 1 i 5–6); "Cling to the command of Jacob your ancestor. Hold fast to the judgments of Abraham and the upright practices of Levi and myself. Be ho[l]y and pure from any [inter]mixture, clinging to the truth and walking in integrity—not with a divided heart, but with a pure heart and with a truth and good spirit" (אחדו בממר יעקב אבוכו ואתקפו בדיני אברהם וצדקת לוי ודילי והוא קד[וי]שין ודכין מן כול [ע]רברוב ואחדין בקושטא ואולין) (בישירותא ולאבלבב ולבב להן בלבב דכא וברוח קשיטה וטבה) (4Q542 1 i 7–10).

³⁹ I.e., "Then you will grant for me a good name among you, and joy to Levi, gladness to J[a]cob, rejoicing to Isaac, and praise to Abraham because you kept and preserved [the] inheritan[ce...]" (ותנתנו לי ביניכון שם טבוחדוא ללוי) (4Q542 1 i 10–12).

⁴⁰ I.e., "Neither give your inheritance to strangers nor your heritage to assimilators lest you become debased and disgraced in their eyes and they despise you. For they will become resident foreigners to you and become rulers over

Qahat then begins to transition his discourse towards some type of apparent vision for the future. Before he makes this transition, however, he first reiterates the legitimacy of his present instruction. Qahat emphasizes the congruency between the ancestral tradition and his teaching, informing his hearers that the different layers of the inherited tradition run “according to everything that I commanded you and according to everything that I have taught you in truth from now on” [ככול די פקדתון וככול די אלפתכון בקושוט מן כען ועד] [4Q542 1 i 13–1 ii 1]).

The second part of this scene appears to focus on some type of future vision for Qahat’s descendants. In this, Qahat seems to convey certain qualitative aspects of his descendants’ future. His language describes a future with a certain assuredness (4Q542 1 ii 2).⁴¹ He seems to anticipate a future in relation to blessing (4Q542 1 ii 3).⁴² He perceives their future as having a degree of permanency (4Q542 1 ii 4).⁴³ Alongside these projected qualities, Qahat seems to identify specific future roles and responsibilities. He envisions his descendants as adopting some type of judicial function (4Q542 1 ii 5).⁴⁴ In tandem with the projected judicial appointment of his descendants, he envisions the “guilty” (חיבי) (4Q542 1 ii 6) seemingly in connection with some type of judgment setting “in the depths and in all the caverns” (ובתהמ^ו א ובכול חלליא) (4Q542 1 ii 7).⁴⁵ He concludes this scene with perhaps some type of dichotomized announcement of final judgment (4Q542 1 ii 8).⁴⁶

אל תתנו ירותכון לנכראין ואחסנותכון לכילאין ותהון לשפלו[ת] ולנבלו בעיניהון ובעיניהון וינסרון עליכו דִּי להון תותבין) you” (4Q542 1 i 5–7).

⁴¹ I.e., “every true word will come to fruition for y[ou...]” ([...עליכ]ון) (4Q542 1 ii 2).

⁴² I.e., “everlasting blessings will rest upon you” (ברכת עלמא ישכונן עליכון) (4Q542 1 ii 3).

⁴³ I.e., “enduring for eternal generations” (קאם לכול דריעלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 4).

⁴⁴ I.e., “you will stand to hand down judgment” (תקומון למדן דין) (4Q542 1 ii 5).

⁴⁵ Qahat’s impression of guilty figures appears in the phrase, “to see the guilt of all the eternally guilty” (למחזיא) (חובת כול חיבי עלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 6).

⁴⁶ I.e., “in the [gen]erations of truth but all [the] sons of wickedne[ss] will pass away[...]” (ב[ד]ִּי קושטא ויעדון כול) (בני רשע[א]...) (4Q542 1 ii 8).

Qahat's instruction, he is careful to identify their significance. He encourages Amram towards careful attention in relation to these writings (4Q542 1 ii 12)⁵⁰ and underscores their ongoing value (4Q542 1 ii 13).⁵¹

3.2.3.4 *Unplaced Fragmentary Materials (4Q542 2–3 i–ii)*

As I noted above, the second and third fragments are considerably damaged. As a result, it is difficult to establish a clear sense of the nature of these sections or to meaningfully situate them within the narrative sequence. Despite these limitations, however, these latter fragments include various notable words and phrases. Fragment two includes a few intriguing references to light and darkness (4Q542 2 11–12),⁵² as well as a possible mention of some type of ruler figure (4Q542 2 13).⁵³ Fragment three includes a line pertaining to “fornication” (זנותא) (4Q542 3 i–ii 12),⁵⁴ a reference to “its roots” (שורשיה) (4Q542 3 i–ii ?), as well as a mention of stones and their weight (4Q542 3 i–ii 11).⁵⁵

Across this four-part schema of events, Qahat develops a distinct profile of identity. An awareness of the included events will help orient our subsequent exploration of his identity profile. In addition to an awareness of the various parts of this schema, however, it is also important to recognize that within the included events Qahat's identity develops in relation to a wider cast of characters. To appreciate the significance of these wider characters and their

⁵⁰ I.e., “all my writings as a testimony with which you should be careful[...] ([...] בהון בהון) (4Q542 1 ii 12).

⁵¹ I.e., “There is great merit when they are persevered with you [...]” (בהון זכו רבה באתהילכותהון עמכון) (4Q542 1 ii 13).

⁵² I.e., “darkness and to dark[ness]” (חשוכ ולח[שוכא]) (4Q542 2 11); “and light for them” (ונהיר להון) (4Q542 2 12).

⁵³ I.e., “and I, [the] prince” ([...] ואנא רוזן[א]) (4Q542 2 13).

⁵⁴ I.e., “they will be from/out of much fornication after (די) (להון מן זנותא שגי מן די) (4Q542 3 i–ii 12).

⁵⁵ I.e., “the stones were heavy” (יקרו אבניא) (4Q542 3 i–ii 11).

contributions to the formation of Qahat’s identity and to orient our investigation further, we will briefly consider them below.

3.2.4 The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Qahat

As in the case of Levi, the following table captures the wider cast of named characters in WQ, records their named appearances, categorizes their primary connection to Qahat, acknowledges their notable contributions to Qahat’s developing profile, and occasionally provides a few additional noteworthy features of the character in question.

Table 3.1

Named Figure	Appearance(s) in WQ	Connection to Qahat	Notable Contributions to Qahat’s Profile	Other Noteworthy Features
Abraham	4Q542 1 i 8, 11–13	- Great, Great-Grandfather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Source of Ancestral Tradition (4Q542 1 i 10–13) - Provides Judicial Standard (4Q542 1 i 8) - Provides Ancestral Connection to the Past 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Association with Judgment (4Q542 1 i 8)
Amram	4Q542 1 ii 9–13	- Son	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a Named Recipient of Tradition Allows Qahat to Demonstrate Commitment to the Transmission of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appears as a Model Student (4Q542 1 ii 9) - Projected as an Instructional Figure (4Q542 1 i 10) - Scribal Association through Reception

			Tradition (4Q542 1 i)	of and Projected Preservation of Written Content (4Q542 1 ii 12)
Isaac	4Q542 1 i 11–13	- Great-Grandfather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Source of Ancestral Tradition (4Q542 1 i 10–13) - Provides Ancestral Connection to the Past 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notably Absent in Initial List Associating Ancestral Figures with Distinct Contributions (4Q542 1 i 7–8)
Jacob	4Q542 1 i 7–8, 11–13	- Grandfather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Source of Ancestral Tradition (4Q542 1 i 10–13) - Source of Commands (4Q542 1 i 8) - Provides Ancestral Connection to the Past 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Association with Command (4Q542 1 i 8)
Levi	4Q542 1 i 8, 10–13	- Father	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Source of Ancestral Tradition (4Q542 1 i 10–13) - Appears as Qahat's Instructor and Model for the Transmission of Tradition (Reception and Perpetuation) (4Q542 1 i 11) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Association with Upright Practice (4Q542 1 i 8) - Prominent Instructional Role (4Q542 1 ii 11)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides Standard for Upright Practice (4Q542 1 i 8) - Provides Ancestral Connection to the Past 	
--	--	--	---	--

As the above table illustrates, Qahat intersects with a broader cast of characters across the narrative of WQ. These individuals and Qahat's interactions with them provide notable contour to various aspects of his developing profile. Over the course of our subsequent exploration of Qahat's profile of identity in WQ, we will at times pick up on the significance of select figures from the above table and will use some of the above observations as departure points in further elucidating aspects of Qahat's developing identity profile.

Working off the above introductory content, we will now turn to our exploration of the figure of Qahat in WQ and his distinct profile of Jewish identity.

3.3 Qahat's Profile of Jewish Identity in WQ

The figure of Qahat develops a distinct profile of identity across the narrative of WQ. As he appears in different circumstances and alongside some of the abovementioned figures, we see this profile take shape in his actions, his words, and his various interactions. As in the case of Levi, and as I outlined in my introduction, my intention is not to create an exhaustive catalogue of every possible angle or facet of Qahat's profile of identity. Instead, I will work to identify and consider what seem to be a complex of key features pertaining to the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space*.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ For more on my bases for selecting these concepts, see the introductory chapter.

In what follows, we will consider the figure of Qahat in WQ in relation to each of these concepts. We will focus on identifying and exploring some of the notable ways in which Qahat intersects with these concepts. We will look to build upon past observations and provide greater precision as to the nature and contours of these intersections towards developing for him a more comprehensive profile of Jewish identity. We will begin with the concept of *kinship*, to which we now turn.

3.3.1 Kinship

Kinship appears as a foundational aspect of Qahat's identity profile in WQ. As in the case of Levi, Qahat's kinship relationships are the primary source of his relational identity in the narrative. Although Qahat perhaps alludes to engagements with wider non-kinship individuals during his instruction to his descendants (4Q542 1 i 5–7), which we will explore in detail below, these apparent connections are very much peripheral to his primary kinship-based identity. In the narrative, Qahat is most clearly a father (4Q542 1 i 4; 1 ii 9)⁵⁷ and he also appears as a son (4Q542 1 ii 11).⁵⁸

The importance of kinship for Qahat, however, is not only evident in these general relational connections. His relational identity functions as a foundational fixture that gives important shape to the overall narrative. As we outlined in the above content overview, the narrative of WQ is primarily that of an instructional address towards a distinct kinship

⁵⁷ We see this in Qahat's words, "And now, my sons" (וּכְעַן בְּנֵי) (4Q542 1 i 4); "And now, to you, Amram, my son" (וְכַעַן לְכָה עֲמָרָם בְּרִי) (4Q542 1 ii 9).

⁵⁸ Qahat status as son appears in the following description: "they gave to Levi, my father, and my father Levi to me" (וַיְהִיבוּ לְלוֹי אָבִי וְלוֹי אָבִי לִי) (4Q542 1 ii 11).

audience.⁵⁹ Within this frame it is Qahat who first offers instruction to a larger group of his descendants (4Q542 1 i 4–1 ii 8). He then turns to offer a more intimate paternal instruction to his son, Amram (4Q542 1 ii 9–13).

This emphasis on kinship for Qahat, however, extends beyond immediate connections and localized realities. The immediate connections between Qahat and his descendants are an important departure point for his instructional address. Yet in the process of his address, Qahat further develops the significance of these kinship connections by situating them within a more expansive kinship network.

While Qahat addresses his descendants and instructs them in view of their immediate relationships and realities, which we will subsequently discuss in greater detail, his words repeatedly draw them beyond their immediate context. As he instructs them, he points them towards future descendants. As he speaks out blessing over them, seeking joy on their behalf, he simultaneously draws their gaze towards the subsequent generations, speaking hope for their future gladness (4Q542 1 i 3–4).⁶⁰ When he speaks to Amram, his instruction maintains a clear view of the generations to come (4Q542 1 ii 9–10).⁶¹

Alongside this interest in the future generations of this growing kinship network, Qahat also orients his descendants in connection to various ancestral figures. When he discusses his descendants' "inheritance" (ירושתא) (4Q542 1 i 4), he frames it as something "that has been bequeathed to you and that your ancestors gave you" (די משׁלמא לכוּן ודי יהבו לכוּן אבהתכוּן)

⁵⁹ Despite the overwhelming evidence that points towards the nature of WQ as a kinship address, more formal designations of WQ as part of the "testament" genre remain wide of the mark. For more on discussions on the "testament" genre designation for WQ, see the above section entitled "The Text and Its Publication," especially n. 7.

⁶⁰ I.e., "May he make for you joy and gladness for your descendants, in generations of truth for eternity" (ויעבד לכוּן) (4Q542 1 i 3–4).

⁶¹ I.e., "And now, to you, Amram, my son, I comma[nd...] and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants, I command" (וּכְעַן לכה עמרם ברי אנא מפק[ד]... [ב]נִיב[א]ה ו[ל]בניהון אנא מפקד) (4Q542 1 ii 9–10).

(4Q542 1 i 4–5); a refrain which he reiterates in 4Q542 1 i 12.⁶² In this Qahat appears interested in conveying the expansive nature of the kinship network in which both he and his descendants participate.

While the future generations understandably go unnamed in this presentation, Qahat adds greater contour to these ancestral connections by coupling more generic ancestral titles with specific named figures.⁶³ He names his descendants' more distant relatives Abraham (אברהם) (4Q542 1 i 8, 11) and Isaac (ישחק) (4Q542 1 i 11).⁶⁴ He reminds them of their great grandfather Jacob (יעקב) (4Q542 1 i 7, 11). And he names their grandfather, and his father, Levi (לוי) (4Q542 1 i 8, 11 [x2]). By specifying the identities of these otherwise more generic familial personalities, Qahat emboldens the significance of his and his descendants' kinship status. With an appeal to the ancestral identities of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Levi in his discourse, Qahat injects his vision of kinship with rich and well-known history, meaning, and significance.⁶⁵

While these appeals to future descendants and named ancestral figures have clear temporal import, which we will explore in further detail below, for our present purposes, these references function at the very least to reinforce the baseline importance of kinship for Qahat.

⁶² 4Q542 1 i 12 captures the inheritance related phrase, “[the] inheritan[ce...] that your ancestors left for you” (ירוֹתָ[תא...] דִּי שְׁבָקוּ לְכוֹן אֲבֹהֵתְכוֹן).

⁶³ Various scholars have identified Qahat's appeal to these named ancestral figures as a type of “authority granting” strategy. Qahat's appeal to these ancestral figures appears to function to both elevate him as an individual and substantiate the legitimacy of WQ as a composition. See for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming; Perrin, “Tobit's Context and Contacts,” 23–51, esp. 35; Dimant, “Themes and Genres,” 15–45, esp. 36; Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 206–28, esp. 228.

⁶⁴ Although Qahat eventually includes Isaac in his list of named ancestral figures (4Q542 1 i 11), he is notably absent Qahat's first ancestral roll call (4Q542 1 i 7–8). For further comment on the initial absence of Isaac in Qahat's first ancestral list, see Bernstein, “Where Are the Patriarchs,” 70.

⁶⁵ Rabbinic Judaism attests to a shift towards emphasizing kinship as determined matrilineally. Based upon the available evidence, WQ demonstrates a clear patrilineal conception of kinship with no hint of any type of matrilineal emphasis. The genealogical points of references seemingly center on paternal or future paternal figures (i.e., “Abraham” [אברהם] [4Q542 1 i 8, 11]; “Jacob” [יעקב] [4Q542 1 i 7, 11]; “Levi” [לוי] [4Q542 1 i 8, 11; 1 ii 11]; “Amram” [עמרם] [4Q542 1 ii 9]; “father” [אב] [4Q542 1 ii 11]; “son(s)” [בר] [4Q542 1 i 4; 1 ii 9]). For more on the matrilineal conception of Jewish kinship identity, see, for example, Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, esp. 263–307.

3.3.1.1 *Elevating the Importance of Kinship*

The above examples seem to offer a basic indication of the importance of kinship for Qahat. His primary identity develops around kinship connections. He directs his primary actions towards a kinship audience. And he orients all of that within a well-established and expanding kinship network. Yet perhaps the clearest indication of the importance of kinship for Qahat appears in some of the underlying substance of the instruction that he offers to his descendants.

A notable feature of Qahat's profile pertains to the notion of "tradition." As in the case of Levi, tradition for Qahat seems to represent *the transmission of a core set of virtues from one generation to the next, often catalyzed by an appeal to some form of lore*. We will explore the significance of tradition for Qahat in greater detail in the following section. We will look at some notable aspects of Qahat's engagement in the transmission process of tradition as well as the contours of some of its underlying core virtues. In the present section, however, I briefly want to pick up on the notion of tradition as a further means to understanding the significance of kinship for Qahat. To do this, we will look at how Qahat conveys tradition in exclusive terms and consider the specific boundaries he uses to establish that sense of exclusivity.

3.3.1.1.1 A Preview of Tradition: Exclusive Tradition

Like kinship, the notion of tradition features prominently throughout WQ. The primary expression that Qahat seems to use to capture the notion of tradition is the term "inheritance" (ירוּתָה).⁶⁶ He uses this term on several occasions throughout his discourse. Following his opening

⁶⁶ While I will subsequently focus on the importance of the notion of "tradition" for Qahat, for our present purposes I will use the term "inheritance" and "tradition" synonymously.

benediction (4Q542 1 i 1–4), he informs his descendants to “be careful with the inheritance that has been bequeathed to you and that your ancestors gave you” (אזדהרו בירותתא די משיִלמא לכון) (4Q542 1 i 4–5). He instructs them to “neither give your inheritance to strangers nor your heritage to assimilators” (ואל תתנו ירותתכון לנכראין ואחסנותכון לכליאין) (4Q542 1 i 5–6). He looks with a hopeful outlook towards his descendants faithful preservation of the inheritance (4Q542 1 i 10–12).⁶⁷ He then offers a succinct description of the inheritance as “truth, upright practice, integrity, perfection, pur[ity, ho]lines, and the pri[est]hood” (קושטא וצדקתא וישירותא ותמימותא ודכִּוְתא וקִּוְדְשָׁא וכוּהַ[ו]נתא) (4Q542 1 i 12–13). Finally, he goes on to describe this inherited tradition to his son, Amram, as something transmitted across generations through both verbal and written instruction (4Q542 1 ii 9–13).⁶⁸

In Qahat’s instructions regarding this inherited tradition, he gives the impression that he envisions a reality in which there are clear boundaries as to who can receive this inherited tradition. In other words, this inherited tradition appears exclusive. The initial indications of this perhaps appear in some of Qahat’s initial words of instruction to his descendants. Following his opening benediction, he begins with an appeal for them to “be careful with the inheritance” (אזדהרו בירותתא) (4Q542 1 i 4). He goes on to describe the inheritance as something “kept and preserved” (נטרתון והילכתון) (4Q542 1 i 11–12). This language of care and preservation again appears in his instructions to his son, Amram. In apparent reference to the inheritance in written

⁶⁷ I.e., “Then you will grant for me a good name among you, and joy to Levi, gladness to J[a]cob, rejoicing to Isaac, and praise to Abraham because you have kept and preserved [the] inheritan[ce...] that your ancestors left for you” (ותנתון לי ביניכון שם טבוחדוא ללוי ושמח לי[ע]קוב ודיאצ לישחק ותשבוחא לאברהם די נטרותון והילכתון ירות[תא]...די שבקו) (לכון אבהתכון) (4Q542 1 i 10–12).

⁶⁸ I.e., “And now, to you Amram, my son, I comma[nd...] and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants, I command[...] and they gave to Levi, my father, and my father Levi to me[...] all my writings as a testimony which you should be careful[...] to you” (אבי ולוי אבי לי [...] כול כתבי בשהדו די תזדהרון בהון[...] לכון) (אבי ולוי אבי לי) (4Q542 1 ii 9–13).

form, Qahat tells Amram that “you should be careful” (תזדהרון) (4Q542 1 ii 12) and that “there is great merit when they are preserved with you” (זכו רבה באתהילכותהון עמכון) (4Q542 1 ii 13).

While a call towards careful handling and maintenance of this inherited tradition does not necessarily confirm a sense of boundary or limited access, it does seem to hint towards it. Qahat, however, corroborates these envisioned boundaries, when he explicitly instructs his descendants away from a general open access handling of the inherited tradition. He draws clear boundaries around the tradition when he tells them to “neither give your inheritance to strangers nor your heritage to assimilators” (ואל תתנו ירותכון לנבראין ואחסנותכון לכילאין) (4Q542 1 i 5).

Through these instructions, Qahat offers a clear indication that he envisions a world in which there is exclusive access to this inherited ancestral tradition. His wider appeals towards its careful handling and preservation seem to function to reinforce this envisioned reality. The question, however, is how does Qahat understand the exclusive nature of this inherited tradition? What is the basis for exclusion or inclusion in terms of reception?

3.3.1.1.2 Kinship-Based Exclusivity

When we take a closer look at how Qahat understands the exclusive nature of this tradition, we quickly encounter the notion of kinship. When Qahat stipulates in his address that his descendants are not to share their inherited tradition openly, he seems to do so primarily in relation to kinship connections. He identifies two groups with whom they should not share their inheritance: “strangers” (נבראין) (4Q542 1 i 5) and “assimilators” (כילאין) (4Q542 1 i 6). As various scholars have observed, in this context, these terms seem to reflect a primary concern for

kinship, although perhaps in different ways.⁶⁹ Regardless of possible degrees of difference between these two terms, both seem to capture a type of individual with a perceived non-kinship status.⁷⁰

Qahat further evidences this kinship-based boundary in his instructions to Amram. As he outlines his vision for the ongoing transmission of the tradition, he seems to draw an explicitly kinship shaped boundary around it. He states: “And now, to you, Amram, my son, I comma[nd...] and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants, I command[...] and they gave to Levi, my father, and my father Levi to me[...] all my writings as a testimony with which you should be careful[...]” ([ב]ִּיכָאֵל וְלִבְנֵיהוֹן אֲנִי מִפְקֵד []) ([] לְכֹן וְיִהְיֶה לְלוֹי אָבִי וְלוֹי אָבִי לִי [] כֹּל כְּתָבִי בְשֶׁהֱדוּ דִי תִזְדַּהְרוּן בְּהוֹן [] לְכֹן) (4Q542 1 ii 9–12). Within this apparent sequence, Qahat repeatedly seems to emphasize the importance of kinship as part of an instruction on the transmission of the tradition. While the fragmentary nature of the text inhibits us from saying for certain that Qahat’s instructions did not include non-kinship terminology within this sequence, the nature of the overall address and wider narrative context seem to offer little indication of that being the case.

Qahat’s conception of kinship as apparently the primary basis for the reception of his inherited ancestral tradition further elevates its significance for him.

⁶⁹ This language does, however, take on wider meanings in the wider second temple context. See, for example, the observations by Hempel on the halakhic related usage of this language in CD (*The Laws of the Damascus Document*, 64–72).

⁷⁰ For more on these terms as reflecting an outsider distinction, see the subsequent section entitled “*Kinship Conversion through a Terminological Lens.*”

3.3.1.1.3 The Perceived Permeability of Kinship: The Question of Conversion

Qahat's adoption of kinship parameters as a basis for the reception of the inherited tradition is important. It helps us begin to understand its elevated significance for him. Yet what seems to make his adoption of these parameters perhaps even more significant, is when we consider further how Qahat seems to understand the nature of kinship status, specifically the "permeability" of this status or the notion of so-called "conversion."⁷¹

The question of conversion has been a notable point of investigation in ancient Jewish studies, particularly in investigations on ancient Jewish identity. Cohen, among several others, offers a diachronic presentation of the development of the conception of conversion in ancient Jewish literature.⁷² As I outlined in the introduction, Cohen primarily engages the conversation to map out the transition of Jewish identity from an ethnic/geographic conception towards what he defines as an "ethno-religion." Regardless of how one might view Cohen's specific understanding of the diachronic development of the conceptual makeup of Jewish identity, he offers a helpful overview of some of the considerable variety of attitudes towards the ancient Jewish notion of conversion.⁷³

As a brief summary of Cohen's survey, he looks at early Jewish engagement with outside non-kinship groups in the Tanakh and suggests that the primary emphasis on destruction seems

⁷¹ As will become increasingly clear in the present section, I adopt much of the present language of "permeability," as well as related notions of conversion, from the work of Hayes, which has been for me a critical resource in understanding both the contours of ancient Jewish purity and its intersections with ancient Jewish identity. She unpacks the notion of conversion through the lens of permeability and purity as follows: "different views on the question of Gentile impurity entailed different definitions of group identity and served to construct group boundaries of varying degrees of permeability. Consequently ancient Jews exhibit very different attitudes toward the processes by which group boundaries are penetrated—intermarriage and conversion. Not all Jews, however, agreed that intermarriage and/or conversion was desirable or even possible. For some ancient Jewish groups, identity was constructed in such a way as to render impermeable the boundary between Gentile and Jew" (*Gentile Impurities*, 3–4).

⁷² Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 109–71.

⁷³ For more on Cohen's perspective and some of the subsequent response to his and others' diachronic charting of the shifting makeup of Jewish identity, see "Introduction."

to suggest an absence of any notion of conversion at the time. He suggests that while the inclusion of non-kinship individuals into the group through certain expressions of slavery perhaps foreshadows later notions of conversion, the outside status of those individuals remained. He continues to trace examples through the Hebrew Scriptures. He looks at various examples within Israel's monarchic period and suggests that the notion of conversion is absent. While he recognizes possible hints of social inclusion and hints of conversion such as in Esther, he suggests overall that inclusion was primarily limited to conversion at a "social" or "religious" level. He does indicate, however, that "the Torah has the raw material for a theology of conversion, and indeed in the second century C.E. the rabbis exploit the analogy between converts and the Israelites at Mount Sinai."⁷⁴ Cohen follows this diachronic thread into the Hasmonean period, which he argues as a point of transition in which the notion of conversion developed in view of a shifting conception of Jewish identity as an ethnic/geographic designation to "ethno-religious" in nature. He argues that an increased emphasis on religious belief as the primary basis for Jewish identity continued to develop from here into later Rabbinic Judaism in which conversion became a standardized feature.

As I pointed out in the introduction, Cohen is not alone in his attempts to chart an apparent developmental trajectory for Jewish identity in relation to conversion. Another notable voice in this conversation on conversion, is Hayes. In her volume, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*, Hayes raises this question of the perceived "permeability" of Jewish identity or again the notion of "conversion" in the ancient Jewish context.⁷⁵ In particular, her work looks at this idea through the lens of purity, and she offers several important correctives as to conceptions of purity in the ancient

⁷⁴ Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 131.

⁷⁵ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 3–4.

Jewish world. Hayes pushes back on what she describes as a “monochromatic” notion of purity in previous scholarship.⁷⁶ She traces the development of perceptions of purity in ancient Jewish scholarship from initial, primarily ritual, conceptions of purity, to the eventual corrective of Klawans, who identified in ancient Jewish writings, both a ritual and a multi-layered form of moral purity.⁷⁷ Furthering the valuable contributions by individuals such as Klawans, Hayes expands the ancient Jewish conception of purity to include three purity types: ritual, moral, and genealogical purity.

Following some of the perceptions of previous scholars, Hayes generally describes each type of purity as follows. She conveys ritual purity as a cultic based purity, non-moral in nature, and reconcilable through ritual purification. As she conceives of all purity as covenant based, she connects ritual purity to the Sinaitic covenant and thus conceives of it as solely pertaining to Jews.⁷⁸ For her, moral purity, or impurity rather, represents something more permanent. Moral purity, a purity based upon the maintenance of certain moral standards, remains, however, reconcilable through notions of behavioral reform and atonement. She attributes this type of purity to the Noahide covenant and thus connects it to both Jews and non-Jews.

The category of genealogical purity represents a notable contribution by Hayes. Where previous scholarship drew the line at ritual and moral purity, Hayes extends it. She argues that beginning with Ezra-Nehemiah, ancient Jewish thinkers conceived of an additional, impermeable form of purity. This form of purity was based upon kinship or notions of genealogical descent. In her estimation, like its moral counterpart, this form of purity extends to both Jews and non-Jews.

⁷⁶ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 7.

⁷⁷ Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

⁷⁸ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 19–44. While Hayes generally recognizes ritual purity as only pertaining to Jews, she does identify some inconsistencies within such a proposal, noting select cases in which Gentiles can in fact become ritually impure. In view of these apparent inconsistencies, she deals with these examples at length in her volume.

Based upon this multi-faceted conception of purity, Hayes suggests that the degree to which ancient Jewish groups conceived of genealogical purity as a feature of Jewish identity was the primary dividing line between such groups. In this sense, ancient Jewish writings, reflect a purity-based spectrum of the perceived “permeability” of Jewish identity or the possibility of “conversion.” On one end of the spectrum Hayes identifies groups that hold to a strictly moral-religious conception of Jewish identity, one in which adherence to or adoption of moral-religious practice represents a sufficient basis for identity. On the other end of the spectrum are groups that hold to a conception of Jewish identity solely based upon genealogical purity. In between are groups that hold varying combinations of these two extremes.

For our present purposes of better understanding the importance of kinship for Qahat, we must address this question of where exactly Qahat falls on this spectrum. In other words, to what extent does Qahat restrict kinship status? Is kinship a permeable category attainable through the notion of conversion? Or is it a fixed status, unattainable to non-kinship individuals. If Qahat perceives of a permeable kinship status, kinship remains important in that it functions to delimit the transmission of the inherited tradition. Yet if he does not perceive of kinship as a permeable status, the fact that he delimits his audience to an inaccessible group elevates its importance for him even more.

If we consider some of the proposals of scholars as to the nature of Jewish identity in WQ, in view of Hayes’s purity-based framework of conversion, WQ seems to fall somewhere in the middle of her spectrum.⁷⁹ This would mean that WQ conceives of Jewish identity in terms of a combination of both genealogical purity and moral-religious features. Such proposals seem to identify this dual basis of identity in both WQ’s widespread kinship emphasis as well as in its

⁷⁹ We will subsequently explore some of these specific proposals.

apparent allusions to the conversion process/converted status of non-Jews. While I agree with the former kinship-based feature of Jewish identity in WQ, as I suggested by my above outline of its considerable presence in the composition, I am less convinced as to the presence of the latter notion of conversion.

Proposals as to the presence of conversion in WQ largely seem to stem from Qahat's choice of language in 4Q542 1 i 5–7. In this section, Qahat instructs his descendants towards the careful handling of their inherited ancestral tradition. In the process, he warns them away from granting access to certain individuals. He instructs them to “neither give your inheritance to strangers nor your heritage to assimilators” (ואל תתנו ירותכון לנבראין ואחסנותכון לכילאין) (4Q542 1 i 5–6). In view of this pairing, he warns them that one of the potential pitfalls of such negligent behavior with their inheritance is that it will allow those abovementioned individuals to “become resident foreigners to you” (להון תותבין לבון) (4Q542 1 i 7).

At the heart of the question of potential conversion in WQ, is an apparent distinction between the initial description of individuals as “strangers” (נבראין) and “assimilators” (כילאין), and the subsequent description of those individuals as “resident foreigners” (תותבין). The logical flow of Qahat's instructions seem to suggest a distinction between the former terms and the latter term, primarily based upon the latter's newfound access to the inherited ancestral tradition. Yet the question is what distinction is there between the former terms, “strangers” (נבראין) and “assimilators” (כילאין), and the latter term “resident foreigners” (תותבין)?” Does this shift in language reflect a process of conversion, in which access to the inherited ancestral tradition allows apparent excluded individuals to take on Jewish identity, and in doing so, become included as legitimate recipients of the tradition?

Several scholars seem to interpret these words as reflecting the possibility of conversion. Reed, in a larger investigation on knowledge transmission and the formation of testaments and the testament genre, identifies Qahat's instructions here as representing an overarching "threat of rupture" within the composition.⁸⁰ While she does not explicitly connect this threat with language of conversion, her words seem to hint towards a sense of conversion or a permeable understanding of kinship. By granting access to their inheritance to excluded individuals through negligent handling, Qahat's descendants provide a point of entry through which those individuals of perceived *illegitimate* status can gain *kinship* status.

Lee's poetic treatment of WQ perhaps reflects a similar interpretation of Qahat's words, in which access to the inheritance results in these individuals undergoing a notable form of "development."⁸¹ While Lee does not explicitly refer to this development in terms of "conversion," his perception of development again seems to hint at a permeable sense of kinship.

Perrin perhaps offers the most explicit reading of Qahat's words as possibly reflecting an apparent possibility of conversion or a permeable notion kinship. In view of some of the wider usage of the term תּוֹתֵב in ancient Jewish writings, Perrin observes:

If any of this sense applies to WQ's use of תּוֹתֵב, it reveals that by accessing the inheritance, the "stranger" and "assimilator" are no longer an outsider. Rather, by virtue of this mismanaged inheritance, they are integrated into the insider group. In effect, the warning is less against insiders abandoning the heritage and becoming outsiders, than a

⁸⁰ Reed, "Textuality between Death and Memory," 395.

⁸¹ Peter Lee, *Aramaic Poetry in Qumran* (Saarbrücken: Scholars' Press, 2015), 266–7.

caution against the “other” permeating the bounds of the priestly line and thereby polluting the inheritance from the inside out.⁸²

3.3.1.1.4 Kinship Conversion through a Terminological Lens

To assess this general proposal that Qahat conceives of a notion of conversion or a permeable sense of kinship, perhaps the best starting point is a consideration of the nature of each of the included terms: “strangers” (נבראי), “assimilators” (כילאין), and “resident foreigners” (תותבין).

Scholars have associated the term נבראי, which Perrin renders as “strangers,” with the Hebrew term זר.⁸³ Perrin emphasizes the “outsider” status of this designation yet recognizes that “this entity is not necessarily or exclusively strangers in the sense of foreigners.” Based upon wider usage in Hebrew literature, he goes on to underscore the nature of the term as reflecting a sense of being “at odds with or outside” of a community in question.⁸⁴ Drawnel, following the appearance of this term in ALD, offers a similar interpretation. He captures the essence of נבראי in reference to a sense of belonging, describing this individual as someone who is “not welcome in a foreign country.”⁸⁵ In view of these proposals, and in view of Qahat’s surrounding warnings to his descendants in the wider instruction, נבראי here seems to reflect a clear sense of some form of outsider status.

The term כילאין seems to reflect a reality related to but distinct from נבראי. Whereas נבראי seems to emphasize a complete sense of outsidership, כילאין seems to reflect a type of blended but

⁸² Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁸³ Perrin notes the adoption of the term נבראי in the Cave Eleven Job translation for the term זר (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

⁸⁴ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁸⁵ Drawnel, *The Literary Form*, 69.

equally undesirable reality. Cook observed this term as reflecting “things of mixed origin.”⁸⁶ Drawnel suggested that this term “is best explained by the reference to the Hebrew dual form בלאים, ‘two kinds,’ indicating types of animals, seed or textile that cannot be mixed (Lev 19:19; Deut 22:9).”⁸⁷ Perrin described this term as referencing “an individual or group of mixed ethnicity” based upon its later synonymous usage in Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 19:19.⁸⁸ When we take these proposals, and Qahat’s wider attempts to deter his descendants from giving their inheritance to these individuals, the underlying sense of כלאים as with the term נכראי also reflects a type of outside status.

In view of the bonafide outsider status reflected in these initial two terms, the question then shifts to the nature of the latter term תותבין. As I noted above, several scholars have read this term as seemingly reflecting a converted status. Given the appearance of this term as describing the apparent result of different types of outside groups or individuals accessing the inherited ancestral tradition, this term clearly aims to express some type of change. While the presence of a change is certain, the nature of that change as conversion from non-kinship status to kinship status seems to me less so.

Drawnel for example, understands this term to reflect a reality in which an outsider gains access to a community or a group, but he does not appear to see that access as reflective of conversion. He instead seems to place emphasis on sustained presence among the group, in the form of “residence,” but does not seem to indicate that this change represents conversion.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Cook, *Remarks*, 209.

⁸⁷ Drawnel, *The Literary Form*, 69.

⁸⁸ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁸⁹ Drawnel, *The Literary Form*, 70.

Previous scholarship identified the term גר as the Hebrew cognate of תוֹתֵב.⁹⁰ Palmer, in a recent monograph, explores the term גר in Second Temple literature.⁹¹ In her investigation, she notes the ways in which the meaning of גר has seemingly developed from its earlier appearances in the Hebrew Scriptures. She identifies the early meaning of גר as referring to a “resident alien”, perhaps similar to Drawnel’s above proposal, and traces its meaning into the Second Temple period in which it comes to represent the idea of a Gentile gaining a Jewish identity through a sense of conversion.⁹² As a central part of her study, she explores the particular meaning of גר in sectarian D and S traditions. In her findings, she recognizes on the one hand, a more permeable conception of גר in the D tradition, one in which גר seemingly represents a convert indistinguishable from a native, kinship-based Jew. And on the other hand, she proposes that גר in materials from the S tradition, while seemingly representing a type of Gentile convert, reflects an individual that ongoing remains distinct from native, kinship-based Jews due to the impermeable nature of kinship status. While she seems to largely attribute the impermeable nature of kinship status to a type of secondary conversion reserved for native, kinship-based Jews, her observations underscore a reality in which גר also reflects an insurmountable kinship-based distinction between Jew and Gentile.

Palmer offers numerous contributions to our understanding of the nature of גר in the DSS, yet for our present purposes, perhaps her most important contribution is her emphasis on the complexity of the meaning of the term גר and its contextual dependence. Although גר can reflect a reality in which an outsider fully permeates the boundaries of Jewish identity, גר can also

⁹⁰ See, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁹¹ Palmer, *Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

⁹² Hayes too identifies this shift in meaning from a non-Jewish sympathizer to a “religious convert who takes on all the obligations, responsibilities, and privileges of a member of the Israelite community” (*Gentile Impurities*, 56–7).

reflect a reality in which Jewish identity remains impermeable on a perceived kinship basis, as well as the apparent possibility of an array of meanings that fall in between.⁹³

Palmer's work does not indicate that תּוֹתֵב here in WQ necessarily represents a reality of kinship conversion. Nor, however, does it indicate that it does not. Rather, it suggests at the outset that both are possible. We must therefore seek to understand תּוֹתֵב primarily based upon the context in which it appears. In this case, in WQ.

3.3.1.1.5 Contextual Considerations: Kinship Conversion and Intermarriage?

Perhaps the most profitable way to explore whether Qahat conceives of the possibility of kinship conversion at a contextual level is through the lens of his apparently strong aversion towards the notion of intermarriage. The presence of such an aversion towards the possibility of intermarriage appears at various instances in Qahat's instructions to his descendants. The first indication of this seems to appear in him drawing attention to כּילאַין, which again Perrin translates as "assimilators." As I suggested above, this term seems to center on the notion of incompatible mixtures. Yet scholars have keyed in on this term as demonstrating a particular concern for intermarriage.

Cook, for example, noted that when כּילאַין is "applied to people, its import is plain: it is a prohibition of mixed marriages or marriage to wives of mixed blood."⁹⁴ While scholars have increasingly dismissed this as a specific concern for the idea of "mixed blood," there is

⁹³ Palmer's perception of the complex and multi-faceted nature of גר across ancient Jewish writings, appears in her emphasis on the need to explore the distinct nature of גר in wider Second Temple materials, which in our present case comes to include WQ (*Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls*).

⁹⁴ Cook, "Remarks," 205–19, here 209–10.

increasing consensus that this term represents a concern regarding intermarriage.⁹⁵ Harrington too, notes that כִּלְאִין and נִבְרָאִין are “equivalents for Hebrew terms first used in Ezra-Nehemiah to describe the woes of intermarriage.” She goes on also to pick up on the potential connection between כִּלְאִין and the earlier notion of forbidden mixtures in Leviticus and Deuteronomy and further observes the term is “applied analogically by the writer of MMT to prohibit intermarriage.”⁹⁶

Qahat’s subsequent instruction to “be ho[ly] and pure from any [inter]mixture” (וְהוּא וְהוּא) (4Q542 1 i 8–9) perhaps reflects the clearest indication of his strong aversion towards intermarriage. The term [ע]רְבָרוּב, which Perrin renders as “[inter]mixture”, seems to reflect a particular concern for intermarriage. In view of Qahat’s concern for handing over the inherited tradition to select individuals (4Q542 1 i 5–7), he appears to make the nature of his request explicit, in that his descendants are to abstain from the practice of intermarriage. This maps onto the previous perceptions of others as to the meaning of this term.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Hayes, for example, dismisses the overall notion of intermarriage as concerned with “mixed blood.” She notes earlier perceptions of the Ezran reforms as a “racial ideology, which is concerned with purity of blood.” She goes on to state that “this is not an entirely accurate description of the rationale behind Ezra’s ban. For Ezra the issue is not purity of blood (the term ‘blood’ does not appear in these contexts) but rather genealogical purity. The genealogical purity promoted in Ezra-Nehemiah refers to biological descent from full Israelite parents, undergirded by the notion of Israel as a holy seed” (*Gentile Impurities*, 27). For more scholars who distance the ancient notion of ethnicity from modern concepts of “bloodline” or “race” see for example, Gruen, “Did Ancient Identity,” *Phoenix* 67.1/2 (2013): 1–22, esp. 13–17; Esler, “Judean Ethnic Identity,” esp. 78; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁹⁶ Harrington, *Intermarriage in Qumran Texts*, 277. See also, Drawnel, who in reference to כִּלְאִין and its appearance in Lev 19:19, acknowledges that “the term may refer at Qumran and in the Mishnah to the animal offspring resulting from this kind of illicit unions. At Qumran the law of Lev 19:19 is cited to stigmatize illicit priestly marriage” (*The Literary Form*, 69).

⁹⁷ White-Crawford, for example, suggests that in this term “special disdain is expressed for ‘intermingling,’ (frg. 1, col. i, line 9), that is, exogamous marriages” (White-Crawford, “Exodus in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr [Leiden: Brill, 2014], 315). Harrington notes that [ע]רְבָרוּב is “probably an allusion to intermarriage” (*Intermarriage at Qumran*, 277). Perrin later confirmed Harrington’s observation, stating that “Harrington is no doubt correct that this phrasing is ‘probably an allusion to intermarriage’” (Perrin, “Tobit’s Context and Contacts,” 38). See also Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

The later phrase “much fornication” (זנותא שגיי) (4Q542 3 i–ii 12) also seems to reinforce the presence of a strong aversion to intermarriage in the narrative. While a lack of context inhibits us from commenting as to its possible role within Qahat’s overall instruction, the basic presence of the term זנות (“fornication”) seems to add to the overarching concern for intermarriage within the composition.⁹⁸ Hayes notes that although the term זנות can capture an array of sexual misdeeds, “the term zenut rarely denotes priestly lay intermarriage in the DSS and related literature; rather, it can refer to incest, polygamy, intercourse with a menstruant (see CD 4:20–21, 7:1, 4:17 col 5), and intermarriage with a Gentile.”⁹⁹ In view of the wider interests of WQ this reference most likely reflects a Jew/non-Jew intermarriage concern. I will subsequently offer further comments on the nature of this phrase within the composition, but for the time being, I simply acknowledge that its presence seems to reinforce the overall atmosphere in which intermarriage is a primary concern for Qahat.

3.3.1.1.6 Contextual Considerations: Kinship Conversion and the Nature of Intermarriage

Upon an initial reading of Qahat’s instructions to his descendants, we could perhaps determine that Qahat’s strong aversion to intermarriage reflects a primary concern for moral purity as per Hayes’s above definition. Qahat warns his descendants that openly handling their inheritance will cause them to “become debased and disgraced” (תהון לשפלוֹן {תָּ} ולנבלו בעיניהון) (4Q542 1 i 6). The moral undertones of his instruction seem to become increasingly clear when he instructs them towards “clinging to the truth and walking in integrity” (אחדין בקושטא ואזלין בישירותא)

⁹⁸ This follows the observations of others such as Perrin, who notes that the earlier reference to “[inter]mixture” (ע[ר]בִּרוּב) (4Q542 1 i 9) “likely intersects with the caution against sexual promiscuity, expressed using the shared terminology of זנו (“fornication”) in both ALD and WQ” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

⁹⁹ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 83. For her larger survey on the notion of “zenut” or “fornication,” see, *Gentile Impurities*, 68–91.

(4Q542 1 i 9), as well as his appeal for them to maintain a “true and good spirit” (רוח קשיטה) (4Q542 1 i 10). In this sense, we could perhaps conclude that Qahat’s instructions resonate with a concern for moral purity, which Hayes locates in Pentateuchal literature. According to Hayes, this Pentateuchal concern for moral purity represents a concern for potential moral threats.¹⁰⁰ This means that the concern for intermarriage is not a concern for the act of intermarriage itself. In other words, if a morally pure individual from the kinship group intermarries with a non-kinship individual who is morally impure, it is the possibility that they will lead the morally pure Jewish individual into moral impurity via syncretism that represents the threat.

While we could perhaps interpret Qahat’s instructions as a concern that his descendants might adopt morally impure behavior if they intermarry with non-Jews, Qahat’s instructions seem to reflect a more complex set of concerns. The most apparent indication of this, is that he integrates alongside his instructions against “[inter]mixture” (ע[ר]ב[ו]ת) (4Q542 1 i 9) or intermarriage, an appeal for his descendants to “be ho[ly]” (והוא קד[ו]ש[ו]ת) (4Q542 1 i 8). By grafting holiness language into his appeal, Qahat dramatically shifts the nature of his intermarriage concern and seems to indicate that his concern pertains to an issue of genealogical purity, as per Hayes’s definition. Qahat seems to envision his descendants as “holy” in kind, distinct from an apparent profane kind with whom they might choose to intermarry.¹⁰¹ Qahat appears concerned that intermarriage will result in a mingling of these two incompatible kinds.

¹⁰⁰ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 12–13.

¹⁰¹ I adopt this holy/profane distinction specifically in relation to intermarriage from Hayes. She explains this distinction as follows: “The word pair ‘holy’/‘profane’ must not be confused with the word pair ‘pure’/‘impure,’ for although the two pairs of terms are related they are not identical. The term ‘impure’ denotes a state of cultic disability and is the antonym of ‘pure.’ The term ‘holy’ denotes that which has been consecrated and thus belongs to God and is the antonym of ‘profane,’ which designates ordinary nonholy entities. The default state for most entities is profane and pure. Something must happen to render a profane object holy (an act of consecration) or to render a pure object impure (an act of defilement). If a pure, profane object becomes defiled (which is not a sin and happens

In this sense, Qahat's concern is not simply a concern for potential moral corruption through syncretistic practice, but a concern for genealogical purity. This conceptualization of his descendants in terms of genealogical purity and as holy in kind, perhaps also seems to explain some of his wider choice in language. The earlier reference to כִּלְאִין (“assimilators”) as an improper mixture of two types of materials, as well as the reference to intermarriage in terms of [ע]רְבֻרֹב (“[inter]mixture”) both seem to convey this notion of a blending of kinds. This treatment of his descendants as a holy kind, seems akin to both Ezra's and Levi's notion of “holy seed” as previously discussed in chapter two.¹⁰² Although this seed language does not appear in WQ, the surrounding language seems to hint at a similar conceptualization.

Furthermore, this concern for genealogical purity also helps explain Qahat's apparent comprehensive prohibition of intermarriage. Unlike in selective Pentateuchal intermarriage prohibitions, which stipulated a prohibition only in relation to certain individuals/groups, Qahat's prohibition appears to make no exceptions. Since Qahat views his descendants as distinct in kind based upon their kinship status, intermarriage is not about the adherence of intermarrying parties to certain moral practices but is based upon their genealogical descent.

The priestly nature of WQ's narrative, however, makes it largely unsurprising that Qahat adopts a concern for genealogical purity, since the genealogical purity of the priestly class was not an uncommon notion. As Hayes observes, the high priesthood always required genealogical

frequently), its purity is generally restored by a ritual of purification. However, holy entities must never be defiled. The holy is always pure. If defiled, holy entities are automatically profaned or desecrated and must be purified before being reconsecrated. Thus, holiness and impurity, although not antonymic, are inimical states” (*Gentile Impurities*, 10, n. 28.

¹⁰² For more on the Ezran basis for intermarriage probation, see Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 19–34.

purity.¹⁰³ What is surprising, however, is that Qahat does not only appear to hold to a requirement of genealogical purity but seems to have in view more comprehensive requirements.

In her work, Hayes identifies a further development in Second Temple literature beyond the basic notion of genealogical purity in Ezra-Nehemiah. Hayes suggests that this developed form of genealogical purity appears in works such as Jubilees and 4QMMT. Hayes argues that in these writings, intermarriage represents more than a possible threat of moral corruption through possible syncretistic practice and more than an incompatibility of kinds which would result in the holy becoming profane. She suggests that in these works, intermarriage itself represents an act of immoral purity. Therefore, intermarriage is not only a possible threat to Jewish holiness, but the act itself corrupts moral purity. My impression is that this treatment of intermarriage as a moral purity concern also appears in WQ.

When we look at Qahat's appeal against intermarriage, he informs his descendants that it is an issue of holiness, calling them to "be ho[l]y" (והוא קד[י]שין) (4Q542 1 i 8) from "[inter]mixture" (ע[ר]ב[ו]ב) (4Q542 1 i 9). Yet Qahat also conveys to them that the practice of intermarriage in the form of "[inter]mixture" is equally a moral issue. He tells them to "be ho[l]y *and pure* from any [inter]mixture" (והוא קד[י]שין ודכין מן כול ע[ר]ב[ו]ב) (4Q542 1 i 8–9).¹⁰⁴ What seems significant, is that Qahat does not call his descendants to be pure from the possible implications of intermarriage (i.e., defilement). He calls them to be pure from the act of intermarriage *itself*. And while we could perhaps assume that this is simply an expression of

¹⁰³ Hayes notes, "genealogical purity in the sense of fully native ancestry was not required of lay Israelites, and thus marriage with Gentiles was not prohibited on that basis. Genealogical purity was required of the high priest, however, and in all likelihood, ordinary priests as well. As holy seed, singled out for God's cultic service, priests could not profane themselves by marital unions with persons of profane seed. Priestly marriage with persons of foreign descent— regardless of the moral-religious orientation of the latter—was therefore prohibited (*Gentile Impurities*, 10).

¹⁰⁴ Italics my own.

Qahat's concern for the genealogical purity of types, the preceding holiness language seems to indicate that he understands his instructions as encapsulating two distinct concerns. As I indicated above, his first concern pertains to genealogical purity in general—the mixing of incompatible holy and profane types. His second concern seems to designate the practice of intermarriage itself as an immoral act, one that defiles any sense of moral purity. Furthermore, following Hayes, since ritual purity only extends to native Jews through the Mosaic covenant, Qahat's reference to purity here cannot reflect a concern for ritual purity.¹⁰⁵

Beyond the basic purity designation here in this line, perhaps the other most compelling indication of what Hayes describes as a “double-barreled notion” of genealogical purity concern, is in the appearance of the term זנותא (“fornication”) (4Q542 3 i–ii 12).¹⁰⁶ Despite the highly limited context in which this term appears, I earlier highlighted that the appearance of this term seems to hint at an overall aversion to intermarriage in WQ. Yet I think there is even greater significance to the presence of this term in the composition.

Hayes observes a notable development in Jubilees and 4QMMT from the genealogical purity of Ezra. She describes this development as follows:

Two extraordinary developments are seen in Jubilees and 4QMMT. The first is the claim that a universal prohibition of lay Israelite sexual intercourse with Gentiles on pain of death may indeed be found in the Pentateuch (Lev 18:21 or Dt 7:26). The identification of a Pentateuchal pedigree for the prohibition means that the intermingling of Israelite and Gentile seed—all Gentile seed—must be viewed as a sexual sin (labeled zenut). The

¹⁰⁵ For a summary of the debate as to the nature of Gentile impurity, see Wil Rogan, “Purity in Early Judaism: Current Issues and Questions,” *CurBR* 16.3 (2018): 309–39, esp. 321–3.

¹⁰⁶ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 90.

second development follows from the first. Since any sexual union with a Gentile is a Pentateuchally prohibited sexual sin, such sexual unions (like violations of other sexual prohibitions in H) generate moral impurity.

In view of Hayes's observations, the appearance of the term זנותא in WQ is especially intriguing. The presence of this term may reinforce the notion that Qahat's vision of genealogical purity more resembles the type found in Jubilees and 4QMMT than the type found in Ezra.¹⁰⁷ Based upon WQ's overarching concern for intermarriage, the inclusion of the term זנותא may suggest that Qahat conceived of intermarriage itself as a morally impure act, and not merely a profaning of holiness.

In closing, Qahat's comprehensive focus on rebuffing all attempts at intermarriage and his seeming lack of interest in the positive notion of endogamy throughout WQ is noteworthy especially when we consider him alongside the preceding figure of Levi. Where Levi dedicates considerable efforts towards endorsing endogamous practice, Qahat seemingly remains silent on the positive notion of endogamy and instead dedicates his efforts towards guarding against exogamous practice.

¹⁰⁷ Whether or not Qahat would have also extended his vision of genealogical purity to all Israel as in Ezra, or only to those within the priestly line is uncertain. We can only conjecture as to if Qahat would have depicted a broader notion of genealogical purity across the wider population of Israel if the context of his writing was not centered on a priestly, pre-exilic family. Since, however, the Aramaic DSS appear to derive from a post-exilic period, beyond Ezra, it is intriguing to consider whether the predominant priestly emphasis across this corpus reflects the ongoing permeation of the Ezran ideology of all Israel as "holy seed." Drawnel proposes that the Aramaic DSS reflect a distinct concern for priestly instruction, based upon this material and priestly instruction literature developed by an isolated group of Babylonian priests seeking to instruct an in-group of priests. Yet I wonder if the distinct priestly emphasis reflects more than that. I wonder, rather, if the priestly emphasis across the Aramaic DSS represents, in the words of Hayes, the "democratization" of the priesthood to all of Israel (*Gentile Impurities*, 71–72, 89–90). In other words, perhaps the priestly nature and emphasis across the Aramaic DSS is part of an ongoing Ezran reimagination of all Jewish people as "holy seed" or priests. Instead of engaging the general Jewish populace as the "general populace" who become the "holy seed," perhaps these writings intentionally forego a non-priestly Jewish designation and simply engage the entire Jewish populace as priests. In doing so, they further reinforce all of Israel as "holy seed," addressing all of Israel through the language and lens of the ancestral priestly line.

3.3.1.2 *Qahat and Kinship*

In the above analysis, we worked to capture a more nuanced portrait of Qahat's intersections with kinship. Towards this end, we build upon select past scholarly impressions of the intersections between Qahat and the concept of kinship.

We first looked at some of the high-level intersections that existed between Qahat and kinship and we identified a notable network of kinship connections that develop across the narrative for Qahat. We then explored some of the notable ways in which Qahat elevates the concept of kinship. We used a preliminary engagement of the concept of tradition as an inroad into this, noting the exclusivity with which Qahat conceives of tradition. In this process we identified kinship as a primary framework by which Qahat constructed this sense of exclusivity. In view of this kinship-based exclusivity, we raised the question of the perceived permeability of the notion of kinship in connection to the idea of conversion. We traced this concept in wider scholarship to explore further Qahat's treatment of this matter. We proceeded to explore Qahat's conception of kinship through both terminological and contextual considerations. Through the lenses of both conversion and intermarriage, we confirmed Qahat's conception of a highly exclusive notion of kinship, one that seemingly stands as an extreme among other contemporary voices. We saw that Qahat not only envisions the notion of kinship in exclusive terms, but he demonstrates various means to ensure its ongoing exclusivity. This was perhaps most apparent in his dismissal of the notion of "conversion" or a "permeable" conception of kinship, as well as his adoption of a rigorous intermarriage prohibition. Finally, we closed by recognizing the notable difference between Qahat's negative tactics around kinship and his lack of specific interest in endogamy when compared to the preceding figure of Levi.

This exploration of Qahat and kinship in WQ allowed us to develop a more substantial portrait of its intersections with him as a figure. Through this process we were able to work off the perceptions of past scholarship as to Qahat's intersections with kinship towards greater precision in our understanding of kinship as a feature of his identity. We will now proceed to consider the concept of *tradition* alongside Qahat.

3.3.2 Tradition

In our above treatment of kinship, we hinted at the notion of tradition as another seemingly important feature of Qahat's profile of identity. Following our engagement with Levi, we described tradition as: *the transmission of a core set of virtues from one generation to the next, often catalyzed by an appeal to some form of lore*. As somewhat of a preface to the present section on tradition, we captured an important intersection between kinship and tradition. We noted specifically the way in which Qahat seems to establish tradition as a highly exclusive concept, accessible only to a distinct kinship audience. He further elevates the exclusivity of tradition and with that the importance of kinship by building out an increasingly exclusive conception of kinship, one that maintains a strict division between kinship and non-kinship individuals. This kinship group becomes increasingly exclusive through the lens of tradition and its extreme intermarriage prohibition when compared to other contemporary voices.

In view of this, we have already begun to see the developing significance of tradition for Qahat's identity profile through its critical intersections with kinship. Yet Qahat seems to develop the importance of tradition in a series of additional ways beyond the primary frame of kinship.

Within this present section, we will therefore first consider some of the apparently more basic indications of the importance of tradition for Qahat's profile of identity. We will then look at some of the specific ways in which he participates in the transmission process, followed by a closer look at some of the core virtues that seem to underly his conception of tradition.

3.3.2.1 Elevating the Importance of Tradition: Qahat's Instructional Emphasis

Perhaps the first way in which we see Qahat elevate the importance of tradition is through an emphasis on the transmission of tradition through the notion of instruction.

Qahat's instructional role and the importance of instruction for him is immediately apparent in that his engagement with his descendants represents an instructional address. Despite the relative brevity of the narrative itself, Qahat also verbalizes the importance of instruction on several different levels.

On one level, Qahat emphasizes the nature of his present address as instructive. He emphasizes to his descendants his embrace of this feature of identity. He conveys this through the phrases such as "I commanded you" (פקדתון) (4Q542 1 i 13) and "I have taught you in truth from now on" (אלפתכון בקושוט מן בען ועד) (4Q542 1 ii 1). Later in his direct address to his son, Amram, he again repeatedly emphasizes this practice (4Q542 1 ii 9–10).¹⁰⁸ This language contributes to a developing perception of the pointed nature of Qahat's engagement with his descendants, particularly regarding instruction.

On a second level, Qahat emphasizes the importance of instruction by conveying its significance in connection to a larger heritage. He does this by acknowledging that his practice

¹⁰⁸ I.e., "I comma[nd...]" ([...אנא מפקד]) (4Q542 1 ii 9); "I command[...]" (אנא מפקד) (4Q542 1 ii 10).

stems from a previous ancestral precedent.¹⁰⁹ He notes how the inheritance was something that was “bequeathed to you” (משׁלמא לכון) (4Q542 1 i 4), something the “ancestors gave to you” (יהבו לכון אבהתכון) (4Q542 1 i 5), and something the “ancestors left for you” (שבקו לכון אבהתכון) (4Q542 1 i 12). He further conveys to Amram the ancestral practice of instruction, noting how “they gave to Levi, my father, and my father Levi to me” (יהבו ללוי אבי ולוי אבי לי) (4Q542 1 ii 10–11). We noted the significance of these references to wider figures in Qahat’s previous emphasis on kinship. Yet by couching his instruction in these wider figures, Qahat also expands the conceptual footprint of instruction, and with that, tradition. Through these associations Qahat’s practice of instruction appears not as part of an isolated personal agenda but part of a much more expansive reality. In this Qahat demonstrates that his elevated valuation of instruction extends well beyond his own immediate interests.

A further indication of the importance of instruction shows up in Qahat’s call for his descendants to take up this practice. Rather than seeing it simply as a necessity of the past and the present, Qahat instructs his descendants toward the transmission of tradition through instruction as an ongoing practice. He appears to command Amram to adopt a practice of instruction in his own life and to perpetuate it. He states, “and now, to you, Amram, my son, I comma[nd...] and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants, I command[...]” (וְכַעַן לְכֵּה עֲמָרָם) (4Q542 1 ii 9–10). He further reiterates this as he tells him that “there is great merit when they are preserved with you” (בְּהֵזֶן זָכוּ רַבָּה) (באתהילכותהון עמכון) (4Q542 1 ii 13). In this latter instance his emphasis on preservation seemingly focusses on instruction in relation to a particular written form of the inherited

¹⁰⁹ We will explore the temporal features of this emphasis below. For the time being—pun intended—Qahat’s orientation of his instructional practice in relation to these wider ancestral figures is significant simply in that he extends the importance of instruction well beyond his immediate context.

tradition, yet the overarching emphasis on a continued practice of instruction nonetheless remains.

3.3.2.2 *Elevating the Importance of Tradition: Transmitting Tradition*

Like Levi, the importance of tradition for Qahat does not only appear in an emphasis on a general participation in the transmission of tradition through instructional practice. He also seems to develop its significance in a series of other ways, most notably *how* he transmits tradition. We see him do so in three primary ways:

- 1) Verbal Discourse
- 2) Modelled Practice
- 3) Written Address

To begin, verbal discourse is perhaps the first medium that Qahat appears to adopt in the narrative. He offers several clues as to his adoption of this medium of transmission. The first indication of the verbal nature of Qahat's instruction is in the basic narrative setting. As we noted above, Qahat offers his descendants a spoken instructional address. Beyond the general narrative context, however, Qahat seems to reiterate the spoken nature of his instruction through the language of "command" (פקד).¹¹⁰ In view of his preceding spoken instruction, Qahat conveys

¹¹⁰ The verbal nature of the term פקד is apparent in view of wider usage in the Aramaic DSS. See, for example, 4Q550 5 + 5a 6, which seems to capture a request for a spoken command or 4Q196 18 16 or 4Q198 1 2, which both capture the spoken nature of a command. This is not to say that פקד does not also appear through wider written forms, yet there remains a notable emphasis on the spoken nature of פקד.

how “*I commanded you*” (פקדתון) (4Q542 1 i 13).¹¹¹ Later in his direct address to his son, Amram, he again reiterates this on several occasions (4Q542 1 ii 9–10).¹¹²

Modelled practice develops as a second notable means by which Qahat transmits tradition or what others have captured as “exemplarity.”¹¹³ We noted above in terms of kinship, that as Qahat instructs his descendants, he points to various exemplary figures, who modelled the core virtues that he seeks to transmit. These figures seemingly function to give Qahat’s descendants a clear point of reference of how to live their own lives. In this process, Qahat both underscores the importance of the actions and values of others as well as the importance of his own exemplarity. This seems to occur on a few occasions.

One such occasion occurs as Qahat points to the examples of several ancestral figures and orients himself among this group. Specifically, he recognizes himself alongside his father, Levi, mentioning “the upright practice of Levi and *myself*” (צדקת לוי ודילי) (4Q542 1 i 8). On another occasion, as he seemingly closes out his initial larger group instruction and transitions to his individual address of his son, Amram, he reiterates the nature of his present actions. In doing so, he emphasizes to his descendants how, “I have taught you in truth from now on” (אלפתכון) (4Q542 1 ii 1), which again seems to carry with it an apparent emphasis on his own exemplarity or modelled practice.

Alongside the transmission of tradition through means of verbal discourse and modelled practice, Qahat seems to emphasize the importance of written address or a scribal medium as a

¹¹¹ Italics my own.

¹¹² I.e., “*I comma[nd...]*” ([אנא מפקד]ד) (4Q542 1 ii 9); “*I command[...]*” (אנא מפקד) (4Q542 1 ii 10). Italics my own.

¹¹³ For more on the notion of “exemplarity,” see, for example, Najman, “Reconsidering Jubilees: Prophecy and Exemplarity,” 229–43; Najman and Reinhardt, “Exemplarity and Its Discontents,” 460–96; Reed, “The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection,” 185–212.

means of transmitting tradition.¹¹⁴ The clearest indication of the value of writing for Qahat shows up in his specific instruction to Amram. He mentions to him, as an apparent part of his overall emphasis on the transmitted ancestral tradition, “all my writings as a testimony with which you should be careful” (כֹּל כְּתָבִי בְּשֵׁהָדוֹ דֵּי תִזְדַּהְרוּן בְּהוֹן) (4Q542 1 ii 12). The inclusion of “writings” (כְּתָבִי) (4Q542 1 ii 12) here seems to capture a wider value on a written medium as a means of instruction and the transmission of tradition. Additionally, the subsequent inclusion of the verb קרא (“call/read” [לְמַקְרָא] [4Q542 2 5]) is intriguing to consider as perhaps also reinforcing a value of written instruction for Qahat. The highly fragmentary context in which this term falls, however, means it does little to confirm a particular valuation on the practice of writing for Qahat.

3.3.2.3 Core Virtues

In the case of Levi, we noted the transmission of tradition pertaining to the larger categories of *kinship, revelation, time, and space*. In addition to this, we discussed the concept of tradition as also capturing a notable complex of virtues pertaining to ritual practice and the notions of truth and wisdom. We saw the overall makeup of this wider complex of virtues develop in a variety of intersecting moments and emphases across the narrative.

Qahat, however, he offers a more condensed presentation of what he considers to be some of the underlying virtues of transmitted tradition. He seemingly distills the concept of tradition into a set of seven key features. He does this through the language of “the inheritance” (ירושתא). He names these features as “truth, upright practice, integrity, perfection, pur[ity

¹¹⁴ For more the different mediums of human knowledge transmission, particularly the adoption of writing and its intersections with perceptions of memory, see, for example, Reed, “Textuality between Death and Memory,” 381–412. For specific intersections with WQ, see esp. 394–6.

ho]lines, and the pri[est]hood” (קושטא וצדקתא וישירותא ותמימותא ודב[ו]תא וק[ו]דשא וכה[ו]נתא) (4Q542 1 i 12–13).

For our present purpose of understanding the significance of tradition for Qahat, we will explore each of these features in greater detail, particularly in terms of what Qahat seems to ask of his descendants apposite each listed item. To do so, we will map out each of these items, consider their meaning, and reflect on how they might contribute to Qahat’s profile of identity in the composition. Through this, we will see some of the specific ways Qahat conceptualizes the inherited tradition, and in this gain a more precise understanding of its significance for him.

3.3.2.3.1 Truth (קושט): A Baseline Principle for Ordering Reality

The term קושט, which Perrin renders as “truth”, represents the first feature in Qahat’s inheritance list. While there is perhaps a temptation to interpret קושט here as a general sub-type of moral purity, its meaning in the list seems to extend well beyond that.¹¹⁵ A strong initial indication of this is that Qahat includes the concept of purity (דב[ו]תא) (4Q542 1 i 12) as a separate item within the list. This is not to say that within the wider composition the notion of purity does not intersect with the present concept of truth. Rather, truth seems to have overarching implications for all the items in the inheritance list including purity. Thus, Qahat appears to conceive of a more expansive vision for the concept of truth.

Qahat’s more expansive vision of truth seems to convey truth as a type of baseline principle for ordering reality. There are several reasons why this seems to be the case. As various scholars have also observed, the pole position of truth within this list seems to hint at this

¹¹⁵ For more purity distinctions, see the above section entitled “Kinship” in which I survey select previous engagements including the work of Hayes. For more on purity distinctions, see Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*.

possible function.¹¹⁶ These initial observations as to the baseline ordering nature of truth seem to gain support from observations as to the nature and function of קושט in wider Second Temple materials. Lange, for example, as part of a survey on the usage of קושט in the Second Temple period observed קושט as having a wide potential semantic range. He noted meanings pertaining to the “straightness” or “truth of a matter”, “legal justice of a matter or even a legal right,” as well as a universal order in relation to which both God and humans operate.¹¹⁷ While I accept Lange’s observations as to the wide spectrum of possible meaning for the term, my impression is that the seemingly more “basic” expressions of קושט all originate with an underlying universal order or principle, which is seemingly reflected to some degree in Qahat’s list.

Machiela too, observed a similar function of truth in his survey of “wisdom motifs” in GenAp and some of the Aramaic DSS. In particular, he identified the Aramaic materials’ common appeal to a distinct wisdom tradition that held the pairing of “truth” (קושט) and “wisdom” (חכמה) as representing a type of basic order or pattern for “knowing and acting.”¹¹⁸ He provides a helpful summary of the essence and nature of this order as: “a totalizing notion

¹¹⁶ Uusimäki, for example, as part of a larger investigation on the concept of “virtue” in WQ, observes that the initial position of truth in the sequence perhaps “makes truth a lens through which the rest of the desirable qualities are assessed.” She further acknowledges truth in this list as possibly functioning as “an elevated category covering over related concepts.” Beyond truth’s primary position in the sequence, she points to perhaps a wider precedent of this function of truth in ALD (“In Search of Virtue,” 206–28, here 219). Perrin too, makes a similar observation, noting that “fronting the mention of קושט in the list of virtues may suggest this item provides the foundation or point of departure for all subsequent items” Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. For a summary of these findings, see Armin Lange, “So I Girded My Loins in the Vision of Righteousness and Wisdom, in the Robe of Supplication” (1QapGen Ar VI.4): קושט in the Book of the Words of Noah and Second Temple Jewish Aramaic Literature,” AS 8.1–2 (2010): 13–45, esp. 44.

¹¹⁸ Daniel A. Machiela, “‘Wisdom Motifs’ in the Compositional Strategy of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran*,” *Hā-’ish Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*, ed. Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, George J. Brooke (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017), 241.

that there is a divinely patterned, ‘right’ way of knowing and acting that holds sway over everything from interpreting dreams to marriage practices, from writing to proper burial.”¹¹⁹

While Machiela emphasizes a combination of truth and wisdom as a governing principle, Qahat seems to focus solely on the notion of truth. Qahat seems to confirm this vision of truth at various turns throughout the narrative. When faced with the looming possibility of his descendants mishandling their inheritance, Qahat instructs them towards “clinging to the truth” (ואחדין בקושטא) (4Q542 1 i 9). Here truth seems to function as a type of magnetic reference point. Rather than a basic moral expression of “straightness,” Qahat seems to indicate for his descendants that there is a “‘right’ way” of knowing.

Truth as a “right way” for Qahat first appears to be in relation to thought. We perhaps see this in the way Qahat classifies his teaching and instruction in terms of truth. Mid way through his address, he reiterates to his descendants the alignment between their inheritance and the teaching he has given them. He notes that it is “according to everything that I commanded you and according to everything that I taught you in *truth* from now on” [ככול די פקדתון וככול די די] [אלפתכון בקושוט מן כען ועד [4Q542 1 i 13–ii 1]].¹²⁰ Thus, for Qahat, there seems to be a “right way” of thinking, or an order of thought that is to guide his descendants’ understanding of reality.

We perhaps also see this in his reference to various ancestral figures. When Qahat appeals for his descendants towards a certain way of life, he tells them to “cling to the command of Jacob” (אחדו בממר יעקב) (4Q542 1 i 7–8) and to “hold fast to the judgment of Abraham” (ואתקפו בדיני אברהם) (4Q542 1 i 8). Qahat’s remarks appear to suggest, in the language of

¹¹⁹ Machiela, “‘Wisdom Motifs’ in the Compositional Strategy,” 241–2.

¹²⁰ Italic my own.

Machiela, that “there is a divinely patterned, ‘right’ way of knowing and acting that holds sway over everything.” In this case, Qahat locates it in the words and thoughts of past exemplars.

Yet for Qahat, truth seems to represent more than a convenient point of appeal for guiding thought life. Qahat seems to envision truth as permeating all of reality. This grand vision perhaps shows up in his use of the designation of truth as the primary marker for entire generations (4Q542 1 i 3–4; 1 ii 8).¹²¹ As Qahat considers the hopes he has for his future descendants, he seemingly distills it down to truth.

Truth according to Qahat, is therefore not merely a quality of a momentary moral judgment or representation. It is not temporally or contextually bound. Truth appears to represent something more expansive: a distinct order or principle of life, one that ongoing gives order to how to interpret reality. Truth thus appears as a foundational feature of his inherited tradition.

3.3.2.3.2 “Upright Practice” (צדקה): Embodied Truth through Charitable Outsider Interactions

The notion of צדקה, which Perrin translates as “upright practice” represents the second feature in Qahat’s list. Unlike truth, the contours of this item are perhaps less immediately apparent.

Uusimäki suggests in her reading of WQ that “the exact meaning of the term צדקה—‘justice’, ‘righteousness’, or ‘charity’—remains uncertain.”¹²² Yet the usage of this term within the wider Aramaic DSS perhaps helps clarify Qahat’s usage of the term. Additionally, Qahat appears to offer select clues as to his understanding of צדקה and its specific contours.

¹²¹ I.e., “generations of truth” [בדרי קושטא] [4Q542 1 i 3–4]; [ב[ד]י קושטא] [4Q542 1 ii 8]

¹²² Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 220.

The term **צדקה** shows up in a similar noun form in the Aramaic DSS on at least eight occasions, two of which appear in WQ.¹²³ Apart from WQ, the highest concentration of the term in extant materials occurs in the Aramaic version of Tobit (4Q198 1 1; 4Q200 2 6, 8, 9). Among these occurrences, those appearing in 4Q200 are perhaps the most instructive as to the general sense of **צדקה** in the Aramaic DSS.

The occurrences in 4Q200, represent a passage in which Tobit instructs his son Tobiah with regards to material wealth (Tob 4:1–11). As part of this instruction, Tobit conveys to Tobiah the importance of the virtue of generosity in the form of “almsgiving” to the poor. He urges Tobiah to “give alms of your substance” (כְּאֶרֶץ יִדְכָּה בְּנֵי הַיָּהוּ [עוֹשֶׂה ...] צְדָקוֹת) (4Q200 2 6) and to “[giv]e al[m]s from it; if you have little, [do not be afraid] according to that little [to giv]e alms” (עוֹשׂ הֵמִמְנוּ צְדָקוֹת [אִם יִהְיֶה לְךָ מֵעַט כְּמֵעֹט] [...] [...] בְּעַשׂ [וְתִתְּךָ צְדָקָה שִׁימָה] (...]) (4Q200 2 8–9). From these readings **צדקה** seems to carry with it an emphasis on embodied virtue, particularly at the level of material generosity.

Scholars have picked up on this specific sense of **צדקה** in the Aramaic DSS in terms of upright practice in the form of “almsgiving” or “charity.” Machiela, for example, makes a compelling case for identifying the specific underlying nature of **צדקה** as pertaining to a sense of embodied upright practice. He argues specifically as to its connection with the idea of “charity.” In his analysis, Machiela picks up on the term **צדקה** in the wider writings of Daniel as well as Tobit. He points to the ways in which both Daniel and Tobit clearly articulate the meaning of **צדקה** distinctly in terms of charitable action towards the poor. He argues that this is a notable development from previous, more general usages of **צדקה** in the Hebrew Scriptures. From there,

¹²³ 4Q198 1 1; 4Q200 2 6, 8, 9; 4Q213 1 i 7, Q542 1 i 8, 12; 11Q10 26:3. 4Q541 13 3 may represent an additional occurrence, however, this reading is largely reconstructed.

he identifies the considerable overlap and similarity between the writings of ALD and Tobit. He notes the ways in which ALD employs *צדקה* and *קושט* as distinct concepts. Furthermore, in view of the considerable similarity between the compositions, he makes a case that the distinct representation of *צדקה* in ALD is the same charitable expression found in both Tobit and Daniel. After establishing this meaning of *צדקה* in ALD, he carries it forward into WQ. He does so in view of the well-established connection between ALD and WQ (as well as with VA), which in his estimation provides grounds for treating the usage of *צדקה* in WQ as analogous to that in ALD.¹²⁴

Perrin picks up on Machiela's work on *צדקה*, yet seems to offer a subtle expansion as to its meaning in WQ. He cites its appearance in the Cave 11 Job translation alongside the readings in Tobit, Daniel, and ALD, and argues for an overall sense of "ethical and pious practices reflecting a lifestyle marked by charity." Perrin thus includes charitable action as central to the meaning of *צדקה*, but does so as part of a larger suite of "ethical and pious practices."¹²⁵

Although the combination of Perrin and Machiela's proposals provides a helpful departure point for understanding Qahat's use of *צדקה*, their exploration of the specific usage of the term in WQ is relatively limited. In my reading of Qahat, the usage of the term seems to resonate with the above proposed meanings of *צדקה* in several ways, yet perhaps also extends them in certain regards.

¹²⁴ Daniel A. Machiela, "Charity as Theme in Some Qumran Aramaic Texts" (Trinity Western University, 23 May 2018). See also, Uusimäki, who despite reservations on attributing a specific meaning to *צדקה* in WQ, identifies "the social virtue of 'almsgiving'" as within its semantic range ("In Search of Virtue," 220).

¹²⁵ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. Cf. the recent study by Dimant, who similar to Perrin, perceives of the notion of *צדקה* ("acts of kindness") in the figure of Tobit as representing a larger suite of pious practices beyond charity and almsgiving ("Tobit and the 'Torah for Exile' in Light of the Qumran Texts," *ZTK* 119.1 (2022): 4–30, esp. 12–17).

One of the first things we see as to the nature of צדקה in WQ, is that it is distinct from קושט. As I indicated above, Machiela notes a similar distinction between these forms in ALD and argues that the two terms represent separate realities.¹²⁶ We get a similar sense in WQ.

Perhaps the clearest indication of this is in the basic shape of the inheritance list. Qahat names צדקה and קושט as separate items within his list. We could perhaps construe צדקה as a type of synonym of קושט, in which Qahat reinforces the importance of truth by following its explicit mention with a related synonym. Yet this does not seem to be the case. Machiela's ALD precedent provides a strong initial indication of this, but beyond that there seem to be several hints of this distinction in Qahat's wider instructions. One example of this is perhaps in Qahat's engagement with ancestral exemplars.

As I indicated above, Qahat invites his descendants towards the notion of truth by appealing to ancestral figures. In his appeal, he specifically cites “the command of Jacob” (ממר) (4Q542 1 i 7) and “the judgments of Abraham” (דיני אברהם) (4Q542 1 i 8). Through these figures he seems to emphasize adherence to a specific way of thinking. Above, I suggested that this specific way of thinking is a principle of truth (קושט). Against this backdrop of truth, however, Qahat points to a second set of exemplars among whom he includes “Levi and myself” (לוי ודילי) (4Q542 1 i 8). He attributes to this second set of exemplars the notion of “upright practice” (צדקת) (4Q542 1 i 8). It seems to me, that in differentiating between these ancestral exemplars, Qahat makes an explicit distinction between קושט or “truth” as a way of thinking, and צדקה as a separate feature of identity that seems to map well onto Machiela and Perrin's proposals of “upright practice” or “charity;” an embodiment of truth.

¹²⁶ Machiela, “Charity.”

Beyond reinforcing the idea of *צדקה* in terms of upright practice or charity, Qahat appears to broaden our understanding of this term by seemingly offering concrete examples of its outworking.

Perhaps one indication of this appears in Qahat's wider emphasis on cautioning his descendants on how they are to handle the inherited tradition in relation to "strangers" (*נכראין*) (4Q542 1 i 5), "assimilators" (*כילאין*) (4Q542 1 i 6), and "resident foreigners" (*תותביין*) (4Q542 1 i 7). As we explored in the above section on kinship, these references seem to represent a spectrum of different types of groups or individuals that stand distinct from and outside of the kinship-based Jewish group of which Qahat is a part. By delineating to his descendants *how* they are to interact with those individuals, Qahat seems to indicate that he anticipates his descendants *interacting* with those individuals. We have already noted that Qahat is readily willing to make comprehensive prohibitions, when necessary, as in the case of intermarriage. Yet he does not appear to make any other comprehensive prohibitions against general interactions with outsiders. Instead, he warns them towards a shrewdness in their interactions (4Q542 1 i 4–5).¹²⁷ Yet his instructions seem to extend beyond negative tactics. Instead, he includes a call for them towards *צדקה* or "upright practice. The inclusion of *צדקה* as part of a wider instruction on outsider interactions perhaps suggests that for Qahat, *צדקה* includes a distinct interest in outside figures. In this sense, a shrewd handling of the inherited tradition does not mean an absence of *צדקה*.

צדקה is therefore distinct from but related to the notion of truth. This relationship appears in that upright practice seems to represent an embodied adherence to the principle of truth, particularly demonstrated in "ethical and pious practices," especially in the form of charity.

¹²⁷ I.e., "be careful" (*אזדהרו*) (4Q542 1 i 4); "neither give" (*תתנו*) (4Q542 1 i 5).

Additionally, Qahat seems to emphasize upright practice particularly in relation to outsiders. Although the composition demonstrates a clear concern for the embrace of select negative tactics when engaging outsiders, its simultaneous inclusion of upright practice in the mix seems to indicate a more nuanced vision of insider/outsider engagement.

3.3.2.3.3 Integrity (ישירו): Uncompromised Thought and Action

The notion of ישירו or what Perrin translates as “integrity” represents the third aspect of Qahat’s inherited tradition. Among the Aramaic DSS, this term only occurs in WQ. Consequently, we will consider the meaning and nature of this term through a closer examination of its appearance in WQ.

The exact nature of what Qahat seems to invite his descendants into through the notion of ישירו perhaps becomes apparent in two specific portions of his instruction. The first instance seems to occur as part of a warning for his descendants to act with shrewdness in their handling of their inherited tradition in relation to outside parties. Qahat’s instructions come with a series of cautions as to the potential implications of outsiders taking up the inherited tradition or other embodied expressions of Jewish identity. He warns them that that illegitimate acquisition of the inherited tradition will cause them to “become debased and disgraced in their eyes and they despise you” (תהון לשפלון{ת} ולנבלו בעיניהון ויבסרון עליכון) (4Q542 1 i 6). He further conveys to them that such a practice will cause those outsiders to “become resident foreigners to you and rulers over you” (להון תותבין לכון ולהון עליכון ראשין) (4Q542 1 i 7).

As we noted above in our treatment of kinship, the notion of “resident foreigners” (תותבין) seems to reflect a type of sub-class sympathizer based upon their adoption of features of the inherited tradition. The questions then that remain, are: what does Qahat mean by his

descendants becoming “debased and disgraced and they despise you?” And what is his concern with those individuals becoming “rulers over” them?

Perhaps one way to understand what Qahat is getting at in these lines is to consider his second reference to *ישירו* or the notion of “integrity.” Following the above warnings, Qahat shifts to instruct his descendants toward holding fast to truth by following in the ways of thinking and acting laid down by ancestral exemplars. In doing so, Qahat calls them to “be ho[l]y and pure from any [inter]mixture, clinging to the truth and *walking in integrity*—not with a divided heart but with a pure heart and with a true and good spirit” (*והוא קד[י]שין ודכין מן כול [ע]רְבֹרֹב ואחדין*) (4Q542 1 i 8–10).¹²⁸

When we consider this line in relation to Qahat’s earlier warnings, a few things perhaps emerge. First, the notion of integrity seems to be a central basis for Qahat’s concern and warnings. Qahat has invited his descendants towards a principle of order in the form of truth. He has coupled that invitation with instruction towards a distinct upright embodiment of that truth particularly in relation to outsiders. And here, he seems to indicate that a critical caveat to those preceding instructions is the ongoing need for his descendants to maintain the uncompromised state of that truth. As he considers his descendants’ interactions with outsiders, his concern seems to center on the potential for a syncretizing of their truth with the virtues of others.

This concern for compromised truth seems to be what he means by “debased and disgraced” (*ותהון לשפלון[ת] ולנבלו*) (4Q542 1 i 6). This is perhaps further reinforced by his call for them to “be ho[l]y and pure from any [inter]mixture, clinging to the truth and walking in integrity—not with a divided heart, but with a pure heart and with a true and good spirit” (*והוא קד[י]שין ודכין מן כול [ע]רְבֹרֹב ואחדין בקושטא ואזלין בישירותא ולא בלבב ולהן בלבב דכא וברוח*)

¹²⁸ Italics my own.

קשיטה וטבה) (4Q542 1 i 8–10). The first part of that instruction, as I indicated above, seems to pertain to a prohibition against intermarriage. An intermarriage prohibition appears to represent an initial safeguard against corruption. Apart from that specifically forbidden form of outsider interaction, however, Qahat clearly seems to envision his descendants as engaging in some form of interaction with outsiders. It is in these wider interactions that he seems to appeal towards “clinging to the truth” (אחדין בקושטא) (4Q542 1 i 9). Yet for Qahat, this does not seem to be merely a matter of subscribing to a set of ancestral virtues. Rather, he couples this with a call to “walking in integrity” (ואזלין בישרותא) (4Q542 1 i 9). The presence of integrity here, seems to suggest that it is not enough to subscribe to truth or קושט. Rather his descendants are to subscribe to that truth *alone*. Qahat seems to hold to this conviction in view of the possibility of outside thought and practice coalescing with their foundational thoughts and practices, eventually leading his descendants to the adoption of some corrupted, compromised, half-hearted, look-alike version of so-called “truth” and “upright practice.” This is what he seems to refer to when he calls them to exist “not with a divided heart, but with a pure heart and with a true and good spirit” (ולא בלבב ולבב להן בלבב דכא וברוח קשיטה וטבה) (4Q542 1 i 10). In other words, to operate with ישירו or integrity.

Scholars have previously suggested that this appeal against a “divided heart” may represent some type of dualistic emphasis, or a belief in the possibility of some type of division at play within an individual.¹²⁹ Yet, as Stuckenbruck suggests, Qahat’s words here seem to have

¹²⁹ Perrin, for example, notes that the “the potential division of one’s heart also invites questions over the relation of this Aramaic phrasing to larger ideas of so-called anthropological dualism as represented, for example, in the Hebrew “Treatise of the Two Spirits” (esp. 1QS 4 23–24). As indicated in the following line, Qahat admonishes his progeny away from this sort of inner bifurcation and toward a unity of identity and ethic, as represented by a pure heart” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). His observation of this possible internal dualistic division maps onto early and ongoing perceptions of anthropological dualism in the DSS. For early perceptions of this, see for example, Oscar J. F. Seitz, “Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis,” *NTS* 6.1 (1959): 82–95. For more recent observations of this internalized dualism, see for example, Frey, “Different Patterns,” 276–305, esp.

in mind an alternative concern. He notes: “although there is some hint of cosmic dualism in the Testament of Qahat (i.e., a possible contrast between darkness and light in the fragmentary text of (4Q542 2 11–12) the writer makes no apparent attempt to integrate the language of double heartedness into such a system of ideas.” He goes on to suggest, rather, that “the notion of walking ‘in a double heart’ is a fixed expression for the disobedient who mingle what they have with foreigners.”¹³⁰ In this sense, Qahat’s use of this language seems to reflect a primary concern for uncorrupted truth and upright practice.

Qahat’s concern regarding the possibility of outsiders becoming so-called “rulers” (ראשין) (4Q542 1 i 7) over his descendants further seems to reinforce an underlying vision of integrity. While it is not immediately apparent as to the exact nature of the threat posed by outside rule, Qahat’s subsequent emphasis towards considering past exemplars and “clinging to the truth and walking in integrity” (ואחדין בקושטא ואזלין בישרותא) (4Q542 1 i 9), seems to indicate that he understands this rule as potentially bringing with it some type of threat of corruption.¹³¹

Overall, Qahat seems to anticipate his descendants as interacting with outsiders. He appears to recognize that with these interactions will come a threat of corruption to their distinct vision of “right” thinking and acting. In view of this, Qahat emphasizes the virtue of integrity in terms of an uncorrupted way of knowing and living. He envisions a people uncompromised in

285; John G. Gammie, “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature,” *JBL* 93.3 (1974): 356–85, esp. 357–8.

¹³⁰ Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The ‘Heart’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Negotiating between the Problem of Hypocrisy and Conflict within the Human Being,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, ed. Armin Lange, Bennie H. Reynolds III, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 445.

¹³¹ Although WQ unfolds in a pre-exilic context, its post-exilic audience would have deeply felt the weight of these warnings regarding foreign rule and with them the critical importance of integrity.

their commitment to a distinct principle of truth, embodied in their human interactions, particularly in relation to outsiders.

3.3.2.3.4 Perfection (תמימו): An Elevated Standard and An Attainable Objective Across Times

The fourth feature in Qahat's inheritance list is תמימו, which Perrin renders as “perfection.”¹³² In WQ, as well as in the wider Aramaic DSS, the only occurrence of this term is in this inheritance list.¹³³ As a result, the contours of this feature of Qahat's inherited tradition are seemingly more subtle. In view of its limited usage, perhaps the best way to understand what Qahat seemingly conceives of through the notion of perfection, is by first considering some wider proposals as to the nature and function of this term in the DSS and broader Second Temple context.

Within the wider corpus of the DSS, the greatest concentration of the Hebrew equivalent of the Aramaic תמימו occurs in the so-called sectarian writing of 1QS. The term appears on at least eighteen occasions.¹³⁴ The majority of these instances largely pertain to the nature of individual or group conduct. In terms of individual or group conduct in 1QS, common translational glosses include “faultless” and “blameless.” From my initial reading of these occurrences the concern seems to center around a ritual or moral quality and a perceived standard of conduct.

Tso, in a recent treatment of ethics in the so-called “sectarian” literature attributed to Qumran, picks up on this emphasis on ritual and moral quality and the notion of a perceived

¹³² Perrin notes that his translation of “perfection” follows the translation of Cook (*Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*, 255), although he does acknowledge that CAL's rendering may be more appropriate. He notes “CAL specifies the meaning here could be closer to ‘honesty’ or ‘sincerity,’ which may in fact fit better within a section enumerating virtues” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). Despite this concession, in my reading of WQ, the notion of “perfection” seems to fit equally as well into this list as those alternative “virtues.”

¹³³ Puech earlier proposed an appearance of תמימותא in 4Q548 1 ii 2 13, which later became the corrected לנעימתא (*Qumran Grotte 4.XXII*, 397). While this proposal is intriguing for our present study, Perrin recently dismissed the likelihood of this reading based upon a recent updated edition of 4Q548 (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). For a recent updated edition of 4Q548, see Perrin and Hama, “4Q548 (Dualistic Fragments in Aramaic),” <http://pseudepigrapha.org/docs/intro/4Q548>.

¹³⁴ 1QS 1:8; 2:2; 3:3, 9; 4:22; 6:17; 8:1, 9, 10, 18, 20, 21; 9:2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19.

standard of conduct within 1QS. He captures the essence of this concern under the term “perfection.” According to Tso, the notion of perfection falls within a wider vision of ethical formation and growth. Within this vision, there is a perceived trajectory of individual and group development. Along this trajectory, the notion of perfection represents what he describes as the “ultimate objective of life.” He goes on to indicate that the journey to this objective within 1QS is one of “effort, striving, and growth.” He further conveys that even within the highly deterministic community of 1QS, a goal of perfection “was not only necessary, but expected, demanded, and possible.”¹³⁵

Deasely, as part of a larger treatment of Qumran theology, offers an extended survey of the notion of perfection in the DSS. Like Tso, Deasely identifies the ways in which perfection represents an ultimate but attainable goal for the community. Along with this idea, he notes the ways in which the writings attributed to Qumran attest to important intersections between perfection and time.¹³⁶

Based upon my initial readings of תמימו in 1QS, as well as the work of Tso and Deasely on the concept of perfection within 1QS and the broader DSS, perfection largely seems to represent a primary life objective pertaining to moral or ritual quality and a perceived standard of conduct. The Qumran writings seem to convey that this objective is, in the words of Tso, both “expected” and “possible” and that it intersects with a larger vision of time. Within this vision of time,

¹³⁵ Marcus K. M. Tso, *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation*, WUNT 292 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 187.

¹³⁶ Deasely writes, “Qumran perfection was seen as both means and end. There was a perfection which was attainable in the present, and the process of perfecting was the means of attainment; nonetheless, a fullness of perfection lay ahead which would be the work of God at the end of days” (*The Shape of Qumran Theology* [Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000]). For related perceptions, see also Brooke, who as part of a larger investigation on Qumran ethics and their intersections with the New Testament, affirms Deasely’s distinction between present and eschatological notions of perfection (“Some Issues behind the Ethics in the Qumran Scrolls and Their Implications for New Testament Ethics,” in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*, ed. Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden, STAR 17 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 83–106, esp. 103).

perfection is something an individual or group pursues in the present and anticipates achieving in the future eschaton.

In view of these broader proposals as to the notion of perfection, how does Qahat employ perfection as part of the inherited tradition?

Uusimäki, in her recent engagement with WQ, picked up on several of the above features of perfection as part of the term's wider terminological milieu. While she did not dismiss the possibility of these features relating to Qahat's usage of the term, her primary emphasis was on perfection in the inheritance list as a sense of "doing more than others and going beyond the 'minimum level laid down in the Torah'" and as a "virtue of exceeding the expected level."¹³⁷ Based upon my reading of WQ, I agree with her initial observations. Qahat seems to include perfection in the list to encourage his descendants towards a higher qualitative ceiling of existence. Yet beyond this foundational sense, I suspect that Qahat's vision of perfection may extend beyond "doing more" or "going beyond."

The appearance of perfection or תמימו among the features of Qahat's inherited tradition seems to demonstrate its general importance for him, and its value as an underlying feature of his identity. Yet as I have already indicated with the preceding items in the list, the sequence in which perfection occurs within this list also seems to me significant. Uusimäki offers an intriguing proposal on the nature of this sequence. She suggests that the notion of perfection here "might close the first part of the list."¹³⁸ If perfection represents an attempt to close off an initial portion of the inheritance list, perhaps Qahat, after laying out a foundational principle of truth, conveying what the embodiment of that truth entails in the form of upright practice, and

¹³⁷ While Uusimäki hints at some wider conceptions of perfection in the DSS and wider Second Temple materials, specifically in relation to time, her treatment of WQ, largely centers on perfection as "going beyond" and "doing more" ("In Search of Virtue," 221, esp. 221, n. 70).

¹³⁸ Uusimäki, "In Search of Virtue," 221.

requiring an uncompromised holding to that truth in the notion of integrity, provides them with the standard by which to pursue those preceding features of identity. In this way, Qahat perhaps positions perfection as a type of elevated standard by which to understand his developing vision of the inherited tradition. This is perhaps what Uusimäki describes as “doing more than others and going beyond the ‘minimum level laid down in the Torah.’”¹³⁹

One way we perhaps see Qahat extend the concept of perfection beyond this initial sense also pertains to the position of perfection within this sequence. The central position of perfection in this list perhaps also indicates that it represents more than an elevated standard and an expanded vision for the preceding three features. The medial position of perfection may indicate that perfection not only has an important bearing on the initial three items, but equally on the latter three.

In her analysis, Uusimäki observes a two-part division within Qahat’s inheritance list. She identifies one set of “interpersonal virtues” and pointing to the other as having notable intersections with the “divine sphere.”¹⁴⁰ While she seems to exclude truth from the initial group of interpersonal virtues, she includes the subsequent features of purity, holiness, and priesthood in a second divinely-oriented group of virtues. As I noted above, she points to the possible role of perfection as marking an end to the first section of the list, but also suggests that perfection may “serve as a link between the first and second sets of virtue.”¹⁴¹ Yet she does not elaborate as to the nature of that link. In my reading, it seems to me that the position of perfection within the list suggests that Qahat envisions perfection as having a similar bearing on the latter portion of the list, which I read with Uusimäki as having a notably divine orientation. In this sense, the

¹³⁹ Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 221.

¹⁴⁰ Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 221–3.

¹⁴¹ Uusimäki, “In Search of Virtue,” 221.

inclusion of perfection in the list may also represent Qahat's appeal for his descendants to embody a set of divinely oriented features of identity with a similar degree of "effort, striving, and growth."

For Qahat, therefore, perfection appears to represent an invitation to an elevated standard for embodying tradition and maps onto both human and divinely oriented aspects of identity.

3.3.2.3.5 Purity (דִּבְרוֹת): A Divinely Given Basis for Human Entrance into Holiness

The concept of "purity" is the fifth item in Qahat's list. Despite the fragmentary nature of the term here in the list (דִּבְרוֹת), the importance of purity for Qahat is apparent in view of its presence in the wider narrative. I highlighted its prominence above with its various connections to the notion of kinship. Within that section, however, although we emphasized the importance of different purity expressions (moral and genealogical), our interest in purity largely centered on its role in understanding the notion of kinship.

Yet Qahat's inclusion of purity within the inheritance list seems to encourage us to consider purity through a wider lens. It invites us beyond seeing purity merely as a key demarcating feature for kinship and access to the inherited ancestral tradition, and to reflect on some of its broader possible significance for Qahat.

As with the preceding items, the sequence of Qahat's list seems to offer helpful clues as to his wider conceptualization of purity. As we indicated above, an invitation to perfection as a type of elevated, far-reaching, yet attainable standard, precedes the notion of purity. We noted that perfection seems to function as an elevated standard for the preceding items in the list. Yet we also noted that perfection, as centrally located in the list, seems to have bearing on the second

half of items Qahat names for the inherited tradition. In this sense, Qahat appears to envision perfection as the standard by which his descendants are also to engage the latter items.

The specific nature of purity perhaps becomes more apparent in view of the subsequent feature of “holiness” (שׁוֹדֵף) (4Q542 1 i 13) in the list. The notion of holiness as a distinct feature of the divine falls in immediate succession to purity in the list, which perhaps hints at an important intersection between these two notions.¹⁴²

Wider scholarship attests to this intersection, particularly through the lens of holiness. While there is ongoing debate as to some of the broader contours of purity and whether it reflects a comprehensive system, its perceived intersection with holiness is a common observation.¹⁴³ Harrington, describes how “moral purity, as well as ritual purity, is essential to holiness.”¹⁴⁴ Naude, as part of his exploration of holiness in the Ancient Near East, Hebrew Scriptures, and DSS, unpacks this further. He points to the way in which the ancient Jewish mind conceived of “a graded conception of the world.” He describes this grade as consisting of “very holy, holy, clean, unclean, very unclean.”¹⁴⁵ In this sense, purity represents the foundation for human access to holiness. As Harrington observes, humans “imitate his [God’s] otherness and separation from impurity, they strive for perfection as far as possible, they exhibit divine goodness (i.e., true

¹⁴² For more on the explicit connection between holiness (שׁוֹדֵף) and the divine in the Aramaic DSS, see the subsequent section entitled “Holiness (שׁוֹדֵף): Accessing the Divine.”

¹⁴³ For systematic treatments of ancient Jewish purity, see, for example Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*, Routledge Classics (London; New York: Routledge, 2005); Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 3 of *Anchor Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1991). For non-systematic approaches to understanding ancient Jewish purity, see, for example: Thomas Kazen, “Dirt and Disgust: Body and Morality in Biblical Purity Laws,” in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*, ed. B. J. Schwartz, D. P. Wright, J. Stackert, and N. S. Meshel, LHBOTS 474 (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 43–64; Thomas Kazen, *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism*, ConBNT 45 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010); T. M. Lemos, “Where There Is Dirt, Is There System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions,” *JSOT* 37.3 (2013): 265–94.

¹⁴⁴ Hannah K. Harrington, “Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 8.2 (2001): 124–35, here 130.

¹⁴⁵ Jacobus A. Naude, “Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–99, here 176.

justice and mercy), and they partake of divine power.”¹⁴⁶ In other words, the elevated standard of perfection extends into a human pursuit of purity, which flows over into expressions of upright practice, and ultimately leads to the ability to enter the holy divine sphere.

Humans, therefore, in their natural state apart from God are profane (i.e., not holy). They are distinctly different in kind from the divine. Yet through a layered system of purity, which according to Hayes is built off the notion of covenant, humans can become pure. Attained purity then represents the basis by which humans can enter the divine sphere of holiness. This does not mean that humans in and of themselves become holy through purity practices alone. Rather, as Harrington notes, “only God is inherently holy. Other persons and items can partake of God’s inherent holiness only by extension and by divine designation. They can never be inherently holy, but they can mirror the divine holiness in various ways.”¹⁴⁷ This designation, according to Hayes, comes through adherence to covenantal purity requirements.

The bottom line is that humans and God are naturally distinct in both kind (holy/profane) and state (pure/impure). Covenantal notions of purity, therefore, represent a divinely orchestrated means by which the profane can become pure, and by doing so qualify themselves to enter the divine sphere of holiness.

When we consider Qahat’s list, it seems to reflect Naude’s “graded conception of the world,” in which purity represents the underlying basis for entering in holiness. Yet, as Hayes, along with many others demonstrate, purity is nuanced. She warns against treating purity as “monochromatic.”¹⁴⁸ In view of this emphasis on purity as a basis for participating in holiness, how does Qahat envision purity as a key feature of the inherited tradition?

¹⁴⁶ Harrington, “Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 124–35, here 129.

¹⁴⁷ Harrington, “Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 124–35, here 129.

¹⁴⁸ Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 7.

As I captured in the above section on kinship, Qahat demonstrates a particular concern for genealogical and moral purity, especially moral purity pertaining to sexual interactions with outsiders. In view of my extended engagement with those purity concerns above, I will forgo further discussion on those issues here. Instead, we will focus our efforts on understanding some of the wider contours of what Qahat urges in terms of purity as an underlying feature of tradition.

As we have already noted on several occasions, moral purity concerns for Qahat primarily center on sexual misconduct in relation to outsiders. Yet moral purity for him also seems to extend beyond that. One instance in which Qahat seems to convey wider forms of moral purity is during his warning to his descendants against mishandling their inherited tradition. He warns them of the possibility of them becoming “debased and disgraced” (לשפלוֹן {תָּ} וּלְנִבְלוֹ) (4Q542 1 i 6). I above referenced this line in relation to a concern for integrity of truth and as a warning to a possible syncretism with non-Jews. Yet the heart of the apparent sense of possible corruption of truth, or the loss of integrity, seems to be moral impurity. In other words, while the notion of becoming “debased and disgraced” perhaps reflects a concern for integrity, it seems to do so in specific view of potential moral corruption.

Although this may include threats to genealogical purity and kinship related aspects of moral purity, it does not appear to be limited to them. This seems to be the case in that Qahat’s appeal to his descendants is for them to respond not by simply abstaining from intermarriage practices, but by holding to certain standards of thought and practice set by past exemplars (i.e., 4Q542 1 i 7–8).¹⁴⁹ In this sense a concern for becoming “debased and disgraced” appears not

¹⁴⁹ I.e., “Therefore, cling to the command of Jacob your ancestor. Hold fast to the judgment of Abraham and the upright practice of Levi and myself” (לֵהוֹן אֶחָדוּ בַּמִּמְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֲבוּכֻן וְאַתְקֻפוּ בְּדִינֵי אַבְרָהָם וּבְצִדְקַת לֵוִי וְלִי) (4Q542 1 i 7–8)

only to be about avoiding immoral intermarriage/sexual practice, but also about operating in accordance with a principle of truth and in a wider state of moral purity (4Q542 1 i 9–10).¹⁵⁰

Furthermore, although Qahat does not explicitly indicate that “debased and disgraced” pertains to a sense of ritual purity, his emphasis on the priestly nature of the group may suggest that this concern is also present.¹⁵¹ The priestly status of the group perhaps suggests that his concern reflects the potential for the adoption of morally impure practices, and with that, a threat towards their ritual purity.

Perhaps a second instance in which Qahat extends the concept of purity beyond specific kinship concerns occurs in his eschatological vision of the future. As he addresses his descendants, he seems to envision a future reality in which they exist in a state of moral, genealogical, and ritual purity. Qahat describes this future reality as follows:

Everlasting blessings will rest upon you and [they] wi[ll...] enduring for eternal generations. No longer will...[...] from your suffering and you will stand to hand down judgment up[on...] and to see the guilt of all the eternally guilty...[...]” and on the earth and in the depths and in all the caverns...[...] in the [gen]erations of truth but all [the] sons of wickedne[ss] will pass away[...]

¹⁵⁰ This is perhaps most apparent in the phrase: “clinging to the truth and walking in integrity—not with a divided heart, but with a pure heart and with a true and good spirit” [אחדין בקושטא ואזלין בישרותא ולאבלבב ולבב להן בלבב] [4Q542 1 i 9–10]

¹⁵¹ For more on the priestly contours of WQ, see the subsequent section entitled “Priesthood (כה[ו]ן): Participation with the Divine.”

ברכת עלמא ישכונן עליכון ולהו[ן] קאם לכול דרי עלמין ול"עוד תב[...]. מן יסורכון ותקומון למדן דין
 ע[ל] ולמחזיא חובת כול חיבי עלמין הב[...]. ובארעא ובתהומ⁽¹⁾ א ובכול חלליא לבלמ[...]. ב[ד]ר[י]
 קושטא ויעדון כול בני רשע[א]...

4Q542 1 ii 3–8

This future vision seems to display a broader conception of purity. Qahat envisions his descendants increasingly standing in positions associated with the divine, which I will further unpack in the subsequent section on priesthood. As they take on these roles, he seems to understand their position first in relation to a wider sense of general moral purity, in that he juxtaposes them with “the eternally guilty” (חיבי עלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 6) and “[the] sons of wickedne[ss]” (בני רשע[א]).¹⁵² The fact that they stand elevated in seemingly divinely associated positions of judgment (4Q542 1 ii 5) over morally inferior individuals seems to reinforce their moral purity.¹⁵³ Yet since his descendants appear to operate increasingly in association with the divine sphere as eschatological judges, Qahat perhaps also means to convey the sense that his descendants have met the additional requirements of genealogical and ritual purity. This is apparent in that any type of purity infraction would disqualify such participation. In view of these examples, a wider sense of purity, beyond kinship related aspects, seems to feature as part of Qahat’s understanding of purity.

These select examples, seem to demonstrate that Qahat envisions a broad expression of purity as a key part of the inherited tradition. Further, Qahat seems to emphasize purity as

¹⁵² For more on these notions of opposition, see, n.136 in the introductory chapter of the present study.

¹⁵³ I.e., “to hand down judgment” [למדן דין] [4Q542 1 ii 5]. For more on the spatial significance of this depiction see the subsequent section entitled “Space.”

departing from an elevated standard of perfection and operating as the means to entrance in the holy divine sphere.

3.3.2.3.6 Holiness (ק[וֹדֵשׁ]): Accessing the Divine

The sixth item in Qahat's inheritance list is ק[וֹדֵשׁ ("holiness"). As I indicated in the above section, the preceding feature of purity appears to represent the primary basis for accessing this feature of the inherited tradition. Qahat's vision of purity emphasizes a variety of purity expressions (genealogical, moral, and seemingly ritual). Through the maintenance of these expressions of purity, Qahat's descendants become eligible or capable of entrance into the divine sphere of holiness. While I noted above that holiness appears to represent a distinctly divine quality within the ancient Jewish context, we did not elaborate on this intersection. We will therefore begin our consideration of Qahat's inclusion of "holiness" by first considering the contours of קדיש in the wider Aramaic DSS.

The term קדיש or its derivative forms appear in the Aramaic DSS with notable frequency. These appearances include references to objects,¹⁵⁴ places or spaces,¹⁵⁵ Israel as holy,¹⁵⁶ and the action of making something holy as part of a sacrificial process.¹⁵⁷

While these examples seem to hint at a wider divine connection, the use of holiness in reference to divine space and otherworldly or angelic figures perhaps offers a more concrete indication of this connection. The Enochic writing, 4Q201, for example, adopts holiness language to describe the heavenly vantage point from which angelic figures observe destructive

¹⁵⁴ I.e., "holy tithe" (קודש קרבן) (4Q213a 3 18).

¹⁵⁵ I.e., "the holy city" (קְרִית קדשא) (4Q196 17 ii 8); "holy house" (בית קדשא) (4Q156 2 4); "holy mountain" (טורא קדיש) (1Q20 19 8).

¹⁵⁶ I.e., "holy Israel" (קודשי ישראל) (11Q18 25 1).

¹⁵⁷ I.e., "sanctify it" (יקדשנה) (4Q156 2 3); "and you consecrated" (וְקִדַּשְׁתָּהּ) (4Q531 17 1).

human practices (4Q201 1 iv 7).¹⁵⁸ In the Enochic Book of Giants, the composition seemingly depicts the angelic heavenly abode in terms of holiness (4Q531 22 6).¹⁵⁹ Instances in which holiness acts as a descriptor of angelic or otherworldly figures also appear in writings such as 1Q20 and 4Q213. Among those references they commonly describe the otherworldly angelic Nephilim as “the holy ones” (1Q20 2:1; 6:20).¹⁶⁰

Yet perhaps the most informative expression of holiness in the Aramaic writings occurs in reference to the figure of God. The Aramaic DSS commonly refer to God not merely as holy, but as “the Great Holy One” (קדישא רבא).¹⁶¹ A similar emphasis on the holiness of God appears in 4Q212 1 v 15–16, which occurs as part of a passage extolling his nature, which reads: “[... who is ab]le to know what is in the mind of [the Lord ... is there one] [wh]o is able to hear the words of the Holy One? [...]” (די יכל לנדע מה בטעם אלהא ומנו הוא מן כול בני אנוש [ד] יכל) (ישמע מלי קדשא ולא יתבהל או יכל יחשב מחשבתה).

From these passages, we gain an overarching sense of a distinct otherworldly or divine connection with holiness, most potently expressed in relation to the divine figure of God, “the Great Holy One.” As I indicated above, this maps onto observations of various scholars as to the nature of קודש in the wider DSS, as well as in the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁶² So how does the above sense of holiness map onto Qahat’s usage of the term?

¹⁵⁸ I.e., “from [the] holy places [...] and they sa[w] much blood being sh[ed on] the [earth]” (מן קדש[י] שמייה על ארעא) (4Q201 1 iv 7).

¹⁵⁹ I.e., “[are angels who] reside in [Heav]en, and they dwell in the holy places” (מלאכיא דבשמיא איתבין ובקדשיא) (אנון שרין 4Q531 22 6).

¹⁶⁰ I.e., “the seed had been planted by the Holy Ones or Nephil[im]” (מן קדישין זרעא ולנפיל[ין]) (1Q20 2:1); “holy ones who [mated] with hum[an] women” ([קדישין די עם בנת אנושא --]) (1Q20 6 20).

¹⁶¹ The concentration of this term is particularly high in 1Q20 (0:11; 2:14; 6:13?, 15; 7:7; 12:17), but also shows up in 4Q201 (1 5) and 4Q530 (2 ii + 6–12[?] 17).

¹⁶² We see this emphasized by Naude in his exploration of holiness in the DSS, who notes that “God is considered to be the *fons et origo* of holiness. The noun קודש denotes the essential aura of God’s being or activity and differs in every respect from the common or profane” (“Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 176). Harrington similarly echoes

As I indicated at the outset of this section, Qahat refers to holiness on two occasions: once in his inheritance list (4Q542 1 i 13) and once as part of his instructions to his descendants (4Q542 1 i 8). It is interesting that unlike the wider Aramaic DSS, on no occasion does Qahat explicitly connect the notion of holiness with otherworldly or angelic figures, spaces, general objects, or even the figure of God. While this may simply be due to fragmentary nature of the material culture, the absence of these wider expressions of holiness is at the very least intriguing to consider. What we do see, is that Qahat primarily conceives of holiness in terms of human figures.¹⁶³

We first see this in Qahat's inheritance list (4Q542 1 i 13). Qahat conveys to his descendants that the inherited tradition includes holiness. Holiness appears as part of the inherited tradition that Qahat's descendants are to exemplify in themselves and carry forward into subsequent generations.

Qahat's second reference to holiness also occurs in relation to human figures. As part of his overall instruction and specifically as part of his appeal for them to guard their inherited tradition, Qahat calls for his descendants to "be ho[l]y and pure from any [inter]mixture" (והוא ויהוה) (קד[י]שין ודכין מן כול [ע]רִבְרוּב (4Q542 1 i 8–9). While we previously discussed this phrase in connection to Qahat's wider prohibition against intermarriage and a highly exclusive conception of kinship, this phrase seems to offer further insights as to Qahat's employment of the notion of holiness.

Naude, describing holiness in the DSS as "an active force which comes from God" and "defined loosely as divine energy" ("Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 129).

¹⁶³ The sense of human participation in holiness is, however, not unique to WQ. A similar attribution of holiness appears in relation to the apparent figure of Aaron in VA. VA seems to capture how the apparent figure of Aaron will be "a holy priest" (בִּהֶן קדִיש) (4Q545 4 16). It goes on to describe how "ho[l]y to God shall be all his descendants for all the generations of e[ternity...]" (קד[י]ש ליהוה לה כל זרעה בכול דרי ע[למי]ן) (4Q545 4 17). While there may be additional hints of this holy attribution to Aaron's priestly family, these subsequent references are uncertain (4Q546 18 2; 4Q547 6 1).

I indicated above that the pairing of holiness and purity language seems to reinforce the interrelationship between these two features. Furthermore, the distinction between holiness and purity, speaks to a layered perception as to the apparent problems of intermarriage. Yet beyond these kinship/intermarriage concerns, Qahat's appeal for his descendants to "be ho[l]y" ($\text{וְהָיָה} \text{ } \text{קִדְדְ[י]שִׁין}$) (4Q542 1 i 8) is interesting in that it seems to indicate that he understands the notion of holiness as neither inherent nor permanent. Rather, in Qahat's mind it seems to be something that his descendants must maintain and guard. As we have already demonstrated, this does not indicate a permeable conception of kinship; non-Jews remain non-Jews regardless of their engagement with the virtues associated with the inherited tradition. Yet for Qahat and his descendants, their entrance into holiness is not guaranteed and rather seems closely connected to notions of purity. In this sense, the notion of holiness for Qahat seems to follow closely to Harrington's and Naude's wider observations as something which humans can engage in through the maintenance of covenantal concepts of purity.

Unlike the majority of expressions of holiness in the Aramaic DSS, Qahat employs holiness not primarily in relation to divine items, places or spaces, or otherworldly figures, but in relation to humans. While holiness maintains its most basic expression in the figure of God and its connection with the divine, Qahat primarily uses the term as part of a wider aim of participation in the concept of holiness.¹⁶⁴ By perfectly adhering to these regulations Qahat and his descendants gain access to the divine notion of holiness. Yet for Qahat, access to holiness represents not an ultimate goal, but a necessary means to the greater aim of *participation* with the divine, to which we will now turn.

¹⁶⁴ For more on Qahat's conceptualization of spaces as part of his identity profile, see the subsequent section entitled, "Space."

3.3.2.3.7 Priesthood (כהן[ו]נת): Participation with the Divine

The final item in Qahat's list is כהן[ו]נת or "priesthood." The priesthood as the final item in this list seems to represent a type of climactic feature for Qahat.¹⁶⁵

Traditional conceptions of the priesthood trace back to the Hebrew Scriptures. Within that framework, the nature and function of the priesthood centered around a cultic role and related responsibilities. At the heart of that role, priests participated with the divine, acting on behalf of non-priestly cultic devotees as intermediary figures between human and divine. The primary expression of this was as cultic practitioners and as instructors of divinely given priestly knowledge, largely pertaining to legal matters of purity.¹⁶⁶ Through these practices the priesthood represented a distinct way by which humans participated in and interacted with the divine.

Qahat's inclusion of the priesthood as part of this list immediately following the notion of holiness (4Q542 1 i 13) seems to indicate that Qahat maintains an ongoing sense that the priesthood represents a central expression of participation in the divine concept of holiness. Yet

¹⁶⁵ While scholars seem to differ as to whether to interpret priesthood as part of the inheritance list (i.e., Uusimäki, "In Search of Virtue," 218; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming) or instead as a separate culminating reality with the preceding items functioning as a set of perquisites (i.e., Drawnel, "The Literary Form," 68) there is general consensus as to the apparent importance of priesthood within this line. Uusimäki, for example, observes that "the last item of the list may carry special significance" ("In Search of Virtue," 222). Drawnel notes: "Assuming the importance of the seventh item, the six precedent moral qualities serve as necessary prerequisites for the priestly office" ("The Literary Form," 68). Further Perrin suggests that "the mention of the priesthood as the seventh item in the list is a structural mechanism to underscore its importance" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). For more on ancient Jewish lists that develop towards a climactic feature, see, Henry A. Fischel, "The Uses of Sorites (Climax, Gratio) in the Tannaitic Period," *HUCA* 44 (1973): 119–51.

¹⁶⁶ For more on the traditional contours of the priesthood and the priestly role in the wider ancient Jewish context, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*, LAI (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 66–114. See also Elias J. Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988), 140–7.

as scholars have observed, the Second Temple context played host to considerable developments as to the nature and function of priests and the priesthood as holiness participants.¹⁶⁷

At a basic level Qahat underscores this perception of the priesthood as intersecting with the divine. Perhaps one way we see this is in his allocation of divinely related attributes to human figures. This is apparent with the notion of light. As Angel notes, as part of a larger exploration on the otherworldly and eschatological priesthood in the DSS, “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.”¹⁶⁸ Qahat perhaps demonstrates this association in his opening blessing over his descendants when he includes the phrase “shine his light upon you” (נהר נהירה עליכון) (4Q542 1 i 1). Qahat’s words seem to reflect an interest in divine participation through the expression of light.¹⁶⁹ A further example of divine

¹⁶⁷ Angel, in his volume, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, offers a helpful inroad for understanding some of these developments, particularly in view of the development of the otherworldly and eschatological expressions of the priesthood. In one section of his work, he explores some of the historical background of these developments. He notes a powershift in the Second Temple period, in which following a return from exile and the end of Jewish monarchy, the locus of power within the Jewish context shifted from royal authority to the Jerusalem Temple and the priesthood. He notes that this shift resulted in an increase of “passionate and consistent criticism” towards the Temple and with it the priesthood (*Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 253). Angel highlights that the primary point of criticism centered on issues of priestly practice rather than issues of “hereditary illegitimacy” (*Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 254). He explains the reason why priestly practice became the primary point of tension as follows: “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” (*Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 253). This concern for maintaining the covenant through the temple alongside a growing sense of priestly malpractice resulted in an increasing number of schisms within the Second Temple context. Angel points to the ways in which these schisms led to various reimaginings of this institution, among which was the notion of an “imaginal temple” (*Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, esp. 83–106, 117, 127, 132, 255). It was within this context, that the traditions around an alternative priesthood increasingly developed. Through this wider priestly expression, individuals could therefore maintain the covenant apart from the Jerusalem temple by participating in this imaginal divine space accessed via ongoing purity practices. It is within this milieu that WQ vision of priesthood fits. See also, Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 87–98.

¹⁶⁸ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 297–8.

¹⁶⁹ Following Angel’s above suggestion, this request perhaps also foreshadows a wider anticipation of divine participation as a type of intermediary. I will explore this idea in the subsequent section entitled “Revelation.”

participation through light may also occur in 4Q542 2 12, although the fragmentary context does not indicate who this passage explicitly refers to.¹⁷⁰

Beyond those basic expressions of participation with the divine, Qahat develops the notion of priesthood in a series of ways. First, Qahat's lack of explicit reference to notions of ritual practice as part of the transmitted ancestral tradition when compared to the figure of Levi in ALD is noteworthy. Where Levi appeared highly concerned with understanding the details of ritual service, Qahat seems to demonstrate little interest in this area. Yet where Qahat does converge and perhaps extend the Second Temple conception of the priestly office is at the level of purity, particularly at a relational level. We noted above the way Qahat elevates the conception of kinship but with that conceives of it in highly exclusive terms. This seems to contribute to the developing perceptions in the Second Temple context as to the distinct nature of the priesthood and how the priesthood was to engage non-kinship individuals.

Alongside Qahat's emphasis on expressions of purity—especially moral and genealogical forms—he seems to demonstrate a heightened interest in the present notion of the inherited ancestral tradition. Qahat seems to underscore this tradition as a key feature of the priesthood. In particular, he emphasizes the importance of its ongoing transmission, and with that a suite of transmissional mediums. In this the priesthood took on scribal and sage like features through writing and instruction.

Qahat's emphasis on notions of revelation, time, and space, as we will subsequently explore, also appear to convey certain developments in the conception of the priesthood's nature, purpose, and function.

¹⁷⁰ I.e., “and light for them” [נהיר להן].

3.3.2.4 *Qahat and Tradition*

In the above section, we explored some of the notable contours of Qahat's connections to the notion of tradition. We did this by first picking up on past scholarly perceptions of connections between tradition or tradition related motifs and Qahat.

We began our analysis with a basic definition of tradition and then considered some high-level impressions of Qahat's elevation of the importance of tradition. In this we picked up on the notion of instruction, as well as a series of ways in which he distinctly participates in the transmission of tradition, noting his specific adoption of verbal, modelled, and written mediums. From here, we moved to explore the underlying makeup of the tradition Qahat transmits through his use of an inheritance list. Working in conjunction with wider scholarly impressions and Second Temple analogues, we unpacked what appeared to be some of the essence of Qahat's tradition.

Our analysis allowed us to develop a more precise portrait of tradition as a feature of Qahat's identity. While we intersected and overlapped with various past observations, we built upon many of these largely compositional or canonically focused observations and located them more precisely within Qahat as a figure. We will now transition to a consideration of Qahat's intersections with *revelation*.

3.3.3 *Revelation*

The notion of revelation seems to represent another important aspect of Qahat's profile. Unlike wider figures whose personas center on prominent otherworldly experiences through which they attain revelation, as we saw in the case of Levi and will subsequently explore in the case of Amram, Qahat's engagement with revelation is seemingly more subtle and indirect. This may in

part be due to the fragmentary nature of the material culture. Nonetheless, Qahat appears to underscore the importance of revelation as part of his profile of identity in a couple notable ways, namely in:

- 1) Revelation pertaining to the figure of God
- 2) Revelation pertaining to his descendants

In the case of the figure of God, Qahat seems to elevate the importance of revelation in terms of an intimate knowledge of who God is. Beyond Qahat's basic call for his descendants to know him ("so that you may you know him" (וּתְנַדְעוּנָהּ) (4Q542 1 i 2), Qahat asks God that "he shine his light" (נְהַר נְהִירָה) (4Q542 1 i 1) upon his descendants. The interest in light in this phrase seems to have far less to do with a sense of spatial quality as in the case of VA or related Aramaic writings such as 4Q548, and more to do with revelatory knowledge. Following Angel's suggestion regarding light in the sectarian writings, this association with the divine through the imagery of light perhaps intersects with the wider Second Temple development in which light comes to represent the attainment of divine knowledge. As part of a larger discussion on the otherworldly priesthood in the sectarian writings, he writes: "another prominent aspect of the light imagery in the sectarian texts that speak of otherworldly priesthood deserves attention, namely the distinct 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 like the angels."¹⁷¹ While the similarities between Qahat's conception of light here and those found in

¹⁷¹ Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 166.

sectarian thinking are noteworthy, we must be cautious in overly assuming parallel meaning in view of the early nature of the Aramaic materials.

Qahat's emphasis on the importance of revelatory knowledge regarding the figure of God further appears in his request that his descendants "know his great name" (יודענכון שמה רבא) (4Q542 1 i 1). While the language of "knowing" (ידע) hints at a basic revelatory interest, the emphasis on specific knowledge pertaining to the name of God seems to build into both ancient Jewish and wider ANE traditions that emphasized an economy pertaining to the knowledge of otherworldly names.¹⁷² In this sense, these opening lines capture Qahat's particular concern for revelation regarding the figure of God.

Qahat's interest in this type of intimate knowledge of the figure of God appears to carry forward into his latter portion of teaching surrounding an eschatological judgment event. As we will explore below, Qahat appears to envision his descendants taking up judicial roles in this scene. This judicial function appears to exhibit their future attainment of certain revelatory knowledge. In this, Qahat seems to offer further detail as to his specific revelatory interests. Here, intimate knowledge of God seems to extend into a particular comprehension of his justice. This depiction of revelatory knowledge of God as enabling judicial function perhaps intersects with Levi's similar perception in his opening prayer in ALD. As previously noted, Levi on that occasion requests revelation of the figure of God as an apparent basis for offering "true judgment" (טשק יד) (4Q213a 2 9) (κρίσιν ἀληθινὴν) (ms E 2,3 10–11 18).

Underneath this eschatological judgment scene, which we will discuss further below, Qahat appears to convey his own attainment of revelatory knowledge. In this, we see his

¹⁷² See, for example, Moses's experience with the divine name of the Lord in Ex 3:14; 6:2–3. For wider impressions of the significance of otherworldly names, particularly the name of the Lord in wider traditions see, for example, George H. van Kooten, ed., *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity* (Brill, 2006).

revelatory emphasis as also specifically pertaining to his children. Again, this seems to map similarly onto the related revelatory concerns of Levi.¹⁷³

Qahat's revelatory emphasis related to his descendants appears to develop on two primary occasions. First, in his opening benediction and second in his engagement with an eschatological judgment event. In the opening lines of his benediction over his children, among the phrases that he offers to the Lord, he includes the following line: “may he shine his light upon you and make you know his great name so that you may know him {so that you may know}” (וְנִהַר נְהִירָה עֲלֵיכֶם וְיִדְעַנְכֶם שְׁמֵהּ רַבָּא וְתִגְדְּעוּנָהּ) (4Q542 1 i 1–2).

The revelatory significance of this phrase is apparent with Qahat's repeated emphasis on the language of “knowing.” Several scholars have highlighted the revelatory nature of this language both in this example and in wider revelatory contexts.¹⁷⁴ This language of knowing, coupled with the apparent divine petitionary context of the phrase, seems to underscore its revelatory contours. In this initial example, Qahat seems to demonstrate the importance of revelation in that it is something in which he aspires for his descendants to attain.

As I hinted at above, Qahat further appears to endorse the importance of revelation in his depiction of a future eschatological judgment scene.¹⁷⁵ As he moves into this scene, he reminds his descendants of the pedigree of his teaching (4Q542 1 ii 1) and assures them of their certain

¹⁷³ I.e., ALD 1c 19; 64; 76; 98; Ryland Recto 13; Rylands Verso 5–8, 10, 12.

¹⁷⁴ See, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

¹⁷⁵ Qahat seems to hint at an eschatological context by describing how “everlasting blessings will rest upon” (בְּרַכַּת לְכוּל דְּרֵי עֲלָמִין) (4Q542 1 ii 3) his descendants, which will endure “for eternal generations” (4Q542 1 ii 4) and that they will be free from “suffering” (יְסוּרִיבִין) (4Q542 1 ii 5). He goes on to tell them that they “will stand to hand down judgment up[on...]” (תְּקוּמוּן לְמִדָּן דִּין עַל לְ[...]) (4Q542 1 ii 5) a group whose primary distinction appears to be at moral level (“the guilt of all the eternally guilty...[...]” (חֻבַּת כּוֹל חִיבֵי עֲלָמִין) (4Q542 1 ii 6). Both the apparent perfected nature of his descendants and the sense of a final judgment for the “guilty” seems to confirm the eschatological nature of the scene. In addition, the passage also seems to capture several further details that point to towards an eschatological judgment context.

place in this future unfolding (4Q542 1 ii 2).¹⁷⁶ Following these prefacing words, he then presents his descendants as taking up judicial positions in an eschatological judgment context. He conveys, “no longer will...[...] from your suffering and you will stand to hand down judgment up[on...] and to see the guilt of all the eternally guilty...[...]” (ולֹעֹד תב[...] מן יסורֹכֹן) [...] (ולמחזיא חובת כול חיבי עלמין הב[...]). His depiction seemingly goes on to provide various additional insights and indications as to the “eternally guilty” objects of his descendants’ judgment (4Q542 1 ii 7–8). The importance of revelation for Qahat within this portion of content develops in a couple of notable ways.

First, the nature of this scene as a future vision of reality begs the question as to where Qahat received these future insights. While Qahat does not offer any explicit depiction of any type of his own revelatory experience, this presentation of his knowledge of a future eschatological scene in relation to his descendants seems to me highly suggestive of Qahat’s own revelatory encounters. Further, if WQ, as Machiela proposed, has a closer connection than first assumed to VA and Amram’s visionary tales, it could suggest Qahat’s knowledge as derived specifically from a dream-vision encounter.¹⁷⁷ Unfortunately, however, this is speculative and is beyond the purview of the material evidence. What does appear to become clear in this scene, however, is that Qahat not only aspires for his descendants to attain revelation as but subsequently operate out of revelatory knowledge.

In view of his revelatory interest in the initial benediction alongside his transitional remark that “every true word will come to fruition” (כֹּל מִמֶּר קוֹשֵׁטָא יֵאֵתָא) (4Q542 1 ii 2) this

¹⁷⁶ On the quality of his degree, Qahat conveys, “I have taught you in truth from now on” [אלפתכון בקושוט מן בען] [4Q542 1 ii 1]. The future unfolding of this event, appears in the phrase, “every true word will come to fruition for y[ou]” (כֹּל מִמֶּר קוֹשֵׁטָא יֵאֵתָא עֲלֵיכֶם [...]) (4Q542 1 ii 2).

¹⁷⁷ Machiela, “Is the Testament of Qahat,” 27–38.

subsequent eschatological judgment scene appears to depict Qahat's opening request in actualized form. At the heart of this proposal is the fact that Qahat's descendants are those who "stand to hand down judgment" (תקומון למדן דין) (4Q542 1 ii 5). They do not appear among the objects of judgment. This seems to me significant, in that it appears to suggest that his descendants in this scene operate from positions of intimate revelatory knowledge. They possess the ability to adjudicate divine justice—"to hand down judgment" (למדן דין) (4Q542 1 ii 5) on the "eternally guilty (חיבי עלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 6).

3.3.3.1 Qahat and Revelation

In this section, we worked to understand more precisely the revelatory contours of Qahat's identity profile. Unlike Levi (or later Amram) we observed how impressions of Qahat as a revelatory figure have been more muted in the history of study. Despite this, we picked up on select allusions to Qahat's revelatory intersections to explore how this concept seems to build into an important feature of his identity.

To do this, we explored Qahat's interest in revelation pertaining to the figure of God and revelation pertaining to his descendants. We noted Qahat's interest in revelation pertaining to the figure of God in connection to notions of light, knowledge of his name, and perspective on divine justice. In connection to Qahat's descendants, we observed his related concerns for their reception of revelation and their subsequent response to it particularly as it pertained to an eschatological context.

Again, while the revelatory facet of Qahat's identity profile is relatively more muted in the available material culture of WQ, we nonetheless gain a sharper impression of its presence. In this process we extended select past scholarly impressions of Qahat's intersections with

revelation and developed a more precise portrait of the revelatory aspects of his identity. We will now transition to Qahat's identity in relation to the concept of *time*.

3.3.4 Time

As with the figure of Levi, Qahat seems to develop the notion of time in various ways that convey its importance as a feature of his identity profile. Throughout Qahat's kinship address, he seems to elevate certain aspects of both the past and the future, which we will now consider.

3.3.4.1 *The Past: Past Figures and Past Precedents*

As in the case of Levi, the importance of the past for Qahat is also perhaps most apparent in his emphasis on figures from the past as well as on various precedents related to their past actions.

We see Qahat develop the importance of past figures in the opening lines of his address to his descendants. Among his first recorded words, he states, “and now, my sons, be careful with the inheritance that has been bequeathed to you and that your ancestors gave to you” (וכען בני אזדהרו בירותתא די משׁלמא לכון ודי יהבו לכון אבהתכון) (4Q542 1 i 4–5). These words capture a few different aspects of Qahat's interest in the past, which we continue to explore in greater detail below. For our present interest, the way in which Qahat orients his instruction in relation to the past through the frame of figures is apparent with his mention of “your ancestors” (אבהתכון). Qahat further demonstrates his interest in this group of ancestral figures again a few lines later. As he conveys to them the essence of the tradition, which we explored in greater detail above, he reminds his descendants of the source of that tradition. He describes it as something “that your ancestors left for you” (די שבקו לכון אבהתכון) (4Q542 1 i 12).

Amidst this general emphasis on a group of ancestral figures, as in the preceding example of Levi, Qahat makes various appeals to specific individual figures. Unlike in the case of Levi in ALD (i.e., 1a 15a–19), however, Qahat does not use named figures as part of a divine petition or benediction. Instead, his interest in named past figures emerges within his subsequent instruction, which bears resemblance to other aspects of Levi’s intersections with the past.

In the process of his instruction, Qahat includes among these named ancestral figures, Levi (לוי) (4Q542 1 i 8, 11; 1 ii 11), Jacob (יעקוב) (4Q542 1 i 7, 11), Isaac (ישחק) (4Q542 1 i 11), and Abraham (אברהם) (4Q542 1 i 8, 11). While we previously noted Qahat’s interest in these figures regarding their kinship statuses, each of these individuals are also noteworthy in that each represents a temporal connection to the past.

Yet for Qahat, the significance of these figures is not simply in their basic connection to the past, but in the past actions or ideals that these figures represent. Qahat describes this group of ancestors as those who specifically handed down the ancestral tradition (4Q542 1 i 4–5, 12; 1 ii 11). He further names them as exemplars of specific past actions. Jacob appears in relation to his “command” (ממר) (4Q542 1 i 7). Abraham is representative of “judgements” (דיני) (4Q542 1 i 8). He names Levi in relation to “upright practice” (צדקת) (4Q542 1 i 8). Scholars have previously attempted to connect these past actions to specific narrative events. We could perhaps explore this further, yet for our present purposes, the primary value in these references is less about identifying the specific narrative occurrence(s) that potentially gave rise to Qahat’s pronouncements, and more that Qahat chooses to adopt these past actions as foundational features of his instruction. In view of these distinct points of emphasis, Qahat seems to elevate the importance of the past.

3.3.4.2 *The Future: Eschatological Perspective*

We briefly noted in our exploration of kinship the ways in which Qahat expands the notion of kinship by directing his descendants' gaze towards their future descendants. In addition to numerically expanding the kinship network, Qahat's emphasis on future generations also seems to carry notable temporal significance. Although Qahat does not simply brush over the value of the present moment—that being his present instruction to his descendants and their present response to it—he does seem to move quickly towards an interest in future horizons. After Qahat anchors his instruction in the past, he swiftly shifts towards the future implications of his descendants' potential actions.

We previously explored in detail Qahat's concern for his descendants' actions in relation to non-kinship individuals. We particularly noted that in the process of his instruction Qahat dismisses the possibility of “conversion” for non-kinship individuals, and further limits group access through a strict exogamy prohibition. For our present temporal interests, Qahat's distinct future concern within this process is noteworthy. As he encourages his descendants towards certain actions and virtues, he does so with a keen eye on an apparent eschatological future. Qahat does note some of the immediate implications of a negligent handling of their ancestral tradition in terms of the nature of their relationship with non-kinship individuals. Yet his primary interest appears to be in terms of a more distant eschaton.

Perhaps the first indication of Qahat's interest in the eschatological future appears in his description of the positive implications of his descendants' proper handling of the ancestral tradition. He describes how “then you will grant for me a good name among you, and joy to Levi, gladness to J[a]cob, rejoicing to Isaac, and praise to Abraham” (ותנתנון לי ביניכון שם) (טבוחדוא ללוי ושמח לי' [ע]קוב ודיאצ לישחק ותשבוהא 4Q542 1 i 10–11). While we could perhaps

interpret Qahat's initial references to both himself and Levi as conveying more of a present interest, the inclusion of the subsequent figures, seems to suggest Qahat has an alternative reality in mind. Although Qahat could simply be suggesting that his descendants' adoption of a right handling of the ancestral tradition will honor the legacy of these ancestors, some of his wider phrases seem to suggest he has something bigger in mind. My sense is that these references have more to do with an eschatological vision.

As Qahat continues to instruct his descendants, his vision shifts to what appears to be a clear eschatological judgment scene (4Q542 1 ii 2–8). While we explored some of the contours of this scene above, for our present purposes, it seems significant that Qahat draws his descendants' attention to this event. By lifting their gaze towards an eschatological context, he seems to convey that one of the primary goals of his instruction is for his descendants to understand their present actions in view of their eschatological implications.

While these temporal references may perhaps appear as incidental within the narrative, to me they seem significant. Qahat makes a distinct effort to ground his present instruction not in view of what others are doing at present, nor create other reasons to justify them. Rather, he anchors his instruction first in the past. He recalls the portraits of other individual figures and their past actions and invites his descendants to orient themselves alongside them. Further he encourages his descendants to contemplate their response to this teaching in view of the future. While he highlights certain immediate future scenarios, he primarily calls them to consider the coming eschaton. He invites them to consider the implications of their actions on their descendants in the coming eschaton and to understand intimately the ways in which their actions will shape their future roles and responsibilities.

3.3.4.3 *Qahat and Time*

In this section we worked to understand more precisely the temporal features of Qahat's identity profile. We looked to consider the underlying realities that built into this perception in scholarship and draw out further the importance of time for him as a figure.

In this we noted that similar to Levi, Qahat demonstrates a notable concern for notions of the past and future for giving shape to his identity. Yet unlike Levi, who seems to demonstrate a particular interest in calendrical realities and the calculation of time, Qahat seems to demonstrate an interest in shaping his temporal identity around what appears to be perhaps a more basic temporal schema. We further observed that while the gaps in the material culture of 4Q542 perhaps suggest that Qahat may have at one time appealed to a more developed temporal schema as a basis for identity, the extant materials do not.

Through this process, therefore, we developed a more distinct sense of the ways in which Qahat's identity profile develops around the notion of time. Our analysis allowed us to locate Qahat more precisely within a temporally shaped identity lens. Let us now consider the related concept of *space* and its importance for Qahat's developing identity.

3.3.5 *Space*

The notion of space appears to represent another important concept that contributes to Qahat's profile of identity in WQ. As was the case with Levi, Qahat appears to emphasize the significance of alternative conceptions of space apart from traditional named geographic

locations. We noted with Levi in ALD, how this perhaps reflects a wider ongoing reimagination of spatial identity within the post-exilic Second Temple context.¹⁷⁸

In the case of Levi, while he does appear in various moments alongside named geographic locations in ALD (i.e., Shechem, Abel Mayin, Bethel, Egypt, Canaan), his primary spatial identity seems to develop around a wider complex of spatial conceptions. This also seems to be the case with Qahat. Yet unlike Levi, Qahat does not appear in relation to any specific named geographic locations in WQ. In fact, WQ wholesale does not include any specific traditional named geographic locations in the extant material culture.¹⁷⁹ Although Qahat does include mention of potential geographic based identities such “resident foreigners” (תּוֹתָבִי) (4Q542 1 i 7), “assimilators” (כִּלְאִי) (4Q542 1 i 6), and “strangers” (נְבֵרָאִי) (4Q542 1 i 5), as we discussed above, these identities seem to pertain more immediately to concerns of kinship and genealogical purity rather than spatial expressions of identity.

Like Levi, the primary places in which Qahat seems to develop the importance of aspects of space for his conception of identity, pertain more to notions of otherworldly or imagined space. Although the importance of spatial identity is more muted in the case of Qahat, he nonetheless seems to develop two notable associations with these forms of space in WQ.¹⁸⁰ This happens through notions of vertical space and horizontal space.

¹⁷⁸ For more on the post-exilic reimagination of spatial concepts of identity, see the section entitled “Space” in the preceding section. See also, the recent collected essays volume, Ben-Eliyahu, *Identity and Territory: Jewish Perceptions of Space in Antiquity*.

¹⁷⁹ Again, if WQ is in fact part of VA (i.e., Machiela, “Is the Testament of Qahat,” 27–38), this shifts this reality, but based upon the established physical boundaries of 4Q542, Qahat does not appear in relation to any named geographic locations.

¹⁸⁰ The notion of spatial quality, particularly regarding the spatial feature of light may also contribute to Qahat’s profile. The later references to both light and darkness in the fragmentary lines of 4Q542 2 10–11 present an intriguing case. These references coupled with Qahat’s opening petition asking that the Lord “may shine his light upon you” (נְהַר נְהִירָה עֲלֵיכֶן) perhaps suggest the importance of light as a feature of Qahat’s identity. Yet the primary emphasis on the opening line as in apparent reference to revelation along with the highly fragmentary nature of the primary light/darkness references in 4Q542 2, discourages us from including the spatial feature of light of among the primary examples in this section.

3.3.5.1 *Vertical Space*

On select occasions throughout WQ there are perhaps hints at Qahat's underlying interest in vertical expressions of space. The mention of "its root" (שורשֶׁהָ) (4Q542 3 i 1) for example, may hint at a concern for some type of vertical notion of space, although the fragmentary nature of the text limits what we can say about this occurrence in connection to Qahat. Perhaps the most intriguing example, however, occurs in 4Q542 1 ii 3–8. In this section of material, Qahat appears to continue in his discourse to his descendants. Amidst his discourse, he seems to convey a vision of some type of future, eschatological reality related to his descendants.

Within this eschatological vision of reality, which is apparent with temporal language including "eternal generations" (דרי עלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 4) and "eternally guilty" (חיבי עלמין) (4Q542 1 ii 6), Qahat's interest in vertical space seems to become apparent. As he maps out this future eschatological reality, he describes his descendants as taking on certain judicial functions. He describes how "you will stand to hand down judgment up[on...] ([...ל]ע) (תקומון למדן דין ע[ל]ע) (4Q542 1 ii 5). What is first intriguing at a spatial level is Qahat's use of the term "stand" (קום). His depiction seems to cast an idealized vision of eschatological judgment in terms of some type of elevating vertical movement. This notion of vertical movement is perhaps reinforced by his possible description of their judgment as "upon" or "over" ([...ל]ע). It is possible, however, that these terms simply represent convenient judicial idioms, rather than Qahat's underlying spatial values. Yet the subsequent line of text seems to draw out the spatial value of this language. As Qahat continues in his discourse, he seems to go on to describe his descendants as observing "the guilt of all the eternally guilty...[...]" ([...] חובת כול חיבי עלמין הב[...]) (4Q542 1 ii 6). These seem to be the objects of Qahat's descendants' judgment. Following this logical progression, Qahat

then appears to locate that guilty conglomerate “on the earth and in the depths and in all the caverns...[...].” ([...] ובכול חלליא לבלמ[...]) (4Q542 1 ii 7). It is in this phrase that we perhaps get confirmation of Qahat’s adherence to a spatial meaning in his initial description of the judgment process. Here Qahat locates these individuals in apparent positions of low vertical space including “the depths” (תהומ¹א) and “the caverns” (חלליא). Qahat therefore casts his descendants as rising to elevated vertical positions of judgement and operating out of those superior locations, adjudicating the morally inferior who exist in positions of low elevated space.

What we perhaps see here, is Qahat presenting his descendants with an alternative means of developing a sense of spatial identity in the form elevated vertical space. This form of spatial identity is attainable through apparent adherence to Qahat’s preceding instruction and various notable aspects of tradition and will be accompanied by a series of judicial privileges.

Qahat’s emphasis here on the importance of vertical space as a key feature of identity perhaps also brings insight into his preceding warnings to his descendants against mishandling their inheritance. As part of a series of warnings, he describes a negative scenario in which “strangers” (נבראין) (4Q542 1 i 5) or “assimilators” (כילאין) (4Q542 1 i 6) “become rulers over you” (להון עליכון ראשין) (4Q542 1 i 7). If we consider Qahat’s subsequent emphasis on the importance of elevated vertical space, his warning here perhaps carries with it certain spatial significance. Although Qahat’s warning perhaps reflects more of an idiomatic expression regarding their potential loss of autonomy, the possible spatial significance of this phrase should not be overlooked. When Qahat describes others as becoming “heads” (ראשין) “over you” (עליכון), he perhaps hints at his wider interest in fostering the importance of aspects of elevated vertical space as key features of identity.

3.3.5.2 *Horizontal Space*

The notion of horizontal space perhaps also contributes to Qahat's envisioned profile of identity in WQ. The main instance in which this seems to happen is with the lone phrase, “be ho[l]y and pure from any [inter]mixture, clinging to the truth and walking in integrity—not with a divided heart, but with a pure heart and with a true and good spirit” (והוא קד[י]שין ודכין מן כול [ע]רְבֻרוב) (4Q542 1 i 8–9).

While we explored this passage as it pertains to the concept of tradition in WQ, for our present purposes, I want us to consider the way in which Qahat couches this appeal. He specifically describes it in terms of “clinging to the truth and walking in integrity” (ואחדין) (בקושטא ואזלין בישירותא (4Q542 1 i 9)). This phrase perhaps captures Qahat's concern for imagined horizontal space. Specifically, this phrase perhaps builds into the wider “two-ways” tradition, which we previously noted in the case of Levi.¹⁸¹ Qahat appears to appeal to his descendants to thoughtfully navigate horizontal space. He does this in apparent view of the elevated importance or value he attributes to certain horizontal spaces. In other words, he appears to derive meaning or identity from certain horizontal spaces.

At first glance, the two-ways nature of this phrase is less apparent. There is no appearance of the traditional language of “ways” (ארח) (i.e., 1Q20 6:3; 4Q243 7 3; 4Q212 1 ii 18; 4Q213a 1 12) or “paths” (שביל/מסל) (i.e., 1Q20 6:2, 5; 11Q10 25:3; 4Q534 1 i 6) common to this tradition. The sense of juxtaposition in the phrase is much more muted compared to wider expressions that offer clear points of contrast (1Q20 6:2–5; 4Q213a 1 12–13; 4Q212). Further

¹⁸¹ For more on the origins of the two-ways tradition, see, Machiela, “Tending the Paths of Truth; Devorah Dimant, “The Two-Ways Notion in the Qumran Texts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Hellenistic Judea: Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Aberdeen, 5–8 August, 2019)*, ed. Barry Hartog, Andrew B. Perrin, in collaboration with Shelby Bennet and Matthew Hama, STDJ 142 (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

the absence of the more traditional two-ways term הלך (“to walk”) (1Q20 6:2) in this phrase and the adoption of the wider terms אחד and אזל, perhaps makes a two-ways association less likely. Yet my impression is that Qahat offers several indications to suggest that he has a two-ways conception in mind.

First, is the use of the phrase “divided heart” (לבב ולבב). Although this term does not reflect some of the traditional dualistic conceptions as we have alluded to above, it does seem to offer a clear sense of juxtaposition as part of Qahat’s appeal. Although Qahat does not contrast his present mention of truth and integrity with a more traditional sense of “evil” or “wickedness”, he does in this language seem to convey that he envisions his descendants as facing two realities. Admittedly, however this division could conceivably represent more than two parts. Yet the impression that Qahat gives is of his descendants either holding to the truth and integrity or conceding to external denigrated practices and values.

Second, although Qahat does not include the traditional term הלך here as part of his appeal, and instead uses broader terminology, these terms term fit well within the semantic range of the two-ways tradition. We see this, for example, in the case of 1Q20 6:3, in which Noah deploys the term אזל as part of his wider depiction of movement in his two ways experience.¹⁸²

Finally, in Qahat’s later address to Amram, he describes his son’s ongoing participation in the transmission of tradition in written form with the phrase “when they are preserved with you” (באתהילכותהון עמכון) (4Q542 1 ii 13). Although Qahat withholds using the term הלך (“to walk”) as part of his initial appeal to his descendants, he adopts this term here as part of what it looks like for Amram, his son, to maintain the transmission in future generations. Here Qahat

¹⁸² I.e., “the highway of deceit, which *leads* to everlasting darkness” [נתיב שקר די אזלן לחשוך עֵלְמָא]. Transcription and translation from Machiela, *Genesis Apocryphon and Related Documents*. Italics mine.

seems to convey to some extent the imagery of his son, Amram, literally “walking” the tradition forward to future generations.

In this sense, Qahat appears to contribute to a developing two-ways tradition, albeit in perhaps a more muted manner.¹⁸³ In doing so, he seems to convey to his descendants, especially his son, Amram, the importance of a proper navigation of horizontal space and with that the association with certain horizontal spaces and avoidance of others. In this, therefore, Qahat appears to elevate the value of horizontal space as seemingly contributing to his profile of identity.

3.3.5.3 *Qahat and Space*

In our above consideration of space, we acted to draw out a sharper impression of the role of space for Qahat’s identity. We did this by first observing the absence of intersections between Qahat and specific named geographic locations. From here we moved to consider some of Qahat’s wider apparent spatial interests. Like Levi, we looked at the importance of features pertaining to vertical and horizontal space. Within each of these frames, we looked at the ways in which Qahat seems to develop the importance of several spatially oriented realities and representations. Among these we noted Qahat’s specific idealization of vertically elevated space and interest in the careful navigation of horizontally conceived space through a seemingly more subtlety appeal to the two-ways motif.

¹⁸³ Past treatments of the two-ways tradition have often excluded 4Q542 among writings that participate in the development of this tradition. See, for example, Machiela, “Tending the Paths of Truth.” Dimant in her upcoming treatment of the two-ways tradition, picks up on WQ at the close of her discussion and hints at some of its possible intersections with this motif, yet does not include it within her primary engagement (“The Two-Ways Notion in the Qumran Texts,” forthcoming). In view of the above evidence, future treatments of the two-ways tradition should perhaps consider increasingly integrating 4Q542 into this research conversation.

3.4 Synopsis

In the above sections, we explored the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space* in connection to the figure of Qahat in WQ to capture more distinctly his profile of Jewish identity. To do this, we picked up on several past impressions in research of Qahat's intersections with these concepts, as well as various wider analogues in the Second Temple literary context.

In this process we added greater precision to our understanding of the distinct intersections that Qahat as an individual figure develops in connection with the concept of kinship. Within this we particularly noted Qahat's emphasis on the role of kinship in his handling of transmitted ancestral tradition. We noted the ways in which through this conception of tradition, Qahat develops a highly exclusive understanding of kinship. We captured a further elevation of kinship boundaries through an apparent rejection of the notion of kinship conversion and a severe intermarriage prohibition relative to some of his contemporaries.

The intersections between Qahat's kinship concerns and the transmission of tradition naturally led us into a further exploration of the concept of tradition in connection with Qahat. We considered both Qahat's particular engagement with tradition as well as the wider contours of his inherited tradition by considering a list of seven items that he outlines as apparently representative of its content. In this we developed a greater awareness as to Qahat's conception of tradition and with that a better sense of its overall significance and contributions to his profile of identity.

We then turned to the concept of revelation. For Qahat, we saw that although he arguably demonstrates a more subtle engagement with revelation compared to Levi, he nonetheless develops notable aspects of his identity profile in connection to this concept. We situated this

revelatory impression alongside Machiela's intriguing proposal that Qahat originally appeared in close connection in material culture to the highly revelatory figure of Amram.

Following our engagement with revelation, our analysis shifted to Qahat's notable intersections with features of time. We looked at select ways in which aspects of time contributed to his developing profile. We noted his concerns for the past and the future, and keyed in especially on his emphasis on certain eschatological realities. Within this, we recognized Qahat's apparent interest in a more basic temporal schema when compared to wider contemporary figures. We qualified this impression, however, in view of the fragmentary nature of the material evidence, which may previously have captured more substantial temporal concerns.

Finally, we landed on the concept of space. We primarily observed Qahat's interest in aspects of vertical and horizontal space. We considered how Qahat engaged vertical divisions as an alternative means to constructing a sense of spatial identity when compared to more traditional named geographic emphases. We also considered Qahat's seemingly subtle interest in two-ways conceptualizations as another important locus that contributed to his sense of spatial identity.

From the above analysis, we come away with a greater awareness of:

- 1) Some of the notable intersections between Qahat's engagement with these concepts and those of other figures in the wider Second Temple world
- 2) A more precise knowledge of the contours and expressions of these concepts for Qahat as an individual figure

This awareness improves our ability to locate Qahat as a figure within the ancient Jewish literary landscape and moves us towards a more nuanced understanding of his distinct profile of Jewish identity.

4 Amram

4.1 The Ancient Jewish Figure of Amram

4.1.1 The (Un)Popular Profile of Amram in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures

Perhaps our most common acquaintance with the figure of Amram comes from the traditions preserved in the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures. From these preserved traditions, we encounter Amram as part of a far-reaching Levitical family. He shows up on several occasions to provide contour to this genealogical line (Ex 6:18, 20; Num 3:19, 27; 26:58–9; 1 Chr 6:2–3 [5:28–9^{MT}, 5:28–9^{LXX}], 18 [6:3^{MT}, 6:3^{LXX}]; 23:12–14; 24:20; 26:23). As part of these mappings of Levitical genealogies, we learn of Amram’s ancestral descent and some of his immediate family relations. He appears as the son of Qahat (Ex 6:18; Num 3:27; 26:58; 1 Chr 6:2 [5:28^{MT}; 5:28^{LXX}]; 6:18 [6:3^{MT}; 6:3^{LXX}]; 23:12) and a brother to Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel (Num 3:19, 27; 1 Chr 6:2 [5:28^{MT}, 5:28^{LXX}], 18 [6:3^{MT}, 6:3^{LXX}]; 23:12; 26:23). We learn of his marriage to Jochebed (Ex 6:20; Num 26:59).¹ Depictions of Jochebed within these writings provide important insights into her story and notably highlight her connection with the Levitical family. Through this we gain an awareness of Amram’s adherence to endogamous marriage practices.

These writings also attest to Amram and Jochebed’s growing family. Amram fathers Aaron, Moses, and Miriam (Ex 6:20; Num 26:59; 1 Chr 6:3 (5:29^{MT}; 5:29^{LXX}; 23:13). In close proximity to the portrayal of Aaron, Moses, and Miriam as Amram’s immediate descendants, these writings also distinguish them as notable figures in their own right. We learn of Amram’s son Aaron’s elevated status in the priestly line as one “set apart to consecrate the most holy things” (1 Chr 23:13), his son, Moses’s distinct position as “the man of God” (1 Chr 23:14), and

¹ I.e., “Amram married Jochebed his father’s sister” (Ex 6:20); “Amram’s wife was Jochebed, daughter of Levi, who was born to Levi in Egypt” (Num 26:59). All translations of the MT are from the NRSV.

Miriam as a “prophet” (Ex 15:20).² While these details may speak principally to the identity of Amram’s descendants, they simultaneously orient Amram within a wider narrative network, developing his profile as one in close connection with a selection of figures of elevated importance. In addition to these few biographical details, the figure of Amram shows up in connection with a Levitical clan bearing his name, known as the Amramites (Num 3:27; 1 Chr 26:23). And we learn of his death at the age of one hundred thirty-seven years old (Ex 6:20).

While the brief above survey of Amram in the traditions preserved in the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures attests to his distinct ancestral profile in certain regards, compared to the traditions preserved in these writings of other ancestral figures (i.e., Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Aaron), Amram emerges as a relatively unknown figure.

² While Miriam’s role in the writings of the Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) Scriptures perhaps appears somewhat limited compared to the oft celebrated roles of her brothers Moses and Aaron, her importance in the story of the Jewish people does not go unnoticed within these writings and in wider traditions. Although the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures only offer a limited portrait of the figure of Miriam, they attest to her key role at various critical junctions within the story of the Jewish people. As I have noted, the writings attest to traditions in which Miriam functions as a prophet, as well as a prominent leader (i.e., Ex 15:20–21; Num 12:1–9). These writings further capture traditions associated with the prophet Micah, which recall Miriam as among the key figures in the Jewish liberation event from Egypt (“For I brought you up from the land of Egypt, and redeemed you from the house of slavery; and I sent before you Moses, Aaron, and Miriam” [Mic 6:4]). Furthermore, although Miriam goes unnamed in the depiction of Moses’s birth and early childhood in the MT and LXX (Ex 2:4), a tradition developed around her apparent presence in this Exodus scene. Writings that capture this tradition range in their portrayal of Miriam from a thoughtful observer (Tg. Ps.-J. Ex 2:4), to a defender of Moses from predatory birds (Jub. 47:4), to a seer who receives divine insight into Moses’s future role as a liberator in a dream (LAB 9:9–10), all the way to playing a critical active role in orchestrating Moses’s safe passage into Pharaoh’s Egyptian household (*Ant.* 2.9.4–5). The discovery of 4Q549 (Words of Miriam) also attests to wider traditions related to the figure of Miriam present in the Second Temple period and the perception of her as a significant Jewish figure. Miriam’s growing profile in these traditions, and especially here in VA as will become apparent in this chapter, is significant for our present purposes in view of the ways in which her developing character makes notable contributions to the formation of Amram’s persona and overall identity. In this sense, we see some of the ways in which the Aramaic DSS capture traditions in which a broader field of ancestral figures contribute to the formation of Jewish identity. For recent investigations on the figure of Miriam, see, Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice*; Tervanotko, “Members of Levite Family,” 155–76; White Crawford, “Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 33–44. See also, White Crawford, “Women in Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 123–51.

4.1.2 The Broader Profile of Amram in the Second Temple Period and Beyond

If we consider the wider Second Temple world, there are various writings that preserve traditions that offer a more substantial profile of the figure of Amram.³ Many of these writings, however, also preserve lore about Amram that overlaps with the traditions preserved in the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures.⁴

Yet we also find Amram content in these writings that notably broadens his profile as an ancestral figure. For example, ALD preserves a tradition that attests to a notable connection between Amram and Jochebed based upon their shared day of birth (ALD 77; ms A, Camb. d, 7 14–15) and that their later marriage took place when Levi was ninety-four (ALD 75; ms A, Camb. d, 7 8–10).⁵ ALD further contains a tradition which emphasizes the onomastic qualities of Amram’s name. In this case, the figure of Levi anchors Amram’s name in his distinct quality at birth and a future significant role that he would play in the liberation/exaltation of his people from Egypt (ALD 76; ms A, Camb. d, 7 10–13).

In the traditions preserved in WQ, which we interacted with in the preceding chapter, Amram again appears as a descendant of Qahat. Yet this writing preserves a scene in which Amram features as a recipient of a paternal blessing and instruction largely concerned with notions of kinship and intermarriage (4Q542 1 i 4–1 ii 8). Within this portrayal, Qahat further distinguishes Amram from the group by making him a recipient of a more personalized set of paternal instructions. Qahat seems to distinctly entrust Amram with a written expression of ancestral inheritance (4Q542 1 ii 9–13).

³ For a brief survey of Amram’s wider profile in the Second Temple period see van der Horst, *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 30–36. See also, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁴ I.e., Amram as a descendant of Qahat and part of the Levitical family (4Q542 1 ii 9; ALD 74 [ms A, Camb. d, 7 5–6]; 4Q559 3 3; T.Levi 12:2; Dem. 2:19; *Prelim. Studies* 24.131); Amram as a father (ALD 75 [ms A, Camb. d, 7 8]; 4Q559 3 3–4; Jub. 46:10; 3 En. 1:3; 49:5; LAB 9:9, 12; *Ant.* 2.210–27; *Prelim. Studies* 24.131–32); Amram’s endogamous marriage to Jochebed (LAB 9:9; Dem. 2:19; T.Levi 12:4; *Ant.* 2.217; *Prelim. Studies* 24.131)

⁵ T. Levi 12:4 preserves a similar tradition highlighting Amram and Jochebed’s shared birthday.

Jubilees contributes to the profile of Amram by preserving a tradition in which he shows up among a group participating in an ancestral burial event at Hebron during the Egyptian war with Canaan (Jub. 46:9–10). In this portrayal Amram becomes part of a small group who, despite threats of war, choose to remain in Hebron seemingly to complete ancestral burial rites. This material additionally captures a reality in which Amram was the one who instructed Moses in the skill of writing (Jub. 47:9).

Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (LAB) preserves a rather substantial Amram tradition as part of a larger account of Jewish captivity in Egypt (LAB 9:3–14). This material contains a first-person account of notable portions of Amram’s experience of these events. As Amram looks upon the Egyptian’s heinous efforts to control a growing Jewish population by putting to death all newborn male babies, he interprets this as a major threat to the Abrahamic covenant and the future of the Jewish people. In view of this, the tradition depicts Amram’s zeal to stand against royal decrees, his rallying of the wider Jewish people, and God’s delight in Amram for doing so. Along the way we encounter some the tensions Amram experienced within this reality and some wider backstory on Amram’s instrumental role in Moses becoming part of Pharaoh’s Egyptian household (LAB 9:13–16).

The figure of Amram also appears in traditions preserved in the later Second Temple writings of Philo and Josephus. The content in Philo largely aligns with that found in the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures. Yet the material in Philo additionally emboldens Amram and Jochebed’s apparent discretion and discernment in their handling of Moses’s birth and early life, particularly in relation to potential threats to his life (*Prelim. Studies* 24.131). Josephus’s work captures a tradition of Amram similar to that in LAB, which develops the profile of Amram in relation to the early life of Moses (*Ant.* 2.210–21). It captures Amram as “one of the nobler

sort of the Hebrews” (*Ant.* 2.210) with a notable concern for the future of his people.⁶ It emphasizes Amram’s action through prayer and as taking on the identity of a dreamer. As a dreamer, Amram receives a dream projecting Moses as a future deliverance figure and Aaron’s future role in the priesthood (*Ant.* 2.212–17). Josephus’s writing further captures content portraying the nature of Amram and Jochebed’s parenting and their efforts to protect Moses in his early childhood as rooted in a heightened trust in the Lord (*Ant.* 2.218–21).

These writings not only offer a broader portrait of Amram at certain points, but also preserve traditions that present the figure of Amram in alternative ways to the traditions preserved in the Greek (LXX) and Hebrew (MT) Scriptures.

One place we perhaps see this is in the Amram material in Demetrius the Chronographer. Similar to the Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) Scriptures, Demetrius preserves a tradition capturing Amram’s paternal descent and his marriage to Jochebed, but diverges in details regarding the nature of his birth and marriage (*Dem.* 2:19). Demetrius alternatively identifies Jochebed not as Amram’s aunt (i.e., “his father’s sister” [Ex 6:20] or “daughter of Levi” [Num 26:59]), but as his “uncle’s daughter” (θείου θυγατέρα) (i.e., his cousin). Further, Demetrius places Amram’s death at one hundred thirty-six years (*Dem.* 2:19) as opposed to other traditions that place it at one hundred thirty-seven years (i.e., Ex 6:20). While these details may not appear particularly significant, they seem to attest to wider traditions surrounding the figure of Amram.

As I highlighted in the introduction, the Aramaic writing known as Visions of Amram (VA hereafter) provides an ideal departure point for our present investigation. VA preserves arguably the highest concentration of Amram traditions in seemingly the earliest material evidence. It is to this material culture and the traditions preserved within that we now turn.

⁶ Translations of Josephus are from Josephus, *The Works of Flavius Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*, trans. William Whiston (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987).

4.2 An Introduction to VA

4.2.1 The Text and Its Publication

Five manuscripts make up the composition of the VA (4Q543–4Q547), all of which were part of the early Cave 4 discovery.⁷ The material evidence behind this work is noticeably fragmentary, which considerably impedes readings of the composition at various points. 4Q544 represents the most complete manuscript of the lot. The manuscripts offer overlapping readings in several places, yet they also include several points of minor variation.⁸

Early researchers previously included 4Q548 and 4Q549 among the texts of VA, however, scholars have increasingly disassociated these compositions from the group.⁹ They argue that an absence of overlapping readings, as well as a shift in thematic concern and

⁷ For a comprehensive review of discovery, see Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. See also Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 283–88.

⁸ The significance of these variants among the VA manuscripts has been a point of debate in scholarship. See, for example, Holst, who in view of eclectic editions of VA (i.e., Duke, *The Social Location*; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband*; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*) states that the question of the material evidence, is “whether we can safely assume that because the manuscripts have clear overlapping passages, therefore they are textual witnesses to exactly the same text, and any information found in one of them can be transplanted to the remaining ones.” While he recognizes exceptions to this assumption, he goes on to suggest that Qumran scholars have “to a great extent proceeded on the assumption that manuscripts with familiar-looking content were most likely copies of the work that they reminded us of” (“Fragments and Forefathers: An Experiment with the Reconstruction of 4QVisions of Amram,” *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (2019): 137–52, here 140–1).

⁹ For examples of the classification of either 4Q548 and/or 4Q549 as part of VA, see for example, J. T. Milik, “4Q Visions de ’Amram et Une Citation D’origène,” *RB* 79.1 (1972): 90; Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 391–92, 399; Frey, “On the Origins,” 359–60; Holly A. Pearce, “The Guide and the Seducer: The Dualism of 4QVisions of (c)Amram” (MA, McMaster University, 2004); Hanna Tervanotko, “The Hope of the Enemy Has Perished: The Figure of Miriam in the Qumran Library,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengellér, FRLANT 230 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 157–60; White Crawford, “Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 33–44. On the possibility of 4Q542 (WQ) as being part of VA, see, Machiela, “Is the Testament of Qahat,” *JSJ* 52.1 (2020): 27–38. For wider perceptions of this possibility, see also, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

narrative voice between these texts and 4Q543–4Q547, decreases the likelihood that these two compositions are directly related to VA.¹⁰

Scholarship on VA has, however, been limited since its initial discovery in the fifties. Milik was among the first to publish work on these manuscripts, beginning in 1972, which included several readings of the texts.¹¹ Fitzmyer and Harrington released a volume on the Palestinian Aramaic texts a few years later, which also included versions of VA.¹² Kobelski's work on the two prominent otherworldly ancient Jewish figures of Melchizedek and Melchireša in 1981 further contributed select readings of text.¹³ Beyer's substantial volume on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls followed in 1984, which included his own eclectic versions of VA.¹⁴ He released two adjusted and expanded editions in the two decades that followed.¹⁵ García Martínez and Tigchelaar provided additional readings of VA in their study edition in 1997.¹⁶ The full publication of VA did not occur until 2001, with the release of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert edition by Puech.¹⁷ Since then, Duke published a volume exploring the social location of VA. His volume included updated transcriptions and translations, as part of an overall eclectic edition.¹⁸ Scholars in recent years continue to offer new readings and re-readings of these texts through the ongoing exploration of material evidence.¹⁹

¹⁰ See, Robert Duke, "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the Vision of Amram," *DSD* 14.1 (2007): 34–48. Perrin and Hama, "4Q548 (Dualistic Fragments in Aramaic)."

¹¹ J. T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram," 77–97; J. T. Milik, "Milkî-Şedeq et Milkî-Rešae," *JJS* 23.1 (1972): 95–144.

¹² Fitzmyer and Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*.

¹³ Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša*.

¹⁴ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*.

¹⁵ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband*; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*.

¹⁶ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.

¹⁷ Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*.

¹⁸ Duke, *The Social Location*.

¹⁹ Enhancements in technology and growing interest in the Aramaic texts continue to catalyze improvements in the overall accessibility of manuscripts and the accuracy of readings. All of the transcriptions and translations of VA in the present section come from Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. Volumes such as this, reflect ongoing opportunities to develop and build upon the foundations of past research. I have been a research assistant and collaborator on Dr. Perrin's forthcoming project and have worked closely in a support role in the transcription

4.2.2 Previous Research

While research on VA is relatively limited, the history of research on VA attests to several notable trends. Alongside conversations on the genre and literary structure of VA, scholars have explored various other questions related to the nature and shape of the composition of VA and its associated material evidence. This includes inquiry into things such as source materials, textual versions, and the social location behind the composition.²⁰ Scholars have also showed interest in shedding light onto the relationships between VA and the wider Aramaic corpus as well as its intersections with later Christian thought.²¹ The authorial/scribal strategies behind the composition represent another notable point of conversation in scholarship on VA. This includes questions related to VA as a pseudepigraphon and the function of some of its pseudepigraphal features, as well as the author's apparent strategic use of geography.²² As an apparent priestly document, scholars have also explored some of the ways in which VA contributes to conceptions of the priesthood and perceptions around Levitical marriage/endogamy.²³ The different figures

and translation of the text of VA. Dr. Perrin generously allowed me to use the pre-publication transcriptions and translations of VA from the project in the present section.

²⁰ On the sources of VA through a comparison with Jubilees, see James C. VanderKam, "'Jubilees' 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram," *DSD* 17.2 (2010): 141–58. On the notion of potential versions of VA, see for example, Holst, "Fragments and Forefathers," 137–52. On the social location of VA, see for example, Duke, *The Social Location*.

²¹ On the intersections between VA and the wider Aramaic DSS, see for example, Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," 197–205; Perrin, "Tobit's Context and Contacts," 23–51; Tervanotko, "A Trilogy of Testaments," 41–59. On the intersections between VA and later Christian writings, see for example, Corrado Martone, "A Proposito di un Passo di 4Q Visioni di 'Amram in Alcune Interpretazioni Recenti," *RSLR* 33 (1997): 615–21; J. T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram," 77–97.

²² On the pseudepigraphal features of VA, see for example, Andrew B. Perrin, "Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 20.1 (2013): 98–123; Mladen Popović, "Pseudepigraphy and a Scribal Sense of the Past in the Ancient Mediterranean: A Copy of the Book of the Words of the Vision of Amram," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke* (2017): 308–18. On the use of geography as a strategic authorial/scribal tool, see for example, Jesper Høgenhaven, "Geography in the Visions of Amram Texts (4Q543–547)," in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*, STDJ 131 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019): 119–36.

²³ For more on the significance of priesthood in VA, see, for example, Angel, *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood*, 53–55; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. For more on VA and endogamy, see

that appear in VA represent another important area of conversation in research. Scholars have shown particular interest in exploring the different contours of these figures and the significance of their presence within the composition. In particular, scholars have shown a notable interest in the intersections between these figures in VA and the so-called concept of dualism.

Scholars have flagged VA as an important voice in the conversation on dualism in view of its notable concentration of apparent dualistic expression.²⁴ Perhaps the most salient dualistic content in VA occurs in the appearance of two seemingly juxtaposed otherworldly beings. VA attests to these beings as representative of different rules, particularly in relation to light and darkness and hints at some of the ways in which the authority of these figures somehow intersects with human existence.²⁵

The concept of dualism in general, and this specific light/darkness dualistic expression in particular, have played an important role in developing conceptions of ancient Jewish identity. Scholars have often explored the notion of dualism and its different expressions as a primary manifestation of so-called “sectarianism” and sectarian identity. Dualistic expression, particularly in view of its prominence across the DSS writings, represents one among many potential points of departure for investigating ancient Jewish identity. While we will at times

Blake Alan Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Vision of Amram (4Q543–547)*,” *JSP* 24.1 (2014): 19, 22; Liora Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers in the Visions of Amram from Qumran,” in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz (Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 240; Tervanotko, “Members of Levite Family,” 12–13, 16, 18–19; White Crawford, “Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 38–42.

²⁴ See, for example, Frey, “Different Patterns, 276–335; Jörg Frey, “Apocalyptic Dualism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 271–94; Liora Goldman, “Dualism in the ‘Visions of Amram,’” *RevQ* 24.3 (2010): 421–32; Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of Community*, 320–29; Andrew B. Perrin, “Another Look at Dualism in 4QVisions of Amram,” *Hen* 36.1 (2014): 107–18; Paul Heger, “Another Look at Dualism in Qumran Writings,” in *Dualism in Qumran*, LSTS 76 (London, New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 39–101; Pearse, “The Guide and the Seducer.”

²⁵ On intersections with light and darkness, see, for example, the phrases: “I am ruler over all light” (אנה שליט על) (כול נהירא) (4Q544 2 16); “pitch darkness” (חשיך חשוד) (4Q543 5–9 5); “[...]and pitch” (חשיך[...]) (4Q547 1–2 13); “and all his work is da[rk] and in the darkness he...[...].see. Now, he is given authority over all darkness but I[...].” ([...] ואנה חשוד הוא ד[ש] וכל עבדה ח[ש] ובהשוכא הוא ד[ש] ה[ח]זה והוא משלט על כול חשוכא ואנה[...]) (4Q544 2 14–15).

intersect with past impressions related to these dualism-focused engagements with identity, our engagement will focus on the concepts of kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space as outlined in the introduction.

4.2.3 Content Overview

As in the case of WQ, the primary challenge of capturing an overview of the content of VA is its fragmentary state. From the available text, however, we can gain a general sense of some of the more notable scenes that occur.²⁶ Amidst the variety of fragmentary phrases and scenes that make up 4Q543–4Q547, these materials include the following seemingly more substantial events:

- 1) An announcement of wider chronological context (4Q543 1a–c 1–3; cf. 4Q545 1a i 1–3)
- 2) A betrothal/wedding (4Q543 1a–c 4–7; cf. 4Q545 1a i 4–8])
- 3) A paternal instruction (4Q545 1a i 7–19 [cf. 4Q543 1a–c 7–10; 4Q543 2a–b 1]; 4Q546 14?)
- 4) An ancestral burial event in Canaan (4Q544 1 1–4; cf. 4Q543 3; 4Q545 1a–b ii 11–19; 4Q546 2; 4Q547 1–2 1)
- 5) A forced extended stay in Canaan (4Q544 1 5–9; 4Q547 1–2 4–8)

²⁶ Others such as Duke (*The Social Location*) and Drawnel (“The Initial Narrative of the Visions of Amram and Its Literary Characteristics,” *RevQ* 24.4 [2010]: 517–54) have previously offered proposals as to the narrative sequence of VA. Drawnel’s engagement is limited in that it focusses on one primary scene, whereas Duke offers a more comprehensive proposal. Both picked up the content preserved in 4Q543 1a–c (Duke 4Q543 1a–c 1–11; Drawnel 4Q543 1a–c 1–9a) as representing the initial scene(s). Duke’s more substantial presentation aligns with much of my present proposal, although it occasionally diverges at notable moments in what seems to be a result of his eclectic presentation of the text. Duke, for example, appears to locate Amram’s dream-vision episodes following his return to Egypt and reunion with his wife (*Social Location*, 17). In my reading, however, Amram’s dream-vision episode(s) takes place during his time in Canaan, and prior to any such reunion with his wife.

- 6) A dream-vision (4Q543 5–9 6; 4Q544 1 10–14; 4Q544 2 11–16; 4Q544 3 1–2; 4Q545 4; 6; 7; 9?; 4Q546 4; 5; 8; 12; 4Q547 1–2 10–13; 4Q547 3; 5; 8; 9 1–7)
- 7) A post-dream awakening (4Q547 9 8–12)
- 8) A possible return journey to Egypt (4Q547 9 8–9)
- 9) An apparent genealogy (4Q547 9 10–12)

The narrative begins with a title that announces the nature of the composition as a written account of the content that Amram passed onto his children during the year of his death (4Q543 1a–c 1–3; 4Q545 1a i 1–3).²⁷ The extant text does not appear to follow a linear chronological sequence but jumps between different retrospective events from Amram’s life that together form the substance of his teaching to his children.

The account begins with a depiction of the wedding of his daughter Miriam. Within this scene Amram plays a prominent role in both the betrothal and marriage of his daughter, Miriam to his brother, Uzziel.²⁸ He seems to arrange their relationship, host their wedding, and feature as an attendee at the event (4Q545 1a i 4–7; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5–7).

²⁷ Despite references to Amram’s death, the text does not portray itself as a deathbed scene. For perceptions of this as deathbed event, see, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *All the Glory of Adam*, STDJ 42 (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2018), 188; Betsy Halpern-Amaru, “Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in Jubilees 46,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 58 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 146; Milik, “4Q Visions de ’Amram,” 85; Pearse, “The Guide and the Seducer,” 13–14. For observations as to apparent overreading of this reference to Amram’s death in VA, in that it does not explicitly seem to include a deathbed scene, see, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

²⁸ Miriam’s marriage has been a point of discussion in scholarship on two primary fronts. First, there has been notable conversation regarding apparent divergent traditions as to the identity of her husband. While 4Q545 1a i 3–4 depicts Uzziel, Amram’s “younger brother” (אחורוי זעירא) (4Q545 1a i 5), as Miriam’s husband, some have suggested that 4Q549 perhaps alternatively portrays Miriam’s husband as Hur. See, for example, Eisenman and Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, 93–4. (Note: Eisenman and Wise designate 4Q549 as “4Q544” in this volume). While the fragmentary nature of 4Q549 makes it difficult to get a clear reading of this possible Hur/Miriam union, there is evidence of this tradition elsewhere in the Second Temple period. Josephus (*Ant.* 3.54), for example, also seems to pick up on this alternative tradition in which Hur appears as Miriam’s husband. More recently, however, White Crawford offered an alternative reading of 4Q549, in which she explains why these materials do not in fact represent a tradition of Hur as Miriam’s husband (White Crawford, “Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 40–42). Second, there has been considerable conversation around the nature of Miriam’s marriage in light

At some point after the wedding event, he engages his children in some type of instructional address (4Q545 1a i 7–19; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 7–10; 4Q543 2a–b 1). His address seems to speak to various aspects of their future roles and responsibilities among the people of Israel although much of the content is blurred due to the fragmentary nature of the materials (4Q543 2a–b 1–8; cf. 4Q545 1a i 15–19]).

Amram’s participation in an ancestral burial event in the land of Canaan represents another notable scene in VA.²⁹ The writing captures how Amram makes the journey to Canaan with a group of relatives, including his father Qahat, to undertake various ancestral burial rites (4Q545 1a–b ii 11–15; cf. 4Q544 1 1–2; 4Q546 2 2).³⁰ Following their arrival in Canaan, they receive “a report of war” (שמועת קרב) (4Q545 1a–b ii 16; cf. 4Q547 1–2 1). The writing conveys the nature of the report as “alarming” (מְבַהֵלָה) (4Q545 1a–b ii 16), which seemingly causes a variety of responses among the group. While it initially appears to cause the group to quicken the pace of the burial proceedings (4Q546 2 2; 4Q544 1 2–3; cf. 4Q545 1a–b ii 11), eventually some of the family members, including his father, prematurely depart (4Q545 1a–b ii 17; 4Q546 2). From there, Amram appears resolute in accomplishing the task at hand and continues the burial

of Qumranic prohibitions against uncle-niece marriages (i.e., CD 5:9–11; 11Q19 66:15–17). See, for example, the contributions from Tervanotko (“Members of Levite Family,” 155–76) and White Crawford (“Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 38), who offer proposals as to why the tradition preserved in the VA materials fit within developing ideas of marriage unions within the ancient Jewish context. For a larger global exploration on the figure of Miriam in the ancient Jewish context, including her marriage, see, Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice*.

²⁹ Cf. Jub. 46:9–10. For more on the possible intersections between the Amram burial event tradition preserved in these writings, see James C. VanderKam, “‘Jubilees’ 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram,” 141–58; Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 90–103.

³⁰ There has been some debate as to who exactly this familial group represents. Suggestions range from a distinct group made up of cousins, to a group that includes Amram’s wife, Yochebed. For proposals as to the specific cousin makeup of this group, see, for example, Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 233–34; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. For proposals as to Yochebed’s presence among the group, see, for example, Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 232; Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 297, 323, 340, 355, 380. For a proposal against Yochebed’s presence among the group, see, Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 20. For more on the significance of geography in this tradition, see, for example, Høgenhaven, “Geography in the Visions of Amram Texts (4Q543–547),” *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (2019): 119–36. See also, Duke, *The Social Location*, 89–122, who picks up on various geographical emphases in the tradition to develop a proposal for the tradition’s social location in Hebron.

proceedings until eventually rumors of war materialize into a full-fledged conflict (4Q545 1a–b ii 19; 4Q544 1 4; cf. 4Q543 3 3).³¹ This geo-political conflict seemingly results in Amram experiencing a forty-one-year absence from Egypt due to a consequent border closure (4Q544 1 5–6; cf. 4Q544 1 7–8; 4Q547 1–2 4–5]).

At some point in this apparent forty-one-year period outside the boundaries of Egypt, Amram experiences some type of dream-vision (4Q544 1 9–10; 4Q547 1–2 9; 4Q547 9 8).³² Within this event Amram engages two otherworldly figures (4Q543 5–9 6; 4Q544 1 10), encounters various features of the otherworldly realm (4Q544 2 13–16), and seemingly learns of different aspects of past and future human reality (4Q545 4 14–19). Despite the fragmentary nature of these materials, the opening title, which emphasizes the dream-vision, seems to suggest the centrality of this scene in the overall narrative.

The final aspects of the narrative appear to capture the events following Amram’s extended otherworldly dream-vision episode. While the content preserved in this portion of the writing is relatively limited compared to the other surrounding accounts, we get a glimpse of Amram’s awakening and post-awakening events. Upon awakening, Amram inscribes his dream-vision and perhaps hints at a return journey from Canaan (4Q547 9 8–9).³³ Beyond those details

³¹ The tradition preserved in the Aramaic writing does not necessarily indicate that it was Amram’s resolve that caused him to stay behind in Canaan. In view of the wider elevation of the figure of Amram throughout the tradition this seems likely the intention. Further, his own mention of his other relatives unfulfilled tasks (“But [they] did not b[uild] the [gr]aves of their fathe[rs]” (ולא בְּנוּ קְבָרֵי אֲבוֹתָיְהוֹן) (4Q545 1a–b ii 17) also seems to reinforce this as an instance of elevating the figure of Amram. Yet there is always the possibility that Amram merely “drew the short straw” among the group. Either way, Amram stays behind to complete the burial rites. Cf. Betsy Halpern-Amaru, “Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in Jubilees 46,” *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (2005): 147, who reads Amram as returning to Egypt before coming back to complete the burial rites.

³² Cf. *Ant.* 2.212–17, which picks up on a tradition developing the dreamer-visionary profile of Amram. For more on wider traditions of Amram as a visionary figure, see, for example, van der Horst, *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 33.

³³ Cf. *Jub.* 47:9, which also alludes to Amram’s apparent scribal skillset, in that he appears as the one who taught Moses the skill of writing.

we get hints of some type of genealogical sequence that includes his daughter Miriam (4Q547 9 10).³⁴

Across each of these scenes, Amram develops a distinct profile of identity. An awareness of the events included in these scenes will help orient our subsequent exploration of his identity profile. In addition to an awareness of these various scenes, however, it is also important to recognize that within these scenes Amram’s identity develops in relation to a wider cast of characters. To appreciate the significance of these wider characters and their contributions to the formation of Amram’s identity and to orient our investigation further, we will briefly consider them below.

4.2.4 The Wider Network of Characters Related to the Figure of Amram

As in the case of both Levi and Qahat, the following table captures the wider cast of named characters that appear alongside Amram in VA. It records their named appearances, categorizes their primary connection to Amram, acknowledges their notable contributions to Amram’s developing profile, and occasionally provides a few additional noteworthy features of the character in question.

Table 4.1

Named Figure	Appearance(s) in VA	Connection to Amram	Notable Contributions to Amram’s Profile	Other Noteworthy Features
---------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	---	----------------------------------

³⁴ The presence of the female figure of Miriam within a genealogical sequence perhaps represents more of an anomaly than a norm within the wider Ancient Jewish context. Yet within the Aramaic DSS, this type of interest in female ancestral figures is seemingly less uncommon. Various writings among the Aramaic DSS capture the development of traditions surrounding female ancestral figures and their profiles. See, for example, 4Q549 (Miriam); 1Q20 (Batenosh; Emzera; Sarah); 4Q196–200 (Anna; Sarah; Edna). For more on the role of Miriam in the ancient Jewish context, see Tervanotko, *Denying Her Voice*; Tervanotko, “The Hope of the Enemy Has Perished,” 156–75. For more on the developing traditions around female figures in 1Q20, see Bennett, “Silenced Voices.” For more on the wider group female figures within the DSS, see also, White Crawford, “Women in Qumran,” 123–51.

Aaron	4Q545 1a i 8–9; 4Q546 8 2	- Son	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gives shape to Amram’s developing instructional profile as recipient of tradition (4Q545 1a i 8–9) - His general presence develops Amram’s association with later Aaronide priesthood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Models the reception of tradition (4Q545 1a i 8–9)
Levi	4Q545 1a i 1; 4Q547 8 2	- Grandfather	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Locates Amram’s within Levitical line within a larger ancestral (4Q545 1a i 1) - Develops to Amram’s priestly connection (4Q547 8 2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appears as performing a priestly function as part of a genealogical sequence (4Q547 8 2)
Miriam	4Q543 1a–c 6; 4Q545 1a i 5–7; 4Q546 12 4; 4Q547 9 10	- Daughter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contributes to Amram’s kinship profile through her marriage (4Q543 1a–c 6; 4Q545 1a i 5–7) - Contributes to Amram’s revelatory profile through Amram’s reception of knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appears as a named female adherent to endogamy (4Q543 1a–c 6; 4Q545 1a i 5–7) - Demonstrates ideal priestly marriage age (4Q543 1a–c 6; 4Q545 1a i 5–7) - Develops notable association with notion of “mystery” (4Q546 12 4)

			regarding her mystery (4Q546 12 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notably features as a female figure within a genealogical sequence (4Q547 9 10)
Malakiya (Moses) ³⁵	4Q545 1a i 9–10; 4Q545 4 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Son 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gives shape to Amram’s instruction of tradition as an intended recipient of tradition (4Q545 1a i 9–1) - Gives further shape to Amram’s revelatory profile as the subject of an otherworldly disclosure through writing (4Q545 4 15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seemingly appears with Hebrew name (4Q545 1a 9–10) - Apparent future role in Egypt comes into view with the mention alongside “the land” (4Q545 4 15) - Appears to feature as part of an otherworldly disclosure through writing (4Q545 4 15)
Noah	4Q547 5 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distant Ancestor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May give Amram an intersection with a more distant priestly expression (4547 5 3) - Appears to give Amram a connection to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Perhaps appears in relation to a cultic function (4Q547 5 3)

³⁵ For more on the identity of “Malakiya” as Amram’s son, Moses, see especially the work of Robert Duke, “Moses’ Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the Vision of Amram,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14.1 (2007): 34–48. See also, Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*, 118–19; Liora Goldman, “Between Aaron and Moses in 4QVisions of Amram,” *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (2019): 105–9; Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 16–18; Andrew B. Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance: Commentary on the Levi, Qahat, and Amram Qumran Aramaic Traditions*, forthcoming. For alternative interpretations of this “name” as a reference to Aaron or some type of angelic figure, see, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *All the Glory of Adam* (Brill, 2018), 187.

			the antediluvian past (4Q547 5 3)	
Qahat	4Q544 1 1; 4Q545 1a i 1; 4Q546 2 3; 4Q547 9 10	- Father	- Adds shape to Amram's kinship connections in the opening genealogical sequence (4Q545 1a i 1)	- Demonstrates kinship commitment through participation in ancestral burial event (4Q544 1 1) - Leaves Amram to complete burial on his own (4Q546 2 3) - Appears in a genealogical sequence alongside Miriam (4Q547 9 10)
Uzziel	4Q545 1a i 5	- Brother	- Gives shape to Amram's kinship commitment through endogamous union with Miriam (4Q545 1a i 1)	- Notably participates in an uncle/niece union (4Q545 1a i 5)
Yochebed	4Q547 1-2 6	- Wife	- Contributes to Amram's primary expression of kinship commitment through endogamy (4Q547 1-2 6)	

As the above table illustrates, Amram intersects with a broader network of characters across the narrative of VA. These individuals and Amram's interactions with them provide notable contour to various aspects of his developing profile. Over the course of our subsequent exploration of

Amram's profile of identity in VA, we will at times pick up on the significance of select figures from the above table. We will at times use some of the included observations as departure points in further elucidating aspects of Amram's developing identity profile.

Working off the above introductory content, we will now turn to our primary exploration of the figure of Amram in VA and his profile of Jewish identity.

4.3 Amram's Profile of Jewish Identity in VA

As was the case with the preceding figures of Levi and Qahat, the figure of Amram develops a distinct profile of identity across the narrative of VA. This occurs through the different ways he engages or cultivates an association with a series of ideas and concepts. As he appears in various circumstances and alongside some of the abovementioned figures, we see his profile take shape in his actions, his words, and his various interactions. As in the cases of Levi and Qahat, and as I outlined in my introduction, my intention is not to create an exhaustive catalogue of every possible angle or facet of Amram's profile of identity. Instead, I will once again aim to identify and consider what seem to be a complex of key features pertaining to the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space*.³⁶

In what follows, we will consider the figure of Amram in VA in relation to each of these concepts. We will focus on identifying and exploring some of the notable ways in which Amram intersects with these concepts. We will look to build upon past observations and provide greater precision as to the nature and contours of these intersections towards developing for him a more comprehensive profile of Jewish identity. We will begin with the concept of *kinship*, to which we now turn.

³⁶ For more on my bases for selecting these concepts, see the introductory chapter.

4.3.1 Kinship

Kinship appears to reflect a foundational aspect of Amram's identity in VA. We see this on various occasions throughout the composition. An initial indication of this appears in that on a relational level our predominant acquaintance with Amram is in kinship terms. Amram is a son.³⁷ He is a brother.³⁸ He is a husband.³⁹ He is a father.⁴⁰ Yet he is more than that.

He is not only a brother, but more specifically an older brother.⁴¹ He is also not only a son, but he is also a grandson.⁴² He is a nephew.⁴³ He is a cousin.⁴⁴ He is not only a father, but a father to sons.⁴⁵ He is a father to a daughter.⁴⁶ He is a father-in-law.⁴⁷ And he is a future grandfather/great-grandfather.⁴⁸

³⁷ I.e., “Amram, son of Qahat” (עמרם בֶּרְ קַהַת) (4Q545 1a i 1; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 1); “my father, Qah[at] (ת) אבי קה[ת]” (4Q546 2 3); “Amram, my son” (עמרם ברי) (4Q542 1 ii 9).

³⁸ I.e., “Uzziel, his younger brother” (עוזיאל אחוהי זעריא) (4Q545 1a i 5; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5).

³⁹ I.e., “I did [not] take anoth[er] wife [to myself]” (וְאֵנָה אַנְתָּה אַחֲרֵי לִי) (4Q544 1 8; cf. 4Q543 4 4; 4Q547 1–2 7); “I beheld the face of my wife” (וְאֵנָה אַנְפִּי אַנְתָּתִי) (4Q544 1 9); cf. ALD 75 (“And Amram took a wife for himself, Yochebed, my daughter” (וְאֵנָה אַנְפִּי אַנְתָּתִי לְיֹכֶבֶד בְּרַתִּי) (ms A, Camb. d, 7 8).

⁴⁰ I.e., “Mir[i]am, his daughter” (לְמִרְיָם בְּרַתָּהּ) (4Q545 1a i 5; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 6); “Aaron, his son” (אַהֲרֹן לְבֵרָה) (4Q545 1a i 8); “my son, to Malakiya (Moses)” (בְּרִי לְמַלְאכִיָּה) (4Q545 1a i 9).

⁴¹ I.e., “Uzziel his younger brother” (עוזיאל אחוהי זעריא) (4Q545 1a i 5; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5).

⁴² I.e., “Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi (עמרם בֶּרְ קַהַת בֶּרְ לֵוִי) (4Q545 1a i 1; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 1); “to bury our father” (לְמַקְבֵּר אֲבֵהֶתָנָא) (4Q545 1a–b ii 12).

⁴³ I.e., “my uncle” (דָּדִי) (4Q545 1a–b ii 14).

⁴⁴ I.e., “the sons of my uncle” (בְּנֵי דָדִי) (4Q545 1a–b ii 14).

⁴⁵ I.e., “his sons” (בְּנוֹהֵי) (4Q543 1a–c 2; cf. 4Q545 1a i 2); “my son” (בְּרִי) (4Q543 16 4?); “my son” (בְּרִי) (4Q545 1a i 9); “his father” (אֲבוּהֵי) (4Q545 1a i 12?); “my son” (בְּרִי) (4Q546 14 1?); “my sons” (בְּנֵי) (4Q546 14 4?).

Although not all the present references to the status of sonship have an explicit connection to Amram, based upon the wider portrayal of Amram within these traditions, these references seem to have a probable connection to Amram as a figure. It is uncertain, however, if these refer to his sons, or merely give shape to some of his wider kinship connections. Furthermore, some of the explicit references to sons not only include his male progeny, but also include his daughter, Miriam (i.e., 4Q543 1a–b 2).

⁴⁶ I.e., “Mir[i]am, his daughter” (לְמִרְיָם בְּרַתָּהּ) (cf. 4Q543 1a–c 6).

⁴⁷ I.e., “And he too]k for himself Mir[i]am, his daughter as a wife” (וְאֵנָה אַנְפִּי לְאֵנָה) (4Q545 1a i 5–6; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5–6; 4Q546 1 4).

⁴⁸ I.e., “his sons after him” (וּבְנוֹהֵי בְתֵרָה) (4Q547 9); “and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants” (וְ[ב]נֵיכֶם{א} הֵ) (4Q542 1 ii 10).

In one way, these added details perhaps only represent mere extensions of some of the primary kinship aspects of Amram's profile within these traditions. Yet these extensions are significant in that they further seem to underscore the importance of kinship for him as a figure. This is especially evident in that apart from the mention of a possible individual intersection with a servant figure and an extended engagement with a pair of otherworldly figures, which we will subsequently explore, each of Amram's relationships with individual figures in VA represent some type of kinship connection.⁴⁹

The importance of these kinship connections for Amram is further apparent in the ways in which these different individual relationships come together to form a type of kinship network. This kinship network repeatedly appears as a point of reference for Amram's identity throughout the composition. The significance of individual relationships often appears in view of this wider network. Amram's status as Qahat's son, for example, is mentioned in view of Qahat's preceding connection to his father, Levi.⁵⁰ These individual and intersecting kinship relationships offer an initial indication of the importance of kinship for Amram in VA.

4.3.1.1 *Kinship: Ancestral Commitment*

The importance of kinship for Amram further develops through some of his primary actions in VA. One place we see this is in the tradition of his participation in an ancestral burial event

⁴⁹ Amram's engagement with a servant figure appears in the phrase: "a man and from our servants" (גבר ומן עבדתנא) (4Q544 1 2; cf. 4Q545 1a-b ii 14-15).

⁵⁰ I.e., "Amram, son of Qahat, son of Levi" (עמרם בר קהת בר לוי) (4Q545 1a i 1; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 1). On other occasions the significance of Amram's identity appears to be closely tied to his connections to the wider Levitical family (ALD 74) (ms A, Camb. d, 7 5-6). Furthermore, when Qahat individually instructs Amram, he undertakes his instruction with a notable emphasis on its implications for their wider kinship network ("And now, to you, Amram, my son, I comma[nd..] and your [des]cendants and their [des]cendants, I command[...] and they gave to Levi, my father, and my father Levi to me[...]") (וְכַעַן לְכָה עִמָּרָם בְּרִי אֲנִי מִפְקָד[...]. וְ[ב]נֵיב[א] הֵו[ל] בְּנִי הוּן אֲנִי מִפְקָד[...]. וְיִהְיוּ לִי אֲבִי וְלֵוִי אֲבִי לִי [...]) (4Q542 1 ii 9-11).

(4Q545 1a–b ii 11–15; cf. 4Q544 1 1–2; 4Q546 2 2).⁵¹ The fact that Amram appears within this ancestral focussed scene seems to reinforce his apparent concern for the notion of kinship. Yet the importance of kinship for Amram is particularly apparent in his disposition and actions within the scene itself. As I indicated in the above overview, Amram takes on a more substantial role within this ancestral burial event compared to many of his relatives (4Q544 1 2–3; cf. 4Q545 1a–b ii 17; 4Q546 2 2).⁵² Unlike others who depart at the threat of war, Amram remains seemingly to complete the intended task (4Q545 1a–b ii 17–19; cf. 4Q543 3 1; 4Q544 1 3–4; 4Q546 2 3–4).⁵³ In doing so, he appears to demonstrate the considerable lengths he is willing to go to honor individuals within his wider kinship network, especially in light of the potential implications of being shut outside of Egypt and separated from his wife (4Q545 1a–b ii 16–17; cf. 4Q544 1 2–3) (4Q544 1 5–6; cf. 4Q547 1–2 4–5).⁵⁴ These actions seem to showcase his deep value for the notion of kinship through a commitment to past ancestral figures.

Amram’s distinct concern for kinship within this ancestral burial tradition preserved in the Aramaic writings becomes even more apparent when we consider it alongside versions of this tradition preserved in some of the wider Second Temple materials. While various later

⁵¹ I.e., “And I went up to b[ury...Qahat there...] to bury our fathers. And I went up [...] to rise, settle and build [...] many from the sons of my uncle together[...a man and from...] our servants[...a g]reat ma[n], until...[...dead[...]]” בארעא דא וסלקת למקבר [...] למקבר אבהתנא ולסקת [...] קחת תמן] למקום ולעמרה ולמבנא ק[... שגיאין מן בני דדי (4Q545 1a–b ii 11–15; cf. 4Q544 1 1–2; 4Q546 2 2).

⁵² I.e., “So I went up to bury[...] hastily. But they did not build the graves of their [f]athers” [וסלקת לעובע ולה בנו (קבריא די א] בהתהון (4Q544 1 2–3; cf. 4Q545 1a–b ii 17; 4Q546 2 2). Several scholars have observed this elevated role when compared to wider traditions that seemingly preserve this same burial scene. See, for example, Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 231–50, esp. 232, 235. Goldman notes that Amram’s elevated role is apparent in that he takes on a similar role to Joseph’s participation in Jacob’s burial in Genesis 50. See also, James C. VanderKam, “‘Jubilees’ 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram,” *DSD* 17.2 (2010): 141–58.

⁵³ I.e., “And they left [me, my father, Qahat,...] and to build and to take for them[selves a]ll [their needs fr[om the land of Canaan[...while] we were building” (ושבקו[ני אבי קהת...] ולמבנה ולמסב לה[ון כ] צרכיהון מ[ן] ארע כנען) (4Q545 1a–b ii 17–19) (cf. 4Q543 3 1; 4Q544 1 3–4; 4Q546 2 3–4).

⁵⁴ I.e., “report of war was alarming [...] [to the land [...] hastily ([...] תנא לארע מ[...]] (לעובע ואחידו ג[בולין] מצרין ולא איתי) (4Q545 1a–b ii 16–17; cf. 4Q544 1 2–3); “And the b[orders of] Egypt were shut down and it was not possible[...she may come...]forty-one years. We were not able to [return to Egypt...]” (אפשר[...]תאתה...] שנין ארבעין וחדא ולא הוינה יכלין ל[מתב למצרין...] (4Q544 1 5–6; cf. 4Q547 1–2 4–5).

Second Temple traditions acknowledge the burial of the ancestral figures seemingly referred to in this event, Josephus's *Ant.* and Jubilees stand out in that they offer an account of the burial event itself.⁵⁵ Josephus writes in reference to the figure of Joseph, noting: “at length his brethren died, after they had lived happily in Egypt. Now the posterity and sons of these men, after some time, carried their bodies, and buried them at Hebron.”⁵⁶

Also speaking in the context of the figure of Joseph, Jubilees 46:4–46:11 alternatively seems to preserve this burial tradition as follows:

He died and all his brother and all of that generation. Before he died he ordered the Israelites to take his bones along at the time when they would leave the land of Egypt. He made them swear about his bones because he knew that the Egyptians would not again bring him out and bury him on the day in the land of Canaan, since Makamaron, the king of Canaan,—while he was living in the land of Asur—fought in the valley with the king of Egypt and killed him there. He pursued the Egyptians as far as the gates of Ermon. He was unable to enter because another new king ruled Egypt. He was stronger than he, so he returned to the land of Canaan and the gates of Egypt were closed with no one leaving or entering Egypt. Joseph died in the forty-sixth jubilee, in the sixth week, during its second year [2242]. He was buried in the land of Egypt, and all his brothers died after him. Then the king of Egypt went out to fight with the king of Canaan in the forty-seventh jubilee, in the second week, during its second year [2263]. The Israelites brought out all the bones of

⁵⁵ The traditions preserved in the later writings known as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs note the burial of each Joseph's eleven brothers (T. Sim. 8:2; T. Levi 19:5; T. Zeb. 10:6; T. Ben. 12:1–3; T. Reu. 7:2; T. Jud. 26:4; T. Iss. 7:8; T. Dan 7:2; T. Naph. 9:1; T. Gad 8:4; T. Ash. 8:2). Whether or not these are in fact the those represented in this burial scene is a point of debate in scholarship. See, for example, Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 19.

⁵⁶ *Ant.* 2.199.

Jacob's sons except Joseph's bones. They buried them in the field, in the double cave in the mountain. Many returned to Egypt but a few of them remained on the mountain of Hebron. Your father *Amram* remained with them. The king of Canaan conquered the king of Egypt and closed the gates of Egypt.⁵⁷

Over the history of research, various scholars have identified the presence of this shared tradition within these writings and used this shared tradition as a departure point for various types of investigations including attempts to understand notions of textual priority, as well as in attempts to understand apparent ancient Jewish exegetical engagement with antecedent traditions.⁵⁸ Amidst these efforts, scholars have often noted, to varying degrees, the significance of the alternative depictions of Amram's role in this event in each of these writings.

When we look at these writings, Josephus at most includes Amram among a general reference to "the sons of these men" who orchestrated the burial proceedings. Jubilees goes one step further, but barely. While Jubilees' account of the event is much more robust compared to what we find in Josephus, in that it offers a wider background on the Egyptian-Canaanite war context, Amram only makes a brief appearance in the tradition as among those stranded in Canaan as a result of the Egyptian-Canaanite war (Jub. 46:11).⁵⁹

Alternatively, the tradition preserved in VA casts Amram as not only present within the burial event, but as taking on a central role in orchestrating and undertaking the burial proceedings. Scholars have made a variety of observations about the notable difference in the

⁵⁷ All translations of Jubilees come from James C. VanderKam, trans., *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

⁵⁸ See, for example, Goldman, "The Burial of the Fathers," 231–50; VanderKam, "'Jubilees' 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram," 141–58; Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in Jubilees 46," *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (2005): 135–52, esp. 146–52; Duke, *The Social Location*.

⁵⁹ I.e., "Your father *Amram* remained with them" (Jub. 46:11).

portrayals of Amram within this event. Among these proposals there is commonly an emphasis on the ways in which VA's alternative depiction functions to elevate the notion of endogamous marriage.⁶⁰ Although his presence at the burial event and his resulting absence from his wife seem to demonstrate a concern for endogamy, which we will explore below, his expanded presence at this burial event alone seems significant. When we consider the alternative portraits of Amram, particularly in terms of his participation in the ancestral burial event, his role grows exponentially. He goes from a minor character to the central and leading player, intentionally sacrificing his own comforts and interests for the sake of honoring his ancestors. As Goldman notes, "Despite the war which breaks out in the middle of the enterprise—and which could have easily thwarted its execution—Amram's leadership and dedication assure the accomplishment of the national mission."⁶¹ Amram's presence at this ancestral burial event comes at a cost, as I noted above. Yet while this cost may eventually function to showcase his endogamous convictions, Amram's participation within this ancestral burial alone encourages us first to see his elevated view of his kinfolk in general.

Beyond wider Amram traditions, the DSS capture other figures with notable intersections with burial practices. Tobit represents the most prominent case. Throughout the Tobit narrative the notion of kinship burial gives considerable shape to Tobit's profile. Tobit describes his past

⁶⁰ As VanderKam notes, the traditions preserved in both Jubilees and VA adopt the account of the Egyptian-Canaanite war but do so with considerably different agendas. He goes on to note how Jubilees seems to be much more concerned with using the war in relation to the movement of Joseph's brothers' bones from Egypt to Canaan, whereas VA seems to key in on the war as a means to reinforce Amram's endogamous marriage ethic. He notes that "VA provides an explanation for why Amram and others stayed in Canaan, whereas *Jubilees* notes their remaining behind but not why they did so." He suggests this difference is particularly significant in light of Jubilees' generally prominent interest in endogamy ("Jubilees' 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram," 141–58, here 152). See also, Goldman, "The Burial of the Fathers," 231–50.

⁶¹ Goldman, "The Burial of the Fathers," 237. Perrin further emphasizes Amram's distinct commitment to ancestral burial in view of surrounding threats, observing the following: "The construction of the ancestral tombs at Hebron is disrupted by regional warfare. At the literary level, this serves to underscore the depth of Amram's commitment to ensuring appropriate internments for deceased family members" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

and ongoing commitment to kinship burial, noting the risk of death that he faces for undertaking this practice (Tob 1:16–20; 2:3–8). Beyond his general participation in kinship related burial, we see Tobit develop various burial related practices. He describes his commitment to washing (Tob 2:5) and he mentions practices related to the presentation of graves following burial (Tob 4:17). He develops burial as a part of the tradition he transmits to his children (Tob 4:4; 14:10). He experiences otherworldly revelation that confirms his burial practice as a demonstration of his faithfulness to the Lord (Tob 12:12–14). We also see the effectiveness of Tobit’s instruction on kinship burial in that Tobias his son carries forward a similar burden (Tob 6:15).

Several scholars have previously picked up on the shared ancestral burial interest between Amram and Tobit. While these engagements have tended to focus on understanding the purpose of ancestral burial for these overall compositions, several of their comments are relevant for our figure focused engagement. Goldman, for example, considers some of the intersections between Amram and Tobit, and argues that for Tobit ancestral burial appears as an ideal whereas for Amram it represents a functional preference for wider narrative interests.⁶² While for our present investigation I am less interested in the wider narrative purpose of ancestral burial, I agree with Goldman as to a notable distinction between the adoption of burial practices for each of these figures. Yet I want to consider a few differences between these portraits to draw out some of the distinctiveness of Amram’s practice.

Like Tobit, Amram develops ancestral burial as part of the tradition that preserves and transmits. They both participate at great risk to themselves. They both experience otherworldly revelation in connection to a burial event—although Tobit’s revelation appears in more direct connection. Unlike Tobit, however, Amram demonstrates little interest in wider burial related

⁶² Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 243.

practices. Although both undertake burial in complicated contexts, Amram appears shows no concern for washing or specific treatment of the graves beyond building them. These differences seem to me less about a sense of ideal vs. functional. Although Amram's approach appears less refined, at least based upon our available evidence, the deep commitment of both appears to demonstrate ancestral burial as a type of ideal, or in our case as an important kinship related feature of identity.⁶³

4.3.1.2 *Kinship: Endogamy*

As I have already alluded to, however, the importance of kinship for Amram further shows up through the notion of endogamy. On several occasions in VA, Amram appears as a strong proponent of endogamous marriage within the confines of a tightly defined kinship network.

One place we see this is with his daughter, Miriam. VA attests to the fact that Miriam adheres to endogamy.⁶⁴ The writing describes how Miriam married Amram's brother, Uzziel (4Q545 1a i 5–6; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5–6; 4Q546 1 4).⁶⁵ While Miriam's endogamous marriage in and of itself does not necessarily reflect an immediate value upon Amram, there are several factors in this scene that seem to indicate his personal endorsement of endogamy.

Perhaps an initial hint of Amram's value of endogamy is in his general presence within the scene of Miriam's betrothal and wedding. While this general presence may be suggestive of his support, Amram seems to offer a couple of indications beyond this of his approval of this endogamous union.

⁶³ For more on ancestral burial as a feature of Tobit's identity, see, Oeming, "Jewish Identity," 545–61.

⁶⁴ For more on the significance of Miriam's endogamous union, see, n. 28 above.

⁶⁵ I.e., "[And he too]k for himself Mir[i]am, his daughter[...] as a wife" (ואס[ב] לה למ[ו]ם ברתה[ה] [...] לאנתה לאנתה) (4Q545 1a i 5–6; cf. 4Q543 1a–c 5–6; 4Q546 1 4).

First, Amram seems to be the one who orchestrates Miriam's betrothal. He appears to be the one who calls on his brother, Uzziel (4Q545 1a i 5; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 5; 4Q546 1 2).⁶⁶ Although the writing does not explicitly indicate that Amram instructed Uzziel to take Miriam as his wife, Uzziel's subsequent actions seem to suggest this to be the case. Following Amram's call to Uzziel, the writing immediately describes how Uzziel takes Miriam as his wife (4Q545 1a i 5-6; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 5-6; 4Q546 1 4).⁶⁷ In this sense Amram appears to play an active role in matchmaking.⁶⁸

Second, Amram does not appear to be a reluctant participant at Miriam's wedding. Rather, speaking of Amram, the writing describes how "he made her a wedding feast for seven [da]ys[...]. And he ate and drank at her wedding feast and rejoiced" (עבד משתותה שבְּעָהָ [יִמְ] אִן) (4Q545 1a i 6-7; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 7). Amram's actions and disposition certainly do not convey a sense of indifference. Instead, they suggest his jubilant support.

Amram's value of endogamy comes into full definition through his marriage to Yochebed.⁶⁹ While this value is perhaps apparent in the basic endogamous makeup of their

⁶⁶ I.e., "And he sent... and called Uzziel his younger brother" (ושלח[...]. וקרא לעוזיאל אחוהי זעירא) (4Q545 1a i 5; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 5; 4Q546 1 2).

⁶⁷ I.e., "[And he too]k for himself Mir[i]am, his daughter[...] as a wife" (ואסב לה למר[י]ם ברתה[...]. לאנתה לאנתה) (4Q545 1a i 5-6; cf. 4Q543 1a-c 5-6; 4Q546 1 4).

⁶⁸ Others have noted the active role Amram plays in Miriam's wedding. Høgenhaven, for example, noted that "as his final active achievement, he has arranged for and celebrated his daughter Miriam's wedding to a family member." While I disagree with Høgenhaven's apparent reading of this as part of Amram's final living contribution rather than as a recollected event, his observation about Amram's active role remains important ("Geography," 119). Jurgens too, identified Amram's active function in this wedding event. He notes that "the usage of the *aphel* of the verb *נסב* in reference to Amram's presentation of Miriam to Uzziel implies that this marriage was arranged and initiated by Amram himself, and suggests that Amram personally selected Uzziel as Miriam's spouse." He goes on to say that "Amram's hand in the arrangement of Uzziel and Miriam's marriage exhibits his own dedication to the principle of endogamous marriages within the Levitical circle, a dedication which reappears on the part of Amram later in the text" ("Reassessing the Dream-Vision," 13, 16).

⁶⁹ Beyond VA, ALD reinforces wider scribal perceptions of Amram as an icon of endogamy. ALD picks up on Amram's marriage to Yochebed. Initially we see Amram's embrace of endogamy in the tradition preserved in ALD. Levi describes how "Amram took a wife for himself, Yochebed, my daughter" (וְנָסַב לָהּ עִמְרָם אֵנְתָא לְיוֹכֶבֶד בְּרַתִּי) (ALD 75) (ms A, Camb. d, 7 8). In this case the emphasis on Yochebed as part of the Levitical family, specifically as Levi's daughter, seems to be a key point of emphasis within the tradition. This is perhaps compounded by the fact that Levi's acknowledgment of Amram and Yochebed's union falls as a part of a wider effort to delineate the

relationship, the most apparent indication of the importance of endogamy for him takes shape not in their initial union, but in events that seemingly follow. When Amram finds himself stranded outside the borders of Egypt for a period of forty-one years (4Q544 1 5–6; cf. 4Q547 1–2),⁷⁰ beyond describing the basic nature of the conflict, his primary focus centers on his wife (4Q544 1 7–8; 4Q547 1–2 4–7).⁷¹ Amram’s depiction of the event narrows in on certain aspects of his relationship to Yochebed. He emphasizes his longing for her and his hopes of returning to her (4Q544 1 9; cf. 4Q547 1–2 8).⁷² Yet beyond those details of their relationship, Amram’s language within the scene simultaneously seems to key in on his unwillingness to marry another woman during that period (4Q544 1 8; cf. 4Q543 4 4).⁷³ While we could perhaps read this scene as an attempt to portray the full extent of Amram’s isolation during this extended period in Canaan, the apparent reference to “women” (נְשִׁי) (4Q544 1 8) following the mention of his wife, seems to indicate that the primary concern in this scene is regarding his endogamous commitment, and with that his underlying value of kinship.

Perrin confirms the importance of this event for demonstrating Amram’s endogamous commitment. The way he sees it, “Amram’s fidelity to Yochebed in the face of danger, distance, and a long duration of separation are no mere romantic flare for narrative effect—the statement here underscores his commitment to maintaining an endogamous marriage at all costs.”⁷⁴

apparent kinship purity of his own genealogical sequence. Whatever Levi’s take on the matter, Amram appears as a proponent of endogamy based upon his selection of Yochebed as his bride.

⁷⁰ I.e., “And the b[orders of] Egypt were shut down and it was not possible[...she may come...] forty-one years. We were not able to [return to Egypt...]” (נְשִׁי מִצְרַיִם וְלֹא אִתִּי אִפְשָׁר [...]תֵּאֲתָה...) שְׁנַיִם אַרְבַּעִין וְחֹדֶשׁ וְלֹא נִוְיָהּ לְכַלֵּין) (4Q544 1 5–6; cf. 4Q547 1–2).

⁷¹ I.e., “Now, [through al]l th[is, Yochebed, [my] wif[e...]] she was not” (וְעַתָּה לְכָל דֶּן יוֹכְבֵד) (4Q544 1 7–8); “[...]she may come [...]to return to Egypt [...] through all this, Yochebed [my wife...]” (לְכָל דֶּן יוֹכְבֵד לְמִצְרַיִם) [...]תֵּאֲתָהּ [...] (4Q547 1–2 4–7).

⁷² I.e., “everything that I may return to Egypt safely. And I beheld the face of my wife...” (כּוֹלָא דִּי אֶתּוּב לְמִצְרַיִם) (4Q544 1 9; cf. 4Q547 1–2 8).

⁷³ I.e., “But I did [not] take anot[her] wife [to myself]” (וְאִנְּהָ אֶתְּ רִי לִי לֹא נִסְבֵּיתִי) (4Q544 1 8; cf. 4Q543 4 4).

⁷⁴ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

In review of both of these marriage related events, Jurgens underscores the overall importance of endogamy for VA, and for our purposes, the figure of Amram. He writes:

Thus it appears that the Vision of Amram contains two episodes that highlight the importance of an endogamous marriage—the marriage of Miriam to Uzziel and Amram’s marriage to Jochebed. In many ways, it seems that the author has intentionally placed these relationships in the forefront in order to emphasize the importance of Amram’s adherence to the principle of endogamous relationships and, in turn, to maintain a pure Levitical line both in his marriage to Jochebed and in the procreation of their descendants.⁷⁵

4.3.1.3 Amram and Kinship

In the above analysis, we worked to capture a more nuanced portrait of Amram’s intersections with kinship. Towards this end, we build upon select past scholarly impressions of the intersections between Amram and the concept of kinship.

We first looked at some of the high-level intersections that existed between Amram and kinship and we identified a notable network of kinship connections that develop across the narrative for Amram and the ways in which their significance seems to compound through a series of interrelated realities. Among these realities we explored Amram’s ancestral commitment, noting especially his commitment to ancestral burial. To develop the contours of Amram’s ancestral commitment through burial practices, we noted intersections with broader Amram traditions, as well as wider contemporary traditions that elevate the importance of burial, most notably Tobit. We then explored Amram’s kinship intersections through the notion of

⁷⁵ Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 22.

endogamy and brought together some of the more notable expressions of his commitment to endogamy.

This exploration of Amram and kinship in VA allowed us to develop the portrait of its intersections with him as a figure. Through this process we were able to work off perceptions of past scholarship as to Amram's intersections with kinship towards greater precision in our understanding of kinship as a feature of his identity. We will now proceed to consider the concept of *tradition* as a feature of Amram's identity.

4.3.2 Tradition

The concept of tradition develops as another notable aspect of Amram's profile in VA. As in the cases of Levi and Qahat, the idea of tradition represents a core set of virtues transmitted from one generation to the next. This notion of tradition develops into a notable aspect of Amram's identity in three primary ways. First, Amram takes on a robust and multi-faceted instructional profile. Second, he repeatedly seems to engage only a very select audience in his instructional efforts. And finally, he distinguishes the nature of this tradition by appearing to transmit a distinct set of core virtues.

4.3.2.1 *A Robust and Multi-Faceted Instructional Profile: Verbal, Written, Modelled*

Amram's elevation of the concept of tradition occurs in large part through the way in which he not only develops an important association with the notion of instruction, but seemingly develops a robust instructional profile. If we look at the various instances in which Amram seems to participate in instruction, this development appears to happen in a few different ways. Amram is

no “one trick pony.” He demonstrates a multi-faceted approach to teaching that seems to further elevate the importance of tradition as part of his profile of identity.

One feature of Amram’s multi-faceted instruction is verbal instruction. Amram is a teacher who instructs through spoken discourse, which seems to take shape in a few key instances throughout the composition. Perhaps the first indication of this feature appears in the opening lines of the composition. As part of an overview of its contents, VA describes itself in relation to Amram, as capturing “A copy of “The Writing of the Words of the Vision(s) of Amram, son of [Qahat, son of Levi.” All that] he told his sons and that he commanded them on...[...]” (פרשגן מלי הזות עמרם ברן [קהת בר לוי כול] אחוי לבנוהי ודי פקד אנון ב) (4Q543 1a i 1–2; cf. 4Q545 1a i 1–2). The phrase “All that] he told his sons and that he commanded them” conveys that Amram instructs his children by both telling (“he told” [אחוי]) and commanding them (“he commanded” [פקד]).⁷⁶

Following this initial allusion to Amram as a type of verbal instructor, we see him embody this instructional approach on a few different occasions throughout the composition. Perhaps the most apparent examples of this show up in two primary scenes. The first place we see Amram taking up this form of verbal instruction occurs seemingly on the heels of his daughter, Miriam’s wedding, which we explored in greater detail in the above section on kinship. Following the wedding (4Q545 1a i 7–8; cf. 4Q543 1a i 7–8),⁷⁷ Amram gathers his children

⁷⁶ Perrin also picks up on this language as indicative of the spoken nature of Amram’s instruction. He notes the following about this phrase: “this context-setting element of the title underscores that Amram’s words were also discursive and directed at his offspring. The emphasis on this instruction as commanding, פקד, is also noteworthy as this verb functions across the Aramaic Levi, Qahat, and Amram materials to express the ongoing instruction of inherited lore through the priestly generations” (Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

⁷⁷ I.e., “Then when the days of the wedding feast were completed” (אדין כדי אשתציו [י]ומי משתותא) (4Q545 1a i 7–8; cf. 4Q543 1a i 7–8).

around him (4Q545 1a i 8–10; cf. 4Q543 1a i 8–10).⁷⁸ He then proceeds to relay onto them a series of verbal instructions, which he couches in a sequence of statements in the second-person voice (4Q543 2a–b 1–8; cf. 4Q545 1a i 10–19).⁷⁹ This includes the phrases, “your command” (ממרד) (4Q543 2a–b 1); “and he gave you” (ונתן לך) (4Q543 2a–b 1); “he gave you wisdom” (ונתן לך חכמה) (4Q543 2a–b 2); “of God you will be” (אל תהוה) (4Q543 2a–b 4); “the messenger of God you will be called” (מלאך אל תתקרה) (4Q543 2a–b 4); “you will do in this land, and judgment” (תעבר בארעא דא ודין) (4Q543 2a–b 5); “your name for all” (שמך לכל) (4Q543 2a–b 6); “in it you will do” (בִּיה תעבד) (4Q543 2a–b 8).

A second place we see Amram provide verbal instruction shows up in the scene preserved in 4Q546 14. The fragmentary nature of this section of material means that both the exact context of this address and the speaker in question are not certain. Yet as I alluded to above, certain aspects in this section of material seem to indicate that Amram is the likely

⁷⁸ I.e., “he sent a summons to Aaron, his son, who was [...] years [...] [...] to him, ‘Call for me my son, to Malakiya, your brothers from the house of [...]...over him, call him” (שלה קרא לאהרון לברה כ[מ] א[מ] בר שנין) (4Q545 1a i 8–10; cf. 4Q543 1a i 8–10). While the question of which of his children are present in this instructional setting has been a subject of debate, we can seemingly confirm Aaron and Moses’s presence at the very least. For those who read both Aaron and Moses into this scene, see, for example, Duke, “Moses’ Hebrew Name,” 40; Høgenhaven, “Geography,” 127–28. Cf. Holly Pearce, “The Guide and the Seducer,” who reads only Aaron in this scene. Aaron’s name is clearly mentioned, while Duke’s observation alongside the work of Beyer as to the Hebrew name of Moses being “Malakiya” seems to also confirm his presence (“Moses’ Hebrew Name,” 34–48; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*, 118–19). Although Amram does not explicitly include Miriam in this summons we cannot rule out her presence. This is largely due to the fragmentary nature of the text. Yet the immediately preceding context to which the summons occurs, that being Miriam’s wedding, makes her potential presence not unlikely (on the inclusion of Miriam in this scene, and perhaps even a wider group of descendants, see, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). Since, however, the gap in time between the end of the wedding and the summons is admittedly not clear, her presence at the wedding may be of little consequence for the instruction scene. All that we know is that Amram summoned his children “when the days of the wedding feast were completed” (4Q545 1a i 7–8). Whether this instruction took place immediately following the wedding or at some later date is not entirely clear. The fact that Moses is no longer present at the event and seemingly requires summoning “from the house of” (מן בית) (4Q545 1a i 9) someone/something, may suggest a larger gap in time between the official end of the wedding and the instructional event.

⁷⁹ In view of the fragmentary nature of the text, the exact identities of the second-person addressees in this section are not entirely apparent. The preceding summons to Amram’s children and the naming of both Aaron and Moses (“Malakiya”), however, gives us strong reason to read the following words as an address to his children.

speaker. Perhaps the strongest indication of this is the mention of the phrase “I saw” (חזית) (4Q546 14 5) within the section. While this phrase does not explicitly confirm Amram as the speaker, Amram’s predominant profile in relation to dream-visions and his repeated experience of “seeing” within the wider composition offers a strong basis for identifying him as the speaker in this scene.⁸⁰ In terms of the instructional nature of this scene, Amram again seems to engage his hearers with verbal instruction. This is apparent in that he calls his children to “hear” (שמעו) (4Q546 14 4). He then appears to couple this call to “hear” with a series of instructional insights and commands (4Q546 14 2–3).⁸¹

Alongside spoken instruction, we see on a couple of occasions in VA that Amram’s instructional profile includes the medium of writing. As in the case of verbal instruction, we see this flagged at the outset of the composition. It attributes writing to the figure of Amram by describing itself as “The Writing of the Words of the Vision] (s) of Amram” (כתב מלי הזוהת עמרם) (4Q543 1a i 1; cf. 4Q545 1a i 1).

Unlike verbal instruction, however, which develops within various narrative events in the composition, the notion of writing as an instructional medium appears more seldom. While allusions to writing in general occur on a few occasions throughout VA (4Q545 4 15; 4Q546 20 2), which we will explore below under the notion of “Revelation”, there is only one instance beyond the main title that casts Amram’s writing as part of his instructional strategy. However, as scholars often remark in studies based upon fragmentary data sets, the lack of emphasis on written instruction here in VA may simply be due to the partial view that the material culture

⁸⁰ I.e., 4Q543 5–9 4, 6; 4Q544 1 10, 12–13, 14; 4Q546 14 5; 4Q547 1–2 9; 4Q547 9 8. Perrin also observes the mention of “I saw” (חזית) as indicative of this material as referring to Amram, (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

⁸¹ I.e., “you will know” [תגידו] (4Q546 14 2); “do not open your house” (אל פתח ביתך) (4Q546 14 3).

affords us.⁸² Despite the limited references to written instruction, however, writing appears to be an important feature of Amram's instructional profile given the description in the opening title. And, when we consider this sole reference to writing in the narrative, the significance of the mention of writing as an instructional medium becomes increasingly apparent.

Amram's sole reference to writing in the narrative, as a type of instructional medium, appears at the close of his dream-vision while in the land of Canaan. He describes how "I woke from the sleep of my eyes and inscribed the vision" ([...] וואנה אתעירת מן שנת עיני וחזוא כתב[ת...]) (4Q547 9 8). While writing in this instance does not immediately appear as a medium of instruction, this depiction of Amram recording the contents of his dream-vision takes on greater significance in view of the opening line of the composition. The composition suggests itself to be "a cop[y of "The Writing of the Words of the Vision](s) of Amram" (פרשגן כתב מלי הזות עמרם) (4Q543 1a i 1). As Perrin observes, this phrase "essentially connects the title of the work with a purported writing inscribed by Amram himself within the narrative."⁸³ In this sense, Amram's choice of writing upon awakening from his dream-vision is not merely an artistic flourish of color within the narrative. Rather, through this action writing becomes a critical aspect of his instruction in that it functions as both the means of preserving major aspects of the tradition he seeks to transmit, and a key means of perpetuating it to a wider audience in the future.⁸⁴

Although verbal discourse and writing get pride of place in the opening self-description of VA (4Q543 1a i 1–2; 4Q545 1a i 1–2), Amram demonstrates a third significant facet of instruction in the composition, modelled instruction, which arguably represents an equally

⁸² For more on the limitations of VA's fragmentary text, see, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁸³ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁸⁴ For more on the importance of writing as a medium of transmission, see Reed, "Textuality between Death and Memory," 381–412.

significant means of transmission. While modelled instruction certainly overlaps and intersects with the mediums of verbal and written instruction, it simultaneously represents an instructional form in and of itself.

We see this through the ways in which Amram participates in the opening wedding scene (4Q543 1a–b 5–7), in his post-wedding instruction (4Q543 1a–c; 4Q543 2a–b; 4Q545 1a i 7–19), through his participation in the ancestral burial event (4Q543 3; 4Q544 1 1–7; 4Q545 1a–b ii 9–19; 4Q546 2), his extended stay in Canaan (4Q543 4; 4Q544 1 5–9; 4Q547 1–2 4–8), during this dream-vision experience (4Q543 3; 4Q543 5–9; 4Q544 1 9–14; 4Q544 2–3; 4Q547 1–2 9–13), in his actions upon waking from that dream-vision (4Q547 9 8–9), and seemingly in a variety of places in between. Goldman, in her exploration on the burial tradition included in VA, emphasized the importance of a modelled form of instruction in VA. She writes that “rather than beginning his account to his sons on his deathbed with his journey to Canaan, Amram outlines for them the way they should follow—imitation of their father so that they may deliver their people.”⁸⁵

In view of Goldman’s comments, we can see in each of these occasions, how Amram rounds out his instructional profile by presenting himself as a model of the tradition he seeks to transmit. He instructs not by primarily referencing the actions of past figures or past events—although past-figures do seem to play an important role in the development of his identity profile—but primarily in reference to himself.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 237–8. Perrin further emphasizes the importance of modelled instruction. He writes, “while VA does not include patriarchal discourses underscoring the essential of endogamy, it achieves this emphasis by providing models of endogamy in the lives of exemplary figures from the past” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

⁸⁶ For more on the importance of past figures, see, for example, Høgenhaven, who observes: “through the references to the well-known patriarchal narratives and the location of the narrative in Canaan the author of VA creates a familiar setting which supports the authority of the vision account, linking it to the authority of the biblical figures. Furthermore, the geographical reference serves to assimilate Amram to the patriarchs. In this way, VA achieves an upgrading of the relatively peripheral figure of Moses’ father to a significant figure of authority. Not only is Amram

4.3.2.2 *A Selective Cross-Generational Audience*

The importance of tradition for Amram further takes shape through the audiences he chooses to instruct or those which the wider composition associates his instruction with.

There are a few occasions in VA where we gain a sense of the intended recipients of this instruction. We first see this in the opening lines of the composition which conveys the intended audience as “his (Amram’s) sons” (בְּנוֹתָי) (4Q543 1a–c 2). As the narrative unfolds, we again see a specific audience named in the instructional segment following Miriam’s wedding. On this occasion it is Amram who identifies the audience as his children. This seems to include Aaron and Moses (“Malakiya”) (מְלָאכִיָּה) (4Q545 1a i 9) at the very least. Further, when we look at the other apparent instructional segment in 4Q546 14, which we connected with Amram above, he again names the intended recipients of his instruction as “my son” (בְּעֵן בְּרִי) (4Q546 14 1) and “my sons” (בְּנֵי) (4Q546 14 4).

Although VA only offers a few depictions of the intended audiences of Amram’s instruction, these audiences seem to provide insights into Amram’s developing instructional profile. If we consider each of these instructional audiences, each seem to emphasize the importance of a kinship connection. In this sense VA seems to underscore the intentionality and care behind the audiences of both Amram’s instructional practice and the subsequent instructional writing associated with him. This care and concern further seem to demonstrate the wider importance of the notion of tradition for Amram.

firmly associated with his sons Moses and Aaron and his daughter Miriam, he also appears as a direct successor in the line of the authoritative patriarchs” (“Geography,” 125).

4.3.2.3 *A Core Set of Virtues*

The notion of tradition further develops as a notable feature of Amram's profile in that he not only develops a multi-faceted instructional profile and delimits a specific group as a legitimate receiving audience, but he also focusses his instruction on a distinct set of core virtues. In this sense, Amram is not merely interested in a general practice of instruction or simply concerned with engaging a specific audience, but also in the transmission of specific content. This final reality situates Amram's audience-specific instruction well within the realm of tradition, as *a core set of virtues* transmitted from one generation to the next.

As we have suggested thus far, Amram's instruction takes on a multi-faceted form consisting of verbal, written, and modelled features. He solely directs this instruction at a tightly defined kinship group. The core virtues that Amram seeks to transmit and perpetuate include: 1) a deep commitment to kinship, demonstrated in his relational image, the practices of endogamy, and ancestral burial practices; 2) a deep value for revelation, captured in his multi-layered revelatory profile and extensive revelatory knowledge; 3) a keen concern for specific features of time and space, as well as some other more subtle items. We have already explored item number one above, and we will explore the subsequent items below. Since the surrounding survey explores each of these items in considerable depth, we will forgo addressing them here. Yet one additional core virtue underlying his vision of tradition bears further mentioning.

This virtue pertains to the notion of instruction itself. We noted above some of the various virtues that Amram emphasizes through the course of his instruction. Yet the very the notion of Amram as an instructional figure represents an important point of instruction and a critical embodied virtue. As an instructional figure Amram models a virtue of instructing to instruct. Or in other words, the importance of developing a culture of instruction, one which

perpetuates a value of instruction as an essential feature of identity. While Amram does not explicitly state the importance of adopting a practice of instruction in quite the way as other figures in the wider Aramaic DSS traditions (i.e., Qahat; Levi), Amram repeatedly embodies this virtue. We see this in the opening title that emphasizes Amram as an instructional figure (4Q543 1a–c 2; cf. 4Q545 1a i 2), and we further see this in him instructing his children (4Q543 1a–c 9; 4Q543 2a–b 1–8; cf. 4Q545 1a i 9–19; 4Q546 14). While these examples certainly function to highlight the importance of the notion of tradition as cross-generational process of transmitting certain virtues, they simultaneously seem to convey a critical virtue regarding the practice of instruction itself. For Amram, his instruction is not merely a functional medium for content transmission, it is representation of a much larger underlying virtue about instruction itself as a critical feature of his identity.

4.3.2.4 Amram and Tradition

In the above section, we explored some of the notable contours of Amram’s connections to the notion of tradition. Building off frames from our preceding explorations of tradition with the figures of Levi and Qahat, we looked at Amram’s instructional profile. Like Levi and Qahat, we looked at Amram’s adoption of verbal, written, and modelled means of transmitting tradition. In this we identified Amram’s distinct expressions of these forms of transmission. We briefly noted the kinship-based audience that Amram engages in his transmission, demonstrating the intersections and overlap amongst the identity concepts within our study. We briefly highlighted some of the core virtues that Amram acts to transmit under the rubric of tradition yet withheld extensive comment in view of engagement with these items in the subsequent sections. We did,

however, observe the importance of instruction as a virtue. We will now transition to a consideration of Amram's intersections with *revelation*.

4.3.3 Revelation

Revelation represents another significant aspect of Amram's developing persona in VA. The significance of revelation for Amram appears primarily in the way in which he emerges as a prominent revelatory figure over the course of the composition. This occurs in two main ways. First, Amram's revelatory pedigree grows through his association with key revelatory language and a variety of revelatory expressions and experiences. Second, Amram's revelatory profile takes on further contour in view of the extent of revelatory content that he receives. This combination of items results in Amram emerging with a multi-faceted revelatory experience and a robust portfolio of otherworldly insights, all of which underscore revelation as a key feature of his identity.

4.3.3.1 Revelatory Association: Language; Expression and Experience

Through a brief survey of VA, we can quickly see that there is a notable association that develops between Amram and revelatory language. On various instances, VA casts Amram in connection to revelatory terms. The self-given title included in the opening line of the composition foreshadows this reality. As we have noted on several occasions so far, this title reads, “The Writing of the Words of the Vision(s) of Amram, son of [Qahat, son of Levi]” (כתב מלי הזות עמרם ברן קהת בר לוי (4Q543 1a–c 1) (cf. 4Q545 1a i 1). The mention of “vision(s)” (הזות) (4Q543 1a–c 1) in connection to Amram immediately conveys his association with the notion of revelation.

In the subsequent narrative, we see increasingly a connection between Amram and revelatory language. Amram repeatedly speaks in revelatory terms. The fragments preserve the following revelatory related lines in connection with Amram: “[...And] I lifted[...]my eyes and saw” (ואחרנא חזית) (עניי והזית) [ו...] [נטלת] (4Q543 5–9 4); “Then I saw another, and beh[old...] (והאחרנא חזית) (4Q543 5–9 6); “[...And I saw] in my vision, the vision of the dream. *vacat* Behold!” (והא) (4Q544 1 10); “[And I lifted my eyes and saw] [...]the appearance [of one] of them” (ונטלת עניי והזית) [והד...] [מנהון חזוה] (4Q544 1 12–13); “[...Then I saw another,] and behold[...]in his appearance” (ואחרנא חזית) [והא] [בחזוה] (4Q544 1 14); “I saw...[...]” ([...]חזית) (4Q546 14 5); “[...]I saw in the vision” ([...]חזית בחזות) (4Q547 1–2 9); “[...] Then I woke up from the sleep of my eyes and inscribed the vision [...]” ([...]חזית בחזות) (4Q547 9 8).⁸⁷ All of these but the phrase in 4Q546 14 5, seemingly represent words explicitly spoken by Amram. Yet given Amram’s wider revelatory association in the composition, as we noted above, the speaker in 4Q546 14 5 almost certainly represents him as well.

Alongside his general association with revelatory language, it is perhaps also important to see the nature and variety of revelatory expression and experience behind this language. If we consider the nature of Amram’s revelatory experience, we need to look no further than the opening lines of the composition for an initial clue as to VA’s primary conception of revelation. The opening line of the composition begins with an announcement of its self-designated title: “A copy of ‘The Writing of the Words of the Vision(s) of Amram, son of [Qahat, son of Levi]’”

⁸⁷ Some of these phrases may reflect overlapping content from the composition, and therefore may temper the actual breadth of revelatory language connected to Amram. Yet in my opinion, the presentation of all these fragmentary phrases together—despite their overlap—affords us a more complete picture and allows us to get a better sense of the extent of Amram’s association with revelatory language. Yet an awareness of the overlap amongst these fragments remains important as also not to overread Amram’s connection with revelatory language.

(פרשגן כתב מלי הזוּת עֶמְרָם בֶּן־קָהָת בֶּר לֹוִי) (4Q543 1a–c; cf. 4Q545 1a i 1). This initial description alludes to the central importance of some type of visionary experience in relation to Amram.⁸⁸ The importance of this dream-vision experience for Amram becomes increasingly apparent as the narrative unfolds. As I have already alluded to on several occasions, Amram unexpectedly experiences an extended stay in Canaan while participating in an ancestral burial event. It is during this event that this dream-vision experience alluded to in the opening title takes place. At some point in this period in Canaan, Amram describes how “[...And I saw] in my vision, the vision of the dream” (עֵינֵי וְהַזִּית [בְּחֻזֵּי חֻזֵּא דִּי חִלְמָא]) (4Q544 1 9–10; cf. 4Q547 1–2 9).⁸⁹ Amram later reaffirms the nature of this event as a dream-vision at the end of the episode in that he describes how “I woke from the sleep of my eyes and inscribed the vision” (אָנָּה אֶתְעִירָתָּ [מִן שְׁנַת עֵינֵי וְחֻזֵּא כְּתִבָּתָּ]) (4Q547 9 8).

As the dream-vision episode unfolds, Amram makes increasingly apparent the revelatory nature of this event. We will explore the contours of his revelation in greater detail below. For the time being, however, it is perhaps important to consider the significance of the composition casting Amram as receiving revelation through the medium of a dream-vision.

Although from a modern perspective, a dream-vision may not represent an overly apparent point of otherworldly revelation, this was not the case within the ancient Jewish context. As Flannery-Daily notes as part of a larger investigation of dreams in early Judaism:

⁸⁸ By emphasizing the importance of Amram’s dream-vision episode it is not my intention to minimize the wider content preserved in the writing. In a recent article, Jurgens noted that previous tendencies to overemphasize the dream-vision content in VA have at times caused scholars to overread the dream-vision content in their proposals while at the same time underreading the wider content. He suggests this has at times resulted in inaccurate findings (“Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 3–42).

⁸⁹ For more on the specific Canaanite location of the ancestral burial as Hebron, see, for example, Goldman, “The Burial of the Fathers,” 234; Duke, *The Social Location*, 89–122; Høgenhaven, “Geography,” 119–36; Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 19; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern peoples regarded dreams quite differently than do those of us in post-Freudian modern society. Whereas we tend to view dreams as unreal, interior, subjective phenomena, ancient peoples believed that some dreams were genuine visits from deities or their divine representatives. One did not ‘have’ a dream; one ‘saw’ a dream, or a dream ‘met’ or ‘visited’ the dreamer.⁹⁰

Amram’s revelation through the medium of a dream-vision is therefore significant. By casting Amram as someone who experiences dream-visions, particularly ones that provide revelation, as we will soon come to see in greater detail, he develops his revelatory profile in a way that moves beyond some of the previously more common means of revelation in the ancient Jewish context, namely authoritative writings. As Rowland as part of a larger exploration on Apocalyptic in early Judaism and Christianity observed: “The means whereby the divine will was ascertained had a long history in Israel from the lottery of Urim and Thummin to the sophisticated exegetical techniques which were developed by the sages to gain as much advice as possible from the sacred texts.”⁹¹ In this sense, Amram represents an expanding conception of otherworldly revelation. Yet as we will explore below, his simultaneous endorsement of writing allows him to present dream-visions as a supplement to wider conceptions of written revelation, and not simply as something that supersedes it.

Underlying Amram’s dream-vision, however, there appear other notable aspects of his revelatory profile. Within his dream-vision experience itself, Amram seems to demonstrate

⁹⁰ Frances Flannery-Dailey, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*, SJSJ 90 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1. Perrin’s recent monograph on dream-visions in the Aramaic DSS further underscores the significance of dream-visions as a means of revelation. As Perrin demonstrates, Amram’s revelation through a dream-vision maps onto a much larger dream-vision tradition within the ancient Jewish world. (*The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation*). Amram’s experience of the otherworldly sphere through a dream-vision maps onto a much larger tradition of otherworldly engagement within the ancient Jewish world.

⁹¹ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 10.

additional reimaginings of otherworldly revelation. At the outset of Amram’s dream-vision, following a *vacat* in the text, seemingly demonstrating some type of shift in scene, he exclaims, “Behold! Two beings” (הא תריין) (4Q544 1 10).⁹² What seems significant in this description, is the immediacy by which Amram engages the otherworldly realm. While Amram’s account of his dream-vision does not seem to indicate the exact otherworldly context of the episode, the immediacy with which he sees these two figures perhaps suggests a perception of relative proximity between this-worldly and otherworldly realms. This seems important to note in that it appears to contrast other dream-vision experiences such as that of Enoch who undertakes a considerable journey through the cosmos to arrive in an otherworldly context.⁹³ Similarly, as we noted in our earlier investigation of Levi, we perhaps see some type of vertical ascent precede his respective revelatory disclosure (ALD 1b 17–18). As Rowland points out in reference to Enoch’s experience, “such a need to travel to the world above to visions of God contrasts with the biblical visions in which the heavenly journey plays no part.”⁹⁴ This depiction, therefore, may further bolster Amram’s revelatory prowess in that Amram contributes to a growing suite of conceptions regarding access to otherworldly revelation, in this case in terms of proximity.

Perhaps a third notable contour of Amram’s revelatory profile, as hinted above, pertains to writing. While we have noted writing as an important aspect of Amram’s instructional profile, writing also seemingly appears as a notable means of revelation. Above we noted the way in which his dream-visions seem to compliment rather than supersede the conception of revelation through authoritative writings. Although the primary medium of revelation for Amram clearly

⁹² For more on this *vacat* as a scene shift here in VA see, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. For more on the scribal significance of *vacats* in the material text, see Perrin, “Redrafting,” 44–71.

⁹³ See, for example, 1 En. 14:8.

⁹⁴ Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 80.

seems to be through a dream-vision, we get possible indications of the revelatory importance of writing within that context. We perhaps see this on two occasions.

On the first occasion in what appears to be part of an otherworldly disclosure about Amram's children, we get a mention of some notion of writing about Moses.⁹⁵ It reads: "wrote/will write in the land for him, Moses" (כְּתֹב בְּאֶרֶץ לְהַ מֹשֶׁה) (4Q545 4 15). As Perrin previously noted, this phrase seems to convey the idea of something written for Moses, and not by him.⁹⁶ Since this phrase appears as part of an otherworldly disclosure, it may map onto larger ancient Jewish tradition that held that heavenly knowledge was preserved within some form of otherworldly writing.⁹⁷ In view of this, and in view of the high likelihood that this section of otherworldly revelation represents part of Amram's dream-vision, otherworldly writings perhaps appears here as important feature of his revelatory profile.

This possibility seemingly increases with the appearance of a second mention of writing within VA. Within an entirely unknown context, VA records the phrase, "with the tablet" (בְּלוּחִים) (4Q546 20 2). Although the context and its immediate connection to Amram are not clear, the appearance of this term within a larger composition bearing his name makes it

⁹⁵ This first reference seems likely to be part of Amram's otherworldly disclosure in that it seems to capture the sense of providing hidden insights as to the future identities and roles of Amram's children. This seems particularly apparent in that it seems to couch the nature of disclosure in relation to the term, "mystery" (רַ) (4Q545 4 16), seemingly in reference to the figure of Aaron. This maps onto wider notions of otherworldly mysteries and this specific reference as a possible revealing of the otherworldly basis for Aaron's priestly office.

⁹⁶ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming. Høgenhaven also confirms Moses as the object of this phrase. He notes, "the context makes it more natural that Moses is the object of the act of writing. Moses, then, is not the agent, but his future deeds are the subject matter of the revelation granted to Amram, whether the act of 'writing' is, in the mind of the author, carried out by some unknown ancestor, by an angelic being, or even by Amram himself in the form of a written record of his vision: The angel might be instructing him to write the contents of the revelation down, or reminding him of something he was told to write down when he was in Canaan" ("Geography," 131).

⁹⁷ See, for example, 1 En. 14:1; 39:2; 47:3; 69:9–10; 72:1; 81:2, 4; 89:68, 70–71, 76–77; 90:14, 17, 20, 22; 93:2; 97:6; 98:7–8; 103:2–3; 104:1, 7; 106:19; 107:1; 108:3, 7, 10; 4Q529 1 6; 4Q537 1 + 2 + 3 3–5; 4Q541 2 i 6; 7 2–6; 24 ii 3–4; Tob 12:12–13; BG (2Q26 1–3).

noteworthy. As Perrin and others have noted, this reference to “the tablet” may also reflect perceptions of otherworldly revelation as stored in some type of otherworldly writing.⁹⁸

In view of these mentions of writing, although their exact meaning is largely veiled, Amram’s revelatory profile perhaps gain an additional written component.

4.3.3.2 *The Nature and Extent of Revelation*

Through the course of his dream-vision, Amram gains a notable breadth of otherworldly revelation. This revelation comes through basic visual observation as well as through verbal dialogue with otherworldly figures. In the preceding section we considered the notable ways in which Amram develops a considerable revelatory profile. We specifically looked at his connections with revelatory language, appearances in revelatory scenes, and the nature of those appearances. In the following section, we will consider the significance of revelation for the figure of Amram by mapping out some of the contours of the revelatory content he receives. In doing so, we will see the extent of his revelation and consider how that reflects upon his overall relationship with revelation.

4.3.3.2.1 *Revelatory Content: Otherworldly Realities*

One major aspect of Amram’s revelation is in regard to otherworldly realities. Through his dream-vision Amram gains considerable insight into various aspects of the otherworldly realm.

A notable portion of this revelation regarding the otherworldly realm pertains to the two otherworldly figures he encounters at the outset of his dream-vision (4Q544 10).⁹⁹ As this scene

⁹⁸ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

⁹⁹ I.e., “Behold! Two beings” (והא תריני) (4Q544 10).

begins to unfold he observes that the “two beings were disputing above/over me and speaking [...] And they were locked in a great dispute about me” (תרין דאנין עלי ואמרין [דילוהי] ואחדין עלי) (4Q544 1 10–11). While Amram expresses that the dispute in question is about him, the exact nature of the dispute is not immediately evident in the composition.¹⁰⁰

Regardless of the nature of the dispute, the event leads Amram into an inquiry into the nature and identities of these figures. Amram begins by plainly asking the figures, “who are you thus...” (אנתון מן די כדן מש) (4Q544 1 11). One of the figures appears to respond on their collective behalf. The first thing Amram learns about these figures, or at least the first thing that the composition preserves, seems to pertain to their perceived sense of authority or rulership. The figure specifically informs Amram of their apparent authority over humanity (4Q544 1 12).¹⁰¹ The figure seems to specify the extent of their rule in relation to Amram, in that their rule extends even over him (4Q544 2 11).¹⁰²

After this initial disclosure, these figures shift the inquiry towards Amram. They ask him, “which of us are yo[u seeking?]” (אנתה בעה) (4Q544 1 12; cf. 4Q547 1–2 12). The text does not preserve much of any substance of Amram’s response. Yet the conversation seems to shift from Amram generally addressing the group, to a more direct dialogue between him and one of the figures. This is apparent in that the otherworldly figure speaking moves from responding in first-person plural (4Q547 1–2 11 [cf. 4Q543 5–9 2]; 4Q544 1 12) to first-person and third-

¹⁰⁰ There has been considerable debate over the nature of this dispute and its connection to the perceived rule of these figures over humanity. Early on Milik reconstructed a notion of “choice” into this reading (“4Q Visions de ’Amram,” 85), which subsequently gained a considerable following. See, for example, Goldman, “Dualism,” 421; Pearse, “The Guide and the Seducer,” 35; Høgenhaven, “Geography,” 120. Perrin’s recent article, however, raised various issues with this interpretation in view of the early overreliance on reconstructed content (“Another Look,” 107–18).

¹⁰¹ I.e., “[...]and rule over all humanity” (אנתון מן די כדן מש) (4Q544 1 12).

¹⁰² I.e., “[...]rules over you[...]” (עליך [מ...] שלט) (4Q544 2 11).

person singular.¹⁰³ This shift in conversation leads into more extensive descriptions and insights of each otherworldly figure.

As Amram traverses beyond these figures' shared aspects of identity and deeper into their independent identities, he begins with various visual observations. He describes how "I lifted[...]my eyes and saw" (נָטַלְתָּ [...] עֵינַי וְהִזִּיתָ) (4Q543 5–9 4). From there he begins to map out the appearance of the first figure. According to Amram "[...]the appearance [of one] of them was dre[ad]ful [and terrify]ing" (וְאִימָתוֹן) (4Q544 1 13), although the "dre[ad]ful [and terrify]ing" quality of the figure comes from a notably damaged section of text. Amram's interest in the "appearance" (חֲזוּהָ) (4Q544 1 13) of this figure, however, is clear. It is also clear that Amram identifies this figure with darkness. The available text does not disclose the full nature of this figure's dark association, but at least part of its dark appearance derives from his clothing. Speaking of this figure, Amram notes "all] his dyed clothing and pitch darkness[...]" ([...] חֲשׂוּדָא חֲשׂוּדָא) (4Q544 1 13; cf. 543 5–9 5; 4Q547 1–2 13).¹⁰⁴

Against the backdrop of this darkly clad figure, Amram captures the appearance of the second figure (4Q543 5–9 6; cf. 544 1 14).¹⁰⁵ Amram captures three features of this second figure's appearance. He describes, in apparent contrast to the initial figure, the smiling disposition of this second figure (4Q544 1 14; cf. 4Q543 5–9 7).¹⁰⁶ He seems to convey that this

¹⁰³ On the first-person plural voice of the speaker, see, for example, "[...]...to me, "We" (וְאִנְחָנָא) (4Q547 1–2 11; cf. 4Q543 5–9 2); "Which of us" (בְּמִן מִנָּא) (4Q544 1 12).

¹⁰⁴ Duke previously proposed that the dark clothing of this figure perhaps reflects a polemic against the lavish Jerusalem priesthood, yet this proposal has drawn a series of rebuttals in recent years (*The Social Location*, 85–88). See for example, Robert Jones, "Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of Its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem," *DSD* 27.1 (2020): 1–30.

¹⁰⁵ I.e., "Then I saw another, and beh[old...]" (וְאִחֲרָנָא חִזִּית וְהָא) (4Q543 5–9 6; cf. 544 1 14).

¹⁰⁶ I.e., "But his face was smiling ...[...]" ([...] וְאִנְפִּיּוּהָ הָעֵבֶן) (4Q544 1 14; cf. 4Q543 5–9 7). Milik first interpreted this phrase as a continuation of the description of the first figure of darkness. In view of this reading, he interpreted this material as providing this figure with serpent like features ("4Q Visions de 'Amram," 81–82). Later scholars picked up and built on this initial impression and read further snake like features into the text. See, for example, Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 298–99; 322–26; Pearse, "The Guide and the Seducer," 36. In response to this proposal, García Martínez proposed this alternative "smiling" appearance, in view of a sense of an apparent shift in

figure was also notably clad with something (4Q543 5–9 7) although the fragmentary text provides little detail as to the nature of this covering.¹⁰⁷ One feature of this figure that the composition seemingly does disclose, however, pertains to something that sits “ov]er his eyes [...] [...] עיניה; ל[ע...]” [4Q543 5–9 8]. The fragmentary text, however, does not disclose as to what seemingly rests above his eyes although various scholars have provided a variety of proposals.¹⁰⁸

After Amram conveys some of the visual features of these figures, his formal inquiry into their nature and identity appears to continue. Once again, the fragmentary nature of the text inhibits us from gaining a full sense of the contents of the dialogue. Yet within the extant text, we see the inquiry seemingly center around two primary features of these figures: their names and the nature and extent of their respective roles and authorities.

The figure in dialogue with Amram seemingly begins by discussing the identity and nature of the second figure, who appears as Melchiresa (מלכי רשע) (4Q544 2 13). Amram makes some sort of inquiry to the first figure, to which he seemingly responds by outlining the role of the second figure.¹⁰⁹ He describes how “all his work is da[r]k and in the darkness he...[...]” (כל ד עבדה ח[ש] וּבַחשׁוּכָא הוּא ד [4Q544 2 14]). This first figure goes on to convey that this dark

subject within these lines from the first figure to the second figure (“4Q ‘Amram B I, 14: Melki-Reša‘ o Melki-Sedeq?,” *RevQ* 12.1 [1985]: 114). Since then, this interpretation has drawn increasing support among scholars. See, for example, Martone, “A Proposito,” 615–21; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

¹⁰⁷ I.e., “he was covered with[...]” ([...] ומכסה ב) (4Q543 5–9 7).

¹⁰⁸ Scholars have offered different proposals as to what it is in fact that Amram sees above this figure’s eyes. Jurgens for example suggested that this perhaps represented a priestly diadem. He noted that: “considering the priestly nature of Melchizedek outside the Vision of Amram, as well as the association of Melchiresa with a wicked or corrupt priest, it seems altogether possible that the unknown object above Melchizedek’s eyes may be the inscribed diadem of the High Priest, an essential accoutrement for the practice of priestly cult and entrance into the presence of the God (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.331)” (“Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 37). While such a proposal is intriguing, Perrin recently offered a reminder of the wider world of possibilities as to what might rest above an individual’s eyes, noting that this might allude to the otherworldly figure’s flowing locks. Perrin anchored this proposal in wider ancient Jewish interests in hair, noting examples such as those found in Daniel traditions (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

¹⁰⁹ I.e., “And I said, “My lord, what is...[...]” ([...] ואמרת מראי מא ש[...]) (4Q544 2 13).

association and role of this second figure is intertwined with wider conceptions of authority. He further conveys that the figure of darkness does not only conduct a dark type of work and seemingly operate in a dark context, but that the figure of darkness holds some type of authority over darkness. He describes that the figure of darkness, “is given authority over all the darkness” (הוא משלט על כול חשוכה ואנה) (4Q544 2 15). While the parameters of this dark figure’s dominion are seemingly central to this part of Amram’s inquiry, it is noteworthy that the passage describes this dark figure’s authority as “given” (משלט) (4Q544 2 15). This perhaps represents an important authority dynamic in the overall hierarchal vision of the composition, especially given these otherworldly figures’ preceding emphasis on their “rule over all humanity” (שליטין) (על כול בני אדם) (4Q544 1 12) and concern for notions of authority throughout their exchange with Amram.

During this initial description of the otherworldly figure of darkness, the conversation eventually pivots to the first figure. The figure dialoguing with Amram seemingly does this by announcing, “but I” (ואנה) (4Q544 2 15). The figure then unpacks some additional contours of their identity. Against the background of the previous mention of the other figure’s otherworldly rule over darkness, this figure describes how “I am ruler over all light and in...[...]” (אנה שליט) (על כול נהירא וב) (4Q544).¹¹⁰ This connection with light is important in that it seemingly positions this figure in stark juxtaposition with the figure of darkness. Immediately preceding the mention of a dominion over light, the figure also includes the phrase, “[...from] the heights to the depths” (מ[...צליא עד ארעיא) (4Q544 2 16). Although the exact nature of this phrase is

¹¹⁰ The figure further underscores their rulership credentials by describing how “I am ruler, not [...]...[...]

(ואנה) (שליט לא) (4Q546 4 2), although in this instance the text does not preserve the nature of the rule in question.

ambiguous due to the fragmentary nature of the text, the concern for notions of authority in the subsequent line makes reading this phrase as referencing an additional layer of this figure's dominion an intriguing possibility. Another notable feature of the light figure's rule and authority is that like the dark figure, he describes his authority as received (4Q544 3 1).¹¹¹

While some of the wider contours of this figure's authority or rule are not immediately apparent within this single fragment, we do perhaps get a glimpse into some of these contours in another portion of the composition. To this end, 4Q545 9 presents us with an intriguing section of content to consider. This portion of material is difficult to place in that neither the speaker nor the wider context is immediately apparent. Yet the content of this section does seem to fit well within the context of the wider otherworldly disclosure unfolding in the composition. The primary phrases of text read: "[...] and from a spirit [...] [...] and for every year... [...] [...] his son over... [...] [...] and from me are their times" (וּמִן רוּחַ [...] [...] הָ וּלְכוּל שְׁנָא [...] [...] בְּרָה עַל) (4Q545 9 2–5). In terms of the speaker in the section, the first-person reference to מִנִּי ("from me") (4Q545 9 5) seems to provide a hint as to the speaker's identity. Across the composition, Amram and the figure of light appear to be the primary first-person speakers.¹¹² Given that this section of content seems to deal with the presentation of otherworldly disclosure, the figure of light almost certainly appears to be the speaker. In view of this

¹¹¹ I.e., "[...]...I have been given authority" (אֶשְׁלַט [...]) (4Q544 3 1). Others have previously picked up on the importance of the given nature of this rule. Perrin, for example, notes that "The use of the *paal* participle מְשַׁלֵּט ("he is given authority") introduces an essential concept here: the figure is made to rule, his authority is granted, perhaps even mandated. In this respect, VA touches on a classic theological conundrum of dualistic expressions in that it seems to maintain an overarching authority and oversight by God. That is, there are two ways, domains, even oppositional forces and figures, yet one supreme figure allowing this infrastructure to exist." He goes on to say regarding the light figure, that "as was noted above with respect to the granting of authority to a certain domain for the dark figure (4Q544 2 15), the light figure here too indicates his authority is given to him, or he has been made to rule (*ophal* of לָטַט). This further affirms that the dominions of both figures within the dichotomies and multi-dimensional model of VA are not ultimate but permitted by a higher power" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

¹¹² As Perrin observes, there seems to be an additional first-person speaker in the composition. In view of the content and wider context, he suggests that Qahat perhaps best fits the bill (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

likelihood, this material then seems to offer further insight into the nature of his abovementioned rule. While the partial phrases do not offer much, they do seem to offer a couple things for us to consider.

The nature of this rule seems to connect back to the abovementioned sense of a rule over humanity. The figure includes the phrase “his son over” (בְּרֵה עַל). Although the meaning of this phrase itself is unclear, the subsequent mentions of the phrases “and for every year” (וּלְכֹל שָׁנָא) (4Q545 9 3) and “from me are their times” (וּמִנִּי עֲדֻנִּיהוֹן) (4Q545 9 5) perhaps offer some insight into its meaning. What the combination of these scant phrases perhaps tells us is that this figure plays some type of role in the governance of time particularly as it pertains to humanity.

Beyond these authoritative intersections with different aspects of space and time, the text preserves an allusion to the name(s) of this figure of light. Although no specific name(s) for this figure survives in the extant materials, the text includes the phrase, “to me, “Three name[s...]” ([...] שְׁמָהּ) (4Q544 3 2). The first person utterance “to me” (לִּי) (4Q544 3 2) seems to confirm that the subsequent mention of “Three name[s...]” ([...] שְׁמָהּ) (4Q544 3 2) refers to the figure of light, particularly in view of the wider narrative sequence. Although scholars have often argued for identifying this figure of light as likely being Melchizedek, and while some of the proposals are particularly intriguing, the text does not explicitly confirm the identity of this figure of light.¹¹³

Alongside these various insights regarding the specific nature of these two otherworldly figures, Amram’s revelation perhaps also extends to select additional otherworldly realities.

¹¹³ Early on Milik identified the second figure as Melchizedek (“4Q Visions de ’Amram,” 77–97). Since then, this perception has been commonly affirmed at the very least as a possibility in subsequent scholarship. See, for example, Milik, “Milki-Šedeq et Milki-Rešae,” 95–144; Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, 584; García Martínez, “4Q ‘Amram B I, 14,” 111–14; Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 5; Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 3–42; Pearse, “The Guide and the Seducer,” 37; van der Horst, *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, 31; Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

Although the following insights into the otherworldly realm may reflect further features of the two preceding otherworldly figures, the fragmentary nature of the materials does allow us to make those definitive connections. Yet this content does seem to offer a notable expansion to Amram's otherworldly revelation. There is one primary place that seems to do this.

Across the two fragments of 4Q545 6 and 4Q547 3, VA depicts some type of otherworldly tension that involves some intersection with an apparent "demon" (שד) (4Q547 3) figure, some type of figure referred to as "the conjurer" (חברא) (4Q547 3 5, 6), and perhaps Amram's place within this struggle (4Q547 3 3; cf. 4Q545 6 3 [19]).¹¹⁴ In his initial assessment, Milik proposed that this scene perhaps built into some type of otherworldly dispute over Amram's body/soul, yet this proposal has been dismissed in recent years.¹¹⁵ Regardless of the exact nature of this scene, it seems to be part of an additional disclosure of otherworldly realities and potentially some additional dynamic intersections that it has with humanity. All of this further contributes to Amram's burgeoning otherworldly knowledge.

Between Amram's observations and the dialogue that he has with the apparent figure of light, his revelatory knowledge pertaining to otherworldly realities is relatively substantial. He develops a rich acquaintance with each of the two figures. He thoroughly catalogues various aspects of their respective appearances, which seems to draw out notable points of visual difference. He is able to observe and make sense of this pair's relational dynamics. Yet Amram's acquaintance with these figures extends well beyond visual observations. Through his dialogue with the figure of light, he comes to understand the respective roles of these figures and their functions on an otherworldly plain. He seems to gain an understanding of how those roles and

¹¹⁴ I.e., "[...for] its life you shall lie in wait between their two" ([...] תרתיהון בין תכמון) (4Q547 3 3; cf. 4Q545 6 3 [19]).

¹¹⁵ Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram," 85. For recent observations on the problems with this interpretation, see, for example, Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

functions intersect with this-worldly realities. He also comes to learn of their names. This additional detail is especially significant in view of wider ancient Jewish traditions which emphasize the significance of otherworldly names as a basis for understanding core identity.¹¹⁶ In addition to specific otherworldly revelation pertaining to these two figures, Amram's revelation also appears to extend to wider aspects and realities unfolding within the otherworldly realm and some other potential intersections with humanity.

4.3.3.2.2 Revelatory Content: Otherworldly Perspective on This-Worldly Reality

A second major component of Amram's otherworldly revelation centers on various aspects of this-worldly reality. As I noted above, through his dream-vision, Amram gains understanding of various significant intersections that seemingly exist between the otherworldly and this-worldly realms, particularly as it pertains to otherworldly dominions, the rules of otherworldly figures, and wider otherworldly tensions. In addition to this, however, Amram's revelation seems to center less on the functional intersections between the otherworldly realm and humanity, and more on the otherworldly perspective of human reality. In other words, the otherworldly speaker presents Amram with an otherworldly understanding of the nature of various this-worldly realities. This revelation seems to fall into two primary categories: otherworldly perspective on past this-worldly realities and otherworldly perspective on future this-worldly realities. While both of these realities have notable intersections with time, we will forgo any significant discussion on the significance of time for Amram's profile for the moment, as we will explore this in greater detail below. We will instead simply use the notions of the past and future as a

¹¹⁶ For more on the significance of otherworldly names, see, n. 172 in chapter 3, "Qahat."

functional way to couch these perspectives and focus our attention on exploring the nature of the revelatory content underlying each.

Amram seems to receive otherworldly perspective on past this-worldly reality in two primary segments in VA. Although each of these instances are not explicitly tied to either Amram's dream-vision episode, or Amram himself, the wider revelatory context makes these appear as probable expressions of otherworldly revelation.

On the first occasion, as part of a highly fragmentary section, there is a reference to Noah as part of what may be some type of sacrificial scene. It includes the phrases "approached/offered thus" (ב[...ב]קרוב בדז) (4Q547 5 3) and "[...a]fter him Noah" (ב[...ב]תררה נוח) (4Q547 5 3). The sense of this as part of Amram's dream-vision appears with the reference "and our greatness" (ורבנה) (4Q547 5 1). It is possible that this first-person plural reference comes from the otherworldly figure of light, as the same figure communicates on behalf of the collective pair of himself and the figure of darkness elsewhere in the dream-vision.

Furthermore, it is not by any means certain that this is a reference to sacrificial event, yet as we will demonstrate below the wider surrounding cultic context increases the likelihood. What we can say at the moment, however, is the inclusion of the phrase "[...a]fter him Noah" (ב[...ב]תררה נוח) perhaps indicates this as part of some type of wider genealogical sequence. If the initial phrase does represent some type of sacrificial reference, this possible genealogical phrase about Noah that follows may indicate that this passage reflects some type of otherworldly revelation regarding the nature and significance of a Noachic sacrificial event.

As I hinted above, the possibility of this as pertaining to some early cultic event perhaps increases in light of the wider cultic interests that appear in the surrounding materials, much of which we will discuss below. Yet the immediate reference to another past event also encourages

this reading. In 4Q547 8, VA preserves some type of sacrificial scene in which Levi appears to undertake some type of cultic proceedings. It reads, “all that Levi his son offered ...[...][...] I said to you, upon the altar [...] of stones [...] [...a]ll sacrifice [...] will be[...].” (כ[ב]ול די קרב) (כ[ב]ול קורבנא^להיא [...][...] די אבני[...][...] על מדבח[...][...] מרת לכה [א...][...] ע[...]) (4Q547 8 2–4). This scene could reasonably function as part of Amram’s instruction to his children, in view of the second person reference “I said to you” (מרת[א...]) (4Q547 8 3), yet the wider sacrificial interests that appear prior to Amram’s awakening, seem to suggest the likelihood that this is also a part of his dream-vision episode. If that is the case, this event appears to be an instance in which Amram receives otherworldly perspective on a notable past human reality. In this case, Amram appears to gain otherworldly insight into the nature of sacrifice through some past event in which Levi conducted some type of sacrifice on an apparent altar of stone.

Alongside these otherworldly perspectives on the past, Amram also gains a considerable complex of revelation pertaining to future this-worldly realities. Amram appears to gain otherworldly perspective particularly in reference to his children and their future identities and roles.

As I previously noted, VA includes the phrase “wrote/will write in the land for him, Moses” (כתב בארעא לה מושה) (4Q545 4 15). The nature of this phrase as part of an otherworldly disclosure appears with the preceding phrase “and I will tell you” (ואחווה לכה) (4Q545 4 14). Again, this phrase regarding Moses may represent some type of otherworldly written disclosure about him. Yet the fragmentary nature of the materials inhibits further interpretation. In tandem with this otherworldly perspective on Moses, Amram seems to gain otherworldly insight about his son, Aaron. This content appears as part of the same fragment in which the Moses material appears, and thus the sense of its dream-vision context follows that same line. In the case of

Aaron, while his name is not explicitly mentioned, the wider interest in him as a figure throughout the material suggests him as the figure in question. Additionally, his appearance alongside Moses reinforces this, as well as the subsequent mention of Aaron in 4Q546 8. On this occasion Amram appears to gain insight into the otherworldly nature of Aaron's office as part of the human priesthood. This is apparent with the phrases "the mystery of his work" (רז עובדה) (4Q545 4 16), the description of him as a "holy priest" (כֹּהֵן קדִישׁ) (4Q545 4 16), the designation of all his descendants as "h[o]ly to him throughout generations" (קד[וי]ש להוה לה כל זרעה) (4Q545 4 17), his apparent position within the wider priestly genealogy,¹¹⁷ and his status as "chosen as a priest forever" (יתבחר לכהן עלמין) (4Q545 4 19). The language of mystery, holiness, and eternity, as well as his cardinal position at number seven in the priestly line all emphasize its otherworldly contours.

Beyond this mention, we also see reference to Aaron in relation to some type of redemption (4Q546 8 1),¹¹⁸ a reference to a return (4Q546 8 3),¹¹⁹ and language emphasizing a calling (4Q546 8 4).¹²⁰ All of this seems to be part of a wider disclosure about Aaron as a figure. Although in this instance the recipient of this revelation is not explicitly named, the wider revelatory status of Amram within the wider composition suggests him to be the most likely receiver.

We also see a notable section seemingly dedicated to revelation regarding Aaron immediately before Amram awakens from his dream-vision. This section of material perhaps

¹¹⁷ I.e., "seventh among men, of [his] will [he will be] called" (שבועי באנוש רעוּת[ה ית]קרה) (4Q545 18).

¹¹⁸ I.e., "you redeemed his name" (פְּרִיקְתָּה שְׁמֵהּ) (4Q546 8 1).

¹¹⁹ I.e., "he will return" (יָחֹב) (4Q546 8 3).

¹²⁰ I.e., "you called him" (תִּקְרָא לֵה) (4Q546 8 4).

includes references to building a bronze altar (4Q547 9 3–5)¹²¹ as well as his elevated priestly status (4Q547 9 6)¹²² as well as that of his sons.¹²³

Amram’s otherworldly insights about his children, however, are not limited to his sons. He also seems to gain notable otherworldly perspective on his daughter, Miriam. In 4Q546 12, as part of an uncertain context, the phrase “and the mystery of Miriam he made for her” (וְרִי מִרְיָם) (4Q546 12 4) appears. The nature of this phrase as an otherworldly disclosure is perhaps apparent in light of the abovementioned use of the term “mystery” (רִי) in reference to Aaron, as well as in view of wider revelatory traditions.¹²⁴ Beyond the apparent revelatory nature of this phrase, however, scholars have offered several different proposals as to its meaning and significance.¹²⁵ Regardless of its specific meaning, this phrase seems to extend the breadth of Amram’s otherworldly insight even more.

4.3.3.3 *Amram and Revelation*

In this section, we worked to understand more precisely the revelatory contours of Amram’s identity profile. We built on previous perceptions of Amram’s considerable revelatory interests, identifying more specifically the nature of Amram’s revelatory profile. We looked at some of the language, expressions, and experiences that give shape to Amram’s revelatory association and drew out some of the underlying contours of this language and Amram’s connected expressions

¹²¹ I.e., “he build [...] [...] on Mount Sinai, a day [...] [...]...[...][...]your great upon the bronze altar [...]” (בנה [...] [...] בְּהַר סִינַי יוֹם [...] [...] כִּה רַבָּא עַל מִדְבַח נְחֹשֶׁת) (4Q547 9 3–5).

¹²² I.e., “[...]... will be exalted as priest more than all the sons of the world ...[...]” (בנה [...] [...] בְּהַר סִינַי יוֹם [...] [...] כִּה רַבָּא עַל מִדְבַח נְחֹשֶׁת [...] [...] כִּהן מִן כּוֹל בְּנֵי עֲלָמָא) (4Q547 9 6).

¹²³ I.e., (“[...]... and his sons after him for all eternal generations ...[...]” ([...] [...] עֲלָמִין בְּקוֹן [...] [...]]) (4Q547 9 7).

¹²⁴ For confirmation of this reference as an indication of otherworldly disclosure, see, for example, Jones, “Priesthood and Cult,” 18.

¹²⁵ For more on these impressions, see, n. 135 and 140 below.

and experiences. We then surveyed the considerable repertoire of revelatory knowledge that Amram develops, including key elements pertaining to spoken and observed revelation regarding otherworldly figures and otherworldly space.

Through this process we developed a more precise sense of the revelatory contours of Amram's identity profile. We built upon several previous engagement with Amram's revelatory profile as part of more general compositional explorations. Through this we were able to locate more precisely Amram within the concept of revelation as a notable feature of his profile of identity. Let us now turn to the concept of *time*.

4.3.4 Time

Time represents another important feature of identity for Amram. Unlike figures in wider traditions preserved in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Amram demonstrates little apparent interest in time related concepts such as Sabbath or other later developed memorializing events from the Jewish ancestral period (i.e. festivals).¹²⁶ Later calendrical interests common to so-called "sectarian" literature and Enochic materials are also notably absent from his profile in VA.¹²⁷ In place of these identity shaping aspects of time, Amram as a figure seems to develop in notable relation to temporal notions of the past and the future.

¹²⁶ For an emphasis on the temporal concept of Sabbath, see, for example, Ex 16:23–29; 20:8, 10–11; 31:13–16; 35:2–3; Lev 16:31; 19:3, 30; 23:3, 11; 15–16, 32, 38; 24:8; Deut 5:12, 15. For interest in wider temporally related festivals, see, for example, Ex 12:17; 23:14–16; 34:18; 34:22, 25; Lev 23:2–6; 23:34–44; Num 10:10; 15:13; 28:17; 29:12; 29:39; Deut 16:10–16.

¹²⁷ Select fragmentary references including the phrase "for every year" (לְכוֹל שָׁנָא) (4Q545 9 3) and "from me are their times" (מִנִּי עֲדִינְיָהוֹן) (4Q545 9 5), may reflect possible calendrical concerns, yet the fragmentary nature of the text highly limits our understanding of these phrases. Yet the included reference to "his son over" (בְּרֵה עַל) (4Q545 9 4) and "from a spirit" (מִן רוּחַ) (4Q545 9 2) may suggest that these phrases perhaps reflect some type of priestly appointment of Aaron and his yearly priestly functions than typical calendrical concerns such as those that deal with seasons, festivals, allotted periods, for example, in 1QS 1 13–15; Tob 1:6; 2:1–2; 1Q20 6:9–10, 18; 8:16, 18, 20; 1Q22 1 iii 1–3; 1 En. 32:2–3; 72:1–75:4; 78:1–79:6; 80:1–8; 4Q318; 11Q18 15 1–5. Perrin, for example, notes the possible connection of this material here with Aaron, yet recognizes the considerable limitations of interpretation given the fragmentary nature of the textual materials (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

Scholars have often pointed to the chronological aspects of VA, and the apparent ways in which the scribal mind behind the composition worked in view of a possible exegetical relationship with different traditions preserved in the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. The essence of these conversations has generally centered on the different ways in which VA adopted/reimagined/reworked materials to navigate certain perceived chronological inconsistencies amongst the varying traditions. These include aspects related to the Egyptian-Canaanite war, the ancestral burial event in Canaan, Amram's marriage to Yochebed, and the conception/birth of Amram's children, to name but a few.¹²⁸

While these conversations have provided numerous contributions to our understanding on notions of intertextuality, in my reading of VA, the more basic temporal notions of the past and the future play a more prominent role in shaping Amram's specific identity as a figure. In view of this, we will focus our discussion on Amram's intersections with the past and the future, and how these give significant shape to his profile.

4.3.4.1 *The Past*

One of the primary ways in which Amram develops in relation to the past, as was the case with both Levi and Qahat, is through his appearance in relation to past figures.¹²⁹ We perhaps first see this in the opening lines of the writing, in which VA maps out Amram's genealogical line and describes him as "son of Qahat, son of Levi" [בֶּרֶךְ קַהַת בֶּרֶךְ לֵוִי] [4Q545 1a i 1; cf. 4Q543 1 a-c 1]).

While Qahat appears as a living personality within the narrative based upon his later participation (or lack thereof) in the ancestral burial event, the wider context of the writing at a

¹²⁸ For more on some of the apparent chronological features of VA, see, for example, VanderKam, "'Jubilees' 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram," 141–58.

¹²⁹ While we have discussed the importance of these kinship relationships above, we have not yet discussed their temporal significance. It is to their temporal significance that we now turn.

to the past figures of both Qahat and Levi, Amram's relational profile becomes increasingly intertwined with the past.¹³³

Beyond these three specific figures, Amram's association with the past also develops through his engagement with the unnamed ancestral figures included in the VA burial event. Scholars have commonly suggested that these figures likely represent Joseph's brothers in view of the tradition preserved in Jubilees 46:8–9. Whoever these figures are, however, Amram's engagement with them as figures from the past further seems to accentuate the importance of the past for him, especially in view of the lengths he goes to participate in and complete the task of burial.¹³⁴

While the basic association that develops between Amram and these past figures is significant merely in that it expands Amram's general connection to the past, it also seems to develop Amram's association to past events. Again, while the exact nature of the events in which these past figures appear in VA lack varying degrees of clarity, we can make some basic observations as to their potential significance for him as a figure.

In the case of Qahat, his primary narrative appearance in VA seems to occur during the ancestral burial event. While Qahat's participation in the event itself appears relatively limited due to his early departure at the threat of war, his apparent engagement with Amram in this scene remains significant. At the very least, we might interpret Amram's decision to stay as representative of an adherence to paternal authority, or the authority of a past figure. While there is no explicit indication that Qahat specifically instructs Amram to stay behind, Amram's

¹³³ As Perrin notes, the phrase "all that Levi his son offered" also seems to indicate that Jacob perhaps also appeared as a named figure in the composition. He notes that "since Levi is referred to as ברה ("his son"), this material also implies the existence of a Jacob tradition, or at least an allusion, in VA" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). Yet the fragmentary nature of the materials only allows us to speculate as to what his influence upon the figure of Amram might have been in the non-extant portions of text.

¹³⁴ For more on the nature of Amram's participation in the burial event, see the above section entitled "Kinship: Ancestral Commitment."

willingness to allow his father to depart, perhaps further indicates his elevated concern for antecedent figures.

In the case Levi, the reference to him in relation to a sacrificial event is noteworthy. By casting Levi in terms of his priestly pedigree, Amram's earlier association as a descendant of Levi seems to take on greater significance. Not only is Amram connected to a notable past figure, but he also seemingly develops some type of larger connection to his priestly activity.

As I indicated above, the exact nature of the event in which the figure of Noah appears is obstructed by the fragmentary nature of the text. Yet the possibility that the term "approached/offered" (קרַב) reflects some type of priestly undertaking is significant for Amram as a priestly figure. Again, while Amram's connection with Noah in the composition is not clear, Amram develops a wider connection with Noah by his very presence in a first-person composition bearing Amram's name. In terms of the past, this potential priestly reference to Noah may represent the establishment of a connection between Amram and priestly activity from the distant past.

4.3.4.2 The Future: Figure Focussed

In VA, Amram also develops a notable interest in the future. He demonstrates this particularly through an apparent interest in future figures and future events. Perhaps the clearest indication of this appears in relation to Amram's children. With each of his children, Amram seems to demonstrate a concern for their future roles and identities.

Amram's interest in a future reality in relation to Miriam perhaps remains the most tentative within the composition. While Miriam appears on various occasions throughout the narrative, content specifically pertaining to Miriam and her future is limited. There is, however,

one instance, that potentially conveys Amram's interest in a future related reality in connection to Miriam.

4Q546 12 includes the phrase “and the mystery of Miriam he made for her[...]...[.]” ([...]ל[...]) (4Q546 12 4). In the fragmentary content surrounding this phrase, there is an apparent emphasis on a future reality. The temporal language of “forever” (עלם) (4Q546 12 1) and “ages” (עלמין) (4Q546 12 2) combined with the future focussed language of “he will be” (לחיה) (4Q546 3), although not directly referencing Miriam, seems to lend itself to the depiction of a future reality. Although there is not explicit connection between Miriam and this apparent future scene, the inclusion of the phrase “and the mystery of Miriam he made for her” (וְרִמְיָם עֲבָדָהּ לָהּ) (4Q546 12 4) seems to situate Miriam well within it. Various scholars have pointed to this significance of this “mystery” language in relation to Miriam. Proposals as to its meaning include an otherworldly disclosure of her role in the priesthood, her function as prophetess, or her place in the priestly genealogical sequence.¹³⁵ Regardless of the meaning of Miriam's “mystery” (רִמְיָם), this section seemingly offers one example of Amram's concern for the future, in this case as it pertains to his daughter Miriam.

Amram's interest in future time is more explicit in the case of his son, Moses. There are two prominent instances in which Amram demonstrates an interest in Moses's future reality. On the first occasion, as part of what seems to be Amram's otherworldly dream-vision, there appears

¹³⁵ White Crawford, for example, suggests “mystery” here builds into Miriam's prophetic profile that develops in the traditions preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures (“Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls,” 39). Tervanotko highlights the significance of this term in view of its limited association with specific figures across ancient Jewish traditions, noting specifically its wider connections with Noah, Enoch, and Methuselah (“The Hope of the Enemy Has Perished,” 158–60). Perrin, however, notes the difficulty in interpreting this term in relation to Miriam. He writes, “like Aaron, she (Miriam) is also associated with the concept of the רַ in 4Q546 12 6, the meaning of which is not easily recovered from the frustratingly fragmentary materials.” Yet he goes on to propose that this phrase is perhaps “ascribing or amplifying the prophetic credentials of ancestral figures,” and notes its priestly significance in VA as therefore likely about her position in the priestly genealogy (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

ומלאך אל תתקרה [...] [...] תעבר בארעא דא ודין מון ס' [...] [...] יהך לה שמך לכל מ' [...] [...] זבה [...] [...] (4Q543 2 a–b 4–8). Amram communicates to his son various layers of his future identity. He seemingly informs Moses about both who he will be and what he will do. The case of Moses therefore appears as a second occasion in which Amram's interests are future focussed.

Amram's interest in the future is perhaps the most apparent in the case of Amram's son, Aaron. There are hints of this in 4Q546 8, in which the passage names the figure of Aaron (אהרן) (4Q546 8 2), and immediately following his name includes the phrase "he will return" (יתוב) (4Q546 8 3). Although the nature and meaning of this phrase is not immediately clear, Amram's interest in some future reality related to his son Aaron is apparent.

A second depiction of Amram's interest in the future of Aaron appears in 4Q545 4. As I mentioned above, this passage begins with an apparent reference to future realities pertaining to the figure of Moses. Following the mention of Moses, however, the passage includes an extended depiction of the future of a priestly figure. From the wider context of the composition, this passage seems to centre on Aaron. Within this passage, seemingly as part of Amram's dream-vision revelation, Amram's interests focus on the significance of Aaron's status as a priest (4Q545 4 16).¹³⁹ His revelation perhaps focusses on an otherworldly basis for his priesthood.¹⁴⁰ Building off this possible otherworldly confirmation of Aaron's priestly status, his observations shift towards Aaron's future role and identity as a priestly figure. Amram's revelation outlines his son's future priestly descendants (4Q545 4 17),¹⁴¹ indicates his apparent future standing

¹³⁹ I.e., "to you the mystery of his work: he is a holy priest[...]" ([...] קדיש הוא) (4Q545 4 16).

¹⁴⁰ For more on this otherworldly connection, see, for example, Jones, "Priesthood and Cult," 18; Høgenhaven, "Geography," 130. See also, Perrin, who suggests that "mystery" here likely pertains to the priesthood, but not necessarily of priestly activity as others have suggested. Rather, he suggests, "the mysterious nature of Aaron's priestly role and that of his progeny is that their angelic endorsement and eternally mandated role place their actions and identity in continuity with the otherworldly priesthood" (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming).

¹⁴¹ I.e., "all his descendants will be h[o]ly to him throughout generations of" (קד[י]ש להוה לה כל זרעה בכול דרי) (4Q545 4 17).

within the genealogical priestly line, and his sure future standing in connection to the otherworldly priesthood (4Q545 4 19).¹⁴²

This depiction of Aaron as part of what seems to be Amram's dream-vision revelation alongside the depictions of his other children, reinforces the ways in which Amram's identity increasingly takes shape in relation to the future.

4.3.4.3 *Amram and Time*

In this section we moved to develop a more precise impression of the temporal features of Amram's identity profile. We looked to consider the underlying realities that built into this perception in previous scholarship and elucidate further the importance of time for him as a figure.

To this end, we worked off past perceptions, and considered the ways in which Amram appears to develop alternative temporal emphases when compared to many of those that appear in wider ancient Jewish traditions. Like Levi and Qahat, we noted Amram's similar emphasis on the notions of the past and future. In view of these similar emphases, we worked to capture some of the specifics of Amram's intersections with the past and future. We looked at Amram's appeals to past named and unnamed figures as well as the ways in which Amram develops a series of future focused interests, primarily in terms of his immediate children.

Through this process we captured an arguably more distinct sense of the ways in which Amram's identity profile develops around the notion of time. Let us now consider the related concept of *space* and its importance for Amram's developing identity.

¹⁴² I.e., "he shall be chosen as a priest forever" (יתבחר לכהן עלמין) (4Q545 4 19).

4.3.5 Space

Space also represents a distinct aspect of Amram's persona in VA. In comparison to notions such as kinship, tradition, or revelation, however, geographic based identity seems to represent a considerably more subtle feature for Amram in the composition. Unlike other traditions, Amram does not appear to develop a traditional geographic-based identity pertaining to a precise, fixed location.¹⁴³ Although Amram appears in relation to a variety of geographic locations throughout the composition, these associations seem to function more as necessary geographic features of a narrative and less as formative aspects of identity.¹⁴⁴ Despite this, however, Amram still appears to develop a type of spatially related identity in VA apart from association with traditional geographic locations.

The primary place which this seems to happen is during Amram's otherworldly dream-vision episode(s). In the scene in which Amram encounters two otherworldly figures, he seemingly gains an awareness of certain spatial realities. The writing preserves different parts of Amram's interaction with these figures. Among this exchange, the writing preserves the lines: "[...]rules over you[...] [...]this from him." And he said to me, "This one ...[...] [...] and Melchiresha." *vacat* And I said, "My lord, what is...[...] [...]...and all his work is da[r]k and in

¹⁴³ On the importance of geographic land in the Pentateuchal traditions develops in a series of different ways. The early promises from the Lord to Abraham (Gen 10:5), and the subsequent anticipation of his descendants as receiving that land develops a central feature of the Pentateuchal narrative. On this developing narrative and an anticipation of land based identity, see, for example, Gen 10:5, 10, 20, 31; 11:28; 12:1, 5; 13:15; 15:7, 18; 17:8; 24:7; 26:2–4; 28:13; 50:24; Ex 3:8, 17; 6:8; 33:1; Num 1:1; Josh 1:2, 6, 11, 13; 11:23; 12:1, 6; 21:43. Following the later exile and the loss of this land, the traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures again concentrate around land based identity as well as new questions of geographic identity. See, for example this emphasis in Ezra/Nehemiah in relation to the province of Judah.

¹⁴⁴ Various scholars have previously recognized the significance of different apparent geographic aspects in VA. Perrin pointed to Amram's movements as possibly echoing geographic language used to describe the Abrahamic burial movements in the Hebrew Scriptures (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). Høgenhaven recently explored how various geographic references in VA seemingly function to connect Amram to notable events and figures. He observes: "the locations mentioned may also be expected to carry a symbolic significance, in particular since the place-names in VA also play important roles in other literary traditions that were probably known to the author and intended readers" ("Geography," 120).

the darkness he...[...][...]...see. Now, he is given authority over all the darkness. But I[...]
 [...from] the heights to the depths. I am ruler over all light and in...[...]" ([...] שֵׁלֵט עֲלֵיךְ [...])
 הָ[...][...] מִן הַדָּן לִי הַדָּן מִן הַדָּן וְאִמְרַת מְרַאֵי מֵא מֵא שֶׁלֵּט[...][...] וְכֹה וְכֹל עַבְדָּהּ
 הָ[שׁ] וְבַחֲשׂוֹכָא הוּא דְ[...][...] הָ חוּזָה וְהוּא מְשַׁלֵּט עַל כּוֹל חֲשׂוֹכָה וְאִנְהָ[...][...] מֵעֲלִיא עַד אַרְעִיא אִנְהָ
 [...][...] (4Q544 2 11–16). From this specific portion of their interaction,
 Amram seemingly becomes aware of some type of apparent spatial reality within the
 otherworldly realm. This reality pertains to the spaces of “the heights to the depths” ([...] מֵעֲלִיא
 [...]) as well as possible spaces of “the darkness” (חֲשׂוֹכָה) and “the light” (נְהִירָא).

There has been considerable debate over the history of research as to the reading and meaning of the phrase מֵעֲלִיא עַד אַרְעִיא (4Q544 2 16). Perrin’s fresh transcription of the fragment confirms the validity of this phrase. He further notes that previous readings of the initial term מֵעֲלִיא as the divine designation “Most High” is less likely in view of the Aramaic DSS’s preference for the alternative language of עֲלִיּוֹן to convey that title. In light of this, Perrin suggests that this reading captures “the reach and range of the domains of the otherworldly figures” and that “the form here most likely refers to an upper portion of the land or cosmos.”¹⁴⁵

While the spatial interests in the phrase “from] the heights to the depths” seems clear, the spatial nature of the language of “darkness” and “light is perhaps less certain and at first glance may reflect more of an interest in a type of moral/ethical division. In my reading, however, it seems appropriate to understand these references to “darkness” and “light,” at least in part, in spatial terms. First, because despite a notable juxtaposition between otherworldly figures, VA

¹⁴⁵ Perrin, *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming.

seems to offer limited interest in moral/ethical language throughout the wider composition.¹⁴⁶ Second, we perhaps get an initial indication of this with the depiction of these juxtaposed realities and their respective figures with the preposition ב. We read of the dark figure, that “in the darkness he” (בחשוכא הוא דִּי) (4Q544 2 14) and of the light figure that “I am ruler over all light and in” ([...]אנה שליט על כול נהירא בוֹס) (4Q544 2 16). These depictions with the preposition ב seem to cast these realities in spatial terms. The juxtaposition of the spatial realities of “heights” and “depths” further seems to encourage this type of spatial reading. As part of his wider exploration on geography, Høgenhaven confirms the spatial nature of these otherworldly features. He observes that “the transcendent world, then, is also spatially structured: Darkness and light become the two areas of dominion, ruled over by the angelic princes of evil and good.”¹⁴⁷

Spatial identity seems to come into play for Amram in the apparent connections that exist between otherworldly figures and certain otherworldly spaces. In this scene, while Amram does not directly associate himself with any one of these spaces (light, darkness, heights, or depths), he seems to do so indirectly through association with the figure of light. As part of this exchange, Amram, describes how “they said to me, ‘Which of us are yo[u seeking?]’...” (ואמרו לי במן מננא) (4Q544 1 12). While the exact nature of this question is uncertain due to the fragmentary nature of the text, what is apparent is that at the start of this dialogue Amram seems to have a choice, not necessarily regarding who he wants to “rule” over him, as some have

¹⁴⁶ While we could perhaps interpret these references through that type of moral/ethical lens, the only reference to clear moral/ethical language appears with the mention of “the righteous” (קְשִׁיטִיא) (4Q546 5 2) as part of what seems to be Amram’s dream-vision, although the fragmentary nature of the materials makes this uncertain. In view of that, the spatial nature of this language seems to be of greater significance. While the onomastics of the name Melchiresa, perhaps indicate an underlying moral/ethical interest, the wider available content in VA, does not seem to indicate this as an overt concern.

¹⁴⁷ Høgenhaven, “Geography,” 126.

suggested, but at the very least the option of whom he wants to engage with in conversation.¹⁴⁸

From what we see of the continued conversation, Amram appears to make a conscious choice to associate himself with the figure of light, who rules “from] the heights to the depths” (מ...[עליא] (עד ארעיא) (4Q544 2 16) Jurgens picked up on this choice of association, noting that, “as can be inferred from the second fragment of 4Q544, it appears that Amram gravitates towards this figure, asking him more about the identity of the first, ominous figure.”¹⁴⁹

In this sense, Amram appears to demonstrate a particular interest in spatial based identity, not in relation to a specific earthly location, but in relation to some type of spatial dominion. Amram seems to spatially associate himself with light, and the space that extends “from] the heights to the depths” through a choice of association.¹⁵⁰ In this sense, Amram seems to indicate a distinctive value for some type of otherworldly spatial identity.

On one hand, we can to some extent likely attribute this apparent emphasis on otherworldly spatial association over more traditional this-worldly geographic locations to the pre-exodus narrative context of the Amram traditions in a pre-conquest reality, before any type of established residence in the land of Israel proper. On the other hand, given the generally assumed compositional setting of this tradition as within a post-exilic context where questions of geographic based identity loomed large, the absence of any substantial claims to traditional geographic space in these traditions is perhaps surprising.

¹⁴⁸ For more on the contours of this question posed by the otherworldly figure, see, n. 100 above.

¹⁴⁹ Jurgens, “Reassessing the Dream-Vision,” 3–42, here 25.

¹⁵⁰ Perrin too observes the significance of this vertical division. He notes as part of some wider observations on the so-called “dualistic” contours of the otherworldly realm and otherworldly rule, that “the scope of their rules, however, is not limited to a horizontal reach of two spaces on a plane: for VA the domains of the dichotomized rule extend also vertically (4Q544 2 16)” (*Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance*, forthcoming). While I agree with the importance of these vertical aspect of the otherworldly realm, the notion of these two spaces as a division seems to me problematic in that these spaces of “heights” and “depths” are not divided between the two figures. Rather they represent one area of spatial dominion ruled over by the one otherworldly figure of light.

4.3.5.1 *Amram and Space*

In the above section, we moved to develop in greater detail the importance of space for Amram's identity. We set out by noting that although Amram appears in connection to traditional named geographic locations, like Levi and Qahat, Amram seems to develop the importance of his connections with wider spatial realities. In this we considered Amram's engagement with various otherworldly aspects of space, most notably in connection with notions of "height" and "depth" and notions of "darkness" and "light." We explored the ways in which Amram seems to develop a connection to these spaces through his engagement with otherworldly figures.

This short survey of Amram's engagement of space moved us towards a more precise awareness of space as an aspect of his identity.

4.4 *Synopsis*

In the above sections, we explored the concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space* in connection to the figure of Amram in VA to capture a more precise portrait of his profile of Jewish identity. To do this, we picked up on several past impressions in research of Amram's intersections with these concepts, as well as various wider analogues in the Second Temple literary context.

To begin this process, we saw how Amram develops a series of notable intersections with the concept of kinship. Like Qahat and Levi we picked up on some of the high-level points of intersection. Perhaps his most substantial intersection with kinship appears in his distinct adoption and ongoing adherence to practices pertaining to both ancestral burial and endogamy.

For the notion of tradition, like Qahat and Levi we looked at the nature of Amram's participation in the transmission of tradition. We considered the selective nature of his chosen

audience and outlined some of the notable underlying virtues contained therein. Within this we recognized certain overlap with Levi, Qahat, and other wider figures, as well as certain distinctives.

We considered revelation as arguably one of the concepts—alongside kinship—with the most substantial intersections with Amram. In this we looked at the considerable revelatory expressions, experiences, and language in which Amram appears in connection throughout the fragmentary narrative of VA. Through this we identified a considerable repertoire of revelatory knowledge that Amram develops, highlighting some of its key elements.

Our exploration of the concept of time and its intersections with Amram led us to identify some of the notable similarities with Qahat and Levi in terms of past and future temporal emphases. Yet in this process we also picked up on some of Amram's notable temporal distinctives such as a concentrated focus on the past and futures of his immediate descendants.

On the question of space, like Qahat and Levi, we considered some of Amram's alternative conceptualizations of space compared to more traditional associations with traditional named geographic locations. We looked at Amram's alternative emphasis on a vertical axis of space, particularly in connection with the ideas of "heights" and "depths," as well as heightened interest in spatial quality. We picked up on some of the distinct ways in which Amram develops these in connection with select otherworldly figures.

From the above analysis, we come away with a greater awareness of:

- 1) Some of the notable intersections between Amram's engagement with these concepts and those of other figures in the wider Second Temple world

- 2) A more precise knowledge of the contours and expressions of these concepts for Amram as an individual figure

This awareness improves our ability to locate Amram as a figure within the ancient Jewish literary landscape and moves us towards a more nuanced understanding of his distinct profile of Jewish identity.

5 Conclusion

5.1 In Review: A Quest for Greater Precision

As stated at the outset of our study, generally speaking, scholarship represents an ongoing quest for greater precision. The common scholarly aim of “thinking better” about a given topic is essentially a question of precision—often a relative or subjectively perceived sense of precision—but in my mind, a question of precision nonetheless.

The present study thus falls within that rich historical quest for greater precision. This historical quest specifically pertains to the understanding Second Temple Judaism, Jewish identity, the Aramaic DSS, and most specifically the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram. At the outset of our exploration, we began with a question regarding the terms “Jew,” “Judaean,” and “Israelite.” With this question, we focussed in specifically on the terms “Jew” and “Judaean” and various associated terminological debates. Through this process we identified some of the notable challenges in adopting specific terminology. With an awareness, however, of the some of the notable challenges and limitations of terms, especially translated terms, we adopted the terms “Jew” and “Jewish” for the present investigation.

From there we identified the question of “being Jewish” as essentially a question of identity. We looked at three primary areas of Jewish identity in the history of study pertaining to: 1) method and approach; 2) key research trends; and 3) notable challenges. Through this process, we highlighted the ways in which past studies have attempted to delineate the underlying makeup of Jewish identity. Amidst these attempts, we noted the ways in which scholars specifically wrestled with questions of diversity in understanding Jewish identity. Efforts to engage diversity created various challenges, as an overemphasis on diversity at times veiled a sense of continuity across the different expressions of Jewish identity. Despite these challenges

we recognized that scholars have maintained an ongoing interest in exploring notions of diversity, yet with a greater attentiveness to underlying unity.¹

We went on to note the considerable body of ongoing investigations that draw out and explore the diversity of Jewish identity. While we noted that many of the intersections with the question of Jewish identity in these investigations are implicit, their contributions to understanding Jewish identity are nonetheless considerable.

A notable outcome of these and other related investigations was a growing awareness of the limitations of textual boundaries. This awareness led scholars to adopt various alternative investigative approaches in elucidating the diverse expressions of Jewish identity in ancient Jewish literature. We highlighted the notion of *figures* and their related *traditions* as a notable means by which scholars have increasingly engaged questions of identity.² In view of this shifting emphasis in research towards figures and traditions, we identified some of the considerable opportunities for future investigation.

Within the frame of figures and traditions, past research has largely focussed on a core cluster of figures and traditions. With select exceptions, we identified a general gap in research when it comes to explorations of so-called lesser-known figures. We traced this gap back to the central place that the so-called canonical writings of the Hebrew Scriptures have held in the history of study. In view of this, we also looked at the ways in which the discovery of the DSS impacted scholarly perceptions on the notion of canon and writings that fall outside what would become the Hebrew Scriptures. In this, we recognized the growing scholarly awareness of the

¹ For more on questions of unity and diversity and ongoing interest in explorations of diversity in ancient Jewish identity studies, see section 1.2.3 in the present study, entitled, “Navigating Challenges of Jewish Identity: Unity and Diversity” in the opening chapter.

² For more on the adoption of figures and traditions for the present investigation and this developing departure point for Jewish identity studies, see especially, sections 1.2.3.1, entitled “Exploring Diversity: From Texts towards Figures and Traditions” and 1.2.3.2, entitled “Exploring Diversity: Previous Figure-Based Investigations” in the present study.

dissonance between modern and ancient Jewish perceptions of the ancient Jewish literary landscape, especially in relation to notions of canon and “bible.” We explored some of the ways in which scholarship has increasingly refined its engagement with materials commonly included under classifications including “pesher” (פֶּשֶׁר), “pseudepigrapha,” and “rewritten scripture.”

Despite efforts to reimagine the nature of these wider materials beyond the Hebrew Scriptures, past perceptions and related approaches continue to impact the trajectory of research, especially in the case of figure-based investigations. Despite these challenges, we saw the ongoing interest in understanding these wider materials in Reed’s language, “on their own terms” and with that, the considerable opportunities for further investigation.³

These opportunities in relation to lesser-known figures from the Hebrew Scriptures, the writings beyond that traditional corpus, and the shifts in how we understand and approach those figures and materials moved us to consider the Aramaic DSS. We recognized the limited exposure the Aramaic DSS have had in the history of research both due to their complete publication only recently, as well as the previous primary interest in the materials contained in the Hebrew Scriptures. This reality in combination with a notable concentration of materials pertaining to the lesser-known figures from the Hebrew Scriptures and the shift in research interests away from canon-centric approaches, emphasized the considerable prospects of the Aramaic DSS for investigation in general, and Jewish identity in particular.

Through a survey of the figures included in the Aramaic DSS as well as related figure-based research, an intriguing opportunity surfaced to explore Jewish identity through the three priestly figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram. We proposed to do so in the earliest and most concentrated portraits of each of these figures contained in material culture, those being in the

³ Reed, *Demons, Angels, and Writing*, 36.

Aramaic DSS. While snapshots of each of these figures appear at various points across the Aramaic DSS, our investigation, while focusing in on each of these figures and their related traditions, adopted natural textual boundaries of the material culture to delimit the content we engaged. This allowed us to explore each figure in the respective Aramaic DSS materials in which they made their most concentrated appearance. For Levi this was ALD (1Q21; 4Q213; 4Q213a; 4Q213b; 4Q214; 4Q214a; 4Q214b),⁴ for Qahat WQ (4Q542), and for Amram this was VA (4Q543–4Q547). This maintained our primary focus on each figure, while recognizing the ongoing value and importance of material culture by using its physical boundaries to manage the scope of our investigation.

Following the identification of this departure point, we moved to frame and justify the nature of our present approach. We recognized that despite a vast body of Jewish identity research, there is an ongoing need for further study in this area. We conveyed a methodological focus on close textual readings, philological analysis, and literary critical investigation, and outlined the specific strategies we would adopt across our figure-focussed investigation. In this we intentionally limited our investigation to an exploration of five primary concepts: *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space*. Each of these concepts were defined and we explained our adoption of them in view of preliminary surveys of the Aramaic materials in question and their notable intersections with wider identity scholarship.

At the heart of our investigation, we proposed to build upon past observations in scholarship and develop intersections with select analogues in wider Second Temple traditions

⁴ As we previously noted, in addition to the ALD materials from the Dead Sea Scrolls, we also adopt some of the wider preserved traditions of ALD into our investigation in view of previous scholarly precedent. This includes Aramaic Cairo Genizah materials (T-S 16.94 [ms A Cambridge]; ms Heb c 27 f. 56 [ms A Bodleian]; P 1185 [Rylands Recto/Verso]), the Syriac British museum fragment (ms Add. 17,193 [ms B]), and the Greek Mt. Athos Koutlounous monastery manuscripts (ms Koutlounousiou 39 [ms E]). For more on the bases for including these into the present investigation, see chapter two, section 2.2.1 “*The Text and Its Publication.*”

towards more precise portraits of the profiles of Jewish identity for each of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in the Aramaic DSS.

5.2 Ancestral Profiles: Levi, Qahat, and Amram

Towards this end, chapters two, three, and four each oriented a particular figure with an introduction to both their profile in the Hebrew Scriptures and their broader profile in wider Second Temple literature. For each, we further primed our investigation by introducing the related material culture from the Aramaic DSS in which we would undertake our investigation. We considered some notable areas of past research related to the Aramaic materials in question for each figure. We provided a basic outline and an extended overview of the content of each narrative in question. Finally, we introduced the wider network of named figures with whom Levi, Qahat, and Amram each intersect with in their respective narratives. Upon this composite foundation we undertook our investigation of profiles of Jewish identity for each of the figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in the Aramaic DSS.

In chapter two, we began by developing the above foundation for the figure of Levi. We built upon select past impressions for the figure of Levi, working to capture a more distinct portrait of his profile of Jewish identity. We did this by sequentially exploring the previously introduced concepts of *kinship*, *tradition*, *revelation*, *time*, and *space*. For each of these concepts, some of our key findings included the following:

- *Kinship*: we mapped out Levi's kinship emphasis and identified several similar expressions in wider figures, yet recognized important distinctives, such as the

lengths Levi was willing to go to endorse and ensure adherence to kinship boundaries.

- *Tradition*: we considered some of the distinctives of his underlying beliefs and practices, noting the importance of notions of ritual practice, truth, and wisdom. We picked up on his particular engagement in the tradition process, including Levi's own comprehensive participation in this process.
- *Revelation*: we identified select notable threads, such as Levi's interest in specific revelation pertaining to otherworldly figures, spaces, and their related realities. We also recognized within this this apparent limited interest in malevolent aspects of otherworldly reality beyond select general observations pertaining to their apparent intersections with humanity.
- *Time*: we saw Levi's interests concentrate around notions of past and future, akin to various wider ancient Jewish figures. Yet within this we captured his notable concern for figures and artefacts connected with the past and a concern for future projected realities pertaining to both him and his descendants.
- *Space*: we catalogued some of Levi's primary interests, picking up on his specific development of an association/engagement with alternative spatial concepts including vertical space through ritual practice and dream-visions; horizontal space through ways and paths conceptualizations; the human body as a sacred space with an awareness of some of its wider halakhic intersections; and wisdom as a spatial concept.

In chapter three, we developed this foundation for the figure of Qahat. We consistently worked off select past observations of Qahat in scholarship, again in connection with the concepts of *kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space* to develop a more precise portrait of his profile of Jewish identity. As with the figure of Levi, we sequentially explored his connections with each of these concepts. For each of these concepts, some of our key findings included the following:

- *Kinship*: we noted Qahat's emphasis on the role of kinship in his handling of transmitted ancestral tradition. We observed through Qahat's distinct conception of tradition, how he develops a highly exclusive understanding of kinship. We captured his further elevation of kinship boundaries through an apparent rejection of the notion of kinship conversion and a severe intermarriage prohibition relative to some of his contemporaries.
- *Tradition*: we considered both Qahat's particular engagement with tradition as well as the wider contours of his inherited tradition through a consideration of a list of seven items that he outlines as apparently representative of its content. Namely, truth, upright practice, integrity, perfection, purity, holiness, and the priesthood.
- *Revelation*: for Qahat, we saw that although he arguably demonstrates a more subtle engagement with revelation compared to Levi in the preceding chapter (and later Amram), he nonetheless develops notable aspects of his identity profile in connection to the concept of revelation. We noted Qahat's overlapping revelatory interests pertaining to his descendants and the figure of God. This included

engagements with the notions of light, knowledge, the divine name, and divine justice.

- *Time*: we noted Qahat's concerns for the past and the future and keyed in on his emphasis on certain eschatological realities. Within this, we recognized Qahat's apparent interest in a more basic temporal schema compared to contemporary figures. We qualified this impression, however, in view of the fragmentary nature of the material evidence, which may previously have captured more substantial temporal horizons.
- *Space*: we primarily observed Qahat's interest in aspects of vertical and horizontal space. We considered how Qahat engaged vertical divisions as an alternative means of constructing a sense of spatial identity when compared to more traditional named geographic emphases. We also considered Qahat's interest in two-ways conceptualizations as another important spatial aspect of his identity.

In chapter four, we developed this foundation for the figure of Amram. We again built upon select past observations in scholarship of the connections between him and the concepts of *kinship, tradition, revelation, time, and space* towards a more precise portrait of his profile of Jewish identity. As with the figures of Qahat and Levi, we again sequentially explored his connections with each of these concepts. For each of these concepts, some of our key findings included the following:

- *Kinship*: like Qahat and Levi, we picked up on some of Amram's high-level points of intersection with kinship. We noted that perhaps his most substantial

intersection with kinship appears in his distinct adoption and ongoing adherence to practices pertaining to both ancestral burial and endogamy.

- *Tradition*: we considered the select nature of Amram’s chosen audience and outlined some of the notable underlying beliefs and practices contained therein. Within this we recognized certain overlap with Levi, Qahat, and other wider figures, as well as certain distinctives, including his particular emphasis on instruction as a virtue to be maintained ongoing among future generations.
- *Revelation*: we considered revelation as arguably the concept—alongside kinship—with which Amram develops the most substantial number of intersections. In this we looked at the considerable revelatory expressions, experiences, and language in which Amram appears in connection throughout the fragmentary narrative of VA. We surveyed the considerable repertoire of revelatory knowledge that Amram develops, including key elements pertaining to spoken and observed revelation regarding otherworldly figures and otherworldly space.
- *Time*: we identified some of the notable similarities with Qahat and Levi in terms of past and future temporal emphases. In this process we also picked up on some of Amram’s notable temporal distinctives such as a primary focus on the pasts and futures of his immediate descendants.
- *Space*: like Qahat and Levi, we considered some of Amram’s alternative conceptualizations of space compared to associations with more traditional named geographic locations. We looked at Amram’s alternative emphasis on a vertical axis of space, particularly in connection with the ideas of “heights” and “depths,”

as well as his heightened interest in spatial quality. We picked up on the some of the distinct ways in which Amram develops these in connection with select otherworldly figures of light and darkness, particularly through his choice not of an otherworldly ruler, but of an otherworldly conversation partner.

Through the above chapters, therefore, we developed more precise identity profiles of the ancestral figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram in the Aramaic DSS. Let us now turn to consider some of larger outcomes and outlooks from the present study.

5.3 Being Jewish in the Aramaic DSS: Outcomes and Outlooks

At the outset of our study, one of the primary questions we set off to answer was: What does it mean to be Jewish in the Aramaic DSS? The primary way we worked to answer this question was by developing the above outlined profiles of identity. In view of those profiles, we can now offer concluding reflections and identify resulting outlooks.

The figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram and their profiles of identity in the present study, in many ways evidence a notable network of similarities. Among these three profiles:

- We see shared emphases on the importance of *kinship* for their identity.
- Each seem to underscore the importance of ancestral *tradition* and its transmission through preserved lore as an important aspect of what it means to be Jewish.
- Alternative conceptions of otherworldly *revelation* play a notable role in shaping the identities of each figure.

- All develop critical intersections with notions of *time*.
- And the importance of *space* appears in different underlying spatial conceptions that give important shape to their overall profiles.

In view of this we could say that Levi, Qahat, and Amram all share a similar conception of what it means to be Jewish in the Aramaic DSS. We could perhaps consequently speak of their Jewish *identity*.

Yet amidst the various similarities and shared emphases, Levi, Qahat, and Amram also develop these concepts along their own distinct lines. The importance of kinship for Levi looks different from Qahat and Amram. The same goes for tradition, revelation, time, and space. While we can perhaps attribute some of these differences to the alternative narrative contexts in which they appear, the apparent distinctions among these figures are a result of their *individuality* as figures whose portrayed attributes as individuals result in a notable degree of individuality in their expressions of Jewish identity. In this sense we would be remiss not to speak of their Jewish *identities*.⁵

These concluding reflections on *identity* vs. *identities* perhaps represent an offshoot of longstanding conversations of “Judaism” vs “Judaisms” or related identity questions pertaining to unity vs. diversity. This is not unexpected since despite our best efforts to move in direct lines and direct routes, progress in scholarship tends to be non-linear.

The primary contribution of the present study is building upon past impressions of the intersections between the three figures of Levi, Qahat, and Amram and a selection of concepts

⁵ I would like to thank Professor George J. Brooke for helping bring awareness to this important distinction between Jewish *identity* and *identities* in a personal engagement at a one-day programme at the University of Birmingham showcasing current research in the DSS on 26, May 2022, hosted by Professor Charlotte Hempel.

pertaining to identity, to develop more precise profiles of Jewish identity. I believe we have accomplished that.

Beyond this primary contribution, however, our study offers additional offerings to wider areas of study and invites further investigation on several additional fronts. In the process of orienting our investigation at the outset of this study, we picked up on several notable intersecting conversations. We noted important intersections between our question of “being Jewish” and specific areas of study pertaining to the Aramaic DSS, the broader DSS corpus, Jewish identity studies, and the larger Second Temple landscape. Our analysis of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, offers contributions to these broader investigative frames and highlights select opportunities for further study.

For the Aramaic DSS, our engagement contributes to a growing body of knowledge on the intersections between these materials and conceptions of the priesthood. We developed some of the notable ways in which Levi, Qahat, and Amram, together pick up on important priestly tropes and motifs. In this we saw places where they both converged around shared impressions of the kinship contours of the priestly line, developed the notion of priestly tradition and its transmission, contributed to the Second Temple portrait of priestly figures in connection to wider notions of scribalism and instruction, and in this all evidenced notable points of divergence among each other. Their profiles provided us with a more nuanced acquaintance with Second Temple portraits of priestly figures in view of their emphases and idiosyncrasies, for example:

- Levi leaves the impression of the priestly figure as a ritually focussed seer who develops into a sage-like instructor.

- Qahat portrays the priestly figure as a type of eschatologically oriented virtue instructor.
- Amram develops the priestly figure as a robust revelatory recipient and a notably well-rounded kinship exemplar.

Through these portraits, our analysis contributes to developing impressions of the priesthood in the Aramaic materials. Yet our figure focused approach and engagement of the Aramaic materials from a decentralized perspective, —canonically speaking—invites a series of additional questions for wider priestly figures, including the following: How might wider decentralized (again canonically speaking) explorations create opportunity for freshly understanding the contours of the priesthood in the Aramaic materials? We could perhaps extend this question further into non-priestly figures as well. When we think about our understanding of the wider network of figures across the Aramaic materials, how much of our previous thinking has been shaped by canonical or compositional frames? How would wider figure-focused, decentralized explorations impact our current perceptions of these figures and their importance for both understanding notions of the priesthood, Jewish identity, and each of their distinct roles within the ancient Jewish literary landscape?

Beyond the priesthood, our investigation perhaps also engages longstanding questions pertaining to the compositional context of the Aramaic DSS. Our figure-based exploration compliments wider compositional investigations, such as the study of Raup Johnson, who considered the contents of the individual literary compositions as representative of distinct

compositional contexts.⁶ When we consider our explorations of Levi, Qahat, and Amram, we come away with distinct impressions of the importance of the priesthood in relation to:

- 1) Kinship relationships
- 2) The ongoing maintenance of transmitted tradition through lore
- 3) The centrality of wider revelatory conceptions
- 4) Time and its intersections with past figures and past precedents and future/eschatological projected realities
- 5) The formation of alternative conceptions of space

Scholars have previously offered a variety of proposals on the compositional context of both the Aramaic DSS in general, and some of the underlying traditions in particular. Drawnel, for example, has developed Mesopotamian connections with the Aramaic DSS, arguing that the close connections with Babylonian thought hint at these materials as being composed outside of the land of Israel.⁷ Kugler picked up on the earlier work of Milik and developed several clues in ALD to argue towards its Samaritan compositional context.⁸ Following his exploration of VA, Duke proffered the possibility of Hebron as its compositional location.⁹

The profiles we have developed of these three figures offer some further contour to this conversation. My impression is that concentrated explorations of figures, in a similar way to Raup Johnson's exploration of historical fictions, provide an opportunity to explore this question

⁶ Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions*.

⁷ See, for example, Drawnel, "Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts," 145–67; Drawnel, "Priestly Education," 547–74; Drawnel, "The Literary Form," 63–64; Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text*.

⁸ Kugler, "Some Further Evidence," 351–58. On Milik's earlier observations, see, Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi," 398–406.

⁹ Duke, *The Social Location*.

in different ways.¹⁰ If we consider figures as a powerful locus for meaning, it invites us to ask how further figure-based exploration in the Aramaic DSS might contribute to developing impressions around questions of compositional location. For example, how might Levi's formation of wider spatial features of identity, such as wisdom as type of impenetrable city speak to this question? Or Amram's development of kinship through the lens of ancestral burial? Or Qahat's heightened concern for exogamous threats?

Stepping back further into the wider DSS corpus, the present investigation opens additional avenues and opportunities for exploration. One area of study pertains the concept of dualism. Following the initial discovery of the DSS, early scholars quickly drew conclusions and identified prominent themes and trends within the materials. They judged some of the materials to be representative of an early Jewish sectarian movement called the Essenes, while others, they classified as non-sectarian in nature, originating beyond the proposed community at Qumran. Among the identified themes in the texts, scholars recognized a two-ways conceptualization of all existence—creation and the creative order as represented by dichotomies and pairs in opposition.¹¹ Comparative religious analysis led researchers to designate this conceptualization in the DSS as “dualism.”¹²

¹⁰ For more on the nature of Raup Johnson's study and its intersections with the present investigation, see, section 1.2, entitled, “‘Being Jewish:’ Previous Explorations of Jewish Identity.”

¹¹ For early impressions, see, for example, William Hugh Brownlee and W. F. Albright, “The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes,” *BASORSup* 10/12 (1951): 1–60; André Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*, trans. E. Margaret Rowley (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952). For more concentrated impressions on dualism, see, for example, Preben C. H. Wernberg-Møller, “Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III, 13–IV, 26),” *RevQ* 3.3 (1961): 413–41; Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen Zum Dualismus in Den Texten Aus Qumran*, OCLC (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).

¹² See, for example, K. G. Kuhn, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *ZTK* 49 (1952), 296–316; D. Winston, “The Iranian Component in the Bible, Apocrypha, and Qumran: A view of the Evidence,” *HR* 5 (1966): 183–216.

This early period of research set much of the tone and direction for future investigation on the DSS, including that on dualism. Scholars took initial impressions of the materials and used them as the foundation upon which to pioneer their way forward. As a result, dualism became a prominent fixture in early DSS studies.¹³ Scholars saw dualism as a key feature of the identity and makeup of the sectarian community behind many of the materials and a considerable body of research since the discovery of the DSS has relied upon and absorbed many of the early perceptions on dualism.¹⁴

In John Collins' recent review of the 2011 volume on dualism entitled: *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World*, he commented that "the volume as a whole suffers from lack of clarity as to what is meant by Dualism."¹⁵ He continued, "a study that focuses directly on the dualism of the Scrolls, and especially on its relation to Zoroastrian dualism remains a desideratum."¹⁶ These comments emphasize the need for further investigation and understanding on the topic of dualism in the DSS.

On various occasions, our present study picked up and intersected with ideas and concepts that prominently feature in dualism research. Among these are vertical and horizontal notions of space, engagements with otherworldly figures, aspects of revelation and knowledge, temporal emphases, and group boundaries/divisions among other things. In view of the scope of the present study, we had limited opportunity to develop these intersections with dualism. While

¹³ A monograph on dualism at Qumran was already published by 1959. See, Hans W. Huppenbauer, *Der Mensch zwischen zwei Welten: Der Dualismus der Texte von Qumran (Höhle I) und der Damaskusfragmente: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Evangeliums*, ATANT 34 (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1959).

¹⁴ The centrality of dualism for the sectarian community has since been called into question. See, for example, Charlotte Hempel, "The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Rule of the Community," in *Dualism in Qumran*, LSTS 76, ed. Geza Xeravits (London, New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–120.

¹⁵ John J. Collins, "Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World: A Review Article," *DSD* 19 (2012): 227.

¹⁶ John J. Collins, "Light Against Darkness," 228.

scholars have explored these dualistic expressions in the Aramaic DSS on numerous occasions, couching these expressions within decentralized, figure-focused frames allows us to consider them from somewhat of a different angle. Instead of looking at the expression of dualism in VA, for example, wholesale, what would shifting it within a figure-based framework do in terms of our understanding of this concept? In what ways would this allow scholars to pivot from previous concentrations of interest around tracing notions of the origin and development of dualism? How might decentralized, figure-based explorations add new dimensions—perhaps literally in the case of spatial dualism—to our understanding of the nature of this concept and refine our engagement with it?

Finally, when we step back even further, towards the wider Second Temple landscape and beyond, the present study invites us to ask additional questions regarding the value of figure-based approaches and alternative ways of engaging with the materials outside of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the present study, we worked to “put our money where our . . . keystrokes are” and reconsider figures in the materials—outside of the Hebrew Scriptures—in which they appear, “on their own terms.” By engaging these figures primarily in these wider materials, giving far less interest to how their portraits therein contribute to our understandings of them in the Hebrew Scriptures, and offering our primary attention towards who they are in those materials, I believe we come away with something to offer. This practice says that each figure, however small, or seemingly insignificant, has a story to tell. It invites us to the fringes; to see just as much value there as we do in some type of conceptualized middle. My impression is that adopting this approach will step on some toes, but also allow space for other sets of feet. I think that is important. As we work to implement this type of approach within Second Temple scholarship and beyond in the years to come, I believe we will come away with more precise impressions of

Jewish *identity* and *identities*, and a much richer encounter with the figures we engage with along the way.

Bibliography

- Albertz, Rainer, and Jakob Wohrle, eds. *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Alexander, Philip S. “The Dualism of Heaven and Earth in Early Jewish Literature.” Pages 169–85 in *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World*. Edited by Armin Lange, Eric M. Meyers, Bennie H. Reynolds III, and Randall Styers. JAJSup 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Angel, Joseph L. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 86. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*. Jerusalem: Magness, 1956.
- Baker, Cynthia. “A ‘Jew’ by Any Other Name?” *JAJ* 2.2 (2011): 153–80.
- Baker, Cynthia M. *Jew*. KWJS. New Brunswick; New Jersey; London: Rutgers University Press, 2017.
- Bar-Asher, Moshé. “Il y Avait à Suse Un Homme Juif.” *REJ* 161.1/2 (2002): 227–31.
- Baron, Salo W. “Problems of Jewish Identity from an Historical Perspective: A Survey.” *PAAJR* 46/47 (1979): 33–67.
- Barth, Frederik, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget Press, 1969.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. “The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Threat to Halakhah?” *TR* 1.2 (1959): 209–21.
- Baxter, Wayne. “Noachic Traditions and the Book of Noah.” *JSP* 15.3 (2006): 179–94.
- Becking, Bob. “Yehudite Identity in Elephantine.” Pages 403–19 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*. STDJ 78. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. “Time and Identity: The Hellenistic Background of the Calendar Treatise in Jubilees 6.” Pages 31–56 in *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. MG 10. Jerusalem: Haifa University Press and Bialik Institute, 2013.
- Ben-Eliyahu, Eyal, ed. *Identity and Territory: Jewish Perceptions of Space in Antiquity*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2019.
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. “On Social Memory and Identity Formation in Late Persian Yehud: A Historian’s Viewpoint with a Focus on Prophetic Literature, Chronicles and the Deuteronomistic Historical Collection.” *Social Memory among the Literati of Yehud*. BZAW 509. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.
- Bennett, Shelby. “Silenced Voices: Hearing Biblical Women Through the Genesis Apocryphon.” MA, Trinity Western University, 2021.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. “Noah and the Flood at Qumran.” Pages 199–231 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts*,

- and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 39–63 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth Clements. STDJ 58. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 151–74 in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. STDJ 107. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran*. STDJ 107. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Where Are the Patriarchs in the Literature of Qumran?" Pages 51–76 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. BZAW 439. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
- Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register: Ergänzungsband*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register: Band 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Bickerman, Elias J. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel*. LAI. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Judaeans, Jews, Children of Abraham." Pages 461–81 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

- Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele. "The Rediscovery of Enochic Judaism and the Enoch Seminar." Pages 9–13 in *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar, University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy June 19–23, 2001*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. *Hen* 24.1/2. Turin: Zamorani, 2002.
- Boccaccini, Gabriele, ed. "Introduction: From the Enoch Literature to Enochic Judaism." Pages 1–13 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Boesenberg, Dulcinea. "Construction of Jewish Identity in Philo's Sabbath Explanations." *JSQ* 26.2 (2019): 99–116.
- Bohak, Gideon. "A New Genizah Fragment of the 'Aramaic Levi Document.'" *Tarbiz* 79 (2011): 373–83 (Hebrew).
- Bohak, Gideon. "A New Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document." Pages 101–14 in *From Cairo to Manchester: Studies in the Rylands Genizah Fragments*. Edited by Renate Smithuis and Philip S. Alexander. *JSSSup* 31. University of Oxford Press, 2013.
- Bonani, Georges, Susan Ivy, Willy Wölfli, Magen Broshi, Israel Carmi, and John Strugnell. "Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls." *Radiocarbon* 34.3 (1992): 843–49.
- Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. *JAJSup* 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism." *CBQ* 61.3 (1999): 429.
- Brin, Gershon. *The Concept of Time in The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. *STDJ* 39. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Brooke, George J. "Some Issues behind the Ethics in the Qumran Scrolls and Their Implications for New Testament Ethics." Pages 83–106 in *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts*. Edited by Jan Willem van Henten and Joseph Verheyden. *STAR* 17. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Brooke, George J. "Praying History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Memory, Identity, Fulfilment." Pages 305–19 in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*. Edited by Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner. *BZAW* 486. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2017.
- Brownlee, William Hugh, and W. F. Albright. "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes." *BASORSup* 10–12 (1951): 1–60.
- Burns, Joshua Ezra. "Gendered Language and the Construction of Jewish Identity in 2 Maccabees." *JJI* 11.1 (2018): 5–16.
- Cason, Thomas Scott. "Creature Features: Monstrosity and the Construction of Human Identity in the 'Testament of Solomon.'" *CBQ* 77.2 (2015): 263–79.
- Charles, R. H. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

- Charles, R. H., and A. Cowley. "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs." *JQR* 19.3 (1907): 566–83.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. "Ioudaios to Genos and Related Expressions in Josephus." Pages 23–38 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. SMTFIJS 31. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Cohen, Shaye. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Routledge, 1997.
- Collins, John J. "The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives." Pages 546–64 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. STDJ 94. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Collins, John J. "Light Against Darkness. Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World: A Revoew Article." *DSD* 19 (2012): 227–28.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2016.
- Collins, John J. *The Invention of Judaism: Torah and Jewish Identity from Deuteronomy to Paul*. *The Invention of Judaism*. University of California Press, 2017.
- Collins, John J., and George W. E. Nickelsburg. *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. SCS 12. Scholars Press, 1980.
- Cook, Edward M. "Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4." *JJS* 44.2 (1993): 205–19.
- Cook, Edward M. *Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Daley, Daniel. "Inheritance, Inclusion, and Identity in Tobit and the Jewish Diaspora." *Bib* 102.3 (2021): 321–34.
- Davies, Phillip R. "Halakhah at Qumran." *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. SFSHJ 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Davies, Philip R. "What History Can We Get From The Scrolls, And How?" Pages 31–46 in . Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Davies, Philip R. "Historiography." Pages 228–36 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018.
- Davis, Kipp. *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions: Prophetic Persona and the Construction of Community Identity*. STDJ 111. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Davis, Kipp. "Forging Reputations of National Icons: Chuck Norris and the Prophet Jeremiah." Trinity Western University, 23 February 2016.

- Deasley, Alex R. G. *The Shape of Qumran Theology*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000.
- Dhont, Marieke. "Jewish Poets, Greek Poetry: Language and Identity in the Hellenistic Jewish Poetic Tradition." *BN* 189 (2021): 65–86.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Noah in Early Jewish Literature." Pages 123–50 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Theodore Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4." Pages 230–49 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emmanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. VTSup 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community." Pages 197–205 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. SJSJ 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts." Pages 15–45 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. STDJ 94. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Dimant, Devorah, and Reinhard G. Kratz. *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Tobit and the Qumran Aramaic Texts." Pages 385–406 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Brill, 2017.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Tobit and the 'Torah for Exile' in Light of the Qumran Texts." *ZTK* 119.1 (2022): 4–30.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Two-Ways Notion in the Qumran Texts." *The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Hellenistic Judea: Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Aberdeen, 5–8 August, 2019)*. Edited by Barry Hartog, Andrew B. Perrin, and in collaboration with Shelby Bennet and Matthew Hama. STDJ 142. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)." *CurBR* 5.1 (2007): 235–86.
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity: (Part II)." *CurBR* 5.3 (2007): 367–432.
- Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concept of Pollution and Taboo*. Routledge Classics. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. SJSJ 86. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

- Drawnel, Henryk. "Priestly Education in the 'Aramaic Levi Document (Visions of Levi)' and 'Aramaic Astronomical Book' (4Q208–211)." *RevQ* 22.4 (88) (2006): 547–74.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "The Literary Form and Didactic Content of the Admonitions (Testament) Of Qahat." Pages 55–73 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "The Initial Narrative of the Visions of Amram and Its Literary Characteristics." *RevQ* 24.4 (2010): 517–54.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "The Literary Characteristics of the Visions of Levi (so-Called Aramaic Levi Document)." *JAJ* 1.3 (2010): 303–19.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "Some Notes on the Aramaic Manuscripts from Qumran and Late Mesopotamian Culture." *RevQ* 26.2 (2013): 145–67.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "Qumran and the Ancient Near East." Pages 109–18 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "The Cairo Genizah Fragment of the Visions of Levi from the University of Manchester Library." *DSD* 28.1 (2021): 75–108.
- Drawnel, Henryk. "Józef Tadeusz Milik and the Publication of the Qumran Fragments of the Aramaic Testament of Levi." *RevQ* 33.1 (2021): 93–119.
- Duhaime, Jean. "La Règle de la Guerre (1QM) et la construction de l'identité sectaire." Pages 131–46 in *Defining identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Duke, Robert. "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the Vision of Amram." *DSD* 14.1 (2007): 34–48.
- Duke, Robert R. *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)*. StBibLit 135. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey*. Translated by E. Margaret Rowley. Oxford: Blackwell, 1952.
- Eckhardt, Benedikt. "Introduction: Yet Another Book on Jewish Identity in Antiquity." Pages 1–10 in *Jewish Identity and Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. Edited by Benedikt Eckhardt. SJSJ 155. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Eckhardt, Benedikt, ed. *Jewish Identity and Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. SJSJ 155. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Edelman, Diana Vikander, and Ehud Ben Zvi. *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*. Oxford: University Press, 2013.
- Eisenman, Robert H., and Michael Owen Wise, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for over 35 Years*. New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1993.

- Elgvin, Torleif, Michael Langlois, and Kipp Davis, eds. *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from the Schøyen Collection*. LSTS. London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.
- Eshel, Esther. “The Proper Marriage According to the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts / לה תנישואם הראויים על פי המגילה החיצונית לבראשית ועל פי מקורות קרובים לה” MG ט/ח (2010): 29–51 (Hebrew).
- Esler, Philip F. “Judean Ethnic Identity in Josephus’ Against Apion.” Pages 73–91 in *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*. Edited by Zuleika Rodgers, Margaret Daly-Denton, and Anne Fitzpatrick-McKinley. SJSJ 132. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Evans, Craig A. “Abraham.” *EDSS* 1:2–4.
- Fabricius, Johann Albert. *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*. Hamburgi & Lipsiae: Sumptu Christiani Liebezeit, 1713.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran.” *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments: Festschrift für Erich Zenger*. Edited by Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger. HB 44. Freiberg: Herder, 2004.
- Falk, Daniel K. “Moses.” *EDSS* 1:576–77.
- Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. LSTS 63; CQS 8. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Feldman, Ariel. “1Q19 (‘Book of Noah’) Reconsidered.” *Hen* 31.2 (2009): 284–306.
- Feldman, Ariel. “Aramaic Levi.” Pages 469–80 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.
- Feldman, Ariel. “Patriarchs and Aramaic Traditions.” Pages 469–80 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.
- Feldman, Liane M. “Perspective and Perception: Sacrifice in the Aramaic Levi Document.” Paper presented at University of Birmingham Biblical Studies Seminar (virtual), University of Birmingham UK, 16 December 2020.
- Feldman, Liane M. “Sanitized Sacrifice in Aramaic Levi’s Law of the Priesthood.” *JAJ* 11.3 (2020): 343–68.
- Fields, Weston W. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Finitsis, Antonios. “The Other in Haggai and Zechariah 1–8.” Pages 116–31 in *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, and Matthew Goff. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2011.
- Fischel, Henry A. “The Uses of Sorites (Climax, Gratio) in the Tannaitic Period.” *HUCA* 44 (1973): 119–51.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Aramaic.” *EDSS* 1:48–51.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “The Aramaic Levi Document.” Pages 453–64 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and*

- Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. W. B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., and Daniel J. Harrington. *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts: Second Century B.C.–Second Century A.D.* BibOr 34. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1978. Repr., Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1982. Repr., Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994. Repr., Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2002.
- Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. SJSJ 90. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Fraade, Steven D. “The Temple as a Marker of Jewish Identity Before and After 70 CE: The Role of the Holy Vessels in Rabbinic Memory and Imagination.” Pages 523–54 in *Legal Fictions: Studies of Law and Narrative in the Discursive Worlds of Ancient Jewish Sectarians and Sages*. SJSJ 147. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. *All the Glory of Adam*. STDJ 42. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2018.
- Frevel, Christian, ed. *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*. LHBOTS 547. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Frey, Jörg. “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library.” Pages 276–335 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Frey, Jörg, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stéphanie Gripentrog. *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Frey, Jörg. “On the Origins of the Genre of the ‘Literary Testament’: Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre.” Pages 345–75 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. STDJ 94. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Frey, Jörg. “Apocalyptic Dualism.” Pages 271–94 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Fröhlich, Ida. “Medicine and Magic in Genesis Apocryphon. Ideas on Human Conception and Its Hindrances.” *RevQ* 25.2 (98) (2011): 177–98.
- Frye, Richard N. “Reitzenstein and Qumrân Revisited by an Iranian.” *HTR* 55.4 (1962): 261–68.
- Fuller, Russell E. “Cultural Memory, the Qumran Library, and Identity.” *Hen* 40.1 (2018): 70–79.
- Gammie, John G. “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature.” *JBL* 93.3 (1974): 356.
- García Martínez, Florentino. “4Q ‘Amram B I, 14: Melki-Reša‘ o Melki-Sedeq?” *RevQ* 12.1 (1985): 111–14.

- García Martínez, Florentino. "4Q Mes. Aram. y el Libro de Noé." Pages 1–44 in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden; Boston: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- García Martínez, Florentino. *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?" Pages 435–50 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008*. STDJ 94. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Parabiblical Literature from Qumrân and the Canonical Process." *RevQ* 25.4 (2012): 525–56.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Mladen Popović, eds. *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. STDJ 70. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Goldman, Liora. "Dualism in the 'Visions of Amram.'" *RevQ* 24.3 (2010): 421–32.
- Goldman, Liora. "The Burial of the Fathers in the Visions of Amram from Qumran." Pages 231–50 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Goldman, Liora. "Between Aaron and Moses in 4QVisions of Amram." Pages 101–18 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, and with the collaboration of Melissa Sayyad Bach, Søren Holst, and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Good, Roger Blythe. "Jacob." *EDSS* 1:395–96.
- Good, Roger Blythe. "Joseph." *EDSS* 1:425–26.
- Good, Roger Blythe. "Judah." *EDSS* 1:438–39.
- Goodblatt, David. *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Goodblatt, David. "Population Structure and Jewish Identity." Pages 102–21 in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Daily Life in Roman Palestine*, 2010.
- Goodblatt, David. "Varieties of Identity in Late Second Temple Judah (200 b.c.e.–135 c.e.)." Pages 11–28 in *Jewish Identity and Politics Between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. Edited by Benedikt Eckhardt. SJSJ 155. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Goodblatt, David. "Ancient Jewish Identity." *AJR* (2018).
<https://www.ancientjewreview.com/articles/2018/10/24/ancient-jewish-identity>.

- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, eds. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004.
- Gross, Andrew D. "Testament of Kohath." Pages 1869–71 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 2013.
- Grossman, Maxine L. "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status." Pages 1–11 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Grossman, Maxine L. "Rethinking Gender in the Community Rule: An Experiment in Sociology." *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Gruen, Erich S. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Rejuvenation of Jewish Tradition*. HCS 30. Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 1998.
- Gruen, Erich S. "Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe." *Phoenix* 67.1/2 (2013): 1–22.
- Gruen, Erich S. *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2016.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hall, Jonathan M. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago, IL; London: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. "Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in Jubilees 46." Pages 135–52 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Hannah, Darrel D. "The Book of Noah, the Death of Herod the Great, and the Date of the Parables of Enoch." Pages 469–77 in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*. Edited by Gabrielle Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 8.2 (2001): 124–35.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls—Current Issues." *CurBR* 4.3 (2006): 397–428.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Intermarriage in Qumran Texts: The Legacy of Ezra-Nehemiah." Pages 251–79 in *Mixed Marriages: Intermarriage and Group Identity in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Christian Frevel. LHBOTS 547. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Harrington, Hannah K. "Identity and Alterity in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals*. Edited by Benedikt Eckhardt. SJSJ 155. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2011.

- Harrington, Hannah K. "How Does Intermarriage Defile the Sanctuary?" Pages 177–95 in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*. Edited by George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Molly M. Zahn. STDJ 103. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Hayes, Christine E. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Heger, Paul. "Another Look at Dualism in Qumran Writings." Pages 39–101 in *Dualism in Qumran*. LSTS 76. London, New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. SJSJ 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If so Was It Mutual?" *RevQ* 24.1 (2009): 135–53.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Context of 4QMMT and Comfortable Theories." Pages 275–92 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Rule of the Community." Pages 102–20 in *Dualism in Qumran*. LSTS 76. London, New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*. TSAJ 154. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Community Rules from Qumran*. TSAJ 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Hillel, Vered. "Aramaic Levi." Pages 261–63 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *JSQ* 6.1 (1999): 1–24.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: The Law of the Priesthood in Aramaic Levi and Jubilees." Pages 103–22 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by Ra'anana S. Boustany and Annette Yoshiko Reed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. JCC. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Judaism in Antiquity: Ethno-Religion or National Identity." *JQR* 99.1 (2009): 65–73.

- Hirsch-Luipold, Rainer, Matthias Konradt, and Ulrike Steinert, eds. *Ethos und Identität: Einheit und Vielfalt des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*. StJC. Paderborn; München; Wien; Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2002.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. "Geography in the Visions of Amram Texts (4Q543–547)." Pages 119–36 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, and with the collaboration of Melissa Sayyad Bach, Søren Holst, and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Holger Gzella. "Dating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Possibilities and Limits." *RevQ* 24.1 (93) (2009): 61–78.
- Holst, Søren. "Fragments and Forefathers: An Experiment with the Reconstruction of 4QVisions of Amram." Pages 137–52 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, and with the collaboration of Melissa Sayyad Bach, Søren Holst, and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Horowitz, Donald L. "Ethnic Identity." Pages 111–40 in *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*. Edited by Nathan Glazer, Daniel P. Moynihan, and Corinne Saposch Schelling. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der. *Studies in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. AJEC 87. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2014.
- Hultgren, Stephen. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 66. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith. *Ethnicity*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Jefferson, Rebecca J. W. "Deconstructing 'the Cairo Genizah': A Fresh Look at Genizah Manuscript Discoveries in Cairo before 1897." *JQR* 108.4 (2018): 422–48.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes." *RevQ* 20.2 (2001): 223–39.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Social Identity Approach: Identity-Constructing Elements in the Psalms Peshet." Pages 63–84 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and 'Insider' Status." Pages 85–109 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Jones, Robert. "Priesthood and Cult in the Visions of Amram: A Critical Evaluation of Its Attitudes toward the Contemporary Temple Establishment in Jerusalem." *DSD* 27.1 (2020): 1–30.
- 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 by Esther G. Chazon, Michael E. Stone, and Avital Pinnick. *STDJ* 31. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Jongeling, Bastiaan, C. J. Labuschagne, and A. S. van der Woude. *Aramaic Texts from Qumran with Translations and Annotations*. *SSS* 4. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Josephus. The Works of Flavius Josephus: Complete and Unabridged*. Translated by William Whiston. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Juhl Christiansen, Ellen. "Judith: Defender of Israel—Preserver of the Temple." Pages 70–84 in *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith*. Edited by Géza Xeravits. *DCLS* 14. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.
- Jurgens, Blake Alan. "Reassessing the Dream-Vision of the Vision of Amram (4Q543–547)*." *JSP* 24.1 (2014): 3–42.
- Justnes, Årstein. "Fake Fragments, Flexible Provenances: Eight Aramaic 'Dead Sea Scrolls' from the 21st Century." *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad and Kasper Siegismund. *STDJ* 131. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Kazen, Thomas. "Dirt and Disgust: Body and Morality in Biblical Purity Laws." Pages 43–64 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by B. J. Schwartz, D. P. Wright, J. Stackert, and N. S. Meshel. *LHBOTS* 474. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Kazen, Thomas. *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism*. *ConBNT* 45. Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Knibb, Michael A. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. *SVTP* 22. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša*. *CBQMS* 10. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Konstan, David. "Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity." *DJTS* 6.1 (2011): 97–110.
- Kooten, George H. van, ed. *The Revelation of the Name YHWH to Moses: Perspectives from Judaism, the Pagan Graeco-Roman World, and Early Christianity*. Brill, 2006.
- Kottsieper, Ingo. "Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture." Pages 167–77 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.

- Kugel, James L. "The Story of Dinah in the 'Testament of Levi.'" *HTR* 85.1 (1992): 1–34.
- Kugel, James L. "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings." *HTR* 86.1 (1993): 1–64.
- Kugel, James L. "How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?" *DSD* 14.3 (2007): 291–312.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. EJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Kugler, Robert A. "Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi (1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi)." *RevQ* 17.1–4 (1996): 351–58.
- Kugler, Robert A. "Whose Scripture? Whose Community?: Reflections on the Dead Sea Scrolls Then and Now, by Way of Aramaic Levi." *DSD* 15.1 (2008): 5–23.
- Kuhn, K. G. "Die Sektenschrift und Die Iranische Religion." *ZTK* 49.3 (1952): 296–316.
- Kynes, Will. *An Obituary for "Wisdom Literature": The Birth, Death, and Intertextual Reintegration of a Biblical Corpus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Lange, Armin. "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process." Pages 21–30 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- Lange, Armin. "'So I Girded My Loins in the Vision of Righteousness and Wisdom, in the Robe of Supplication' (1QapGen Ar VI.4): טשק in the Book of the Words of Noah and Second Temple Jewish Aramaic Literature." *AS* 8.1–2 (2010): 13–45.
- Lee, Peter. *Aramaic Poetry in Qumran*. Saarbrücken: Scholars' Press, 2015.
- Lemos, T. M. "Where There Is Dirt, Is There System? Revisiting Biblical Purity Constructions." *JSOT* 37.3 (2013): 265–94.
- Levine, Lee I., and Daniel R. Schwartz, eds. *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Lipschits, Oded, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming, eds. *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Looijer, Gwynned de. *The Qumran Paradigm: A Critical Evaluation of Some Foundational Hypotheses in the Construction of the Construction of the Qumran Sect*. EJL 43. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. STDJ 79. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009.
- Machiela, Daniel A. "Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism—A Review of Recent Developments." *JJS* 61.2 (2010): 308–20.
- Machiela, Daniel A. "Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts." *JAAJ* 2 (2014): 113–34.
- Machiela, Daniel A. "The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 147–56 in *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the*

- Apocalyptic Worldview: The First Enoch Seminar Nangeroni Meeting Villa Cagnola, Gazzada (June 25–28, 2012)*. LSTS 88. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls: Coherence and Context in the Library of Qumran.” Pages 244–58 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. STDJ 116. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “‘Wisdom Motifs’ in the Compositional Strategy of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) and Other Aramaic Texts from Qumran*.” Pages 223–47 in *Hā-’ish Mōshe: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein*. STDJ 122. Edited by Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, George J. Brooke. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “Charity as Theme in Some Qumran Aramaic Texts.” Trinity Western University, 23 May 2018.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Settings.” Pages 88–109 in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism: Engaging with John Collins’ The Apocalyptic Imagination*. Edited by Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2018.
- Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Genesis Apocryphon and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Henry W. Morisada Rietz, and Loren L. Johns. PTSDSSP 8A. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “Is the Testament of Qahat Part of the Visions of Amram? Material and Literary Considerations of 4Q542 and 4Q547.” *JSJ* 52.1 (2020): 27–38.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “The Compositional Setting and Implied Audience of Some Aramaic Texts from Qumran: A Working Hypothesis.” Pages 168–202 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, and with the collaboration of Melissa Sayyad Bach, Søren Holst, and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Machiela, Daniel A. “Tending the Paths of Truth: Two Ways in the Hebrew Bible, Dead Sea Scrolls, and Early Christianity.” (n.d.).
- Machiela, Daniel A., and Andrew B. Perrin. “Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon: Toward a Family Portrait.” *JBL* 133.1 (2014): 111–32.
- Mali, Hillel. “Priestly Instructions in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Order of the Morning Daily Sacrifice / ההוראות לכוהנים בכתב לוי הארמי וסדר עבודת התמיד.” *MG יד* (2018): 119–138 (Hebrew).
- Martone, Corrado. “A Proposito di un Passo di 4Q Visioni di `Amram in Alcune Interpretazioni Recenti.” *RSLR* 33 (1997): 615–21.
- Mason, Steve. “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.” *JSJ* 38.4/5 (2007): 457–512.

- Mason, Steve. "Ancient Jews or Judeans? Different Questions, Different Answers." *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014. <https://themarginaliareview.com/ancient-jews-judeans-different-questions-different-answers-steve-mason/>.
- Mermelstein, Ari. *Power and Emotion in Ancient Judaism: Community and Identity in Formation*. Cambridge: University Press, 2021.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 3 of *Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Milik, J. T. "The Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments of the Book of Enoch." *Bib* 32 (1951): 393–400.
- Milik, J. T. "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragment de La Grotte 4 de Qumrân." *RB* 62.3 (1955): 398–406.
- Milik, J. T. "Prière de Nabonide' et Autres Écrits d'un Cycle de Daniel: Fragments Araméens de Qumrân 4." *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15.
- Milik, J. T. "4Q Visions de 'Amram et Une Citation D'origène." *RB* 79.1 (1972): 77–97.
- Milik, J. T. "Milkî-Şedeq et Milkî-Rešae." *JJS* 23.1 (1972): 95–144.
- Milik, J. T. "Écrits Préesséniens de Qumrân: D'Hénoch à Amram." Pages 91–106 in *Qumrân: Sa Piété, Sa Théologie et Son Milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. Paris: Duculot, 1978.
- Milik, J. T. "Les Modèles Araméens du Livre D'esther dans La Grotte 4 De Qumrân." *RevQ* 15.3 (1992): 321–406.
- Miller, David M. "The Meaning of Ioudaios and Its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient 'Judaism.'" *CurBR* 9.1 (2010): 98–126.
- Miller, David M. "Ethnicity Comes of Age: An Overview of Twentieth-Century Terms for Ioudaios." *CurBR* 10.2 (2012): 293–311.
- Miller, David M. "Ethnicity, Religion and the Meaning of Ioudaios in Ancient 'Judaism.'" *CurBR* 12.2 (2014): 216–65.
- Mizzi, Dennis, and Jodi Magness. "Provenance vs. Authenticity: An Archaeological Perspective on the Post-2002 'Dead Sea Scrolls-Like' Fragments." *DSD* 26.2 (2019): 135–69.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Mroczek, Eva. "True Stories and the Poetics of Textual Discovery." *BSR* 45.2 (2016): 21–31.
- Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. SJSJ 77. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Najman, Hindy. "Reconsidering Jubilees: Prophecy and Exemplarity." Pages 229–43 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, with the collaboration of Jason von Ehrenkrook, James Waddell, and Jason Zurawski. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Najman, Hindy. *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation, and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*. SJSJ 53. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Najman, Hindy, and Nicole Hilton. "Revelation." Pages 481–89 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2019.

- Najman, Hindy, and Tobias Reinhardt. "Exemplarity and Its Discontents: Hellenistic Jewish Wisdom Texts and Greco-Roman Didactic Poetry." *JSJ* 50.4–5 (2019): 460–96.
- Naude, Jacobus A. "Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 171–99 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Neusner, J. *Formative Judaism: Religious, Historical and Literary Studies*. BJS 37. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Constructing 'We, You, and Others' through Non-Polemical Discourse." Pages 13–22 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts." Pages 22–31 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. STDJ 70. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., and Klaus Baltzer. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001.
- Niditch, Susan. "Defining and Controlling Others Within: Hair, Identity, and the Nazirite Vow in a Second Temple Context." Pages 67–85 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Karina Martin Hogan, Matthew Goff, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 2011.
- Norin, Stig. "The Aramaic Levi—Comparing the Qumran Fragments with the Genizah Text." *SJOT* 27.1 (2013): 118–30.
- Oegma, Gerbern S. *Early Judaism and Modern Culture: Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Oeming, Manfred. "Jewish Identity in the Eastern Diaspora in Light of the Book of Tobit." Pages 545–61 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Achaemenid Period: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Edited by Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Manfred Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. *Gott und Belial Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Palmer, Carmen. *Converts in the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Gēr and Mutable Ethnicity*. STDJ 126. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2018.
- Pass, H. Leonard, and J. Arendzen. "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi." *JQR* 12.4 (1900): 651–61.
- Pearse, Holly A. "The Guide and the Seducer: The Dualism of 4QVisions of (c)Amram." MA, McMaster University, 2004.

- Penner, Ken M. "Testament of Qahat." Pages 454–55 in *T & T Clark Companion to Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Daniel M. Gurtner. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Capturing the Voices of Pseudepigraphic Personae: On the Form and Function of Incipits in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 20.1 (2013): 98–123.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Another Look at Dualism in 4QVisions of Amram." *Henoch* 36.1 (2014): 107–18.
- Perrin, Andrew B. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*. JAJSup 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Tobit's Context and Contacts in the Qumran Aramaic Anthology." *JSP* 25.1 (2015): 23–51.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "The Textual Forms of Aramaic Levi Document at Qumran." *Reading the Bible in Ancient Traditions and Modern Editions: Studies in Memory of Peter W. Flint*. Edited by Andrew B. Perrin, Kyung S. Baek, and Daniel K. Falk. Early Judaism and Its Literature. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Remembering the Past, Cultivating a Character: Memory and the Formation of Daniel in the Aramaic Pseudo-Daniel Texts (4Q243–244; 4Q245)." Pages 6–30 in *Vision, Narrative, and Wisdom in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium, 14–15 August, 2017*. Edited by Mette Bundvad, Kasper Siegismund, and with the collaboration of Melissa Sayyad Bach, Søren Holst, and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 131. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2020.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Redrafting the Architecture of Daniel Traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures and Dead Sea Scrolls." *JTS* 72.1 (2021): 44–71.
- Perrin, Andrew B. *Horizons of Ancestral Inheritance: Commentary on the Levi, Qahat, and Amram Qumran Aramaic Traditions*. LSTS 100. New York: T & T Clark, 2022.
- Perrin, Andrew B. "Charting Constellations of Aramaic Jewish Pseudepigrapha at Qumran." Forthcoming in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Hellenistic Judea: Proceedings of the Tenth Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Aberdeen, 5–8 August, 2019)*. Edited by Barry Hartog, Andrew B. Perrin, and in collaboration with Shelby Bennet and Matthew Hama. STDJ 142. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Perrin, Andrew B., and Matthew Hama. "4Q548 (Dualistic Fragments in Aramaic)." *The Online Critical Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by Ian W. Scott, Ken M. Penner, and David M. Miller. Society of Biblical Literature, 2017, <http://pseudepigrapha.org/docs/intro/4Q548>.
- Peters, Dorothy M. *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Peters, Dorothy M., and Esther Eshel. "Cutting Off and Cutting Down Shechem: Levi and His Sword in the Rylands Genizah Fragment of the Aramaic Levi Document." Pages 237–59 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by

- Kipp Davis, Dorothy M. Peters, Kyung S. Baek, and Peter W. Flint. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Popović, Mladen. "Pseudepigraphy and a Scribal Sense of the Past in the Ancient Mediterranean: A Copy of the Book of the Words of the Vision of Amram." Pages 308–18 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Puech, Émile. "Le Testament de Qahat en araméen de La Grotte 4 ('4QTQah')." *RevQ* 15.1/2 (57/58) (1991): 23–54.
- Puech, Émile. "Fragments d'un Apocryphe de Lévi et Le Personnage Eschatologique. 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa." Pages 449–501 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress (2 Vols.): Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991 Vol. II*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden; New York; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens première partie: 4Q529–549*. DJD 31. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens deuxième partie: 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587*. DJD 37. Oxford: Clarendon, 2009.
- Quick, Laura. "Lamech's Change of Mind: The Hellenistic Philosophy behind the Use of אַנְשׁ in the Genesis Apocryphon and the Book of Daniel." *AS* 11.1 (2013): 53–66.
- Quick, Laura. "Bitenosh's Orgasm, Galen's Two Seeds and Conception Theory in the Hebrew Bible." *DSD* 28.1 (2021): 38–63.
- Raup Johnson, Sara. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection: Abraham and Exemplarity in Philo, Josephus, and the Testament of Abraham." *JSJ* 40.2 (2009): 185–212.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Textuality between Death and Memory: The Prehistory and Formation of the Parabiblical Testament." *JQR* 104.3 (2014): 381–412.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Ioudaios before and after 'Religion.'" *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014. <https://themarginaliareview.com/ioudaios-religion-annette-yoshiko-reed/>.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Demons, Angels, and Writing in Ancient Judaism*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Reeves, John C. "Enoch." *EDSS* 1:249.
- Reeves, John C., and Annette Yoshiko Reed. *Enoch from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "A Response to the Jew and Judean Form." *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014. <https://themarginaliareview.com/response-jew-judean-forum-adele-reinhartz/>.
- Rogan, Wil. "Purity in Early Judaism: Current Issues and Questions." *CurBR* 16.3 (2018): 309–39.

- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2002.
- Sagi, Avi. *Reflections on Identity: The Jewish Case*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2016.
- Samuel, Harald. "Levi, the Levites, and the Law." Pages 215–30 in *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Satlow, Michael L. "Jew or Judaeon?" Pages 165–76 in *The One Who Sows Bountifully: Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers*. Edited by Caroline Johnson Hodge, Saul M. Olyan, Daniel Ullucci, and Emma Wasserman. BJS 356. Atlanta: Brown Judaic Studies, 2013.
- Satlow, Michael L. *How the Bible Became Holy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.
- Scales, Joseph. "Religious Identity and Spatiality in Hasmonean and Herodian Galilee." PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2020.
- Schattner-Rieser, Ursula. "J. T. Milik's Monograph on the Testament of Levi and the Reconstructed Aramaic Text of the Prayer of Levi and the Vision of Levi's Ascent to Heaven from Qumran Caves 4 and 1." *QC* 15 (2007): 139–55.
- Schiffman, Lawrence. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship." Pages 205–19 in *Jüdische Geschichte in Hellenistisch-Römischer Zeit*. Edited by A. Oppenheimer and E. Müller-Luckner. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1999.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "Halakhah and History: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to Recent Scholarship." Pages 63–78 in *Qumran and Jerusalem: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the History of Judaism*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage." *JBL* 118 (1999): 235–52.
- Schniedewind, William M. "Language and Group Identity in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case for an "Essene Hebrew"." Pages 280–91 in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Fifth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Jointly Sponsored by the Eliezer Ben-Yehuda Center for the Study of the History of the Hebrew Language, 29–31 December, 2008*. Edited by Steven Ellis Fassberg, Moshe Bar-Asher, and Ruth Clements. STDJ 108. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Schoor, Hanneke van der. "The Assessment of Variation: The Case of the Aramaic Levi Document." *DSD* 28.2 (2021): 179–206.
- Schreiner, Patrick. "Space, Place and Biblical Studies: A Survey of Recent Research in Light of Developing Trends." *CurBR* 14.3 (2016): 340–71.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Doing Like Jews or Becoming a Jew? Josephus on Women Converts to Judaism." Pages 93–110 in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der Griechisch-Römischen Welt*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripenotrog. AGJU 71. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.

- Schwartz, Daniel R. “‘Judaean’ or ‘Jew’? How Should We Translate Ioudaios in Josephus?” Pages 3–28 in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World: Jüdische Identität in der Griechisch-Römischen Welt*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, Stephanie Grippentrog, and Jörg Frey. AGJU 71. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. “The Different Tasks of Translators and Historians.” *Marginalia*, 26 August 2014. <https://themarginaliareview.com/different-tasks-translators-historians-daniel-r-schwartz/>.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. *Judeans and Jews: Four Faces of Dichotomy in Ancient Jewish History*. KMTSJS. Toronto; Buffalo, NY; London: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Imperialism and Jewish Society: 200 B. C. E. to 640 C. E.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Schwartz, Seth. “How Many Judaisms Were There?: A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization.” *JAJ* 2.2 (2011): 208–38.
- Seitz, Oscar J. F. “Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis.” *NTS* 6.1 (1959): 82–95.
- Shemesh, Aharon. “Halakhah between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature.” *OHDSS* 1:595–616.
- Shemesh, Aharon. *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis*. TLJS 6. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Revival*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Sneed, Mark. “Is the ‘Wisdom Tradition’ a Tradition?” *CBQ* 73.50 (2011): 50–71.
- Sparks, Kenton L. *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and Their Expression in the Hebrew Bible*. Winona Lake, IN: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997.
- Staples, Jason A. *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism: A New Theory of People, Exile, and Israelite Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Starcky, Jean. “Le Travail d’Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân.” *RB* 63.1 (1956): 49–67.
- Stone, Michael E. “Amram.” *EDSS* 1:23–24.
- Stone, Michael E. “Levi.” *EDSS* 1:485–86.
- Stone, Michael E. “Qahat.” *EDSS* 1:731–32.
- Stone, Michael E. “Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins.” *JSJ* 19.2 (1988): 159–70.
- Stone, Michael E. “The Axis of History at Qumran.” Pages 133–49 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Stone, Michael E. “Aramaic Levi in Its Contexts.” *JQS* 9.4 (2002): 307–26.
- Stone, Michael E. “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah.” *DSD* 13.1 (2006): 4–23.

- Stone, Michael E., Aryeh Amihay, and Vered Hillel, eds. *Noah and His Book(s)*. EJL 28. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Stone, Michael E., and Esther Eshel. "Aramaic Levi Document." Pages 1490–1510 in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2013.
- Stone, Michael E., and Jonas C. Greenfield. "The Prayer of Levi." *JBL* 112.2 (1993): 247–66.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Pseudepigraphy and First Person Discourse in the Dead Sea Documents: From the Aramaic Texts to Writings of the Yaḥad." Pages 295–326 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The 'Heart' in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Negotiating between the Problem of Hypocrisy and Conflict within the Human Being." Pages 437–53 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Edited by Armin Lange, Bennie H. Reynolds III, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Sundermann, Werner. "What Has Come Down to Us from Manicheism? (With an Appendix by Prods Oktor Skjærvø)." Pages 226–48 in *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World*. Edited by Armin Lange, Eric M. Meyers, Bennie H. Reynolds III, and Randall Styers. JAJSup 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Taylor, Joan E. "Real Women and Literary Airbrushing: The Women 'Therapeutae' of Philo's De Vita Contemplativa and the Identity of the Group." *Early Jewish Writings: Perspectives on Gender and Reception History*. Edited by Eileen M. Schuller and Marie-Theres Wacker. BWEECH 3.1. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Tervantko, Hanna. "The Hope of the Enemy Has Perished: The Figure of Miriam in the Qumran Library." Pages 156–75 in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengellér. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Tervantko, Hanna. "A Trilogy of Testaments: The Status of the Testament of Qahat versus Texts Attributed to Levi and Amram." Pages 41–59 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures: Contributions of the 61th Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense that took place from July 26–28, 2012 in the Maria-Theresia College and Paus Adrianus VI College of the KU Leuven*. Edited by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. BETL 270. Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Peeters, 2014.
- Tervantko, Hanna. "Members of Levite Family and Ideal Marriages in Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram and Jubilees." *RevQ* 106 (2015): 155–76.

- Tervanotko, Hanna K. *Denying Her Voice: The Figure of Miriam in Ancient Jewish Literature*. JAJSup 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. "The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem." Pages 257–70 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Emile Puech, and Eibert Tigchelaar. SJSJ 122. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. "Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations." Pages 155–72 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Popović. Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "Moisés y Aarón." *EO* 89–90 (2019): 5–22.
- Trotter, Jonathan R. "Jewish Identity and the Intercommunal Links between Diaspora Jewish Communities in the Second Temple Period." *JAJ* 12.1 (2021): 71–93.
- Tso, Marcus K. M. *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation*. WUNT 292. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Tzoref, Shani, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Adolfo Daniel Roitman. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)*. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Uusimäki, Elisa. "Wisdom, Scripture, and Identity Formation in 4QBeatitudes." Pages 175–86 in *Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Samuel Byrskog, Raimo Hakola, and Jutta M. Jokiranta. SUNT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Uusimäki, Elisa. "In Search of Virtue: Ancestral Inheritance in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542)." *BibInt* 29.2 (2020): 206–28.
- Uusimäki, Elisa. "Rethinking the Boundary between Jewish and Greek Writings: The Case of Educational Travel." Paper presented at the Categories and Boundaries in Second Temple Jewish Literature. University of Birmingham, 5 March 2021.
- VanderKam, James C., trans. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 511. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works." Pages 41–56 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaeen Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library, 2002.
- VanderKam, James C. "'Jubilees' 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram." *DSD* 17.2 (2010): 141–58.
- VanderKam, James C. *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Vered, Noam. "From 4QMMT to the Rabbinic Halakhah." Pages 137–60 in *Interpreting and Living God's Law at Qumran: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah, Some of the Works of the Torah (4QMMT)*. SAPERP 37. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

- Vered, Noam. "Halakhah." Pages 395–405 in *T & T Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London; New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018.
- Vermès, Géza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Vermès, Géza, and Pamela Vermès. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. Cleveland, OH: William Collins & World Publishing, 1978.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE) A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts." Pages 255–81 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSJSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Wassen, Cecilia. "Do You Have to Be Pure in a Metaphorical Temple?: Sanctuary Metaphors and Construction of Sacred Space in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Paul's Letters." Pages 55–86 in *Purity, Holiness, and Identity in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Memory of Susan Haber*. Edited by Carl S. Ehrlich, Anders Runesson, Eileen M. Schuller, and Susan Haber. WUNT 305. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Wassen, Cecilia. "Purity and Holiness." Pages 513–23 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. T & T Clark, 2019.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press, 1968.
- Weitzman, Steve. "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *JAOS* 119 (1999): 35–45.
- Weitzman, Steven. "On the Political Relevance of Antiquity: A Response to David Goodblatt's Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism." *JSS* 14.3 (2008): 165–72.
- Wenell, Karen J. *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism*. London; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2007.
- Werman, Cana. "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period." *DSD* 4.2 (1997): 211–25.
- Werman, Cana. "Qumran and the Book of Noah." Pages 171–81 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January 1997*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Wernberg-Møller, Preben C. H. "Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Q Serek III, 13–IV, 26)." *RevQ* 3.3 (1961): 413–41.
- White Crawford, Sidnie White. "The 'Rewritten' Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts." Pages 1–8 in *Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies*. Edited by Baruch A. Levine, Philip J. King, Joseph Naveh, and Ephraim Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999.

- White Crawford, Sidnie. "Traditions about Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 33–44 in *Women and Judaism*. Edited by L. J. Greenspoon, R. Simkins, and J. Cahan. SJC 14. Omaha: Creighton University Press, 2003.
- White Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "Women in Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 123–51 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "Exodus in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 305–21 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- White Crawford, Sidnie White, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. STDJ 116. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Wills, Lawrence M. "Challenged Boundaries: Gender and the Other in Periods of Crisis." Pages 24–40 in *Women and Exilic Identity in the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Martien A. Halvorson-Taylor and Katherine E. Southwood. LHBOTS 631. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018.
- Winter, Paul. "Ben Sira and the Teaching of 'Two Ways.'" *VT* 5.1 (1955): 315–18.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. "Languages: Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek." Pages 216–27 in *T & T Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London, New York: T & T Clark, 2019.
- Zaehner, R. C. *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *JBL* 131.2 (2012): 271–88.
- Zahn, Molly M. "Parabiblical Texts/Rewritten Scripture." Pages 378–86 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Zahn, Molly. "Avoiding the Category Trap: A Multivariable Approach to Second Temple Literature." Paper presented at the Categories and Boundaries in Second Temple Jewish Literature Conference (virtual). University of Birmingham, UK, 4, March 2021.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. "The Jews: Race, Nation or Religion: Which? A Study Based on the Literature of the Second Jewish Commonwealth." *JQR* 26.4 (1936): 313–47.