

Durham E-Theses

*Psalms of assurance: an analysis of the formation
and function of Psalms of Solomon in Second Temple
Judaism*

Bradley Jason Embry

How to cite:

Embry, Bradley Jason (2005) *Psalms of assurance: an analysis of the formation and function of Psalms of Solomon in Second Temple Judaism*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/768/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Psalms of Assurance:

An Analysis of the Formation and Function of Psalms of Solomon in Second Temple Judaism

A copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Dissertation Submitted to the Theology Department,

University of Durham

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By Bradley Jason Embry

9th May 2004

(Supervisor: Prof. C.T.R. Hayward)

21 SEP 2005



Abstract

This dissertation presents a study of the 1st century Jewish document Psalms of Solomon, the primary focus of which concerns the theological framework and authorial intention that gave rise to its formation and function. As a response to Pompey's invasion of Jerusalem, the authors construct an apologetic predicated on a specific theological framework from the Hebrew Bible, herein termed the 'prophetic paradigm'. This paradigm provided the basic elements of punishment for sinfulness and redemption for repentance that constitute the theological trajectory of the document. By reading history through this particular theological lens, the authors effectively create a didactic response to the historical conflagration, and the document reads as 'literature of assurance'. The project proceeds in seven parts. The introduction contains a discussion of the general features of the document, such as authorship, date, provenance, language, textual history, as well as the most recent scholarly conclusions. Specific details pertinent to this particular dissertation are also introduced, such as inter-textuality, working definitions of apocalyptic and prophetic genres, and the need for a re-examination the document. In the first section, Psalms of Solomon and Deuteronomy 32 are set in comparison along the lines of my approach to inter-textuality. The effort in this first section is to ascertain to what extent Psalms of Solomon was written with the biblical prophetic material in mind, and to probe the extent to which this program dominated the composition. With this view in mind, the second section seeks to examine the overall cohesion of the document in light of its poetic structure and reveals certain hermeneutical insights encountered in the process. Section three acts on the observations of the first two sections, that a dominant theological program governs the document and that it is to be read as a cohesive whole, by critiquing a particular concept in this light, namely the Temple motif. The findings reveal that the Temple motif figures prominently in the text and that categories such as sinners, righteous, purity, impurity, Jews, non-Jews are defined from the perspective that God is present in the Temple at Jerusalem. Inasmuch as the issues of sinners, righteous, purity, impurity, Jews, and non-Jews are of central importance to the community at Qumran, the findings of section three commend a comparison between Psalms of Solomon and Qumran, which gives a point of comparison in highlighting these concepts within the document. In section four, a comparison between the theology of Psalms of Solomon and Qumran is made on three points, the Law of Moses, the Temple, and the will of God. Section five consists of a brief evaluation of the use of Psalms of Solomon by NT scholarship. The intention of this final section is to promote an awareness of the need for re-evaluating Psalms of Solomon's position and place within the history of the development of religious concepts, in this case messianism and use of the document by NT scholarship.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
Declarations	6
Acknowledgements	7
Abbreviations	9
INTRODUCTION: A Theological Response to a Historical Crisis	11
1. Introduction to the Document	11
1.1 Prophecy and Apocalyptic	12
2. The Composition	15
2.1 . Authorship	15
2.2 . Historical Context, Provenance and Date	18
2.3 . Textual Witness and Original Language	22
3. Recent Scholarship	25
3.1. Mikael Winninge	26
3.2. Robert Wright	30
3.3. Kenneth Atkinson	34
4. Methodology and Inter-Textuality	39
5. Need for this Study and Its Arrangement	46
PART I: The Psalms and Deuteronomy 32: Use of the Prophetic Paradigm	49
1. Introduction	49
2. Deut. 32.1: Heaven and Earth as Witnesses	51
3. Deut. 32.3: The Name of the Lord	55
4. Deut. 32.4: God is Righteous and Just	61
5. Deut. 32.5: Israel Sins: Israel as “blemished”	65

6.	Deut. 32.7: Remember the Past	69
7.	Deut. 32.9: Israel is God's Inheritance	72
8.	Deut. 32.10: The Discipline of God	74
	8.1. The Use of LXX by PssSol	74
	8.2. The Discipline of God	76
9.	Deut. 32.12: God as Israel's Leader	78
10.	Deut. 32.15: Israel as the Beloved of God	79
11.	Deut. 32.22-25: The Punishment of Israel	82
	11.1. Plagues of the Earth	83
	11.2. Conquest of Israel	85
12.	Deut. 32.26: The Dispersion of Israel	88
13.	Deut. 32.27-42: Hubris, God's Vengeance and the Eschaton	89
	13.1. Failure of the Universal Witness	89
	13.2.1 Deut. 32.34-35: Punishment of the Nation, Certainty and Uncertainty	92
	13.2.2 Use of ' <i>kairo,j</i> ' in PssSol: Messianic Eschatology	94
14	Deut. 32.36: Mercy of the Lord	97
15	Conclusions	99
PART II: The Psalms, Literary Genre and Poetics		106
1.	Introduction	106
2.1	The Question of Genre: Two Types	107
2.2	Poetry as a Creative Enterprise	110
3.	The PssSol as a Poetic Document	114
	3.1. PssSol Chapter 1	115
	3.2. PssSol Chapter 8	121
	3.3. PssSol Chapter 18	137
	3.3.1. Understanding of Discourse based on Chapter 18	148

4.	Conclusions	150
PART III: The Temple Motif in PssSol		152
1.	Introduction: The Importance of the Temple	152
2.	Sin and Impurity in Leviticus	156
2.1.	Hebrew Bible: Ritual Impurity and Inadvertent Sin	156
2.2.	Hebrew Bible: Moral Impurity and Defiling the Land	163
2.3.	Conclusions to Impurity and Sin in Hebrew Bible	167
3.	Impurity and Sin in LXX Tradition	171
3.1.	Ritual Impurity and Inadvertent Sin	171
3.2.	Ritual and Moral Impurity in LXX: Two Systems, One Offence	177
3.3.	Conclusions to Ritual and Moral Impurity in LXX Tradition	180
4.	The Temple, Impurity and Sin in PssSol	182
4.1.	Linguistic Evidence of the Temple Motif in PssSol	183
4.1.1.	‘House’ as a Metaphor for the Temple	190
4.2.	Sin as Encroachment upon the Temple in PssSol	192
4.3.	Purity, the Temple and Messiah in PssSol	201
5.	Conclusions	203
PART IV: The PssSol and Qumran		207
1.	Introduction	207
2.	The Law of Moses at Qumran and in PssSol	212
3.	The Temple at Qumran and in PssSol	219
4.	The Will of God at Qumran and in PssSol	237
5.	Conclusions	246
EXCURSUS: The PssSol and the New Testament: A Re-evaluation		250
1.	Introduction	250
2.	PssSol in NT Research	252

4.1.Christology	252
4.1.1. Marinus de Jonge	253
4.1.2. H.J. de Jonge and Wayne A. Meeks	256
5. Conclusions	262
PART VI: Effects of the Study	265
1. Internal Conclusions	265
2. External Implications and Applications	267
PRIMARY SOURCES	270
BIBLIOGRAPHY	273

The Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any form, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or in any other university. If material has been generated through joint work, my independent contribution has been clearly indicated. In all other cases material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

Signature:

Date:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks must go to several people for making our time in Durham possible. First, Ken and Lenore Mullican have lent constant, unwavering, and indispensable help in getting here, staying here, and finishing. Kenny and Stephanie Mullican helped us in our move to Durham and Jessie and Ian Warmington have helped us along the way. Jeff and Amber Barbeau provided support for the move to Durham and unexpectedly during a research break in Cambridge.

From a social and emotional standpoint, my wife and I have found our time in Durham to be very comfortable. This, of course, lends to the ease of completing a degree on time. Merit for this ease is due to some very special people. First, Archie Wright and Ron Herms developed into the two people with whom I interacted most thoroughly during the development of my project. They are dear friends who have been the source of much good in my life and provided me with diversions aplenty from academic work; such as these are salt of the Earth. Ron's wife Kathy deserves a special commendation for affording my wife a 'friend of common cloth' during our time here. Without her ear my wife's time in Durham would have been much the bleaker. Finally, we are thankful to Hatfield and St. John's Colleges for their support during our time. There are many people behind those two edifices whose support contributed directly to this project.

Our families have been supportive throughout. There is great deal of energy spent during the prosecution of a PhD, which can inhibit familial relations in the best of situations. It is all the more acute with the span of an ocean in between. The result produced, a pile of papers of as yet unproven worth, is little consolation to these years of separation. Yet neither of our families complained nor faltered in their support of our progress here...too much...and our many thanks for seeing the value of this project, which was difficult at times for me.

Finally, my wife deserves a medal for courage under fire. She lovingly worked in supply teaching making as much money as I will if I get a job upon completion of this degree all the while staring at years of work on a project that she hardly understanding and being told that there is a better than average chance that I will not get a job at the end

of it all. Although I spoke freely and openly of quitting the program at times she never did, and her encouragement and perseverance was an inspiration to me.

Abbreviations

ABC	Anchor Bible Dictionary
ATD	<i>Acta Theologica Danica</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus <i>Antiquities</i>
AOT	Sparks' Apocryphal Old Testament
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentary Series
APOT	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament
BDB	Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon
<i>BJ</i>	Josephus <i>Jewish Wars</i>
<i>BJS</i>	Brown Judaic Series
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CCWJC	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World: 200 BC to AD 200
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series
ConBNT	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
CPs	Canonical Psalm
CurBS	Currents in Biblical Research
DBRE	Dictionary of the Bible, Revised Edition
<i>de Congressu</i>	Philo <i>Preliminary Studies</i>
<i>de Vita</i>	Philo <i>Life of Moses</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSSSMM	DSS: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts (vols. I and II)
FAT	<i>Forschungen zum Alten Testament</i>
GBSOTS	Guides to Biblical Scholarship Old Testament Series
GHG	Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar
Gk.	Greek
HB	Hebrew Bible
Heb.	Hebrew
HJP	History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ
HRCS	Hatch and Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint
HUCA	Hebrew University College Annual
ICCS	International Critical Commentary Series
IOSCS	<i>International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JSNTS	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>Leg. All.</i>	Philo <i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>
L-S	Liddell-Scott Greek-English Lexicon
LXX	Septuagint (this is to stand for LXX tradition)
MT	Masoretic Text
MSS	Manuscripts
MSU	<i>Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens</i>

<i>Mut.</i>	<i>Philo Change of Names</i>
NCBC	New Century Biblical Commentary
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NovTest	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NT	New Testament
NTOA	<i>Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus</i>
OCHJS	Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies
<i>OED</i>	Oxford English Dictionary
OTP	Old Testament Pseudepigrapha
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>Philo Noah's Work as a Planter</i>
<i>Post.</i>	<i>Philo Posterity and Exile of Cain</i>
PssSol	Psalms of Solomon
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SABH	<i>Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics</i>
SBEC	<i>Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity</i>
SBT	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i>
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>Sob.</i>	<i>Philo Sobriety</i>
<i>Som.</i>	<i>Philo Dreams</i>
Syr.	Syriac
TN	Targum Neofiti
TPsJ	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TO	Targum Onkelos
<i>Vir.</i>	<i>Philo Virtues</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
ZWT	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>

An Introduction to Psalms of Solomon and This Study:
The Document as a Theological Response to a Historical Crisis

1—Introduction to the Document:

PssSol is in some ways a popular document. It continues to find a place of reference in scholarly works on a range of biblical topics, primarily in NT, and one is hard pressed to find a biblical scholar who is unaware of its significance for the discussion of Christology. But the messianic element in the document is both its boon and bane. On the one hand, the messianic portions foster awareness of the document's importance for inter-textual studies while on the other hand they (and the interests of scholars) restrict a holistic appreciation of the document's wider (and I think more important) thesis. In short, scholarship on the document often suffers from scholastic myopia.

In the following study, I will be reevaluating the document by way of examining its central themes, the 'wider thesis' just mentioned. More specifically, I am offering here a reading of PssSol that reflects what I feel to be the authors' intentions for the document. My work on the document has led to the conclusion that the authors were informed primarily by their reading of the 'prophetic paradigm' from HB and followed this paradigm as a theological program.¹ Their adoption of this paradigm allowed them to assimilate historical events within a theological framework. Their work, therefore, is a 'theological apologetic' and must be read with such an aim in mind. In short, the 'wider thesis' of the document is an assurance of God's faithfulness in human history, and is predicated on the prophetic view of history from HB. PssSol is, in short, a statement of trust in God's divine plan.

The ramifications of this primary thesis are several and important. First, the individual elements within the document, e.g., sinners, righteous, messiah, are to be read within the greater theological framework of the sin, punishment, redemption of Israel. Without an eye to the wider thesis, these individual elements can assert themselves outside their intended means. Secondly, reading the document from this standpoint is an

¹ Although he does not develop this concept in any detail, Gene L. Davenport "The Anointed of the Lord in PssSol 17" in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (Eds. George W.E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins: Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 71 hints at the prophetic element in the document.

exercise in inter-textuality, the study of which is substance of great debate. So, while serving the purpose of examining the document anew, this study is also venturing opinions on the nature of inter-textuality. Before I move on to those subjects, however, it seems important to offer a brief introduction to PssSol in terms of authorship, historical context and date, textual witnesses, and original language.

1.1—Prophecy and Apocalyptic:

Essential to the assertion that a 2nd Temple Period text is prophetic is the development of a distinction between prophetic and apocalyptic texts. The two genres are very closely related, and the making of such distinctions has occasioned a significant amount of secondary literature.² If this body of literature tells us anything it is that the issue is not always straightforward. As this thesis posits a prophetic tenor to PssSol, it is essential to offer a reason why the genre ‘prophecy’ was chosen rather than ‘apocalyptic’, particularly because others have used this latter term in their description of the document.³

J. Collins has made this statement regarding apocalyptic literature:

The scriptures provided at most the occasion of the revelation, and the authority of the apocalypses was not derived from scripture but from new revelation.⁴

In so stating, Collins is making an important distinction between an apocalyptic text and a text concerned with a prophetic view of history, namely the perception of revelation. To be sure, apocalyptic developed in the crucible of the Babylonian Diaspora and owes some of its imagery to that provenance.⁵ But the relationship between characteristics of biblical prophecy and apocalyptic literature is exceedingly close, to which Collins’ study attests.⁶ Nonetheless a distinction ought to be made between the two.

² See John. J. Collins *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 1-42 and the accompanying bibliography.

³ Robert Wright, “The Psalms of Solomon,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press, 1985) 642-643.

⁴ Collins *ibid.* 40; also 10-12 in which Collins identifies the range of problems in pinning down a precise definition of apocalyptic.

⁵ Otto Plöger *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (Wageningen, The Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1968) 37. Plöger recognizes, however, that the Jewish mindset was disposed to the reception of these Babylonian traits.

⁶ Collins *op.cit.* 10-13.

One such area of distinction is the view of history embraced by each genre. While one could easily see in 1 Enoch a historically grounded narrative, the literature itself posits a radical view of the interplay between the metaphysical and the historical. There is constant interaction between the author and otherworldly beings, such as angels.⁷ While there are instances of angelic interaction with people in HB prophets (e.g., Ezek. 1; Isa. 6. 1-13; Zech. 1.9-19, 2.3-6.15), which likely form the necessary scriptural tradition out of which apocalyptic revelation originated, much that is found in the apocalyptic revelations is novel.⁸ As Ithamar Gruenwald has argued, ascension to heaven is not a theme derived from HB.⁹ While interaction with the angelic and celestial spheres is an aspect of prophecy, in apocalyptic literature it is a literary element which is emphasized and revised.¹⁰ The presence of angelic referents and a heavenly ascension is wholly absent from PssSol, which suggests at the outset that the document is not of the apocalyptic genre. Yet it is important to point out that there is an interest in cosmology (PssSol 18.10-12) and a reference to a 'dragon' (PssSol 2.25), both of which have a place in apocalyptic texts.¹¹

Other areas of distinction are the concepts of the afterlife and resurrection, which are elements central to apocalyptic thought and constitute a fundamental difference between it and the prophetic. The *Testament of Abraham*, for instance, speaks of Abraham going to heaven after his death (*Test. Abr.* 20.17; *Apoc. Abr.* 29.17; 1 En. 46.6-7; Rev. 7.9) as well as giving a detailed account of the judgment of the dead (*Test. Abr.* 12.1-33; also cf. 1 En. 90.33; Rev. 11.18).¹² There is very little evidence from HB for the concept of afterlife or resurrection, which has led to these concepts as elements

⁷ E.g., 1 Enoch 1.1-2; 6.1-13-10.

⁸ Ithamar Gruenwald *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 46 suggests that the Bible is the root for apocalyptic and mystical expression, citing Isaiah 6 as formative to the development in the ascension motif in *Ascension of Isaiah*.

⁹ *Ibid.* 32.

¹⁰ John J. Collins "Towards the Morphology of a Genre" in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre Semeia* 14 (John J. Collins ed.; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979) 9 makes the point that the interplay between otherworldly mediator and human recipient is a universal feature of apocalyptic.

¹¹ The interest in cosmology is only to emphasize the priestly element in the document, which is discussed in section 2 on *Poetics*. Dragon imagery is not uncommon and more of a literary device to describe the historical than it is a literal rendering of a metaphysical reality. Cf. also Rev. 12.3, 4, 7; Gk. Esther 10.3 (addition F according to the Cambridge version of NRSV).

¹² Collins *idem.* 70 suggests that the theme here is one of resurrection.

distinctive to the apocalyptic literature.¹³ From an anthropological point of view, Robert Wilson has noted that there is no definitive and objective impetus that gives rise to the apocalyptic over and against the prophetic, sapiential, or cultic emphases within a community.¹⁴ Wilson may have touched on something here, and his comment is cause for considering the possibility that a text, such as PssSol, might best be understood as an apocalypse in spite of the absence of certain themes, such as the ascension or resurrection motif. After all, a text could omit the resurrection motif and still be apocalyptically minded.

But Wilson's point argues the other way as well. That PssSol contains apocalyptic elements is no case for considering it to be an apocalypse. It may very well be the case that the text is, for instance, sapiential in tone with apocalyptic elements thrown in. More decisively, PssSol contains no reference to a heavenly mediator and a human interlocutor, which is a distinctive feature of the apocalyptic. This, alongside the notable omission of resurrection and ascension features, suggests that PssSol is not an apocalyptic text.

¹³ Hosea 6.2-3 may be a reference to resurrection of some type, as might Ps. 22.15. The latter was certainly taken as such by the New Testament writers. According to Collins *ibid.* 70, Daniel 12.2 is the only clear-cut case of resurrection in Hebrew Bible. I disagree with Collins' interpretation of Dan. 12.2, preferring to see it as being informed by Dan. 8.11-12, and see the 'resurrection' as the re-establishment of the priesthood in the Temple. In a conversation with N.T. Wright, he suggested that, while my position was tenable, it did not necessarily represent the way in which Dan. 12.2 was received by later Christian communities. That does not undermine the objection to Collins' position, but rather strengthens it suggests his interpretation of the pericope from Daniel reflects an anachronism. Collins' wider point about resurrection as constituting one criteria for the apocalyptic seems to stand, but it may be more appropriate to suggest, along with George W.E. Nickelsburg's *Jewish Literature between the Bible and Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 89, cf. generally 83-91, that Daniel 10-12 awaits the destruction of death more than the resurrection of life. This binds the prophetic and apocalyptic. The book of Zechariah has been called a 'proto-apocalypse' and contains some apocalyptic elements, such as angelic mediator and heavenly ascension. See John J. Collins "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death" *CBQ* 36 (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1974) 30-31. An alternative view is expressed most radically by Jean Carmignac "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament" in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (David Hellholm ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983) 166-168 when he suggests that there are apocalyptic elements present in every book of the Hebrew Bible.

¹⁴ Robert R. Wilson "The Problems of Describing and Defining Apocalyptic Discourse" in *Anthropological Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy Semeia* 21 (Robert C. Culley and Thomas W. Overholt eds.; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982) 133 states: "...apocalyptic, the scholarly study of the Torah, a concern with the development of wisdom literature, the elaboration of the cult, and an interest in the interpretation of earlier prophetic literature all seem to be features of Israel's post-exilic religious life." Collins *Apocalyptic Imagination* 37-38 issues a similar caution as does William Adler "Introduction" in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (James C. VanderKam and William Adler eds.; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996) 19. Lars Hartman "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre" in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (David Hellholm ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983) 329-332.

The several motifs of ascension into heaven, angelic mediators, and resurrection are significant elements of genre that distinguish the apocalyptic from the prophetic.¹⁵ They are not the only ones, but they are the most substantial in terms of the distinctions that I am drawing here. P. Vielhauer has noted that, for the prophet, the initial interaction between the divine and the prophet was auditory; for the apocalyptic seer, this interaction is primarily visionary.¹⁶ To be sure, neither an auditory call nor a visionary experience is prominent in the document studied here, the account of the messiah in chapter 18 is a future snapshot. But this may owe much to the cessation of the biblical prophetic models during the late 2nd Temple period.

There are several, specific ‘apocalyptic’ elements found in PssSol. Most conspicuous is the concern for the salvation of the individual as well as the nation.¹⁷ This is found occasionally throughout PssSol (e.g., 2.34; 13.11), is a feature of the HB Psalter (e.g., 37.28; 41.13; 48.9—perpetuity of Jerusalem; 61.8; 89.30, 37; LXX 101.29), and so any assertion that apocalyptic was here innovating must wrestle with the possibility that this concern for the individual arose out of a combination of material from prophecy and psalms.¹⁸ There is also a section (PssSol 18.10-12) that focuses on cosmology, but it serves the purpose of pointing to the Jerusalem priesthood rather than relating manifestations of the heavenly realm.¹⁹

In short, although the document shares elements with the apocalyptic genre, generally the content and style of PssSol resists a definition as an ‘apocalypse’. Prophecy and apocalyptic are themselves, however, closely related and, as such, one might reasonably expect to find apocalyptic elements in PssSol if the latter is indeed prophetically minded. The preoccupation with God’s justice, punishment as a result of

¹⁵ E.P. Sanders “The Genre of Palestintian Jewish Apocalypses” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (David Hellholm ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983) 451-453.

¹⁶ P. Vielhauer “Apocalyptic” in *New Testament Apocrypha* v. II (E. Hennecke, W Schneemelcher, and R. McL. Wilson eds.; London: Lutterworth Press, 1965) 583.

¹⁷ Occasionally this feature takes the form of a messianic advent. This feature is discussed in section 1 *Deuteronomy and PssSol* below.

¹⁸ Collins “Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death” 30 suggests that this inclusion on the individual was one essential difference between the apocalyptic and the prophetic, which dealt with the community rather than the individual, and the apocalyptic. But John Eaton *Vision in Worship* (London: SPCK, 1981) 1-39 has made clear that the intentions of the psalms and prophets was closely related. Joachim Schaper *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* WUNT 76 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995) 26-35 and his discussion of the personal aspect to eschatology in the Greek Psalter.

¹⁹ See the section 2 on *Poetics of PssSol*.

Israel's sin, redemption and restoration may reflect both prophecy and apocalyptic; but the lack of the more definitive ingredients of apocalyptic as described above suggests that PssSol is prophetic in character rather than apocalyptic.

2—*The Composition:*

2.1—*Authorship:*

In this study, I have necessarily to make decisions about the authors and date of PssSol, so some explanation of my reasoning in these matters is needed. These two issues of date and authorship are difficult, possibly irresolvable, and generally mired in issues of sectarianism. Each issue has its own problems and, while these are related, I will deal with each independently.

Regarding authorship, several problems present themselves. First, the question of authorship generally has to take into account the issue of sectarianism. But, as many scholars have pointed out, sectarianism itself is at best difficult to define.²⁰ This makes it very difficult to locate PssSol within a particular sect; and therefore presents serious challenges to specific types of form criticism. This is not to say that we cannot learn something of the document's *Sitz im Leben*; but simply reducing questions of *Sitz im Leben* to concerns to pinpoint a sectarian origin for the document severely limits the value and possible results of any form critical study undertaken on such a basis.

Throughout this study I use the form 'authors' in the plural for the following reasons. While I see no particular reason for suspecting multiple authors on a thematic or compositional level, it is important to weigh the possibility that the document went through some early revision stages. Having said this, I do think that these revisions were minor, perhaps involving the addition of chapter headings or itacisms, and not necessarily reflective of an intense editorial activity.²¹ Nonetheless, I think it wise to maintain that

²⁰ Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim ed.; Edinburgh, T and T Clark, 2000) 124-125, 128, and 138; Eissfeldt *OT Introduction* 612; also note Chapter 1, fn. 110.

²¹ As R.R. Hahn *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon* SCS 13 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982) specifically chapter 4 and the sections in which he points out the differences between the different MSS. This, of course, is not evidence for editorial activity as it may simply reflect scribal errors. Some of the alterations are, however, suggestive of a specific tendency, e.g., *Ισραηλ* for *Ιερουσαλημ* at 2.22 by MS 253. Kenneth Atkinson *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon Pseudepigrapha* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001) 397 has suggested the presence of two authors, but posits that the work of the second author, the redactor, was relatively minor.

the author of the document had some help in producing what is before us now; thus the use of authors throughout.

Most scholars assert that the psalms differ greatly in tenor and content, and that this disparity between psalms suggests a wide range of genre, date, and, consequently, authorship. While I agree that the psalms do differ substantially throughout the compilation, I see that as no sufficient reason of itself to conclude that a variety of different dates or authors for PssSol must be accepted. Each psalm seems concatenated to the foregoing and proceeding psalm, and from a thematic and literary standpoint, the document reads fluently and with a high degree of interrelation between chapters. An examination of the degree of fluency is the substance of the first two chapters of the following study. In short, the document reads as one continuous theological response to a specific historical crisis and, therefore, does not require the student to posit the involvement of many authors.

Returning to the issue of *Sitz im Leben*, a few words may be hazarded. It may be argued that the authors of the document were either priests themselves or members of a priestly circle. This is for several, important reasons. First, the Temple occupies a central position in the authors' theology. A critical objection to this point might be that the Temple formed the primary point of emphasis for all Jewish groups during the 2nd Temple period and as such the presence of the Temple motif in the document is no reason for assigning a priestly authorship to the document.²² To this I would agree, specifying however that, in the case of PssSol, the authors' complaints are about moral *and* ritual issues (compare the moral sins in 1.7-2.1 to the ritual sins in 3.5-8). The sanctity of the actual, physical Temple at Jerusalem is of great importance to the authors. Moreover, the point that Judaism of the 2nd Temple Period is 'Temple-centric' should not discourage an attempt at nuancing a particular community's attitude and application of the concept of the Temple.²³ In short, it is not enough simply to call 2nd Temple Period Judaism 'Temple-centric'; discussions of the Temple's importance for Jewish, and Christian,

²² A very fine example is the book of Judith in which the Temple forms a conceptual centrepiece. The book itself, however, is hardly a priestly work inasmuch as priestly means solely concerned with Temple praxis.

²³ For instance, the Temple is of obvious significance to both the Maccabean author and the Qumran sectarians, but they certainly do not agree on what the problems with the Jerusalem Temple are.

communities in the 2nd Temple Period can benefit from examinations that look at *how* the community appropriated the Temple concept.²⁴

Secondly, the authors speak of the redemption of Israel in terms of purification and of their relationship with the divine in terms of preparedness. In fact, the concept of purity, along with the Temple, is a central concern for the authors. Again, it may be argued that purity was a central concern for every Jew in Palestine in the 2nd Temple period. But that is not an argument that can be ranged against the suggestion that the authors of PssSol were priests. Rather, it only points to the feature of Judaism in the 2nd Temple period, gaining consensus among modern scholars, that the majority of Jews generally shared central theological concepts, and they often differed only on the finer points of application.²⁵ Finally, the association of PssSol with the canonical Psalter (Ps) strengthens the view that the authors were from priestly circles, and I am inclined to agree that the document seeks to imitate the Psalter.²⁶ This is not to suggest that a layperson would have been incapable of ‘imitating’ the Psalter in such a way; but there is a greater possibility that a member of the priestly and highly literate caste was responsible for the composition.

2.2—*Historical Context, Provenance, and Date*

To be sure, the three areas are related, and it seems appropriate to discuss them together. The historical context of the PssSol has a relatively firm foundation in Pompey’s invasion and conquest of Jerusalem in 63 BCE. Something has already been said of the possible *Sitz im Leben* (Jerusalem) of the document and it is now appropriate to comment more extensively on the document’s historical context, provenance, and date.

²⁴ The same is true for post-70 Judaism as well.

²⁵ Schiffman *idem.* 128, 138; E.P. Sanders *The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences in The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 7, 9, 19; Samuel Sandmel *Judaism and Christian Beginnings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978) 15.

²⁶ Wright *OTP* 646-647; H.E. Ryle and R.J. James *Psalms of the Pharisees: Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891) lx; J. Viteau *Psaumes de Salomon* 90 also makes this identification. That the Psalter was used in the context of Israelite worship is self-evident. On the issue of the Psalms as a collection of priestly origins note John Gray *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979) 5; R.N. Whybray *Reading the Psalms as a Book* JSOT Supp. 222 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 16.

The Gk. version displays many of the characteristics of LXX Gk. and therefore suggests, possibly, an Alexandrian provenance. Yet, as I discussed earlier, the tenor of the document is decidedly Palestinian; rather, it is decidedly Judean, and was likely written in or around Jerusalem.²⁷ But, the issue of Alexandrian provenance does not disappear in light of this suggestion. If PssSol displays LXX characteristics, is it not a Hellenistic document? How could the document be akin both to LXX and speak to a Judean milieu?²⁸ A solution to these queries might be made from the following points: the LXX, while harboring Gk. elements, is primarily a Jewish work.²⁹ This is to say, language is not a useful rubric in distinguishing between Jewish and Hellenistic material, as the presence of Gk. materials at Qumran attests.³⁰ That the covenanters accepted ‘Gk.’ material is not to suggest that they accepted ‘Hellenistic’ material. Rather, it is to suggest that the Gk. material is Jewish by nature and content. With regard to PssSol, the Syr. version, because of its Semitic nature, only strengthens the position of the Gk. as a witness to a Judean milieu. For instance, the last line of the two versions of PssSol 1.8 read:

Gk.: ἐβεβήλωσαν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου ἐν βεβηλώσει

Syr.: כֹּה־כֹּה־כֹּה כִּי־נָא מַלְמַל אֲכֹלָא³¹

²⁷ E.g., Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 397-398; Ryle and James *idem.* lviii-lix; H.F.D. Sparks *Introduction to Psalms of Solomon* in AOT (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 652; Robert Wright “The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees and the Essenes” SCS 2 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1972) 150 fn 8.

²⁸ My thanks to Joseph Trafton for asking this question and offering his comments on this and several other matters in a recent email correspondence.

²⁹ J.W. Wevers *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* SCS 35 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) xiiff; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981) 70-72; F. M. Cross, “The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts” as found in *1972 Proceedings of IOSCS Pseudepigrapha* (Los Angeles: SBL, 1972) 110. Cross *ibid.* 115 notes that the Hebrew text of the Hebrew Bible was not ‘foreign’ to the community of Jews in Alexandria. Note Rahlfs’s introduction to his *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979) lvii; Sidney Jellicoe *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 54ff. Note L. Greenspoon “‘It’s All Greek to Me’: Septuagint Studies Since 1968” in *Currents in Research* 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 147-171.

³⁰ Note Eugene Ulrich *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999) 83 who suggests that the presence of Greek material at Qumran is evidence of a continued circulation of Greek material for a century. He suggests that 4QJer^b and 4QSam^a are renditions of an originally Greek text.

³¹ The same Gk. phrase in PssSol 2.3 reads in the Syr. with מַלְמַל אֲכֹלָא.

The Syr. version is clearly indicative of the Temple and the Divine Name. In translating HB into Syr., the Syr. term ܠܒܝܬ is used almost exclusively to render the יהוה. The presence of ܠܒܝܬ in the line certainly suggests that the Temple is in the minds of the authors.³² Of course, this is also true for the Gk. text if LXX is kept in mind regarding the use of κύριος and τὰ ἅγια. So the Temple and Divine Name are central to the thoughts of the authors at the outset, and in the light of the context of Jerusalem personified in chapter one, is indicative of a specific Judean setting. The Syr. version helps to clarify this point. The translation of the document into Gk. may have been an effort to make its dissemination to the Diaspora more feasible, to which the literary liturgical markers already attest. In short, the Judean provenance has more to commend it than does an Alexandrian one.

But this assertion dredges up another question, Who read the document? This question is in some ways related to the issue of textual witnesses and original language, which I will introduce presently. A summary of the transmission history of the document is present in many works and need be rehearsed here only in general terms.³³ The earliest evidence of the document in Greek is from a list in the 5th century C.E. Codex Alexandrinus, in which the leaves that would most likely have contained the document, however, have been taken out. The same is true for Codex Sinaiticus. It is clear, therefore, that Diaspora Judaism and Early Christianity were privy to the document up to a point, but that its appeal was lost at some point prior to the formal codification of the canon. As such, its general distribution and influence no doubt waned before it was rediscovered in the early 17th century.

³² Cf. J.H. Charlesworth *Odes of Solomon* Texts and Translations 13 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977) 23 and the appearance of the phrase ܠܒܝܬ in OdSol 4.2. The difference between the two documents are, of course, apparent. OdSol speaks within a 'realized eschatology' according to D.E. Aune *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology* (Leiden: Brill, 1972) 165-194 from the perspective of the Incarnation. Yet, Charlesworth's comment is instructive for PssSol in that the term indicates in OdSol, very precisely, the Temple. With regard to PssSol, which is a Jewish document speaking of a 'potential eschatology,' to keep with Aune's distinctions (very unfortunate terms in my opinion), the term certainly applies to the Temple.

³³ For a complete summary of the textual history see Hahn *Manuscript History* 6-11; Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 399-400; Wright *OTP* 639.

To return to the initial question: if the Diaspora were reading the document, why are there not more copies available? Moreover, why did the Heb. original fall out of use altogether? I have no answer to the first question. Insofar as we have very little idea as to when the PssSol were excised from the different recensions, it is very difficult to know for what reasons it was removed and or who read the document and where. Regarding the lost Heb. version, it should be pointed out that that Heb. versions of other documents have fallen into disuse as well, and that that feature of transmission history is not an uncommon one.³⁴ In light of the biblical texts amongst the DSS, studies of LXX/MT translation technique have led to the observation being made that certain Hebrew texts, which had into disuse among the mainstream Jewish population, were maintained in LXX tradition.³⁵ Nonetheless, the questions are still puzzling and nothing, short of another archaeological find, seems ready to break the deadlock.

Regarding the issue of the date of the compilation several problems present themselves immediately. First, some of the chapters from PssSol fairly clearly refer to the historical events of Pompey's invasion and conquest of Jerusalem and his death in Egypt; but this does not necessarily mean that the document was composed during the years shortly following his death. Second, much of the material from PssSol is, quite simply, a-historical. When taken apart from the document as a whole, many of the individual chapters have absolutely nothing connecting them to a specific event.³⁶ Nonetheless, several observations may be made.

The date of the compilation follows closely on the issue of historical context and authorship. If the authors are few, or one, then the compilation was, by default,

³⁴ E.g., Jubilees, Baruch, Assumption of Moses, Testament of the 12 Patriarchs. See Sparks' introduction to each of these in *APOT passim*.

³⁵ Note the distinct differences between LXX and MT at Deut. 32.8 and 43; Is. 36.11 for instance and compare MT with the Heb. texts from Qumran. On this point, note e.g., Tov *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint* 51, 130-132.

³⁶ A. Geiger "Aus Briefen," in *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 6 (1868) 240 was the first to suggest a wider sweep of historical dating. Nonetheless, his final observation suggests that he valued the specificity of a milieu in which criticism of the Hasmonean household was at its fiercest. J. Wellhausen *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Greifswald: L. Bamberg, 1874) 138 suggested that, while much of the document did date from the Pompeian invasion, the historical fixity of the document was largely indeterminable. More recently, Moses Aberbach "The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon," *JQR* 41 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951) 379-396, specifically 384-386, 391, has argued along the lines of Wellhausen, that the historical setting of the document is wide-ranging, levelling critiques of Antipater, Pompey, Antigonos II, Herod and even later Roman governors.

completed over a relatively short period of time.³⁷ I suggest an approximate date for the compilation between Pompey's invasion of Jerusalem in 63 BCE to shortly after his death in 43, with the final form coming into view sometime before Herod's conquest in 37.³⁸ Kenneth Atkinson has argued, largely because of a distinction noted by Johannes Tromp in which the Gk. text changes from future indicative to aorist indicative in PssSol 17.7-9, that PssSol 17 refers to Herod's conquest in 37 and the subsequent purgation of the Hasmonean household.³⁹ Joseph Trafton has pointed out, however, that the Syr. version preserves verbs with an imperative force, and argues that the Gk. text has here misread the underlying Heb.⁴⁰ Tromp's and Atkinson's methodology, adopting the Gk. text without an eye to the Syriac and drawing historical allusions from grammatical shifts, is dubious. Even if their position were granted, the appeal in PssSol 17 is for a change in the political element, not the cultic. Atkinson's assumption is that the community responsible for PssSol were religious separatists who rejected the Temple.⁴¹ Given this assumption, it would follow that PssSol 17.7-9 were referring to all Hasmoneans, the High Priest Hyrcanus II included, and lead naturally enough to Herod's eradication of the Hasmoneans. But, as I argue in the following study, nothing in the document suggests that the authors were interested in removing themselves from the current Temple hierarchy or interested in a 'cultic coup'. To be sure, the punishment meted out to the Hasmonean rulers stems solely from Temple malpractice. But the malpractice is just that and not evidence of improper Temple leadership. A return to

³⁷ This suggestion was raised earlier by J. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah: A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews from the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud* (London: Longmans, Green, 1877) 133 and G. B. Gray *APOT* v. 2 628. Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 397 has suggested two authors, a principle and a redactor.

³⁸ Contrary to Johannes Tromp "The Sinners and the Lawless in Psalms of Solomon 17" *NovTest* 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1993) 345-361 who suggests a very wide period during which the psalms could have been composed.

³⁹ Kenneth Atkinson "Towards a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon: Implications for Understanding the *Sitz im Leben* of an Unknown Jewish Sect" *JSP* 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 95-112 suggests a period from 62-30 B.C.E for the composition; cf. Eissfeldt *OT Introduction* 612. Atkinson bases his argument on Tromp's interpretation of the Greek text. Note Emil Schürer *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* v.I (Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black eds.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979) 301. Initially, Herod coexisted peacefully with the remaining Hasmoneans, even being married to Mariamme. Note M. de Jonge "The Psalms of Solomon" in *Outside the Old Testament CCWJC* 4 (M. de Jonge, ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 159-177 who explains the future to aorist shift as an indication of the shift towards the eschaton.

⁴⁰ Trafton *The Syriac Version* 163-164.

⁴¹ Atkinson *idem*. 109.

proper practice would have effectively ended the punishment, Hasmoneans or no. According to Trafton's insights, the grammatical data could be read either way and, I suggest, the evidence still supports a Pompeian dating. Inasmuch as PssSol is not concerned to eradicate the Temple hierarchy completely, it seems likely that PssSol 17 refers to Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem and the disposal of the *royal* power of the Hasmoneans.⁴² The document, therefore, refers to events preceding Herod's rise to power.

On this issue I am partly guided by the document's overall unity. From start to finish, it presents an argument with unity of purpose, and therefore commends the conclusion that the authors were few, or one, as regards to composition. Addition of chapter titles and minor revisions there may be, but the general tenor of the document suggests a unity of purpose in addressing a specific historical event, certainly that of Pompey's invasion. A similar state of affairs is evident in the case of the biblical Psalter, where no one seriously doubts that the hands of editors may be traced in a final compilation which still, however, allows the reader to discern clearly poems of many varied types and genres. So, while the Psalter does present a unified front, it does so with some limitations.⁴³ PssSol displays no such ambiguity or ambivalence in its thesis and, I shall argue, was intended to address a particular theological program. In short, the document's unity argues in favor of both a limited date and authorship.

2.3—*Textual Witnesses and Original Language*

R.R. Hahn has already considered in detail the status of the extant texts of PssSol available to the modern scholar, and many fine summaries of the document exist already.⁴⁴ In the common, standardized edition of Gk. PssSol, there are 18 psalms of

⁴² Schürer *et.al.* HJP 238-241; William Fairweather *The Background of the Gospels* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1951) 232 makes this insightful point regarding PssSol: "Prior to the siege of Jerusalem by Pompey the Pharisees had attained to the position of supremacy under Alexandra, and our psalms are a protest against the secularisation of Israel during the Maccabean rule." It is interesting in that Fairweather advocates Pharisaic authorship while at the same time noting the anti-ruling class attitude of the psalms.

⁴³ R.N. Whybray *Reading the Psalms as a Book* JSOT 222 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996) 84 has noted that the redactional aspects of the Psalter have not completely eliminated the individuality of many of the Psalms.

⁴⁴ Wright, *OTP* 639-649; H.E. Ryle and R.J. James *The Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly called the Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1891) xiii-xci; Kenneth Atkinson *Intertextual*

varying lengths and content.⁴⁵ The interests of each individual psalm seem to differ greatly, a fact that has contributed to an approach to the document that disregards its unity and cohesion, as I noted above.⁴⁶ Regarding versification, I generally follow Rahlfs' enumeration, but, like other scholars, I have introduced my own versification on occasion, which I follow in the section on the *Literary Genre and Poetics*.

The document is preserved in two languages, Gk. (11 manuscripts) and Syr. (5 manuscripts).⁴⁷ Although the consensus of modern scholarly opinion maintains a Heb. original, nothing of it remains. This makes it somewhat difficult, and very hazardous, to make conjectures on the underlying Heb. based on the Gr. For this, LXX must be our only guide, but the Syr. version is certainly helpful. All the same, it is important to point out at the beginning that any reconstruction of the underlying Heb. ever offered is conjectural and based on the information one can glean from LXX and its translations of the books of the Hebrew Bible.

The Syr. is versified slightly differently from the Gk., displayed clearly in the fine work done by Joseph Trafton, which I follow in this study when reference to the Syr. is made.⁴⁸ While Trafton maintains that the Syr. is a translation from the original Heb. and not from the Gr., Atkinson has suggested otherwise.⁴⁹ Atkinson critiques Trafton's position in the following way:

...the Syriac version contains numerous Greek loan words...neither Kuhn nor Trafton recognized the extent to which the Greek translator expanded the PssSol based upon intertextual allusions from the LXX. Because these intertextual

Study 395-427; Mikael Winninge Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters CB 26 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1995) 9-21.

⁴⁵ Wright *ibid.* 639; Hahn *Manuscript History* 11-12.

⁴⁶ This is not to say that scholars have not issued caution in this respect. J. Viteau, *Psaumes de Salomon* 86 offers this insight, "Mais on voit toujours reparaître les mêmes réflexions, les mêmes passions, les mêmes manières de parler, les mêmes doctrines, qui formaient comme la substance immuable de son âme, agitée par les changements politiques et sociaux." Viteau insightfully notes that the PssSol were most likely used liturgically, thereby lending to their overall continuity. Elsewhere, however, he makes comments regarding PssSol such as that "...ne suivait ni l'ordre logique ni l'ordre chronologique" cf. 94 and also 85. Also note G. Buchanan Gray's comment in "The Psalms of Solomon" in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (R.H. Charles ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916) 628 in which he states that the compilation displays a "...general similarity of tone and character..."

⁴⁷ The Gk. MSS are summarized by Hahn *op. cit.* 3-6 and Trafton *op. cit.* 6-9. Trafton *idem.* 5-6 lists the Syr. MSS.

⁴⁸ Joseph L. Trafton *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* SCS 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

⁴⁹ Compare Trafton *Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon* 227-237 with Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 399.

additions are found in the Syriac, and since the Syriac is a literal translation of the Greek that also reflects Greek grammar, the Syriac cannot have been translated directly from the PssSol's original Hebrew text.⁵⁰

But it is a commonly known fact that Syriac (Aramaic) shares some grammatical similarities with the Greek language (e.g., the postpositive $\Upsilon\Upsilon/\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$) and is therefore no pressing reason to suggest that the Syriac slavishly rendered the Greek version. In short, an authentic Syriac translation of the Heb. might very well appear to support Atkinson's observations without relying on the Greek version. While both positions have merits, what should not be lost in this discussion is that both versions speak, generally, to similar Heb. phrases. So while the statement that reconstructions of this underlying Heb. are conjectural is accurate, it must be remembered that these conjectures can be very accurate according to what LXX and MT relations tell us. Of course, the translation techniques of LXX leave us with a certain level of uncertainty. Nonetheless, philology can yield very important finds if employed specifically and rigidly. I agree with the majority of scholarship that the Gr. text speaks to a Heb. original (Aramaic?) and does so according to LXX patterns of translation, to which the Syr. version lends certain insights. In short, we have before us Gr. and Syr. texts which, while they do ultimately lead back to a reconstructed Heb. version, can tell us something of what the authors had in mind, if LXX is kept in constant view.

Every psalm but the first has a title, which, when coupled with the inclusion of the Gk. term $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha$ and the phrase $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, suggests that the document was originally intended to be read in a liturgical setting.⁵¹ The Gk. term and phrase are both 1:1 renditions of the Heb. terms הַסֵּל and לְמַנְצֵל found in the biblical Psalter. It is precisely because of the similarities between the Gk. in PssSol and that of LXX that an underlying Heb. text has been suggested. Very early on in critical examinations of PssSol, the Jesuit scholar Juan Luis de la Cerda suggested that the document was a Christian compilation.⁵²

⁵⁰ Ibid. 399.

⁵¹ On the liturgical nature of PssSol, note P.N. Franklyn "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon" JSJ 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1987) 5; H. St. J. Thackeray's comment in *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921) 100-104; Otto Eissfeldt *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Peter R. Ackroyd, trans.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965) 611.

⁵² Juan Luis de la Cerda "Ad Lectorem," in *Adversaria Sacra* (Lyon: Ludovici Prost Haeredis Roville, 1626) 10-12

Apart from the objections this raises to our dating, it also maintains the possibility that the compilation was first written in Gk. or Syr.⁵³ Cerda's conclusion that the document is Christian has been universally rejected and with it the notion that the original language was Gk.⁵⁴

Most modern scholars who have worked on the document simply take the Gk. text as authoritative and make use of Syr. where that version lends particular insight. In some ways my approach is no different from theirs.⁵⁵ But very often, modern scholars do not attempt to reconstruct what may have been the underlying Heb. term and offer suggestions as to what the meaning or intent of the authors was based on the purported Heb. reconstruction. In the following I attempt precisely this at a number of points. In the third chapter dealing with the Temple motif in PssSol for instance, I attempt to formulate a Septuagintal understanding of certain key terms (e.g., ἁμαρτία; ἐπικαλέω) and, because I reach the conclusion that the authors of the document are closely associated with priestly circles, I offer suggestions as to what they are intimating through the use of certain Gk. terms, which point to specific underlying Heb. terms and, more importantly, concepts from a priestly perspective. Thus, I attempt reconstructions that point to a specific theological outlook, which is itself evident from the way in which the authors envision history, God, and Israel. It is these concepts that I am most interested in understanding with the help of a linguistic approach.

3—Recent Scholarship:

As I remarked earlier, research on PssSol has yet to provide a thoroughgoing critique of the document as a witness to themes from HB. Until recently, the antiquated (yet still remarkably useful) work of Ryle and James was the authoritative guide for PssSol. Most recently, Robert Wright has provided a translation and brief introduction to

⁵³ This suggestion follows from the close association in the ancient world of PssSol with Odes of Solomon, which is preserved primarily in Syr. but also in Gk. The two texts were often preserved together in the same folio, with Odes of Solomon following PssSol. In the list of Nicephorus *Quae Scripturae Canonicae* 2 (9th century CE) the Psalms and Odes are listed together διὰ Ψαλμοὶ Καὶ ᾠδαὶ Σολομῶντος στίχοι and earlier (6th century CE) by Pseudo-Athanasius *Synopsis Scripturae Sacrae* 74 with Ψαλμοὶ Καὶ ᾠδὴ Σολομῶντος; cf. J.H. Charlesworth *Odes of Solomon* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977) 3; Wright *OTP* 639-640.

⁵⁴ A. Hilgenfeld *Die Psalmen Solomo's und die Himmelfahrt des Moses, griechisch hergestellt und erklärt* ZWT 11 (1868) 133-168 also argued for a Gk. original. His position has been universally rejected.

⁵⁵ E.g., Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 399.

he document (1985), Kenneth Atkinson has published a thoroughgoing commentary and intertextual study (2001), and Mikael Winninge a thematic comparison between Paul's theology and that of PssSol regarding the sinners and righteous. While each of these works have a number of strengths to commend them as useful and informative guides to understanding PssSol, none of them adequately summarize the manner in which the document was formed nor the function it played as a product of 2nd Temple Jewish culture. Future scholarship could benefit from such an assessment; and there is a need for re-evaluating PssSol in light of proposals regarding inter-textuality and tradition-historical criticism. To give an assessment of recent work, I present here a critique of three recent, significant, large-scale treatments of PssSol.

3.1—*Mikael Winninge:*

Mikael Winninge's recent monograph is unique among publications on the document. Such a thematic study on PssSol is rare, and it is by far the most ambitious and extensive use of PssSol by NT scholarship to date. Winninge's use of PssSol as a witness to the themes developed by Paul in the NT is admirable, and his comments on the 'status aspect' of the sinners and righteous is a helpful rubric. There are, however, some possible shortcomings in his work.

First, Winninge's admitted intention is to develop a better understanding of pre-70 Pharisaism. He notes the major problem with such an undertaking: a paucity of source material. But Winninge is undaunted, and concludes in his discussion of the provenance of PssSol that:

...the opponents in the PssSol are adversaries of the Pharisees. At times these opponents are Hasmoneans, including especially Aristobulus II and his supporters, but occasionally also Hyrcanus II with his partisans. Sometimes the adversaries are Sadducees, due to differing practices and beliefs. Now and then the criticism of these groups coincides.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous* 173; while Winninge's attempts are admirable, they are not persuasive and clearly represent a throwback to Ryle and James' theory of authorship, now largely abandoned. Note Charlesworth's editorial note to Wright's introduction to "The Psalms of Solomon" 642; also note Wright's assessment in, "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes" in which he outlines possible sectarian authorship and the pitfalls of assigning such authorship to the PssSol. Perhaps most enlightening is Schiffman's article, "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions" in which he notes the use of similar invective and praise terminology by various sects 264-65. Chester "Jewish Messianic Expectations" 29 concludes regarding PssSol's affiliation with Pharisaism (my parenthetical remarks): '...most of the points of contact (i.e., between PssSol and Pharisaism) can be seen to belong to the common

Winninge's conclusion suggests that the Pharisees had no political allegiances towards the end of Hasmonean dynasty. He comments that Hyrcanus II '...reasonably had support from the Pharisees...' but that the '...pretences of Hyrcanus to the throne were not accepted among the Pharisees'.⁵⁷ But these statements hardly seem likely in the light of the Pharisees' actions during the reign of Alexandra. In fact, the Pharisees seemed quite ambitious about political action if given the chance.⁵⁸ What is perhaps most telling of the situation between Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II is the delegation sent to Pompey in the spring of 63 BCE. Here, the two delegations of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus are opposed by a third delegation consisting of a group of Jews wishing to be rid of the Hasmoneans altogether. If one is to accept the consensus of scholarship on this point, then one must assume that the two main Jewish sects, Sadducees and Pharisees, were included in the delegations of the two Hasmonean brothers. Thus it seems that at least a significant portion of the Jewish population in Palestine openly opposed both political parties. Winninge notes this and states:

...he (Josephus) also mentions a third group, which complained over how the brothers governed the country, and asserted that it was the custom of their country (πάτριον) to obey the priests of God (*Ant* 14.41). This is exactly what could be expected of the Pharisees, who in reality had governed the country with the permission of queen Salome Alexandra.⁵⁹

This is a curious argument, in that Winninge seemingly portrays the Pharisees as both non-political and yet ultimately political at the same time. The facts indicate that no one knows for certain who constituted this 'third group', other than that it constituted people who wished for a return to a theocracy. What is also known is that the Pharisees were not

stock of Judaism of the first century BC, so that it is a mistake to connect the Psalms of Solomon too closely with any group of which we know, simply because of correspondence of this kind (i.e., terminology and religious disposition)'.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Winninge *Sinners and Righteous* 173.

⁵⁸ Note Schürer *HJP* vol. 1 229-236 (229-231) states: "Whereas he [Alexander] hated, and was hated by, the Pharisees, Alexandra was well disposed towards them and entrusted them with the reins of government." See also Smallwood *Jews under Roman Rule* 19-20 has noted how brutal the Pharisees were during the brief rule of Salome Alexandra. Clearly this is an indication of not only the Pharisees' presence in political affairs, but also their willingness to assert themselves. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* xiii.16.405-408; *BJ* i.5.107-109.

⁵⁹ Winninge *idem.* 173.

a-political, and were likely represented in one of the two delegations sent to Pompey, most probably comprising a portion of Hyrcanus' side.

PssSol offers no definitive proof connecting the political or non-political motivation of the authors with the Pharisees. PssSol 17.5-7 is frequently cited in the debate on authorship, but the section is rather vague.⁶⁰ While I agree with the view that the 'usurpers' is a reference to the Hasmoneans, I also acknowledge that the prevailing religious groups seemingly supported one Hasmonean against another. The reference to the 'throne of David' (PssSol 17.6) further clouds the issue. While the books of Maccabees never make the claim that the Hasmoneans are descendants of David, they acknowledge that David 'inherited the throne of the kingdom forever'.⁶¹ As such, it does not seem likely that a Hasmonean supporter, either Pharisee or Sadducee, would suggest that Aristobulus II or Hyrcanus II had usurped David's throne.

Elsewhere, though he admits that PssSol 2.3 '...seems to contain an accusation directed particularly at the priesthood...',⁶² Winninge notes that the primary issue for PssSol is the monarchy, and not the high priesthood.⁶³ In point of fact, PssSol do not support such a clear distinction between king and priest and reflect in some ways with the historical reality of the office held by the Hasmonean priest-kings.⁶⁴ While the authors of PssSol observe a problem with the political leadership of Judea, and therefore call upon God to be their king (17.1, 46), they also notice a problem with the priesthood and the functioning of the Temple (2.3-5; 8.11-13).⁶⁵ Thus, one of the first functions of the messiah in 17.22 is to purge Jerusalem of the Gentile and to destroy the unrighteous rulers (priests-kings?).

For Winninge, the issue of authorship is vital to the understanding of the use of the terms sinners and righteous by PssSol and, consequently, to his thesis as a whole. Regarding this connection he concludes:

⁶⁰ Atkinson *Intertextuality* 339, for instance, makes no comment on authorship from this section.

⁶¹ 1 Macc. 2.57.

⁶² Atkinson *idem.* 32.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 172.

⁶⁴ Winninge *Sinners and Righteous* 126 also notes that the characteristic sin elements in PssSol were sexual and cultic 126. Cf. section on *Temple Motif*.

⁶⁵ The reason for the arrival of the Gentile to punish Jerusalem is because the Temple and its sacrifices have been profaned, PssSol 1.8; 2.3; 8.14.

...the Psalms of Solomon (PssSol) have been carefully studied with regard to the classification and description of sinners and the righteous respectively. ...as the PssSol most likely are of Pharisaic origin, it is plausible that they reflect several of the convictions and views that Paul held as a Pharisee.⁶⁶

In response to this line of thought regarding the issue of sinner and righteous in PssSol and the affiliation of those rubrics with particular sects, Jerry O'Dell has argued:

The fact, however, that the 'godless' in these psalms (PssSol) cannot possibly be justifiably interpreted as a nomenclature applying only to a definite single oppositional party is not only evident to one who has made a thorough examination of the psalms themselves...⁶⁷

In addition to O'Dell's observation, I suggest that another point may be raised, namely, that the terms 'righteous' or 'devout' cannot be considered exclusive identification of any one Jewish group, just as the terms 'wicked' or 'sinner' cannot be considered an tag exclusive of any specific group. In short, every 'sect' used the positive terms to define themselves and negative ones to describe their opponents. As Trafton suggests in his critique of Winnige's position regarding the use of such terms to isolate sectarian groups:

In any case, such a criticism could easily be leveled by anyone opposed in principle to the non-Zadokite Hasmonean priesthood.⁶⁸

Winnige makes very specific claims for the language in PssSol by concluding:

If it is assumed that οἱ ὀσίοι are the Pharisees, it is an almost inescapable conclusion that συναγωγαί are synagogues in their control.⁶⁹

Thus, by looking to use the terms 'sinner' and 'righteous' in such a fashion, namely as Pharisaic terms, Winnige has unnecessarily constrained the document to fit his need for a source '...in which Pharisaism is not primarily subjectively defended, but in which the core of Pharisaism is inherent'.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Winnige *idem.* 333.

⁶⁷ O'Dell "Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon" 252.

⁶⁸ Joseph L. Trafton "The Bible, the Psalms of Solomon, and Qumran" paper read at *The 2nd Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Nov. 9-12, 1997).

⁶⁹ Winnige *Sinners and Righteous* 176.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 2. This also reflects the type of 'looking back' evident in the de Jonge's and Meeks' papers above and typifies the dominant methodological approach when attempting to use the PssSol in NT studies.

Perhaps one of the Winninge's greatest oversights is his assessment of the document with regard to purity. On the issue of the sinners Winninge concludes that the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem are of two kinds, cultic and sexual.⁷¹ He concludes later that:

...in the PssSol the inhabitants of Jerusalem were accused of committing sexual sins (PsSol 8.9f), plundering (PsSol 8.11) and sacrilege (PsSol 8.12). Paul mentions stealing (Rom. 2.21), adultery and temple robbery (Rom 2.22).⁷²

For HB, these categories are particularly offensive and two observations are in order.⁷³ First, because they mention the profanation of the Temple, the authors of PssSol clearly did see a problem with some aspect of the priesthood in Jerusalem other than genealogical legitimacy, which undermines his earlier observation regarding the central thrust of PssSol 17. The Temple had been profaned and morally defiled as a result of improper maintenance and neglect. Secondly and in light of the first point, purity is one of the main issues for the authors of PssSol. For the authors of PssSol the issue of purity and impurity, both ritual⁷⁴ and moral⁷⁵, is taken from the HB understanding of purity and impurity. The discussion of such moral sins as those found in Lev. 18, 26; Deut. 28 and 32 are source-texts for the concept of moral behavior as developed by the authors of PssSol. But just as Winninge opens the door to associating HB antecedents (on this point with PssSol on the issue of purity, astonishingly he fails to make any mention of the HB texts themselves!⁷⁶ In short, Winninge fails to frame his discussion of sinners and righteous in PssSol (and Paul) within HB classifications of purity, which is clearly what the authors of PssSol set out to do.⁷⁷

⁷¹ Winninge *Sinners and the Righteous* 126.

⁷² Ibid. 260.

⁷³ Cf. Klawans and his discussion of the two types of impurity as found in HB in *Sin and Impurity in Ancient Judaism* 25-27.

⁷⁴ Note PssSol 3.5-12.

⁷⁵ Note PssSol 1.7-8; 4.5; 8.9; and 14.8.

⁷⁶ Winninge *Sinners and Righteous* 125-136.

⁷⁷ Note Klawans' *Impurity and Sin* 50 and his discussion of PssSol 1.7-8, 4.5, 8.9 and their relations with Lev. 18. To this we might add 14.8.

3.2—Robert Wright

Robert Wright's translation of and introduction to PssSol provides useful references to both HB and NT.⁷⁸ He also gives a fresh theological introduction (along with V. Schwartz), which attempts to guide the reader through PssSol. While Wright's work is useful and helps apprise one of the basic parameters of the document's scope, a few questions remain regarding his assessment.

First, Wright characterizes the document as a '...literature of crisis'.⁷⁹ He clarifies this assessment by stating:

But it is more than the crisis of an alien army invading the homeland; it is one of harsh reality invading a traditional theology.⁸⁰

One wonders, however, what is implied by 'traditional theology'? For Wright, it appears to be the 'inviolable covenant' (Law of Moses?) that Pompey's soldiers (and Pompey himself) transgressed when they walked into the Holy of Holies.⁸¹ Yet the Law of Moses contains explicit warnings about the consequences of certain types of sin, namely bloodshed, sexual deviancy, and idol worship.⁸² In all cases the point of the true affront of these sins is leveled against the presence of God in the Land of Israel represented by the Temple. Thus the 'inviolable covenant' of which Wright speaks does itself warn of punishment that is a *result* of these categories of sins. As Winninge has noted, the primary sins in PssSol are cultic and sexual. Such sins are punishable by the harshest means allotted in HB: invasion and expulsion from the Land. One might conclude, therefore, that 'traditional theology' considered the invasion of the Land and the subjugation of the people by Pompey necessary and foreknowable consequences of the actions of the sinners described in PssSol. Thus there is no 'harsh reality invading a traditional theology' in PssSol precisely because the 'traditional theology' to which Wright refers indelibly etched the possibility of punishment by means of invasion,

⁷⁸ He also produced a very useful article years ago on the debate over authorship in the document; R. Wright "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes" in *1972 Proceedings of the IOSCS* (SCS 2; ed. Robert A. Kraft; Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).

⁷⁹ Wright *OTP* 643.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 643.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 643.

⁸² On bloodshed note e.g. Num. 35.33-34; on sexual deviancy note e.g. Lev. 18.24-30; and on idolatry note e.g. Lev. 19.31 and 20.1-3.

conquest and exile into the minds of its practitioners through its daily and yearly ordinances.

Secondly, how surprising were these events to the authors of PssSol?⁸³ Wright continues in his introduction:

Since he (the author) is caught off guard by the suddenness of the events, we see in the unsystematic and somewhat unstable theodicy of the Psalms of Solomon the author's desperate appropriation of any possible rationale by which to make sense of the situation.⁸⁴

This seems to me to be a faulty assessment of the subtlety of the argument put forth by the authors of PssSol. Contrary to Wright's assessment, the authors of PssSol display a calm assurance that the judgments of the Lord are righteous and, above all, necessary.⁸⁵ The interjection by the authors of references to God's righteous judgment being justified (δικαιῶ) displays a literature not of crisis, but of assurance based on biblical models, as I shall demonstrate.⁸⁶ Wright is correct in observing that the document displays 'traditional theology', but it is a theological system fully capable of accommodating and justifying the historical realities of Pompey's invasion. This assurance stems from adherence to and faith in the Law of Moses.⁸⁷ If I am correct in this assessment, the document would then read not as an 'unsystematic and somewhat unstable theodicy',⁸⁸ but as a seamless whole of lament and praise, hope and dismay, penned as a reaction to historical pressures. The accommodation of HB texts by the authors would then represent a reaction to historical events with the intent of educating the readership towards a particular end. Wright has

⁸³ Nickelsburg's *Jewish Literature* 204 comment is useful in this regard: 'The author not only petitions or praises God for deliverance from distress but also explicates how this distress serves as chastening or punishment for sin'.

⁸⁴ Wright *OTP* 643 my parenthetical comment.

⁸⁵ Note the placement of instances in which the authors mention the judgment of God; routinely they break up a narrative of historical conflagration. It is as though the authors are keen to point out to their readership that the historical problems of invasion and exile are a direct and predictable result of the sins of Israel. This attitude is maintained throughout the entire document, with the possible exception of 2.22. Contra Wright *OTP* 641, we have also noted that the titles in the PssSol are actually apropos of the content or running narrative of the document as a whole.

⁸⁶ The common argument, which is that of Wright, is that the document was not intended to convey a unified message. Instead, the points at which the authors punctuate the narrative with praise of God's judgment, a seeming *non sequitur*, are, for Wright, evidence of the fragmentary nature of the narrative. This, for Wright, is evidence of the authors' utter dismay. Note Wright 643. Quite the contrary, however: the placement of these appeals to God's righteous judgment is too well organized and deliberate to be considered a knee-jerk reaction.

⁸⁷ Most particularly the prophetic sections of the Law of Moses, e.g. Lev. 26, Num. 23-24, Deut. 28 and 32.

⁸⁸ Wright *OTP* 643.

noted this 'end', which he identifies as 'apocalyptic messianism'.⁸⁹ But, as I noted in relation to the case of messianism above, the authors intended the messianic portions of their writing to be a summative event, not a central theme.

A point of clarification needed in Wright's thesis is his use of the phrase 'apocalyptic eschatology'. He provides a summary of his position regarding this term as follows:

When the collapse of history as a viable vehicle for covenantal promises prompts the crisis in theology, when the hopelessness of the political expectations of the oppressed community brings forth the call for a divine interruption of history, apocalyptic eschatology provides relief. The oppressed community looks for the realization of present and ancient hopes, and the rescue of traditional theology.⁹⁰

It does not seem, however, that the authors of PssSol composed their thoughts with such a view of history in mind. First, historical events are simply a means of communicating a theological message. So, while the messiah in PssSol will actually be present in history, it his actions in establishing God's kingdom on Earth that are important to the authors.⁹¹ Thus while the historical event of Pompey's invasion is a key component of the theological composition, individual historical events in and of themselves are secondary to the main point of the document.⁹² It is through the historical event that the prophetic

⁸⁹ Ibid. 642.

⁹⁰ Ibid. 646.

⁹¹ There is something very important in this conception of history. See Nicolai Berdyaev *The Meaning of History* (London: Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press, 1936) 8 in which he notes in a discussion of the development of higher criticism that historical criticism 'had become absolutely powerless to explain the mystery of the religious phenomenon.'

⁹² It is important to point out that historical criticism fails to account fully for the meaning of a text. It is clear that historical events are essential to a proper understanding of the intention of the authors of PssSol. But historical criticism by no means exercises a monopoly over the document, and even holds some danger when applied univocally. On this point note Stephen Barton's approach to interpreting the Scriptures in *Invitation to the Bible* (London: SPCK, 1997) particularly ch. 9; and A.K.M. Adam's work *Making Sense of New Testament Theology: 'Modern' Problems and Prospects* SABH 11 (Macon, GA: Mercer, 1995) chs. 6-7. But, in spite of Adam's fine work, I must disagree in part with his conclusions, which allow (cautiously on Adams' part) for an open-ended approach to the biblical text. This open-endedness differs qualitatively from the open-endedness described by Bernhard W. Anderson, "The Bible as a Shared Story of a People" in *The Old and the New Testaments: Their Relationship and the "Post-biblical writings" Literature* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993) 5 in which he highlights the continuity between the two testaments. For Anderson, the openness is a result of *interacting* with the OT text, which can lead one to Islam, Judaism, or Christianity. For Adams, the openness is a result of *interacting solely* with the NT text sociologically, politically, and personally. In so far as the NT text is so reliant upon the OT text, an approach such as the latter always runs the risk of renegotiating theological parameters without respect to their origins or authorial intent. Walter Brueggemann presents a very subtle and insightful argument in *The Prophetic Imagination* (Minneapolis:

paradigm is again recast. Secondly, nowhere are we to read that the advent and work of the messiah are tantamount to the abolition of human history. The work of the messiah represents a radical change in the existing socio-political order. This is particularly important for PssSol because of its emphasis on the advent of a messianic king with priestly characteristics, rather than a messianic priest with royal characteristics. Thirdly, ‘eschatology’ has somehow become synonymous with messianism—certainly for Wright. Yet messianism and eschatology are two different and not necessarily related concepts.⁹³ What Wright has done is import the concept of ‘eschatology’ to a text mostly concerned with historical messianism, or as Schaper put it, ‘traditional messianism’.⁹⁴ By importing the concept of ‘eschatology’, Wright’s summation may be misguided when he claims that the authors are ‘...caught off guard...’ and are looking for ‘...the realization of present and ancient hopes, and the rescue of traditional theology’.

One final point is worth mentioning because it has profound implications with respect to the overall influence of PssSol. Wright notes the long-recognized similarities PssSol 17 shared with Isa. 11. One of the strengths of Wright’s work happens also to be one of its possible shortcomings. He provides a useful list of biblical verses relevant to PssSol, but ultimately fails to associate any of the references in PssSol using those biblical verses in a way that displays the interpretive efforts of the authors.⁹⁵ Taking the passage from Isa. 11 for instance, PssSol 17.35 states: ‘He (messiah) will strike the earth with the word of his mouth...’ As Wright has observed, this is an obvious reference to Isa. 11.4.⁹⁶ More specifically, a detail which Wright does not point out, it is a reference to the Isa. 11.4 of the LXX, not the extant MT.⁹⁷ This is very important in that the textual

Fortress Press, 2001) noting particularly ix-xxi and 38-40 in which he appropriates OT themes in the modern day through modern historical events.

⁹³ Certainly Schaper *op. cit.* 26-30 is right on this point. Note his distinction between ‘messianism’ and ‘eschatology’, the first being political and the second being personal. Schaper also relates that the phenomena of the two theological outlooks are the result of differing social stimuli, 135.

⁹⁴ Schaper *idem.* 143 notes: ‘Traditional messianism contains a political, Davidic king who enlarges Israel’s territory’.

⁹⁵ Note particularly his section on relation to canonical books 646-647.

⁹⁶ This is also one of the main positions held by M. de Jonge in his thesis in *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*, 72. See the subsequent arguments of H.J. de Jonge “Jesus’ Historical View of Himself” 26 and Meeks “Asking Back to Jesus” 47.

⁹⁷ Qumran offers no new insights as 1QIs^a preserves the extant MT reading. In his introduction, Wright 64C notes that the author of the PssSol used the LXX over against the MT.

tradition embraced by the author of PssSol 17 was apparently that of the LXX.⁹⁸ In the light of Wevers' statement, it becomes clear that a tradition of interpretation is embraced by the authors of PssSol and demands exploration. PssSol are a witness to the development of the concept of 'word of his mouth' out of HB source material, as understood by Alexandrian Jews, and later received by the Christian community.⁹⁹ Wright here has missed the opportunity to examine the 'transmission history' of a particular theme, very important to both Jews and Christians alike.

3.3—Kenneth Atkinson

While of a similar nature to Wright's commentary only on a larger scale, Kenneth Atkinson's recent publication is really the first of its kind. Atkinson's work is very thorough in providing the reader with a truly substantial concordance of inter-textual references. In this capacity, it is a very helpful work. But Atkinson did not stop there. He also included a series of helpful commentary sections that break up the narrative of each chapter. At the end of each chapter, he provides a conclusion to help draw together the chapter as a whole as well as provide the reader with an intra-textual assessment of the function of each chapter. This reflects, in my view, a very important step in the right direction. The arrangement of Atkinson's work is effective in encouraging the reader to look for threads of continuity within the document.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁸ A point neatly summed up by Debra Rosen and Alison Salvesen "A Note on the Qumran Temple Scroll 56:15-18 and Psalm of Solomon 17.33" *JJS* 38 (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1987) 99-101. The LXX represents a larger issue of translation technique vis-à-vis interpretation on the part of the translators, which is not in question here. It should suffice to note that the LXX is a Jewish work and reflects in many ways Jewish interpretive history. This is particularly true in the light of the fact that, in the case of differences between the MT and LXX, Qumran MSS often agree with the LXX, note Deut. 32 on this point. It is also interesting to note the theory of Thackeray regarding the Septuagint's liturgical functions, *Septuagint and Jewish Worship* particularly 100-107, which would attest to an interpretive editorial and translation process. For a history of translation technique of LXX and its significance cf. Olofsson, *Guide to the Translation Technique* particularly the introduction and chapter 1. Note here Wevers *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* xii-xiv as a contrary opinion to the school of "translation technique" represented here by Olofsson. Wevers *idem*. xv comment regarding the position of LXX as a commentary to HB is again fruitful.

⁹⁹ The impact of 'word of his mouth' found in Isa. 11.4 (and later in Isa. 49.2) is evidenced in the NT in Rev. 1.16, a clear reference to Christ, in which the 'word of his mouth' is equated to a two-edged sword and is combined with the 'smashing of nations as pottery' in Ps. 2. Note Davenport's "The Anointed of the Lord" 72-73 comments on the 'social control' factor implicit in the phrase 'word of his mouth'.

¹⁰⁰ Atkinson *Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* noting particularly his comments on the MS history of the PssSol 395-402.

Unfortunately, the commentary does not improve on the problematic portions of Wright's work on several accounts. In spite of his conclusion that the document was edited intentionally into its present form, Atkinson does not produce a theological critique to support such an opinion. As he notes:

Most likely, a later redactor affixed the first and eighteenth PssSol as an introduction and conclusion in order to give the collection a more unified appearance.¹⁰¹

One might expect that, given this conclusion, Atkinson would be ready to comment on the document's overall unity and, therefore, any particular affect such a unity might potentially have on the interpretation of the document. But no such comment appears. The difficulty for Atkinson is that his particular style of inter-textual study, one predicated on and formed by the creation of a detailed concordance, unnecessarily constrains his conclusions by uncritically associating elements from PssSol with sundry HB and NT 'inter-texts'. The work founders due to its breadth. Ultimately, Atkinson is unable to establish definitive thematic, theological, and textual links between HB, PssSol and the NT precisely because his approach militates against such conclusions. Thus the fatal flaw in Atkinson's work is that it is too cumbersome and imprecise for use in examining the thematic, theological, and textual links between the HB, PssSol and NT. A closer examination shows this to be true.

Atkinson states in his introduction:

...the goal of this study is to show contemporary readers how PssSol's authors used the HS and what the [sic.] they meant when they wrote PssSol. ... The extent to which PssSol was indebted to the HS will be evident in this commentary, in which PssSol and the intertextual passages are placed in adjacent columns.¹⁰²

What Atkinson is saying is that the inter-textual citations, in some way or another, influenced the authors of PssSol. Take for instance PssSol 2.1. In his inter-textual apparatus, Atkinson rubricates Ezek. 4.2 and 21.22 under 'First Testament Intertexts' to this passage in PssSol.¹⁰³ Yet later, Atkinson concludes that the '...historical event

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 393, 396.

¹⁰² Ibid. 2-3.

¹⁰³ Ibid. 23.

described in PsSol 2 was the Roman general Pompey's 63 BCE siege of Jerusalem...¹⁰⁴ Are we to think that the authors of PssSol were inspired to write on the siege of Jerusalem from Ezek. 4.2 and 21.22 rather than the historical reality of Pompey's siege? It is likely that the authors, while aware of the passages in Ezekiel, were motivated to comment on this historical reality in the light of the judgments of God from the prophetic portions of the Law of Moses, such as Deuteronomy 28 and 32. The commentary, therefore, offers no real comment on the interaction between inter-textuality and historical events. Rather, Atkinson's work functions as a concordance and not an inter-textual study.

Moreover, to what extent is every reference of Atkinson's commentary actually a useful aid in showing what the authors of PssSol meant? For instance, taking the example from PssSol 2.1 again, Atkinson has first noted Deut. 28.52 under his heading 'First Testament Intertexts' for 2.1. The selection from Deuteronomy reads:

It (an invading nation) will besiege you in all your towns until your high and fortified walls, in which you trusted, come down'.

Then comes Atkinson's inclusion of the passages from Ezekiel. But would not a battering ram be assumed under the prophetic punishment listed in Deuteronomy 28? It is likely that the author of Ezekiel was himself mindful of the Deuteronomy 28 passage (or Leviticus 26 or Deuteronomy 32) in the light of a particular historical event to which he was a witness. Is it not the case, then, that both PssSol and Ezekiel are using the same HB text here? This is more likely than the suggestion that the author worked in a line from Deuteronomy 28 *through* Ezekiel 4 and 21 to PssSol, as Atkinson's commentary seems to indicate? Atkinson's methodology actually impedes the process of understanding inter-textuality; instead of encouraging an assessment of a primary prophetic witness such as Deut. 28, Atkinson's commentary produces a cobbled approach to the appropriation of HB texts by PssSol. Instead of showing the result of the interaction with Deut. 28 by the authors, Atkinson has actually funneled the use of the passage unnecessarily through the prophet Ezekiel. This is a shortcoming with respect to a concordance style approach, which can be avoided by comparing the conclusions of two different authors' use of the

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 50.

same or similar HB texts. At any rate, it becomes clear that Atkinson's definition of inter-textuality and his methodology are in need of refinement.

The foregoing may be the result of a fundamental problem in Atkinson's work, namely a subtle underestimation of the document's cohesive elements.¹⁰⁵ The impression one gets from reading the individual chapter conclusions in his work is that the document's editorial phase did not completely erase the theological differences between the independent chapters. If this last point were granted, then the reliability of the document to comment inter-textually would be placed in serious jeopardy. For instance, at one point Atkinson writes, 'Piety has become a substitute for sacrifice...'¹⁰⁶ in spite of the document's obvious and repeated concern for the Temple and its sacrifices (1.8; 2.3; 8.11-13). If Atkinson's point were granted, then it would be difficult to assess why a pre-occupation with Temple purity and messianism exists in the same document in the light of the messiah's action of purifying Jerusalem, Israel, and the nations. Should the conclusion be reached that PssSol, or any other post-biblical text, displays a pre-occupation with themes such as the Temple and its sacrifices, then the task for an inter-textual study is to examine the manner in which individual concepts, such as piety, are understood against these themes. A closer examination reveals the problem.

Although the Temple is not explicitly mentioned in every chapter, this in no way suggests that the motif was not a dominant consideration throughout the document. Atkinson may have, therefore, overstated the case by suggesting: '...PsSol 3 is remarkable for its lack of interest in the Temple cult'.¹⁰⁷ Certainly repentance through humbling the soul and fasting are elements with which the Temple is fundamentally associated. As I will discuss in the section on the Temple motif, PssSol 3 is likely referring to the Day of Atonement. It goes without saying that the Day of Atonement is intimately connected with the Temple and its sacrifices, and follows, therefore, that the

¹⁰⁵ This is also evident in Atkinson's choice to notate individual Psalms as "PsSol" whereas he refers to the entire document as "PssSol." Likely this is a result of the categorization taken from the canonical Psalter. While related in some capacities, the canonical Psalter and the PssSol are two very different documents. We suggest that the PssSol be read in much the same manner as Isaiah or Jeremiah, in which differing styles and genres, i.e., poetry and prose, history and prophecy, are thrown together with a single-mindedness.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. 425; also note fn. 99.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 69. Cf. my discussion of PssSol 3 in section *Temple Motif* 4.1.

authors of PssSol 3 were keen to demonstrate the central importance of Temple worship in the chapter and document.

Atkinson, it seems, is compelled to his conclusion by the constraints of his approach to inter-textuality, and the example from ch. 3 serves to illustrate this point. He has noted that the issue of ‘humbling his soul’ is to be found in the Day of Atonement description in Lev. 16, yet he curiously avoids associating this portion of PssSol with the Temple. Instead, he writes:

Although PsSol 3.8 alludes to Leviticus, the psalmist theologically attempted to fulfill its prescriptions concerning the offering for unintentional sins in a different manner...For the psalmist, however, fasting constitutes the sole means by which the righteous atone for unintentional sins.¹⁰⁸

Had he associated the phrase ‘humbling his soul’ in PssSol 3.8 with the ritual performed on the Day of Atonement in Lev. 16.26, Atkinson would no doubt have reached the conclusion that the authors of PssSol were here referring to the Day of Atonement ritual in the Temple, and that the issue of the Temple, highlighted in 1.7 and 2.3, was here again being brought to center stage. The conclusion reached in his commentary on this point is all the more peculiar in the light of another of his inter-texts, Ps 69.10 (LXX tradition). This verse discusses weeping and fasting subsequent to a comment on having zeal for the Temple (v.9) and would seem to indicate that the Temple service was indeed the conceptual centerpiece to Ps. 69.10. Accordingly, therefore, the association of Ps. 69.10 to PssSol 3.8 assumes that the conceptual centerpiece for both is the Temple as viewed in a positive light.¹⁰⁹ Atkinson continues to add other inter-textual witnesses, thereby drawing attention away from what is clearly a reference to the Temple service and, specifically, the Day of Atonement ceremony, and concludes that the authors of PssSol 3 are writing in a separated capacity from the Jerusalem Temple’s religious hegemony. This conclusion, it seems, is at odds with supporting Hebrew and Greek Bible inter-texts. Had his commentary taken seriously the issue of the Temple, and viewed its inclusion as central to the whole of the document, then the formation of an inter-textual witness would have centered on a search for pericopes having the Temple as a central

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. 64.

¹⁰⁹ Indeed, many of Atkinson’s inter-textual associations cast a favorable opinion on the Temple and do not, therefore, confirm his conclusion, e.g., Ps. 35.13 (LXX tradition); Jdt. 4.9; and Lev. 23.29, 32.

issue and shaped the interpretation of the passage in PssSol accordingly. Thus the oversight is two-fold. First, the internal, thematic continuity of the document has not been adequately assessed. This in turn leads to a flawed assessment of the document's central concerns. Secondly, because the thematic unity was missed, the inter-textual insights are also misguided. The placement of all HB textual 'allusions' and 'sources' alongside PssSol leads to faulty assessments of the intent of particular sections of the document. In sum, this leads to flawed conclusions regarding the insights offered by the document into Second Temple Period Jewish religious self-awareness.

4—Methodology and Inter-textuality:

My approach to the document differs considerably from that of recent scholarship. As I mentioned above, one type of linguistic that I undertake in the following is a comparison of terms between different texts. But that is not a methodological difference from the critiques I just examined. Where I differ from recent scholarship is in the area of tradition-historical criticism.

As I began to work more closely with PssSol, I noticed several key features (Temple, purity, Law of Moses) that the authors seemingly embraced. As these themes seemed central to the agenda of the authors, I took them to be the pillars upon which they constructed their interpretation of historical events. The authors' approach to history seemed then to emerge. They were interested in history only insofar as it was an indication of God's divine plan. This was, in my opinion, the fundamental feature of the prophet view of history. The concept of messianism, for example, represents one aspect of the divine plan and cannot be understood properly apart from it. History is secondary to the authors.¹¹⁰ The event of Pompey's invasion is simply a marker of the institution of the divine plan. But how did the authors come to this conclusion?

In the case of PssSol, I found that the document was a reproduction of a particular paradigm found in HB. This is the 'prophetic paradigm'. Once I realized this framework in PssSol, I began to look for a way of approaching a study of PssSol that emphasized

¹¹⁰ Although historical writings are common in Judaism, and make up a major part of HB, they are most concerned to convey theological and religious messages than to relay historical developments. Even a book such as Daniel does not do a great deal to help the historian recreate the events accurately. Most important for many of the authors of HB and post-biblical writings were the theological ramifications of the people's behavior, and the development and institution of God's divine plan in human history.

this feature, which seemed to me to be its hallmark. Moses' song in Deuteronomy 32 formed a useful example of the prophetic paradigm for several reasons.¹¹¹ First, the poem is certainly considered a prophetic text. It has all the fundamental features of the prophetic view of history: God's righteousness, Israel's election, Israel's sin, punishment and exile at the hands of a conquering nation, the redemption of Israel through repentance and punishment of the conquering nation, and the re-establishment of Israel and universal recognition of God's sovereignty. The first chapter is devoted to this discussion. Moreover, it is clear that later Jewish communities envisioned Moses to be the preeminent prophet, and there is biblical support for this view as well.¹¹² Second, it was a text held in very high esteem in 2nd Temple Judaism, to which its inclusion on a separate scroll at Qumran, Philo's praise, and indications from Josephus that the song was stored at the Temple attest.¹¹³ Its renown, certainly by the 1st century CE, makes it commendable as a source text for the prophetic view of history. Thirdly, it encompasses the whole of Israel's history, past, present and future in 43 verses. The view of history that it takes resonates with that of the prophetic corpus and its compact size makes it ideal for comparative purposes.¹¹⁴

The benefits of comparing two conceptually complete texts are obvious. Such a comparison provides a greater conceptual framework in which to operate. Instead of focusing on allusions and references apart from a contextual mooring, which can lead to

¹¹¹ George W.E. Nickelsburg *Jewish Literature between the Bible and Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 205 hints very vaguely at Deut. 32's influence on PssSol as does Rodney Alan Werline *Penitential Prayer in 2nd Temple Judaism* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 188. On the nature of Deut. 32, see Cecile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl, *La Bible D'Alexandrie* vol. V (Paris: Leuven Press, 1998) 320-321; Philo *Virt.* 72-75; Ronald E. Clements "Deuteronomy" in *New Interpreters Bible* vol. II (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998) 527; Jeffery Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996) 509-510. Note the introduction to the Song found in Michael L. Klein, *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch* v. II (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980) 181-82 in which Moses is identified by the text as 'the Prophet'.

¹¹² Deut. 18.15 is chief in this respect, but see also Deut. 34.10 and Neh. 1.8-9, in which the Exile is viewed as a 'prophecy come true' by the post-exilic community (cf. also Dan. 9.13).

¹¹³ Philo often refers to Ha'azinu as the *μεγαλή ᾠδή* *Leg. All.* iii. 105; *Post.* 167; *Plant.* 59; *Sob.* 10; *Mut.* 182; *Som.* ii. 191; *Virt.* 72; Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, et. al. eds. *DJD XIV 4QDeut^f* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 137; Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 4.303; Jeffery Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996) 513; H. St. J. Thackeray *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1967) 90. Thackeray asserts that Josephus refers to these 'writings deposited in the temple' elsewhere in *Ant.* 3.38; 4.303; and 5.61.

¹¹⁴ Patrick W. Skehan "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (32:1-43)" in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song* (Duane L. Christensen ed.; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993) 156-168 has shown the Songs cohesion and unity. This means that the conceptual intentions of the author of Deut. 32 may still be seen vividly, easing comparison with other texts.

misinterpretation, this type of inter-textual comparison, by virtue of its engagement with the fundamental theological elements within a particular text or document, fosters a greater understanding of the intent of the authors. Individual concepts can subsequently be set within this wider thesis of the document and examined as elements viewed as necessary by the author to meet the divine program. So, for instance, the messianic section in PssSol 17 is set within a wider framework of the purity of Israel and God's divine plan in human history. These elements, I will argue, are central to both PssSol and Deuteronomy 32. None of the recent scholarly works on PssSol discuss the biblical traditions involved in the formation of the compilation. Thus, regarding methodology, I have resorted to a combination of linguistic and narratological studies and theology not unlike that embraced by Joachim Schaper in his assessment of eschatology in the Gk. Psalter.¹¹⁵ Implicit in this discussion of methodology is the issue of inter-textuality.

Having assessed the possible hazards of the type of inter-textuality envisioned by Wright and Atkinson (and reflected in Winnige to some extent), it is important to outline clearly the definition of inter-textuality that I will follow in this study. In setting out this approach, it will be useful from a Christian standpoint to incorporate the NT as the furthest extreme of the textual trail in order to set in relief my understanding of the formation of 2nd Temple texts.

First and foremost, I wish to draw attention to the importance of post-biblical writings such as PssSol. As Edward Schillebeeckx remarked:

...one forgets that the Old Testament was not functioning *per se* or in isolation but in the context of late Jewish piety as that had since been developing. One cannot with impunity skip over the time that had elapsed between the great prophets and Jesus.¹¹⁶

In agreement with Schillebeeckx, my understanding of inter-textuality begins with the acceptance of the development of traditions, traceable in large part through the literature produced by later communities. This is to say, the post-biblical writings to which

¹¹⁵ Schaper *op. cit.* 135, 156-157 is a fine example of the type of study I undertake here. In his work, Schaper states his goal is to explore, "...a comparatively new alley of Septuagint research, namely that of historical and theological investigation as opposed to a merely linguistic approach" 176. Schaper's approach is a combination of history and theology.

¹¹⁶ Edward Schillebeeckx, *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*, (trans. Hubert Hoskins; New York: Seabury Press 1979), 257.

Schillebeeckx refers reflect an assessment of certain HB texts by later, faithful communities in response to their own historical circumstances.

On the one level, the use of HB themes by NT may be viewed, simplistically, as diachronic.¹¹⁷ The NT is a collection of typologies, analogies, and metaphors of HB events and concepts that reflect religious beliefs. But to assess these stories requires a particular approach to understanding religious textuality. As Timo Eskola states regarding some of the methodological problems associated with tradition-critical study in Christology:

...(a) weakness of historical investigation in biblical studies has further been its insufficient ability to treat the content of religious beliefs.¹¹⁸

So, a text that has re-appropriated HB themes for a new community does so from a religious perspective. Religious perspectives, however, are only communicable in simple sentences if they also have the backing of entire theological systems.¹¹⁹ These systems are essential to the formation of technical terms. So, a halakhic ruling on the amount of distance that may be traveled on a Sabbath without desecrating the day holds meaning only in light of the regulations set forth in HB and other authoritative sources regarding the sanctity of the Sabbath.¹²⁰ In short, inter-textuality, or textual dependence, implies more than the mere use of a line; it is the use of whole concepts and systems.

Bernhard W. Anderson discusses the manner by which the Old and New Testaments were transmitted in which he noted that the 'storylike history and the

¹¹⁷ To be sure, there is also something of a synchronic value to the NT as well, which R. Bauckham's high Christology in *God Crucified* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1998) suggests, in particular in regard to his treatment of Is. 53.

¹¹⁸ Timo Eskola, *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2001) 17 and 29, where he comments on the interaction between "tradition and new contexts" in which he notes the application of old traditions for new purposes.

¹¹⁹ It may prove useful for the reader to consult a principle first elucidated by Neils Bohr called the 'Complimentarity Principle'. Ian G. Barbour summarizes this principle in *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (London: SCM Press, 1998) 117 thus: '...a complete elucidation of one and the same object may require diverse points of view which defy a unique description'. This may help to explain the compositional elements in 2nd Temple texts. Applying this to the biblical text, one might suggest that the 'divine plan' of HB required a Jonah as much as an Isaiah.

¹²⁰ So e.g., Gen. 2.2-3; Ex. 20.9, 23.10-13, 35.1-3. The concept of Sabbath holds significance as a holy day in the created order. Thus, the Sabbath carries the connotation of creation, God nearness to man, and the obligations of man, and especially Israel, in the created order. So, when the concept of Sabbath is intimated in a text, the religious system that embodies its significance, i.e., God's nearness to man and man's responsibility in the created order, is implicit to the statement.

historylike story qualities' of HB were to be found emulated by the NT.¹²¹ To Anderson, this is what unified the two Testaments: it was not simply content, pulled apart from the seams of its narrative, but the narrative itself and the meaning conveyed in that narrative that were important. Inter-textuality of this type is represented by the importation and adaptation, and not transmission, of content deemed vital to a particular historical milieu.¹²²

Certainly Anderson is right in stating that HB is the conceptual precursor to the NT, which holds true for the post-biblical writings, and indicates a specific type of inter-textuality. But to assess what the later religious writings were doing inter-textually is to require that an account of the particular document's interaction with the religious system of HB be given. This is where I differ most acutely with Atkinson's definition of inter-textual.¹²³ Bearing in mind my earlier point regarding religious perspectives, this requires that whole concepts, and not isolated statements, be paralleled. For instance, if Leviticus defines purity with respect to the Temple, and a post-biblical writer uses Leviticus to argue a point, is that post-biblical author making a statement that also implies an intimate understanding of the Temple and divine presence? In short, is the post-biblical author thinking 'Levitically'? If so, then it behooves anyone who approaches to the text to be familiar with the concept of Levitical purity and not simply an isolated statement about it.¹²⁴ If one loses sight of this process, that is the importation of whole concepts through inter-textuality, one runs the risk of obfuscating the meaning of the post-biblical Jewish

¹²¹ Bernhard W. Anderson, "The Bible as a Shared Story of a People" in *The Old and the New Testaments: Their Relationship and the "Intertestamental" Literature* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993) 5.

¹²² To be sure, "transmission" is not what was intended by the post-biblical authors. They were keen to import and adapt biblical texts for use within the communal and historical setting. Thus the vehicle, i.e. finished product, is important. Anderson develops this point at length in his work *The Living World of the Old Testament* (London: Longman, 1988): see particularly 1-17. Anderson notes that the creation of the people of Israel was bound to traditions of story telling. In a sense, the stories of the nation of Israel are what made the nation of Israel a people. Cf. also Anderson, "The Bible as a Shared Story of a People" 32.

¹²³ As Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 429 observes of his work: '...this intertextual commentary expects to generate further interest in the PssSol not only as a valuable historical composition, but also a creative work of poetry that used Intertextuality to comment upon contemporary events.' As I have already objected, the inter-textuality of which Atkinson speaks is a rather loose arrangement of concordance type references, making it difficult to ascertain exactly what was in the minds of the authors of PssSol when they composed the text.

¹²⁴ Perhaps the best example of this point is to be found in 1QM. In it, the 'eschatological' armies of the community are arranged in a fashion that mimics the organization of Israel on their wilderness wanderings. Compare Ex. 18.21 to 1QM 4.1-3 and Num. 5.1-4 to 1QM 7.1-7.

or Christian text. Form criticism often picks up on this historical reception and re-appropriation and constructs the 'trail' of textual reliance.¹²⁵ But the varied and often incompatible conclusions of source criticism on the Pentateuch, to give but one example, demonstrate its limitations for assessing the historical transference of themes from HB.¹²⁶ This may be due in large part to the shortcomings of a purely historical approach in assessing biblical and non-biblical religious texts. For the Jews of the 2nd Temple Period the reality of HB text as a Law book, prophetic text, sociological delimiter, and political organizer, was evident all around them. Thus, while historical events expose faith and religious ideas, the events themselves are often secondary.¹²⁷ More important for those authors was the religious meaning evident in the historical event.¹²⁸ As such, the various elements of human life, such as socio-political structures (including messianic expectations), were never far removed from their position within the context of a religious life.

This understanding of inter-textuality under which this study will proceed, then, may be summarized as follows. First, inter-textuality relies on the conveyance of entire concepts, not simply isolated statements. Concordances that pile on reference after reference, while helpful in some respects, aid very little in understanding the tenor of a

¹²⁵ Often, this reliance is not stated in explicit terms, but through a reaction to a historical event which masks direct quotations of the OT text. I need here to thank Matt Rupp for his valuable insights into this topic, shared with me in a private conversation 15 July, 2002 in Fremont, IN USA.

¹²⁶ This is not to suggest that the documentary hypothesis is not without merits. Certainly the many insights gained from the development of the theory were alone worth the work. What I am suggesting here is that the documentary hypothesis as a textual critical model cannot provide for an assessment of the *reason* for the creation of a particular text. It therefore offers little insight into the text as a theological response to a historical event. For an overview of the development of OT source criticism see Rolf Rendtorff "Directions in Pentateuchal Studies" *CB: BS 5* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 43-58; also note A.K.M. Adam *Making Sense of New Testament Theology: 'Modern' Problems and Prospects* *Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics 11* (Macon, GA: Mercer, 1995) thorough critique of the historical-critical method, noting particularly chs. 1-2 and 5.

¹²⁷ It might be argued that the historical events described by a document are primary to its understanding, but this hardly seems the case with PssSol. In the example of the punishment of Israel cited in the PssSol, the larger and more important issues are the holiness of the people, covenantal obedience, and, in the end, the mercy and faithfulness of God. The historical event of Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem is seen by the authors as a necessary contingency; the people of Israel, having sinned gravely, were to be punished with conquest and exile.

¹²⁸ The creation of so-called mythic or legendary texts was most likely a result of a particular way of visualizing reality: a seamless relationship between the human and the divine. Regardless of the way in which that relationship was mediated one thing seems clear: God was present in the lives of his faithful ones. See the important and insightful work of Mary Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) in which she details the mytho-poetic language used by ancient cultures to describe reality as they saw it, noting particularly chs. 1-2.

particular document. Post-biblical writings are, very often, intended to draw the reader's attention back to these 'large-scale' concepts.¹²⁹ Second, texts that re-appropriate a HB theme very often incorporate more of the target text than is explicitly stated. So, while the Book of the Watchers is concerned primarily with an expansion of Gen. 6.1-4 and the origins of evil, it is also making statements regarding purity (1 Enoch 10.20f), anthropology (e.g., 1 Enoch 15.1, that Man is essentially good and made in the image of God), and obedience to God's created order (1 Enoch 2.1-3, a notion that implicates fidelity to the Law of Moses). Each of these individual references may be traced to larger scale concepts found in HB. In short, I assume that the process of inter-textual studies does not result in a concordance; the two are unrelated in their foci. Rather, as it applies to biblical studies, I view inter-textuality as the description of the integration of the theological with the historical, the use of 'Scripture' to explain and address history. The appearance of stock phrases and concepts accomplishes this task, but the result is nonetheless a new compilation. As such, the confluence of the new event (the historical) with the old ideas (the 'Scriptural') produces a new response (the theological).¹³⁰

In the following study, I will attempt to bring PssSol in from the fringes of scholarly opinion. Its value has often been given short shrift by dint of its assessment as a lesser witness to mainstream Jewish religiosity. First and foremost, I will show that the authors were inspired entirely from their understanding of biblical texts. Secondly, the authors were not obscurantists, but dealt with core Jewish topics. Their understanding of

¹²⁹ An interesting comment made by John C. Endres in *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Bible Association of America, 1987) 236, in which he notes that, for the author of Jubilees the faithful of the Lord, i.e. Abraham, Noah, Jacob, etc. have all been perfect Mosaicists. Thus, Jubilees represents an appropriation of a biblical category for the purpose of exhorting fellow Jews to close adherence to the Mosaic Law. On this point also note Jack T. Sanders "When Sacred Canopies Collide. The Reception of the Torah of Moses in the Wisdom Literature of the Second-Temple Period" in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, XXXII, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 122-129 in which Sanders demonstrates the integration of Mosaic Law into Wisdom Literature during the 2nd Temple Period.

¹³⁰ I am using John Barton *Oracles of God: Prophecy in the Post-Exilic Period* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) distinction between the terms 'Scriptural' and 'canonical'. Note Walter E. Rast *Tradition History and the Old Testament* GBSOT (J. Coert Rylaarsdam ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) 1-7; see Barton *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Studies* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996) 30-44 and his discussion of form-criticism and definition of *Sitz im Leben*; C.S. Lewis *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960) 20-21 discusses Milton's use of 'stock phrases' and comments that the use of such phrases is to produce in the audience a desired result. For Lewis, this result is that the attention of the audience will be kept and focused on the themes of the story. Also note Merritt Y. Hughes, introduction to *Paradise Lost*, by John Milton (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1962) xvi-xvii.

concepts such as Temple, Law, and purity is governed by their interpretation of those concepts within a biblical framework. As such, the authors were intimate with HB texts and theology, and conveyed their understanding by means of a particular theological program inherent to HB: the prophetic paradigm. As such, I will argue in the following that the document has a great deal to say about mainstream Jewish religiosity in the century preceding the rise of Christianity. This is to say the tenets of God's presence in the Land and the authoritative claim made by the Law of Moses are common to both PssSol and, indeed, much of the literature of the 2nd Temple Period. A critique of PssSol is, therefore, useful towards understanding Jewish perception on a wide range of topics.

5—Need for this Study and Its Arrangement

R.E. Clements has noted the prophetic view of history involves the re-application of covenantal blessings and curses to a contemporary context.¹³¹ I think that this is precisely what is taking place in PssSol and will argue in the following five chapters for a re-evaluation of the nature of the document. None of the recent scholarship produced on the document attempts this type of analysis, which combines linguistic study with tradition-historical criticism and theological analysis. That the authors may have been priests or from priestly circles does not undermine the observation that the document interprets history 'prophetically.' Rather, it simply states that those of the priestly circles in the 1st century BCE saw in the prophetic material answers to the current crisis. Moreover, visions of doubt in the ultimate ability of Israel (and indeed mankind) to maintain a pure status, a central critique of the prophets, are certainly reflected in the priestly material from HB.¹³²

As I have shown in the foregoing there are a number of scholarly questions to be asked of PssSol. Some are more opaque than others. What was the original language? Who were the authors? What is the historical provenance? While each of these questions holds a certain level of importance for this project, they are by no means central to queries I attempt to answer in the following study. Rather, I am more interested, as the title of this project suggests, in understanding the theological and textual impetuses that

¹³¹ R.E. Clements *Prophecy and Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975) 15-17.

¹³² So F.M. Cross "The Tabernacle" BA 10:3 (Jerusalem: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1947) 68.

gave rise and informed the authors' view of history. Furthermore, I am also interested in addressing the reason why the compilation was composed in the first place; what need did it fill theologically?

In the following five sections I will try to apply this approach to a criticism of the document. In the first section, I will compare *Ha'azinu* and PssSol. This is the foundation for the rest of the study and represents the outworking of my particular approach to intertextuality. I had considered using different texts from HB as comparative examples, such as Is. 1-12 or selections of the Psalter (e.g., 105), but found that a prophetic reading of history is most conveniently summarized by the selection Deut. 32.¹³³ Thus, having first conjectured that PssSol was reading history prophetically, I selected this example to confirm or disprove my observation. In the second section, I will be examining the document's literary genre. The goal in this section is to strengthen the notion that the compilation reflects a unity and cohesion to the degree of other poetic texts. In the third section, I will examine a concept, the Temple motif, from the document in the light of the conclusions reached in the first sections. This section serves a dual role. First, I hope to demonstrate how my approach to the document leads to a better understanding of the authors' reception and application of concepts from HB. Secondly, examining the Temple motif in the document gives an indication of the authors' disposition to the Jerusalem Temple and assesses the degree of their 'priestly ethos'. In the fourth section, I will compare two communities, those of PssSol and Qumran. There are a number of overlaps between the two communities in the area of theology, but also a number of differences. Bearing in mind that not a trace of PssSol has so far surfaced at Qumran, the practicality of this section is that it may offer some indication of both the nature of the authorial community responsible for PssSol and their involvement in the mainstream issues of Jewish religiosity. Also, a comparison of this type may offer some comments on

¹³³ To be sure, a reading of the Psalter in this respect would be informative. It would require, however, several extra steps in setting up the comparison. First, the degree to which the Psalter reads prophetically, in any respect, would need to be assessed. Then the manner in which the prophetic material in the Psalter or the Psalmic material in the prophets is implemented would need to be taken into account. Eaton *op. cit.* 1-39 has already done this admirably and so to repeat the endeavour, which would be necessary in some respects in the course of this project, seems redundant. Furthermore, Eaton's main point is to say that the Psalmic material contains prophetic elements and vice-versa. I have come to the same conclusion by analysing the prophetic content of PssSol vis-à-vis the archetype of Deut. 32. Atkinson's inter-textual study points in this direction. While he does cite many Psalms in his inter-textual comparisons, many of these citations are not from the Psalter.

the degree to which the covenanters were isolated from 'mainstream Judaism'. I have included an excursus that demonstrates how a misappropriation of the document's central argument can lead to a faulty interpretation of individual concepts. In this case, I give examples of some modern New Testament scholars and their understanding of messianism and suggested how a re-evaluation of that concept in PssSol is needed in light of my thesis.

1—Introduction

In the opening two chapters from PssSol, the authors present their view of history, that is, the actions of Israel and the world. Jerusalem has been invaded by a Gentile (1.1; 2.3-5), who has come to punish Israel for sinning against the ‘holy things of God.’ Yet the Gentile is himself guilty of the grievous sin of entering into the Holy of Holies (2.1). Finally, the authors make it plainly clear that sin and inappropriate behavior in general, whether committed by Jew or Gentile, is not to be tolerated (2.15; 28). In short, the authors see the crisis of Pompey’s invasion as a response to Israel’s failure to maintain proper religious practice and the punishment of the Gentile as indicative of his refusal to recognize God’s universal sovereignty (2.30). Through the course of this chapter, the extent of the authors’ use of this paradigm will become clear.

In his study entitled *God and Temple*, R.E. Clements argues that the prophetic reaction to the destruction of the Temple, or the prophetic anticipation of that destruction, does not undermine the theological conception in ancient Israel and 2nd Temple Judaism of the presence of God in Israel’s midst, but rather confirms this observation by pointing to the causes of such destruction.¹ As such, as Clements rightly points out, the Temple as the place wherein the divine presence is said to Tabernacle amongst the people is of central concern to the prophetic mindset, if only as a barometer of religious infidelity. Thus Clements highlights the interrelation between the two religious perceptions of the priestly and prophetic material, showing that there exist some clear overlaps. This perception is certainly evident in PssSol. While a more thorough discussion of the Temple motif in the document must wait until section three, in the present section I will examine the nature and extent of the prophetic influence on the document. To what degree do the authors adopt the prophetic view of history?

But the sheer volume of prophetic material in the HB is an obstacle to the space constraints of this paper. As such, it is important to use a paradigmatic example or

¹ R.E. Clements *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965) 101.

exemplar of the prophetic view of history to compare and contrast with PssSol. The selection of Deut. 32 was dictated by several means. First, as was mentioned above, the text was certainly held to be prophetic and its author the premier prophet. Secondly, the text contains the whole history of Israel from Egypt to Exodus to Land to Exile. As such, it presents the prophet's view of history past, present, and future. This is not exclusively a feature of the prophetic material, but it is representative of one aspect of the prophetic model. Finally, as a witness to God's covenant, the text clearly held great importance in 2nd Temple Period Judaism, to which its inclusion on a separate scroll at Qumran (4Q44=4QDeut⁹) Philo's praise, and indications from Josephus that the song was stored at the Temple attest.² It is significant that Cecile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl suggest that Deut. 32 was paired with Is. 1.2 (a book of great expectations) in '*la lecture juive de la Bible*'.³ For 2nd Temple Jews, this coupling would have given *Ha'azinu* an added emphasis by way of contrast with the eventual outcome of Isaiah, and the 'futuristic' implications of the Song are well attested in *Sifre Deuteronomy*.⁴ As I intend to demonstrate below, this 'prophetic paradigm' served as a template used by the authors of PssSol.⁵

² Philo often refers to *Ha'azinu* as the *μεγαλή ᾠδή* *Leg. All.* iii. 105; *Post.* 167; *Plant.* 59; *Sob.* 10; *Mut.* 182; *Som.* ii. 191; *Virt.* 72; Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, et. al. eds. *DJD XIV 4QDeut⁹* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 137; Josephus *Jewish Antiquities* 4.303; Jeffery Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996) 513; H. St. J. Thackeray *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1967) 90. Thackeray asserts that Josephus refers to these 'writings deposited in the temple' elsewhere in *Ant.* 3.38; 4.303; and 5.61.

³ Dogniez and Harl, *La Bible D'Alexandrie* 32. The modern day *Haftarah* reading for Deut. 32 is II Sam. 22.1-51.

⁴ It is clear from even a cursory comparison of Deut. 32 with formalized prophetic literature, e.g., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, Hosea, etc., that the structure and form of Deut. 32 was prophetic. This point forms the subject matter of the use of Deut. 32 in the following chapter and so will be spelled out in detail therein. The *Sifre* contains a reading of Deut. 32 that reflects, in my opinion, the understanding that the text spoke 'prophetically'. As such, *Sifre* may reflect the formalized impression of a long-standing appreciation of *Ha'azinu* as a prophet text. The central point of this chapter is to argue that PssSol understood history prophetically, that its framework and structure mimic that of Deut. 32, and that, owing to its putative dating to the 1st century BCE, it may represent an early appreciation of the prophetic literature. *Sifre* is marshaled to confirm the assertion that Deut. 32 was read prophetically by later communities and, as such, is not a groundless position to take with respect to PssSol, in that *Sifre* may not represent a novel interpretation. It is true that I could have used a prophet text, such as Amos, as my comparative example, but the usefulness of Deut. 32 is obvious: it is far less cumbersome, much more direct in that it avoids Amos' particular historical points, and structured almost exclusively in a poetic form. As such, it makes a useful comparative example of the prophetic literature. See the discussion in this chapter *passim*.

⁵ Devorah Dimant, "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran" in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1, 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1994) 157 notes the tendency of 2nd Temple Period material to adopt 'biblical models and style', but points out that this alone does not invest the document with authority. In addition to the biblical material, a pseudonym is needed. Furthermore, it is no small matter that the authors selected Solomon as the

In the following reading, I will suggest that the authors of PssSol are conditioned by their historical milieu only insofar as that milieu gives rise to their theological expenditure.⁶ In short, the historical event functions as a reason for revisiting the Scriptural texts, and the Scriptural texts give an explanation of the historical event which is intended to comfort the readers. Thus we arrive, full circle, back to Clements' opening comment: far from being a literature of uncertainty and doubt, the document relies on the authoritative texts of the Pentateuch to strengthen adherents by compiling an explanation of the historical event. The act of importing a particular paradigm (as opposed to specific verses exclusively) permits the authors the flexibility of embodying the biblical text in historical events after the necessary fashion. Without this flexibility, the historical events may prove difficult to conform to biblical history. Thus, I will argue that in the case of PssSol, the authors applied the prophetic paradigm to a specific historical context and subsequently applied it to their community. In so doing, the content of the HB antecedent is defined anew through a different historical lens.⁷

2—Deut. 32.1—Heaven and Earth as Witnesses:

The introduction to Deut. 32 holds the heavens and the earth as witnesses to the forthcoming speech. Note verse 1:

MT: האזינו השמים ואדברה ותשמע הארץ אמר־י פי

LXX: Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ, καὶ λαλήσω, καὶ ἀκούετω ἡ γῆ ῥήματα ἐκ στόματος μου.⁸

pseudonym in this composition. It is evident that Solomon was associated with prophecy as 'one of Moses' disciples', cf. Philo *de Congressu* 177 and John Barton *Oracles of God: Prophecy in the Post-Exilic Period* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) 49. Further evidence for Solomon's standing as a prophet is clearly stated by the rabbis in the Targum to Song of Songs 1.1, which reads: שִׁירֵיךְ וְתִשְׁבַּחְךָ דְאִמְרֵי שְׁלֹמֹה נְבִיא מַלְכָא דִּישְׂרָאֵל.

⁶ Note J. Viteau *Psaumes de Salomon* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1911) 68 who insightfully comments that 'Le Psalmiste n'est pas un fanatique...il (psalmiste) ne prêche pas la guerre à outrance contre le païen, et il ne fait pas appel à l'insurrection contre le parti de pécheurs'.

⁷ As I intimated in the introduction regarding my approach to inter-textuality, the use of a particular text requires a particular and definite understanding of that text by the community that borrows it. It would be unwise to suggest that the authors of PssSol were merely borrowing wholesale from the HB antecedents without a particularly resolute understanding of the HB antecedent. The individual identity of the HB antecedent undergoes a transformation. The content of the *Ha'azinu* is neither lost nor completely redefined. In a way, PssSol may be viewed as an explanation of the prophecy of Deut. 32.

⁸ References to the LXX in this section are taken from the Göttingen edition.

PssSol 2.9 and 10 explain the role of the heavens and earth as witnesses against the sins of the people:

PssSol 2.9-10:

- 9) καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐβαρυθύμησεν καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐβδελύξατο αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἐποίησε πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐπ' αὐτῆς ὅσα ἐποίησαν
- 10) καὶ γνώσεται ἡ γῆ τὰ κρίματά σου πάντα τὸ δίκαια ὁ θεός.

Both Deut. 32.1 and PssSol 2. 9-10 contain language invoking the witness of heaven and earth. The fragment Targums explain this to mean that the heavens and earth 'do not taste death' and, as such, could act as witnesses to the divine and everlasting covenant.⁹ Heaven and earth, therefore, stand as the primary witnesses, to be called upon if the covenant is ever breached.¹⁰ *Sifre* Deuteronomy points to a different emphasis in the opening lines to Deut. 32. *Sifre* Deuteronomy 306 suggests that the true witness in the opening is not the heavens and earth, but Moses.¹¹ But the rabbinic material here is characteristically rich and multifaceted. In the same section on *Sifre* Deuteronomy 306, the heavens are understood as a primary observer, and again in 306 as the eternal witnesses to the covenant, outlasting Moses.

Jeffery Tigay summarizes this opening line of *Ha'azinu* as follows:

In this poem, however, heaven and earth play no such role (i.e., as elements that punish Israel). They are summoned only to hear, and it seems that they are employed as a literary device, functioning as objective onlookers who witness the justice of the poem's charges and the fairness of Israel's punishment.¹²

Tigay concludes that the heavens and the earth are actually not functioning as 'lawsuit language' in *Ha'azinu*, and suggests that the heavens and earth do not participate in the

⁹ Note Klein, *Fragment-Targums* 181-82; heaven and earth are witnesses that do not taste death. This is also a point made by *Sifre* Deuteronomy 306 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 305-306). All references to *Sifre* Deuteronomy are taken from Jacob Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation* v. II Brown Judaic Studies 101 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

¹⁰ Note Deut. 4.26; Ps. 50.4, Is. 1.2, Jer. 2.12, 6.19, Micah 1.2, for other examples in HB. In each situation named here, the Lord is appealing to the heaven and earth as witnesses in a case that he has against Israel thereby functioning as 'lawsuit language'. For comments on this 'lawsuit language' note Clements "Deuteronomy" 526-27; Christopher Wright "Deuteronomy" as in *NIBC* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996) 297; A.D.H. Mayes "Deuteronomy" as in *NCBC* (ed. H.H. Rowley and Michael Black; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmanns Co., 1981) 380.

¹¹ Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 299.

¹² Tigay *Deuteronomy* 299.

punishment of Israel in Deut. 32.¹³ I agree with Tigay that the classification ‘lawsuit’ is overplayed in addressing Deut. 32 as he rightly points out that the relationship engendered by the Song is one of a father addressing his child, not a king his vassal. But he may have slightly overstated his objections, specifically his understanding of the role of the heavens and the earth.

The heavens and earth do indeed participate in the punishment of Israel, if only in the secondary fashion as implements in God’s wrath. Deut. 32.24, to be discussed below, presents several of the punishments meted out on Israel. They are: wasting hunger (famine); burning heat (associated with famine); poisonous pestilence (plagues of insects); and attack by wild animal and serpents, which the author states are ‘creepers in the dust’—a clear reference to the earth. Each of these elements could very reasonably be associated with one of the foregoing witnesses, either the heavens (burning heat and famine) or earth (plagues of insects and animals).¹⁴ Elsewhere in Deuteronomy (e.g., 11.17) the heavens are ‘shut up’ by the Lord as a sign of punishment. Commenting on *Sifre Deuteronomy* 306, Neusner makes this very point:

This is a familiar point, namely, the heavens and earth respond to the condition of Israel. They become accommodating when Israel does God’s will, but they narrow—hence prosperity fades—when Israel does not.¹⁵

On at least one level, then, the rabbis understood the heavens and earth as cooperative in the punishment of Israel.¹⁶ So, while several approaches to the text exist, a very ancient one in the form of the rabbinic material asserts that the heavens and earth are participants in the punishment of Israel.¹⁷

¹³ Ibid. 509-510.

¹⁴ Indeed, this is precisely the terms set out in Haggai 1.10-11. In verse 10, the earth and sky participate in the punishment by withholding rain and produce, but in verse 11 God reminds the people that it was he who ‘called—*קָרָא*—drought on the land, mountains, new wine and oil...’

¹⁵ Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 302.

¹⁶ Tigay *idem.* 309 even sees this connection in his commentary on Deut. 32.24, wherein he comments, “Settled territory was often in danger of being overrun by wild animals; the threat of that is one of the curses in Leviticus 26.22.” Certainly Leviticus 26.33-35 asserts the position that the land is an active participant in purification process, even though it is God (26.18f) who acts against Israel. If Tigay draws parallels between the punishments in Deut. 32.24 and Lev. 26.22, which is reasonable, then surely the concept of the activity on the part of the heavens and the earth must be implied. Note Jacob Milgrom *Leviticus v. III* in *ABC* (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 2309-2310.

¹⁷ The importance of the rabbinic material rests in the fact that much of the material was very likely in some type of circulation long before being codified. As such, the opinions it promotes could be seen as contemporary with much of the 2nd Temple literature. Of course the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE

In PssSol, the heavens and earth react anthropopathically to the actions of the people of Israel. The reason for the invocation of these two witnesses becomes evident. PssSol 2.3-5 details the desecration of God's sanctuary by the 'sons of Jerusalem', and the later statement in 2.9—'no one on (the earth) had done what they did'—certainly relates to this behavior. Due to their transgressions against God's sanctuary (PssSol 2.3: Gr. τὰ ἅγια κυρίου—Sy. ܠܥܠܡܝܢܐ ܕܥܠܡܝܢܐ), the earth and heaven are set against them. The verb used to describe the attitude of the heavens is βαρυθυμέω—'to be weighed down'. This term is used by LXX only twice (Num. 16.15 and 1 Kgs. 11.25) and in both instances renders Heb. terms which convey the sense of being abhorred or utterly disgusted (קִוֶּה and קִרְהַת respectively). In 2.9, the Syr. preserves a much stronger term (ܕܠܥܠܡܝܢܐ) than the Gk. and suggests that the underlying Heb. was very likely one of these strong terms of disgust. Armed with a sense of what lies behind the Gk. term βαρυθυμέω, both the Gk. and Syr. suggest that the heavens are utterly angered by the actions of the 'sons of Jerusalem'.¹⁸

This anthropopathic language lines up nicely with the understanding of the heavens and earth as participants in the judgment and punishment of Israel as found in Deut. 32. Indeed, this is precisely what takes place in PssSol 2.9. The sins of Israel

requires a radical break from traditional views of theology, but the appreciation of the rabbi's insights into 2nd Temple theology persists. Lee I. Levine *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000) 26-35 makes the statement (26): 'The synagogue may not have resulted from a crisis or a specific decision by any one person or community to initiate something boldly new.' Implicit in Levine's remark is the development of the theological perceptions that came to embody synagogue Judaism, and he sees the city-gate locale as the likely starting point. In terms of archaeology, Levine suggests that the city-gate was revised under Hellenistic influence to a completely practical entry point to a city. This eliminated the city-gate as a communal gathering point and may have led to the erection of independent buildings to suit that purpose. R. Travers Herford *Talmud and Apocrypha: Comparative Study of the Jewish Ethical Teaching in the Rabbinical and Non-Rabbinical Sources in the Early Christian Centuries* (London: Soncino Press, 1933) 41-105 has suggested just such a development in terms of religious perspectives from Ezra to the foundation of the schools of Hillel and Shammai.

¹⁸ S. Brock "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources" in *JJS* 30 (Oxford: Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1979) 212-232 points out the characteristic of Syriac sources to follow Targumic hermeneutical practices. While Brock considered the Syriac version of PssSol to have been a translation of the Greek his point regarding the nature of the Syriac versions is important: they preserve Jewish concepts and idiosyncrasies. In this light, I propose that ἐβαρυθύμησεν ought to intimate a level of disgust beyond the current translation 'were weighed down'; something rather more like 'were abhorred or disgusted'. This accords better with the overall literary structure of 2.9, in which the second stich contains a verb of strong contempt to describe the attitude of the earth—βδελύσσομαι.

aroused a response from heaven and earth. The response of the heavens and earth in PssSol is much the same as that described in Deut. 32.24 to be discussed below. In short, the authors of PssSol likely modeled their understanding of the two primary witnesses on a common understanding of the function of the heavens and earth within the parameters of the divine covenant. The ‘sons of Jerusalem’ broke this covenant by their actions and the two witnesses are described in their sickened states. The implication is that the authors likely understood the use and function of these two witnesses as employed by *Ha’azinu*: they are signs of the eternal covenant with God. As such, the authors are making clear their intentions: PssSol is a document that addresses the covenant between God and Israel.

3—Deut. 32.3—*The Name of the Lord*:

In Deut. 32.3, Moses calls upon the Name of the Lord.

MT: כִּי שֵׁם יְהוָה אֲקַרָא הִבּוֹ גְדֹל לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ

LXX: ὅτι ὄνομα κυρίου ἐκάλεσα δότε μεγαλωσύνην τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν.

In PssSol examples of the invocation or blessing of the Name of God are numerous.¹⁹ PssSol 6.1 and 15.1 provide two examples:

6.1: Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐτοιμή ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐν τῷ μνημονεύειν αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

15.1: Ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐπεκαλεσάμην τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου εἰς βοήθειαν ἤλπισα τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ καὶ ἐσώθη.

The phrase ‘Name of God’ may imply a reference to the Temple, and the use of that phrase in HB and LXX requires a brief discussion. The occurrence of the phrase in PssSol should certainly alert us to the possibility that the Temple motif was a dominant one for the authors, particularly if the case that the document is prophetic can be substantiated. Regarding the use of the phrase in HB, Deut. 12.5, 11; 16.2; and 1 Kgs.

¹⁹ PssSol 1.1; 2.36; and 5.2 concern calling to God but make no mention of the Name of God; PssSol 7.6; 8.22, 26; and 17.5 relate the Name to the Temple or Temple sacrifices; in 6.4 and 15.2 the Name of God is not called upon, but blessed.

8.16 discuss the Temple as the location where God's Name is said to dwell. Moses, when he received instructions for offerings in the Temple in Ex. 25.8, is directed to instruct the people to 'make a sanctuary for me (God), and I will dwell among them'. For LXX, however, the dwelling of the Name of the Lord, i.e. the Tabernacle, came to mean the place wherein the Name of God was 'called upon'. C.T.R. Hayward noted this shift in LXX in Ex. 29.45 from 'dwelling' to 'being called upon':²⁰ Note the text:

MT: וּשְׁכַנְתִּי בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

LXX: καὶ ἐπικληθήσομαι ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ

Hayward observed that 'without exception', LXX translated those verses in Deuteronomy in which the Name of the Lord is to dwell as being the place where the Name of the Lord is to be invoked.²¹ Tigay suggests that proclaiming God's Name in Deut. 32.3 means, '...declaring His qualities, recounting His deeds'.²² The interest here, however, is where, precisely, the author of *Ha'azinu* envisioned this calling on God to have taken place. Josephus relates that Moses:

...read them (the people of Israel) a poem in hexameter verse, which he has also left in a book in the Temple, containing a prediction of things to come, according to which all has come and is coming to pass...²³

Tigay notes that the poem referred to by Josephus was *Ha'azinu*,²⁴ and H. St. J. Thackeray commenting on this passage from Josephus states:

As these passages, with one doubtful exception (*Ant.* 3.38), all refer to lyrical portions of Scripture, I venture to regard them as references, not to the sacred scrolls of the Law and the Prophets, but to a separate collection of chants, taken mainly from the Bible, for the use of the temple singers.²⁵

²⁰ C.T.R. Hayward, "Understandings of Temple Service in Septuagint Pentateuch" (paper presented to the fortnightly seminar in OT at Durham University, Michaelmas Term 2001). Hayward also goes on to note that the concept of calling upon the Name of the Lord came to be understood as prayer. On this last point, note Michael Maher "The Meturgemanim and Prayer" *JJS* 41 (Oxford: Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1990) 226, 239-242 and Israel Drazin, *Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy* (Baltimore: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1982) 270.

²¹ Deut. 12.5, 11; 14.23; 16.2, 6, 11; 26.2.

²² Tigay *Deuteronomy* 300.

²³ Josephus *Ant.* 4.303.

²⁴ Tigay *idem.* 513.

²⁵ H. St. J. Thackeray *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1967) 90. Thackeray asserts that Josephus refers to these 'writings deposited in the temple' elsewhere in *Ant.* 3.38; 4.303; and 5.61.

According to both Thackeray and Tigay, *Ha'azinu* was kept in the Temple to be used in the Temple. The recitation of Deut. 32.3 occurred in the very place that God's Name was to be invoked. This is in keeping with observations on the translation of the Hebrew שָׁכַח with ἐπικαλέω by LXX. Tigay's observation that the Song of Moses was extolling the qualities of the Lord may now be combined with the probable locale of that praise, to which Sirach 50 offers an exceptional example. The chapter tells of the actions of the High Priest, likely on the Day of Atonement, as he ministers in the Temple. Note 50.16-19:

- 16) Then the sons of Aaron shouted; they blew their trumpets of hammered metal; they sounded a mighty fanfare as a reminder before the Most High.
- 17) Then all the people together quickly fell to the ground on their faces to worship their Lord, the Almighty, God Most High.
- 18) Then the singers praised him with their voices in sweet and full-toned melody.
- 19) And the people of the Lord Most High offered their prayers before the Merciful One, until the order of worship of the Lord was ended, and they completed his ritual.

The Temple and its precincts were clearly areas where great fanfare and merriment took place in the context of sacrificial worship, and the recitation or incantation of Deut. 32 in the Temple seems all the more likely.²⁶ Theologically speaking, the invocation of the Name of God in the Temple carried the connotation of correct worship. Again, *Sifre Deuteronomy* is instructive:

- B) R. Yose says, "how on the basis of Scripture do we know that when standing in the house of assembly and saying, 'Blessed is the Lord who is to be blessed,' people are to respond afterward, 'blessed is the Lord who is to be blessed forever and ever'?"

²⁶ I am not suggesting here a connection between the recitation of *Ha'azinu* and the passage in Sirach 50. Rather, I am setting the two in parallel to show the possible range of events occurring at the Temple precinct. Tigay *Deuteronomy* 513 discusses some possible liturgical uses of the poem in the Temple and ends his discussion with a note regarding the modern day placement of the poem between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur.

C) “As it is said, ‘For the name of the Lord I proclaim; give glory to our God.’”²⁷

According to the rabbis, right response to the proclamation of the Lord’s Name is to ‘give glory’ as Moses commanded in Deut. 32. Thus, one may conclude that the proper response to the invocation of the Name of the Lord, which takes place in the Temple, is to give glory, and that an improper response is to do otherwise.

I aver that the same understanding of the Name of God is present in PssSol. The Name of the Lord is connected explicitly with the Temple on three occasions (7.6; 8.22; and 17.5), of which one (7.6) likely refers to the Temple as a ‘dwelling place’.²⁸ In fact, the whole of chapter 7 suggests that the authors of PssSol were intimate with the concept of the Temple as God’s ‘dwelling place’. This suggests that on one level the authors were keen to maintain the HB understanding of the Temple as the place where God dwelled. But that is an incomplete summary of the authors’ opinion on the Name of God.

The idea expressed in PssSol 6.1 and 15.1 is that God saves those who remember his Name. Such an expression recalls a text such as Is. 43, in which God expresses himself as Israel’s savior.²⁹ This idea is also intimated in Deut. 32.27, 36 and 43.³⁰ Tigay suggests that the phrase ‘give glory’ in Deut. 32.3, ‘...seems to point to His great kindness and justice in dealing with Israel.’³¹ Combining the notion imbedded in Deut. 32 that God is Israel’s savior with its routine usage at the Temple makes a compelling case for suggesting that the invocation of God’s Name for aid took place first and foremost at the Temple. The same observation applies to PssSol for two reasons. First, that the Temple occupied a central concern for the authors of PssSol is clear. The desecration of the Temple and its implements by the ‘sons of Jerusalem’ precipitated the invasion and conquest of Jerusalem; all of the weal and woe of the document is centered on the

²⁷ *Sifre Deuteronomy* 306 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 314-315). Incidentally, the same idea is found in PssSol 10.7 (Syr. 10.8) which reads: ‘For God is good and merciful forever, and the synagogues (Gr: συναγωγαί/Sy.: כְּלֵי קִבְּוֹת) of Israel will glorify the Lord’s Name forever’.

²⁸ The Greek word used in 7.6 is κατασκηνώω.

²⁹ God is called savior in Is. 43.3, 11; 45.15, 21; 49.26; 60.16; 63.8; Hos. 13.4; Micah 7.7; Hab. 3.18; as endowed with salvation in Zech. 9.9.

³⁰ Cf. Walter Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* in *AOTC* (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2001) 277f; Gerhard Von Rad *Deuteronomy: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 1966) 199; Tigay, *Deuteronomy* 312.

³¹ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 300.

profanation of the Temple. As such, the Temple is conceived as the place of God's presence and, therefore, the location wherein one might make supplication to the deity. Secondly, invoking the Name of the Lord as a recipe for aid is well attested in both HB and PssSol. Furthermore, by 250-200 BCE at the latest (LXX Pentateuch) the Temple had become the place in which the Name was invoked. In short, there is every reason to suggest that the authors of PssSol had the Temple in mind when referring to the invocation of God's Name.

It is clear from PssSol that those who bless the Name of God are righteous and those who do not are sinners.³² Memory is an important feature in *Ha'azinu*, which discusses the forgetfulness of Israel in verse 15. Moses' action of calling upon the Name of God may have as much to do with memory as anything else.³³ In fact, this is precisely the reason Deuteronomy gives for the production of the poem in the first place.³⁴ PssSol makes mention of Israel's failed memory in 2.8, which reads:

For he turned his face from their mercy
Young and old and their children once more
For they did evil once more by not listening (μη ἀκούειν).

This statement immediately calls to mind Deut. 6.4 and the injunction to remember (the Gk. term used there is ἀκούω). Essential to the covenant is the constant memory of God's work for Israel. The act of God turning his face from Israel is in the prolegomena to *Ha'azinu* found in Deut. 31.16-18 (as opposed to turning his face *toward* the afflicted in the canonical Psalms, e.g., 22.23). The importance of listening to the terms of the covenant, indeed of continually rehashing them, is central to the deuteronomist's theology. PssSol 2.8, which follows the desecration of the Temple in 2.3-5, precedes the statement in 2.9 that the heavens and earth despised Israel because '...no one of all mankind had done upon it (earth) what they had done'. This last statement recalls the actions described in 1.8 that the sins of the 'sons of Jerusalem' had surpassed those of the Gentiles before them. This sin, according to chapter 1, was the profanation of the Temple.

³² Compare the righteous who bless the Name of God in 5.1, 6.4 and 15.2 with the sinners who do not in 17.5.

³³ Note Brevard S. Childs *Memory and Tradition in Israel* SBT 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962) 45-50 and his treatment of the verb 'to remember' in which he summarizes (47): '...the verb when used with Israel as its subject denotes a basic human psychological function: to recall a past event'.

³⁴ Note Deut. 31.19; Tigay *Deuteronomy* 510-511.

If this is the same sentiment being revisited in 2.9, which I think it is, then the statement in 2.8 means that the 'sons of Jerusalem' had ceased to be responsive to hearing the terms of the covenant. In short, they had defiled the Sanctuary through their abominable practices and their irresponsiveness to the words of the covenant.

The invocation of the Name of the Lord was an exceptionally holy action. It is frequently related directly to worship and, in the Pentateuch, was often accompanied by the construction of an altar.³⁵ For the Pentateuchal *Targumim*, the phrase 'calling upon the Lord' was synonymous with prayer.³⁶ This simply reinforces the view that the act of calling upon the Lord in the Temple was a personal action, i.e., request for help, as much as it was a ritual and liturgical mechanism for the community, in 2nd Temple times. When Moses proclaims the Name of the Lord and ascribes greatness to it in Deut. 32.3, it may also be viewed as something of an act of worship, which Tigay relates to Ps. 29.1-2.³⁷ That Psalm instructs the readers/listeners to give glory to the Name of God. PssSol use this phrase in much the same way.³⁸ For the authors of PssSol, the invocation of the Name of the Lord involved either a hope for salvation from danger or was viewed as an act of worship.³⁹

There are some references in the DSS to the invocation or praise of the Name of God, and the Scrolls offer many insights into theological practices of the 2nd Temple period as well as insightful commentary on textual development.⁴⁰ They contain several instances of the use of the Name of God in praise settings. For instance, 1QH 4.20 reads:

³⁵ Note several instances in which the Name of the Lord is called upon in an act of worship: Gen. 4.26, 12.8, 13.4, 21.33, 26.25; Ex. 33.19, 34.5; Deut. 18.5, 7.

³⁶ Cf. fn. 18.

³⁷ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 300, fn. 12; cf. also Pss. 22.23-24; 68.35; 96.7-8—all of which are connected to the Temple.

³⁸ Cf. fns. 29 and 41.

³⁹ The phrase was significant for prophetic literature as well, cf. Is. 12.5, 18.7, 24.15, 56.6; Joel 2.26, 3.5; Amos 6.10; Micah 5.3; Zeph. 3.9.

⁴⁰ On the nature of the Hebrew text of Deut. 32.43 for example, cf. Tigay *Deuteronomy* Excursus 31 for his fine discussion. For a summary of the editorial processes of the MT note e.g., Staffan Olofsson, *The Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, CB OTS 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International: 1992); Olofsson, *God is My Rock* (Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990) 1-14; F. M. Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts" as found in *1972 Proceedings of IOSCS Pseudepigrapha* (Los Angeles: SBL, 1972) 115-18; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981) 50-63. James Barr, "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations" MSU 15 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1979).

לך אתה הצדקה ולשמך הברכה לעול[...].⁴¹ From this selection note particularly ‘blessing is to your Name for ever...’ In 1QH 11.21-23, the author relates that God ‘purifies the depraved spirit...so that he praises your (God’s) name in the community of jubilation...’ According to the self-awareness of the DS community, they participated in the on-going communion of the ‘sons of heaven’ (e.g., 1QH 11.22; 1QS 1.12; 2.22, 24),⁴² and it is clear that the Name of God was central to their worship ceremonies.⁴³

In short, Jewish texts contemporary to PssSol used the Name of the Lord in instances involving praise and worship. The community at Qumran went so far as to excommunicate those who misused the Name.⁴⁴ Insofar as the community itself functioned as the *de facto* Temple in lieu of the ‘profaned’ Temple at Jerusalem,⁴⁵ it is not difficult to see the need on the part of the covenanters of Qumran to appropriate the use of the Name as evidence of the presence of the Temple and to take strict measures to ensure its proper usage.⁴⁶ For PssSol, the Name of God is associated directly with Temple praise and prayer. According to the ancient interpreters, the same attitude is present in *Ha’azinu* as well.

⁴¹ Also note 1QH 10.29.30.

⁴² Svend Holm-Nielsen *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran ATD* vol. 2 (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960) 68 suggests that the term אֲבִי is used of both the heavenly hosts and the community of Qumran. Bonnie Kittel *The Hymns of Qumran* SBL Dissertation Series 50 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 57-67 presents an insightful textual analysis. The conclusion obtained from her observations that the ‘sons of heaven’ mentioned in 11.22 refer to the constituents of the community, who are related to the heavenly hosts as a result of poetic similarity, that is size and weight.

⁴³ This point is made clear elsewhere in the Scrolls, note 1Q34 frag. 3 1.6, which Martinez and Tigchelaar translate: ‘we will celebrate your name forever’. The verb is הִדָּו , which in HB is often used to convey the idea of ‘confession’, e.g., Lev. 5, 16, and 26, or ‘praise’, e.g., Gen. 49.8, 2 Sam. 22.50, and many Psalms. Noting those affinities, a better sense might be made by rendering the line in 1Q34 as: ‘we will confess (or praise) your name forever’; note also 11QT 29.4; 1QM 14.12.

⁴⁴ 1QS 6.27-7.2; CD 15.1-3, where even a falsely taken oath is an offence to the Name of God and is punishable through excommunication; also note *Jubilees* 23.21 wherein sinners are those who misuse the Name of God.

⁴⁵ On the perception that the community at Qumran was to substitute for the Jerusalem Temple, note 1QS 8.5-6 as well as 1QS 5.6, 21; 8.9; 9.6; 11.8; and CD 1.7; 6.2. Leaney *Rule of Qumran* 216 states: ‘The community is to take the place of the sanctuary of the Temple...’ He then links this idea with the concept of Temple replication implicit in the New Testament; cf. 1 Cor. 3.16; 6.19; 2 Cor. 6.16; and Rom. 8.9. Also note Geza Vermes *Scripture and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1973) 32 in which he states that ‘...the Council of the Community is the one true sanctuary in which God is to be worshipped.’ Moshe Weinfeld *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect* NTOA 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986) 46-47 notes that the separation between the covenanters and the Temple hierarchy in Jerusalem led to the absence of festivals and convocations in a temple structure evident in the literature from Qumran.

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g., 1QS 8.5-6; 9.5-6.

4—Deut. 32.4—God is Righteous and Just:

Having seized the attention of the reader/listeners, the author of *Ha'azinu* continues with a description of God's nature. Deut. 32.4 reads:

MT: הַצֹּר תָּמִים פִּעְלוֹ כִּי כָל־דַּרְכָיו מִשְׁפָּט

אֱלֹהֵי אֱמוּנָה וְאֵין עוֹל צַדִּיק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא

LXX: θεός, ἀληθινὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πασαὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κρίσις θεὸς πιστὸς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία δίκαιος καὶ ὁσιος κύριος.

Verse 4 acts as an introduction to the second part of the chapter. The Hebrew term **צור** is used in the Pentateuch as an appellative for God only in Deut. 32.4;⁴⁷ LXX never rendered **צור** literally when the term referred to God.⁴⁸ Instead, the translators used the Greek term θεός. For the rabbis, this term held some significance as an indication of God's generative and creative characteristics. *Sifre Deuteronomy* 307 states:

'The Rock': the artist, for he designed the world first, and formed man in it [and all of these deeds are perfect].⁴⁹

Another interpretation of this title is that it signifies God's protective and supportive nature towards his people Israel. Tigay comments on the use of the term:

It expresses the idea that the deity is a source of refuge, a protector...From the Bible's viewpoint, the Lord is "*The Rock*," the only one deserving of the appellation.⁵⁰

While the *Sifre Deuteronomy* never explicitly states as much, it is in complete agreement with Tigay's observation. The rabbis understood God's nature in terms of enduring fidelity, i.e., as 'rocklike'.⁵¹

⁴⁷ It is used with greater frequency in the Psalms, e.g., 18.3; 28.1; 62.3.

⁴⁸ Note Olofsson, *God is My Rock*, 35-45 for a thorough discussion on the translation of the term **צור**.

⁴⁹ Neusner's bracketed comments 317 read, 'The letters for the word 'rock' may be read to mean artist, design, and form or create, thus yielding this sense'.

⁵⁰ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 300.

⁵¹ The several passages that deal with this verse never discuss the use of the term 'rock' as a title. Rather, the focus uniformly on the aspect of 'unchangeableness' in God's judgments. There is a comfort conveyed

The importance of the verse in *Ha'azinu* is that it vindicates the coming action: if God is ever just, then the coming punishment is warranted and without caprice. Again, *Sifre* Deuteronomy is insightful. Note 307:

- 3B) Just in the world to come as he (God) pays back a completely righteous person a reward for the religious duty that he did in this world,
- C) so in this world he pays the completely wicked person a reward for every minor religious duty that he did in this world.
- D) And in the world to come just as he exacts punishment from a completely righteous world (*sic.* person?) for the transgression that he did in this world,
- E) so in this world he exacts from the completely righteous person a penalty for every minor transgression that he did in this world.⁵²

The idea of the passage, and the whole of *Sifre* Deuteronomy 307 for that matter, is that God's actions are unimpeachable; however grievous or misplaced a historical event might seem, it is just and warranted.

In *PssSol*, the authors are quick to point out that the calamities that befall Jerusalem are ultimately God's doing (8.14-17) and that this action, more importantly, is appropriate. Just as Deut. 32.4 functioned to open the second stage of the chapter by characterizing God as just, faithful, and perfect, so too do the authors of *PssSol* take steps to characterize God as just, faithful and perfect.

PssSol 9.2 presents an exemplar of such theology⁵³:

PssSol 9.2: ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ἡ διασπορὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δικαιωθῆς, ὁ θεός, ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαις ἡμῶν, ὅτι σὺ κριτὴς δίκαιος ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς τῆς γῆς.

God is held responsible for Israel's former dispersion (and this one as well—note *PssSol* 2 and 8) and is called 'righteous' by the authors. In fact, the authors' penchant for

in the writings that God's nature never changes in his application of justice, righteous, and faithfulness. In short, God is like a rock.

⁵² Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 319.

⁵³ Also cf. 2.15, 18; 2.32; 3.4, 5, 7; 5.1; 8.24-26, 34; 9.5; 10.5, 7; 13.8; 14.1; 17.10, 32.

vindicating God's actions leads occasionally to awkward interruptions in the narrative. For example, in PssSol 2 the narrative runs from judgment to judgment. Verses 1-9 record the invasion of Jerusalem as a result of the sins of the 'sons of Jerusalem'. Verse 10, however, reads:

And the earth shall know all your righteous judgments, O God.

Verses 11-14 then once again iterate the calamity of the conquest of Jerusalem. But verse 15 reads:

And I shall justify you, O God, in uprightness of heart

For your righteousness is in your judgments, O God.

The memory of the conquest and the reasons for its occurrence are punctuated by references to God's just nature. This construction of 'historical apologetics' is characteristic of the chapter and, indeed, much of the document.⁵⁴ But a pre-requisite for such an apologetic is the establishment of God's righteousness, thereby justifying his actions. This is precisely the avenue taken by the authors of PssSol.

To conclude, Deut. 32.4 sets the tone for the next section of *Ha'azinu* wherein the punishment of Israel is detailed. The verse functioned as an introduction to the coming prophecy, one in which the characteristics of the Lord are established in order to enforce the coming invective against Israel. God's nature is one of steadfast justice and righteousness. As such, he is incapable of punishing without cause or rewarding with merit. In short, God's characteristic justice is as unchangeable as a 'rock'. The authors of PssSol understood this basic model very clearly and endeavored to clarify to their readers that the historical conflagration of Pompey's invasion was nothing more than God's just punishment of Israel. Such is the case in other prophetic works. Amos, for example, outlines the punishment set for Israel (2.4ff) because of its sins. The actions of the Lord are not criticized in the oracle of Amos; it is simply assumed that they are just. The tenor of Amos 7 suggests initially that the author is on the verge of questioning God's punishment of Israel. But such a prolepsis is never realized. In the end Amos' claim, while seeking to stave off obliteration, is not seeking a reversal of fortunes. For Amos,

⁵⁴ PssSol 2.32-35 argues as such, as do most of the monologues concerning the differentiation between righteous and sinner in the document.

God is still justified in punishing Israel.⁵⁵ In just such a way, the authors of PssSol do not plead to the Lord for the acquittal of the 'sons of Jerusalem'.⁵⁶ Rather, the document seeks to lessen the punishment for fear of complete disaster. It is only later, in such works as 4 Ezra, that the actions of the Lord are thought even mildly questionable.⁵⁷ As for PssSol, the authors sought to mimic the introduction of Deut. 32 wherein God's righteousness is established as a prerequisite to the punishment of Israel. Implicit in this relationship is the guilt of Israel vis-à-vis God's righteousness.⁵⁸ This contrast forms the introduction to the prophetic paradigm of HB.

5—Deut. 32.5—*Israel Sins: Israel as 'blemished'*:

Deut. 32.5 is a very significant verse in the Song of Moses in light of the foregoing discussion of God's righteousness. In it, the nation of Israel is identified as 'blemished'. The use of the Hebrew term, מום, is key to understanding the intention of the author at this point. Note the text:

MT: שחת לו לא בניו מומם דור עקש ופתלתל

LXX: ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητὰ γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη.

Of the 23 occurrences of the Hebrew מום in the HB, 14 of those occurrences are found in the Pentateuch. Of those instances, 10 are in Leviticus, 1 in Numbers, and 3 in Deuteronomy. On every occasion, LXX use the term μῶμος to translate the Hebrew. Indeed, this homeophonic term only occurs in the translation of this one particular Hebrew word.⁵⁹ Such stereotypical affiliation between words in translation serves to limit

⁵⁵ Note Amos' criticism of 'Jacob's' lavishness in 6.1-7. His rebuke contains the plea for temperance on God's part, but not forgiveness; cf. Elizabeth Achtemeier "Amos" in *NIBC* 17 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999) 219-221.

⁵⁶ Note and compare PssSol 2.22-23 with Amos 7.2.

⁵⁷ Cf. 2 Esdras 3.1-36. The HB antecedent of displeasure with God is, of course, David's frustration towards the Lord at the death of Uzzah 2 Sam. 6.8.

⁵⁸ This is a point emphasized by Arnaldo Momigliano *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987) 80-81 in which he suggests that the defeat of the Jews at the hands of Pompey is directly related to God and His 'dissatisfaction with his People'.

⁵⁹ This is the only conclusion one could draw if one had only the Pentateuch by which to judge. The use of the term is entirely related to the priestly sphere (cf. Lev. 21, 22, 24; Num. 19.2; and Deut. 15.21, 17.1.), except for the possibility of Deut. 32.

the range of meaning of the Greek term.⁶⁰ In the case of the term $\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$, this limitation confines the term to the priestly sphere; $\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ and מום are exclusively applied to discussions regarding the ministrations of the priests at the Temple.

Regarding the Hebrew word, Tigay makes this comment contrasting God and his people Israel:

It (מום) is an apt antonym to 'perfect' (*tamim*) (v.4), for in their literal sense 'perfect' and 'blemish(ed)' are used to designate sacrificial animals as acceptable or unacceptable for sacrifice.⁶¹

The use of the term in Leviticus occurs 5 times in chapter 21. In that chapter, the term always refers to the ritual purity laws. The chapter is concerned to regulate the purity of individuals who approach the veil or altar of God. Lev. 21.23 is a tidy summation of the legislator's efforts:

only he (with מום) shall not go near the veil or approach the altar, because he has a defect, lest he profane my holy things ($\text{מום בו ולא יחלל את מקדשי}$).

The same may be said for Lev. 22.20. In his assessment of the selections from Leviticus, Philo also uses $\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$ when discussing the requisite status of officiating priests and ritually acceptable animals, i.e., that they be free of $\mu\omega\mu\omicron\varsigma$.⁶² In Lev. 24.19-20, the term is used in reference to the disfigurement of an individual. Given the comments in Lev. 21, the assertion may be made that the disfiguring discussed in Lev. 24 would render the disfigured one unacceptable, i.e. forbidden to approach the veil and altar of the Lord (cf. 21.23). In Num. 19.2, מום is used in reference to the pure red heifer, which is to be without blemish (אין בה מום). Noting Lev. 22, one is reminded that an animal with a מום is unacceptable and must not be offered as a sacrifice.⁶³ From this, I suggest that the

⁶⁰ In the case of 'stereotyping' consult Olofsson, *Trans. Tech* 15, Tov, *Text-Critical Use* 54.

⁶¹ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 301. He also posits that this term is used occasionally to describe a 'moral blemish', citing Prov. 9.7 and Job 11.15. These references, however, fall outside the priestly scope into wisdom literature, where their meaning was likely extended. It is possible that this meaning may have attended the word during the penning of PssSol. Note the discussion on 'acceptability' below. Cf. Milgrom *Leviticus* v. II 1823.

⁶² Philo, *Spec. Leg.* i.117 and i.166.

⁶³ Also note Deut. 15.21 and 17.1.

term **קָדַשׁ** is a technical term of sacrificial language used to differentiate between that which is acceptable and that which is unacceptable to the Lord. The importance of belaboring this point is that it establishes the ethos of the author of *Ha'azinu* on the matter of acceptability; it is a decidedly priestly category.

Being 'blemished', however, is not prohibitive to participating in parts of the religious life. Milgrom comments on the life of a 'blemished' priest:

In the Second Temple, blemished priests were employed in the Wood Chamber (located in the northeastern corner of the woman's court, the farthest from the Temple building) to remove worm-eaten wood from the altar stockpile...A blemished priest could sound the trumpets and pronounce the priestly benediction from the porch.⁶⁴

What Milgrom's comment, along with Lev. 21.23 wherein the blemished priest is permitted to eat of God's 'most holy food', suggests is that irregularities described in terms of a 'blemish' require a modified, but not total, separation from the Temple rituals. This is the very point the rabbis emphasize in *Sifre Deuteronomy*. Note Neusner's concluding remarks on 308:

The issue is not the justification of God's ways, but rather, the allegation that, despite sin, Israel remains God's children and family. That is the balance between divine perfection and Israel's sin that is drawn out of the cited verse.⁶⁵

The rabbis' point is clear: being so tarnished, Israel is still God's chosen 'offspring'.

With respect to Deut. 32.5, I feel that the foregoing, priestly understanding of the term must be maintained. Physically speaking, the relative acceptability of the offering or offerer is contingent upon their purity, to which the term **קָדַשׁ** attests. I suggest that the indictment against Israel in Deut. 32.5 is one of impurity with respect to the holy things of God. It is because of their sins that Israel is no longer considered *acceptable* to the Lord. The implications of this are substantial considering Israel's status as God's inheritance from among the nations (Deut. 4.19-20; 32.9). The author of Lev. 22.19-20, in discussing the status of a particular offering, has this to say:

⁶⁴ Milgrom *ibid.* 1824; cf. *m. Mid.* 2.5; *Sifre Num.* 75; cf. *t. Sota* 7.16; *y. Yoma* 1.1. Indeed the 'blemished' priest of Lev. 21 may eat of the food of God, described as 'most holy'.

⁶⁵ Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 322. This particular *Sifre Deuteronomy* is really a call to obedience. The rabbinic hermeneutic *qal vehomer* is applied with great force. The argument runs thus: if the children of Israel are still called 'children of God' while they are blemished, imagine if they were pure.

- 19) To be accepted for you (לרצונכם) it must be a perfect (תמים) male from the cattle, sheep, or goats
- 20) anything that has a blemish (מום) on it you shall not offer, for it will not be accepted (לרצון) on your behalf.

Hence, ‘blemish’ and ‘acceptability’ are set in construct. If my assertion stands, namely that מום in Deut. 32.5 must be understood with a mind to the priestly legislation of Leviticus, then the implicit notion of ‘acceptability’ must also persist. The call of *Ha’azinu* on this point, as the rabbis noted, is a return to spotless purity so that Israel will once again be acceptable to the Lord.⁶⁶

Regarding PssSol, the authors seemed to hold to the same understanding of acceptability. Note PssSol 2.3-5:

- 3) Because of these things, the sons of Jerusalem defiled the holy things of the Lord (τὰ ἅγια κυρίου), profaning the gifts of God in lawlessness.
- 4) Because of these things he said, Throw them far from me, I am not pleased with them (οὐκ εὐδοκῶ)
- 5) The beauty of her glory was despised before God, it was dishonored completely.⁶⁷

Verse 4 displays God’s displeasure with the ‘sons of Jerusalem’ because they had defiled the ‘holy things’ of the Lord. The Greek of verse 4 is suggestive of the rubric of the priestly categories of ‘blemish’ and ‘acceptability’. The term εὐδοκέω is used in HB to render רצון in the Psalter (e.g., 19.15; 51.20; 69.14). Psalm 19.15, for instance, even

⁶⁶ As *Sifre Deuteronomy 308* (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy 322*) states, “If, when they do evil, they are called ‘children’ if they did not do evil, how much the more so!”

⁶⁷ The text itself, and therefore its translation, is debated among modern scholars as to whether the text, currently εὐδόωκεν or εὐώδωκεν, is legitimate. Trafton *Syriac Version 33* points out that the Syriac confirms neither Greek reading, but resonates most closely with εὐδοόω. But ܐܘܕܘܘܐ does not readily entertain the meaning ‘prosper’, as the Greek εὐδοόω must certainly convey. The Syriac term in the *Aphel* means more specifically ‘establish, make ready’. My proposal that the Greek term εὐδοκέω is to be understood as relating to priestly rubrics of acceptability makes better sense in the light of the Syriac, which could suggest that the Lord could no longer permit the ‘sons of Jerusalem’ to enter the Temple confines as a sacrifice. Most commentators maintain the text as presented by Rahlfs, which contains the emendation to εὐδοκέω.

combines the two categories of blamelessness (תמים) with acceptability (note 19.14-15). It seems plausible to suggest that this term carried with it, particularly in cases where the Temple is of central importance, implications of physical or moral purity.

Physical and moral purity was clearly a concern for the authors of PssSol. Listed in the grievances committed against God in 8.11-12 is the introduction of menstrual blood into the Temple precincts (cf. Lev. 15). Bearing in mind the association between מום and רצון in Lev. 22.19-20 as well as Milgrom's and Tigay's comments on the historical development of מום⁶⁸, it seems plausible to suggest that the term εὐδοκέω in 2.4 refers to the status of the 'sons of Jerusalem' vis-à-vis the holiness embodied by the Temple. The sins committed by the 'sons of Jerusalem' caused them to be classed as an impure people, both ritually (cf. 8.11-12) and morally (cf. e.g., 2.13; 4.4ff) to the point that they, as the nation Israel, were no longer acceptable to the Lord.⁶⁹

In conclusion, the 'blemished' status of the children of Israel, as related by *Ha'azinu* and other portions of the Pentateuch mentioned in the foregoing, seems to have informed the argument put forward by the authors of PssSol. The point of emphasis posited by both is this: the people of Israel are unfit due to certain impurities. As such, they and their sacrifices are no longer acceptable to the Lord.⁷⁰ This observation, more importantly, suggests that a central theme for PssSol is the Temple.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Milgrom *Leviticus* v. II 1821-1823, 1841-43; Tigay *Deuteronomy* 301.

⁶⁹ Also note this feature in other prophetic writings from HB, e.g., Jer. 6.20 and Mal. 2.13. This issue is discussed in greater detail in the section on Qumran and PssSol.

⁷⁰ Also note 3.3-4.

⁷¹ H.E. Ryle and M.R. James *The Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly called the Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1891) lix conclude that the presence of priestly elements in PssSol "is based upon (a) the prominence given to ceremonial pollution and purification..." Surely this is right. In a seminar paper, C.T.R. Hayward, in a paper given in the OT Seminar at Durham University, 2001 noted that the root for the term ἀγίασμα is used only sparingly in the LXX Pentateuch and only then in reference to things of most holy importance, i.e. the Temple or its sacrifices. Its use by the authors of PssSol suggests that the authors held a particular view on purity and the Temple closely affiliated with its understanding in the priestly legislation. For the authors of PssSol, the same type of purity espoused by the HB and *Ha'azinu* was inextricably bound not only to the Temple and its accompanying sacrifices, but also to the keeping of the Law of Moses. On this final point, note PssSol 14.2. This may be a point on which the 'moral' aspect of 'blemish' as noted in Prov. 9.7 and Job 11.15 may be detected in PssSol.

6—Deut. 32.7—Remember the Past:

Deut. 32.7 is an invitation on the part of the Song for the people of Israel to remember its past. This is a common theme in the Pentateuch, perhaps embodied most fully in the *Shema* of Deut. 6.4. The call to remember the words and actions of the Lord pervades the entire development of the covenant between God and Israel.⁷² Note the text:

MT: זכר ימות עולם בינו שנות דור ודור

שאל אביך ויגדך זקניך ויאמרו לך

LXX: μνήσθητε ἡμέρας αἰῶνος, σύνετε ἔτη γενεᾶς γενεῶν ἐπερώτησον τὸν πατέρα σου, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ σοι, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους σου, καὶ ἐροῦσιν σοι.

Now compare with PssSol 2.8 and 4.21:

2.8: ἀπέστρεψεν γὰρ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἐλέους αὐτῶν, νέον καὶ πρεσβύτην καὶ τέκνα αὐτῶν εἰς ἅπαξ, ὅτι πονηρὰ ἐποίησαν εἰς ἅπαξ τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν.

4.21: καὶ οὐκ ἐμνήσθησαν θεοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν θεόν ἐν ἅπασιν τούτοις καὶ παρώργισαν τὸν θεὸν καὶ παρώξυναν

The use of race memory as an injunction to right behavior is not uncommon in HB.⁷³ Such language is a scathing rebuke when contrasted with God's 'rocklike' characteristics of righteous justice. In fact, the two go hand in hand. God's characteristic fidelity to the covenant, described later in terms of God's selecting, rearing, and providing lavishly for Israel (vv. 8-14), matches the call to remember the past. In fact, the poem exhorts: even the oldest living members of the community will testify to God's provision. This suggests in no uncertain terms that God has recently (as recent as the lifespan of a human being)

⁷² Cf. Num. 11.37-41; Deut. 6.4-9, 11.13-21; and the end to the restatement of the Decalogue in Deut. 5.32-6.3, in which the people are encouraged to do all that has been commanded them. A particularly telling verse is Deut. 5.29: 'Oh, that their hearts would be inclined to fear me and keep all my commands always, so that it might go well with them and their children forever'. Clearly, a major concern is one of memory. Note that Walter E. Rast *Tradition History and the Old Testament* GBSOTS (J. Coert Rylaarsdam ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) 8-9, 21-24 points out the importance of memory to the transmission of texts.

⁷³ Note, e.g., Amos 2.9-16 and Mic. 6.1-8. Cf. Childs *Memory and Tradition* 49-51.

done these things. Thus the rebuke is emphasized: why did Israel, knowledgeable of the past so near to them, abandon the covenant?⁷⁴

In the comparison above, it is clear that PssSol conveyed an importance on memory not unlike that found in Deut. 32.7. PssSol 2.8 resonates with the *Shema* directly; Israel has ceased ‘hearing’. Both selections from PssSol point to the authors’ repulsion that the people had forgotten the covenant.⁷⁵ In fact, ‘not remembering’ the Lord and his ways is one characteristic ascribed to the ‘sinners’ in the document (e.g., 14.7). Israel are called a ‘stiff-necked people’ (τράχηλος + σκλήροϛ) in Deut. 31.27, which leads directly to Moses’ dictation of *Ha’azinu*, and that the Song is intended to function as a mnemonic tool (cf. Deut. 31.21). In much the same way, PssSol engages the readers in a sort of memory-trial. In PssSol 8.29 the authors admits that the people of Israel ‘stiffened their necks’ (τράχηλος + σκλήροϛ). The reason for the punishment, invasion, and exile is because those who currently control the Temple ministrations, including their forefathers, did not act according to the laws of purity as outlined in the HB (cf. 8.22). As noted above in Deut. 32.5, this is precisely the invective leveled against the children of Israel. Thus, the selections above and 8.22 from PssSol are examples of appeals to memory to the same extent found in Deut. 32.7. Impious behavior in the form of a rejection of God’s hegemony is grounds for punishment under the guidelines of the covenant (cf. e.g., Lev. 26).

These passages in PssSol function to explain the current historical conflagration. PssSol 2.7, which states that Israel was abandoned ‘to the hands of those who prevailed’, comes as little surprise considering the HB prophetic paradigm.⁷⁶ Hosea 2.10, for

⁷⁴ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 302; Von Rad *Deuteronomy* 196.

⁷⁵ Neusner’s synopsis to *Sifre Deuteronomy* 310 (328) is insightful: ‘The complete statement of the entire passage may be given very simply: if we remember what God has done in the past, how he exacted punishment from generations and from individuals, but also how he revealed himself to generations and individuals, we shall know what is coming in the future—which is the same thing’. Implicit to this type of construction is a projected hope in the time of crisis. If a particular crisis can be identified as an event governed by the covenant of Moses, then the event itself may be set within a religious framework and dealt with as a matter of God’s imminence. I am arguing here that this is precisely what the authors of PssSol have done.

⁷⁶ In *Ha’azinu*, one of the punishments levied on Israel is defeat, occupation, and dispersion. This re-visitation of past and current sins for the sake of a memory trial is also a characteristic of prophetic literature. Note Is. 9.8-10.11; Jer. 2-3; Ez. 22; Hosea 4; Amos 3; Micah 1.1-7; Mal. 1.6-2.16. It is for this reason that I am inclined to reject the observation that PssSol represents a ‘literature of crisis’, a primary assessment of the document, cf. Robert Wright, ‘The Psalms of Solomon,’ in *OTP*, (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press, 1985) 643; Kenneth Atkinson *An Intertextual Study of*

instance, uses the analogy of Israel as a whore to provide the reason for the punishment contained in the book:

She did not know that I gave to her grain, fresh wine and oil, silver and gold I multiplied to her—they made Baal!

The incredulity of the cry at the end, as though the stress of the crimes made the analogy a tactic no longer endurable, represents Israel's sins, their rejection of God. Much like in Deut. 32, in Hosea there is couched within the condemnation of the nation of Israel a reminder of God's provision. The breach of covenant, which will never be committed by God, flies in the face of the nation's history. While the enumeration of specific sins is left to be discussed elsewhere, the poem's point is loud and clear. God's provision has been spurned and punishment is on its way. As is clear, the very same paradigm is implemented in PssSol.⁷⁷

7—Deut. 32.9—*Israel is God's Inheritance*:

Deut. 32.9 represents a very important feature of later prophetic literature, namely the concept that the nation of Israel is the inheritance of God.

MT: כִּי חֶלֶק יְהוָה עִמּוֹ יַעֲקֹב חֶבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ

LXX: καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

This tradition, i.e., the rubrication of the nations, is found elsewhere in HB and post-biblical writings.⁷⁸ The singular point for the Deuteronomist with regard to the division of

the Psalms of Solomon Pseudepigrapha (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001) 426. George W.E. Nickelsburg *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 204 offers a more guarded assessment, stating, 'The author not only petitions or praises God for deliverance from distress but also explicates how this distress serves as chastening or punishment for sin'.

⁷⁷ Note particularly PssSol 5.8-15, which is certainly reminiscent of Gn. 1 but also of the tension between the punishment of famine and the blessing of prosperity in the prophetic paradigm. Cf. e.g., Lev. 26, and compare Hosea chapter 2 with chapter 4, and Ez. 5.12 and with 36.30.

⁷⁸ TPsJ in its rendition of Deut.10.22, and also Ex. 24.9, tells of the 70 elders ascending Mt. Sinai with Moses and Aaron. A very important corollary is the division of the other nations. Note Deut. 4.19 and Jubilees 15.30-32, which suggests that the nations were given over to ruling angels. On this point note John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Bible Association, 1987) 226-227 in which he states regarding the "theologoumenon" of Jubilees that "...even the people of Noah's generation were fully observant 'Mosaists'." The reception of the division of the

the nations is this: Israel is God's own allotment. The defining characteristic of this concept is that God reveals himself to Israel, giving them his name and entering into a covenant with them.⁷⁹ Such elements are present in PssSol as well. Note 9.9 and 14.5:

9.9: ὅτι σὺ ἠρετίσω τὸ σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ ἔθου τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, κύριε, καὶ οὐκ ἀπόση εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

14.5: ὅτι ἡ μερὶς καὶ κληρονομία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν Ἰσραηλ.

PssSol 14.5 is particularly telling, using many of the same words found in LXX of Deut. 32.9. Verses 1-4 of PssSol 14 detail God's continued care for those who are faithful to him. Moreover, this first section of chapter 14 (vv.1-5) intimates other aspects of the covenant; verse 4 reads of the 'planting' of the faithful evoking images of Land ownership and verse 2 is an overt reference to the Law of Moses.⁸⁰ Verse 5, therefore, stands as a summary for the first four verses: the faithful, defined as being a part of Israel through obedience to the Law of Moses, are entitled to the covenantal promises precisely because Israel is God's allotment among all the nations of the earth.

Regarding PssSol 9.9, the case is made for Israel's selection apart from all other nations, tying in with the selection of Abraham. Perhaps the most important aspect of this line from PssSol is the incorporation of God's Name being given (lit. 'set upon') to Israel. The same root, τίθημι, is present in Num. 6.23 (LXX) in the famous passage of the priestly blessing. There, the priest is literally to set (Heb.— נָשָׂא ; Gr.—ἐπιτίθημι) God's Name upon the people. In his translation of the passage, Milgrom places a figurative emphasis on the meaning, rendering the verse, 'Thus they shall link My name with the

nations and the portion of Israel was, for the author of Jubilees, eternal. The presence of Jubilees in some 17 MSS at Qumran suggests that the DS community held to or was at least aware of this common Jewish understanding. On this point, note Dogniez and Harl 326, "*La leçon majoritaire de la Septante (anges) correspond a une tradition juive et a été à l'origine des explications artistiques sur les 'anges des nations'.*" Note also Deut. 7.6, 14.2, 26.18-19; Is. 44.2; Amos 3.2. The nation of Israel is central to the designs of the authors and primary in their development of the 'eschaton'. The advent of the Messiah is inextricably linked to the redemption of the nation of Israel.

⁷⁹ On the giving of the Name, note Num. 6; on the covenant through Moses, cf. Ex. 20 and *Sifre Deuteronomy* 311 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 329-331).

⁸⁰ For a fuller discussion of the term and the verse, note the section on PssSol and Qumran below. The Law of Moses is a key component to the concept of 'plantation'. Cf. the discussion of Shozo Fujita "The Metaphor of Plant in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *JSJ* 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1976): 30-45.

people of Israel, and I will bless them'. In his commentary, however, Milgrom allows for a literal meaning, stating:

In the light of the Ketef Hinnom silver plaques, which demonstrate that in seventh (or sixth)-century Jerusalem the Priestly Benediction was worn on the body in the form of amulets, the possibility exists that the literal meaning of this phrase is the correct one, that is, that the Priestly Benediction delivered by the priests in the sanctuary was *also* to be placed on the Israelites as prophylactics.⁸¹

However the verse ought to be understood, the overriding principle persists that God selected Israel and one of the markers of that selection is that they are given his Name.

Returning to PssSol 9.9, a few points may now be made. First, the appeal of the verse is to the archaic allotment of the nations of the earth, at which time Israel was selected as God's. Clearly the attempt of the authors is to re-emphasize Israel's glorified status. As such, this is a call to obedience. Secondly, God's Name is 'set' upon Israel as a marker of this selection. This smacks of the priestly blessing in Num. 6, and the authors are once more bringing to the reader's attention Israel's covenantal obligations, both to proper Temple worship and to fidelity to the Law of Moses. To close, the verse refers to the eternal nature of the covenant, which provides a pertinent introduction to an explicit reminder of the covenant stricken with the 'ancestors' of the authors. In short, the concept evinced by the authors regarding Israel is that they are God's eternal possession, selected long ago.

To conclude, the concept of Israel as God's inheritance is fundamental to *Ha'azinu* and other prophetic texts of HB. It is also a fundamental aspect in other post-biblical writings. The authors of PssSol embraced this idea and incorporated it into their wider thesis of the central importance of Israel in God's redemptive activity. The hopeful outlook of the authors of PssSol required that the catastrophe be predicated upon the knowledge that Israel is God's eternal possession, and, moreover, that the covenant is still valid and efficacious. Both *Ha'azinu* and PssSol appear as mnemonic tools, reminding the people that they are the elect of God by pointing to the pillars of the faith, the Law of Moses and the Temple. This point in the poem and PssSol fit nicely with the reminder of God's fidelity and past actions.

⁸¹ Jacob Milgrom "Numbers" in *JPS Torah Commentary Series* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989) 52.

8—Deut. 32.10—The Discipline of God:

8.1—The Use of LXX by PssSol:

Before turning to the comparison of Deut. 32.10 and PssSol, I want to comment briefly on the use of LXX by PssSol. Deut. 32.10 reads:

MT: **ימצאֵהוּ בארץ מדבר ובתהו ילל ישמן**
יסבבנהו יבוננהו יצרנהו כאישון עינו

LXX: αὐτάρκησεν αὐτόν ἐν γῆ ἐρήμῳ, ἐν δίψει καύματος ἐν ἀνύδρῳ ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτόν καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν αὐτόν καὶ διεφύλαξεν αὐτόν ὡς κόραν ὀφθαλμοῦ,⁸²

LXX use the verb ἐπαίδευσεν to render **יבוננהו**.⁸³ The Heb. term could contain the meaning ‘instruct’ but this is the only occasion in which the translator(s) of LXX used the term παιδεύω for the Heb. term. This is particularly telling considering the popularity of the Heb. verb **בִּיַן**. The Gk. translators/interpreters may have thought this the best verb to use in this context. This type of translation operates under the modern scholar’s title ‘semantically accurate’ translation.⁸⁴ In terms of content, the ‘semantically accurate’ translation often reflects a level of interpretation on the part of the translators. A fine example of this is to be found in Deut. 32 in which the Heb. term **צור** is rendered by the Gk. word θεός, discussed above. Though a substantial difference, it may be considered to be a 1:1 translation and, therefore, ‘literal’ insofar as it renders the Heb. term with a Gk. equivalent—θεός = **צור**. But such a conclusion may only be reached by observing that θεός renders **צור** in other passages.⁸⁵ In the case of παιδεύω for **יבוננהו**, however, one is confronted with a singularity.

In most modern translations, **יבוננהו** is rendered as ‘he cared for him’. Its occurrence is frequent and varied, but nowhere in HB, save Deut. 32.10, is the Gk. verb

⁸² For an interesting parallel of the description of Israel in the last line of Deut. 32.10, note Greek 1 Enoch 100.5 in which the people chosen by God were guarded round about by holy angels as the κοριον οφθαλμου.

⁸³ Note Dogniez and Harl *Deuteronomie 327* and their fine discussion of the Greek text.

⁸⁴ Olofsson, *Trans. Tech.* 21; Tov, *Text-Critical of Septuagint*, 58-59.

⁸⁵ Note (MT ref.) Ps. 31.2; 62.2, 6; 71.3; 73.26; 92.15; 95.1; and Is. 30.29.

παιδεύω used for its translation. Generally, the semantic fields of the MT and LXX align in a more or less uniform fashion, so much so that the translators are sometimes accused of disregarding the content in favor of a specific word usage. Aberrations can be, therefore, indicative of interpretive activity, often simply evidence of an attempt to clarify a confusing section. But such anomalies do not always constitute a quantitative difference, nor are they the product of a simple misunderstanding on the part of the translators. In the case of παιδεύω, I suggest that the alteration is qualitative, intended to emend and clarify the passage. Thus, while semantically the translation represents a 1:1 rendering, the substance of the translation carries a slightly different meaning from the original. Such a rendering indicates an interpretive effort on the part of the translators. As Emanuel Tov has pointed out:

Failure to stereotype was conditioned by the context, the limitations of the Greek language, and above all, by the inclinations of individual translators.⁸⁶

Owing to the common usage of the Hebrew term יָבַח, the second of Tov's three insights does not apply to Deut. 32.10.

The Gk. verb παιδεύω has a very specific meaning. While a number of informative insights have been proposed for translation technique in LXX, none seem adequate enough to explain the usage of παιδεύω in this situation.⁸⁷ A case could be made that it was the best and most accurate rendering that could be made for יָבַח וְנָחַהּ, in so far as the Heb. term in this form is a *hapax*. In other words, the translators were confused by the Heb. form and struggled with the translation. For that argument to succeed, however, one would need to assert that elsewhere in the verse, LXX attempted a 1:1 translation. This is not the case as LXX use a Greek *hapax* in the same verse with αὐτάρκησεν for יָמְצָהּ.⁸⁸ The latter is certainly a well-known Heb. term and so the translators' choice, if governed by a 'translation technique' would be puzzling as the Heb. term is far from

⁸⁶ Tov, *Text-Critical Use* 54.

⁸⁷ Note Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 50f and 82f. There seems to me to be a qualitative difference between the MT and the LXX. Although I do allow for the possibility for a missing *Vorlage*, it seems neither necessary nor accurate to make such an intellectual leap in this instance.

⁸⁸ MT contains a textual note in the critical apparatus in which the Samaritan Pentateuch reads יָמְצָהּ, which in the Piel has the meaning of 'strengthening', which could be the intention of the Greek term. This may explain the choice of the Greek term, but does not nullify the suggestion that it is here a *hapax*, and as such is unique in its application as both Hebrew terms are fairly common.

confusing.⁸⁹ The translators, so it seems, were not opposed to developing or importing singular words to translate common Heb. terms.⁹⁰ It appears that the translators used a Gk. *hapax* for a common Heb. term and a common Gk. term for a Hebrew *hapax*. The explanation may rest in how the translators understood the intent of the verse from *Ha'azinu*.

8.2—*The Discipline of God:*

In spite of the textual and conceptual issues surrounding the meaning of the verse, I assert that LXX had a very specific idea of the Exodus account in mind when rendering the passage into Gk. It seems that they understood the Exodus in terms of its corrective efficacy on the nation of Israel. Such ‘correction’ is not uncommon to the relationship between God and Israel. Deut. 4.36 is particularly noteworthy:

MT: מן השמים השמיעך את־קלו ליסרך ועל־הארץ
הראך את־אשו הגדולה ודבריו שמעת מתוך האש

LXX: ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀκούστη ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ παιδεῦσαί σε
καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐδειξέν σοι τὸ πῦρ αὐτοῦ τὸ μέγα
καὶ τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ ἤκουσας ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός.

Here, the concept of God’s παιδείαν is associated with the Exodus and the giving of the Law. This understanding may lend some insight to the use of the term in Deut. 32.10 for the Hebraic *hapax*, as the term is elsewhere used in the Exodus cycle to describe the effect of God’s paranormal activity.⁹¹ Very clearly, the Hebrew term רָאָה means ‘to see, perceive, understand, know’. This verb accords well in a poetic setting with the description of Israel as the ‘apple of God’s eye’, as Tigay’s versification underscores (cf. Deut. 32.10). As both Tigay and von Rad have intimated, this portion of Deut. 32 MT is slightly ambiguous. It hints at the Exodus, but does not seem to engage the account fully.

⁸⁹ רָאָה occurs well over 400 times in HB.

⁹⁰ The Greek ἀντάρκτησεν may have been imported from Stoicism; see Robin Campbell’s discussion of this term in Seneca’s *Letters From a Stoic* trans. by Robin Campbell (London: Penguin Books, 1969) 17.

⁹¹ Von Rad *Deuteronomy* 197 suggests that this ‘finding in a desert place’ may represent a very old tradition that was subsumed by the Exodus account; cf. also Tigay *Deuteronomy* 304. Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* 279 relates this section of *Ha'azinu* with Deut. 26.6f, which is a clear reference to the Exodus account; cf. Sifre *Deuteronomy* 313 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 334-336).

I suggest that it was precisely this ambiguity in the text that prompted the translators to use the much more common term παιδεύω. In short, the use of the Greek term, coupled with the content of the verse, leaves little doubt that the translators understood this section as referring to the Exodus account.

The authors of PssSol use the term παιδεύω frequently when discussing the Lord's activity towards Israel (or the faithful).⁹² For the authors, to be disciplined by the Lord is to be led by him, and it seems plausible to suggest that they understood the Exodus account as an example of God's simultaneous guidance and discipline. The theological significance of the Greek term is evident by its use in Deut. 32 and elsewhere in the Pentateuch.⁹³ In the light of the frequent use of the term παιδεύω by LXX wherein the punishment is a corrective,⁹⁴ PssSol seemingly took from LXX the understanding of the term as a time of divine chastisement in order to restore religious punctiliousness. Due to the Heb. *Vorlage*, Deut. 32 strikes me as one of the most significant usages of the term by LXX. It certainly points to a well-developed sense that punishment was to be defined in terms of discipline. This, I think, is the focus of discipline as understood by PssSol. In short, while PssSol was most likely a translation from Heb. to Gk., the usage of the term παιδεύω suggests that the authors of PssSol were intimately aware of LXX's understanding of HB passages, and particularly that of Deut. 32.

9—Deut. 32.12—*God as Israel's Leader:*

Deut. 32.12 describes God as leading his people:

MT: יהוה בדרך ינחנו ואין עמו אל נכר

LXX: κύριος μόνος ἤγειν αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐκ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν θεὸς ἀλλότριος.

The verse explains God's leadership of his people in terms of the allotment of the nations discussed earlier; no other god may lead Israel. Implicit in this statement, however, is the germ of a later understanding of Israel as being a theocratic entity. Thus, God's

⁹² PssSol uses παιδεύω/παιδείαν in 3.4; 7.3, 9; 8.26; 10.2-3; 13.7-10; 13.1; 16.7-11, 13; 18.7.

⁹³ R. Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon" 640 suggests that LXX was the 'sourcebook' for PssSol's OT references.

⁹⁴ E.g., Lev. 26.18; Deut. 8.5 in reference to the wilderness wanderings; Ps. 2.10 in reference to the disciplining of the nations that they may worship the Lord; Hos. 7.12; Jer. 2.19.

hegemony over Israel vis-à-vis the ‘pantheon’ of other gods also reflects a claim to ultimate leadership over the community itself. So, while Moses was the corporeal ‘ruler’, God is the power behind him. Here, so it would appear, *Ha’azinu* is attesting God’s kingship, the culmination and climax of which is to be found later in 1 Sam. 8 and selections from CPss (e.g., 47, 96-99). In the former, God explains to Samuel that Israel is simply rejecting him (the manifestation of God’s rule) just as they had rejected God (their ruler) by following after the other nations of the earth (1 Sam. 8.5).⁹⁵

PssSol is conspicuous on this matter. Not only is God’s authority over Israel mentioned, so too is his authority over the created order.⁹⁶ PssSol even go so far as to call the Lord ‘king’ on several occasions.⁹⁷ Two examples will suffice to show the degree of the authors’ appreciation of God’s sovereignty. Having just discussed the provision and discipline of the Lord, 5.19 states:

εὐλόγημεν ἡ δόξα κυρίου ὅτι αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν.

PssSol 17.46⁹⁸ ends the messianic Psalm 17 and resonates of 5.19:

κύριος αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι.

In both instances, the Lord is clearly defined as king. PssSol 2.32, mentioned above, asserts God’s hegemony over the whole earth by the phrased appellation, ‘a great and righteous king, judging what is under heaven’. This aspect of judging also links God with kingship. 1 Kgs. 3.16-28 contains the famous story of Solomon’s judgment between the two mothers, both of whom claimed the same baby as their own. This famous story illustrates the position and role of the king in ancient Israel. He was both ruler and judge. On this point, the authors of PssSol are quite clear; God is king and judge.⁹⁹ For *Ha’azinu*, God is righteous and just (32.3), he selected the nation of Israel as his portion (32.7-9), claims hegemony over his people (32.12), and through the Song itself passes

⁹⁵ *Sifre* Deuteronomy 315 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 338-339) may contain an allusion to this when it states: Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to them, ‘Just as you have dwelt alone in this world, without deriving benefit from the nations in any way, so I am going to make you dwell alone in the age to come, and none of the nations of the world will derive any benefit from you in any way’.

⁹⁶ This ‘tension’ between a national and universal God is evident in the Psalter. Compare for example CPss. 46 and 48 with 47 and 93. Note S.E. Gillingham *The Poems and Poetry of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 1994) 270-271.

⁹⁷ Note PssSol 2.30, 5.19, 17.1, 46; incidentally, even the Messiah’s advent in chapter 17 does not change the seat of power: God is still king over Israel.

⁹⁸ Cf. also PssSol 17.1.

⁹⁹ Note PssSol 2.10, 18; 3.3; 4.8, 24; 5.1; 8.18, 24; 9.2, 5; 10.5; 17.10. Note Ps. 93.1, 96.10, 97.1; Is. 24.23, 52.7; Zeph. 3.15.

judgment on Israel. These characteristics are present in other portions of HB and are described in PssSol as well.¹⁰⁰

10—Deut. 32.15—Israel as the Beloved of God:

The next section is related to the discussion in v. 5 above, where Israel's 'blemished' status is mentioned. Deut. 32.15 reads:

MT: וישמן ישרון ויבעט שמנת עבית כשית
ויטש אלוה עשהו וינבל צור ישעתו

LXX: καὶ ἔφαγεν Ιακωβ καὶ ἐνεπλήσθη, καὶ ἀπελάκτισεν ὁ ἠγαπημένος,
ἐλιπάνθη, ἐπαχύνθη, ἐπλατύνθη, καὶ ἐγκατέλιπεν θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντα
αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀπέστη ἀπὸ θεοῦ σωτήρος αὐτοῦ.

From this verse I want to highlight the title 'Jeshurun', and demonstrate what appears to be a significant philological link between *Ha'azinu* and PssSol. 'Jeshurun' is a rare appellation of affection given to Israel by HB.¹⁰¹ Israel is the 'beloved one' of God. There exist only three examples in HB in which the form ישרון is used: Deut. 32.15, 33.26, and Is. 44.2. Commenting on the term in Deut. 32.15, Tigay offers this observation:

The epithet "Jeshurun" (Heb. *yeshurun*, "the Upright," from *yashar*, "upright") alludes to "Israel" and sounds something like it.¹⁰²

Tigay's insight is evident from the passages where the term is employed; clearly it is a reference to Israel. In each case, the LXX equivalent is an inflected form of ἀγαπάω. In Is. 44.2, the term is used in connection with God's selection of his people:

MT: כה אמר יהוה עשך ויצרך מבטן יעזרך
אל תידא עבדי יעקב וישרון בחרתי בו

LXX: οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός ὁ ποιήσας σε καὶ ὁ πλάσας σε ἐκ κοιλίας ἔτι
βοηθηθήσῃ, μὴ φοβοῦ παῖς μου Ιακωβ καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος Ισραηλ ὃν
ἐξελεξάμην.

¹⁰⁰ Also note and compare Is. 24.21-23 with PssSol 2.30-32 and Zeph. 3.14-15 with PssSol 17.45-46.

¹⁰¹ The Gk. equivalent is used more extensively.

¹⁰² Tigay *Deuteronomy* 306.

Is. 44.1 illustrates the limitation of the term to the nation of Israel and people of Jacob, i.e., Jacob-Israel. This 'Jacob-Israel' designation likely had messianic connotations based on the Balaam cycle from Num. 23-24.¹⁰³ The sense of Is. 44.2, moreover, is that of an ideological nation, one in which no evil or sin exists; those who constitute this ideal nation are collectively called **יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Thus, one aspect of **יִשְׂרָאֵל** in HB is that it indicates future expectation. In LXX Psalter, the Greek term, ἡγαπημένος, is used in reference to the Messiah.¹⁰⁴ As such, it became for LXX both a collective term in its application to Israel and a specific term in its application to the Messiah. Moreover, Schaper's analysis of the term in the Greek Psalter discloses its close association with the concept of the 'first-born son' of God. So, on the one hand the term is synonymous with the nation of Israel and on the other with the Messiah of God, either of which may be referred to as God's 'first-born son'.¹⁰⁵

As Tigay has pointed out, In HB **יִשְׂרָאֵל** held futuristic implications and referred in part to an ideologically righteous body of people.¹⁰⁶ The relative reservation to employ the term in HB and its Greek counterpart in LXX suggests a fairly specific understanding of its applicability, and its appearance, therefore, in any text outside HB is highly suggestive of a rather specific theological impression.

In PssSol, the term is used in 13.9:

13.9: ὅτι νουθέτησεν δίκαιον ὡς υἱὸν ἀγαπήσεως, καὶ ἡ παιδεία αὐτοῦ ὡς πρωτοτόκου.

¹⁰³ See also below in section 14.2; note C.T.R. Hayward, "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch" in P. J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward (eds) *New Heavens and New Earth: Essays on Honour of Anthony Gelston* (1999).

¹⁰⁴ Note Joachim Schaper *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* WUNT 2: 76 (J.C.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1995) 78 and 92f for a fine critique of the evolution and use of this term in the Greek Psalter.

¹⁰⁵ Gen. R. 77, perhaps reminiscent of Ps. 110, includes a most interesting discussion of this point in which Jacob-Israel, so referred to by the interpreter as Jeshurun, is said to be 'like God'.

¹⁰⁶ He notes *idem*. 306 that the term is employed in Deut. 32 'ironically, underscoring how Israel has failed to live up to its expected character'.

In the context of chapter 13, the righteous as a community are the ‘beloved son (ἀγαπήσεως—Heb. יְשׁוּרֻן?) and first-born son’ of God (cf. also 18.4).¹⁰⁷ This resonates with Tigay’s understanding of the term as an alternative appellation for Israel as well as the understanding of an ideological community defined in Is. 44.2. Bearing in mind that the term carried messianic implications in the Greek Psalter, PssSol also fits Schaper’s formulaic expectation. The messianic advent in chapter 17 completes the ‘future-thinking’ done in chapter 13, wherein the ideal nation is envisioned. In 17.26-30, this ideal nation is created through the work of the Messiah, again a reminder of Is. 44.2. In *Sifre Deuteronomy* 313, the commentators produce a sweeping historical account of Israel’s history, moving from the ancient past to the speculative future. Neusner comments on this section:

On a large scale, therefore, we see, the exegesis of “remember the days of yore” leads us to a systematic review of God’s relationship with the world through Israel. The climax, we now anticipate, focuses not on the past but on the future...The past is now invoked as a model for the messianic future, which is to be anticipated.¹⁰⁸

Indeed, the *Sifre Deuteronomy* understood *Ha’azinu* not just as a record of the past, but as an indication of the future as well. The conclusion, therefore, that יְשׁוּרֻן in Deut. 32 has futuristic implications is attested by the earliest commentary on the text. The surfacing of the term in PssSol seems to link it clearly to either *Ha’azinu* or to Is. 44.2, both of which indicate future speculation. Apparently the authors of PssSol understood this point as well, and they introduce the term to describe the community of the righteous in a document that moves towards the messianic advent and the purification of the nation of Israel. PssSol seems to understand this term only in its application to the nation Israel, as it is nowhere applied to the Messiah. When *Ha’azinu* portrays Israel as God’s beloved son, it does so in order to highlight their sins. Nevertheless, the inclusion of the term

¹⁰⁷ Sy. has ܩܫܘܪܘܢܐ. Interestingly, Peshitta renders ‘Jeshurun’ in both Dt. 32.15 and Is. 44.2 with

ܩܫܘܪܘܢܐ.

¹⁰⁸ Neusner *Sifre Deuteronomy* 336 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 388-389); also note *Sifre Deuteronomy* 322 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 358-360).

carries the speculation of Israel's ultimate purification (thus the root *יָשַׁר*). The contrast in Deut. 32.5 between God's perfect nature and Israel's blemished status again reappears.

11—Deut. 32.22-25—The Punishment of Israel:

Commenting on the punishments of Deut. 32, Walter Brueggemann states:

The punishments now to come upon Israel are the implementation of covenant curses from chapter 28. What Israel is to suffer is not due to divine capriciousness, but on the basis of sanctions already known ahead of time: fire, hunger, consumption, pestilence, beasts, sword.¹⁰⁹

The punishments outlined in Deut. 32 represent God's four types of punishment.¹¹⁰ Yet, *Ha'azinu* is not specific about the outlay of these punishments, answering such historical questions as who, what, and when. This 'veiled language' lends itself to continual reinterpretation in the light of historical events.¹¹¹ The types of crises delineated by Deut. 32 are common to prophetic literature.¹¹² For the authors of PssSol, history had provided the necessary details to the non-specific punishment and redemption elements in Deut. 32, e.g. sword, famine, etc.¹¹³ PssSol re-appropriates these categories in the light of the historical event of Pompey's invasion. In this way, *Ha'azinu* serves as an archetype for the prophetic paradigm in HB and beyond. PssSol's familiarity with this paradigm is evident when a comparison is made.

11.1—Plagues of the Earth:

The first example will be taken as a section. Deut. 32.22-24 is a description of the punishment of Israel. Verse 22 introduces famine:

MT: כִּי־אֵשׁ קָדַחַּ בְּאִפִּי וְתִקַּד עַד שְׂאוֹל תַּחֲתִית

וְתֹאכַל אֶרֶץ וַיְבַלֶּה וְתִלְהַט מוֹסְדֵי הָרִים

LXX: ὅτι πῦρ ἐκκέκαυται ἐκ τοῦ θυμοῦ μου, καυθήσεται ἕως ἄδου κάτω, καταφάγεται γῆν καὶ τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς, φλέξει θεμέλια ὀρέων.

¹⁰⁹ Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* 280.

¹¹⁰ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 308. He takes the notion from Ibn Ezra's comments on Ez. 14.21.

¹¹¹ What Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* 277 calls the 'revealing and concealing' aspect of poetry.

¹¹² Ezekiel, Daniel and Zephaniah as examples in the OT.

¹¹³ R. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," 643-646 on veiled language in PssSol.

The famine is total, burning up earth and harvest. In PssSol, famine is a strong image of judgment on the unrighteous as PssSol 13.2 attests:

13.2: ὁ βραχίων κυρίου ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ρομφαίας διαπορευομένης, ἀπὸ λιμοῦ καὶ θανάτου ἀμαρτωλῶν.

Unlike the righteous, the sinners are not to be saved from such disasters.¹¹⁴ Moving on, the punishment of famine is re-emphasized in Deut. 32.24, but this time with the added punishment of the “fang of beasts.”

MT: מזי רעב ולחמי רשע וקטב מרירי

רשי־בהמות אֶל־שׂאֵב־בַּמֶּלֶךְ־תִּמְחֹץ־לִי־עֵפֶר

LXX: τηκόμενοι λιμῶ καὶ βρώσει ὀρνέων, καὶ ὀπισθότονος ἀνίατος ὀδόντας θηρίων ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς, μετὰ θυμοῦ συρόντων ἐπὶ γῆς.

PssSol also contain such calamities, again leveled against the unrighteous. Note the following passages:

4.19: σκορπισθείησαν σάρκες ἀνθρωπαρέσκων ὑπὸ θηρίων, καὶ ὄστᾶ παρανόμων κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ.

13.3: θηρία ἐπεδράμοσαν αὐτοῖς ποιηρά ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν αὐτῶν ἐτίλλοσαν σάρκας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς μύλαις ἔθλων ὄστᾶ αὐτῶν.

This imagery of the punishment of the sinners from Deut. 32 is also evident in Ezekiel.¹¹⁵ It is important to remember that the unrighteous element in *Ha'azinu* is, first and foremost, the nation of Israel. It is not until Israel has been punished that God turns his attention towards the other nations. The author is very careful to proceed in a specific order: punishment of Israel *leads to the* punishment of the nation. Such a tension is formulated in PssSol, though with less control than exhibited in Deut. 32.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Note also PssSol 15.7; note also this theme by way of its opposition in 5.8-14, in which God is the provider of all means of sustenance in times of plenty.

¹¹⁵ Ez. 5.16-17, 14.21, 33.27; note Lev. 26.33 as well.

¹¹⁶ Whereas *Ha'azinu* follows the pattern from sin (Israel) → punishment (Israel) → sin (Israel) → punishment (Israel), PssSol is not so chronological. For instance, the punishment of the foreign nation (or

That PssSol use the 'four types of punishment', i.e., famine, plague, invasion and conquest, and exile, found in other prophetic texts is suggestive of the influence of paradigmatic, prophetic concepts on the document and indicative of its close relationship to the prophetic genre. As I suggested in the opening to this section, these phrases in *Ha'azinu* do not carry a temporal or national specification. In the case of HB prophecy and PssSol, however, they are inserted into fairly specific historical milieux. The substitution of the 'sons of Jerusalem' (possibly a limited reference to the priesthood) in PssSol for the nation of Israel in *Ha'azinu* is not a substantial difference. So, on the one hand, the unrighteous in PssSol fit the bill of unrighteous Israel in *Ha'azinu* while on the other hand, the righteous in PssSol are the ideological Israel of 'Jeshurun'. Thus the punishment in PssSol is simply the adaptation of paradigmatic phrases and structuring found in texts like Deut. 32 in the light of contemporary historical events. The dualism in PssSol is neither purely anthropological (the nations are seemingly redeemed in 17.34-35) nor purely sociological (the authors never distance themselves from the priestly circles). Rather, the dualism in PssSol seems to be of a 'priestly ethic': one side is unrighteous either because of their actions in regard to the holy things of God, whereas the other side is righteous because of the intent of their heart, even when sin has been committed (PssSol 3.5f).¹¹⁷ The authors never indicates a desire to dislocate himself/themselves from his/their contemporaries. Rather, they appeal for a return to unblemished purity in the face of the divine. This requires the purification of the Temple, which leads them to the hope in the messianic advent resulting in a purified Israel. Thus, while there is the separation between just and unjust, righteous and unrighteous, the

leader) is detailed in various places in the composition, e.g., 2.25f and 17.22. This is not necessarily indicative of a departure from the biblical genre however. Amos details the same type of paradigm as Deut. 32, but alters the order to this arrangement: 1.1-2.5=judgment on the nations; 2.6-16=judgment on Israel; 3.1-5.17=word spoken against Israel; 5.18-6.14=exile; 7.1-9.10=visions of retribution; and 9.11-15=Israel's eventual restoration. Compare this to Hosea 4-14, which follows more closely to the outline of Deut. 32.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Viteau's comments fn. 2. I am basing my understanding of this phrase on the notion that those who are righteous are so because their intentions are upright. I develop this idea in the section on the Temple and PssSol below where I link this 'intention' to the Priestly concept of inadvertent and unintentional sins. I suspect that the authors of PssSol took seriously the edict of Ex. 19.6 in which Israel was to be a 'kingdom of priests and a holy nation' and combined that with this understanding of intent.

authors should not be viewed as sectarian along the same lines as the Qumran community.¹¹⁸

11.2—The Conquest of Israel:

Now comes invasion and conquest in Deut. 32.25:

MT: מחור תשכל-חרב ומחדרים אימה

גם-בחרור גם-בתולה יונק עם-אישי שיבב

LXX: ἔξωθεν ἀτεκνώσει αὐτοὺς μάχαιρα, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ταμιείων φόβος νεανίσκος
σὺν παρθένῳ, θηλάζων μετὰ καθεστηκότος πρεσβύτου.

The last of the punishments is that of the sword.¹¹⁹ In this verse, the subjugation of the nation is implicit: punishment by sword equals conquest. This is all the more telling in the light of v.26 (cf. below). In verse 25, the sword is a plague in much the same respect as a famine or attack of beasts, and the ‘surrounding terror’ obviously refers to a siege.¹²⁰ *Sifre* Deuteronomy offers an interesting interpretation of the matter.

According to the rabbis, the sword and the terror it brings will deal with every living being. If one were to be outside the city, he/she would fall victim to the sword itself. If one were to hide indoors, the terror of the sword would cause him/her to have a

¹¹⁸ See the section on Qumran and PssSol below. This is neither to suggest that the PssSol share nothing with Qumran, nor to lessen the sharp contrast between the sinners and righteous in the PssSol. Rather, it is to emphasize that the theology and anthropology of the DS community are not *only* sectarian sentiments, but were held by a wide range of Jews. See Charlotte Hempel *Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society in The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran After Fifty Years* JSP 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 43-53; E.P. Sanders *The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences in The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 7-43; and Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions According to the Dead Sea Scrolls” *Dead Sea Discoveries* v. 8 n. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2001) in which he outlines the perception of the Pharisees in the DSS. To summarize, the nomenclature of the DSS illustrates the extent of the conflicts between Jewish sects in the 2nd Temple Period but is not distinct to any particular group, as Sanders *idem.* 16 states; “...there was a lot in common between the group at Qumran and the rest of Judaism, and even more in common between the Dead Sea sect and the rest of Palestinian Judaism.” Cf. also Jerry O’Dell “Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon” *Revue de Qumran* v. 3 n. 10 (Paris: Letouzey et Ane: 1961) 252; and R. Wright’s useful outline of characteristics of different sects present in the PssSol in “The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes” in *1972 Proceedings of the IOSCS* (SCS 2; ed. Robert A. Kraft; Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).

¹¹⁹ Note Jer. 14 and Amos 9.1, 4 for other examples of the threat of the sword in the OT; cf. also 1QpHab vi.10.

¹²⁰ Note Ez. 5 for another instance of the threat of conquer in the OT.

heart attack.¹²¹ In *Sifre* Deuteronomy 321, the rabbis relate this external/internal punishment to the sins committed externally/internally. The passage is worth quoting at length:

- A) Another interpretation of the phrase, “the sword shall deal death without”:
- B) This refers to what they did in the streets of Jerusalem.
- C) And so Scripture says, “For according to the number of your cities are your gods, O Judah, and according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem have you set up altars to the shameful thing: (Jer. 11.13).
- D) “...as shall the terror within”:
- E) This refers to what they did in the innermost rooms.¹²²

In short, punishment by the sword and the accompanying terror is intended to deal with both public and private sins. For the rabbis, this was an essential characteristic of the punishment. Bearing in mind that the punishment of the sword equals conquest, the sword and terror are both important elements in PssSol. Note two examples:

2.1: Ἐν τῷ ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐν κριῶ κατέβαλε τείχη ὄχυρά
καί οὐκ ἐκώλυσας.

8.5: συνετρίβη ἡ ὀσφύς μου ἀπὸ ἀκοῆς παρελύθη γόνατά μου ἐφοβήθη ἡ
καρδία μου ἐταράχθη τὰ ὀστᾶ μου ὡς λίνον

The siege of Jerusalem in 2.1-2 is predicated on the sins of the ‘sons of Jerusalem’.¹²³ As the authors make clear in 2.3-5 and 8.11-13, these sins are the public desecration of the Temple. But the authors also suggest that some of the sins are of a secretive nature (cf. 4.5-7; 9.3) and that God will, when punishing, ‘expose their sins’ (2.12, 17; 4.7; 8.8). In short, PssSol understands God’s judgment as applicable to both the external and internal transgressions in much the same way as *Sifre* Deuteronomy. What was clear above all else to the rabbis was that the punishments in Deut. 32 fit the crime; they were intended

¹²¹ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 309.

¹²² Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 356.

¹²³ Even more than the conclusion to chapter 1, note the introductory ἀνθ’ ὧν in v. 3, which explains why verses 1 and 2 occurred

to deal first and foremost with the sins of Israel, both public and private. The same attitude towards divine punishment is espoused in PssSol.

Ha'azinu predicates God's judgment on the sins of Israel. Idolatry is specifically mentioned (v. 21). This type of behavior constitutes what Jonathan Klawans has termed 'moral impurity'.¹²⁴ Such behavior is a direct offence against the Temple, imputed miasmally. I suggest that this is precisely what the authors of PssSol envisioned. The 'sons of Jerusalem' had profaned God's Temple. The opening stanza reflects Jerusalem's grief at her children's behavior. The causal relationship between sinfulness and punishment through sword is a common prophetic and apocalyptic theme.¹²⁵

The usage of this terminology in PssSol, precisely within the context of a present punishment for sins, shows the document's specific affinity with *Ha'azinu* and the prophetic paradigm of HB. Furthermore, PssSol 13.2, mentioned above, strengthens these examples by offering an antithesis: the righteous are those who are 'saved from the sword passing through (the land)'.¹²⁶

12—Deut. 32.26—The Dispersion of Israel:

The conclusion of the punishments is the scattering of children of Israel to the nations. This 'final movement' in the process is more often referred to as an event, the Dispersion. Deut. 32.26 details this final catastrophe:

MT: אמרתי אפאיהם אשביתה מאנוש זכרם

LXX: εἶπα Διασπέρω αὐτούς, παύσω δὴ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν.

The translation is accurate in terms of semiotic elements, each Heb. term has a corresponding Gk. term and nothing more. The precision of the term διασπέρω leaves little doubt as to how the translators understood this punishment. The threat of dispersion is first mentioned in Lev. 26.33 and is frequently reiterated in other prophetic and non-

¹²⁴ Jonathan Klawans *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: University Press, 2000) 24-26. Note a fuller discussion of this in the section on the Temple and PssSol below.

¹²⁵ For example, in Isaiah, the invading nation is Assyria; in Jeremiah, the nation is Babylon; in Ezekiel, the nation is Babylon. Many of the Minor Prophets intimate these invasions as well. Also note Hosea 5.13; Joel 1.6f; Amos 3.12f; Zeph. 1.13f.

¹²⁶ Note David R. Catchpole "The Anointed One in Nazareth" in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* JSNT 84 (Marinus C. de Boer eds.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 247 and his discussion of the work of the Jesus in Lk. 4.25-26.

prophetic writings.¹²⁷ Dogniez and Harl can make no sense of the Hebrew term **פְּרָצָה** in the sentence, but state that the Greek term is typical to the context.¹²⁸ In short, LXX envisioned the inevitable outcome of invasion and conquest: Israel dispersed.

PssSol is no less clear in its understanding of the resolution of invasion and conquest. The dispersion and re-gathering of the nation of Israel is discussed in great detail.¹²⁹ Two examples are in order:

9.2: ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ἢ διασπορὰ τοῦ Ἰσραηλ κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δικαιωθῆς, ὁ θεός, ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαις ἡμῶν, ὅτι σὺ κριτὴς δίκαιος ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς τῆς γῆς.

11.2-3:2) στῆθι Ἱερουσαλημ ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἰδὲ τὰ τέκνα σου ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν συνηγμένα εἰς ἅπαξ ὑπὸ κυρίου.

3) ἀπὸ βορρᾶ ἔρχονται τῇ εὐφροσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν, ἐκ νήσων μακρόθεν συνήγαγεν αὐτούς ὁ θεός.

As is evident from these passages, the authors placed great emphasis on the Diaspora, its language and significance. The events that lead to the dispersion are greatly tragic, while the events surrounding the return are immensely joyous. Chapter 9 resonates very closely with the 'letter of confession' in Bar. 1.15-17 and PssSol 11 with the 'letter of assurance' in Baruch 4-5.¹³⁰ One thing is for certain on this matter: punishment in the form of invasion, conquest, plague, and famine is a direct result of the sins of the 'sons of Jerusalem'. The relevant passages in PssSol and Baruch simply restate the reason for such castigation. More than that, however, PssSol and Baruch attempt to produce a sense of hope among the readers/listeners. This hope is predicated on the knowledge that just as the punishments are clearly defined, so too is God's mercy upon those who steadfastly

¹²⁷ E.g., Deut. 4.27; Ps. 147.2; Is. 11.11-12 (Lord will gather the dispersed—cf. also Is. 66.18); Ez. 5.10; Joel 3.2; Micah 4.6-7, 5.3; Zeph. 3.8f; Zech. 7.14. We here call the passages in Deut. and Ps. prophetic because of their content and intention; they are passages dealing with future possibilities.

¹²⁸ Dogniez and Harl *Deuteronomie* 333.

¹²⁹ For the other examples note 2.6, 17; 3.11-12; 7.3; 8.28; 17.12, 18. Chapter 11 is a discussion of this return of Israel in language similar to Is. 51.17-52.12, Zeph. 3.14, and Bar. 4-5. On the theme of 're-gathering' in *Ha'azinu*, see below section 15.

¹³⁰ It could be argued that Baruch used *Ha'azinu* as a template as well. Compare Bar. 4.6 with Deut. 32.17; Bar. 4.11 with Deut. 32.10. This makes H. St. J. Thackeray's comment in *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921) 101f that the recitation of Baruch and PssSol came during the fasts memorializing the destruction of the Temple all the more appealing.

adhere to and maintain the covenant with Moses. The language of the Diaspora is part and parcel to the prophetic paradigm of sins, punishment, forgiveness and redemption, and is evident in both PssSol and *Ha'azinu*.¹³¹

13—Deut. 32.27-42—*The Hubris of the Nation: God's Vengeance and the Eschaton*.¹³²

13.1—*Failure of the Universal Witness*:

Deut. 32.27-35 is best considered as a section. It continues the change in focus for *Ha'azinu* begun in verse 26 away from the sins of Israel to the arrogance of the conquering nation(s). The poem sees a limitation to the extent of the punishment meted out upon Israel. The impetus for God's moderation, however, is not the completion of Israel's rehabilitation, but the hubris of the surrounding and conquering nation(s), and their failure to see that their part in Israel's correction is due to God's providence.¹³³ Note Deut. 32.27:

MT: לולי כעס אויב אגור פן־ינכרו צרימו

פן־יאמרו דינו רמה ולא יהוה פעל כל־זאת

LXX: εἰ μὴ δι' ὀργῆν ἐχθρῶν, ἵνα μὴ μακροχρονίσωσιν, καὶ ἵνα μὴ συνεπίθωνται οἱ ὑπεναντίοι, μὴ εἴπωσιν ἢ χεῖρ ἡμῶν ὑψηλῆ, καὶ οὐχὶ κύριος ἐποίησεν ταῦτα πάντα.

Here, those sent to punish the nation of Israel are rebuked because of their pride. But another element, and likely more important, is at work. Verses 28 and 29 are indicative of a particular response hoped for from the nations. Implicit in the verses is an appeal to common sense; it is only because the Lord chose to punish Israel that the foreign nation

¹³¹ Gordon J. Wenham *Story as Torah* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 49-54 sees this 'paradigm' at work in the Judges cycles. In short, Israel's need for deliverance from enemies is due initially to their disobedience and outright sinfulness. The people eventually 'cry out' to God for help, whereupon he sends a deliver. John Gray *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979) 49-50 has pointed out that Covenant provides a framework for the 'prophet cycle' in the book of Judges is embodied. Also note Peter R. Ackroyd *Continuity* (Oxford Alden Press: 1962) 17-18 who notes that the paradigm of forefathers in Egypt/oppression/deliverance/promised land is replicated throughout Hebrew Bible. Ackroyd 19 also points out that the same prophetic oracle is used book to book in the Major and Minor prophets.

¹³² Although I will not discuss every verse in this section, I have included all of the verses as they discuss the same issue. On the choice of title, cf. Tigay *Deuteronomy* 309.

¹³³ So Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* 280; Tigay *idem*. 309; and von Rad *Deuteronomy* 198. This is a point emphasized by Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* chapter 7.

succeeded in conquering her. Deut. 32.28-29 describe the unwillingness (ignorance?) on the part of the conqueror to acknowledge the God of Israel. In short, the poem seems set on some type of universal appeal wherein the surrounding nations, through the catastrophe in Israel, recognize God's universal sovereignty. As Tigay has pointed out:

The Bible frequently expresses the idea that God would spare Israel to protect His own reputation. "For the sake of His great name, the Lord will never abandon His people" (1 Sam. 12.22). His aim of securing the universal recognition of humanity would be undermined because the other nations, in their foolishness, would not recognize that Israel's defeat is an expression of God's power, not His weakness.¹³⁴

In verse 29, the poem appeals to the nation(s)' wisdom, which is tantamount to a recognition of God's sovereignty over the whole earth.¹³⁵ The nations' refusal to acknowledge God is compared to Israel's failure to abide by the covenant, and the conquerors are eventually punished in the same way as Israel, i.e., with God's 'sword and arrows' (verses 41-42).¹³⁶ But Israel's collapse fails to obtain the acknowledgement of the God on the part of the conquering nation. In fact, the opposite occurs and the nation becomes prideful. An important element, to be discussed in 13.2.1 below, is the non-specificity in Deut. 32. The poem does not suggest any one nation in particular. This type of ambiguity strengthens the assertion that it serves as a paradigmatic example through diachronic re-evaluation. The non-specificity of the 'nation' allows for a timeless re-visitation to the prophecy.¹³⁷

The punishment of the prideful nation is an important theme in PssSol and there are a number of points in which this concept of 'universal witness' is evoked therein.¹³⁸ PssSol 2.25-32 tells of the death of Pompey in Egypt. The narration proceeds as follows: 25: the author adjures the Lord to punish the Gentile invader:

¹³⁴ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 309.

¹³⁵ Some commentaries assert that the 'nation' spoken of in v. 28 is Israel; TO and TN inserts 'Israel' to make sure and the rabbis in *Sifre Deuteronomy* 322 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 358-360) are divided, some suggesting that the passage refers to Israel and some that it refers to the nations of the world. I agree with Dogniez and Harl, in which M. Harl's hypothesis is stated, "...ces versets peuvent décrire l'incompréhension des ennemis," 334. Cf. also Tigay *Deuteronomy* 310; Von Rad *Deuteronomy* 198-199.

¹³⁶ Pss. 96.4-6, 13; 97.3-4, 6; 98.1; 144.6; Ez. 5.16; Zech. 9.14; Joel 3.7-17.

¹³⁷ This prompts Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* 280 to write: 'When YHWH considered termination of Israel, YHWH feared that the watching nations—Egypt? Assyria? Babylon?—would imagine that they themselves had prevailed and defeated not only Israel but the God of Israel'.

¹³⁸ Also note this motif in PssSol 2.10, 32; 8.8; 9.2; 17.31.

μὴ χρονίσης ὁ θεὸς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς εἰς κεφαλὰς τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν τοῦ δράκοντος ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ.

26: soon, the author is shown God's retribution:

καὶ οὐκ ἐχρόνισα εἰς ἐδειξέν μοι ὁ θεὸς τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ ἐκκεκεντήμενον ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων Αἰγύπτου.

27: the punishment is terrible:

τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ διαφερόμενον ἐπὶ κυμάτων ἐν ὕβρει πολλῇ καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ θάπτων ὅτι ἐξουθένωσεν αὐτόν ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ.

28: the reason for the 'dragon's' punishment is not simply his actions against Jerusalem...¹³⁹

29: ...but his claims to deity that set God against him:

εἶπεν Ἐγὼ κύριος γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης ἔσομαι καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνω ὅτι ὁ θεὸς μέγας κραταιὸς ἐν ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ τῇ μεγάλῃ.

Then, in the following 3 verses, the power of the Lord is asserted, which culminates in universal recognition of God's sovereignty in v. 32.

30: αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ κρίνων βασιλεῖς καὶ ἀρχάς.

31: ὁ ἀνιστῶν ἐμέ εἰς δόξαν καὶ κοιμίζων ὑπερηφάνους εἰς ἀπώλειαν αἰῶνος ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ ὅτι οὐκ ἐγνώσαν αὐτόν.

32: Καὶ νῦν ἴδετε οἱ μεγίστανες τῆς γῆς τὸ κρίμα τοῦ κυρίου ὅτι μέγας βασιλεὺς καὶ δίκαιος κρίνων τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν.

In chapter 2, the authors of PssSol seemingly understood the punishment of Israel as two-fold. First, it was a disciplinary step, one in which the people of Israel were to repent and be purified. Secondly, it was a way in which knowledge of the Lord was made universal. Deut. 27-29 ostensibly hold to the same understanding. As a means of solidifying the point, Deut. 32.30 recalls, yet again, Lev. 26 and the famous phrase of one putting a thousand to flight; it is only because the Lord intended the destruction and dispersion of

¹³⁹ In this case the 'dragon' clearly refers to the Gentile conqueror and is, therefore, a negative appellative. It is not always the case, however, that 'dragon' is so considered, note e.g. Mordechai's dream in Greek Esther 10.3 (addition F according to the Cambridge version of NRSV).

Israel that a nation was permitted to conquer her. The use of this theme of the punishment of the nations and universal awareness in PssSol points to the authors' familiarity with Deut. 32 and other prophetic literature.

The paradigm 'punishment of Israel *leading to* pride-of-assailant *leading to* punishment of the nation' in Deut. 32 is replicated in PssSol. PssSol 8.23 relates that God is 'justified' in his judgment of the nations of the earth. Set within the framework of prophecy, the authors of PssSol would clearly have understood this to be the next step in the completion of the paradigm. Foreigners had just conquered Israel (vv. 18-21) in response to the sins of those in charge of the Temple cult (vv.11-13). As such, the punishment of invasion and exile fits the paradigm of prophecy found in HB prophetic works. The punishment of those who invaded, which follows the profanation of the holy things of God (8.22), is further evidence of the same prophetic paradigm at work.

13.2.1—Deut. 32.34-35—*The Punishment of the Nation—Certainty and Uncertainty:*

This subsection of two parts seeks to ascertain the resolution to the punishment of the nations in *Ha'azinu* and PssSol. I suggested briefly above that, in the major prophetic works, the nation used as an instrument to punish Israel is itself to be disciplined for aberrant behavior.¹⁴⁰ In the Prophets, the punishment of a particular nation is sometimes elaborated without a discussion of its role in the divine punishment paradigm, but that nation's past history with Israel would have been well known all the same.¹⁴¹ This feature of the prophetic paradigm is poignantly summed up in Deut. 32.34-35:

¹⁴⁰ This paradigm is also apparent in the Animal Apocalypse, 1 Enoch 85-90. In 1 Enoch 89.14-16 speaks of Israel's sojourn to Egypt and eventual captivity. From there and through Saul (89.42), David (89.45), and Solomon (89.48) the story finally reaches the conquests of Assyria and Babylonia (89.55-68), who do God's will in punishing Israel (89.59-60), but overstep their mandate (89.69-77) and are eventually punished themselves (90.15-19). The final result of all of this is the universal recognition of God's sovereignty through the restored Israel (90.29-38).

¹⁴¹ Cf. Is. 13; 14.3-17.3; 18-21, 23; Jer. 46-51; Ez. 25-32; also note Amos 1-2. This element of interplay within a single document is not always to be found every book from the Minor Prophets. Note, for instance, Hosea, in which the punishment of Israel is detailed, but no reciprocal punishment given upon the nations; cf. 9-10 specifically. While Israel is restored in Hosea 14, no mention is made about the punishment of the nations that one finds in Joel 3 and Amos 1-2. My thoughts center on the notion that the arrangement of individual books function in much the same way as the organization of individual chapters. So Obadiah, Jonah, and Nahum for instance, perform the same function as the aforementioned chapters in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. My lead in this matter is taken from a paper given by Christopher Seitz entitled "Book of the 12" in the OT Seminar, Durham University, Michaelmas Term, 2001, in which he outlined the continuity of the Book of the 12. In summary, the Book of the 12 represents a 'compilatory unit' in which some of its constituent elements cannot be read in isolation without undermining their relevance.

MT: 34) הלא הוא כמס עמדי חתום באוצרתי

35) לי נקם ושלם לעת תמוט רגלם

כי קרוב יום אידם שח עתדת למ

LXX: 34) οὐκ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα συνήκται παρ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐσφράγισται ἐν τοῖς
θησαυροῖς μου

35) ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω ἐν καιρῷ ὅταν σφαλῆ ὁ πούς
αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν καὶ πάρεστιν ἔτοιμα ὑμῖν.

From these two verses, two characteristics of the punishment of the nations emerge. First, that they will be punished is certain. The tenor of verse 35 is that of imminent doom, it is only a matter of time. Secondly, the use of *καιρός* suggests the element of uncertainty noted earlier in reference to the nations. The poem is specific in its assertion that God will act, but is non-specific as to when. Thus the punishment is a futuristic expectation; it is 'eschatological'. Key to the 'eschatological' in *Ha'azinu* is the concept of 'right time', the time when God's judgment will unfold.¹⁴² This unknown, yet planned, element in *Ha'azinu* is important to messianic and eschatological thinking. This element is present in PssSol as well.

13.2.2—The Use of 'καιρός' in PssSol—Messianic Eschatology¹⁴³:

The balance between certainty and uncertainty is present in PssSol 17. The chapter begins by retelling the sins and punishment of Israel (5-20), which precedes the advent of the Messiah. Verse 21 reads:

¹⁴² This is not the same type of 'eschatology' is contained within the collection of literature found at Qumran. Note 1QM 1.5; 4Q174.3-5; 4Q175.9-13; 4Q252.V.1-4; 4Q416^b frag 1.13. All discuss, in one way or another, the events to be. The element of the 'right time', an essential aspect of messianism, is central to 'eschatology'. In the War Scroll, for instance, a certain number of weeks are in order for the dispatching of particular nations. Thus, the temporal element, whether intended to be literal or non-literal, is indicative of an attempt to negotiate the temporal uncertainties intrinsic to eschatological-oriented HB texts, i.e., Deut. 32. James Barr *Biblical Words for Time* (London: SCM Press, 1962) 21-49 provides a summary and overview of the use of *καιρός* in the Bible and argues that *χρόνος* and *καιρός* do not refer to different aspects or types of time. Barr's point is well made but does not find support from PssSol. The two terms are used in different capacities in the document.

¹⁴³ Note here the distinction intimated by Joachim Schaper *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter 26-30* between 'messianism' and 'eschatology', the first being political and the second being personal. To be sure the two are mixed in PssSol, but Schaper's distinction is applicable.

17.21: ἰδὲ κύριε καὶ ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν υἱὸν Δαυιδ εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὃν εἶλου σύ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ παῖδά σου.

This καιρόν, ‘appropriate or right time’, is an indication of the balance between certainty and uncertainty also found in Deut. 32.35. In *Ha’azinu*, the fulfillment of the ‘right time’ is tantamount to the judgment of the nations. So, when the ‘καιρός’ occurs it ushers in the punishment of the nations and salvation of Israel. In PssSol, the first function of the Messiah subsequent to the advent is the judgment of the nations. I maintain that, insofar as the term is understood in *Ha’azinu* as an ‘eschatological’ term, it is also so used in PssSol. As such, it represents a turning point in the narrative of the chapter. The first action taken by the Messiah in 17.22 is telling:

17.22: καὶ ὑπόζωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχὺν τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους καθαρῖσαι Ἱερουσαλημ ἀπὸ ἔθνων καταπατούντων ἐν ἀπωλείᾳ.

The first action undertaken by the Messiah is to purge Jerusalem of the Gentiles.¹⁴⁴ It is known from above that in Deut. 32.34-35, the time of the punishment of the nations is kept as a mystery in the ‘storehouse’ of God. A periphrastic rendering of the narration taken from PssSol 17.21-22 above reads, ‘at the right time, the Messiah will come and punish the nations’. This unknown element, καιρός, present in both *Ha’azinu* and PssSol, invites a messianic interpretation. I suggest that the opacity of *Ha’azinu* on the notion of ‘right time’ is clarified in PssSol by the introduction and discussion of the Messiah and his work. Zeph. 1-3.20 is particularly noteworthy on this point. Chapter 1 concerns God’s advent, wherein He is furious against all sinners. Zeph. 2.1-3.8 then goes on to speak of God asserting His kingship over all other nations. Finally, in Zeph. 3.9-20 God recreates a purified society within Zion. The text from PssSol 17 replicates this basic paradigm with the assertion of God’s kingship (vv. 1 and 46), His coming furiously against all

¹⁴⁴ It must be mentioned that here PssSol seem to be taking part in a tradition that would continue until John’s Apocalypse. That tradition is the use of the phrase first found in Num. 24, ‘a rod shall come out of Israel (and) shatter the leader of Moab’. This phrase was later used in CPs. 2 and then again in Is. 11. Rev. 2 again employs this phrase. It is quite clear that the messianic meaning behind Ps. 2, Is. 11, PssSol 17, and indeed Rev. 2, was first formulated in criticisms of Num. 24. Note Philo, *Vita* i. 290 ἐξελεύσεται πότε ἀνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπικράτησιν πολλῶν ἐθνῶν... cf. Hayward, “Balaam’s Prophecies.”

sinners (vv. 7-9, 22-25), and the creation of a purified people in a purified Jerusalem (vv. 26-34).¹⁴⁵

Evidence of the expansion of ambiguous verses from HB is numerous. For instance, the translation of TO to Deut. 32.5 reflects the efforts of the translators to fill in spaces left undetermined by MT.¹⁴⁶ Another example, this time from LXX, is Num. 24.17. In that verse, MT has Balaam reporting that a 'scepter shall come out of Israel,' but LXX reads a 'man shall come out of Israel.' Balaam's oracle has often been interpreted messianically and eschatologically.¹⁴⁷ While such an alteration found in LXX may add clarity, it also reflects a particular view of the prophecy. The reception of such opaque biblical content often undergoes certain permutations based on historical and psychological matters, alterations often encouraged by a certain level of ambiguity intrinsic to the texts themselves.¹⁴⁸ John J. Collins' comment on the development of the messianic expectation is insightful:

The passages we have considered thus far all have viewed the kingship, however idealized, as a present reality. Only later, when the monarchy no longer existed would they be understood in an eschatological sense, as predictions of a future restoration.¹⁴⁹

If Collins is right, the development of concepts such as messianism does not depend merely on straightforward exegesis, but on the developments in human history. The historical and theological become intertwined. With regard to Deut. 32.34-35, the suggestion may be put forward that the elements mentioned therein, that is, the certain and uncertain elements of retribution and redemption, are found in an expanded form in PssSol. In PssSol, these certain and uncertain elements have been clothed in historical dress.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Eaton *Vision in Worship* 32-33 and his discussion of this passage. Eaton *idem.* 1-39 relates prophecy to psalmody and suggests that liturgical efforts at relating God's sovereignty in the royal Psalms, e.g., 47, 96-99, or autumnal festivals, e.g., CPss. 68, 132, 149, are replicated in the prophetic material in which God comes against the foes of Israel and establishes His kingdom in perpetuity; cf. Hab. 3; Nahum 1.2-7; Is. 40-55; Jer. 46-51; see also Gray *Reign of God* 110.

¹⁴⁶ The lack of clarity invites all types of interpretive efforts. TO on Deut. 32.5 adds a discussion of idols: 'Corruption is theirs, not His; children who worship idols, a generation that changes its work, and has itself become changed'. Note Drazin's comments *Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy* 271.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. fn. 106; 4Q175.9-13.

¹⁴⁸ Having said that, it is important to point out that the reception of a biblical text is a theological enterprise. Note Rast *Tradition History* 29.32.

¹⁴⁹ J.J. Collins *Scepter and Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995) 24.

A link between PssSol and Deut. 32 may therefore be posited. In PssSol, the work (salvation) of the Messiah comes as a result of Israel's sins (apostasy or impurity), punishment, and redemption (17.5-20). This paradigm in PssSol mimics the arrangement in *Ha'azinu*, in which the nations will be punished for their arrogance, subsequent to their service in punishing the nation of Israel for its sins. The insertion of the messianic terminology by the authors of PssSol functions as a conclusion to the process intimated in Deut. 32. In short, the messianic advent in PssSol is a specification of one aspect of the prophet paradigm, only generalized in *Ha'azinu*. The 'right time' event in *Ha'azinu*, i.e., the destruction of the nations, is linked to their failure to recognize the God of Israel. This is a theme strongly emphasized by PssSol as well and fits with the prophetic paradigm. For the authors of PssSol, Israel's sins require punishment, a disciplinary step and in some sense a purifying process. This punishment leads to arrogance on the part of those sent to carry out God's decrees. Due to their arrogance, God then turns his wrath toward the Gentiles (foreign nations) sent to punish Israel. M. de Jonge links the section in PssSol 17.13-14 in which the 'alien' is said to have acted arrogantly to PssSol 2.28-31 and suggests that the arrogance of the nation is what precipitates the eschaton.¹⁵⁰ The judgment that comes upon them is enacted in God's 'right time'. For the authors of PssSol, this 'right time' required a Messiah who would judge the nations, purify Jerusalem and Israel, and establish God's kingdom on earth. This, and not the punishment of Israel, would be the final and lasting universal witness of God's sovereignty (PssSol 17.34-35; 8.23). Thus, the salvation of the Lord came to be embodied in the advent of the Messiah, which signaled the condemnation, destruction, and eventual redemption of the nations (cf. PssSol 17.32-34).¹⁵¹

14—Deut. 32.36—*Mercy of the Lord*:

The conclusion to the comparison between Deut. 32 and PssSol contains the very important and prominent feature of the prophetic paradigm, the mercy of the Lord. This seems to be an often-overlooked element from Deut. 32.36:

MT: כִּי־יִדִין יְהוָה עַמּוֹ וְעַל־עַבְדָּיו יִתְנַחֵם

¹⁵⁰ M. de Jonge "The Psalms of Solomon" in *Outside the Old Testament* CCWJC 4 (M. de Jonge, ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 173.

¹⁵¹ This theological program is evident in 1 Enoch as well.

כִּי יִרְאֶה כִּי־אֲלֵלֵךְ יְדֹאֲפֵס עַצְמוֹ וְעִזְבוֹ

LXX: ὅτι κρινεῖ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δουλοῖς αὐτοῦ
παρακληθήσεται εἶδεν γὰρ παραλελυμένους αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκλελοιπότας ἐν
ἐπαγωγή καὶ παρειμένους

The differences between MT and LXX are of interest, and a few comments are in order. In the strict sense of the definition, LXX tradition is not a literal translation of the MT.¹⁵² The first indication of the free style of the translator is to be found in the usage of the aorist εἶδεν for יִרְאֶה in the 2nd clause. In the first clause, the future tense of the Gk. is used in translating the imperfect form of the Heb. as one might expect. The use of the aorist for the imperfect is, therefore, evidence of a shift. The meaning, however, remains largely unaltered and thus the translation should be considered semantically accurate. Such hair-splitting serves a purpose in this instance. The transition from future to aorist on the part of the translator may indicate the translators' historical disposition. The translators have rendered the Heb. phrase according to a historical analysis: Israel is already dispersed and God has already seen their weakened state.¹⁵³

With the nature of LXX in mind, a few comments on the Heb. text are in order. The verb מִנְחָה is aptly rendered by the future passive form of παρακαλέω. But Brenton's LXX translation 'he (God) shall be comforted over his servants' makes no sense. It is better to understand the Gk. term in light of the Heb. The Heb. verb carries the connotation of pacification. As Tigay suggests: 'Its meaning is to change one's mind or mood, to assuage one's feelings'.¹⁵⁴ But his translation that the Lord '...will take revenge for His servants...' seems to depart from this observation, *hitpael* conjugation notwithstanding. Neusner's translation, 'repent oneself', attempts to approximate the sense of the Heb. without entertaining the concept of 'vindication', but is unfortunately cumbersome. Better is a rendering that combines Tigay's and Neusner's observations, for

¹⁵² Note James Barr, "Literalism" 6-7. Also note fn. 21, 41, 43, and 44 above.

¹⁵³ It seems likely that the translator(s)' particular interest in altering the aspect of the verb was to elicit hope for the future in the readership/listeners. In a liturgical setting such an alteration would have been very significant.

¹⁵⁴ Tigay *Deuteronomy* 312; Milgrom *Numbers* 199 also asserts this position with respect to the *hitpael* form of the verb.

example 'show oneself compassionate.'¹⁵⁵ Clearly the translators detected the implicit suggestion of God's mercy in Heb. text.¹⁵⁶ Such a rendering in the second stich fits nicely with Tigay's suggestion that the Hebrew ׀׀׀ be understood as 'judge in favor of'. In short, God relents because he is compassionate towards his people.

There are a number of references to the mercy of God in PssSol.¹⁵⁷ Note PssSol 2.35:

2.35: καὶ ἐλεῆσαι δίκαιον ἀπὸ ταπεινώσεως ἀμαρτωλοῦ καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἀμαρτωλῶ ἀνθ' ὧν ἐποίησεν δικαίῳ.

The context of chapter 2 has been mentioned above: the foreign invader is sent to punish Israel ('sons of Jerusalem') because of their sins and is, in turn, punished for his hubris. PssSol 2.35 comes at the climax of this paradigm and, in connection with 2.34, represents the permanent stratification of sinners and righteous. PssSol 2.36 follows as explanation of why the Lord separates between the sinners and the righteous:

2.36: ὅτι χρηστός ὁ κύριος τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις αὐτόν ἐν ὑπομονῇ ποιῆσαι κατὰ τὸ ἐλέος αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὀσίοις αὐτοῦ παρεστάναι διὰ παντὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι.

In short, the Lord is merciful towards those who obey him. In 2.36, the central theme is the compassion shown to those who maintain a proper relationship with him. This is the case in Deut. 32.36 in which the compassion of the Lord is on the people in exile, the nation of Israel. This compassion directly follows or is coterminous with the judgment of the nations. For both Deut. 32.36 and PssSol 2.36, the element of the mercy of the Lord is central to the over-arching thesis: the sovereignty of the Lord in history and the truth of his precepts from the Pentateuch.

15—Conclusions:

¹⁵⁵ Note E. Kautzsch and A.E. Cowley eds. *GHG* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1910) 149-150 on the possible uses of the *hitpael*.

¹⁵⁶ So too did the rabbis, cf. *Sifre Deuteronomy* 326 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 370-371).

¹⁵⁷ PssSol 2.36; 4.25; 5.2, 15; 6.6; 7.10; 8.27; 9.8, 11; 10.3, 4, 7; 11.1, 9; 13.12; 15.13; 16.6, 15; 17.3, 34; 18.1, 9.

The above considerations have led me to approach PssSol in a particular manner. The discussions that are to come in the following sections assume the general methodology that governs this approach. For that reason, it is important to establish this approach and methodology clearly and firmly. In addition to summarizing the foregoing, I will briefly review several points not fully covered in this section.

The first point to be made is that PssSol argues a single idea: God's will in the world through His servant Israel. The document begins with the sins of Israel, drawing on past history as an example of a pattern of their disobedience. The authors routinely appeal to the Law of Moses and to God's corrective discipline. The authors 'repeat' key themes, or 'stock concepts' for the audiences to ponder once more.¹⁵⁸ In working their way towards the messianic future, the authors build the foundation of their argument on the pillars of Jewish faith, namely, the Temple and Law of Moses. The 'prophetic paradigm' in HB presents a similar argument by highlighting Israel's sins, punishment, and eventual redemption. According to both Deut. 32 and PssSol, the element of redemption is not limited to Israel alone, but is universally applied. This prophetic paradigm is central to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Malachi. As in Deut. 32.43, it is through Israel that God's redemptive plan will be initiated. In short, the role and actions of Israel in PssSol and *Ha'azinu* define the framework into which the eschaton is placed. It is into this framework that a discussion of messianism in the document must be set. Failure to do so risks misinterpreting the purpose, and indeed significance, of the Messiah for the authors and impinges on the document's continuity.¹⁵⁹

As I have attempted to show, the authors of PssSol used *Ha'azinu* as a template for their discussion of Pompey's invasion and conquest of Jerusalem. The document represents the authors' reaction to the invasion predicated on the authors' interpretation of the prophetic paradigm. A comparison between PssSol and *Ha'azinu* has shown this to be the case, and that the authors' reaction to the event is conditioned by a prophetic understanding of history. This understanding accommodates Israel's punishment as a necessary element in God's corrective nature. Furthermore, for the authors the historical

¹⁵⁸ C.S. Lewis *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (London: Oxford University Press, 1960) 20-23 notes that the replication of stock phrases is a characteristic of textual reproduction among the ancients. This was particularly true with regard to Epic material.

¹⁵⁹ See the section on NT and PssSol below.

calamity of the invasion serves to initiate the process which will ultimately culminate in the redemption and purification of not only Israel, but the entire world (cf. PssSol 17.29-31, 34). With this in mind, PssSol reads as a message of hope, encouraging the readership/listeners to steadfast adherence to the covenant and punctilious maintenance of the purity laws. In the case of PssSol, the historical event gave rise to the theological response. Pompey's invasion, and in particular his entry into the Holy of Holies, led to the theological expenditure of the document. The non-specificity of *Ha'azinu's* narrative lends to the text's constant reinterpretation as a representative of a broader theological program in HB. What I have suggested above is that PssSol represents just this type of re-appropriation. Such an understanding, if accepted, requires that the continuity of PssSol govern the interpretation of individual concepts. The individual themes of Israel, Temple, messianism, are, therefore, subordinate to the document's overall intent: the installation of God's divine plan.

This is precisely the importance of establishing my approach to PssSol in more specific terms. So for instance, the messianic pronouncement in PssSol is the final event of the document's central theme and punctuates the explication of the prophetic paradigm of sin, punishment, arrogance of the nation(s), and their eventual redemption. These are prevalent themes in *Ha'azinu* and are also to be found conspicuously in PssSol. The addition of the 'messianic' in PssSol vis-à-vis *Ha'azinu* is a necessary component to the resolution of the paradigm. Thus, the function of the messianic section in PssSol 17 can only be understood in the light of the HB prophetic paradigm, a point noted by J.J. Collins. Collins' comment, however, leaves the matter underdeveloped. The advent of the Messiah, at least for PssSol, is not simply a case of the absence of the Davidic monarchy. For PssSol, messianism provides the necessary conclusion to the prophetic paradigm, befitting the historical milieu of the Late Hasmonean and Early Roman Era. All other chapters of PssSol serve in the capacity of developing this theological program. A lack of emphasis on the continuity of the document contributes to its dismemberment and endangers its integrity.¹⁶⁰ This raises an important conclusion regarding the continuity of PssSol.

¹⁶⁰ Thus for instance, the socio-political factors of the document, while essential to its interpretation, are not the primary means by which the document may be understood. Furthermore, any socio-political factors

While not altogether irrelevant, the assertion that PssSol is a compilation is of minor significance to the discussion of its intent. That PssSol are modeled on the canonical Psalter detracts neither from its function as a prophetic work nor from its overall continuity. While PssSol do mimic aspects of the CPs the same might be said for Is. 12. It would be misguided, however, to suggest that Is. 12 is in the same genre as CPs to the extent that the text becomes disembodied from the intent of Isaiah as a whole as a prophetic text; to do so would run counter to the continuity of Isaiah.¹⁶¹ In short, Is. 12 serves a purpose in the book of Isaiah as it is, where it is. Such is the limitation of the definition offered by the CPs on both Is. 12 and PssSol.

The continuity of PssSol is further commendable on the prospects of its use in a liturgical setting. The Song of Moses was likely read liturgically as a mnemonic tool for living a life in obedience to the Law of Moses, a point strengthened by the fact that the poem was kept in the Temple.¹⁶² Taking *Ha'azinu* in context within Deuteronomy 31 also strengthens this point.¹⁶³ While the precise nature of the synagogue service during the 2nd Temple Period is by no means certain, it is apparent from the NT that such an organism most likely existed, at least in its infancy, during the 1st century BCE. Lee I. Levine has pointed out that the earliest reference to an independent 'house of prayer' (προσευχή) is

present in the document, i.e. sectarian terminology or catch phrases, are marginalized due to an inability to characterize and rubricate precisely 2nd Temple Period Jewish sects on lexicographical grounds. Note Schiffman, "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions"; as O'Dell "Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon" 252 has pointed out: "The fact, however, that the 'godless' in these psalms cannot possibly be justifiably interpreted as a nomenclature applying only to a definite single oppositional party is not only evident to one who has made a thorough examination of the psalms themselves..." Therefore, while such nomenclature constitutes a socio-political element of PssSol, it cannot carry any determining factor in the interpretation of the fundamental concepts of sin, punishment, holiness, mercy, and redemption in PssSol. Thus the debate of authorship is periphery. Note Mikael Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous*; Robert Wright, "Psalms of Solomon" 641-642; R. Wright "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes".

¹⁶¹ Here I support the efforts of redaction criticism over and against source criticism. While valuable in the search for definite rules about genre, which undoubtedly adds clarity to our understanding of the text, source criticism seems over-confident in our ability to pinpoint the nature of 'genre' in ancient Israel. On this point, note John Barton *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996) 28-29. Modern definitions of 'genre', e.g., poetry and prose distinctions, should not be read anachronistically onto Israelite literature as binding rubrics. Note Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* chapter 2.

¹⁶² Incidentally, this may explain the insertion of the term παιδεύω by LXX. The term may have reinforced the corrective aspect conveyed by the Song, a nuance possibly lost in a strictly literal translation of the Heb. term in a liturgical setting.

¹⁶³ This is precisely how the rabbis employed the text. On several occasions in *Sifre* Deuteronomy, e.g., 313 (Neusner *Sifre to Deuteronomy* 334-336), the appeal to memory often goes to Abraham. The same is true for PssSol at 9.9 and 18.3.

from the 3rd century BCE in Egypt. While this does not insist that the origins of the synagogue as institution must lie in the Ptolemaic era, it suggests that the origins of synagogue roots extend back into this period.¹⁶⁴ The presence of the term 'synagogue' within PssSol, coupled with a date in the mid-first century BCE, suggests further the liturgical nature of PssSol.¹⁶⁵

Regarding PssSol and its possible liturgical usage, we can turn to H. St. John Thackeray's essays on the liturgical usage of the LXX.¹⁶⁶ In his essays, he outlines a possible reading schedule for the fast-days in the months of Ab and Elul in which he includes Baruch and PssSol. According to Thackeray, the LXX functioned as a foundation for Jewish liturgy and worship. His proposal that PssSol was intended to be read in coordination with Baruch and Is. 54 and 60, is an interesting thesis. I agree that PssSol could have been used in a liturgical setting based on the document's overall continuity and the manner in which it reads like a history of Israel. That it seems to have been modeled on texts such as Deut. 32 strengthens this point in the light of the latter's liturgical usage. This 'history' contains sins and punishment, but also looks forward to redemption and the installation of God's rule on earth. As such it is a type of 'proleptic

¹⁶⁴ See Levine *The Ancient Synagogue* 1-41.

¹⁶⁵ PssSol itself mentions the 'synagogues of Israel' in 10.7. This may refer to the 'congregation of Israel' as in Ex. 12.3 and Sir. 46.14. When referring to the congregation of Israel, however, the term is generally singular. In PssSol 10.7, it is plural and likely refers to actual gathering places. Samuel Sandmel *Judaism and Christian Beginnings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978) 35 suggests that 'Synagogue Judaism was already reasonably well developed' prior to the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E; cf. also Joseph Gutmann "Synagogue Origins: Theories and Facts" in *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research BJS* 22 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 3. Gutmann suggests *idem.* 1-7 that evidence for the existence of the synagogue cannot be maintained empirically before the Hasmonean revolt and issues caution regarding Gk. word συναγωγή, suggesting that, initially, the term simply meant the gathering of the people. Also see Gutmann *The Jewish Sanctuary IR* 23:1 (Leiden: Brill, 1983) 1 in which he notes that the synagogue began as the replication of the Temple; Levine *idem.* 2. Donald D. Binder *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* SBL Dissertation Series 169 (Atlanta: SBL, 1999) 92-93 agrees with Gutmann in that the term within LXX or Pseudepigrapha is not made in reference to a particular locale. Binder is surely correct when he refers this observation to PssSol 10.7. John J. Collins *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) 420 points, however, to a potential early use of the term as indicative of a particular place in the Old Greek text of Susanna 28.

¹⁶⁶ While I do not support his blanket statement that the translator(s) of the LXX 'misread and blundered' the translation, I feel that H. St. J. Thackeray's thesis in *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* regarding the liturgical usage of LXX to be very informative on this point; note 16-22 discussing the 'whitewashing' of David's life for readability and the insertion of grammatical reading markers; 41-50 for organization into liturgical framework, discussion of 'catch phrases', and the rendering of Hab. 3 along strictly liturgical lines; and 102-107 for Thackeray's discussion of the usage of Baruch in 102-107. Also note P.N. Franklyn "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon" *JSJ* 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1987) 6 who suggests that it is '...highly plausible that our collection is the liturgical deposit of a worship community...'

apology' intend to instill hope by anticipating the coming redemption explicit in certain prophetic text from HB. Though not unique to prophecy, one of its characteristics, as discussed above, is that it appeals to memory. More than that, prophecy was itself a mnemonic tool, ensconcing timeless theological insights in historically based narratives.¹⁶⁷

I have stated that PssSol is a re-appropriation of *Ha'azinu* in light of contemporary historical events. Dogniez and Harl propose that Is. 1 and 2 was the *haftarah* reading for Deut. 32. Should such be the case, then the liturgical association of Isaiah 1 and 2 with Deut. 32, linking the end of the Pentateuch with the beginning of the Major Prophets, and Thackeray's work regarding the association of PssSol 11 with Is. 54, 60, 61, and 62, would present an attractive thesis, one that would connect PssSol to some of the greatest and most respected prophetic texts all set within a liturgical context. Regrettably, such a thesis wants for definitive proof. That a liturgical framework existed is evident, but the precise nature of that framework is, however, lost to us. Along these lines, it is important to comment on the attribution of this document to Solomon. Clearly, as many have noted, the document resonates with the canonical Psalter. In the literature of the 2nd Temple Period, however, Solomon became most popularly known as an exorcist.¹⁶⁸ Yet, exorcistic language is absent from PssSol, and it may suggest another aspect of Solomon's characteristics. In the light of my thesis, it could be that Solomon was also considered a type of prophet. As many later authors portrayed Solomon as a prophet or being prophetically gifted¹⁶⁹ it may be that PssSol represents an early example of his perceived prophetic characteristic.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁷ This is also true for the NT; note John's Apocalypse. R.E. Clements *Prophecy and Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975) chapter 4 suggests that one aspect of the prophet's 'role' is the continuation of Moses' work of conveying the Law to God's people. As such, the role of the prophets was to re-appropriate legal material to a contemporary audience.

¹⁶⁸ Josephus *Ant.* 8.2.5; Michael E. Stone "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha" in *Biblical Archaeology Today* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993) 383-390. Very little has been done on the significance of Solomon's name in Pseudepigraphic literature. Cf. fn. 108.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. e.g., Targum to Song of Songs 1.1; 1.17; 7.2, 7.7; 8.5, 8.12, 8.13; Philo *De Congressu* 177; Josephus *Antiquities* 8.125-126 and 8.197; *Exodus Rabbah* 30.9 in which material from Song of Songs 1.2 is used to clarify the giving of the Law; see also *Exodus Rabbah* 29.9. A section of *Exodus Rabbah* 29.4 reads: '...for when they came to Sinai and God revealed Himself to them, their souls fled because He spoke with them, as it says, *My soul failed me when He spoke* (S.S. 5.6)'. *Canticles Rabbah* 1.2.1-5 supports this observation resoundingly. Note a selection from 1.2.2 regarding the verse *He kissed me with the kisses of His mouth*: 'The Rabbis, however, say that Israel heard all the commandments from the mouth of the Holy One, blessed be He'. Philip S. Alexander *Targum of Canticles* in Martin McNamara, Michael Maher, and Kevin

Finally, then, J. Viteau's conclusion that PssSol, '*...ne suivait ni l'ordre logique ni l'ordre chronologique*' is found inaccurate on several counts.¹⁷¹ A 'logical order' is dependent upon the expectation of the document with respect to its particular intent. If the document were understood as being 'cobbled together' out of largely unrelated theological styles and themes, then Viteau would be right. But Viteau is not right. It is clear that PssSol employed the prophetic paradigm, evident in *Ha'azinu*, as a model for its interpretation of history. If understood from this standpoint, then continuity and a logical order are not only possible, but are to be expected. In this introductory section, I have pursued the study along the lines of one feature of classical, biblical literary criticism by approaching PssSol as having used an older template to construct a response to history.¹⁷² But this is not the only manner in which the document ought to be discussed. Having assessed its thematic intent, it is appropriate now to turn to the document's literary form (from the standpoint of non-biblical literary criticism) and to probe the issue of genre.

Cathcart eds. *The Aramaic Bible* vol. 17a (London: T and T Clark, 2003) 14-18 has noted that Targum to Song of Songs repeats cycles of communion with God, sin, punishment, repentance, and redemption not unlike that which is present in PssSol.

¹⁷⁰ Odes of Solomon is one of the earliest explicit sources portraying Solomon as a prophet. Many of the captions contain προφητεύω in reference to Solomon's words in the composition. I have argued this point more fully in a paper to be read at the International convention of the Society of Biblical Literature in Groningen, The Netherlands July 22-26, 2004. Cf. H.E. Ryle and M.R. James *Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly called Psalms of Solomon* (Cambridge: University Press, 1891) Appendix 156-159; James H. Charlesworth, ed. and trans. *Odes of Solomon* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977) 1. An understanding of Solomon as prophet suggests that the individual chapter headings are intentional and instructive.

¹⁷¹ J. Viteau *Psaumes de Solomon* 94.

¹⁷² This is not the only avenue of biblical literary criticism, which looks to assign date, author, and place as much as anything else to be sure, but a feature of that school that affords useful and needed insights into the nature of PssSol. Note Barton's discussion of literary criticism in *Reading the Old Testament* 20-25.

The Psalms, Literary Genre and Poetics:

A Question of Purpose

1—Introduction:

It is safe to say that very little work has been done to critique the long-standing observation that PssSol rely solely on the CPss in form and content.¹ I doubt that this is due to the difficult nature of the text of PssSol or to the complexities associated with an application of literary criticism to the text. Nonetheless, it is a study that has been long neglected and, in light of the foregoing section in which the overall unity of the content of the compilation has been discussed, such an assessment now seems appropriate. This is to say, any attempt at interpreting the document in the light of its thematic intent, i.e., the theological program outlined in chapter 1, demands that the literary form also be closely assessed. On this note I would like to start this section with a quotation from Robert Alter's *The Art of Biblical Poetry*:

The artifice of form, in other words, becomes a particular way of conceiving relations and defining linkages, sequence, and hierarchies in the reality to which the poet addresses himself.²

The definition of literary genre that I will be following in this section is the 'artifice of form' of which Alter speaks. Literary genre is, simply put, the mold into which the content of a particular document is placed. Thus, the rubric 'literary genre' is to be kept distinct from the type of literature that is produced, i.e., prophetic, historical, apocalyptic, etc. These latter categories I consider to be thematic, rather than literary, forms. Therefore, in addition to being a 'prophetic' text (thematic form), the PssSol is also a 'poetic' text (literary form). It is important to remember, however, that as a vehicle by which the prophecy is delivered, poetry contributes to the intent of the author. That is to say literary expression and thematic content are indivisible in the final analysis. In her

¹ Joseph L. Trafton "The Bible, The Psalms of Solomon, and Qumran" paper read in *The 2nd Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Nov. 9-12, 1997) and James H. Charlesworth "Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers (ca. 167 B.C.E.- 135 C.E.)," *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* as found in *The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters II*. (R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nicklesburg eds.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 422 are, to my knowledge, the only published examples in which the poetic nature of the document is questioned.

² Robert Alter *The Art of Biblical Poetry* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1984) 62. Also note S.E. Gillingham *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: University Press, 1994) 1-12.

study on the Hodayot Hymn texts from Qumran, Bonnie Kittel remarks of poetic analysis:

Such analysis helps to solve textual problems; it enables us to understand the focus of a poem far better than line-by-line commentaries. Most of all, poetic analysis deepens appreciation for the poet at work, the range of his imagery, the subtlety of his expressions, the depth of his insights.³

In the following assessment of the document, I will operate with a literary critical model in which I distinguish the *literary* form used by the authors from the *thematic* content of the document. I think this procedure will be justified, as it will prove useful to examine each 'form' on its own, and then assimilate the two categories in the light of their separate examination.

In the following section I will examine the nature of the Gk. text of PssSol with an eye to its literary form. To this end, I will first explicate my understanding of the term 'genre'. Following that, I will give a short introduction to the nature of poetry as a creative enterprise. Having set down my understanding of both genre and poetry, I will turn to PssSol and examine the presence of poetic elements therein. Implicit in this type of undertaking is an interest in the type of content that the poet wished to convey. This dovetails with the observation that literary form and thematic content are symbiotic rubrics. Thus, in the course of this section I will naturally follow the course of the poetry and the content that the authors wish to reinforce through that medium. The constraints of space prohibit an examination of the entire document, so I have selected three test chapters. Before this, however, the question of genre must be discussed.

2.1—*The Question of Genre: Two Types:*

Generally, the classification of a document as a particular type of genre elicits certain expectations of the document. If a document is called 'prophetic' one learns to look for key phrases or concepts that 'fit' with the prophetic mold; if a 'wisdom' text, one looks for 'wisdom' elements, and so on. But in looking for *elements* that are associated with a particular genre, one often presupposes that 'genre' means thematic content.⁴ As

³ Bonnie Kittel *The Hymns of Qumran* SBL Dissertation Series 50 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 173.

⁴ No doubt, this confusion led Robert Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon," in *OTP* 642-643 to suggest that, in terms of genre, the PssSol reflects 'apocalyptic messianism' and is a 'literature of crisis,' both of which are thematic, and not literary, elements in the PssSol. I think that this reflects a failure to assess the

Alter has demonstrated, however, literary form is vital to understanding the intent of the author and, therefore, interpretation.⁵

It follows from a discussion of the interplay between the thematic and literary forms of a particular text that a working classification of genre must be supplied. Generally, the classification of a document as a particular type of genre elicits certain expectations of the document. So, in prophetic texts such as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets, one looks for elements that indicate the *prophetic response* to history. For instance, Isaiah 1-12 intermingles severe judgment for sin (1, 2.6-3, 5, 8.1-10, 9.8-10.11) with God's merciful provision (7, 9.1-7, 11) and profound hope (2.1-5, 10.20-34) ensconcing Isaiah's call (6) within this structure and concluding with a Song of Praise (12). Jeremiah uses a different pattern to introduce and critique Israel's sin. First comes Jeremiah's call (1), then a discussion of Israel's sins (2-3). Chapter 4.1-4 promotes hope in repentance, but 4.5-31 tells of the disaster of invasion. It is not until chapter 30 that the restoration of Israel is iterated, and the portion of praise (33.11) is noticeably slight by comparison with Isaiah. Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah follow much the same pattern of the prophet's call couched within a series of pronouncements of God's wrath and love for Israel and Judah. It will be noticed, however, that the term 'prophetic' is indicative of the content of the document, its particular view of history, or its response to certain elements such as sin or punishment. But these characteristics are not examples of the literary form used by the authors to convey their message. So, the label 'prophetic' constitutes only one type of genre rubric, i.e., the thematic.

A counterpoint to the prophetic that illustrates this point of thematic expectations is a comparison of the prophetic with sapiential material from HB. Wisdom literature, like prophetic literature, is considered divinely inspired, as the reference to Wisdom as one of God's own confidants ensures.⁶ While sin, purity, and righteousness are key elements within wisdom material, the nature of the genre itself is to present these categories in axiomatic fashion for practical application. The bulk of the wisdom material

document's poetic nature, which often leads to the conclusion that the text is obscure, fragmented, and therefore a haphazard composite.

⁵ So also J. Barton *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996) 8-19 makes this very point in his assessment of genre and 'literary competence'.

⁶ A.S. Herbert "Wisdom" in *Dictionary of the Bible Revised Edition* (F.C. Grant and H.H. Rowley eds.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963) 1039. Cf. also C.H. Toy "Proverbs" in *The International Critical Commentary Series* (S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C.A. Briggs eds.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1959) xff.

in HB pertains to instruction in practical terms. As Richard J. Clifford has suggested in commenting on Proverbs, 'The purpose of the book is thus to make its hearers wise, that is, to live successfully, without undue trouble, which means living in 'fear of the Lord'...' ⁷ Thus wisdom material represents a different type of thematic outlay. Its interests are the practical application of prudence, and to suggest that adherence to the Law leads to a life of relative ease. Prophetic material, on the other hand, is a response to historical events that attempts to vindicate the events in light of God's covenantal promises. ⁸

The other type of genre, of which this study is primarily concerned, is that of literary form. ⁹ Literary form consists of the manner in which the thematic content is conveyed. One such literary matrix is poetry. It has been oft noted that poetic devices engender particular responses to the content. ¹⁰ Both Alter and Fisch have suggested that poetry is the primary medium used in the prophetic works to convey the message because poetry encourages diachronic reevaluation. ¹¹ But their suggestion also highlights the distinction between content and form, between the historical, actual event and the timeless, archetypal response. Poetry's proclivity to the timeless is what makes it so suitable to prophecy, the very nature of which is the projection of the historical and actual onto the timeless and universal. In many ways, poetry is prophecy's *sine qua non*. As I hope to demonstrate below, PssSol's use of poetic elements, coupled with the fact that it is a *response* to a historical event, strongly suggest that it was intended to function as 'divine speech' in much the same way as biblical prophecy.

⁷ Richard J. Clifford *The Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998) 45.

⁸ Shailer Mathews "Pseudepigrapha" revised by Bruce M. Metzger in *Dictionary of the Bible* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963) 821.

⁹ H. C. Brichto *Towards a Grammar of Biblical Poetics* (Oxford: OUP, 1992) 21-27 presents a particularly disheartening outlook on genre classification. In short, he suggests that genre is largely unsystematisable. Brichto's caution, I think, applies more to the category of the thematic rather than literary form and is well worth heeding. That is to say, Brichto's warns against the simply view that genres have well defined boundaries and distinct descriptive categories.

¹⁰ Gillingham *op. cit.* 23; Alter *Art of Biblical Poetry* 144-162 offers a masterful study of the relationship between poetry and message, i.e., form and content. Much of the impetus for my examination of PssSol along literary lines is drawn from Alter's fine work. Cf. also Harold Fisch *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988) 136ff; Wilfred G.E. Watson *Classical Hebrew Poetry* JSOT 26 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) 66-67. Barton *Reading the Old Testament* 8-19 discusses the interaction between content and literary form and states (p.18), '...meaning depends on genre'.

¹¹ Alter *idem.* 137ff and Fisch *idem.* 58-67.

2.2—Poetry as a Creative Enterprise

Poetry has long been a favorite medium by which information is given. G.S. Kirk's discussion of Homeric poetry leaves little doubt that Homeric poetry influenced the religious and social structure of the target community to a great degree.¹² Bernard Knox, in his commentary on Sophocles' *Oedipus Turranos*, offers this insight:

Oedipus the King is a dramatic embodiment of the creative vigor and intellectual daring of the fifth-century Athenian spirit.¹³

Knox's insights into Sophocles' work, namely that it creates a metaphor through which the audience might work through a particular problem (in this case Athenian self-destructive disregard for tradition and religion in the late 5th century BCE), are helpful in understanding poetry in general. Poetry prompts the listener or reader to ponder social, religious, and political events or problems by condensing or restating the issue in terse, formulaic or metaphorical ways.¹⁴ The reader is then invited to engage with the issue once more by carefully following the semantic and semiotic relationships developed by the poem or narrative. So, an important facet of poetry is its ability to create awareness of a particular problem through oblique and metaphorical language.¹⁵ This is particularly true if we consider the nature of speech in the ancient world. Timo Eskola, summarizing Roman Jakobson's insights into communication theory, has noted the effect of speech in matters of discourse in these words:

¹² G.S. Kirk *Homer and the Epic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) 91-101, 192-197; cf. also Martha C. Nussbaum *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990) 23; also note Gordon J. Wenham's *Story as Torah* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) 5-16 (following quotation from 14) position in which he suggests that the stories in the Old Testament are diachronically geared and 'seldom contain explicit moral judgements, but much more often leave the events to speak for themselves, thereby encouraging the reader to reflect on and relate past events to him- or herself in the present.'

¹³ Sophocles' *Oedipus Turranos* trans. by Robert Fagles, notes by Bernard Knox (New York: Penguin Books, 1982) 140.

¹⁴ On the nature of 'discourse' and its purpose, see Timo Eskola's *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 2001) 17-29; Harold Fisch *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988) 60-61; Alter *Biblical Poetry* 138-141.

¹⁵ Regarding the use of poetry for prophetic discourse, Alter *Biblical Poetry* 138 suggests that prophetic pronouncements were more readily received through the medium of poetry.

...he (Jakobson) considered the text a result of a speech event and studied it as an act of communication. All communication consists of a *message* initiated by an *addresser*, whose destination is an *addressee*.¹⁶

Speech is a means whereby a message is communicated to an audience. Thus, three elements, the message, the speaker, and the listener, are involved in the process of communication. The loss of any one of these elements results in the breakdown of the system.¹⁷ Speaking, or the act of preserving 'speech' in the case of written material, involves the use of phrases, terms, and structure that best convey a message (content) from the speaker (addresser) to the listener (addressee). Alter has noted that the divine discourse of the biblical prophets takes on the aspect of 'divine speech,' to which the use of poetic devices is indispensable.¹⁸ In short, poetic devices function to help 'create' a response to an event or a way of thinking that invests the listener with personal responsibility to the story.

With respect to this 'creative ability', biblical poetry is no different. In his helpful discussion, Alter states:

Poetry...is not just a set of techniques for saying impressively what could be said otherwise. Rather, it is a particular way of imagining the world—particular in the double sense that poetry as such has its own logic, its own ways of making connections and engendering implications, and because each system of poetry has certain distinctive semantic thrusts that follow the momentum of its formal dispositions and habits of expression.¹⁹

Overall, Alter concludes that the medium of poetry is as relevant to the meaning of a particular passage as the content itself because it adds elements of human emotion, namely, surprise, grief, joy, suspense, etc., to the overall intent of a document.²⁰ These human elements hold the audiences' attention and create personal reactions to the content of the poem.

Two such poetic devices, which Alter refers to, are 'specification' and 'intensification'. He defines these two categories as follows:

¹⁶ Timo Eskola *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 2001) 32.

¹⁷ Eskola *ibid.* 32.

¹⁸ Alter *op. cit.* 141.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 151.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 62-67.

In the case of biblical poetry, the two basic operations of specification and heightening within the parallelistic line lead to an incipiently narrative structure of minute concatenation, on the one hand, and to a climactic structure of thematic intensifications, on the other hand.²¹

In short, as poetic elements, specification and intensification function together to solidify the narrative as well as to heighten interest and tension within the particular selection. These elements of 'heightening' and 'specification' serve to draw the reader into the discourse and promote an engagement with the issues deemed relevant to the author. But these poetic devices are not limited to individual stichs and cola.²² On the contrary, these poetic elements often direct the course of entire documents. Harold Fisch notes Alter's insights and incorporates them into his assessment of biblical poetry:

There is a 'dynamic movement' from one half-verse to the next; parallelism is not merely the rhyming or echoing of the same idea but involves intensification, a mounting passion, as the idea or perception is carried forward incrementally. But this principle does not only apply to the movement from verse to verse; as we saw in relation to the Song of Solomon, it may be said to govern large poetic structures. There the 'plot' advances purposefully even as it stays with a number of central dream motifs.²³

Thus, Fisch points out that these poetic devices operate on a large scale (macro) as well as on a small scale (micro) within biblical poetry. The key in Fisch's comment is his suggestion that biblical poetry contains a 'plot' that 'advances purposefully.' In spite of a highly developed structure of versification in which metaphor, verbal ellipsis, and non-literal, a-chronological language abound, biblical poetics are able to maintain a general flow of narrative from one point (introduction) to a final point (conclusion).²⁴

In point of fact, these poetic anomalies are what allow the poet to compose or edit a document that comments on historical realities without being constrained by temporal institutions. This is best accomplished by the use of poetic devices such as a-historical

²¹ Alter *op. cit.* 11-23, and all of ch. 3.

²² I use these terms as defined by Watson *op. cit.* 11-15.

²³ Fisch *op. cit.* 136-137.

²⁴ With respect to the concept of the metaphor, Eskola *Messiah and the Throne* 26 states, '...one is inclined to think that the meaning of metaphorical expression exceeds the limits of the meaning of the exploited image, the vehicle'. In this respect, metaphor can be a confusing literary device. Watson *Hebrew Poetry* 18 in regard to literary criticism of a Hebrew poem states: 'Each time, the text must be read through *completely*. The poem must always be considered as a whole, even in the process of detailed analysis, since this acts as a check against excess...'

metaphors and subtle turns-of-phrase. In so doing, historical conflagrations are projected upon an a-historical canvass, to be used later again and again. Alter suggests that this is an element of poetry in general:

What I would like to suggest about the effect of the language of poetry in this and most other biblical prophecies is that it tends to lift the utterances to a second power of signification, aligning statements that are addressed to a concrete historical situation with an archetypal horizon.²⁵

To achieve this, the biblical poet must link together the different concepts through 'minute concatenation'. Biblical poetry is, therefore, a mode of expression whereby the central theme or intent of a particular section (concrete historical, religious, or social commentary) is mediated through graduating steps of intensification or specification (non-literal, elided, metaphorical, a-historical language). Eskola, in laying the foundation for his study of Merkabah mysticism, discusses the symbolic and metaphorical world in these terms:

The theological scene is built up by using different metaphors that enable the writer to express his message perfectly.²⁶

In this respect, poetic versification functions as a key element in the transmission of content and occurs both on the level of the individual stich and the over the course of the entire selection.²⁷ The aim, however, is not a literal representation but a series of heightening, often stark, phrases that lead the reader to examine, or re-examine, a particular point.²⁸ Kirk has noted this element in poetry in general and Homeric poetry specifically:

Thus the possible discrepancy between individual case and generalizing description does not detract from the Homeric poetry; on the contrary it confers a special 'archaic' directness, a powerful starkness, that more than compensates for a sacrifice of the literal realism to which, in any case, poetry cannot properly aspire.²⁹

²⁵ Alter *Biblical Poetry* 146. This is precisely the manner in which John Barton *Oracles of God* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984) 95 suggests that texts such as Jubilees, Daniel and Isaiah were read by Jews of the 1st centuries BCE and CE.

²⁶ Eskola *Messiah and the Throne* 28.

²⁷ *Ibid.* 62-68;

²⁸ This Rast's point with regard to the use and reuse of tradition in the biblical text. The 'exodus typology,' as Rast terms it, appears in 2nd Isaiah but with a different shape, one conditioned by the exile and hopeful for the redemption of Israel; cf. Rast *Tradition History* 63-68.

²⁹ Kirk *Homer and the Epic* 17.

Alter's and Fisch's insights into biblical poetry in this respect provide us with a framework by which to approach the PssSol. If the elements of 'intensification' and 'specification' can be shown to exist in the PssSol in a manner similar to other biblical poetry, this will contribute to the overall assessment of the individual elements within the document, e.g., sinners, righteous, messianism. To do this, I will be following from Alter and Fisch in their conclusions with respect to biblical poetry and then applying their insights to PssSol. I also hope to emphasize Kirk's point. If poetry in general does not attempt a literal reproduction, and PssSol is a poetic text, then the intent of the document may not lie in its literal, historical memory, but in the elements upon which it focuses its historical experience.

3—*The Psalms of Solomon as a Poetic Document:*

What I will attempt to do in the following section is give examples of the poetic elements in the PssSol of which I have previously spoken in order to gauge the nature of PssSol's literary genre.³⁰ To do this I will present the whole of selected chapters from the PssSol and offer an annotated version of the Greek text. I will include a verse or two from foregoing and following chapters where pertinent and possible to demonstrate intra-chapter concatenation. My hope is to show that the document is a finely wrought *and* continuous poem, with each chapter directly related to the whole. My annotations are designed to help the reader see the more subtle poetic elements. By highlighting these elements, I hope to demonstrate that the document has been carefully constructed. To do this, I have used underlines, italics and parentheses to give examples of poetic devices such as intensification and specification.³¹ Following the Greek text of each chapter, I will offer some commentary on the structure of the chapter in the light of its poetic elements.

³⁰ Although 'poetic criticism' of this type is a modern entity, it is simply, like a grammar, a modern dissection of existing categories. Dr. Scott J. Masson has brought this to my attention in a private conversation at the University of Durham.

³¹ The use of parentheses, underlines, and italics is designed to show related, i.e., repeated, elided, elements between lines, stichs, cola, and sections. Included in these categories are particular poetic tools such as ellipsis, complementarity, synonymity, and antithesis.

3.1—Chapter 1

- 1:1 ἐβόησα πρὸς κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με εἰς τέλος
(ἐβόησα) πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ ἐπιθέσθαι ἀμαρτωλούς
- 2 ἐξάπινα ἤκούσθη κραυγὴ πολέμου ἐνώπιόν μου
ἐπακούσεται μου ὅτι ἐπλήσθην δικαιοσύνης
- 3 ἐλογισάμην ἐν καρδίᾳ μου ὅτι ἐπλήσθην δικαιοσύνης
(ἐλογισάμην) ἐν τῷ εὐθηνῆσαί με καὶ πολλὴν γενέσθαι ἐν τέκνοις (ὅτι ἐπλήσθην δικαιοσύνης)
- 4 ὁ πλοῦτος αὐτῶν διεδόθη εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν
καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν (διεδόθη) ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς
- 5 ὑψώθησαν ἕως τῶν ἄστρον
εἶπαν οὐ μὴ πέσωσιν
- 6 καὶ ἐξύβρισαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς (cf. 8b) αὐτῶν
καὶ οὐκ ἤνεγκαν (ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτῶν)³²
- 7 αἱ ἀμαρτίαι αὐτῶν ἐν ἀποκρύφοις
καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν (τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν the first element in 7a repeated)
- 8 αἱ ἀνομίαι αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ πρὸ αὐτῶν ἔθνη
ἐβεβήλωσαν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου (cf. 6a) ἐν βεβηλώσει

[ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμων περὶ Ἱερουσαλημ]

- 2:1 ἐν τῷ ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι (cf. 2.2b) τὸν ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐν κριῶ κατέβαλε τείχη ὄχυρά
καὶ οὐκ ἐκώλυσας

³² This refers to offerings, cf. Ps. 64.5 (LXX) and reference to Lev. 5.6 for example.

2 *ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριόν σου ἔθνη ἀλλότρια*
κατεπατοῦσαν ἐν ὑποδήμασιν αὐτῶν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ (cf. 2.1a)

3 *ἀνθ' ὧν (reason for 1-2...) οἱ υἱοὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἐμίαναν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου*
ἐβεβηλοῦσαν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀνομίαις

Verse one begins the examination of the poetic elements in the PssSol. I have used the parentheses to set off what I feel to be elided elements. In the first verse, it is clear that ἐβόησα is to be carried over from the first stich into the second.³³ Ellipsis of this type occurs again in vv. 3, 4, 6, and 7, the most striking of which is v. 6. A very literal translation of this verse is as follows:

And they were hubristic with their good things/prosperity
And they did not carry ...

We are not explicitly told what the hubristic ones ‘did not carry’. If we understand this verse as another example of elided parallelism, then the phrase that is missing is ‘their good things/prosperity—τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτῶν’. The second stich would then read, ‘and they did not carry/bring their good things/prosperity’. R. Wright has suggested that the second stich is to be rendered ‘and they did not acknowledge (God)’.³⁴ Unfortunately, this translation ignores any poetic parallelism in the bicolon. If my suggestion is accepted, then the verb ἤνεγκεν is perfectly acceptable for the following reason.

The Greek verb φέρω is routinely used by LXX to render the Hebrew *hiphil* form of נָשָׂא in reference to sacrificial offerings (e.g., Lev. 5.6; 15.29; Num. 6.10). Thus in the bicolon of v. 6, the idea presented by the author is that the sinful inhabitants of Jerusalem

³³ On ellipsis cf. Watson *Hebrew Poetry* 303-306, 153-155; Alter *Biblical Poetry* 23 suggests that ellipsis occurs to introduce ‘an increment of meaning.’

³⁴ Robert Wright “Psalms of Solomon” *OTP* 651; no better is Ryle and James 5 ‘But they waxed haughty in their prosperity, and were not able to endure.’ J. Viteau *Psaumes de Salomon* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1911) 255 suggested ‘they in no way supported,’ which conceptually may have been closer to the meaning intended by the author. Kenneth Atkinson *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon Pseudepigrapha* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001) 9, 18-19 rightly asserts the translation ‘and they became insolent in their prosperity and did not bring (gifts),’ but suggests in his commentary that the direct object in the second stich was “...inadvertently omitted by a scribe early in the text’s history since all the extant Greek manuscripts contain ‘they did not bring.’” This explanation is unnecessarily complex in the light of the poetic structure of the document.

are withholding their wealth (ἀγαθος) and refusing to bring (φέρω) their offerings to the Lord. This is in direct contravention to the Law of Moses at Ex. 22.28f (cf. especially Deut. 26.11 and the provision given to the Levites). The Israelites are required by the Law of Moses to render a portion of their wealth to the Lord at the Temple. Leviticus 27.30 is instruction to the community of Israel with regard to presenting a tenth of all produce, whether of the land or livestock. Neither LXX nor *Targumim* present any alteration in this respect, suggesting that the notion of tithing (מעשר) was still intact to some degree through the Second Temple Period. Thus, the issue for the author of chapter one seems to be the failure of the sinful lot of Jerusalem to present the prescribed tithe at the Temple. It is important to remember that the Levitical narrative is keen to point out that this tithe is ‘holy to God’—קדש ליהוה. As such, to withhold this offering is a grave offense, tantamount to a moral impurity. Wright’s translation and the suggestion that the text reflects a ‘scribal error’ are necessary only if the text itself can offer no other solution. In this case, elided parallelism does offer a viable solution to the seemingly enigmatic verb ἤνεγκεν.

Ellipsis of this type helps to draw the reader into the narrative by intensifying the text.³⁵ Instead of passively listening to a ‘story,’ the reader actively ‘fills in the blanks’ of the narrative. Alter discusses intensification through repetition in his assessment of biblical passages such as Amos 8.9-10,³⁶ Job 3.3-26,³⁷ and Fisch in his examination of Ps. 63.5b-7 and 13.³⁸ By allowing certain elements from the first stich to govern the objects of the second, the author of chapter one effectively draws the reader away from an objective interaction with the text. Instead, the reader is invited to engage and wrestle with the concepts of the text. Insofar as chapter one functions as a thematic introduction to the corpus, I suggest that this poetic technique of engagement through intensification is also intended to introduce the reader to the coming narrative; the reader is invited to interact personally with what follows.

³⁵ Roman Jakobson and Morris Halle *Fundamentals of Language* (New York: Mouton Publishers, 1980) 16 also point out that a feature of ellipsis, in this case on the sematic level, is that the meaning of the sentence is readily understood in all its explicitness by the listener.

³⁶ Alter *Biblical Poetry* 73.

³⁷ *Ibid.* 76-77.

³⁸ Fisch *op. cit.* 108-109; both Alter and Fisch do not note ellipsis in these instances, but Alter defines ellipsis as a type of intensification 7, 25. Also note Watson *op. cit.* 174-175 and 303-304 on Ps. 100.

Verse two also introduces an interesting poetic device that I have termed 'misplaced discourse.'³⁹ In v.2, the author as Jerusalem says that he has heard a 'cry of war.' In the second stich, the 'cry of war' is heard and says something rather bizarre: 'He will hear me for I am full of righteousness.' While the reader may suspect that the 'cry of war' would either be one calling for destruction, or one from Jerusalem calling for protection, the outburst that is presented to us by the authors is puzzling. Clearly from vv. 3-4, it is Jerusalem that is speaking in the second stich of v. 2 and not the 'cry of war.' Yet the combination of the two stichs in v. 2 produces a tension. This tension comes as a result of the author associating the conquest of Jerusalem with righteousness. In many respects, this 'misplaced discourse' is much like the Psalms of lament from the Hebrew Bible. As a general rule in the Psalms of lament, the Psalmist offers thanks to God for what W.H. Bellinger Jr. calls the 'certainty of hearing.'⁴⁰ In the tenor of these Psalms of lament, giving thanks seems out-of-place. The result, however, of placing thanks within a Psalm of lament is the production of a particular religious view: the assurance that God will answer the suppliant. Thus, 'misplaced discourse' helps to create a tension through which the readership is invited to engage a particular religious viewpoint through seeming discrepancies and oxymorons. It is likely that this is what the author of chapter one intended: the readers are encouraged to view the historical conflict as a 'righteous return' for the sinful actions of the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

A few comments regarding the transference from chapter one to chapter two are in order here. First, chapter one ends with a flurry of synonymous and antithetical parallels in a quatrain consisting of verses 7-8. The translation reads:

7) Their sins were in secret

And I did not know (their sins).

8) Their lawlessness was more than all the nations before them

They made completely common/profaned the holy things of God.

³⁹ I am not terribly comfortable with this phrase but can think of nothing better. 'Misplaced discourse' is something of a 'conceptual anacoluthon,' whereby the authors heightens the tension or suspense or drama of a sequence by placing a discourse where one might least expect it.

⁴⁰ W.H. Bellinger Jr. *Psalmody and Prophecy* JSOT 27 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984) 24, 36-38, 80-85.

‘Their sins’ and ‘their lawlessness’ are synonymous parallels *par excellence*, but the concept conveyed by the respective sentences is clearly intended to be antithetical. In verse 7, ‘their sins’ are in secret, hidden and unknown to the speaker Jerusalem. Yet, in verse 8, their lawless actions are said to be greater than all the nations before them. This implies that their sins were in effect on a world stage in comparison to those nations that were before them, likely intended as a reference to the nations of Exodus 23; in short, their sins were known and open to the judgment of all viewers. The ellipsis in verse 7, as I have reproduced, shows that this verse is arranged anadiploically with ‘their sins’ standing on the ends of the statement ‘I did not know’. Verse 8a provides the antithesis to verse 7 followed by an augmentative/summative closure to the whole of the chapter in 8b. This final stich explains why everything in chapter 1 is transpiring, and also prepares the reader for the rest of the document: the holy things of God have been profaned/made common.

As I will discuss in the section dealing with purity and the Temple in the PssSol below, the verb βεβηλόω and its cognates—‘making common’ or ‘profaning’—implies that something has been taken from one sphere in which it is intended to be and transferred to another sphere in which it is not intended to be.⁴¹ This can happen when something common is taken into the holy, such as the ‘fire’ offered by Nadab and Abihu.⁴² It is in this concept that the Jewish and Gentile sinners are linked in 2.1-2, which structurally forms an elaborate chiasmus. Stylistically, ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι and ὑπερηφανία, both derivatives of the same root, bracket the quatrain, which I have shown by italicizing the terms. Intensification is achieved by repetition of concepts that focus on a topic from one stich to the next. For instance, ‘the sinner’ in verse 1 ‘throws down’ the strong wall. This ‘strong wall’ was clearly part of the Temple compound breeched by Pompey’s men

⁴¹ Cf. the section *The Temple Motif in PssSol* below.

⁴² Again note Lev. 10. As I noted in the previous section, Nadab and Abihu’s error lay not in what they intended to do, nor in the fire itself, which could at any rate not be considered profane, but in bringing something foreign— הַרְבֵּי שָׂרָף —before the Lord. What they were guilty of is bringing something from the common area of life, i.e., coals from a stove, and introducing this element into the sancta. Normally, Israelite law makes provision for errors of inadvertency, thus the הַרְבֵּי שָׂרָף , but in the case of the ‘super-sacred’ any transgression, whether inadvertent or not, is punishable by death; note e.g., the case of Uzzah in 2 Sam. 6. On this last point, note Jacob Milgrom “The Compass of Biblical Sancta” *JQR* 65 (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 213-215. The *Targumim* confirm this message: the fire offered was from common stoves; cf. Neofiti (marginal gloss) and Pseudo-Jonathan on Lev. 10 and Num. 3. The rabbis confirm this rendering further at Num. R. 1.59-60 and *Sifra Shemini* 1.22.

after a siege of three months in 63 B.C.E.⁴³ Conceptually, the first stich of 2.1 may be represented in the following manner:

ἐν τῷ ὑπερηφανεύεσθαι + τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν + ἐν κριῶ + κατέβαλε + τείχη ὄχυρά

The first bicolon ends with what turns out to be a fulcrum upon which swings the chiastic structure, αἱ οὐκ ἐκώλυσας—‘and you did not intervene.’ Then the chapter continues with a reversed repetition of 2.1 in 2.2, conceptually rendered as follows:

ἀνέβησαν + ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριόν σου + ἔθνη ἀλλότρια + ἐν ὑποδήμασιν + ἐν ὑπερηφανία

The transition from the first bicolon to the second in this quatrain is a brilliant turn of phrase. From the outset of the second bicolon, the verbal concept of ‘throwing down’ from the first bicolon is turned on its head; now the sinful Gentile ‘goes up’ to commit a transgression. Yet the outcome is the same; whether ‘tearing down’ or ‘going up’, everything that was done was a transgression against the holy things of God. More importantly, however, τὸν ἁμαρτωλὸν is equated with ἔθνη ἀλλότρια through chiastic parallelism. But the great insight here is that this ‘sinner’ is a sinner as such because he ‘goes up’ to the sacrificial altar of the Lord *as a foreign element* (ἀλλότρια), and not because he is viewed as intrinsically sinful. In much the same way as the ‘strange fire’ of Nadab and Abihu defiles the sancta, so too does this Gentile who goes up upon the sacrificial altar. In short, he has introduced that which is considered common to that which is holy; this is his transgression.

This is the same concept with which the reader is left at the end of chapter 1. It will be remembered that chapter 1 details the Jewish sinners, who are so called because they have made common/profane the sacred things of God. Now we are told that the Gentile sinner is so called because he has introduced a common element into the holy place of God. In 1.8b, the ‘holy things of God’ is bracketed by the verb ἐβεβήλωσαν and the noun ἐν βεβηλώσει, much like the ‘bracketing’ technique used in the first two verses in chapter 2. I suggest that this was an intentional technique on the part of the author to join the two chapters together stylistically and to join the two types of sinners together theologically. In both instances, by both Jew and Gentile it is the Temple or the holy things of God that are being made common/profane.

⁴³ Sirach 50.1 tells of the ‘strong wall’ of the Temple added to and completed by Simon son of Onias; cf. Schürer *HJP* v. I 238-239.

3.2—Chapter 8

The beginning to chapter 8 is reminiscent of the whole of chapter 1. Again, the ‘sounds’ mentioned at the beginning of the chapter are heard by Jerusalem; and again, Jerusalem reaches the same conclusion as in chapter 1: the ways of her inhabitants were directed in righteousness. A chain-linking takes place between chapter 7 and 8 that I will only mention briefly here.⁴⁴ Verse 7.10 contains the term *κατευθύνεις* in referring to the work that the authors assure their readers that God will do. This term pops up again in 8.6, in which Jerusalem is apparently speaking again. Once more, the invasion and conquest are set up as elements brought upon Jerusalem as just punishment for the sins of the ‘sons of Jerusalem.’ As I have noted in the annotation, 7.10 contains the elements

κατευθύνεις + ἡμᾶς + ἐν καιρῷ ἀντιλήψεώς σου

8.6 contains the following elements:

κατευθύνουσιν + ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν + ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ

In the case of 7.10, it is God who will be setting the devout’s way aright in His (God’s) time of help. 8.6, however, presents us with the image of the people of directing their ways in righteousness. The advent of war and destruction in 8.1-5 suggests otherwise and it seems that the authors are contrasting God’s ‘setting of the people right,’ which takes the form of punishment, to the people’s own sense of religious propriety. This feature of ‘chain-linking’ or *inclusio* often transcends chapter demarcation and is a feature of other biblical pericopes.⁴⁵ Here is my annotated Greek text:

⁴⁴ Joachim Schüpphaus *Die Psalmen Salomon: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 154 suggests rightly that the individual Psalms are connected with one another. I do not, however, think that Schüpphaus’ conclusion that the individual Psalms were composed in isolation is accurate. Such concatenation could very well indicate a single author as much as a later redactor/compiler. In particular note the discussion of the relation between PssSol 17.44 and 18.6 below.

⁴⁵ Cf. Watson’s study on refrain repetition or *inclusio* *Hebrew Poetry* 274-279. This is also called ‘distant repetition.’ Bruce Longenecker, in a paper read at the British New Testament Conference in Birmingham, UK 06/09/03 presented a series of examples from the Book of Acts in which Luke seemingly uses ‘chain-link interlock,’ a type of thematic repetition, to weld the narrative together. In Acts, Longenecker noted for example Acts 1.1-8.3 and its connection to 8.4-12.25 and there “interlocking” at 8.1b-8.3. Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* 69-88 makes clear that parallelism is flexible in application and serves a wide variety of capacities. Note and compare differences between CPs 114.1-2 with Is. 40.7-8, both examples of parallelism. While this technique of joining two narratives together is generally a feature of prose

7.10 κατευθυνεῖς ἡμᾶς ἐν καιρῷ ἀντιλήψεώς σου

τοῦ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν οἶκον Ἰακωβ εἰς ἡμέραν ἐν ἣ ἐπηγγείλω αὐτοῖς

[τῷ Σαλωμων εἰς νεῖκος]

8:1 θλίψιν καὶ φωνὴν πολέμου ἤκουσεν τὸ οὖς μου

(ἤκουσεν τὸ οὖς μου) φωνὴν σάλπιγγος ἠχούσης σφαγὴν καὶ ὄλεθρον

2 φωνὴ λαοῦ πολλοῦ ὡς ἀνέμου πολλοῦ σφόδρα (φερομένου δι' ἐρήμου)

(φωνὴ λαοῦ πολλοῦ) ὡς καταγιγίς πυρὸς πολλοῦ φερομένου δι' ἐρήμου

3 καὶ εἶπα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου

ποῦ ἄρα κρινεῖ αὐτὸν (φωνὴ λαοῦ πολλοῦ) ὁ θεός

4 φωνὴν ἤκουσα εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ πόλιν ἀγιάσματος

5 συνετρίβη ἡ ὀσφύς μου ἀπὸ ἀκοῆς

παρελύθη γόνατά μου (ἀπὸ ἀκοῆς)

ἐφοβήθη ἡ καρδία μου (ἀπὸ ἀκοῆς)

ἐταράχθη τὰ ὀστᾶ μου ὡς λίνον (ἀπὸ ἀκοῆς)

6 εἶπα (see 1.2—Jerusalem speaking?)

κατευθυνοῦσιν ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ

7 ἀνελογισάμην τὰ κρίματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς

ἐδικαίωσα τὸν θεὸν ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀπ' αἰῶνος

8 ἀνεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν ἐναντίον τοῦ ἡλίου

ἔγνω πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τὰ κρίματα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ δίκαια

9 ἐν καταγαίοις κρυφίοις αἱ παρανομίαι αὐτῶν (συνεφύροντο)

ἐν παροργισμῷ υἱὸς μετὰ μητρὸς καὶ πατὴρ μετὰ θυγατρὸς (συνεφύροντο)

συνεφύροντο

composition, Gillingham has pointed out that both categories of 'prose' and 'poetry' share features. Note Gillingham *idem*. 18-43.

- 10 έμοιχῶντο ἕκαστος τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ
συνέθεντο αὐτοῖς συνθήκας μετὰ ὄρκου περὶ τούτων
- 11 τὰ ἅγια τοῦ θεοῦ
διηρπάζουσαν ὡς μὴ ὄντος κληρονόμου λυτρομένου (30b)
- 12 έπατοῦσαν τὸ θυσιαστήριον κυρίου ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας
καὶ ἐν ἀφένδρω αἵματος
έμίαναν τὰς θυσίας (κυρίου) ὡς κρέα βέβηλα
- 13 οὐ παρέλιπον ἁμαρτίαν (revisits 1.7-2.2) ἣν οὐκ ἐποίησαν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἔθνη
- 14 διὰ τοῦτο
έκέρασεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα πλανήσεως
έπότισεν αὐτοὺς (ὁ θεὸς) ποτήριον οἴνου ἀκράτου εἰς μέθην
- 15 ἤγαγεν (God) τὸν ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς τὸν παίοντα κραταιῶς
έκρινεν (God) τὸν πόλεμον ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτῆς
- 16 ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς γῆς μετὰ χαρᾶς (16e; 18a)
εἶπαν αὐτῷ
έπευκτὴ ἡ ὁδός σου
δεῦτε
εἰσέλθατε (ὡς πατὴρ εἰς οἶκον υἱῶν αὐτοῦ—v. 18) μετ' εἰρήνης (16a; 18a)
- 17 ώμάλισαν ὁδοὺς τραχείας ἀπὸ εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ
ἤνοιξαν πύλας ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλημ (ἀπὸ εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ)
έστεφάνωσαν τείχη αὐτῆς (ἀπὸ εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ)
- 18 εἰσῆλθεν ὡς πατὴρ εἰς οἶκον υἱῶν αὐτοῦ μετ' εἰρήνης (16a and e)
έστησεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας πολλῆς
- 19 κατελάβετο τὰς πυργοβάρεις αὐτῆς
καὶ (κατελάβετο) τὸ τείχος Ἱερουσαλημ

[ὅτι]

ὁ θεὸς ἤγαγεν αὐτόν (15a, b) μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἐν τῇ πλανήσει αὐτῶν (14a)

- 20 ἀπώλεσεν (Gentile) ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν καὶ (ἀπώλεσεν) πᾶν σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ
ἐξέχεεν τὸ αἷμα τῶν οἰκούντων Ἱερουσαλημ ὡς ὕδωρ ἀκαθαρσίας (12a)
- 21 ἀπήγαγεν τοὺς υἱοὺς καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν ἃ ἐγέννησαν ἐν βεβηλώσει
- 22 ἐποίησαν κατὰ τὰς ἀκαθαρσίας αὐτῶν (12a; 20b)
καθὼς οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν ἐμίαναν Ἱερουσαλημ
καὶ (ἐμίαναν) τὰ ἡγιασμένα τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ θεοῦ
- 23 ἐδικαιώθη ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τῆς γῆς
καὶ οἱ ὄσιοι τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἀρνία ἐν ἀκακίᾳ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν
- 24 αἰνετὸς κύριος ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ
- 25 ἰδοὺ δὴ ὁ θεός
ἔδειξας ἡμῖν τὸ κρίμα σου ἐν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ σου
εἶδσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν τὰ κρίματά σου ὁ θεός
- 26 ἐδικαιώσαμεν τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ ἔντιμον εἰς αἰῶνας

ὅτι

σὺ ὁ θεός τῆς δικαιοσύνης
κρίνων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν παιδείᾳ

- 27 ἐπίστρεψον ὁ θεός τὸ ἔλεός σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς
καὶ οἰκτίρησον ἡμᾶς

- 28 συνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ ἐλέους καὶ χρηστότητος

ὅτι

ἡ πίστις σου μεθ' ἡμῶν

- 29 καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσκληρύναμεν τὸν τράχηλον ἡμῶν

καὶ σὺ παιδευτῆς ἡμῶν εἶ
30 μὴ ὑπερίδης (7.1) ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν

ἵνα

μὴ καταπίωσιν ἡμᾶς ἔθνη ὡς μὴ ὄντος λυτρομένου (11b)

31 καὶ σὺ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν κύριε
32 καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἀφεξόμεθά σου

ὅτι

χρηστὰ τὰ κρίματά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς

33 ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν ἡ εὐδοκία εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κύριε σωτῆρ ἡμῶν
οὐ σαλευθησόμεθα (ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν) ἔτι τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον

34 αἰνετὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτοῦ ἐν στόματι ὀσίων
καὶ εὐλογημένος Ἰσραηλ ὑπὸ κυρίου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

The first four verses form an introduction to the chapter with a series of intensifying ellipses. In 8.1 is the 'double-duty' ellipsis of ἤκουσεν τὸ οὖς μου, which furnishes the first and second stichs with both subject and verb. In regard to 'double-duty' ellipsis, Alter makes this comment, which is worth quoting at length:

In a system of semantically corresponding versets, it is understandable that quite frequently a single verb or noun would do double duty for two parallel utterances. But from the viewpoint of the poet, what is accomplished through this simple syntactic maneuver is a freeing of space in the second verset (through the absence of one whole rhythmic unit out of two or three or four), which can then be used to elaborate or sharpen meaning. This freeing of space, moreover, nicely accords with the formal focusing effect of the absence of the verb in the second verset, which has the consequence of *isolating for attention* this second object of the verb.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ Alter *Biblical Poetry* 24.

The omission of ‘my ear heard’ from 8.1b accomplishes what Alter notes. Likely many of the first readers of PssSol had experienced conflict similar to that which the author is here intimating. By using the phrase, ‘my ear heard,’ as the fulcrum for both stichs, the author centers the intent of the first verse on the individual’s experience: the reader has heard these very sounds. I suggest that this phrase is intended to be an understood element in the opening 4 verses. PssSol 8.2 continues the theme of elision with a savvy use of standard and reverse ellipsis. In the first stich, the author opens the line with φωνή λαοῦ πολλοῦ, which is clearly to be understood in the second stich. Then, the author ends the second stich with φερομένου δι’ ἐρήμου, which is clearly to be understood in the first stich. Conceptually, it looks like this:

	ὡς ἀνέμου πολλοῦ σφόδρα (B)	
φωνή λαοῦ πολλοῦ (A)		περομένου δι’ ἐρήμου (C)
	ὡς καταιγίς πυρὸς πολλοῦ (B’)	

As such, both φωνή λαοῦ πολλοῦ and περομένου δι’ ἐρήμου are doing double duty in the sentence. As in verse 1, the structure hinges on a fulcrum. This time, however, the fulcrum is doubled, with the two ὡς clauses functioning as the hinge in the verse. The ‘expanded’ structure of both stiches in verse 2 would then read (ἤκουσεν τὸ οὖς μου) + A + B or B’ + C. Thus there is present here a double ellipsis as well. Both A and C phrases are elided, A in the second stich and C in the first.

‘Expanding’ the text, however, minimizes the forcefulness of the two verses. In this case, recall Alter’s statement regarding the ‘artifice of form.’ Poetry is as dependent on form as it is on content. In the case of the opening lines to chapter 8, the authors of PssSol clearly arranged their material in a manner that demanded certain inferences to be made by the reader. Such engagement on the part of the reader seems the goal of poetry; it does not consist of a simple retelling of events or a didactic statement, but a representation of an event through which the reader becomes an active part of its retelling. In the case of the opening verses to PssSol 8, this is accomplished by means of intensification through elision. In the case of verses 1 and 2 above, removal of the ellipses produces a much less forceful text.

Another poetic device that the author of chapter 8 employs regularly is asyndetic homoioteleuton. Note verse 5, in which I have underlined the leading verbs. Asyndesis was intentional on the part of the authors as elsewhere they are guilty of polysyndeton.⁴⁷ Verse 5 is also another display of elision, indicated by parentheses in my annotation. The physiological terms, in conjunction with the effect rendered by homoioteleuton, continues in the trend of the first verse by making the present conflagration personal for the reader. Further examples of asyndetic homoioteleuton are found in verses 14-15, 16-17, 18-19a, and 20-21.⁴⁸ In the case of 18-21, I have made two divisions. The first verses are joined to the latter two by a $\delta\tau\iota$ clause, which I have bracketed in the annotation. Thus, surrounding the $\delta\tau\iota$ clause are two sets of three asyndetic stichs, each beginning with a verb. 19b interrupts the flow of the asyndetic, homoioteleutic verbs, the authors effectively underline what turns out to be an overriding principle of the document: namely, the Lord is responsible for the punishment of Jerusalem's inhabitants. The poetic use of asyndetic homoioteleuton clearly links 18-19a with 20-21. The actions of the Gentile conqueror form another bracket around the fulcrum relating the work and will of the God of Israel in the destruction wrought by the conqueror. The literary structure, then, mirrors the thematic intent: the conqueror's actions center on the will of God.

Verses 7 and 8 abandon the homoioteleutic aspect of verse 5 in favor of simple parallel complementarity or consequentiality.⁴⁹ In verse 7, from the first to the second stich the author goes from 'considering' to 'justifying' God. In verse 8, God first 'reveals' the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, which then allows the earth to 'know' the judgments of the Lord. Complementarity as a form of intensification and specification actually 'concretizes' the idea by focusing it into a more narrow or specific arena.⁵⁰ It is only after the authors has considered the ways of the Lord that he accords them a level of righteousness, and only after the Lord has revealed the sins of the inhabitants of

⁴⁷ E.g., 2.7f with $\delta\tau\iota$ and $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ abundant; 4.21 and 5.13 with $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$; and 7 with a series of $\delta\tau\iota$ clauses.

⁴⁸ 16-17 is another type of focal point for the authors. It represents a switch from 3rd person singular (the Gentile) to 3rd plural (the inhabitants of Jerusalem). Thus, the actions of the Gentile bracket the actions of the Jewish sinners. The effect of the asyndetic versification in this instance is to focus ever again the reader's attention on the verbs, begging the question, What has brought about this Gentile and our destruction?

⁴⁹ Alter *Biblical Poetry* 29, 62-82; note also verse 25 in which the Lord first shows his righteous judgments to his people, whose eyes then see his judgments.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 29-31 and his discussion of 2 Sam. 22.

Jerusalem to the world that the world becomes aware of the judgments of the Lord. To strengthen the force of the complementarity, the authors continues to employ asyndeton, which heightens the contrast between the first and second stichs. Without a conjunction joining the two stichs, a break is forced between them directing the readers' attention to the verbs in the first position of each stich. A comparison between the two verbs is automatic and the desired effect of intensification through specification is accomplished.

This allows the content of the verses to be strengthened by the literary form. For instance, if the authors had decided to put a *καί* between the first and second stich, the two would very easily be read as one sentence. But that was not the intent of the authors. Rather, the intent seems to have been to place an emphasis on the *break* between the two stichs, and in so doing to highlight the focusing effect of the verb in the second stich. Conceptually, the two stichs look like this:

I considered → I accorded as right
He revealed → The earth knew

In short, the lack of conjunctions compresses the text, adding to its intensity.⁵¹ In the case of verse 7, the idea goes from consideration to justification. The author, having weighed the evidence carefully in the first stich, has decided in favor of the Lord's judgments. In verse 8, the earth, having seen the 'revealed' sinfulness of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, 'knows' of the judgments of the Lord. In short, the Lord 'points out' Israel's sins to the world that then becomes aware of the judgements of the Lord.

Verses 9-13 continue with the use of asydetic versification. I will be treating this selection as a unit, with an introduction, a body, and a conclusion. Verse 9 serves as the introduction. As I have shown in the annotated Greek text above, the first and second stichs of verse 9 begin with prepositional phrases governed by the preposition *ἐν*. Neither stich contains a verb, which has led most translators to supply the verb 'to be'.⁵² These translations follow the arrangement of the Greek text by Rahlfs and may need some correction based on our literary criticism of the document. Rahlfs' text runs as follows:

⁵¹ In his discussion of Job 3.3-26, Alter *idem*. 76-77 notes the 'muscular compactness' of the poem. I suggest, for example in Job 3.4, that asyndeton heightens the intensity of Job's outcry. Notably, LXX inserts a *καί* between the first two clauses, which I feel lessens the intensity.

⁵² Wright "Psalms of Solomon" *OTP* 659; Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 161; Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 77.

ἐν καταγαίοις κρυφίοις αἱ παρανομίαι αὐτῶν ἐν παροργίῳ
υἱὸς μετὰ μητρὸς καὶ πατὴρ μετὰ θυγατρὸς συνεφύροντο⁵³

As can be seen, the arrangement of the text contains the second of the two 'ἐν' clauses in the first stich. This arrangement is directly reflected in several of the modern translations.

R. Wright translates and arranges the verse:

In secret places underground was their lawbreaking, provoking (him),
Son involved with mother and father with daughter;⁵⁴

Atkinson follows the same basic pattern with this translation:

In secret places under the earth [was] their lawlessness provoking [him] in anger,
They committed incest, son with mother, and father with daughter;⁵⁵

Both of these translations follow Rahlfs' enumeration exactly. This is to the detriment of the literary form of the text in my opinion. I suggest that *συνεφύροντο* is to be understood in both stichs and that its elision in the first is to intensify the meaning, much like the examples of elision above. If the poetic structure of the verse is expanded and the elided elements inserted, this translation results:

In secret places underground their lawless actions (were mixed together)
In provocation son with mother and father with daughter were mixed together

The sentences are then to be read in parallel with one another; the 'mixing together' is the important point of emphasis for the authors; it is done in secret and provokes. What this 'mixing' involves and its effect in the land is then further expanded and concretized in the following three verses, which form the body of this selection.

If my arrangement of the text is accepted as well as my translation, the poetic force of the literary structure becomes apparent in the transition from verse 9 to verse 10.

⁵³ Trafton *Syriac Version* 92 notes that the Syriac does not represent ἐν παροργίῳ. This does not change the observation noted in the argument, namely, that *συνεφύροντο* is an elided element, which the Syriac does maintain along the lines of the Greek text.

⁵⁴ Wright *idem*. 659.

⁵⁵ Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 161-162; Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 77 go one step farther than the others by breaking the two stichs in verse 9 into two separate verses.

As I have noted above in the annotated Greek text, συνεφύροντο should be understood as governing both stichs. I have therefore offset the Greek verb as the last element in the two stichs. Notice now the first element in verse 10: the verb ἐμοίχωντο. One of the few instances of the occurrence of συμφύρω in the whole of LXX is in Hosea 4.14 in reference to harlotry and prostitution. Concomitant with the occurrence of συμφύρω in Hosea is the presence of μοιχεύω. As we can see, the same is true for PssSol. The structural arrangement of the text places the two Greek verbs in succession, which I suggest was certainly intentional and reflective of the literary arrangement begun in verse 9. The elision of συνεφύροντο in verse 9 emphasizes that what happened in subterranean seclusion leads to provocation, and that ‘mingling’ of the type portrayed by the authors is clearly a sin of great gravity. The incestuous affairs of the second stich are apparent and the authors seizes this opportunity to focus and concretize this concept by immediately opening verse 10 with ‘they committed adultery.’ My translation, with emphasis added, looks like this:

In hidden places underground their lawless actions,
 In provocation son with mother and father with daughter
were mingled
They committed adultery
 each one with the wife of his neighbor.

The transition from introduction to body in this selection is by way of emphasis of the problem of mingling, one highlighted in LXX Hos. 4.14. Verse 10 initiates a series of 3rd person plural verbs in grammatical repetition, all the while continuing in the asyndetic versification. Though not as formalized (there is a καί in the final stich of verse 12) or as homoioteleutic as the other examples of asyndetic parallelism above, the literary form of verses 10-12 is every bit as potent:

They committed adultery...
 They set contracts about these things...
 They stole from God’s holy things...
 They walked upon God’s altar in uncleanness...
 They profaned the sacrifices...

Asyndetic repetition of the verbs lends to the content a force even greater than the meaning alone. One clear parallel is the Song of Moses in Ex. 15. Note verse 9 for instance:

And the enemy said,
I will pursue
I will overtake
I will divide the spoils
I will satisfy my soul
My desire will have its fill of them
I will draw my sword
My hand will possess them

Neither the Heb. nor the Gk. contain any conjunctions. The seriousness of the adversary is here intensified to show the tenuous position Israel had once been in: the enemy was occupied primarily with the capture, punishment, and subjugation of the Israelites. In the case of PssSol 8.10-12, it is the intensity of the offence that is on display. In short, the Gk. text in question resists the observation that it is a 'poor-man's copy'. Rather, it elicits the observation that it is a carefully arranged translation of well-constructed Hebrew poetry.⁵⁶

Verse 13 functions as a type of 'conclusion' to verses 9-12 and bears mention here primarily to demonstrate the arrangement of the versification of chapter 8 into blocks arranged by means of grammatic repetition.⁵⁷ The content of the verse continues a trend evident in chapter 8 of reflecting on the content of chapters 1-2. Already in chapter 8 we have encountered such reflections in verses 1-2 and 6. Verses 1-2 recall the impending attack on Jerusalem in chapter 1.1 and 8.6 recalls the appeal made by

⁵⁶ This view is, of course, contrary to the one put forth by Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* lx, who state, 'We cannot claim any high standard of poetical merit for the majority of our Psalms.' In their commentary, Ryle and James do not make any note of such poetic structure. No one, however, has properly examined their statement regarding PssSol to reflect on its viability. As I have shown above, the poetic structure can lend insight into the proper interpretation of the document.

⁵⁷ The other instances in chapter 8 of grammatic repetition are found in verses 27-28; I will be following Watson's *Hebrew Poetry* 274-282 basic outline of the form and function of repetition in biblical compositions.

Jerusalem in 1.2. In noting this ‘conclusion’ in 8.13, I can draw attention to the structural feature of ‘subject grouping’ in this chapter. Verses 1-7 center on the narrator as subject and therefore are composed of first person singular verbs. Verse 8 functions as a segue between verses 1-7 and verses 9-13. Verses 9-13 are in the third person, centering on the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Verse 13 concludes this section by stating clearly the gravity of their offences. In so doing, it also recalls the criticism that began the collection: the inhabitants of Jerusalem commit sins of extraordinary severity and thereby bring disaster upon the land (cf. 1.7). Verses 14-17 of chapter 8 function as another segue between sections, this time transferring from the third person plural in 9-13 to the second person singular in verses 18-21, which discuss the Gentile conqueror.

I noted earlier the asyndetic parallelism in this section, which one can now see is a characteristic of this chapter.⁵⁸ The purpose of pointing out segues in the chapter is to highlight the ‘subject grouping’ feature used by the authors. Two observations may be made.⁵⁹ First, the authors of chapter 8 were well aware of the literary structure of chapter 1 and seemingly model chapter 8 on its form. Secondly, the authors of chapter 8 made certain to incorporate all four groups into the mix: the authors himself, God, the Jewish sinners, and the Gentile conquerors, again a feature of chapter 1. In doing this the authors was keen to relate one to another through a series of gradually intensifying subject blocks. First comes the authors himself, who initially does not understand the coming invasion (verses 6-7). In this section, invasion is imminent, but not realized. Verse 8 clears the mind of the author, who then moves to recount the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (verses 9-13). In this second section of chapter 8, one encounters the reason for the impending disaster. Then comes the second, more lengthy, segue between verses 9-13 and verses 18-21. In this third section (18-21), the impending and imminent invasion is unleashed. By arranging the chapter into this subject blocks, the authors intensifies the story as the narration proceeds. Just as Fisch expanded Alter’s observations on intensifying aspect of poetry from the micro-scale to the macro-scale in regard to the Song of Solomon, poetic intensification is at work on the micro- and macro- levels in PssSol as well, to which the examples above attest.

⁵⁸ Also a common feature of the document; cf. e.g., 1.1-5; 2.11-12; 3.7-10; 11.1, 8; 13.1.

⁵⁹ Subject grouping is an important technique that holds some bearing in terms of interpretation. Cf. Brichto *op. cit.* 15.

Another poetic feature that I would like to highlight in chapter 8 is an additional type of grammatic repetition. So far, we have encountered instances in which the subject of the verb is kept for several colons. Another type of grammatic repetition in chapter 8 is the repetition of clauses. A case in point is illustrated by the *ὅτι* clauses.

Repetition, according to Alter, is simply another tool whereby the author heightens and intensifies the story.⁶⁰ A problem, however, is in classifying the type of repetition involved in the case of the *ὅτι* clauses in PssSol 8. According to Watson's helpful chart, I suggest that these clauses function as a type of refrain repetition.⁶¹ In discussing refrain repetition, Watson points out the following feature of refrain repetition:

...refrains segment a poem into smaller units and generally these can be identified as stanzas...The purpose of a constant refrain must surely have been to enable people listening (whether as audience or congregation) to join in.⁶²

While I feel it is overstating the case to suggest that this is the precise definition of the *ὅτι* clauses in chapter 8, that is that they enabled the audience to join in, I do think that Watson's comment is appropriate to describe something of the intention of the authors and that their attempt here approximates refrain repetition. Listed together, the *ὅτι* clauses are as follows:

- 26) For you are the God of righteousness, judging Israel in discipline
- 28) For your faithfulness is with us
- 32) For your judgments upon us are kind

Essentially, the tenor of each of the clauses is the same: God is characteristically good in everything that he has done *and is doing*. That each clause follows thematically from the 'stanza' it precedes is no accident. Verses 23-25a discuss God's condemnation of the nations and his judgment over Israel. Verses 27-28a discuss God's compassion towards Israel and hope for a return of the Diaspora. Finally verses 29-32a lead the reader from a recapitulation of Israel's sinfulness, to a plea for God's protection, to a steadfast hope in the Lord's continued mercy towards Israel, and finally to the authors own decision of fidelity.

⁶⁰ Alter *Biblical Poetry* 10-11, 64-65.

⁶¹ Watson *Hebrew Poetry* 274.

⁶² *Ibid.* 297.

Here is the archetypal example for making the case that form and content work together. The clauses, as refrains, continually re-immense the reader in the intent of the narration.⁶³ As such, the narrative produces a spiraling effect, wherein the historical conflagration is continually recast on different levels and through different, yet related, themes. I think it is wrong to suggest anything but particular attention to detail in regard to the formation of verses 23-32. The organization of the poem in these verses reflects a careful attention to detail, and the use of repetitive refrain in the form of the *ὅτι* clauses suggests as much.

The refrain repetition indicated by the *ὅτι* clauses strengthens the point made regarding the affect of micro elements on the macro level, specifically the issue of complementarity. I have already discussed this concept in relation to verses 7-8 and need not define the poetic term again. It is important, however, to reiterate that the function of complementarity is to concretize particular themes. Up unto this point, the authors have arranged the narrative around a spiraling theme ear marked by a series of *ὅτι* clauses. The sum effect of these clauses is to paint a picture of the relationship envisioned by the authors between God and Israel. God judges the world, which the devout have witnessed (23-26). Yet this was not enough and Israel sinned and was disciplined by God (29). The result, unspoken, was the Exile. All the same, the devout continue to hope in God's continued support of Israel, to the point of the return of the Diaspora (27-28). The plea for God's support is based on covenantal obligations and binds the authors to God (30-32). All of this is based, of course, on the subject matter of the *ὅτι* clauses: God is the righteous judge of Israel (26b), faithful to his holy ones (28b), and kindly in his judgments (32b).

The conclusion to the chapter essentially summarizes these elements, only with the added emphasis of concretizing this relationship, to which I will turn momentarily. Quite clearly the 'us and our children' in verse 33 refers to the 'us' and 'our' from verses 25ff. The first stich contains the phrase *ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν*, which I have pointed to as the subject of the second stich. Most importantly, the phrase engenders the sense of perpetuity; it is a revisitation of the covenant. The placement of the phrase *ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν* as the first element in 33 is no accident; it initiates a conclusion in

⁶³ Cf. Watson *Hebrew Poetry* 140; Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* 199.

which the relationship between Israel and God is to be concretized and reiterated. In this case, the first issue is the covenant, which the authors show as still binding and valid. Inaugurating verse 33 with this phrase serves notice to the readership, in covenantal language (we and our children—cf. e.g., Dt. 29.28), that what is to follow is for them to understand as their religious identity and summarizes their particular view of history.

For this reason, I cannot agree with most modern translations of the verse.

Robert Wright's translation does not convey the sense of covenantal reciprocity:

May (you) be pleased with us and our children forever...⁶⁴

and Atkinson, who closely parallels Ryle and James, offers a slightly different, yet equally unsatisfying reading:

Upon us and our children [is your] good will forever...⁶⁵

It is clear from the location of the phrase ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν that the authors is patently concerned with the covenantal relationship between God and Israel. That relationship has been seriously challenged in the light of recent events (i.e., the sins of Israel and the punishment meted out by God), and so the authors are keen to show its endurance. The term εὐδοκία, then, must not be translated as 'good will,' but as 'favor' or perhaps even 'choice.'⁶⁶ Each of these meanings is permissible in the range of lexical meanings, but is supported more by the context in which the term occurs. Instead of the above translations, I suggest the following reading:

Upon us and our children the selection is forever, O Lord our savior...

This translation reflects the selective will of God so prominent in the writings of the Hebrew Bible. Israel is God's chosen people (Ex. 19.5) and is given the rare and honorific title 'Jeshurun' (Dt. 32.15; Is. 44.2). Election of the type espoused by PssSol 8 is 1) unavoidable in the context, contrary to many modern translations and 2) fully acceptable, indeed expected, within a religious consciousness governed by HB. In short, this type of election is central to Israel's religious self-awareness and is defensible as a covenantal prerogative. The foregoing assessment leads us naturally to the final bicolon in the chapter and a fitting summation of the emphasis on the covenantal relationship.

⁶⁴ Wright *OTP* 660.

⁶⁵ Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 177; Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 89.

⁶⁶ Note e.g., Psalm 5.13, in which the 'shield of favor' encompasses Israel.

It is clear that elsewhere in PssSol the 'devout' are understood to mean 'Israel.' For instance in 4.1, the profaner is said to 'enrage the God of Israel—τὸν θεόν Ἰσραηλ' by sitting in the council of the devout—δσίων. Here I think the authors are attempting to associate the devout with Israel. Other instances of this are readily found in the document.⁶⁷ 5.18, for instance, tells us that 'those who fear the Lord' are Israel.⁶⁸ In short, for the authors of PssSol, the 'devout' are associated with Israel.⁶⁹ Chapter 8 confirms this association of Israel with the 'devout.' The translation of verse 34 reads as follows:

Praiseworthy is God because of his judgments in the mouth of the devout ones
and blessed is Israel by God forever.

The translation into English hardly does the poetic vitality of the bicolon justice. In the Greek, the two stichs are nearly equal in semiotic units, the first stich having 9 units and the second 8. They are set in mutual reflection by a clever arrangement of the material on the part of the authors. The object of the first stich, the devout ones, is rephrased as Israel in the second stich where it now functions as the subject. In short, the object of the first stich (God) becomes the subject of the second and the subject of the first stich (devout ones/Israel) becomes the object of the second:

First stich: Devout ones bless God

Second stich: God blesses Israel

This final bicolon feigns no cryptic language. In the first stich, Israel, here termed 'the devout ones', bless God for his judgments. In the second stich, God blesses Israel forever. All of the essential components of the covenant are present: God, Israel, and

⁶⁷ Note in particular 10.5-8; 12.6; and 14.3-5.

⁶⁸ R.W.L. Moberly *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 78-97 has effectively demonstrated that the stock phrases such as 'fear of the Lord' or 'one who fears the Lord' are meant to be understood as signifying fidelity to and faith in God. Note especially Ex. 20.20, where Moses comforts the people who are recoiling in fear at the sight of God speaking on Mt. Sinai. Here, Moses explains that the fear of God is to keep them from sinning. The occurrence of this parenthesis at the end of the giving of the 10 commandments is significant if only to illustrate Moberly's point: fearing God is equivalent to obedience to God.

⁶⁹ Chapter 9 contains a discussion of Israel in her sins, which is a prominent theme in the document. Here is not the place for the discussion of the relationship between the Israel that sins and is punished and the Israel that is devout and righteous.

perpetual relationship. Standing at the end of a section in which the historical conflagration has led to a re-evaluation of Jewish religious identity, this concluding statement is exceptionally poignant, and gives recall to the statement of G.S. Kirk regarding the function of poetry in general.⁷⁰

I suggest that the authors of PssSol in general and chapter 8 in particular were keen to respond to a historical conflagration by way of a timeless theological truth, namely, the covenantal obligations contained in the Law of Moses. The historical event of Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem provided the necessary motive and impetus. In a way, it is something of the 'converse that proves the rule' of Alter's statement regarding the projection of historical events onto archetypal horizons.⁷¹ In doing this, poets and writers carve out reality for a people group. The lessons learned through historical events are passed down through the generations as social and cultural identity. In the example from PssSol, however, the authors have taken what are considered to be timeless truths and have projected them on an historical event in order to explain its occurrence. It is very likely that the authors saw the need to do this because of the severity of the event and the potentially unnerving effect it might have on the Jewish religious community.

3.3—Chapter 18

[ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμων ἔτι τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου]

18:1 κύριε

τὸ ἔλεός σου ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

ἢ χρηστότητος σου μετὰ δόματος πλουσίου ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ

2 οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ἐπιβλέποντες ἐπ' αὐτά καὶ οὐχ ὑστερήσει ἐξ αὐτῶν

τὰ ὠτά σου ἐπακούει εἰς δέησιν πτωχοῦ ἐν ἐλπίδι

3 τὰ κρίματά σου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν μετὰ ἐλέους

καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη σου ἐπὶ σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ υἱοῦ Ἰσραηλ

4 ἡ παιδεία σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὡς υἱὸν πρωτότοκον μονογενῆ

ἀποστρέψαι ψυχὴν εὐήκοον ἀπὸ ἀμαθίας ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ

5 καθαρίσαι ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ εἰς ἡμέραν ἐλέους ἐν εὐλογίᾳ

⁷⁰ Cf. fn. 26.

⁷¹ Cf. fn. 22.

(καθαρίσαι ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ) εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκλογῆς ἐν ἀνάξει χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

6 μακάριοι οἱ γενόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις (cf. 17.44)

ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἃ ποιήσει γενεᾷ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ

7 (γενεά ἢ γενομένη) ὑπὸ ῥάβδον παιδείας χριστοῦ κυρίου

(γενεά ἢ γενομένη) ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ

(γενεά ἢ γενομένη) ἐν σοφίᾳ πνεύματος

καὶ δικαιοσύνης

καὶ ἰσχύος

8 κατευθῦναι ἄνδρα ἐν ἔργοις δικαιοσύνης φόβῳ θεοῦ

καταστήσαι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον κυρίου

9 γενεὰ ἀγαθὴ ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμέραις ἐλέους

διάψαλμα

10 μέγας ἡμῶν ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἔνδοξος ἐν ὑψίστοις κατοικῶν

ὁ διατάξας

ἐν πορείᾳ φωστῆρας εἰς καιροὺς ὥρων ἀφ' ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας

καὶ οὐ παρέβησαν ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ ἧς ἐνετείλω αὐτοῖς

11 ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν

ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἔκτισεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἕως αἰῶνος

12 καὶ οὐκ ἐπλανήθησαν ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἔκτισεν αὐτοὺς

ἀπὸ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ὁδῶν αὐτῶν

εἰ μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐπιταγῇ δούλων αὐτοῦ

At the outset, one is immediately impressed by the poetic repetition of grammatical phrases in verses 1-4. After the opening vocative, κύριε, the authors quickly move to asyndetic repetition reminiscent of earlier efforts in chapter 8. The rhythmic pattern that this type of repetition produces dramatically enhances the effect of the

discourse.⁷² This four-verse repetition in chapter 18 is perhaps one of the foremost examples in the whole of the document of written word functioning as ‘speech.’⁷³ Notice the layout of the repeated grammatical element in the first four verses:

Your mercy...

Your kindness...

Your eyes...

Your ears...

Your judgments...

Your love...

Your discipline...

To turn away a listening soul from unwitting sins of ignorance.

The authors presents personality characteristics (mercy, kindness, love), physical properties (eyes and ears), and behavioral traits (judges and disciplines) of God as a type of terse explanation of God’s nature, possibly in anticipation of suspicion arising regarding God’s protection of Israel in the light of the recent historical events. As both Alter and Watson have noted,⁷⁴ repetition is a literary element that effectively encourages audience participation. Standing at the end of the document, it is very likely that the authors sought to underline their appreciation of God’s nature one last time by way of a series of repeated elements. It is also important to point out that the discourse is in the 2nd person. Therefore the reader was, in a real sense, addressing God and, in so doing, confirming the covenantal parameters.

Repetition, as a means of audience persuasion and involvement, is as much a part of modern rhetoric as it was of ancient. A modern example of this device is to be found in the speech given by Franklin D. Roosevelt subsequent to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Note the repetition⁷⁵:

⁷² All the more so if this document were at one time read in a liturgical setting as H. St. John Thackeray *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study of Origins* (London: Oxford University Press, 1921) 102-110 suggests.

⁷³ Cf. fn. 15.

⁷⁴ Cf. fns. 53 and 54.

⁷⁵ This type of repetition is an example of ‘antistrophe.’ The question here is not the type of repetition, but the effect of repetition as a literary device. For an example of Roosevelt’s speech as antistrophe refer to the

In 1931, ten years ago, Japan invaded Manchukuo—without warning. In 1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia—without warning. In 1938, Hitler occupied Austria—without warning. In 1939, Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia—without warning. Later in 1939, Hitler invaded Poland—without warning. And now Japan has attacked Malaya and Thailand—and the United States—without warning.

Initially, of course, this speech was a spoken word, and it would be fitting to suggest that the speech has lost its original potency. After all, the Germans are no longer occupying countries with a military force and the Japanese are no longer sending their armies and navies all over the Pacific region acquiring territory. Yet, it would not be too terribly difficult to see in Roosevelt's speech a rough framework into which a modern leader might fit contemporary world leaders or powers.⁷⁶ In short, the potency of the repetition is not what is lost, but the historical figures that Roosevelt's thesis identifies.

The same type of re-appropriation seems to be at work in the first four verses of chapter 18.⁷⁷ It is not difficult to find examples of God's mercy, love, and kindness, or of his actions as judge and disciplinarian in HB; even the anthropomorphic language of his 'eyes' and 'ears' is evident in selections. 2 Chr. 6.40, for instance has Solomon stating:

Now, my God, may your eyes be open and your ears be attentive to the prayer offered from this place.

The context of this prayer is the dedication of the Temple, which marked the completion of a religious history that had taken the Israelites from a wandering band with a Tent of Meeting to an established political power with a proper Temple. By including these elements in the discourse of verses 1-4, the authors punctuates the description of God's character with a reminder of his attentiveness, lest the reader forget. As a summary to the whole collection,⁷⁸ this type of discourse is fitting. Not to be lost in the discussion of the literary repetition of the first four verses is the strong covenantal language used in the first four verses. Although this is not the place for such a discussion at length, it is

University of Kentucky's Department of Modern and Classical Languages at www.uky.edu/ArtsSciences/Classics.

⁷⁶ One need only think of the terrorist attack on New York on Sept. 11, 2001 or North Korea's sudden withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as possible candidates for inclusion in Roosevelt's 'without warning' repetition.

⁷⁷ Brictho's *op. cit.* 35-37 discussion of our 'debt' to literary expression is particularly illuminating here.

⁷⁸ So suggests e.g., Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 383; Schüpphaus *op. cit.* 74-75.

sufficient to point out that the first four verses are an elaborate interaction between the physical actions and characteristics of God and his chosen people and the world. In short, by reading aloud the repetitious section, one not only affirms the general characteristics of God, i.e., that he is just, kind, loving, faithful, but also affirms the covenant between God and Abraham that has been passed on to Israel. Indeed, covenant is the central theme for the authors of chapter 18, which repetition serves to highlight.⁷⁹

This brings us to a more difficult section in chapter 18, verses 6-9. After an initial, cursory reading, the discourse seems clear enough, but closer examination leads to another, and different, hermeneutic altogether.⁸⁰ Verse 6 begins the section in question with clear and obviously meditated reflection on 17.44. They two verses in Greek read:

- 17.44) μακάριοι οἱ γινόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν συναγωγῇ φυλῶν ἃ ποιήσει ὁ θεός
- 18.6) μακάριοι οἱ γινόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἃ ποιήσει γενεᾷ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ

My translation of the two verses reads as follows:

- 17.44) Blessed are those living in those days
to see the good things of Israel in the gathering of the tribes,⁸¹ which God
will do.
- 18.6) Blessed are those living in those days
to see the good things of God, which he will do with the coming
generation.

⁷⁹ Although there is not space here, I would like to point out that the verse 5 begins with an infinitive like 4b. I suggest that this repetition, while minor and obvious, forms a type of conclusion to the first four verses. As I will show with regard to verses 6-9 below, this type of repetition is common for PssSol.

⁸⁰ For the consensus understanding of the passage, consult the translations of Wright and Atkinson. I do feel that the passage lends itself to several different strata of interpretation. The main problem, however, is that no other possible offerings have been made that I am aware. Possibly the greatest difference is to be found in Ryle and James' *Psalms of Solomon* 151 note that the phrase ἐν σοφίᾳ πνεύματος can only be translated with any sense as 'in the spirit of wisdom.' Wright's and Atkinson's translations obviously disagree. What I am proposing here, which I will demonstrate by literary analysis, is that the fundamental thesis of the passage is that the Messiah is not the subject of chapter 18 at all, as the majority of scholarly opinion on the passage holds.

⁸¹ For a discussion of 'synagogue' in PssSol cf. section on Deuteronomy 32 and PssSol fns. 162 and 163.

Surprisingly, no commentator has offered a critique on these two parallel bicola, and this serves another example of literary concatenation discussed in relation to 7.10 and 8.6 above.⁸² Each event is accomplished by divine activity, ‘God will do.’ Yet the two bicola, while strikingly similar in many respects, are also very different. In the second stich of each, the phrase τὰ ἀγαθὰ...is followed by two different genitives: Israel and God respectively. In 17.44, the good things of Israel and the gathering of the tribes are what are supposedly of interest to the μακάριοι οἱ γινόμενοι of the first stich. Clearly the subject matter in chapter 17 is the advent and work of the Messiah (cf. verses 21-32). As such, the hypothetical ‘ingathering’ spoken of in verse 44 is likely a symptom of the messianic presence in Israel. Indeed, HB seems fairly certain of this fact (cf. e.g., Is. 11.11; Jer. 23.3 and 31; Ez. 11.16-25). So, for PssSol 17, this ‘ingathering’ is a messianic function and the ‘good things of Israel’ of which the authors speak is inextricably connected with the messianic advent.

The bicolon from 18.6, however, speaks of the ‘good things of God,’ which is different from the concept in chapter 17. What is the difference? To find out, one must first examine the context of chapter 18 closely. I do not think that the messianic advent is the theme of 18.6 in particular. Furthermore, I do not think it to be the theme of chapter 18 in general, as I believe verses 6-9 of chapter 18 prove.

Starting now in verse 7 one is immediately struck by a missing element. Wright helpfully and rightly conjectures the start of his translation of verse 7 as ‘which will be.’⁸³ But what is the true subject of ‘which’ in Wright’s translation? In my annotations of this chapter above, I have noted what I feel to be several elided elements in this section. First, I suggest that the subject of the first stich of verse 7 is γενεά ἡ γινόμενη. I can see no other viable alternative.⁸⁴ With that said, the first stich, as I have it, of verse 7 reads as follows:

(A generation living) under the rod of discipline of the Lord’s anointed...

⁸² Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 147 only suggest that 18.6 is reminiscent of 17.44; Viteau *Psaumes de Salomon* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1911) 372 notes that this is a phrase of messianic significance; Schüpphaus’ work is of a different type and does enter into such comparison; and Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 387-388 simply points out that chapter 17 and 18 have shared characteristics.

⁸³ Wright “Psalms of Solomon” *OTP* 669.

⁸⁴ While the term ‘Messiah’ was used in verse 5, it is only to firm up the concept of Israel’s purity in the foregoing four verses. I cannot, therefore, see any reason for suggesting, so far, that the Messiah is the subject of verse 7.

The next portion of verse 7 contains a series of two ἐν clauses, which serve to modify the lifestyle of the subject. As I see it, the subject must still be the generation to come. The translation then reads:

- (A generation living) under the rod of discipline of the Lord's anointed,
- (A generation living) in the fear of his (Messiah's) God,
- (A generation living) in the wisdom of spirit and righteousness and strength.

Any suggestion that maintains that the subject is the Messiah must first answer for the incompatibility between the ἐν clauses and the foregoing phrase '...under the rod of discipline of the Lord's anointed.' Nothing suggests that it is the Messiah that is being modified by the two ἐν clauses; no subject can be made to fit grammatically or logically with the ἐν clauses from phrase mentioning the Messiah. Should my translation be accepted, it would constitute a marked change from the prevailing opinion of the verse. I do not think that the authors of chapter 18 was speaking of the Messiah as the subject in any respect. This is in keeping with my foregoing analysis of verses 1-4 in which I attempted to highlight the strong covenantal language therein. In short, I find that Israel and the Covenant are the main features in chapter 18, and the two final verses of the section solidify my position.

Modern scholarship has left little doubt that the two verbs that initiate each stich in verse 8 are infinitives.⁸⁵ This permits me to revisit the common poetic device used by the authors, namely grammatical repetition. It also offers a grammatical thread by which one can follow the subject through the verses. Note once more verse 6b:

ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἃ ποιήσει γενεᾷ τῇ ἐρχομένῃ

The verse begins with an infinitive, which I suggest links it to verse 8. Clearly the subject of verse 6 is the coming generation, and I suggest it to be the subject in verse 8 as well; the two infinitives act as grammatical markers to suggest as much. In that case, it is the coming generation that will 'direct mankind in righteous works in fear of God' and 'set all of them before the Lord,' and not, in chapter 18, the Messiah. I am not suggesting that the authors of chapter 18 differs with the authors of chapter 17 on the work of the

⁸⁵ As opposed to optatives; cf. Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 151; Wright *OTP* 669; Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 387.

Messiah. In fact, I am suggesting that the authors of chapters 17 and 18 were likely one person. This is due to the following observation: chapter 17 speaks of the work of the Messiah through the divine empowerment of God's spirit, to accomplish the divine plan. Chapter 18 speaks of the work of the newly purged (cf. 17.26ff) Israel to continue in the work of the Messiah. As such, the chapters function as a type of teeter-totter, the fulcrum of which being the 'enveloped figure' of chapter 17: God is king; this evidence for this is supplied from the bracketing in 17.1 and 46.⁸⁶ Under the auspices of God, both the Messiah and the newly purged Israel accomplish their tasks. This is attested by the inclusion of the Messiah in chapter 18, not as the subject, but as a feature in the purification of Israel.

To return to the discussion of the infinitives, I would like to isolate the infinitives in the chapter to illustrate how the literary devices help to divide the content. To do so, I will reproduce the entire four verses, including my suggestions for the elided elements. I will also replace the actual infinitive with the word 'infinitive' to represent them as semiotic entities and nothing more. For the ἐν clauses, I will use the symbol '→' to indicate that they function complementarily to the first stich in verse 7. Notice now the discourse:

6) Blessed are those living in those days

infinitive the good things of the Lord, which he will do for the coming generation

7) A generation living under the rod of discipline of the Lord's anointed,

(A generation living) →(ἐν) in the fear of his God

(A generation living) →(ἐν) in wisdom of the spirit and righteousness and strength.

8) infinitive men in works of righteousness in fear of God,

infinitive all of them before the Lord.

⁸⁶ On 'envelope figure', also known as *inclusio*, see Watson *Biblical Poetry* 284-286. John Gray *Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979) 5 suggests that one of the liturgical functions of the 'Kingship of God' motif is to challenge the audience and to instill hope.

One can very easily see how the infinitives have been separated by verse 7. These grammatical elements function as a type of refrain for the discourse. To take a liberty and rearrange the text for a moment, one arrives at this reading:

- 6) Blessed are those living in those days
 to see the good things of the Lord, which he will do for the coming generation.
- 8) to direct men in works of righteousness in fear of God,
 to set all of them before the Lord.
- 7) A generation living under the rod of discipline of the Lord's anointed.
 (A generation living) in fear of his (Messiah's) God,
 (A generation living) in wisdom of spirit and righteousness and strength.

Verse 9 puts the finishing touches on this section. If one were told that verses 6-9 constitute a section, and that the primary interest of this section was the 'coming generation,' which was the purged Israel of 17.26ff, one might make an educated guess, without looking at the text, that verse 9 would contain some type of summary statement about this generation. This is precisely the content of verse 9. The term *διάψαλμα* needs no explanation, as it is clearly a term from LXX Psalter corresponding to *הלל*. Both of these terms, which are synonyms in translation terms, are grammatical representations of musical notation indicating a pause in the Psalm.⁸⁷ Armed with this final component of verses 6-9, I can now piece together the section entirely, highlighting all of the elided elements, infinitive phrases, and complimentary *ἐν* clauses. Note the discourse:

- 6) Blessed are those living in those days
 to see the good things of the Lord, which he will do for the coming generation.
- 7) A generation living under the rod of discipline of the Lord's anointed.
 (A generation living) → in fear of his (Messiah's) God,
 (A generation living) → in wisdom of spirit and righteousness and strength.

⁸⁷ The presence of this term in the chapter strongly suggests the document's liturgical use. Gillingham *Poems and Poetry* 45-51 presents an informative and concise examination of the relationship between poetry and music, particularly as it concerns communities in which music and poetic recitation were the primary modes of transferring historical information.

- 8) to direct men in works of righteousness in fear of God,
to set all of them before the Lord.
- 9) A good generation (living) in fear of the Lord in the days of mercy.

Verse 9 effectively concludes the section by re-visiting the subject of the section: a good generation. It is clear from this final verse that the subject of the entire section is the 'coming generation,' now in verse 9 also called 'good.' What makes this section so potent, however, is a combination of the content and the literary structure, which is a type of symmetrical parallelism.⁸⁸ If we were to strip the four verses of their modifiers and prepositional phrases, and were to assign a letter value to the semiotic elements (infinitive phrase = A; 'generation' = B), then the intent of the authors becomes clear:

- 6) A
- 7) B
- 8) A
- 9) B

This is parallelism in its purest form.⁸⁹ The effect produced by this type of structure is the intermingling of the actions (A) of the generation with a description of their character (B).

The final three verses of chapter 18 are peculiar and have generated no small amount of consternation amongst commentators. Ryle and James held these final three verses to constitute a separate chapter.⁹⁰ Viteau seemed to lack the courage to take that step, suggesting simply that the three verses did not follow logically with the rest of the chapter.⁹¹ All modern translations leave the final three verses in chapter 18, and Atkinson rightly comments, 'There is no evidence that PsSol 18 should be divided into two separate psalms.'⁹² Atkinson's comment is supported by an important link between 7b

⁸⁸ Watson *Biblical Poetry* 114ff; more on this element will be mentioned in the conclusion to chapter 18 below.

⁸⁹ Ibid. 117.

⁹⁰ Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 150-153.

⁹¹ J. Viteau *Psaumes de Salomon* 373.

⁹² Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 383; cf. also the translations of Wright and S.P. Brock "Psalms of Solomon" in *AOT* ed. by H.F.D. Sparks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); Ryle and James *Psalms of Solomon* 148 do hint at this possibility.

and 11a. This concatenates the two sections. More importantly, it suggests that the author is here relating the nature and constancy of the luminaries to the actions and functions of Israel in their daily worship and fidelity to the covenantal obligations.⁹³

Literarily, I see these last three verses as an independent refrain for the whole of the compilation. This is not to suggest that they act as a summary of the document. Rather, their function seems to be that of an expansion of the concepts. As I have noted in the foregoing analysis, oftentimes the authors arrange the text to concretize or focus the discourse on one particular theme, for instance the use of elision in chapter 1 or the asyndetic homoioteleuton in chapter 8. PssSol 18.10-12, however, represents a thematic expansion to the cosmological realm.⁹⁴

Typical to the rest of the document, literary formulae such as repetition, complementarity, and parallelism contribute to this type of expansion. Time and orderliness is of utmost importance for the author of chapter 18. Phrases using the temporal construction of ἀπό + 'element of time' are found in all 3 verses. Furthermore, the concept of 'way' or 'path' is reinforced through nominal and verbal parallels. The whole of the three verses swings on one point, the ἐν clause in verse 11—ἐν φοβῶ θεοῦ. The breakdown of the sections is as follows. First is the introductory acclamation of God's greatness, which is reinforced in 12d according to my versification. Second comes a description of God's activity in creating the heavenly luminaries. The introductory article + aorist participle refers to the whole of the first stich: God who dwells in the highest place glorified and great = the one who arranged or marshaled. The subject ο διάταξας economizes the first line and performs a type of suggestive introduction to the

⁹³ I have elsewhere examined this section in more detail. There I have noted that Sirach uses the term φωστῆρος in description of the High Priest Onias in Sir. 50 and have suggested that something similar was intended by the authors of chapter 18. As I suggest, the association of the duties of the High Priest with the constant motion of the luminaries implicated the High Priestly functions on the cosmic scene. This type of projection is not uncommon in later Jewish writings; both Philo *de Vita* II.109-135 and *Spec. Leg* I.83-97 and Josephus *Ant.* III.124-125, 182-184 accord cosmic significance to the High Priestly garments. The function of the last three verses in chapter 18 are, I aver, an appeal to the cosmological significance of Jewish obedience to the Law of Moses and continued performance of the Temple functions. Appeal to the luminaries in the heavens is both biblical, e.g., Gn. 1.14; 1 Esdras 8.76-79; CPs. 72.5, 148.3; Jer. 31.35; and Dan. 12.3, as well as non-biblical, e.g., 1 Enoch 2.1, 41.5-7; Test. of Levi 14.3-4. A biblical structuralist's examination of Gn. 1-2.1 reveals that the author of this selection was 'balancing' man with the luminaries. From a theological perspective this makes sense in that each are created by God for particular purposes. Note Barton *Reading the Old Testament* 124-125 for a discussion of this point.

⁹⁴ Schüpphaus *op. cit.* 73-74, in whose thematic study such an observation would fit nicely, thinks that vv. 10-12 were added later, representing a 'new idea' largely unrelated to the rest of the document.

main point of these last three verses. What follows is a series of concatenated versets. First comes the two ἐν clauses, both of which are conceptually governed by ὁ διάταξας. Next is the act of fidelity to the created order on the part of the luminaries. In 10d, 12a and 12c, the fact that they do not depart from their original flight plan is emphasized. Moreover, 10d, 11a, and 12b all reinforce this concept by stressing the everlasting adherence to God's will. All of this action is predicated on the phrase ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ in 11a. Finally, the obedience of the luminaries to this ordered path is qualified in a reiteration of God's sovereignty in 12d; the luminaries will depart from their created order at God's discretion.

3.3.1—Understanding of Discourse based on Chapter 18

Before moving to the final conclusion of this section, a final word about the nature of discourse is in order. In his discussion of parallelism, Watson points out that the function of parallelism in Hebrew poetry is not two-dimensional, but contains a temporal element as well that requires the designation 'discourse.'⁹⁵ Foucault considers the nature of discourse to be the determinative element in the construction of 'reality.' He argues that it is not the categories used in conversation alone that constitute a definition of reality, but the on-going interaction between category and interlocutor that makes a concept real.⁹⁶ Watson is characteristically reserved in entering into a detailed description of what *discourse* might be, but his point is instructive nonetheless. Poetry is also spatial (Foucault's 'on-going' interpretation) in the sense that one element reflects on another, such as is the case with symmetrical parallelism. Taking the example from PssSol 18.6-9, one quickly becomes aware that the discourse continually reflects on itself, as though in a

⁹⁵ Watson *Biblical Poetry* 114-115.

⁹⁶ Cf. Michael Foucault *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith; London: Routledge, 1972) particularly 21-78. At the end of the day, I do not think that Foucault leads us down a constructive path with respect to biblical studies. His interaction between category and interlocutor presses the notion of reality too much in the subjective direction. From a biblical, and post-biblical, perspective, such a vision of reality would have been altogether foreign. While the biblical and post-biblical authors do re-evaluate categories in a contemporary setting, they do so predicated on a valuation of tradition that replicates with the intent of adhering to the past. What came before the post-biblical authors is what is real; they are merely reminding their readers of that reality. Also note the discussion of this point by George Steiner *In Bluebeard's Castle: Some Notes Towards a Redefinition of Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971) 6-12.

mirror, which I consider ‘thematic anadiplosis.’⁹⁷ In this sense, Harold Bloom’s concept of poetry as ‘influence’ or ‘having been influenced’ is helpful. Bloom’s basic position is that authors are generally creating new works *in response to* older works. They are, so to speak, interacting with tradition. In so doing, they create new texts based on the older ones.⁹⁸

In the case of PssSol the authors were imitating something. In so doing, as Bloom suggests, they were creating a new text.⁹⁹ The subject matter for the authors was two-fold. It was not only past literary works as repositories of authoritative thinking. It was also the adaptation of this repository in the light of current historical events. With respect to PssSol 18, the substance of their replication is nothing other than the covenantal promises to be found in the Law of Moses. Their ‘new creation’ in chapter 18 is the replication of this covenant in a post-messianic world; a world initiated originally by the sins of Israel and God’s subsequent punishment. This brings us back to Eskola’s analysis of discourse, which he describes as:

A group of statements which provide a language for talking about a topic..While a discourse has a role in constructing its own objects of knowledge, its analysis focuses on processes of text production.¹⁰⁰

The discourse available to us in PssSol 18 is the result of the replication of authoritative, Scriptural texts set against a historical backdrop. Watson’s comments, along with those of Bloom, Foucault, and Eskola, suggest that parallelism, a defining characteristic of Hebrew poetry, leads to just such a construction. In conjunction with the subject matter of PssSol, namely the invasion and conquest of Jerusalem, the discourse produced by the

⁹⁷ Ibid. 115-117 a mirror is precisely the analogy Watson uses. The analogy seems to me to be flawed in the end, as a mirror reflects a perfect, inverse image, whereas symmetrical parallelism in poetry often recasts the first element in different terms. My suggestion for ‘thematic anadiplosis’ is commendable in that it shows the true nature of this type of parallelism, which is often not identical repetition but rather a revisitation of a particular theme. By including the term ‘thematic’ my definition also shows the close relation between literary form and thematic content. Thus, Eskola *Messiah and the Throne* 23-25 is right in noting that discursivity is also a primary feature in all types of discourse.

⁹⁸ Harold Bloom *The Anxiety of Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973) 5f; the insights of Bloom’s work on my present discussion must end with this. For Bloom, much of the ‘creation’ of new poetry is accomplished through a misinterpretation of a prior author. In fact, Bloom goes so far as to suggest that the desire to misread the prior author is intentional. I do not feel as though this is a possibility with respect to our subject matter. Cf. Bloom *idem*. 30.

⁹⁹ Aristotle’s comments in *On the Art of Poetry* trans. by T.S. Dorsch (New York: Penguin, 1965) 31 are appropriate.

¹⁰⁰ Eskola *Messiah and the Throne* 24.

authors is certainly the production of a text, which provides language (i.e., sinners and righteous, Temple, Law of Moses) for talking about a topic, i.e. the divine plan and future of Israel and the world. In fact, the only type of ‘anxiety’ to be found in PssSol in any degree is that of Bloom’s articulation; the authors re-appropriate material to address contemporary needs.

4—Conclusions:

In this section, I selected 3 examples to illustrate the poetic value of the document. An exhaustive examination of the other chapters would only serve to confirm my observations. The foregoing analysis results in two specific observations. First, PssSol is clearly a carefully constructed document. Evidence for the use of poetic devices abounds, and a clarification and examination of these devices leads to a greater understanding of the intent of the authors. Secondly, the hermeneutic derived from literary analysis actually enhances the thematic content of the document along the lines of Kittel’s comments mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. Alter offers a first-rate assessment of this quality of poetry from his examination of Jer. 36, which I will quote at length:

Since poetry is our best human model of intricately rich communication, not only solemn, weighty, and forceful but also densely woven with complex internal connections, meanings, and implications, it makes sense that divine speech should be represented as poetry. Such speech is directed to the concrete situation of a historical audience, but the form of the speech exhibits the historical indeterminacy of the language of poetry, which helps explain why these discourses have touched the lives of millions of readers far removed in time, space, and political predicament from the small groups of ancient Hebrews against whom Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and their confreres originally inveighed.¹⁰¹

Certainly Alter’s comments are applicable to PssSol. The document has shown itself to be an intricate web of detail, displaying anadipodic characteristics in the form of elision, repetition, and concretization. As a means of interpretation, literary criticism of this type leads to a more thorough analysis of the document’s fundamental themes of covenant, purity, and fidelity to the Law of Moses. These themes in many respects are inseparable from the notion of God’s Presence with His people, a notion which, for Jews of the

¹⁰¹ Alter *Art of Biblical Poetry* 141.

period under discussion, was focused principally upon the Temple in Jerusalem. Our next task is therefore plain: the attempt must be made to elucidate how the authors of PssSol integrated these primary elements into their literary composition. Their concern for and observations about the earthly dwelling-place of the God they served should provide an apt subject.

The Temple Motif in PssSol:

An Opinion of Purity and Sin in the Late Hasmonean and Early Roman Era

But there was nothing that affected the nation so much in the calamities they were then under, as that their holy place, which had been hitherto seen by none, should be laid open to strangers; for Pompey, and those that were about him, went into the temple itself...

Josephus *BJ* I.vi

Foreign nations went up to your place of sacrifice; they walked around in their sandals in arrogance. Because the sons of Jerusalem defiled the holy things of God, they profaned the gifts of God in lawless acts.

PssSol 2.2-3

1—Introduction: The Importance of the Temple

In the document, the Temple motif figures prominently in several locations: PssSol 1.7-8; 2.2-4, 19, 22; 3.7-8; 7.6; 8.11-13, 22; 10.6; 11.1; 18.10-12 all speak explicitly of the Temple or Temple function. PssSol 5.1; 6.1; 9.6; 13.12; 14.4; 15.1 all speak of a type of activity that took place in the Temple compound. The following chapter will assess the nature of the reception of the Temple motif, its precise definition, and the degree to which the Temple formed a conceptual linchpin in the thoughts of the authors of PssSol. A comment of Arnaldo Momigliano anticipates the coming chapter:

The man who put together these Psalms (if he did not actually write them himself) intentionally placed the experience of having the Temple entered by Pompey at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the collection. He made it the central experience.¹

An examination of the Temple motif in PssSol is, however, a matter that requires more attention than a simple glance through the HB and LXX before making assertions about the authors' understanding of the edifice. In addition to explicit references to the Temple, the issues of sin and impurity, forgiveness and cleansing, all of which take their meaning from the perception that the Temple represents God's presence in the land, are oftentimes the literary entities by which one enters the discussion on the Temple. Debates over the nature of these issues are many and diverse. As such, before beginning a discussion of the Temple motif in PssSol it is essential to establish a working definition

¹ Arnaldo Momigliano *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987) 80.

or understanding of the concepts of sin and impurity in HB and LXX. The task is a difficult one, but the reader should rest assured that a better understanding of HB and LXX understandings of sin and impurity, redemption and cleansing will only foster necessary perspectives from which to view the Temple motif within PssSol. This is particularly the case in that the authors seemingly relied heavily on HB and LXX for the construction of their document.

A fundamental element for Jewish literature from ben Sira to the NT was the presence of God in Palestine.² For most Jews, even those living in the Diaspora, the tangible evidence of this Divine Presence was the Temple at Jerusalem, the importance of which for Jews in the 2nd Temple Period is apparent from the amount of literature in which the Temple and its sacrifices figure prominently. C.T.R. Hayward introduces his discussion of non-biblical references to the Temple by stating:

The Jerusalem Temple was revered by the vast majority of Jews in the land of Israel and in the Diaspora as the one legitimate sanctuary required by the commandments of the Torah (e.g., Dt. 12.5; 16.2; 26.2).³

Hayward's work on the Temple is concerned with texts that give some practical, physical description of the Temple, in addition to texts which detail the cosmic and social significance of the Temple for Jews (and indeed the world).

A rubric by which to indicate the presence of the Temple in the literature from HB to the NT is the issue of purity. Purity, in this sense, is meant to indicate both ritual and moral purity as defined by Jonathan Klawans in his recent work *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Regarding ritual impurity, Klawans writes:

The sources of ritual impurity are generally natural and more or less unavoidable. That the sources of ritual impurity are natural is quite clear. Birth, death, sex, disease, and discharge are all part of normal life.⁴

Klawans speaks of moral impurity in these terms:

Moral impurity results from what are believed to be immoral acts. We cannot avoid the term "impurity" either. What we will call "moral impurity" results from

² R.E. Clements *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965) xi.

³ C.T.R. Hayward *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996) 3. Examples of 2nd Temple Period texts that speak to the Temple's importance include Tobit 1.3-8 and 14.4-5; Judith 4.2-13, 9.1, and 16.18; 3 Maccabees 1.8-2.20; Baruch 1-3.8; Sirach 50. 1-21.

⁴ Jonathan Klawans *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: University Press, 2000) 23.

committing certain acts so heinous that they are explicitly referred to in biblical sources as defiling. ... These defiling acts include sexual sins (e.g., Lev. 18.24-30), idolatry (e.g., Lev. 19.31; 20.1-3), and bloodshed (e.g., Num. 35.33-34).⁵

For the authors of PssSol, these two rubrics were both active and important. As I intend to show, the authors defined the status of an individual as a 'sinner' or 'righteous one' according to their phenomenological relationship to the Temple. Ritual and moral impurity in PssSol resonates the understanding espoused by HB. In short, the duality in the document, between the sinner and the righteous, is defined by the relationship between the individual and codes of conduct for the Temple, this is, a priestly ethic.⁶ For the authors of PssSol, purity and the Temple are of central importance.

Three remarks may be made at the outset to guide the forthcoming discussion. First, most important for our authors was the creation of a synthesis in which impurity, sin, and defilement, both ritually and moral, would be related to the Temple and the holiness which they believed dwelled therein.⁷ Everything considered pure, impure, sinful and righteous must be set against the backdrop of the Temple and its sacrifices.⁸ Secondly, grave sins (introducing the common to the holy—note 1.8; 2.3; 8.12; and sexual immorality—note 2.13; 4.5; 8.9) represent for the authors of PssSol, just as for the Pentateuch, moral impurities. If one sins in these ways, one is morally impure, defiling

⁵ Ibid. 26.

⁶ The understanding of anthropology and sociology used in this section are as follows. *OED* defines anthropology as 'The science of man, or of mankind, in the widest sense'. Sociology, again in *OED*, is defined as 'The science or study of the origin, history, and constitution of human society'. Surely the latter term falls within the description of the former, but it does not entirely encompass what is being intimated in these religious texts, which certainly make assumptions that apply to mankind generally and not simply to the 'constitution of human society'. That is to say, the term 'sinner' does not merely imply a social construct, but points to an impression of mankind in the most basic sense. Of course a narrow-minded biologist could always object to the theologian's use of anthropology, as it is defined in biological contexts, according to *OED*, as 'The study of man as animal (Latham). The branch of the science which investigates the position of man zoologically, his 'evolution', and history as a race of animated beings'. But this is surely not the impression of anthropology one gets from the biblical texts.

⁷ P.N. Franklyn "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon" *JSJ* 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1987) 1-17 understands the 'cultic' sense in PssSol to align most closely with Qumran. While I do agree that PssSol resonates with Qumran on significant points, the authors clearly did not go so far as to conceive of the Jerusalem priesthood and Temple as defunct. Thus, I disagree with his suggestion that the authors endorsed a program of worship separated from the 'centralized Temple hierarchy'.

⁸ This issue has not yet been adequately treated by scholarship. Although the Temple does figure in several of the commentaries, note e.g., Ryle and James *Psalms of the Pharisees* 6, 10, 85; Wright "The Psalms of Solomon" *OTP* 651-653; Atkinson *Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* 16-17, 19, 36, 64; Mikael *Winning Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters* CB 26 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1995) 34-35, 40 none have adequately assessed the central importance of the Temple and purity for the authors of PssSol.

both the sanctuary and the land. This is to say, the authors seemingly distinguished between ritual and moral impurities along Pentateuchal standards. Thirdly, though the primary emphasis in the document is on moral impurity, ritual impurity is not altogether absent. In fact, the authors are quick to associate ritual and moral impurity in order to demonstrate the importance of both remaining ritually pure and of reinstating, through the proper sacrifices and waiting period, one's ritually pure status (note 3.5-8; 9.6-7). This indicates that ritual impurity is an important rubric for the authors. In short, the one point of familiarity by which the authors sought to contrast impurity and sin in the document was the Temple, a phenomenon that Jacob Neusner sees as universal.⁹

According to Neusner, Jewish interpretive efforts, in the area of purity and impurity, have, for the life of the religion, centered on the Temple. This is true even of the post-70, rabbinic age. For the rabbis, the Temple and its sacrifices continued to hold prominence in religious thought long after the Romans destroyed the Temple in 70 CE.¹⁰

The central importance of the Temple motif for Judaism persisted after the destruction of the physical edifice in 70 CE. The 'permanence' of the Temple concept, however, was not simply a product of rabbinic imagination. Joseph Gutmann has noted that the synagogue developed as an approximation of the Temple.¹¹ 2nd Temple literature, therefore, stands in the flow of the development of this tradition at its most active ebb. This is particularly true where historical conflagrations gave pause to consider the nature of the Temple vis-à-vis the process of history, a situation precisely represented in PssSol. The approach to the concept within the document must be, therefore, treated with some diligence and care. This chapter aims at assessing the concept within PssSol having first examined the issue of purity and sin in the priestly material of HB, taking Leviticus as its representative. LXX will have something to say on this matter and must be given due attention. Texts contemporary with PssSol will be discussed only referentially. This is

⁹ Jacob Neusner *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973) 29 comments, 'The Temple in retrospect therefore would evidently turn out to be the one point in Israelite life upon which the lines of structure—both cosmic and social—converge'.

¹⁰ C.T.R. Hayward "Red Heifer and Golden Calf: Dating Targum Pseudo-Jonathan" in *Targum Studies* vol. 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 10 states, "The red heifer was of cardinal importance when the Temple stood, and continued to occupy the finest minds among the tannaim and amoraim." Note e.g., Gn R III.4; b. Suk. 55b; b. Lev. R. VII. 2. Also note Abraham Cohen *Everyman's Talmud* (New York: Schocken Books, 1949) 157.

¹¹ Joseph Gutmann *The Jewish Sanctuary IR 23:1* (Leiden: Brill, 1983) 1.

because that aim of this chapter, and indeed the entire thesis, is to present the theological views of PssSol as a text replicating specific ideas and patterns inherited from HB and LXX.

First, as has been shown in the first chapter, PssSol relies in no small part on certain and definite biblical patterns, e.g., the prophetic paradigm. That the poem from Deut. 32 is used as the fundamental model is suggested by the nature of the poem's non-specificity. Thus, it was argued that PssSol was informed by Pentateuchal models. My thoughts are that the structuring of PssSol after Pentateuchal models also indicates a reception of the ideas within those particular antecedent models. PssSol, therefore, are not only modeled on the structure of these Pentateuchal antecedents, but also on their content. Secondly, key terms and phrases are often the primary indicators of authorial intent and form the links by which thematic material bridges the gap of history. Intertextuality is, therefore, reliant first and foremost on an assessment of the source text.

2—Sin and Impurity in Leviticus

2.1—Hebrew Bible: Ritual Impurity and Inadvertent Sin

First and foremost, it is important to point out that, with respect to the purity system in HB Pentateuch, two different yet related systems coexist. As Klawans has pointed out regarding purity and impurity:

The Pentateuch is fully capable of expressing very clearly that one ritual serves as a reminder of some other greater purpose.¹²

This seems to be true with regard to sin and impurity in Leviticus. On the one hand, **אָמָט**, used adjectivally, represents impurity contracted through the touching of something that carried the contagion of ritual defilement (e.g., Lev. 11), the emission of something potentially animate, i.e. semen or menstrual blood (Lev. 15), or the outbreak of leprous skin diseases (Lev. 13-14). On the other hand, **אָטָן** represents an unintentional or inadvertent offense (Lev. 4 and 5). The latter term is also used frequently to identify

¹² Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 37. Klawans is quick to point out, however, that the purity system in the Pentateuch is not a single symbolic system, 36-38, and that one is not a metaphor for another, 32-36. Thus Klawans' point in stating the coexistence of two purity systems, i.e. ritual and moral, is to highlight their distinction and intrinsic meaning.

the purification offering specifically, as in Lev. 6.19, 8.15, 9.15, and 14.49. Generally speaking, the two terms are not intermixed.¹³ When they do occur in the same chapter, it is in reference to the purification offering (תִּטֹּחַ) required of the ritually impure to complete the purification process, and not to identify the impure person as a sinner.¹⁴ Thus, for Klawans, sin (חַטָּאת) and impurity (טִּמְאָה) are kept largely separate and distinct, forming two rubrics: inadvertent sin and ritual impurity.¹⁵

As an adjective, the Heb. for impurity (טִּמְאָה) occurs most commonly in Lev. 11-15 and describes the effects of contacting corpses, bodily emissions, or contracting certain contagion, i.e. skin diseases. By coming in contact with these elements, either directly or indirectly, one is rendered impure—טִּמְאָה. Thus, ontologically, impurity is transmitted through contact and transmutes purity to impurity. Yet this is not considered by Leviticus to reflect a state of sinfulness *per se*. Nowhere in Lev. 11-15 is the aspect of sin formally mentioned in relation to impurity, i.e. that being impure in such a way is tantamount to sinfulness. As Klawans states: ‘It is not a sin to contract these impurities’.¹⁶

As a verb, טִּמְאָה suggest that alteration of a state of purity to impurity. This transmutation is the result of either a ritually defiling agent (e.g., the puerperal impurity in Lev. 12) or the active defilement of the land through the types of activities described in Lev. 18. The distinction is a matter of status. On the one hand, if one is טִּמְאָה (adjective) one *is* impure. On the other hand, if one is doing טִּמְאָה (verbal), one *is rendering* something impure.¹⁷ In the case of ritual impurity, one simply *is* impure, which is

¹³ טִּמְאָה also appears in Lev. 5.2-3, but note that sinning—חַטָּאת—is not associated with impurity; the one who is impure is simply guilty—חַטָּאת—of impurity and does not sin.

¹⁴ Note Lev. 12.8; 14.2-31, 53f; 15.15 and 31.

¹⁵ The overlap occurs where particularly impurities, i.e. post-partum women or a person having recovered from leprosy, require a purification offering to fulfill the atonement process. Yet the text does not convey the sense that either the woman or the leper is sinful. Note Milgrom’s comments on the תִּטֹּחַ offering in “Leviticus” v. I 253-254.

¹⁶ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 24. Nobuyoshi Kiuchi *A Study of Hata' and Hatta't in Leviticus 4-5* FAT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003) 10 suggests that חַטָּאת as a concept of sin has nothing to do with אָשָׁם, but that the former term implies guilt and the latter an absence of guilt. Kiuchi’s distinction seems too simply put. The close interplay between חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם throughout Lev. 4 and 5 suggests a more complex relationship between sin, guilt, and inadvertency.

¹⁷ This point is solidified through an examination of the other side of purity. In the case of one who is becoming pure, i.e., moving from impurity to purity, the ‘offender’ must wait for a period of time before

negotiable through the purity system in Leviticus and is not an abomination—thus Klawans' distinction. In the case of moral impurity, one is *rendering* something impure through scandalous behavior. In the latter case, one imparts impurity to the land and the Temple (note Num. 19) and is therefore guilty of committing an abomination (תועבה). Klawans' distinctions in this matter are invaluable in that they identify the characteristics of the two systems. One important point to consider at the moment is that by becoming unclean through contact with a ritually defiling agent, one is simply considered impure and not sinful.¹⁸

As I briefly mentioned above, the Heb. word for sin—חטא—does occur on several occasions in Lev. 12-15, a context discussing ritual impurity specifically. In each instance, the word is used substantively, standing for the purification offering required in order to complete the purification process, the חטאת. The inclusion, however, of the purification offering required of an inadvertent sinner into the context of ritual impurity may suggest a more subtle and fundamental connection between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin than Klawans' foregoing statement implies. If no sin is involved, why then is the purification offering required of the parturient, the one healed of leprosy, and the one with a bodily emission? The text clearly holds that this is for 'atonement'.¹⁹ Lev. 12.6-7 reads:

6) And when the days of her purification are complete, whether for a son or a daughter, she shall bring a yearling lamb as a burnt offering (עלה) and a pigeon or a dove as a purification offering (לחטאת) to the door of the tent of meeting to the priest.

being pronounced 'clean'. Thus there is a process of purification and a state of purity. Cf. e.g., Lev. 12.6f; Lev. 15.13, 28.

¹⁸ The overall approach by Leviticus in this respect seems to be an anthropological and sociological discourse. Clearly it is the activity of the individual in connection with the type of offence. This type of view of sin and purity and their anthropological ramifications are certainly on display at Qumran. Compare the use of purity language in 1QS.IV, in which an existential comment is made by the use of the two spirits, to the use of purity language in 1QS.V, in which the discussion is more simply a matter of purity; note Loren T. Stuckenbruck's discussion of this point in "Wisdom and Holiness at Qumran: Strategies for Dealing with Sin in the *Community Rule*" in *Where Shall Wisdom be found?*" (ed. Stephen Barton; Edinburgh, T & T Clark: 1999) 47-60.

¹⁹ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 256-257 and his discussion of חטאת.

7) And he shall bring it before the Lord and atone (כפר) for her and she shall be pure from the flow of her blood; this is the Law for the one who bears a child, whether male or female.

What is striking about this is that it is the same type of offering required for one who has committed an unintentional sin (Lev. 4) or a sin against one's neighbor (Lev. 5).²⁰ While on the one hand the text seems to suggest that these impurities are not sins, it seems here to be equating the impure one with the inadvertent sinner by requiring the ritually impure to offer the same sacrifices as that of the inadvertent sinner in order to complete the purification process. For both the inadvertent sinner and the ritually impure, the same offerings are required.²¹ How then might inadvertent sin and ritual impurity be related? The question seems to center on the purification offering.

Jacob Milgrom has defined the חטאת sacrifice in these terms:

The very range of the *hatta't* in the cult gainsays the notion of sin. For example, this offering is enjoined upon recovery from childbirth (chap. 12), the completion of the Nazirite vow (Num 6), and the dedication of the newly constructed altar (8.15; see Exod 29:36-37). In other words, the *hatta't* is prescribed for persons and objects who cannot have sinned.²²

Milgrom points out that the term is not to be understood with sinfulness in the same category as, say an adulterer. Yet for Leviticus, the impurity of the individual woman, leper, or one suffering from bodily emission (Lev. 12, 14 and 15) is equitable with inadvertent sin at two points: 1) both require the purification offering and 2) both must be administered at the Temple. In short, ritual impurity and inadvertent sin each offend against the Temple to the same, quantifiable degree: they each require the חטאת.

²⁰ For the purification of a leper note Lev. 14.2-31; for the purification of a "leprous" house note Lev. 14.49f; for the purification of someone who has a genital flow note Lev. 15.15f and 15.30f. In fact, the only instance in which no mention is made of rendering an offering in order to complete the purification process is that in which the description of clean and unclean animals is discussed in Lev. 11 and Dt. 14.

²¹ The חטאת sacrifice is in fact a graduated offering, but not with respect to impurity or inadvertency. This distinction is made very clearly in Lev. 4.1-5.13, wherein a priest must offer a different sacrifice from an ordinary member of the community. Thus, the graduation stems from an anthropological/sociological distinction. Note Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 226-228, 307-308 and James Barr "Sacrifice and Offering" in *DB* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963) 874.

²² Milgrom "Leviticus" 253.

Perhaps the issue is not so much what is meant by the purificatory sacrifice in Leviticus, but rather how it defines the effect of unintentional sins *and* ritual impurity on the Temple. Insofar as the זָבַח sacrifice is required in both situations, two observations may be made. First, ritual impurity and inadvertent sin have the same effect on the Temple: both defile a certain section of the Temple compound. Secondly, because, as Klawans has pointed out, ritual impurities are largely unavoidable, they might easily have been classified alongside inadvertent sins, thereby requiring the same purgation as inadvertent sins. Evidence in support of this view comes from the text itself. Lev. 4 makes clear that the inadvertent sins are essentially a breaking of commandments of the Lord (מִצְוַת יְהוָה).²³ The commandments regarding ritual purity, such as touching a leper, a parturient, or a corpse, certainly fall under the stipulation from Lev. 4. Inadvertency, then, may reflect unavoidability as well as unintentionality. Therefore, Milgrom's statement:

Spiritual impurity, conversely, which is caused by inadvertent violation of prohibitive commandments (4:2), requires no purificatory rite. The fact that his sin is inadvertent (*bisegaga*) and that he feels guilt (*we'asem*) means that he has undergone inner purification²⁴

might also apply to ritual impurity insofar as the ritual impure person has done nothing wrong (the transgression is natural), knows of their impure state (through separation from the community²⁵), and must offer the purification offering alongside the inadvertent sinners.²⁶ If Mary Douglas' insights regarding the analogical and systematic nature of the purity laws are granted, then perhaps sin is simply the best definition for describing an infringement, transferred analogically from the person to Temple holiness.²⁷ In short,

²³ Although he pushes the definition of the sacrifice זָבַח too far, Kiuchi's *Study of Hata' and Hatta't* 48 suggests that זָבַח carries the understanding of 'being estranged' from God is useful.

²⁴ Milgrom "Leviticus" 254.

²⁵ This is certainly equitable to 'feeling guilt'. Note that the one with a skin disease that is not cured must cry out "unclean, unclean" in Lev. 13.45.

²⁶ It is also useful to note that the rabbis at times equated such diseases with the guilt of sin; cf. e.g., Tosefta Negaim 6.7 and Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 98-101, 103, 117 for a fine discussion of leprosy and other afflictions as punishment brought about by sin.

²⁷ Mary Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: University Press, 1999) 195, who comments quite succinctly: 'Scholars wonder why the two narratives occur just where they do: the answer is that their position in the book is an element of structure. They have to be placed exactly where they are in order to make the text correspond to the three spaces of the desert tabernacle'. Note also her discussion of 'macro markers' 219-222.

inadvertent sin and ritual impurity may be best defined as the defilement, that is rendering impure, of certain aspects of the Temple precinct.

Milgrom makes clear that the sanctuary, set up in the three parts corresponding to the Holy of Holies, the Altar of Incense, and the Altar of Sacrifice, are related analogically to three different types of sins, brazen and unrepented offenses, involuntary communal offenses, and involuntary individual offenses respectively.²⁸ Thus, while the **תִּטְאֵהוּ** sacrifice is intended for purification, it is precisely so intended in situations regarding both unintentional sins *and* the completion of the purification process for the ritually impure. The puerperal woman may not sin, but, as a result of her impurity, something in the Temple requires purgation (**תִּטְאֵהוּ** with the intent to **כַּפֵּר**).²⁹ Milgrom has argued clearly and definitively in this direction, positing that in the case of the ritually impure and inadvertent sinner, it is not the offender who requires purification, but the Temple.³⁰ Yet Milgrom does not apply these conclusions to his discussion of LXX.³¹

Milgrom's interpretation is a correct one, but the argument may be misleading. The **תִּטְאֵהוּ** offering might best be defined as 'the offering that purges the Temple for the committed, unintentional **טִמְאָה**, as well as those who are **טִמְאָה** in the process of becoming **טָהוֹר**'. It may not be a 'sin-offering' *per se* but it purges the Temple for the defilement caused by inadvertent sin. Klawans, too, who, while rightly stating: 'It is not a sin to contract these impurities', may have left the issue under-developed. That is to say, while the offerer is not being purged by the blood of the sacrifice, it is he/she who is

²⁸ Milgrom "Leviticus 1-16" 256-258 noting in particular the diagram on 258.

²⁹ This would seemingly mediate against Kiuchi *A Study of Hata't and Hatta't* 14, who suggests that purification is at best secondary in the process of offering the **תִּטְאֵהוּ**. According to Kiuchi, **תִּטְאֵהוּ** means to 'uncover', and the sacrifice discloses someone guilty of **טִמְאָה**, that is, having hidden themselves. Against this position may be marshaled Baruch Levine's fine study *In the Presence of the Lord* (Leiden: Brill, 1974) 56-63, wherein he clearly shows that the verb **כַּפֵּר** cannot convey the sense of 'to cover' in cultic situations. Levine's overall thesis that the biblical material approaches the issue with apotropaic or magical intentions seems, in my opinion, to associate too closely the biblical material with Akkadian cognate understandings of the term. From a cultic standpoint, it has long been noted that while the Israelite religion did borrow elements from surrounding people groups, the heart and soul of the religion was novel to Israel. This should surely apply in the case of the area of worship. Cf. also H.C. Brichto "On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement" *HUCA* 47 (Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1974) 27-28.

³⁰ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 254-255; and especially *idem*. "Israel's Sanctuary: A Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray" *Revue Biblique* v. 83 (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1976) 391-395.

³¹ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 253 states: "To my knowledge, all versions and translations, old and new, render the *hatta't* sacrifice as "sin offering." This translation is inaccurate on all grounds: contextually, morphologically, and etymologically'.

responsible for the defilement of the Temple; this is true both for the ritually impure and the inadvertent sinner.³²

The effect on the *sancta* might best be traced to the view of the Temple in Leviticus. Regarding the analogical relationship of the purity system, Mary Douglas has pointed out that this type of relationship is a function of society, relating the cosmic to the mundane. In summarizing her methodological approach to Leviticus Douglas states:

As we read any part of Leviticus we see that the rules build up verbal analogies: the consecration of a priest has a pattern of points in common with the consecration of the altar. We should read them as projections of one another and learn from each something more about what consecration means.³³

Most importantly, this type of relationship clearly shows that impurity, even of the ritual kind described by Klawans, does indeed affect the Temple directly. It seems that the ritual purity system is concerned not only with the status of the individual vis-à-vis the Temple, as Klawans has stated,³⁴ but also with the status of the Temple itself. Clearly the former is a concern insofar as the ritually impure must not come in contact with the divine. The latter is also of primary interest insofar as one who is ritually impure is required to purge the Temple itself with the **תאטת** in addition to waiting for a certain period of time. Thus the Temple forms the primary point of departure when discussing ritual impurity and inadvertent sin for HB. But we must be guarded in our assessment so as not to define the relationship too one-sidedly. Thus, while Neusner has astutely noted:

If for the long period of time represented by the data we have examined—from the seventh century A.D. backward into remote antiquity—purity and impurity were associated by priests and cultic sects primarily with the Temple, the reason, following Douglas, must be that to the priest and their imitators it was the Temple in which the cosmic and social lines were clearly defined, there and no where else,³⁵

one must also take seriously Douglas' rebuttal:

³² In light of Brichto's *op. cit.* 31-32 point that the 'rite' associated with the administration of the **תאטת** as the most important element in the sacrifice tends to support our argument, namely by asserting that the rite is essential to a type of purgation of the Temple and is not predicated merely on the offering of blood.

³³ Mary Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 20.

³⁴ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 25.

³⁵ Jacob Neusner has emphasized this point in *The Concept of Purity in Ancient Judaism* 129.

Is there any justification for making all the lines of thought converge on the temple instead of the other way round? It is equally plausible to argue that the temple stands for the pure consecrated body of the worshipper and that the rules which protect the sanctuary from defilement represent by analogy the rules which protect the purity of the human body from wrong food and wrong sex, and the people of Israel from false gods.³⁶

If we take Douglas' note of caution and insert the above discussion of sin and impurity as found in HB, it seems that the legists were keen to draw distinctions between sin and impurity in the practical application of the Law (societal normalization) but yet to display the deeply rooted connectedness between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin (biotic relationship) as they impinge upon the divine.³⁷ In short, it seems that both inadvertent sin and ritual impurity might best be described as a types of action that impinge upon the divine and render a certain portion of the Temple impure, the degree of which is quantifiable in terms of the **תטאח**.

2.2—HB: Moral Impurity and Defiling the Land

The several exemplars of moral impurity from the Pentateuch are sexual immorality—Lev. 18, idolatry—Lev. 19.31, 20.1-3, and bloodshed—Num. 35.33-34. Moral impurities are often called 'abominations'—**תועבה**. As Klawans puts it:

They bring about an impurity that *morally*—but not *ritually*—defiles the sinner (Lev. 18.24), the land of Israel (Lev. 18:25, Ezek. 36:17), and the sanctuary of

³⁶ Mary Douglas "Critique and Commentary" found in *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* by Jacob Neusner 140. Douglas, commenting on the fact that Hebrew 'society' was regulated by a purity construct which gave relevance to the societal boundaries, concludes: "...not all societies invoke the principle of purity to justify their constitutive rules. For some justice, for some honour, for some equality is the governing principle. But in the case of the bible, purity and impurity are the dominant contrastive categories leading to holiness." 138. On this note, Neusner might be more right in assigning a focus upon the Temple. Certainly purity of the individual is given meaning through comparison to the Temple, as Douglas stipulated, but the Temple is not rendered holy through a comparison to the individual. Leviticus 11.45, '...be holy for I am holy...' seems to militate against such a view. The status of ritual impurity imparts a certain impurity to the Temple as well as the individual, requiring expiation, but so too does sin. Yet sin does not render the offender impure, as it does with the Temple, which consequently requires a sin offering. This is the great strength of Klawans' *Impurity and Sin* 29 when he states: 'The force unleashed defiles the sinner, the sanctuary, and the land, even though the sinner is not ritually impure and does not ritually defile. Yet—and this is the source of much confusion—the sinner is seen as morally impure'. This comments hints at the deeper relationship between ritual and moral impurity. Klawans' shortcoming, in my opinion, may be in his light treatment of the 'deeper' interaction between ritual impurity and sin, which defined, renders a portion of the Temple impure and thus has a *morally* defiling characteristic.

³⁷ Mary Douglas *Purity and Danger* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979) 1-5, 21-23.

God (Lev. 20:3; Ezek. 5:11). This defilement, in turn leads to the expulsion of the people from the land of Israel (Lev. 18:28; Ezek. 36:19).³⁸

To Klawans' above statement, this grammatical note may be added: in the instances which Klawans defines as moral impurities, the term **אָמָט** is used verbally, in the instances which Klawans defines as ritual impurities, the term is used adjectivally.³⁹ Thus, to become ritually defiled is to come in contact with an entity that carries ritually defiling contagion. To become morally defiled is to *actively defile* something through illicit actions directly affrontive to established norms of holiness in the Land. Milgrom's comment:

Indeed, the concept of "holy land" is totally absent from HB and does not surface until the Apocrypha (e.g., 2 Macc 1:7) and Philo (e.g., *Laws* 4.215)⁴⁰

notwithstanding, one certainly could equate the presence of the Lord in the land, embodied in the Temple, the dwelling place of his name, to represent the presence of such holiness.⁴¹ On this point, Mary Douglas has helped define the analogical relationship between Sinai and Temple. She states:

At the end of Exodus, God transferred his earthly presence to the tabernacle in the form of fire and cloud. The tabernacle thereafter became the site of all subsequent meetings. God's direct presence is too terrible to be endured, so it is veiled in

³⁸ Klawans *op. cit.* 26-37, especially 37 where Klawans makes clear that ritual sins do not defile the land as do moral impurities; also note Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1397, who states that these sins '...defile the sanctuary and the land...'

³⁹ The term is used in connection with corpse defilement in Lev. 21, but this is in reference to the actions of a priest, specifically a son of Aaron. To that end, a priest is permitted to defile themselves for close family relations, but not for anyone else; so doing would be to commit a profane act—**לָלַל**; cf. Lev. 21:1-4. The verbal form is used in Lev. 18-22 (also note Num. 35:34-35) in reference to illicit sexual unions, consultation of wizards and magicians, offering children to Molech, and as stated prohibitions for Aaronic priests. The clear notion from this is that the performance of any of these actions is not expiable through the purificatory system in place in Lev. 1-16; cf. Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1572-1573. By simple literary analysis one may conclude that "abominable" transgressions are of a variety much more insidious and affrontive to the divine. What is striking, however, is that these transgressors are not forbidden from entry into the Temple; in fact, they are required in some instances to be brought to the Temple, note Num. 5; Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 26-31.

⁴⁰ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1573. He acknowledges in the same comment, however, that the notion of holy land is implied in HB.

⁴¹ Clearly this is the case in the narrative at Sinai in which the people are not to touch the mountain. The entire narrative of Ex. 19, culminating in Ex. 20:20 perhaps, focuses on consecration—**שָׁדַק**—because of the presence of the Lord amongst his people. Note too how a breach of the barrier between the people and the "realm of the divine" upon the mountain is punishable only by death; no expiation is offered for those who transgress the realm of the divine.

cloud, and the holy of holies in smoke of incense. The cloud is the sign of God's presence as he journeyed with his people in their wanderings.⁴²

If such is the case, and bearing in mind the overall analogical method employed by Leviticus to relate elements (i.e., priest, sanctuary, people) one with another, then abominations may function as an offence directed against the divine presence in much the same way as ritual impurity renders a portion of the Temple impure. Milgrom does point out that it is the land, and not the Temple specifically, that expurgates the inhabitants of the land, either Israelites or Gentiles, because of their abominable actions in Lev. 18-21.⁴³ But Milgrom, along with Leviticus, tempers this statement by noting that it is the locus of holiness in the Temple that is affronted directly by the abominable actions (Lev. 20.4).⁴⁴ Insofar as the Temple is at the center of the discussion of both types of impurity, it suggests that the difference between ritual and moral impurity is *quantitative* and not *qualitative*. In the case of ritual impurity, it is the person who is 'rendered impure' whereas in the case of moral impurity, it is the person who 'renders something impure'.⁴⁵ Thus the observation to be made is that moral impurity, along with ritual impurity and inadvertent sin, pollute the Temple to some degree. Based on this observation, we may proceed to enquire more deeply on the issue of moral impurity.

In addition to Klawans' observation regarding the presence of 'abomination' in Lev. 18 as a distinguishing element between ritual and moral impurity, I wish to add another that may help to clarify the position of Leviticus with respect to moral impurity. Lev. 12-15, in which the primary instances of ritual impurity are given, contain no language of detestation whatsoever. It is only in Lev. 11, which uses זָקַשׁ in reference to the prohibited animals, in which a mark of detestation occurs. But the use of זָקַשׁ in Lev. 11 is to qualify a specific type of avoidance, rather than to classify the aesthetic state of a

⁴² Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 63, 228.

⁴³ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1573.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 1577; Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 26-27.

⁴⁵ This should not lessen the analogical approach taken by Douglas, who notes that the relationship between individual, sacrificial animal, Temple and Sinai is direct and proportional. Impurity, therefore, in one system automatically renders something impure in another system. This, of course, assumes that all purity and impurity begins with human action.

particular animal.⁴⁶ Thus Milgrom's statement: 'Thus the term *šeqeš* connotes something reprehensible' may be overdrawn.⁴⁷ What is particularly reprehensible about the eagle (v. 13) or the hawk (v. 16), which are elsewhere viewed with a sense of awe (eagle—cf. Ps. 103.5; hawk—cf. Job 39.26)? Two related points may be raised to qualify the statements made in Lev. 11. First, none of the prohibited animals are to be eaten. Ingestion, then, is the primary concern with respect to the nature of the animal. Secondly, implicit in the act of ingestion is the touching of a corpse. In every case of animal prohibition in Lev. 11, except the case against the detestable birds in vv. 13-19, the issue against touching carcasses is explicit. Yet, even with respect to the prohibited birds of vv. 13-19 the central issue is corpse defilement.⁴⁸ Thus, corpse defilement is a central concern. It is not so much that the animals in question are less ritually defiling as the text does not use the term **טמא** specifically. Rather, what the text suggests is that **שקש** is a technical term describing a category of unclean things, much like bodily emissions (human uncleanness) and dead animals, which renders those who touch them ritually impure. Thus the distinction may be one of quantity rather than quality between **שקש** and **טמא**; both are ritually defiling to those who come into contact with them.

The issue of **עברת** is different. In Lev. 18, the term denotes an action that is an abomination because it alters a state of purity in the land and Temple. This affront penetrates deeper into the Temple than ritual impurity, impinging upon the Divine

⁴⁶ There is not space here to discuss the nature of **שקש** fully. Milgrom v. I 656 has suggested that **שקש** and **טמא** differ in a ritual and legal sense, the former denoting forbidden animals that do not defile and the latter denoting animals that pollute on contact. The problem with this assessment is two-fold. First, the defilement rendered by the animals in Lev. 11 is through their corpses specifically; and corpse defilement is a standing Levitical prohibition and not necessarily reflective of an intrinsic characteristic of a particular animal. Certainly the detestable birds would render one impure if one came into contact with their corpses, but so too would one be rendered impure upon contact with a human corpse. The central issue is that death and more specifically dead bodies are ritually defiling agents. Secondly, Lev. 7.21 suggests that **שקש** is simply another category of impure things, much like bodily emissions or an unclean animal (a dead animal?). Thus the "detestable" animals might be viewed as those whose corpses defile ritually. Note Douglas' *Leviticus as Literature* 166-169 discussion of **שקש** as a term meaning "to shun."

⁴⁷ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 656; note Mary Douglas *Leviticus* 134-135, who suggests that prohibitions are never made based simply on aesthetic parameters.

⁴⁸ While vv.13-19 regarding the prohibition on birds does not explicitly state that their carcasses are to be avoided, this may be inferred from v. 11, which reads: 'And they will be a detestation (**שקש**) to you, their flesh you shall not eat and their corpses (**נבלתם**) you shall detest (**תשקצו**)'. One might therefore conclude that, by detesting something, one by default avoids their corpses. This, of course, extends logically from corpse prohibition in the Levitical narrative.

Presence directly.⁴⁹ But *תועבה* differs from *שקש* in that the latter defines a thing that is to be detested by the Israelites; it is to be *avoided*. The abominations (*תועבה*) are enacted upon the land and Temple by certain types of heinous sin, which are those that are not to be *done*. The finer point of the distinction is in the semantics of doing and being.

In short, detestation (*שקש*) in Lev. 11 is the language of boundaries. It defines the parameters of a society and serves to isolate Israelite society from others, thereby protecting its uniqueness.⁵⁰ Abomination (*תועבה*), on the other hand, functions as the language of societal stability. The foundation of Israelite society is bound up in God's election; the ancient Israelites viewed society as inextricable from religion. Should the election of God ever be undermined by acts of disobedience, the pillars of their society would erode and the stability represented in the selection of Israel, namely the fertility of land and people, and their dominance of their enemies, would be overturned (cf. Lev. 26). Thus, while both *שקש* and *תועבה* offend against the Temple, they have different social functions.

2.3—Conclusions of Impurity and Sin in HB

I have very briefly discussed the issue of ritual and moral impurity in HB above. In his assessment of the two systems, Klawans has chosen to highlight their differences. In the foregoing analysis, I have centered on the connections displayed between the two systems in the text. This summary will attempt to recapitulate these findings.

Ritual impurity and inadvertent sin are related in their affect upon the Temple compound. Milgrom's commentary as well as Douglas' insights have brought to our attention the analogical relationship between human action and divine presence. Klawans' work on the two categories has served to highlight their differences and has

⁴⁹ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 257 has noted the penetrative abilities of sin and summarizes, "...the graded purgations of the sanctuary lead to the conclusion that the severity of the sin or impurity varies in direct relation to the depth of its penetration into the sanctuary." That the land is key in the process finds support from the fact that Sodom and Gomorrah were guilty of such offences as those enumerated in Lev. 18, yet an actual Temple did not exist in the land at that time—note Gn. 13.12 and 19.5; also note the sins of Amorites in Gn. 15.16.

⁵⁰ Douglas *Purity and Danger* 114-128.

dismissed the presence of any substantive relationship between them. On this Klawans concludes:

In the end, one cannot eliminate the possibility that the two impurity systems are connected on some deeper level. Yet none of the arguments in favor of such a view is persuasive.⁵¹

But this conclusion cannot dismiss the thematic overlaps present in Leviticus. On the issue of ritual impurity it is clear that some type of defilement of the sanctuary has taken place, thereby requiring the performance of the **זָבַח** sacrifice. The same holds true for those who have sinned inadvertently. In either case, the offender must, after a period of waiting, render the proper **זָבַח** sacrifice to complete the purification process. As Milgrom has emphasized, the application of the **זָבַח** is to purify the Temple, not the offender. Failure to complete this process results in a moral transgression.

Moral impurity has no rites of amelioration under the purificatory system of Lev. 1-16. Although moral transgressions are infractions that do not find expiable pardons within the purity system, both Milgrom and Klawans have noted that they stand outside the purity system of Lev. 1-16 at their incipience.⁵² That is to say, the text itself does not suggest a connection between ritual and moral impurity with respect to *purification*. Rather, as I am suggesting here, ritual and moral impurities are related one to another in that they are both offences, either passive (ritual), or active (moral), which impinge upon the divine. Thus, their common ground is the Temple and Divine Presence, and their dissimilarities are minimized by this factor. Moral impurity, just as ritual impurity, impinges upon the Temple compound. This impingement differs from ritual impurity quantitatively, not qualitatively. Both infract upon the divine and therefore require purgation of some type. For ritual impurity, this includes a specified waiting period, generally water immersion or sprinkling, and then the **זָבַח** sacrifice. For moral impurities, because there is nothing in the purificatory system to mediate against the crime committed, the required amelioration is much more severe. The offender himself or herself must be put to death and cut off from among their people. If we take the

⁵¹ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 38.

⁵² Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1570 and Klawans *op. cit.* 26.

analogical system suggested by both Milgrom and Douglas seriously, as well as Klawans' insistence that moral impurity is not a metaphorical construct based on ritual impurity, then our analysis of ritual and moral impurity takes on new light. Both instances of impurity require blood: ritual impurity requiring the **תטאת** and **עלה** sacrifices and moral impurity the blood of the offender. Offence of the moral variety must be purged entirely from the land. If it is not, the community at large is held responsible, which leads eventually to expulsion from the land. In this way, the land acts irrespective of guilt or innocence; if a moral grievance has not been redressed then all are guilty.

Milgrom has noted the 'aerial' quality of ritual contagion.⁵³ This miasmatic quality is clearly possessed by moral impurities as well insofar as they defile the Temple from anywhere in the land.⁵⁴ In both categories, the Temple itself is affected by the state of impurity requiring a type of sacrifice. If we are to think analogically of the Temple as an extension of the body (or vice-versa), then the effect of ritual impurity on the Temple directly becomes clear; it is impure just as the person is impure. The text itself might suggest the connection in Ex. 19.6 in which God commands the Israelites to be a holy people. As Milgrom has noted: '...the theme of the entire book of Leviticus is holiness'.⁵⁵ As such, it may be that the intent of the book of Leviticus was to expound upon the mandate from Exodus with respect to the Temple. While not as important as remaining morally pure, remaining ritually pure was nonetheless very important, particularly so because a ritual impurity infringed upon the Temple directly. Holiness and impurity cannot abide under the same roof. Klawans may have overstated the case by remarking:

'The primary concern incumbent upon the priests is not to avoid ritual impurity, but to safeguard the separation between ritual impurity and purity'.⁵⁶

He cites Lev. 10.10 in support of this statement, but the claim made by the text in Leviticus 10 anticipates the discussions regarding the purgation of the Temple by the **תטאת** sacrifice to come in chapters 12-15. Klawans is right in suggesting that the priests

⁵³ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 257.

⁵⁴ Klawans *op. cit.* 29.

⁵⁵ Milgrom *idem.* v. II 1397.

⁵⁶ Klawans *op. cit.* 24.

were charged with a separation of pure and impure, holy and common, but clearly they were charged equally with the administration of the sacrifices to ameliorate inadvertent sins and ritual impurities. Milgrom offers a fine summary regarding the **חטאת** sacrifice:

Finally, why the urgency to purge the sanctuary? The answer lies in this postulate: the God of Israel will not abide in a polluted sanctuary. The merciful God will tolerate a modicum of pollution.⁵⁷

If this position is accepted, which I think it must be, then the significance of the purgation of the Temple with respect to ritual impurity demonstrates its ontological similarity to moral impurity: both defile the Temple and are an affront to the holiness of God.

In conclusion, the statement may be made that ritual impurity profanes the Temple in much the same way as moral impurity. Likely this is due to the fact that both are an affront to the Divine Presence embodied in the Temple. That the required purgation of the Temple during the process of purification of the ritually impure mimics the required purgation of the Temple to ameliorate inadvertent sins is no accident. Both offences defile a certain portion of the Temple, thereby requiring that the Temple be purified. In this case, remorse at having committed the inadvertent sin and the compulsion of contracting a ritual impurity (i.e. it would be difficult to avoid burying one's relative or of giving birth) function in the same way. The transgression is 'forgiven' by God, but the impurity in the Temple remains to be purged.⁵⁸ In the case of moral impurity, it is the offender him/herself who must give account and amelioration for the offence committed. This is normally done through death and/or **כרת**. If this type of purgation, this time affecting the land, is not enacted, then the only recourse is to expulse the inhabitants from the land. One way or the other, purgation of the land must take place. The first solution is the death of the offender, which ameliorates for the offence. The second solution is that the offender has not been punished accordingly and the entire community has become liable for the offence. In this case, the entire community must be punished and expunged.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Milgrom *idem.* v. I 258.

⁵⁸ This resonates with Milgrom's understanding of the doctrine of repentance in the P material. Cf. "Priestly Doctrine of Repentance," *RB* 82. (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre: 1975): 186-205.

⁵⁹ On this point it is important to point out that even moral impurities are expiable, but only so by divine pardon. Note Ez. 36.24f in which God says that he will purify Israel from her uncleanness. This is

3—*Impurity and Sin in LXX Tradition:*

3.1—*Ritual Impurity and Inadvertent Sin:*

Neither Klawans nor Kiuchi address the issue of sin and impurity in LXX. Milgrom notes LXX, but only to point out a possible origin to the mistranslation of תאטת:

It is not my intention to investigate the origin of this mistranslation. It can be traced as far back as the LXX, which consistently renders ἀμαρτία, followed by Philo (*Laws* 1.226) and Josephus (*Ant.* 3.230).⁶⁰

But such a statement may create more confusion that it resolves, particularly if we give any credence to Wever's comment regarding the importance of LXX for understanding Jewish interpretation in the 3rd century BCE and following. Moreover, Milgrom's statement may be misleading. If a redefinition of 'sin offering' is needed, perhaps the misunderstanding is contemporary rather than ancient.

In her study on Temple language in LXX, Suzette Daniel concludes that LXX actually clarified ambiguous phrases from Heb., phrases that may have implicated the ritually impure or inadvertent sinner too closely with their offense. Daniel bases her conclusions on LXX's continual expansion and clarification of the Hebrew terms תאטת and חטא. For instance, she points out that one never finds a ἀμαρτία or πλημμελία standing alone for תאטת or חטא.⁶¹ Instead, one often finds τὸ περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας or τὸ τῆς πλημμελείας, where τό stands for the offering, animal, or victim of or for the transgression.⁶² In short, Daniel concludes that by continually adding elements such as τό (cf. also my discussion of Lev. 14.19-20 below) to the text in cases dealing with the ritual impurity, the more developed LXX phrases are evidence that the translators were keen to

subsequent to punishment through conquest and exile. What is most important, however, is that Ez. 36 illustrates the same position as Lev. 26 and Dt. 32 in which the promise of return is contingent upon divine forgiveness. Note Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 30-31 and his discussion of Ez. 36 in which he draws reference to the superimposition of the paradigm of ritual impurity in Ezekiel to cover for moral transgressions much like those in Lev. 18.

⁶⁰ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 253.

⁶¹ Suzette Daniel *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966) 301-303.

⁶² Lit. 'that which constitutes the ἀμαρτία or πλημμελία.

show that they understood the use of ἀμαρτία and πλημμελεία, in sacrificial settings, that is as technical terms.

So instead of misinterpreting the terms, LXX was aware of the significance of the **הקטן** sacrifice as purgation for the Temple and its implements and not as a metaphysical characteristic of the ritually impure or inadvertent sinner. The rabbis clearly understood the sacrifices in such terms as well.⁶³ Note, for instance, the statement attributed to R. Meir:

All goats [offered as Sin-offerings, whether at the three Feasts of at the New Moons] alike make atonement for uncleanness that befalls the Temple and its Hallowed Things.⁶⁴

For Milgrom, the rabbis made this connection independent of LXX. Daniel's comments, however, tend to point in the other direction and I suggest that a harmony may be reached between the two. Both the rabbis and LXX confirm the understanding of HB: the **הקטן** is rendered to purge the Temple and its implements of impurity caused by ritual impurity and inadvertent sin.

In this section, I will attempt a basic formulation of the reception of the notion of ritual and moral impurity by LXX. Initial observations on LXX in this matter are two. First, the translators recognized two separate systems, ritual and moral impurity, in much the same manner as HB. This 'blending' of the two systems is demonstrated by the translators' choice of terms in particular passages, which will be discussed below. Secondly, the translators may have been *led* to their 'blending' of ritual and moral impurity by virtue of the relationship between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin in the Heb. text discussed above. If 'sin' was associated with ritual impurity on this level, i.e., the tendering of the purification offering to purge the Temple from impurity, and both ritual and moral impurity have the same, though quantitatively different, affect on the Temple, then the categories could very easily be closely associated. Indeed, this seems to be the case in LXX's rendering of the Heb.

For the Hebrew term **טמא**, LXX use ἀκάθαρτος. In classical Greek, if the context demanded that something be said to be impure, the construction ἀκάθαρτος ἔχειν—

⁶³ Note Milgrom's "Leviticus" v.I 253-254 comments on the subject.

⁶⁴ Translation taken from *The Mishnah* translated by Herbert Danby (Oxford: University Press, 1933) 409.

‘having an impurity’—was generally used.⁶⁵ But the translators of the LXX avoid this construction altogether, preferring ἀκάθαρτος—‘impure or unclean’—for the adjectival use of אָמֵט, and μιάινω—‘to profane or defile’—for the verbal instances of אָמֵט. These verbal instances of אָמֵט are found in pericopes describing both moral and ritual defilements. Yet, no form of ἀκάθαρτος is to be found in any of the pericopes described by Klawans as moral defiling.⁶⁶ LXX prefer μιάινω to portray the verbal use of אָמֵט.⁶⁷ But this is expected in the light of my foregoing argument regarding the differing meanings behind ‘being impure’ (אָמֵט as an adjective) and ‘rendering impure’ (אָמֵט as a verb) in which HB was shown to distinguish between ritual and moral impurity. LXX’s usage of two different terms seems to suggest a differentiation between events of ‘being impure’ and ‘rendering impure’, and may provide a useful commentary on the theological understanding of the Heb., in which the concepts of ritual and moral impurity are carefully separated yet maintain certain similarities. HB clearly allows for this type of interpretation through the use of the same term in the two different systems. Whatever can be said of the differences between ritual and moral impurity, and they are many, there does exist a substantial and important connection between them. In short, LXX is seemingly consistent with the MT on this point: there are two different systems, but they share certain fundamental characteristics.

In the case of אָשָׁם, LXX favors the use of ἁμαρτία. Of the 159 occurrences of the term for sin—אָשָׁם—in Hebrew Pentateuch, LXX use ἁμαρτία to render it 129 times (81%).⁶⁸ The same term is also used to render the Heb. חַטָּאת. This, of course, is what led Milgrom to his comment regarding the mistranslation of the term in the LXX. But the use of the term by LXX would be consistent with our conclusion that, regarding the relationship between inadvertent sin and ritual impurity, the Temple is polluted to some

⁶⁵ L-S 25.

⁶⁶ The exception is Lev. 20.25 and 22.5-6, but both are in reference to the clean and unclean animals found in Lev. 11.

⁶⁷ Note in this regard in particular 8.22, in which the Jewish sinners are castigated as those who “defile (ἐμίαναν) Jerusalem and the holy things of the name of God.” The only other instances of μιάινω being used in the document are in direct reference to the profanation of the Temple in 2.3 and 8.12. Note the brief discussion of μιάινω above.

⁶⁸ In the Pentateuch, only אָשָׁם (3 times) and חַטָּאת (26 times) are translated with by ἁμαρτία. The verbal form, ἁμαρτάνω is used only in Lev. 4, 5, and 19.22.

degree, and therefore the two concepts, ritual impurity and inadvertent sin, have a degree of synonymity. A few examples may serve to show the relationship better.

Lev. 12.7 reads:

MT: And he (priest) shall bring it (חטאת) before the Lord and he will purge for her (כפר עליה) and she shall be clean from her flow of blood; this is the Law concerning one who gives birth, whether for a male or female.⁶⁹

LXX: And he (priest) shall bring (it—ἀμαρτίας) before God and the priest shall atone (ἐξιλλάσεται) for her and purify (καθαρίει) her from her flow of blood; this is the Law of birthing a male or female.

The use of ἀμαρτίας as a rendering of חטאת is here connected both with atonement and purification. To understand LXX one must not envision a misunderstanding of חטאת, but of an appropriation of two dynamic and interrelated categories: ritual impurity and inadvertent sin.⁷⁰ Clearly LXX understood that what was at stake was not sin, but impurity, and that this process required an offering—the same tendered by the inadvertent sinners in Lev. 4-5—to complete the process of purification. This is to say, just as HB present both inadvertent sin and ritual impurity as requiring חטאת, so too does LXX, which at the same time makes clear the purpose of the technical term ἀμαρτία: it is for purification. It seems that LXX was not mistranslating at all, simply clarifying the interrelationship between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin. Note Lev. 14.19-20:

MT: And the priest shall make the purification offering and he shall purge the one being cleansed (על המטהר) from his impurity (מטמאתו), and afterwards he shall slaughter the burnt offering. And the priest shall offer up the burnt offering and the grain offering upon the altar and the priest shall purge for him (הכהן וכפר עליו) and he shall be clean.

⁶⁹ Stuttgartensia suggest a reconstruction of the phrase כפר עליה הכהן to כפר עליה based both on Lev. 12.8 and TPsJ.

⁷⁰ The discrepancy between LXX and MT regarding the purification is inconsequential to our argument. The Massoretes understood the form וטהרה to be a 3rd fem. sing. Stuttgartensia noted the difference between MT and LXX with a reference in the textual apparatus suggesting that the Hebrew be read as a 3rd masc. sing. 3rd fem. sing. suffix, "he shall cleanse her." Clearly LXX understood the form to be the latter.

LXX: And the priest shall perform the sin offering (ἁμαρτίας) and the priest will atone (ἐξιλάσεται) for the impure person (ἀκαθάρτου) who is undergoing purification (καθαριζομένου) by his sin offering (ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ), and after this the priest shall slaughter the burnt offering. And the priest shall offer up the burnt offering and the offering (τὴν θύσιαν) upon the altar before God; and the priest shall atone (ἐξιλάσεται) for him, and he shall be purified (καθαρισθήσεται).⁷¹

Here again, the purification offering (ἁμαρτία) is ensconced in a pericope rife with purification language. At first, the translation seems straightforward enough, but a closer examination reveals an editorial addition by LXX. In v. 19, the Heb. contains four elements related to purity. In order they are: the purification offering—תאטת, the purgation by the priest—כפר, the one being purified—תטהר, and what that one is being purified from, viz. his impurity—למטה. The LXX, however, represents these four elements with five, again in order: the purification offering—ἁμαρτία, the purgation by the priest—ἐξιλάσσομαι, what the one who is being purified is being purified of, viz. impurity—ἀκάθαρτος, the one being purified—καθαριζόμενος, and finally a restatement of what is purifying the impure person, viz. the purification offering—ἁμαρτία. Hatch and Redpath have noted that here the LXX uses ἁμαρτία for למטה, which would represent the only instance in all the Pentateuch in which the term ἁμαρτία is used to denote למטה.⁷² Such a conclusion is disagreeable in two respects. First, the LXX could have left out the final instance of ἁμαρτία and still rendered the necessary elements of the Hebrew. It is, therefore, a superfluous inclusion and certainly does not necessarily point to a rendering of למטה. This is particularly true insofar as, in the Pentateuch, ἀκάθαρτος is used univocally for למטה. Such a conclusion must be founded on a hapax usage of the term by LXX, which is unlikely and, in the light of the whole of the passage, unnecessary. Secondly and most obviously, both MT and LXX contain the element of impurity

⁷¹ In our translation, we have used ἀπό in the instrumental sense meaning “by the means of” or “through.” Note L-S 94.

⁷² HRCS v. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897) 62.

(**לְהַכִּיִּם/ἀκαθάρτου**) and should be seen as textual equivalents in this selection. Thus, LXX's rendering is slightly altered, adding *ἁμαρτία* to clarify the procedure. In short, the conclusion that *ἁμαρτία* must be the antecedent of **כֹּהֵן** must be reached in spite of all the textual and linguistic examples from the Pentateuch as well as a disregard for the conceptual quality of the term **לְהַכִּיִּם** in HB and the structure of the passage in question. If the purification offering for the ritually impure is viewed in some way equivalent with the purification offering of the inadvertent sinner, as I think it should be, and thereby linking inadvertent sin and ritual impurity together, the LXX's translation is not difficult to understand.

LXX certainly understood that the requirements for the completion of the purification process. That LXX use *ἁμαρτία*, elsewhere used in conjunction with the purgation of the Temple following an inadvertent offence (note Lev. 4 and 5), to render the same offering in the cases of ritual impurity is in keeping with HB, which use **לְהַכִּיִּם** in both cases as well. Where LXX have chosen to make distinctions is in the area of purification. It seems that the translators have taken pains to clarify, where technical and cultic language is being employed, that *ἁμαρτία* represents a purificatory activity.⁷³ Where the LXX has chosen to draw the distinction between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin is not in distinguishing between two types of purification offerings (which HB does not do) but by making a distinction in regard to impurity—*ἀκάθαρτος*—and sin—*ἁμαρτία*. In Lev. 14.19-20, the impure person (*ἀκαθάρτου*) is being returned to a state of purity (*καθαριζομένου*) by the tendering of his purification offering (*ἁμαρτίας*). The purification offering required to purge the Temple is, for LXX, used to link ritual impurity and inadvertent sin together phenomenologically in the same manner as HB. That LXX chose to restate the means by which the process was completed strongly suggests that the translators were aware of the main issue, purity. In light of the overlap between ritual impurity and inadvertent sin in HB discussed above, it is not surprising that LXX has followed suit.

⁷³ Lev. 4 shows this clearly. Verse 5 contains the addition *ὁ τετελειωμένος* with regard to the affect the purification has on the priest. In discussing the purification of the priest in vv. 1-2, HB contains no purificatory term. LXX addition seems tendentious, with the point being to clarify the event of the **לְהַכִּיִּם**.

3.2—Ritual and Moral Impurity in LXX: Two systems, one offence.

So far, the examination of ritual impurity and inadvertent sin in HB and LXX has led us to one conclusion: both editions convey the same understanding of the two systems and their affect on the Temple compound. But how does LXX understand the portions of Leviticus (and perhaps elsewhere) that detail moral impurities? To answer this question, I will look first at Lev. 18 and then proceed to compare ritual and moral impurity in LXX.

As I noted above, Klawans demonstrates the sharp distinction between ritual and moral impurity in HB. One of his main points rests soundly on this observation: ‘abomination’—תועבה—is used in situations regarding moral impurity.⁷⁴ For the purposes of my argument, I would like to focus on two terms—שקץ and תועבה, which seem to function as conceptual markers that distinguish between ritual and moral impurity in HB.

שקץ—‘detest’ or ‘abhor’—does not occur in any pericope in which moral impurity is the issue, except Dt. 7.26. Likewise, תועבה—abhor or abominate— does not occur in any pericope in which ritual impurity is the issue. In LXX, the Greek term used to render תועבה in every instance in the Pentateuch is βδέλυγμα—abomination. But βδέλυγμα is also used to render every instance of שקץ in the Pentateuch as well. It seems, then, that the systems were seen as parallel in some respect for LXX. But does this reflect a change of course for LXX, independent of HB, or was it motivated out of a more deeply rooted connection between ritual and moral impurity displayed by HB and perceived by the translators?

Generally speaking, the two Heb. terms do not occur in the same context in the Pentateuch. There is an exception to this statement in Dt. 7.25-26. For my argument, it is enough to state that the primary occurrences of the two terms are, respectively, Lev. 11 and 18.⁷⁵ I have suggested above that, while ritual and moral impurities operate in distinct

⁷⁴ Note Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 37. It is important to note that Klawans’ statement regarding moral impurity in HB also incorporates the term חניף. Insofar as the term is used in the Pentateuch only in Num. 35, it lies outside our present discussion in most respects.

⁷⁵ Following Klawans’ *idem*. 21-42 distinction of the two categories, it is plausible to suggest that these two terms are significant markers insofar as they exist in significantly different systems yet still describe

systems within HB, they point to the same phenomenological offence against the Temple, albeit to a different degree. So far, the same seems true for LXX with respect to inadvertent sin and ritual impurity: they are two systems that demand the same purification offering to purge the Temple. On that point, LXX was clear to blend the systems by the use of ἀμαρτίας as a rendering of the תּאֲטִיף. But this reflects no deviation from HB. The same subtle connectedness displayed by HB is apparent in LXX. On the issue of distinguishing between ritual and moral impurity, however, LXX reflects a little less subtlety.

Dt. 7.26 may aid us in understanding the relationship between the two categories for both HB and LXX. MT reads:

And you shall not bring an abomination—i.e, an idol—(תּוֹעֵבָה) into your house, unless you become cursed (קִרְבָּה) just like it; you shall utterly detest it (שָׂקַף וְשָׂנְאָה) and you shall utterly abhor it (וְהָתַעֲבַר וְהָרַג) and for it is cursed.

Now note LXX:

And you shall not bring an abomination (βδέλυγμα) into your house or you will be cursed (ἀνάθημα) just as this thing; you shall utterly hate it (προσοχθίσματι προσοχθειείς) and you shall utterly abhor it (βδελύγματι βδελύξει) for it is a cursed thing.

The term προσόχθισμα is most often used by LXX Pentateuch to render two different Hebrew terms: קִרְבָּה and גֵּעַל. Both Heb. terms carry the connotation of ‘casting something away because of its abhorrent nature’. In Lev. 18.25, for instance, the term refers to the action of the land ‘vomiting out’ the inhabitants who came before the Israelites because of their abhorrent (תּוֹעֵבָה — βδέλυγμα) practices. Thus the term was clearly used in connection with the results of abominable actions of the morally impure variety. The presence of the Heb. term שָׂקַף in the passage in Dt. 7 may indicate that the terms that normally distinguished ritual and moral impurity were not always so rigidly

something as being detestable. But the two terms cannot simply be seen as synonyms; such would suggest that the animals in Lev. 11 are, in some manner, equated with the licentious activities in Lev. 18.

cordoned. This is not to suggest that what was meant by Dt. 7 was anything other than a moral transgression, but it does serve to show that, in certain instances, catch terms for ritual and moral impurity could be found in the same context. This is all the more telling in the light of LXX's usage of βδέλυγμα irrespective of the Heb. antecedent (or קִשְׁט תועבה). If, aside from Dt. 7.26, HB was attempting to make a clear distinction between ritual and moral impurity with the terms קִשְׁט and תועבה, LXX was not.⁷⁶

One could certainly assert that the choice of προσόχθισμα was determined by stylistic necessity insofar as the presence of both קִשְׁט and תועבה demanded alteration in the Gk. as well. But this simply begs the question, which more properly put is, How could the authors of HB, if aware of the distinction between ritually and morally impurity to the extent that Klawans contends, choose this term (קִשְׁט) *without implying* a connection between ritual and moral impurity on some level? The same is true for the use of תטאח in reference to both ritual impurity and inadvertent sin, which the LXX render with the same term, ἀμαρτίας, irrespective of context. So far, I have suggested that the term קִשְׁט denoted another form of ritual impurity in Lev. 7, and has been used exclusively in the context of ritual impurity. Its use in Dt. 7.26 confuses the issue if there exists a dominant concern to distinguish ritual and moral impurity for HB. The entire chapter of Dt. 7 contains the simultaneous commandment and prohibition—destroy completely the nations before you and do not follow after their gods—and the context clearly refers to moral impurity. Could it be that the authors were here demonstrating what LXX has more clearly shown; namely, that the categories ritual and moral impurity impart similar consequences on the Temple compound, therefore are related on a fundamental level, and differ in degree but not in kind? If we permit ourselves to view

⁷⁶ Univocalizing activity of this nature is evident outside LXX as well in the *Targumim*. Note Michael Maher, "The Meturgemanim and Prayer," *JJS* 41 (Oxford: OCHJS, 1990): 226-246. Note for instance Dt. 9.18 wherein TN and LXX both render the Heb. term נפל with a term for prayer (TN=אלץ; LXX=δέομαι). The implications for this are far reaching, particularly in the light of the blending of ritual and moral impurity rubrics at Qumran. It is also a possible starting point for understanding rabbinic blending insofar as the rabbis viewed certain diseases, e.g., scale disease (a ritual impurity), as punishment for sinful offences. It may bear researching the connection between rabbinic commentary on the purity laws and the LXX's blending more fully. On the former point, cf. fn. 20; Neusner *The Idea of Purity* 114-118.

ritual and moral impurity as related phenomenologically in the same way as ritual impurity and inadvertent sin, then the use of terms by LXX is not at all curious.

3.3—Conclusions to Ritual and Moral Impurity in the LXX:

Mary Douglas has rightly urged caution in approaching different books of the Pentateuch univocally, with one informing on the other regardless of context.⁷⁷ Yet in searching for an explanation of LXX's univocal use of βδέλυγμα for both זָקָו and תּוֹעֵבָה we find ourselves compelled to address the use of the Heb. terms in other Pentateuchal contexts. Dt. 7.26 seems an instance of blending the two categories by HB. Aware of this notion, LXX may have followed with a univocal rendering of the term. But this would hardly be possible unless LXX already had in mind a common association between sin and impurity in general. As I suggested above, this common point is the Temple and its holiness. Just as ritual purity and inadvertent sin form a phenomenological relationship centered on the Temple and its holiness, so too do ritual and moral impurity. The connection between both is that they offend the *sanctum* to relative degrees.

I have been brief in my discussion of ritual and moral impurity in HB. By and large, I concur with Klawans' observations on the distinction between the two systems. I have, however, noted points in which I feel Klawans may have overstated his case and tried to offer an alternative solution. This examination will serve as a hermeneutic by which I will interpret the appearance of certain terms in the narrative of PssSol.

From my examination regarding ritual and moral impurity in the Pentateuch, several observations may be made. These observations will help to guide our assessment of the two categories in PssSol. Ritual impurity and inadvertent sin render at least a section of the Temple impure. Milgrom has suggested that the particular sections of the Temple rendered impure correspond to the several altars in the Temple.⁷⁸ The primary pedestal of support for this view is the requirement of the purification offering in the Temple at this outer altar, which Milgrom plugs into his analogical models only as it pertains to inadvertent sin. Additionally, as I have noted, this offering is required of the

⁷⁷ Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 25, 41, 88-108.

⁷⁸ Milgrom v. I 256-258 stipulates that the outer altar is "impurified" through the actions of an individual, the inner (incense) altar by the inadvertent actions of the community, and the Holy of Holies by a brazen transgression.

offensive transgression than ritual impurity and inadvertent sin and can lead to the expulsion of the people from the land. Amelioration is a possibility in the case of moral impurity⁷⁹, but the waiting period (which is also found in ritual impurity) generally concludes with some type of punishment. In the case of HB, this type of punishment is normally invasion and exile. For both categories, the same formula (a 'purification paradigm') persists: initial impurity, assessment of guilt, waiting period (punishment in the case of a moral impurity), amelioration/purgation of Temple or land, and restoration of a pure status (redemption).⁸⁰ On this point, PssSol offers a unique perspective. Due to the obvious presence and emphasis on purity language as evidenced by the Temple motif in the document, PssSol represents an ideal specimen by which to examine the reception of these concepts by a 2nd Temple Period Jewish community. The ultimate failure of this 'purification paradigm' to produce a stasis of purity is very likely what led to the formation of messianic ideals. This is to say that, if the process of re-purification in the face of the Temple holiness were not seen as efficacious, some other and radical alternative would be needed.⁸¹ For the authors of PssSol, it seems that this alternative was

⁷⁹ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 26 has noted this as a possibility stating, "...moral purity is achieved by punishment, atonement, or, best of all, by refraining from committing morally impure acts in the first place" —note Ez. 36 and 1 Chr. 7. Milgrom v.I 256 has noted this aspect of forgiveness as well stating, in regards to the inadvertent sinners 264, "Repentance is thus a precondition for the *hatta 't*."

⁸⁰ Redemption may be too strong a word for the process of re-purification from a ritual impurity. But in keeping with our analogical assessment of the two categories, i.e. that they both offended the Temple in kind but not in degree, it seems best to view ritual purification as a type of redemption. Certainly the case could be made that holiness will "break out" against all who are ritually impure and come into contact with the holy—cf. e.g., Ex. 19.22 and the requirement that the priest be purified to keep the Lord from "breaking out against them" and Lev. 7.20 in which the one with any impurity who eats of the sacrificial offering is to be cut off from his people. The dominant theme for all the Pentateuch is purity in the face of the divine holiness. Milgrom has noted "Leviticus" v. II 1711 that "...purification is a prerequisite for holiness." Note Ex. 19.6—holiness is the existential *sine qua non* for the Israelites, and, as such, it is imperative that they return to a state of purity, which protects them from the "breaking out" of holiness; cf. Milgrom v. II 1718-1719.

⁸¹ Joachim Schaper *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* WUNT (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995) 47 suggests, for instance, that wisdom literature was not an adequate form of relief in the Maccabean Period. Also note Schaper 151 and C.T.R. Hayward' article, "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch" found in P. J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward (eds) *New Heavens and New Earth: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 23-31. In discussing the messianic inclination of Philo and the Targum on Balaam's oracles, Hayward 31, concludes, "...there are yet victories for Jews to win, the most important of which will bring all mankind into submission to the universal cosmic Law, the Law given to Moses. ...Philo believed that this last victory would come about through the 'man' of Balaam's prophecy."

messianism.⁸² This conclusion, however, must be seen in the light of the issue of purity and the Temple motif in the document itself.

4—*The Temple, Impurity and Sin in PssSol*:

On the issue of the Temple and purity, PssSol represents a literary reaction to two related issues: the invasion of the holy by the common and the punishment meted out for moral transgressions. The lines and boundaries that define purity and impurity have been crossed, and the lines and boundaries of purity must be restored. For the authors, it is not a question of when this order will be re-instituted, but how. For certain, the authors never intended to present either the breakdown of a system or the abandonment of traditional theology in the face of intense adversity; traditional theology clearly warned of punishment in the face of rampant impurity (cf. Lev. 26 and Dt. 32). What the authors do wrestle with is the profanation of the Temple, and it is this motif that forms one of their theological reference points. It, along with the Law of Moses, determines the description of sinner and righteous in the document and, in so doing forms the introduction to the messianic sections in chs 17 and 18. Indeed, the messianic picture that the authors paint might best be defined as the consummation of a long discussion on the issue of purity and impurity with respect to the Temple at Jerusalem as well as the fulfillment of the prophetic paradigm discussed in chapter 1.

To discover the underlying presence of the Temple, I will continue with the word study. Subsequently, I will examine the overt references to the Temple in the light of the foregoing discussion on purity and impurity in the Jewish Scriptures. It is important to bear in mind that the authors of PssSol never ridicule the Temple itself. As such, neither the Temple nor its sacrifices are viewed as irrevocably defunct. Rather, rampant and salacious moral impurities have left the Temple profaned. PssSol is, therefore, a document concerned with the existential nature of sinfulness: by what reference are sinners considered sinful? The authors' duality of 'sinners' and 'righteous' (who also

⁸² F.M. Cross "The Tabernacle: A Study from an Archaeological and Historical Approach" *BA* 10:3 (New Haven, CT: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1947) 68 suggests that the rise of messianism or messianic solution was implicit in the priestly perception of the Temple, anticipating the New Testament conventions or dealing with sin.

commit sins!) is in harmony with the Jewish Scripture's contrast of ritual and moral impurities.⁸³

4.1—*Linguistic Evidence of the Temple Motif in PssSol*

First, I will examine the presence of the Temple motif in PssSol by examining philological links to the Jewish Scriptures. Assessing the degree to which the Temple has influenced the opinions of the authors will help determine the understanding of purity and sin in the document. The importance of such an assessment is obvious insofar as the terms 'sinner' and 'righteous' figure prominently in the document. If the authors' distinction in this matter is based on a particular understanding of the Temple, then it is essential to define that understanding before drawing conclusions about the nature of the two groups.

In his commentary on PssSol, Kenneth Atkinson has noted regarding ch. 3:

The psalmist was not concerned with Zion or the messiah but only with the spiritual life of the righteous. Although indebted to the HS, PsSol 3 is remarkable for its lack of interest in the Temple cult.⁸⁴

This conclusion is disagreeable for several reasons, which will be discussed below. Whatever the categories would become for post-70's Jewish elements, pre-70's Jewish writings defined ritual and moral transgressions, as well as inadvertent sins, in relation to the Temple and its sanctity. This is not to lessen Douglas' insights in her response to Neusner cited above (cf. fn. 35), but it is to show that the Temple formed a paradigmatic

⁸³ Anthropology is defined as the 'study of races, physical and mental characteristics, distribution, customs, social relationships, etc. of mankind: often restricted to the study of the institutions, myths, etc. of primitive peoples'. Sociology is defined as 'the study of the history, development, organization, and problems of people living together as social groups'. A quick glance through the HB, stopping off at covenantal theology, e.g., Lev. 26, Deut. 30; Psalmic discourses, e.g., Ps. 1; prophetic theology, which characteristically distinguishes between sinner and righteous; and Wisdom theology, e.g., Prov. 9, 15, shows that HB theology is *not* concerned merely with the 'problems of people living together', but is dealing with the fundamental nature of Man. This nature is consistently addressed as being in need of redemption (a fundamental characteristic of both Jewish and Christian theologies) and, as such, is certainly anthropological rather than social. The point of contrast is always the covenant, with its twin manifestations of the Law and Temple, word and presence, which does not address the meager means of communal living, but the essential characteristics of Man communing with God, a fundamental element to the whole of the biblical text. Regarding the discussion at hand, it may be that this duality is a product of the priestly ethic, which maintains that sinfulness, whether hidden or not, is an affront to God and His presence in the land. Failure to rectify these sins through specific means of amelioration results in punishment along the lines of the prophetic perception.

⁸⁴ Atkinson 69; also note 327.

point of reference for Jewish religious self-awareness in the 2nd Temple times.⁸⁵ Regardless of whether the lines of thought go out from the Temple or converge on the Temple, the two constants in the dialogue are man and the Temple, which represents the presence of God in the land.

For instance, the Temple was not seen as unimportant for the DS Community, rather the existing Temple was simply considered defiled and therefore defunct.⁸⁶ Colleen M. Conway has suggested that purity took on an altered identity in the Qumran community, and states regarding the use of purity language by Qumran:

...what is at stake for this community is more than a shift of focus from Jerusalem to the Dead Sea. To reconfigure the laws of purity and pollution is to reconfigure the symbolic system, the very system that brings order to existence.⁸⁷

This explanation may go far in identifying the use and appropriation of biblical models of purity by Qumran. But the identification of such use may not, in the end, matter greatly. What is important to note is that the DS community did indeed value the Temple service greatly, the status of the actual Temple notwithstanding. For instance, 11QTemple is clearly concerned to show the importance of the biblical Temple service (cf. e.g., 11Q19.XXV.11). In 1QS, the purity laws play an important role (cf. e.g., 1QS.III 4-11), but the Temple itself is not explicitly mentioned. Furthermore, if the home and table became, analogically, the Temple and the sacrifices in post-70 Judaism, they did so through an appropriation of the Temple holiness to the local populace.⁸⁸ In short, one observation may be made: 2nd Temple Period writings are intimately concerned with either the Temple directly, regarding historical events surrounding it (e.g., 1 Maccabees;

⁸⁵ As we have noted in the beginning of this section, the Temple formed a primary point of emphasis even for the later rabbis.

⁸⁶ Note Colleen M. Conway "Toward a Well-Formed Subject: The Function of Purity Language in the Serek Ha Yahad" *JSP* 21 (2000) 103-104 who comments, "The desert community that they established was to be a new spiritual center and dwelling place for God, in other words, a replacement for the defiled Jerusalem Temple."

⁸⁷ *ibid.* 109.

⁸⁸ Note Neusner *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities* v.22 (Leiden: Brill, 1974-1977) 99, who comments on the appropriation of purity language shifting from Temple to home and table. Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 230-231 has argued for the ability of a system such as is present in Leviticus to replicate Temple holiness, without the Temple proper, if given the proper analogical space on which to do so. This seems the response of the rabbis who, operating without a Temple proper, reworked Temple holiness into everyday life. Cf. R. Travers Herford *Talmud and Apocrypha: Comparative Study of the Jewish Ethical Teaching in the Rabbinical and Non-Rabbinical Sources in the Early Christian Centuries* (London: Soncino Press, 1933) 47-55 of the 'Sopherim'; Brichto "On Slaughter and Sacrifice" 53; *Berakhot* 55a.

Josephus *BJ* V.212-214⁸⁹); physical descriptions and cosmological significance (e.g., Philo *Spec. Leg.* I.66-67, *de Vita* II.117-121; Sirach 50.1-21⁹⁰), or they deal with topics for which the Temple forms the primary object of tension, e.g., purity laws and sinfulness (e.g., 11QT^a III.11, XV.1-18; 11QT^b I.1-26; CD I.7, II.4-5; 1QS III 4-12; 9.5-6).

PssSol 5 and 6 begin with phrases that may make reference to the Temple service in some capacity: praising the Lord in a communal setting and calling upon the name of the Lord. Note 5.1:

Lord God, I will praise (αἰνέσω) your name with joy in the midst of those who know your just judgments.

For the authors of PssSol, communal worship is of obvious import and the similarities to Qumran have been well discussed.⁹¹ It should be noted, however, that HB presumed communal worship in discussions of the Temple.⁹² As such, it seems plausible to suggest that Temple formed the communal gathering area in which praise was offered to God. Indeed, several examples from HB suggest that communal worship was a vital part of the Temple service (cf. Ps. 35.18; 109.30; 111.1). 2 Chr. 5.13 provides one of the finest examples of praise being offered in the Temple. The scene of the dedication is filled with trumpeters, singers, and other accompanying instruments to offer praise (לְלַחֵם—αἰνέω) to the Lord (e.g., CPs. 27.6). The Psalter itself is a testimony to the presence of music and

⁸⁹ Cf. also Neusner's discussion of both Maccabees and Josephus *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* 34-40; note on Josephus specifically Hayward *The Jewish Temple* 142-153.

⁹⁰ Note Hayward's *idem* 108-125 on Philo; 77-84 on Sirach (Greek); 44-47 on ben Sira (Hebrew).

⁹¹ Note Wright "Psalms of Solomon" *OTP* 642, 649; Robert Wright "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes" in *1972 Proceedings of the IOSCS* (SCS 2; ed. Robert A. Kraft; Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972) 141-146; Atkinson *Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* 405; Jerry O'Dell "Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon" *Revue de Qumran* v. 3 n. 10 (Paris: Letouzey et Ane: 1961); J.J. Collins *Apocalypticism and the DSS* (London: Routledge, 1997) 75 points out that PssSol represent the only substantial messianic reference outside Qumran in the 2nd Temple period.

⁹² E.g., Ex. 30.16 in which the Israelites are required to give the half shekel as a ransom for themselves at the Tent of Meeting; the Levitical purity laws require that the impure person to present the purification offering at the Tent of Meeting in 12-15; Num. 27.2 in which the assembly was gathered to hear the case of the daughters of Zelophehad; Dt. 16.6 in which, unless prohibited by distance, the Passover meal must be consumed in the place where God "has chosen for his name to dwell." Also note Sirach 50.13 in which the offerings in the Temple are made before the "whole congregation of Israel" (πασῆς ἐκκλησίας).

praise offered at the Temple.⁹³ Yet perhaps the best-preserved example of Temple worship is to be found in the 2nd Temple document Sirach.

Sirach 50 contains an important description of the Temple service. The performance of the duties of High Priest by Simon son of Onias is spoken of in cosmological terms. The High Priest is described in 6-7 as the ‘morning star’, the ‘full moon’, and even as the ‘sun, shining on the Temple of the Most High’. Following a description in 12-15 of the offerings being presented by the High Priest before the congregation of Israel, a great fanfare ensues in which the people of the Lord worship and praise the Lord. Note 50.17-18:

- 17) Then all the people hurried in common and fell face down upon the ground to worship their Lord, the Almighty God Most High.
- 18) And the psalm-singers praised with their voices, and the melody was sweetened with a great roar.⁹⁴

The Temple was the setting for communal praise, and as we have noted above, examples from HB suggest as much. But praise was also considered an offering. So Ps. 69.31-32:

- 31) I shall praise the name of the Lord in song and I shall magnify him in thanksgiving.
- 32) It will be better to the Lord than a bull or an ox with horn and hoof.

Here, the psalmist has equated praise with sacrificial animals (note Heb 13.15 and 4Q403 frag. I col. I 1-11). In short, verbal praise was intimately connected with worship at the Temple.⁹⁵ With this in mind, it is reasonable to suggest that the authors of PssSol had this type of gathering in mind in chapter 5. The number of parallels within HB to PssSol on the association of praise with the services in the Temple suggests that the holy edifice dominated the thoughts of the authors. Note further PssSol 10.5-7:

- 5) Our God is holy and just in his judgments forever, and Israel will praise

⁹³ Note R.N. Whybray *Reading the Psalms as a Book* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 16, in which he discusses the influence of Temple “intellegensia” on the Psalter and 30 for its use in “cultic” matters.

⁹⁴ B, S, and A all have οἶκω as the reading for ἤχω—roar—in v. 18, with it being the original reading in S. Note the discussion of ‘house’ below.

⁹⁵ Herford *op. cit.* 69 makes the insightful comment that this was part of the daily practice of the common man.

the name of the Lord with joy.

- 6) And the holy ones will praise in the gathering (ἐκκλησία) of the people and the Lord will show mercy upon the poor to the joy of Israel.
- 7) For the Lord is merciful and kind forever and the assemblies (συναγωγαί) of Israel will glorify his name.

In this selection, the emphasis is on the assembly (ἐκκλησία or συναγωγή) of Israel. We know from the Pentateuch that συναγωγή is used to render two different Heb. terms, קָהָל and עֵדוּת (note Gn 1.9, 28.3, 35.11 for קָהָל and Ex 12.3, 3, 47; Lev 4.13; Num 1.2 for עֵדוּת)⁹⁶ and that these terms are often indicative of the gathered people of Israel before the Lord.⁹⁷ Knowing that HB intended for praise to be offered in a communal manner and that the people often gathered at the Tent of Meeting or Temple, it is plausible to suggest that the reference to the gathering and praising in PssSol was intended to be done in the Temple itself. As such, the instances in which communal praise is mentioned in PssSol probably indicate a reference to the Temple.⁹⁸

The next phrase is 'calling upon the Lord'. Note chapter 6.1:

Blessed is the man whose heart is ready to call upon (ἐπικαλέσασθαι) the name of the Lord; when he remembers the name of the Lord, he will be saved.

The instances of the phrase 'calling upon the name of the Lord' in HB are infrequent (e.g., Gn. 4.26, 12.6, 13.4, 21.33, 26.25). In LXX Pentateuch, however, this phrase became a commonplace for rendering the 'dwelling place' of the Lord, i.e., the Temple. As C.T.R. Hayward has pointed out regarding the LXX rendering of the term:

⁹⁶ The term ἐκκλησία is used in the Pentateuch to render קָהָל regularly, but is not employed until Deuteronomy, which uses the term συναγωγή only at 5.22 and 33.4.

⁹⁷ Often the term simply means the "whole of the Israelites." This is particularly the case in Exodus. Once the Temple has been established however, the term often referred to the gathering of the people at the Tent of Meeting; note e.g., Ex 16.9, Lev 4.13, 8.5, and most importantly 16.5; Num 8.9.

⁹⁸ Also note the references 2.33, 37; 3.1-2; 8.34 and 15.3. I have examined each of these references and can find little reason to doubt that they refer to praise being offered in unison at the Temple. This is particularly true in the light of Pompey's actions in quickly restoring the Temple to operating purity standards; cf. E. Mary Smallwood *The Jews under Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 27-28. The tenor of PssSol in this respect is that nothing is inappropriate about the Temple itself but with those who have invaded it or who have misappropriated its sacrifices and affronted its holiness.

There can be little doubt that, in adopting this particular explanation of שָׁכַן , the LXX translators are concerned to present the sanctuary as a place of prayer, where God may be called upon directly by His Name.⁹⁹

For example, note Ex. 29.45-46:

MT: I shall dwell (אֶשְׁכֶּנֶן) in the midst of the sons of Israel and will be their God. And they will know that I am the Lord their God who brought them out of the land of Egypt to dwell (לִשְׁכֶּנֶן) amongst them; I am the Lord their God.

LXX: And I shall be called upon ($\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$) by the sons of Israel and will be their God. And they will know that I am the Lord their God who led them out of Egypt to be called upon by them ($\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$) by them and to be their God.

The shift from 'dwelling' in HB to 'being called upon' by LXX is common.¹⁰⁰ We know from the text (e.g., Ex. 25.8) that the dwelling place of God was the sanctuary. Thus, for LXX, the sanctuary took on the stereotyped meaning of the place in which one calls upon the name of the Lord. The occurrence of such language in PssSol is likely a reflection of this categorization. While HB contains instances of 'calling upon the name' (בְּשֵׁם יְקִרָא), none of these instances are direct references to the Temple.¹⁰¹ The distinction between the Temple as a place in which God is to be seen as opposed to his dwelling place is not evident until Ex. 25.8. The selection reads:

⁹⁹ C.T.R. Hayward "Understandings of the Temple Service in LXX Pentateuch" (paper presented for the fortnightly Postgraduate Research Seminar in Old Testament at the University of Durham, England 8th Sept. 2001) 5.

¹⁰⁰ Occasionally in the Pentateuch, Num. 35.34, the Gk. term $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ is used to explain God's presence amongst the Israelites. It is more common in later literature, e.g., I Chr. 23.25; II Chr. 6.1; Ezra 6.12; Neh. 1.9; CPs. 5.11; 68.17 (67.17 LXX); 78.60 (77.60 LXX). This term is also used in PssSol 7.6. Also, the presence of God in the Temple in LXX is as an 'appearance', rendered with the Gk. $\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$.

¹⁰¹ Rather, the references are made to places such as Beer-Sheba in Gn 26.25 and Mt Sinai in Ex. 34.5 in which a visitation from God is remembered. This is not to suggest that these references are not applied to the understanding of the Temple in some capacity. As Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 228f has pointed out so clearly, the Temple was likely related intentionally and analogically to Mt Sinai. Indeed, this may provide the basis by which LXX tradition rendered the Heb. as they did. This concept of analogical relations is certainly not limited to literary works. Ian Barbour *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (London: SCM Press, 1998) 116f explains that 'models' are useful in explicating the relationship between two objects. Writing with a view to both Science and Religion, Barbour concludes that all models are ultimately didactic, relating individuals to larger concepts that are otherwise unintelligible by means of self-perpetuating analogies.

MT: And they shall make for me a sanctuary (מִקְדָּשׁ) that I might dwell (וַשְׁכֵּנִי) in your midst.

LXX: And you shall make for me a sanctuary (ἁγίασμα) and I shall appear (ὀφθήσομαι) among you.

But it is not out of character for God to appear to his people. In Gn 12.7, God appears to Abram at the oak of Moreh in Shechem. Thus, LXX may represent an intentional editorial commitment to appropriate ancestral experiences as representative of the contemporary Temple services.¹⁰²

PssSol 7 provides perhaps the most thorough account of these concepts in the document. Note vv. 6-7:

- 6) While your name dwells in our midst, we shall receive mercy.
- 7) For you (God) shall be our shield and we shall call upon you (ἐπικαλεσόμεθα) and you shall hear us.

The whole of the chapter deals with the election of Israel and the inheritance of God (vv 8-10). Insofar as vv. 6-7 contain the two most important and widespread references to the Temple from HB, 'dwelling in the midst' and 'calling upon the name', it stands to reason that the Temple occupied a fundamental position in the authors' theology and anthropology.

In the case of both communal worship and 'calling upon the Name of God' in LXX, several insights may be applied to the discussion of the phrase or concept in PssSol. First, it is important to keep in mind that the Temple is implied in each instance in which 'calling upon the name of God' is mentioned by the authors (cf 2.36; 6.1; 9.6; and 15.1) or in which communal worship is implied (2.33, 37; 3.1-2; 5.1; 8.34; 10.5-7; and 15.3). In short, the Temple formed a dominant motif for the authors. It is also likely that, because of the volume of occurrences of the Temple motif, 'sinners' and 'righteous'

¹⁰² Note Bernhard W. Anderson *Living World of the Old Testament* chapters 1-2 and his understanding of tradition and history; also note Walther E. Rast *Tradition History and the Old Testament GBSOTS* (ed by J. Coert Rylaarsdam; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972) chapter 5.

were classified in large part as such according to their relation to the Temple. As is clear from the discussion of ritual and moral impurity above, both act against the Temple. Secondly, inasmuch as the Temple motif is a central element, it is likely that the messianic section in PssSol 17 and 18 is related to the function of the Temple and the purity system. It seems that the authors concluded that the Messiah was needed in order to establish, in perpetuity, the purity laws leading to a nation that no longer defiled the habitation of God's Name on Earth.¹⁰³

4.1.1—'House' as a metaphor for the Temple

At this point, it is important to discuss the term 'house' in PssSol. Generally, οἶκος is used by LXX to render בית. Occasionally, however, LXX use this term to render such Hebrew terms as שֶׁכֶן, הַיִּכָּל, and even קֹדֶשׁ. For instance, II Chr. 35.5 reads:

MT: And stand in the holy place (בְּקֹדֶשׁ) according to the divisions of the houses of your fathers, according to your brothers the sons of the people, and divide your father's house according to the Levites.

LXX: And stand in the house (οἶκος) according to the division of the houses of your fathers, according to your brothers the sons of the people, and divide your father's house according to the Levites.

The translation may be termed 'literal' insofar as each element of the Hebrew is likewise accounted for by an element in the Greek, but the use of the term οἶκος for קֹדֶשׁ fits the description of a free interpretation.¹⁰⁴ The Greek term οἶκος likely reflected the well known fact that the Temple was often called the 'house of God' (cf. e.g., Ex. 23.19, 34.26; Dt. 23.19—בֵּית יְהוָה)¹⁰⁵ and therefore probably does not reflect any sort of

¹⁰³ Cf. Cross "The Tabernacle" 68.

¹⁰⁴ Note Tov *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint* 50-53; Olofsson *Translation Technique in the LXX* 10-23.

¹⁰⁵ The use of "house" as a metaphor for a state of being is also significant, note e.g., Ex. 20.2 in which the Lord reminds Israel that he brought them out of the "house of bondage" in Egypt; also cf. Ex. 13.14, Dt. 5.6, 6.12.

exegesis on the part of the translators.¹⁰⁶ Given the context of II Chr. 35, a reference to the 'house' would clearly indicate that what was meant was the house of God, namely, the Temple. Thus 'house' functioned as a metaphor for Temple in certain contexts within HB. Another example is found in Micah 1.2, which reads:

MT: Listen all people and give heed O land and all that is in it, the Lord is a witness against you, the Lord from his holy Temple (מהיכל קדשו).

LXX: Hear *this* word O people and let the earth and all that is in it give heed, and the Lord will be a witness against you, the Lord out of his holy house (οίκου ἁγίου).

Again we have a reference to the Temple, very clearly stated in HB by the use of היכל, for which LXX has chosen to use οἶκος to duplicate the sense of the passage (cf. also Deut. 26.15 and Ps. 84.5).

This same metaphor may be present in PssSol. PssSol 3.5-8 discusses the actions of the righteous who, having sinned, remove the unintentional sins from 'his house'. As I noted above, this process requires the rendering of the purification offering by the offender to complete the purification process (Lev 4-5). Note PssSol 3.6-7:

- 6) The truth of the righteous is from the Lord their savior; sin upon sin will not lodge in the house of the righteous.
- 7) The righteous examines the whole of his house to remove injustice of his transgression.

The goal of the righteous is to remove the sin from 'his house', which may be an analogy to the actual person (note the use of house in this capacity by Mt 12.43-44; Lk 11.24). As

¹⁰⁶ *Meg.* 16b records the paradigm shift from Temple-as-edifice to Temple-as-Torah study. This shift is also recorded in *ARN IV* in which R. Jochanan says to his disciple, who is distraught by the sight of the destroyed Temple, "My son, be not distressed. We still have an atonement equally efficacious, and that is the practice of benevolence." It may be that the rendering of "holy place" with "house" was an interpretation on the part of LXX with the knowledge that their version was to be received by the Diaspora, and, as such, may reflect a tendency in ancient Judaism to appropriate the Temple edifice into daily life. Note *Ber.* 55a; cf. Neusner *The Idea of Purity* 112, in which he notes the development of the "holy community" as a response to alienation or separation from the Temple.

Milgrom has remarked, the recognition of the inadvertent sin by the offender is the first step in the process of amelioration, and this seems to be the intention of the authors in vv. 6-7.¹⁰⁷ But the process of amelioration is not fulfilled until the tendering of the purification offering by the inadvertent sinner. This, as Milgrom has also pointed out, purifies a portion of the Temple that was defiled by the inadvertent sin. PssSol seems to mimic this model. Note 3.8:

He atones from his unknown deeds (ἀγνοίας) by fasting and humbling his soul and the Lord purifies (καθαρίζει) every righteous man and his house.

In the first line, it is the individual who atones for his unknown deeds. These are likely a reference to unintentional sins and the atonement made is the same that is made for unintentional sins in Leviticus 4-5. In the second line, however, it is the Lord who purifies the righteous and cleanses 'his house'. Most commentators have taken this to refer to the house of the righteous person.¹⁰⁸ If, however, it is granted that what is taking place in 3.5-8 is an assessment of the amelioration process for inadvertent sinners and the ritually impure, then it stands to reason that the 'cleansing' that takes place is in reference to both the righteous person, who is having his 'pure status' reinstated, as well as the Temple, which requires purgation from the pollution of inadvertent sinfulness. In most cases in which 'house' is used by the authors, it is in obvious reference to one's family. In PssSol 3, however, 'house' is likely a metaphor for the Temple, and the event of vv. 6-7 is in reference to either the Day of Atonement or the customary tendering of the $\eta\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ (cf. discussion below).

4.2—Sin as Encroachment upon the Temple in PssSol

The sanctity of the Temple in the 2nd Temple Period is well known. The first transgression mentioned in PssSol is the profanation of the Temple in 1.8, which reads:

¹⁰⁷ Milgrom "Priestly Doctrine of Repentance" 196-199.

¹⁰⁸ So Wright "The Psalms of Solomon" OTP 655; Atkinson *Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* 61-64; Ryle and James *Psalms of the Pharisees* 36 give a slight indication of the procedure hinted at in this section with this terse statement, 'For the cleansing which follows upon the act of atonement, see the use of $\xi\lambda\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in Lev. xii.8; xiv. 19, 53; Ezek. xliii.26'.

Their lawlessness was greater than the nations before them; they made common (ἔβεβήλωσαν) the holy things of God (τὰ ἅγια κυρίου).

Two terms are significant. First, the Gk. word βεβηλώω is used in the Pentateuch to describe the process by which elements become defiled through being made common or mundane. Lev. 19.8 contains the warning against eating of the peace offering three days after it is first offered. So doing is an act of ‘making common’ or ‘defiling’ which is rendered by the Greek term βεβηλώω. After three days the offering is said to become profane and the person who eats of it is to be cut off from the people because he has ‘profaned the holy things of God’ (τὰ ἅγια κυρίου ἔβεβήλωσαν). An example of this is to be found at Lev. 10.13 in which Moses commands the sons of Aaron to eat of the sacrifices in the holy place because they are holy and must be kept from the ordinary areas of life.¹⁰⁹ Again these are boundary markers, which serving in a sociological role to protect against dissolution of communal association. But this should not mask the theological intent of such markers. For instance, that the Lord threatens to ‘hide his face’ from his people (e.g., Dt. 32.20, Is 59.2) should be seen as a response to the impingement upon these boundary markers. This seems the same type of idea present in PssSol 1.8 as well. For the authors, the ‘making common’ of the holy things of God undermines the identity of the nation of Israel and distorts the boundary markers which are its special privilege, that is, the Temple as a marker of the Divine Presence in the land.

Secondly, the term ἅγιος in the Pentateuch often refers to a place in which the Lord is currently dwelling. One example is the burning bush episode in Ex. 3. Moses is required to take off his sandals because he was walking on ‘holy ground’. Elsewhere, the term refers to the Sabbath (e.g., Ex. 12.16); to the various elements of Temple worship (e.g., Ex. 30.25-29—the anointing oil and Temple accoutrements); and as a direct reference to the Temple (e.g., Ex. 30.13, 24; Ex. 35.21, 35; Ex. 36.1; Ex. 39.1; Lev. 5.15). In PssSol 1.8, the term is used to mean ‘the sanctuary of God’ (τὰ ἅγια κυρίου).¹¹⁰ Since the consensus of opinion regarding ch. 1 is that it functions as a type of introduction to

¹⁰⁹ On the issue of ‘making common’ the holy, note Ex. 31.14 in which doing work—a common, weekly activity—is said to profane—βεβήλων—the Sabbath, which is holy—ἅγιον.

¹¹⁰ This is one of Wright’s “The Psalms of Solomon” 651 suggestions. The Syriac is less ambiguous with
ܠܝܘܐ ܡܠܟܐ.

the whole of PssSol, the use of the phrase in chapter one likely reflects the understanding of chapter two.¹¹¹ As such, τὰ ἅγια κυρίου in 1.8 is surely referring to same thing as in 2.3: it is the Temple that is defiled in ch. 1.

Key to understanding this process of defilement in chapter 1 is to understand what is meant by ‘sins’ in v. 7. The verse reads:

Their sins (ἁμαρτίαι) were in secret (ἀποκρύφους) and I did not know.

Jerusalem personified is speaking of the sins of her inhabitants, the Jews (note Lamentations 1). Clearly one of the primary offences is that the sins are ‘in secret’. But this is not to suggest the sins were inadvertent, for which the term ἀκουσίως, is used by LXX. It is likely that נטפ underlies the Gk. ἁμαρτία based on the LXX’s usage of the term, which, coupled with ἀποκρύφους, may suggest an intentional, brazen offence that is kept hidden. Dt. 27.14 may provide an indication of the type of offence alluded to by the authors. The verse reads:

MT: Cursed is the man that makes an idol (פסל) or the one who casts an abomination to the Lord, the work of skilled hands, and sets it up in secret (בסתר). And all the people answered and said amen.

LXX: Cursed is the man, the one who will make an image or a cast figure, an abomination to the Lord, the work of skilled hands, and sets it up in secret (ἀποκρύφω). And having answered, all the people said, Amen.

The setting of Dt. 27 is the division of Israel to the two separate mountains, Gerizim and Ebal, to hear the blessings and curses. Prior to this division, the text is keen to point out that it is the keeping of the whole of the covenant law that is important. Walter Brueggemann has stated regarding this passage:

These twelve curses are one version of the “bottom line” concerning practices that are intolerable in Israel because they will jeopardize the community. By this recital and the regular communal response of assent (“Amen”), Israel accepts its peculiar status as the people of YHWH and the uncompromising requirements and prohibitions that go with that status.¹¹²

¹¹¹ Wright *ibid.* 651; Atkinson *Intertextual* 20, 393; Nickelsburg *Jewish Literature* 204.

¹¹² Walter Brueggemann *Deuteronomy* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001) 252.

Brueggemann's impression of the significance of the passage, as a communal response that defines the nature and character of the society, is in keeping with the above discussion of purity laws with respect to the Temple. Furthermore, the Law, which consists in part of the twelve curses of Dt. 27, seeks to define the characteristics of the relationship between the human and divine. As I have argued above, this relationship is ultimately mediated through the Temple and its rituals. Brueggemann's understanding of the Law as a boundary marker for the social and religious identity of the Israelites follows an understanding of all Israelite institutions: they are directed towards the establishment of a special people set apart for God. To either break or undermine that identity is to abandon willfully the very essence and fiber of 'being' Israelite. This type of an offence is expiable only on the Day of Atonement described in Lev. 16.

Regarding the verse in PssSol, Klawans has suggested the text is referring to moral impurity, specifically illicit sexual unions (cf. ch. 4.5 and 8.10).¹¹³ But it could have been any number of abhorrent offences, in particular idolatry, and could be a response to the influx of Hellenistic and syncretistic practices.¹¹⁴ One of the characteristics of both ritual and moral impurity is they have an 'aerial' quality and can defile the Temple from afar. Likely what is meant by ch. 1 is this: the Jews in Jerusalem—it could have been any Jew¹¹⁵—were defiling the sanctuary through their immoral activities.¹¹⁶ Verse 8 may mean that the Jews who were administering the Temple sacrifices were so doing in a state of ritual impurity, thereby bringing into contact the mundane and the holy, or were guilty of moral impurities (e.g., sexual immorality or

¹¹³ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 59.

¹¹⁴ E.g., Ezra 9.1-10.44 and the issue of marrying foreign women might be the forerunner to this resistance. Schürer *HJP* v.II 54 comments that the Jewish religion was largely unaffected by the influx of Hellenism; also note Smallwood *Jews under Roman Rule* 123. Schürer *idem* 81 points out, however, 'Two points in particular were not to be lost sight of in the struggle against paganism: idolatry, and the Gentile non-observance of the Levitical laws of purity'. This may suggest that idolatry was entering into the Jewish religious sphere to an appreciable degree. Also note Louis Feldman *Jews and Gentiles in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) 67-69 who notes the evidence of syncretistic practices, but suggests that core Jewish faith remaining hermetically isolated from pagan influences.

¹¹⁵ Contra Atkinson *Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon* 25; Wright "Psalms of Solomon" *OTP* 652; Winninge *Sinners and the Righteous* 32, who assume that this must be speaking against the priests in particular. We do not find any reason to limit this injunction to the priests alone. Clearly the rubric of moral impurity in Leviticus has community wide application.

¹¹⁶ Nicklesburg *Jewish Literature* 206 has pointed out, "...the cardinal sin (of 1.8, 2.3, and 8.12-14, 25) involved defilement of the sanctuary and the cult."

idol worship).¹¹⁷ In either case, it is little wonder that PssSol would speak in such imprecatory language regarding the Jewish sinners. According to the Pentateuch, the very nature of these sins was actively disruptive to the order of existence of the nation of Israel. The failure to guard against impingement upon the divine is the foremost invective leveled against the Jewish sinners.

In ch. 2, we find that the Gentiles are called sinners in ch. 1 because of their actions against the Temple.¹¹⁸ In v. 1, the Gentiles have invaded the city and v. 2 reads:

A foreign (ἀλλότρια) nation went up on your altar of sacrifice (θυσιαστήριον) and walked around arrogantly in their sandals.

The connection with the episode of the burning bush in Ex. 3 and Moses' removal of his sandals is clear. What has also become clear in the light of our discussion regarding the issue of making the holy mundane is that the Temple is forbidden to non-Israelites. The use of the term ἀλλότρια resonates with several instances in the Pentateuch, most completely with the separation of the anointing oil in Ex. 30.33 and the offering of 'strange' fire by Nadab and Abihu in Lev. 10. In Lev. 10, Nadab and Abihu are said to offer 'strange' fire to the Lord. Verse 1 reads:

And the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu each took and made fire and placed incense upon it and they brought (וּתְקַרְבוּ) before the Lord strange fire (אֵשׁ זָרָה) that the Lord had not commanded them.

Two observations are important. First, Nadab and Abihu offer the fire before the Lord as a sacrifice. The intent of their hearts was likely right. The phrase 'brought before the Lord' is common in Leviticus to describe the priestly duties of offering sacrifices to the

¹¹⁷ While Ex. 29.37 and 30.29 both state that contact with the holy things, i.e. the sacred articles and accoutrements of the altar, renders whatever touches them holy, Milgrom has pointed out that this does not apply to persons. Therefore, an impure person, coming into contact with the holy, must be destroyed.

¹¹⁸ Gentiles are not thought of as intrinsically sinful by the authors of PssSol. Rather, it is only after the Gentiles have trampled on the Sanctuary that they are considered sinful. This is in support of one of Feldman's *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* 91-92, 99, 102 general thesis that Jew and Gentile were largely amicable during the two centuries surrounding the turn of the millennium. Also note e.g., Gn. R. 64.10, 75.4 and Lev. R. 15.9 in which the rabbis mix criticism with favor towards Rome. John Bright *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981) 442-446 intimates such a tension between Jew and Gentile.

Lord (cf. e.g., Lev. 12.8, 14.31f, 15.15).¹¹⁹ Thus, even in a correct state of mind, inappropriate offerings can result in the cataclysm of the contact between the holy and divine, the result of which is death. This is true even for the sons of Aaron who, more than any other human, have rights of access to the *sancta*. The second observation is that what was offered was ‘strange’—*אֲלֹתֵי*. The LXX reads:

And the two sons of Aaron, each taking his wood, set upon it fire, placed incense upon it and brought before the Lord a strange fire (*πῦρ ἀλλότριον*) which the Lord had not commanded of them.

This strange fire is indeed an alien fire; it was not commanded of the Lord and the offence of its presence before the Lord required instantaneous purgation. What is offensive about the actions of Nadab and Abihu is not their status as individuals (they were priests in the order of Aaron) nor their intentions (they were bringing before the Lord an offering), but the nature of the offering itself—it was not commanded of the Lord to be presented.¹²⁰

The offence in PssSol 2.2 now makes better sense. The Gentile conqueror who went up into the Temple was condemned not because he was a Gentile, but because he was alien (*ἀλλότρια*), that is, not commanded or permitted of the Law of Moses to enter into the Holy of Holies. But prohibition from entry into the Holy of Holies does not define ‘Gentile’. If it did, many Jews would also be considered ‘Gentile’. What it does demonstrate is that the Gentiles in ch. 1 were not intrinsically considered sinners; they became sinners when they entered into the sanctuary and because they were alien. This concept, which defines the Gentile’s sinfulness in entering into the sanctuary, has a very clear Pentateuchal antecedent—Ex. 19.6 and Lev. 10.10. The nation of Israel are to be a

¹¹⁹ Haran *Temple Service* 187-188 points out that holiness is contagious. The destruction that results from the contact made between that which is holy and that which is common or profane is an impersonal and static result; the holy consumes the profane.

¹²⁰ Also note Ex. 30.9 in which ‘foreign incense’ (*קִטְרֵת זָרָה*) is not permitted upon the altar of incense before the Ark of the Covenant. On the issue of ‘unauthorized fire’ note Milgrom *Leviticus* v. I 598, in which he suggests that the ‘coals’ spoken of in this passage were ‘profane’, the introduction of which into the Temple encroached upon the Lord. This should not suggest that the elements that constituted the fire were unholy in any way. Rather, the fire was out of place. Being out of place again reflects on the importance of boundary markers. A marginal gloss in TN on Lev. 10 notes that the coals were taken from ‘beneath the stoves’. TPsJ is more explicit, stating that the fire was from ‘ordinary fireplaces’.

holy people and distinguish between the holy and the common precisely because the quintessence of holiness dwells among them.¹²¹

Regarding the Jewish sinners, we are very quickly apprised of what determines their sinfulness: they are guilty of profaning the Temple. PssSol 2.3 reads:

Because (ἀνθ' ὧν) the sons of Jerusalem defiled (ἐμίαναν) the holy things of God (τὰ ἅγια κυρίου), they profaned (made common—ἐβεβήλουσαν) the gifts of God in lawlessness (ἀνομίαις).

First, it is important to note that ἀνθ' ὧν indicates that what happened before is a direct result of what is about to be described. The appearance of the Gentile conqueror is a direct result of the defilement of the Temple. Secondly, ἐβεβήλουσαν recalls our discussion of 'making common' in HB. Indeed, 'making common' seems to be a focus of the discussion for the authors at this point, who make an overt reference to Moses' removal of his sandals in the presence of God at the burning bush and the Gentiles' failure to do so in going up to the Temple (2.2). Finally the authors quickly clarify the opaque reference to 'defile the Temple...through lawless acts'. These lawless acts are, succinctly, moral impurities. The most indicative evidence for this is found in 2.9a, which reads,

And heaven was weighed down and the earth (land) abhorred (ἐβδελύξατο) them. As I noted above, for the Pentateuch both the Land and the Temple are affected by moral impurities. One of the possible consequences of a moral transgression is expulsion from the Land; the land 'vomits out' its inhabitants. This procedure and result of moral impurities is not limited to the Israelites, but seems to be an ontological characteristic of the land.¹²² PssSol 2.13 is quick to show that these lawless actions are sexual sins, that they defile the Temple directly, and that they lead to expulsion from the land. Elsewhere in the document, sexual immorality is defined as the dominant characteristic of the sinner (4.5 and 8.9). Klawans has suggested that the element of 'Gentiles before them' in

¹²¹ Note Milgrom's comments "Leviticus" v. II 1721 that the charge placed on Israel by H is to 'advance the holy into the realm of the common and to diminish the impure, thereby enlarging the realm of the pure'.

¹²² One must only remember the instance in Gn. 15.16 in which the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet complete as well of the example from Lev. 18 in which the inhabitants of the land before the Israelites did all those things that were prohibited and were expelled.

PssSol 1.7 recalls Lev. 18.27.¹²³ More significant, however, is the imagery of the earth abhorring the sinful element in Jerusalem in 2.9a, which leads to the invasion of the land and expulsion of the people.

The importance of the Temple for the authors is not limited to the accounts of its defilement. Again note PssSol 3.7-8:

- 7) The righteous constantly examines his house in order to remove injustice in his transgression (παραπτώματι).
- 8) He atones (ἐξιλάσατο) from his unknown deeds (ἀγνοίας) by fasting and humbling his soul (ταπεινώσει ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ); and the Lord purifies (καθαρίζει) every righteous man and his house.

This pericope likely refers to the several purgation rituals described in the Pentateuch, and in particular the Day of Atonement. Based on our observations of Lev. 14.19-20 in LXX and MT above, it stands to reason to suggest that ἐξιλάσατο in verse 8 renders the underlying Heb. כִּפֵּר. The use of this term in reference to purgation of the Temple as a result of inadvertent sin, ritual impurity, and brazen offences by the Pentateuch is well known. Its use by PssSol seems to indicate that a characteristic of the document is a pre-occupation with punctiliously rendering the proper sacrifices—likely the תָּאֵטַן—either to purge the Temple subsequent to an inadvertent offence or to complete the process of re-purification. Further examination of the pericope solidifies this view. The sins for which the righteous atone are those of ignorance—ἀγνοίας. Likely the ‘sins of ignorance’ refer to the category of inadvertent sins in Leviticus. The imagery of a man ‘constantly searching his house’ to remove these offences should remind the reader of the first step in ameliorating for inadvertent sins—recognition of the wrong committed (e.g., Lev. 5.18, 22.14). As has been discussed above, both inadvertent sins and ritual impurities require the same purification offering in order to purge the Temple from impurity. Likely the ‘atonement’ of v. 8 is in reference to this very ritual. In addition to being a reference to the propitiation of inadvertent sins, this passage is likely referring to the Day of Atonement. Note Lev. 16.29:

¹²³ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 59.

MT: And it will be an everlasting ordinance for you; in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, you shall afflict your souls (תענו את נפשת'יכם) and you shall do no work, the native or the foreigner living among you.

LXX: And this shall be for you an everlasting ordinance; in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, humble your souls (ταπεινώσατε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν) and you shall do no work, the native and the foreigner living among you.

The use of the phrase ταπεινώσει ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ certainly connects the process in PssSol 3.8 to the process on the Day of Atonement in Lev. 16.29. Milgrom has noted regarding this phrase:

The entire phrase is usually interpreted as referring to fasting. ... There are, however, several reasons why the limitation to fasting does not do justice to the range of the idiom.¹²⁴

Milgrom goes on to suggest that the phrase likely incorporates bodily neglect on the whole, citing in particular David's neglect of his person in 2 Sam 12.16-20. It is likely that the authors of PssSol are making the distinction clear in this pericope by including fasting as a separate category from 'humbling one's soul'. As such, this portion of PssSol refers directly to the purification of the inadvertent sins of an individual, which require recognition, repentance, and the purgation of the Temple via the תאטת sacrifice. The appropriation of this discovery to our discussion yields this observation: in PssSol, the sins of the righteous are not, contrary to the sins of the 'sinners' in chapters 1 and 2, moral impurities. But this does not lessen the importance of the Temple for the authors of the document. If ritual impurities, or inadvertent sins, are the category of offence ascribed to the righteous in chapter 3, then the offence is still against the Temple.

With the foregoing assessment of chapter 3 in mind, the opening verse to chapter 4 becomes all the more clear. Note PssSol 4.1:

¹²⁴ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. 1 1054.

Why are you, O profaner (βέβηλε), sitting in the council (συνεδρίω) of the holy ones, and your heart is far removed from the Lord, enraging the God of Israel in your law-breaking.

Aside from the use of the term βέβηλε in the verse, which indicates an affront against the Temple proper in some capacity, the mere contrast of the sinner from chapter 4 with the righteous one who sins in chapter 3 indicates a separation of concepts. Ryle and James suggest that βέβηλος is used generally by the authors, "...for *things* common or unclean in contrast to things sacred and dedicated..."¹²⁵ The sinner of chapter 4 has committed something that breaks the Law and enrages the God of Israel. One important corollary to Klawans' observations is that none of the instances of ritual impurity or inadvertent sin in the Pentateuch ever enraged the Lord, but moral transgressions provoke his anger every time. Lev. 26 and Dt. 32 are both prime examples of those types of transgressions that incur the wrath of God—disobedience of God's law, which is tantamount to rejection of God's sovereignty over Israel (cf. Lev. 26.14f; Dt. 32.15-19).

Klawans has suggested that PssSol 4 defines moral impurities which defile the Temple from afar.¹²⁶ It is important to note that these sins are secretive (4.5) and sexually illicit (4.4-5). As such, the authors, following Pentateuchal parameters, consider these as moral transgressions based on the categorization of these terms by the Pentateuch. This is to say, these transgressions are directed against the Temple. The contrast between the sinners in chapter 4 and those in chapter 3.5-8 is that the former defile the Temple through moral impurities—sexually illicit affairs and deceit—while the latter are guilty only of ritual impurities or inadvertent sin.

4.3—Purity, the Temple and Messiah in PssSol

It seems fitting in the light of the foregoing analysis to comment briefly on the messianic portion of PssSol. In this respect, it may prove useful to note that one of the Messiah's primary actions is to purify in a general sense. He first purifies (καθαρίσαι)

¹²⁵ Ryle and James *Psalms of the Pharisees* 40. Ryle and James 40 would also state regarding the term, "...βέβηλος here is the man who, having to represent a holy people and to deal with holy things, is himself unholy..."

¹²⁶ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 59.

Jerusalem from the Gentiles (v. 22), then, after having gathered a holy people (v 26), in whom he will not allow any trace of injustice (ἀδίκιαν) to 'lodge (αὐλισθῆναι) in their midst', he will purge (καθαρίει) Jerusalem. The Messiah does not allow injustice (ἀδίκιαν) to lodge (αὐλισθῆναι) in much the same way as the righteous person who sins in 3.5-8 does not allow sins to lodge (αὐλίζεται) in his house, but blots out all injustice (ἀδίκιαν). The actions of the Messiah, so it seems, are to accomplish on a universal scale what the righteous have accomplished personally. The comment needs to be made, however, that the purity system in Leviticus is intended to produce a 'purity equilibrium' between the human and the divine. As such, the system itself depends on human involvement. That the authors rail against the 'sinners' and clearly define their inheritance as destruction and eternal death seems to suggest that the authors see the ultimate failure of the purity system through human neglect (cf. 9.1). The hopelessness in PssSol is not in the prospects of a failure on the part of the Lord to redeem them, but in the ability of the purity system *as is* to regulate the human/divine relationship. It is through this lens that the messianic advent must be viewed. In short, the advent of the Messiah in PssSol represents the authors' answer to the shortcomings of the purity system and the culmination of the prophetic paradigm. This does not alter the importance of the purity system for the authors. Rather, it suggests that the most important element in the theological self-awareness for the authors was their traditional theology. The holiness and purity of the Temple was inextricably linked to the actions of the individuals. The relative purity of the Temple demanded constant care and supervision, not just by those who ministered in the Temple itself, but also by individual Jews the world over. That the messianic advent takes place as a summation to the whole of the document suggests that messianism was a force that addressed most completely the authors' dismay at the ineffectiveness of the purity system to produce a stasis of purity.

Finally, it is also important to point out that the Messiah in PssSol completely removes both the Jewish and Gentile sinners (17.22-24) who have committed moral impurities. Not so the righteous, whom he disciplines for having committed inadvertent sins or ritual impurities for their correction (17.27, 42; reiterated in 18.4-5). In so doing, he purifies both Jerusalem and the world, establishes the kingdom of God, in which there is no arrogance or unrighteousness (17.32, 41), and a sanctified Israel (17.43; reiterated in

18.8-9). To this end, the Messiah functions as the ‘hope’ of the authors of PssSol for the establishment of a stasis of purity in the land. In the light of the presence of the Temple motif and the reception of the purity laws of the Pentateuch by the authors of PssSol, the ‘messianic hope’ in the document indicates that Jewish piety in the middle part of the 1st century BCE is predicated on the adherence to and belief in the efficacy of the purity laws as a medium by which the relationship between the human and the divine is regulated.

5—Conclusions:

It is clear from the foregoing analysis of impurity that the authors of PssSol classified sinners as such based in large part on the parameters found in the Pentateuch. As for the Gentiles, they ostensibly became ‘sinners’ only when they interacted with the Temple in a direct capacity, to which the discussion of parallelism in the chapter on literary genre and poetics also indicated.¹²⁷ As I have attempted to show, this interaction was of a ‘foreign’ nature in much the same manner as the illicit fire offered by Nadab and Abihu in Lev. 10, the commandment to keep separate the holy anointing oil from any ‘foreign’ person in Ex. 30.33, or requirement that only a certain type of incense be burned upon the altar of incense in Ex 30.9. For the Jewish element among the sinners, these sins were sexual debauchery and deceit, and, as such, moral impurities.¹²⁸ Insofar as the moral transgressions committed by the Jewish element and the invasion of the sanctuary by the Gentiles defiled the Temple in kind, it seems plausible to suggest that, for the authors, the key point in their assessment of sin was the status of an individual, be it Jew or Gentile, vis-à-vis the Temple.¹²⁹ A key point not discussed above is the publicity of the offenses. For the Gentiles, they entered for all to see. The Jewish element’s sins, however, were

¹²⁷ This divinely appointed intervention of Gentile nations as punishment for wayward Israel (e.g., Dt. 32.25-26 and Is. 7-10.11) does not characterize the Gentiles as sinners. It is only after the Gentiles have been used to mete out punishment on Israel that the Lord punishes them for their own waywardness (e.g., Dt. 32.35-36 and Is. 10.12-13).

¹²⁸ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 123-124 has shown that deceit had become a moral impurity through a process termed by Milgrom ‘homogenization’. As the name suggests, later interpreters often associated two different yet related pericopes, thereby yielding blended perspectives on particular biblical categories. Klawans has suggested that Pr. 16.5 functioned as the source upon which later Jewish exegete would base their conclusion that deceit represented a moral transgression.

¹²⁹ This is to compare the “aerial” quality of moral and ritual impurity with the effrontery of the Gentiles (i.e., foreign ones—ἀλλότρια/ἑῶν) in the face of the holiness of the Temple.

originally committed in secret. But the authors explain in 2.17 that God had ‘...exposed their sins...’ It is equally important to point out that, while the sins were committed surreptitiously, they were punished nonetheless. In short, nothing escapes the knowledge of God (cf. 9.3; Sir. 23.19). Both types of sinners, Gentile and Jew, are reckoned as sinners because their offence defiles the Temple. The centrality of the Temple and its meaning, *viz.* the presence of the God of Israel in the land, evidently formed the primary point of departure for the authors in their categorization of sinner and righteous.

Moreover, the primary interest for the authors was to demonstrate the inheritance of God and Israel in the Land. Set within the context of sin and punishment (chs. 1-2), as well as a distinction between moral sinners¹³⁰ and the ritually impure/inadvertent sinners,¹³¹ references to the Temple likely serve as waypoints for the readers, informing them that it is the Temple that serves as one of two key references for determining sinfulness and righteousness. Impurity is, for the authors, a critical subject precisely because it is impurity that profanes the Temple and brings on God’s punishment. The holiness of the Temple was paramount for the authors in much the same manner as it was for the priestly writer in Leviticus, to which the reference to menstrual blood in PssSol 8.11-13, and its affects on the Temple, attests (cf. Lev 15). It is important to bear in mind that ritual impurities have a specific means by which the offender is re-purified. If the offenders do not follow the prescribed course for re-purification, then they have broken the Law of the Lord and profaned the Temple and have committed a moral transgression (note Num. 19). For instance, in profaning the sanctuary in 8.12, the guilty party was said to come to the Temple in a state of impurity (*ἀκαθαρσίας*). In so doing, they have introduced an impurity directly to the Temple compound. It may also be an indictment on certain elements of those in control of the Temple and its functions who disregarded the purity laws of Lev 15. In this case, they have committed a moral transgression by not undergoing the re-purification process (cf. Num 19.20).¹³² Whether or not the transgression committed in PssSol 8.11-13 is of the moral or ritual variety does not change the conclusion that the Temple formed one of the primary points departure by which the authors categorized humanity.

¹³⁰ 1.1 (based on 2.2); 1.7-8; 2.2, 3, 12-13; 3.9-12; 4.4-5, 8, 24; 8.9-10, 11-12, 22; 12.4; 15.8; 16.7-10; 17.5.

¹³¹ 3.5-8; 9.6-7; 10.1, 2-4; 10.7-10.

¹³² Also note TN and TPsJ on Num 19.

It is also important to comment briefly on the punishment for the separate categories. In the discussion of ritual impurities and inadvertent sins above, notice that no severe punishment is ever mentioned. It is likely that PssSol can help to clarify the psychological perception in 2nd Temple times of what happens to one who contracts a ritual impurity or commits an inadvertent sin. In the document, the righteous sinners are 'disciplined' by the Lord. The vulgar sinners, however, are thoroughly destroyed. The clearest example of this contrast is found in 13.6-7, which reads:

- 6) For the destruction (καταστροφή) of the sinner is terrible, but nothing of all these things will harm the righteous.
- 7) For the discipline (παιδεία) of the righteous of ignorant *transgression* is not like the destruction (καταστροφή) of the sinner.

Clearly the contrast is between 'discipline' (παιδεία) and 'destruction' (καταστροφή). The destruction of the morally impure follows after the manner of the morally impure in HB. There is little hope of survival for the morally impure. On the contrary, the righteous obviously sin only inadvertently and are, therefore, disciplined according to the correctives underlined in the Levitical purity laws (e.g., separation from community, fasting and humiliation of one's person). For the authors of PssSol, discipline seems to have been a characteristic of the covenantal relationship between God and Israel (cf. e.g., 7.9; 8.26; 10.2-3; 13.7-10; 14.1; 18.4, 7—compare to Dt 32.10). What the righteous could be certain of was salvation (cf. e.g., 3.6; 8.33; 16.4; 17.3—compare to Dt 32.15). In contrast, those who have committed moral transgressions were doomed to destruction (cf. e.g., 2.34; 3.11; 4.14-22; 12.6; 13.6-7; 14.9; 15.10—compare to Gn 19.29; Lev. 26.14-39). The astute reader will have noticed that curiously lacking from the discussion of the Temple motif in PssSol so far has been the technical term ἁμαρτία. A very simple explanation for this absence may be offered. PssSol is, first and foremost, a response to the crisis of Pompey's invasion. The document is a historical apologetic designed to account for this event, answering the questions 'why did he come' and 'what will happen now'. As I have suggested, the authors' response was conditioned by the prophetic view of history. Their concern is not to retell how one might offer the sacrifice and for what reason, this is a job fulfilled by Leviticus. The absence of sacrificial, technical jargon

only further presses the issue that the authors are concerned to offer an explanation of the event and a program of recovery.

Finally, the foregoing comparison brings several points to light that will be addressed in the following section. The tension between 'righteous and sinner', 'purity and impurity', 'Jews and non-Jews', 'inheritance of the Land and exile for sin', and messianic hope are all elements intimate to the theological awareness of the Qumran community. As such, the next step is to compare and contrast the communities of Qumran and PssSol and their understanding of these concepts. The groundwork laid in this chapter, then, forms the starting point for examining these two communities. Due to the importance of the Temple and the categories that accompany its discussion, the foregoing provides a proper platform from which a correct assessment of the relationship between PssSol and Qumran may be made. Heretofore, most studies on the relationship between Qumran and PssSol have been concerned to demonstrate the latter's affinities with Essenism but have failed to detail first the manner by which the two communities are to be related. Rather, most studies have been contented to point out first an *inability* to define clearly authorship in PssSol based on nomenclature and then to posit, generally by way sound yet cursory observations, that PssSol resonates with the literature from Qumran.¹³³ Yet these studies do not engage with PssSol from a thematic level and are susceptible, I think, to their own critique: it is impossible to assert sectarian affinities based exclusively on categorical comparisons, e.g., sociological or anthropological language. At stake in this comparison is not only a better perception of the authors' understanding of central Jewish tenets such as Law, Temple, and Will of God, but their relative relationship with the Qumran community.

¹³³ O'Dell "Religious Background to Psalms of Solomon" 241-259; P.N. Franklyn "The Cultic and Pious Climax" 17; Wright "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes" 136-154.

The Psalms of Solomon and Qumran:

A Question of Proximity

1—Introduction:

The foregoing chapter dealt with the view taken by HB, LXX and PssSol on God's presence in the land as embodied by the Temple edifice. Within that conversation the social questions of who is righteous and who is a sinner are raised. This same tension, between orthodoxy and orthopraxy, is certainly present in the literature found at Qumran. As I have suggested throughout, PssSol was composed with the intent of addressing a particular community. As such, it is a 'communal document', defining specific responses to events, social perceptions, and religious praxis for general communal consumption. In much the same way, the community gathered at Qumran composed and collected literature that embraced a particular view of their place in history as well as their definition of social boundaries. For the covenanters at Qumran, history was coming to its conclusion, which demanded a messianic and cataclysmic response. Sociologically, the group isolated itself from the outside world. For them, the Temple and religious practice in Jerusalem was no longer efficacious.

The authors of PssSol also generated responses to each of these categories. Of course the document has messianic elements, which creates a profound cataclysm in human history (PssSol 17). Sociologically, the terms sinner (cf. PssSol 1.1; 2.1, 16, 34-35; 3.9, 11-12; 4.2, 8, 23; 12.6; 13.2, 5-8, 11; 14.6; 15.5, 8, 10-13; 16.2, 5; 17.5, 23, 25, 36) and righteous (cf. PssSol 2.10, 18, 32, 34-35; 3.1, 3-7, 11; 4.8; 5.1; 8.8; 9.2, 7; 10.3, 5; 13.1, 6-9, 11; 14.9; 15.3, 6-7; 16.15; 17.32) convey a separation between two separate classes of people and form a central concern for the authors. It is important to point out that these designations are often found in the same verses and are used to explain one another (PssSol 2.34-35; 3.11; 4.8; 13.1-2, 5-9, 11; 15.6-8).

The value of a comparison between the two communities is manifold. First, Qumranic studies occupies a central sphere within modern biblical and textual criticism. Secondly, for traditional-historical and inter-textual studies that attempt to assess the wider reception of particular concepts in a 2nd Temple milieu, the value of the corpus at Qumran can hardly be overstated. Thirdly, because of the similarities between PssSol and

the literature found at Qumran already mentioned, much has been done to compare the two communities. As I am in this dissertation offering a new understanding of the formation and function of PssSol in 2nd Temple Judaism, it is appropriate to reassess the relationship between the two communities. Finally, an assessment of this nature runs two directions. The first is to add sharper contrast to the message and concepts in PssSol. The second is to examine the relative isolation of the Qumran community's theological constructs.

In his assessment of the *Rule of Community*, George W.E. Nickelsburg states regarding the nature of the DS community:

During this time they will prepare the way to go out into the wilderness (9:19-20), where they will constitute the nucleus of a larger group dedicated to the same strict observance of the Torah (8:12-16). *This* group as a whole will serve an expiatory function (9:3-5). In the light of statements in the Scrolls about the defilement of the Temple, this cultic language suggests that the Community and its pious conduct are understood to be a substitute for the Jerusalem cult.¹

Twenty years earlier, A.R.C. Leaney introduced the DS community's understanding of God in history with this statement:

God has revealed not only himself in his action in history, but also his will in the Law, given to Moses on Mount Sinai, requiring interpretation and application, but none the less given once for all. To the pious Jew therefore man's duty is to live less according to the structure of the universe than according to the will of God which he has revealed for this purpose.²

In this section, I hope to incorporate both Nickelsburg's and Leaney's assessments of the literature of the DSS and to comment on the relationship that literature may have with PssSol. This is to say, the self-awareness of the community that located itself in the Judean desert was expressed in terms of an authentic and genuine representative of God's will and purpose on the earth, standing as both the Temple and the embodiment of belief in the Law of Moses. I intend to examine this feature of the community with PssSol in mind and to assess the latter's affinities or differences with the Qumran material. I contend that the community at Qumran saw itself, first and foremost, as operating within God's will, which they defined as adherence to the Law of Moses and fastidious

¹ Nickelsburg *Jewish Literature* 133.

² A.R.C. Leaney *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning* (London: SCM Press, 1966) 57.

maintenance of purity laws that governed Temple practice. These categories and this type of language may be best summed up as a 'priestly ethos'.³ By priestly, I mean that it reflects a type of language that centers itself on the Temple, wherein the Temple functions as the focal point of the literature and defines human action or status according to the type of holiness envisaged as existing at the Temple compound. Indeed, it is the reverence held for the Temple as the 'dwelling place of God's name' and the perceived defilement of that dwelling place that presents the impetus for the authors' punctiliousness with respect to the boundary markers established by the legal regulations.

To prosecute this type of assessment, I will take one exemplar from Qumran, 1QS, and compare the nature of theological resonance between the document and PssSol. In so doing, I will also draw in examples where needed from other biblical, non-biblical, and Qumranic documents. Having examined the relative relationship between selections of Qumran literature and PssSol, I will probe the details of their relationship along a thematic line: priestly language. I have intimated that the tenor of PssSol reflects an overt interest in the priestly categories of purity, Temple, and Law.⁴ By contrasting the document with a 'priestly community' such as Qumran, which also held to a particular view of history as envisioned by priests and prophets alike (that is, sinfulness leads to punishment, repentance to redemption) I hope to highlight further the priestly and prophetic influences in the document.

³ Jacob Milgrom traces in detail the course of priestly language from the Pentateuch to Ezekiel, noting the various linguistic alterations that this language underwent. Cf. Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 3-13; in particular note his evaluation of Ezekiel's use of Leviticus 26 in "Leviticus" v. III 2328-2329, which is an excellent example of priestly, doctrinal modification at work.

⁴ The law being an essential aspect of the priestly sphere, particularly with respect to teaching. Philip R. Davies' comments in "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 222-232 serve to illustrate the degree to which the concept of the Law is blended with other Jewish religious institutions, e.g., Temple and king. The common conception that many of the texts that we now have originated in a liturgical framework centered at the Jerusalem Temple strengthens this point. Note Rast *Tradition History* 19-25 and his comments on the 'localization' of traditions. The implicit interaction between text and the office of the priesthood is evident in the work of those who specialize in priestly material or institutions. Note Menachem Haran *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) chapter 4 and 194ff; Clements *God and Temple* 27 makes the insightful comment that God's presence in Israel was identified primarily through the covenant and not simply through the Temple edifice. R. Travers Herford *Talmud and Apocrypha* 35-41 sees in Ezra a desire to set Law over Temple as the primary authority. He cites the instance in Ezra 10.3 where Eliashib is not included in the names of those who sign the covenant to reject intermarrying. Whether or not Herford is correct, the fact remains that, with Ezra, and to a lesser extent the Josianic reforms, the Law began to occupy a central role, one equal in many respects to Temple orthodoxy.

It is not my intention either to prove or disprove the document's association with the DS community. Rather, my goal is to assess selections from the Qumran material that may shed some light on concepts in PssSol. Straightaway one might object to this methodology on the grounds that it is tendentious. But Nickelsburg's comment regarding the religious self-awareness of the DS community, who envisioned themselves as the embodiment of God's will, continues to ring true. This understanding, I contend, is not a characteristic exclusive to the Dead Sea community. In fact, associating oneself with the will of God is a Jewish characteristic intrinsic to all the literature of this era. In short, I fail to see the disassociation of the religious self-awareness present at Qumran from that of 'mainstream' Judaism as being of *greater* value to Judeo-Christian scholarship than the association of the two.⁵ Thus, using the Qumran literature as a litmus test is useful and justifiable. Indeed, one need only compare briefly 1 and 2 Maccabees with 1QS and 1QH for evidence of the similarities between the two ostensibly diametrically opposed groups of Jews. 1 Maccabees 2-4 paints the picture of Matthias and his sons, in particular Judas, as 'saviors' of Jerusalem and of the Jews. Some of the hymnic refrains (e.g., 2.7-13; 3.3-9) are exemplary samples of pietistic certainty: the Maccabees were God's vehicles for deliverance, and ultimately purify and rededicate the Temple (cf. 1 Macc. 4). This action of purifying the place in which God's name dwells, to be sure, is an action that any pious group of Jews would readily undertake and for which all would gladly claim credit. Indeed, the impurity of the Temple compound and priesthood is one of the chief elements against which the Qumran writers rail. In a sense, the defilement of the Temple at the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes and the perverse Jewish element (1 Macc. 1.20, 41-49) is to the authors of Maccabees what the 'breakers of the covenant' and their wickedness is to the DS community.

⁵ This is not to suggest that the fact of Qumran's disassociation from 'mainstream' Judaism to be a primary characteristic of the sect. Rather, I am suggesting that the Dead Sea Community shared many features in common with Jewish religiosity in general: they thought themselves to be following the will of God; they chastised other groups for what they saw as lawless and aberrant behavior; and they eagerly held to the rulings of the Law according to their own hermeneutical practices. Note the fine discussions of the characteristics common to both the Dead Sea Community and other Jewish communities in Charlotte Hempel *Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society in The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran After Fifty Years* JSP 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 43-53; E.P. Sanders *The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences in The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 7-43.

This invites, of course, a discussion of the issue of authorship of PssSol, into which one is immediately immersed into debates regarding the rigid classifications of Jewish sects in the early Roman era in Palestine. From the evidence, however, the issue becomes less important, and certainly less fruitful, than it at first appears. L. Schiffman, for instance, has aptly pointed out that the invectives recorded at Qumran against the priesthood are directed against the Pharisees, and that these invectives are rooted in perceived Pharisaic misappropriation and interpretation of the Law of Moses.⁶ Josephus describes a large contingent of Jews that openly opposed both Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II in their struggle for kingship in Judea as a ‘...nation against them both (i.e., Hyrcanus and Aristobulus)’.⁷ What this serves to show is the great diversity and instability in Jewish sectarianism during this era; all groups accused all others of lawlessness.⁸ Thus, Ryle and James’ conclusion that PssSol reflects *Sadducean* behavior perhaps overstates the case:

The Psalmist avers that those who discharge the sacred functions pollute the holy things and the offerings by their neglect of the true observances and by their ceremonial uncleanness...It is notorious that the Sadducees were not so scrupulous as the Pharisees, and did not accept all the rules of purification required by the tradition of the Scribes.⁹

Of course, Ryle and James completed this work long before the discovery of the DSS, but the categorization of Sadducees in these terms persists.¹⁰ But as Jerry O’Dell has pointed out, nomenclature in and of itself is no grounds for assessing authorship in 2nd Temple

⁶ Lawrence H. Schiffman “The Pharisees and Their Legal Traditions according to the Dead Sea Scrolls” *DSD* v. 8, no. 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

⁷ *Ant.* XIV.41; cf. Smallwood *Jews Under Roman Rule* 22; Schürer *HJP* v. I 236-238.

⁸ According to Josephus *Ant.* XIII. 408ff, the Pharisees were supported by Alexandra the wife of Alexander Jannaeus; cf. also *Ant.* XIII.288-98. Schürer *HJP* v. I 212-215, 229-232; v.II 394-395, 413-414 gives some indication of the shifting alliances between the political rulers and the Sadducees and Pharisees. Indeed, the revolt led by the Pharisees against Alexander Jannaeus suggests as much, cf. *Ant.* XIII.376f; *HJP* v.II 400-402.

⁹ Ryle and James *Psalms of the Pharisees* xlvi.

¹⁰ In the case of PssSol note Winninge *Sinners and the Righteous* 127-133; Pomykala *Davidic Dynasty* 160; Fairweather *Background of the Gospels* 232-234. Most other commentators such as Atkinson *Intertextual Study* 419-424; J.H. Charlesworth, “From Jewish Messianology to Christian Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives” in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (ed. J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E.S. Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 234, 258-259; Chester “Jewish Messianic Expectations” 29-30; and Wright “Psalms of Solomon” 642; *idem.* “The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes” 136-154 are more guarded about ascribing authorship to the Pharisees based on terminology.

Judaism.¹¹ Samuel Sandmel entertains the problem of sectarianism and comes to this conclusion:

...in ancient Judaism the admitted diversity paradoxically existed against a background of cohesive themes which marked Judaism off from paganism and pagan religion...The methodological error which can arise is that of attributing total difference to what is in reality a restricted difference.¹²

Sandmel's comments are *apropos* to the whole issue of authorship, which very frequently reflects a myopic tendency to rubricate theological texts under conventionalized sectarian terms. But such allocation is unnecessary and, more importantly, inaccurate. In short, terminology and content are no case for assigning sectarian affiliation. More evidence is needed.

But I do not intend to enter the debate over authorship in this section, though characteristics of the authors will inevitably surface. Rather, I have pointed out the possible pitfalls to assigning authorship to PssSol in order to direct my study along another path. What I am interested in examining in this section are the possible connections or dissimilarities between the two 'communities', that of Qumran and that of PssSol as reflected in the literature they produced. Although there may be a need to draw 'Pharisaic', 'Sadducean', or 'Essene' categories into the discussion, I intend to keep these as unobtrusive as possible. Thus, I hope to fill this section with thematic and conceptual comparisons for the purpose of associating and disassociating Qumran and PssSol, and not arguing for authorship.

2—*The Law of Moses at Qumran and in PssSol:*

1QS dates from the early part of the 1st century B.C.E.¹³ From the outset, the purpose of this document for the community becomes clear: it is to perfect the rule of the Law of Moses in the land. Note the first three lines of the text:¹⁴

¹¹ O'Dell "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon" especially 251-252.

¹² Samuel Sandmel *Judaism and Christian Beginnings* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978) 12 and 15.

¹³ J.H. Charlesworth *et. al* "Rule of Community" in *DSSSMM II* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1994) 2; F. M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. G.E. Wright (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1965) 169-171; Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes "Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts" *DJD XXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) 1-27 conclude that the text itself was early and likely "studied and applied for almost the

To [...] (וְשׁוֹ) for his life, the Community's [book of rule] in order to seek¹⁵
God with [all heart and soul] to do what is good and upright before him, just as
He commanded through Moses and all his servants, the prophets, and to love all
That he has chosen and to hate all that he hates, to draw afar off from all evil...

In order to fulfill this task of perfecting the Law of Moses in the land, the Qumran covenanters saw fit to re-appropriate many of the Temple's functions for their community. First and foremost, they considered themselves (at least a portion of the community) to be sons of Zadok and Aaron, the Great High Priests (5.2, 21; 9.7), who organize and maintain the Community according to 'all the things of the Torah' (5.3, 8; 8.15-16).

In PssSol, there are several direct and indirect references to the Law of Moses.¹⁶
On two occasions the authors refer to the Law of Moses overtly. Note 10.4:

And the Lord remembers his servants with mercy
For the testimony is in the law of the eternal covenant
The testimony of the Lord is over the ways of men as an examination.

The 'law of the eternal covenant' certainly refers to the Law of Moses. In chapter 10, the authors are developing the concept of Israel's ingathering, which is to be given top billing in chapter 11. The discussion begins at 9.9-10 in which the covenant of Abraham is recounted. In the course of the transfer from chapter 9 to chapter 11, the authors are keen to point out that it is the 'righteous' in the document who fall under the covenantal parameters. 10.1 presents a clear picture of the function of the covenant and the righteous:

Blessed is the man whom the Lord remembers in rebuke

whole period of the Community's existence." The authors date the text to 125 BCE to 50 CE based on palaeography and orthography.

¹⁴ All translations are my own, although I follow the text found in DSSSMM II. I will be using the same brackets as DSSSMM II and direct the reader to note Charlesworth's and Qimron's notes on this text contained therein.

¹⁵ Leaney *Qumran and Its Meaning* 117-118 reconstructs this phrase as "For [the Instructor and for the me]n his brothers..."

¹⁶ The indirect references are such as '...according to the saying of God' at 9.2; '...and you put your Name upon us, Lord...' at 9.9; 'May the Lord do what he has spoken about Israel and Jerusalem...' at 11.8.

And restrains from the way of evil with a whip
To purify from sin that it may not increase.

The discipline (10.2—*παιδείαν*) of the Lord functions as a corrective to the righteous, keeping them from sinning and recalls the discussion of the term in Deut. 32. Sinning in this case is definable from the standpoint of infidelity to the Law of Moses. In Deut. 11.2 this term is used in the context of obeying the 'laws, decrees, judgments and commandments of the Lord'. In short, discipline of this type keeps the righteous from sinning, i.e. turning from the Law of Moses.¹⁷ As such, there is no reason to suggest that PssSol is using the term differently, a point PssSol 14 confirms.

The first three verses of chapter 14 are important for this discussion. Note verses 1-3:

- 1) The Lord is faithful to those who love him in truth
To those who remain steadfast under his discipline
- 2) To those who walk in his the righteousness of his commandment in the Law
Which he has commended to us for our life
- 3) The devout of the Lord will live by it (Law) forever
The paradise of the Lord, the trees of life are his devout ones

Here we see the manifestation of the authors' understanding of the relationship between the Law and discipline. Furthermore, we see how the authors of PssSol envisaged the 'community' of the devout living in obedience to the Law of Moses. This is not unlike the perspective taken on by 1QS. As I pointed out earlier, the Law of Moses was to be perfected in the Qumran community. In a sense, the devout of that community were to live by the Law in much the same way as the community of the devout in PssSol. Indeed, the call to obedience is similar in both documents.

¹⁷ Apparently the discipline of the Lord helps the adherent to maintain the commandments, decrees, etc. in Dt. 11. Indeed, this seems to be one way in which the CPs understood this term with respect to the Law of Moses: it keeps one from turning from God's will (Ps. 18.36; 50.17; 119.66). This type of discipline is even a corrective and guide for the Gentile nations (Ps. 2.12). Of special interest on this point is the opening chapter to Proverbs in which Solomon explains instructions ability to keep one from sinning.

Discipline for the DS community became a foundation of their preparation for the coming Messiah (1QS 9.11).¹⁸ In the Pentateuch, discipline is held to be a corrective against falling away from the edicts and ordinances of God. At Qumran, the strict observance of the purity laws and regulations seemingly functioned as a disciplinary code.¹⁹ Discipline in the community is strict, with punishments ranging from ten days (7.11), to six months (7.3), to two years (7.19). Josephus gives an indication of the severity and stringency of the Essene community:

But for those that are caught in any heinous sins, they cast them out of their society; and he who is thus separated from them, does often die after a miserable manner...²⁰

This description of the stringency of the Essene community matches with the punctiliousness of the Qumran community in terms of slandering the community or grumbling about its authority (1QS 5.25-26; 7.1-14). Such stringency on the part of the community seemed to be essential to their religious identity. If, and it certainly seems so, they understood their community in terms of a corporeal Temple, the exacting standards of purity required by the Law of Moses for the Jerusalem Temple would have applied directly to their community. Failure to abide by these standards is the very invective leveled against the Jerusalem Temple (CD A 5.5-8). Furthermore, the community acts as atonement for the land in the same way that the Jerusalem Temple was intended to do (1QS 3.6-9, 8.10).

In 1QS 11.8, the assembly (מִסְבָּח) of the community becomes 'an eternal plantation' along with the sons of heaven. Imagery of the holy plantation is both biblical (Ps. 92.13; Is. 60.21, 61.3; Sirach 24; and Mt. 15.13) and non-biblical (1 Enoch 10.16, 93.2-10, and Jubilees 7.34), and also finds further documentation at Qumran (1QS 11.8; 1QH 14.15, 15.19, 16.5ff). PssSol 14.4 represents another non-biblical instance. I have included verse 5 for its insights into the minds of the authors. The verses read:

¹⁸ 4Q256 18.3 contains the phrase *בר להשכילם בכל הנמצא לעשות* [...which likely refers to the object of the communities separation and may speak to the preparation for the Messiahs; 4Q258 8.4 contains much the same phrase as does 4Q259 3.1-6. None of the 4Q material mentions the text from 1QS 9.11 and the two Messiahs. See Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes *Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts Qumran Cave 4 XIX DJD XXVI* (Oxford: University Press, 1998) 1-27, especially their helpful chart 1-3.

¹⁹ As much is stated in 1QS 6.14; indeed, the document is often called the "Manual of Discipline."

²⁰ Josephus *BJ* 2.8.8.

- 4) Their plantation being rooted forever,
They shall not be uprooted for all the days of heaven
- 5) For God's portion and inheritance is Israel.

For the authors of PssSol, this 'plantation' seems to be synonymous with the community called Israel.²¹

Yet this is not to be taken strictly as those who are by birth Jews. In discussing the 'sinners' in the text, the authors refer to two groups, the Gentile sinner(s) (e.g., 2.1) and the Jewish sinner(s) (e.g., 2.3-5; 4.1ff; 8.22). 'Israel', therefore, cannot simply refer to the national Israel of the authors' day and age. Nor can it refer an idealized Israel of all Jews unified under the banner of their religion; the authors clearly did not have room in their camp for certain Jews. Rather, 'Israel' in PssSol must refer to an idealized Israel of the faithful who have strictly adhered to the Law of Moses.²² Indeed, they define their 'community' by this very Law.

This characteristic is not unlike the Qumran community. At Qumran, however, the function of the community as embodiment of the Law is more developed than in PssSol. The covenanters viewed joining their community as tantamount to accepting the Law of Moses. It is a reflection of proper devotion to the biblical faith. This allows the authors of 1QS to state in all honesty that one who enters the Community is entering into covenant with God, as 5.7b-8a plainly states:

- 7b) ...all who enter the council of the Community
- 8a) shall enter into the covenant of God...

²¹ It is likely that PssSol and Qumran are preserving much the same idea with respect to the plant metaphor, namely, that a purified Israel is to be left in the Land eternally. Much of this language is biblical, cf. Ex. 15.17; Num. 24.6ff; 2 Sam. 7.10; Is. 60.21; Jer. 24.6, 31.28; and Amos 9.15. Patrick Tiller "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls" *DSD* 4:3 (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 323 makes the important connection between Jubilees 1.16 and much of the Qumran literature regarding this metaphor that the covenanters associate their plantation with a restoration of God's presence in the land. Tiller's discussion 326-329 of the plant metaphor in 1QS 8.4-7 and 11.7 points to an assimilation of several implied meanings: the present reality of the righteous in the land (one meaning of the 'plant'), the future hope of the restoration of a purified Israel (another meaning of the 'plant'), and the permanent tabernacling of God with His people (the result of the 'plantation'). Cf. also Shozo Fujita "The Metaphor of Plant in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period" in *JSJ* 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 30-45. Fujita's conclusion resonates with Davies' observation that the Law was systematically integrated with religious concepts. The Law functions as the 'water' within the metaphor of the righteous community being likened to a 'plant'.

²² Cf. the discussion on 'Jeshurun' in PssSol in *PssSol and Deuteronomy* 32.10 above.

Indeed, observation of all of God's commandments is possible only through a 'return' to the covenant as mediated by the Community (5.22). In short, the foundation, or plantation, of the community, that is, its existence and function in the world, is the will of God.²³ This understanding of their own existence allows the authors of 1QS to discuss the atoning qualities of the Community in rather shocking language; note 9.3-4:

- 3) When these things happen in Israel, and all of these are prepared to be a council of the Holy Spirit in eternal truth,
- 4) to atone concerning guilty transgression and unfaithful sin and (to act as) acceptance (ולרצון) for the land without the flesh of burnt offerings and the fat of the sacrifices and offerings...²⁴

It is the Community that atones for guilty transgression (אשמת פשע) and unfaithful sin (מעל חטאת).²⁵ In HB, these types of transgressions always require expiation through sacrifice, which sometimes carry the name of the offence, e.g., חטאת sacrifice for the transgression of חטא.²⁶ Furthermore, it is clear that the particular danger of these offences is not in that they render the offender unclean or 'sinful', but rather that they render a portion of the Temple impure. As such, it is vital that the Temple be purged from

²³ Note E. Larson's "461. 4QNarrative B" *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI* in *DJD XXXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000) 391 brief comments on the association of 'will of God' with Qumran community; cf. 4QpPs. II.5.

²⁴ Also note 1QS 3.4-8 and 8.6. My rendering is somewhat labored due to my desire for a literal translation based on the context. Verse 4 is dominated by the one infinitive, לכפר. The section that interests me most is the term ולרצון, which requires the supplied helping verb 'to be'. Charlesworth and Qimron, *DSSSMM II* 39, citing Knibb, have "...so that (God's) favor for the land (is obtained)..." Whichever translation one chooses, the sole issue in this passage is the atoning actions of the Community, which itself acts as an 'acceptable thing' for God. This is clearly sacrificial language and I aver that the covenanters saw this type of action as the will and purpose of God as mediated through the Temple narratives found in the Pentateuch (cf. e.g., Lev. 1-3, 11-16). Based on their perspective of the current Temple administration, the covenanters certainly viewed this aspect, i.e., the will of God as mediated through the sacrificial system, as having been undermined. As such, I do not suspect that the covenanters wished to curry God's favor *per se*, but rather to uphold his will for the land and his people.

²⁵ It is significant that James Barr has pointed out that these two categories of 'guilt and 'sin' reflect later, priestly codification of earlier traditions, both oral and written. Cf. Barr "Sin and Offering" 873ff. Without attending to the problems of dating the P material from a source critical standpoint, Barr's comment raises the very important point that these two rubrics are priestly categories.

²⁶ The distinction is not so clear as the חטאת sacrifice is a fairly wide-ranging sacrifice. Note Jacob Milgrom's opening comments on the two sacrifices in *Cult and Conscience* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 1 and his discussion of the two in "Leviticus" v. I 254-258 for the חטאת and 339-345 for the אשם.

the uncleanness.²⁷ What steps must the Community take in order to atone for these sins? The answer is supplied by the authors: separate from the men of deceit in order to establish a community that accords perfectly with the Law of Moses.

For the Qumran covenanters to atone effectively in the Land, they must separate themselves from mainstream society (5.2, 10, 15; 8.13).²⁸ And yet, this Community was to be established in the midst of Israel (8.4-5, 9, 12; 9.3). The Community is not separated from mainstream Judaism in a purely geographical sense, although they clearly understood this to be part of the process. Rather the Community was to separate itself in a spiritual sense, particularly with respect to their peculiar application of the Law of Moses. L. T. Stuckenbruck has commented regarding the 'separation ethos' in the Community that it:

...reflects a community which understands itself as a group *separating itself from other Jews in order to engage in the proper study of the Torah*.²⁹

This, of course, leads to the discussion of the Two Spirits in the Community Rule. This type of division of good and evil into two separate and rigidly defined camps is characteristics of literature from Qumran,³⁰ but it is not exclusive to the reclusive community.

One of the primary discussions in PssSol is the separation of the righteous from the sinners. Perhaps the finest example of this is found in PssSol 4.1 in which the 'profaner' is ridiculed for his association with the council of the holy ones (συνεδρίω ὁσίω). Elsewhere, sinners and righteous are clearly separated into two groups (2.34-35; 3.5-12; 4.6-8; 12.4-6; 13.6-12; 14; 15; 16.2; 17.27). The authors of PssSol, therefore, seem to have envisioned a 'community' wherein the Law of Moses was adhered to without fault. The authors see the failure to follow the Law of Moses as the precipitation leading to the invasion and conquest of Jerusalem (2.3-5). In the concluding chapter to

²⁷ Klawans *Impurity and Sin* 41-42; Milgrom "Israel's Sanctuary: A Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray" *RB* 83 (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1976) 391; *idem*. "Leviticus" v. I 254-258; Neusner *Idea of Purity* 28-31 all agree on this point. Again note the comment of R. Meir on this point in the section *Temple Motif* 3.1.

²⁸ Conversely, anyone who transgresses against even one word of the Law of Moses is banished forever from the Community, 8.22-23.

²⁹ Loren T. Stuckenbruck "Wisdom and Holiness at Qumran: Strategies for Dealing with Sin in the *Community Rule*" in *Where Shall Wisdom be found?* (ed. Stephen Barton; Edinburgh, T & T Clark: 1999) 47-60, quotation from 51.

³⁰ IQM and the war between the 'Sons of Light' and 'Sons of Darkness'. The 'astrological texts' are particularly keen to express the significance of the division, 4Q186 and 4Q561.

the document, the authors suggest that the purified Israel will help to 'direct men in righteous acts, in the fear of God' and 'to set them all in the fear of the Lord' (18.8). Thus the 'community' in PssSol functions in kind, though perhaps not in degree, according to the credo held by the Dead Sea community.

3—*The Temple at Qumran and in PssSol:*

This begs the question of relationship between 1QS and PssSol with respect to the Temple and its sacrificial functions. The Qumran covenanters clearly understood their community as a representation of the Temple, which 1QS makes explicit.³¹ Note 9.5b-6.³²

5b) At that time, the men of the community will separate

6) themselves as a House of Holiness (בית קודש) for Aaron to be a most Holy community (להיחד קודש קודשים), and a house of the community of Israel, those walking in perfection...

I included the phrase להיחד קודש קודשים in order to point to the sacrificial significance of the community. The phrase קודש קודשים is used most frequently by HB in reference to the holy sacrifices rendered by the priests (e.g., Ex. 30.10; Lev. 2.3, 10; 6.10; 7.1; 24.9) or implements upon which or by which sacrifices are administered (e.g., Ex. 29.37; 30.29; 30.36; 40.10). Conceptually, the community ostensibly viewed itself as a sacrifice, perhaps *the* sacrifice, for the land. This type of re-casting of sacrificial language and analogical linkage between the community and the priestly purity laws and regulations led to a reevaluation of the nature of purity with respect to the community.

Jacob Milgrom has noted in his commentary to Leviticus:

What is significant is that the sectaries of Qumran have effectively eliminated H's notion of irremediable (moral) impurity. Their reading of Ezek 36:25 led them to this radical doctrine: all one's sins can be washed away by the waters containing

³¹ Joseph M. Baumgarten *DSSSMM* I 51 makes this insightful comment regard the Qumran community: "...the Qumran sect never went so far as to reject the sacrificial cult in principle." Although the Temple at Jerusalem had ceased to function as the religious nexus for the covenanters, they still honored the ordinances surrounding the Temple's ministrations. As such, it stands to reason to suggest that they required the re-appropriation of such ministrations equivocally.

³² Also note 8.5-6 and 11.8-9.

the ashes of the red cow if one's life is conducted in the right "spirit." This doctrine is not in the Bible: the priests (H) deny it. The prophets affirm it, but in their view, one's correct behavior (spirit) by itself suffices. Qumran adds that the proper "spirit" must be accompanied by the rite of sprinkling with the purificatory waters of the red cow.³³

This conflagration of different biblical concepts serves one purpose at Qumran: to help establish a corporeal Temple in lieu of the corrupt Temple at Jerusalem, a problem not entertained by the Prophets. At Qumran, the two distinct biblical categories of impurity (i.e., ritual and moral) are merged into one.³⁴ What this amounts to is the establishment of a system of purity wherein aberrant behavior (such as exposing oneself to a neighbor or causing a disturbance at a meal) is viewed as a ritual impurity. Furthermore, denigration of the community, through expressed disagreement with the hierarchy of the community or failure to obey every word of the Law of Moses results in excommunication. Excommunication is similar to the separation required of a ritually impure person from the Temple in the Pentateuch (e.g., the parturient in Lev. 12). In the case of the parturient in Leviticus 12, expiation is made by way of a process. First the woman must wait for a prescribed period of time (1 week + 33 or 2 weeks + 66 days) and then offer the necessary offerings at the Temple. In the case of those excluded from the 'pure' items of Qumran (1QS 5.13, 6.16), they may only re-enter the community after a waiting period (e.g., 1QS 6.25, 7.1-3, 5, 16). Presumably they would then need to go through immersion and demonstrate that they have 'circumcised the foreskin of their heart' (5.13). This latter phrase likely meant repentance and return to proper behavior, i.e., obedience (cf. Deut. 10.16). Milgrom has argued that remorse is a key element in the ritual re-purification process for the priestly writers of the Pentateuch.³⁵ Likely this was the intention of the Qumran authors as well. Repentance is a key element in arbitrating for a return to the covenant community. This makes sense in light of the community's self-understanding: as a composition, the community is the Temple and one must be completely pure to enter the Temple. In this light, the stringency of the community with respect to purity is understandable.

³³ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. II 1575.

³⁴ See Klawans' *Impurity and Sin* 52-59, 75-78 fine treatment of the issue.

³⁵ Milgrom "Leviticus" v. I 254-255; *idem.* "Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray" 391-395; *idem.* "Priestly Doctrine of Repentance" *RB* 82 (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1975) 196-199.

In the sections of the biblical texts that deal with ritually impurities (e.g., Lev. 11-15) the only prohibition, aside from spreading the ‘contagion’ through physical contact, is on entry into or contact with the holy on the part of the impure person. In short, a ritually impure person must not come in contact with the holy things of God. Entering the Temple in such a state is a violation of the biblical sancta and considered a moral impurity. Since the Qumran community envisioned itself as a corporeal Temple, it is not difficult to see how the connection between sin and impurity was made and why the need arose to legislate the removal of ritually impurities from the camp. On several occasions in PssSol, the authors point to the Temple-defiling actions of the sinners.

In PssSol, there are several overt references to the Temple’s defilement.³⁶ The first of these is in 1.8, which reads:

Their lawlessness was greater than the nations before them

They made utterly profaned the holy things (ἐβεβήλωσαν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου) of God.

There is little doubt that the ‘holy things’ refers to the Temple and its implements.³⁷ LXX use this phrase almost exclusively in a context of Temple worship.³⁸ Note Malachi 2.11 for instance:

MT: Judah has been faithless and an abomination has been committed in Israel and Jerusalem; for Judah has profaned the holy thing of God (יהוה ללן חן וקדש) that he loved, and has married the daughter of a foreign god.

³⁶ Implicit references to the Temple in the document include mention of the “name of God.” This is a well-attested Pentateuchal phrase used to refer to the Temple. In LXX, the Temple began to be referred to as the place wherein one “called upon the name of the Lord.” This differs from HB, which suggests that the Temple is the place where God’s name “dwells.” Here is an exhaustive list of references to the name of God or the act of calling upon him: 1.1; 2.36; and 5.2 concern calling to God but make no mention of his name; 7.6; 8.22, 26; and 17.5 relate the name to the Temple or Temple sacrifices; in 6.4 and 15.2 the name of God is not called upon, but blessed. I will not cover these instances in this section, though the reader should be aware that the importance of the Temple occupied a large portion of the authors’ concern.

³⁷ Milgrom “Leviticus” v. I 182, 320-321, 394-395, 605f, and 752f has pointed out the wide range of meaning implied by “holy things” within the context of cultic rituals. The phrase, so it seems, can refer to sacrifices, Temple implements, and priestly accoutrements; cf. section on *Temple Motif* 4.2.

³⁸ The references are numerous: note e.g., Ex. 36.1, Lev. 20.3, 21.22, 22.3, 26.31; Num. 4.15 (x2), 4.19-20, 8.19, 10.21, 18.3, 19.20, 31.6; Deut. 12.26, 26.13, 1 Ki. 7.37 (x2), 8.4-6; 2 Chr. 15.18 (x2), 24.7; Zeph. 3.4; Mal. 2.11; Isa. 30.29, 43.28; Jer. 28.51; Ezek. 5.11, 7.24, 21.7, 22.8, 22.26, 23.38-39, 24.21, 25.3, 37.26, 37.28, 42.13 (x2), 44.9, 44.13 (x2), 44.16; Dan. 8.13. The books of Maccabees are also, and expectedly, keen on this point: 1 Macc. 2.12, 3.51, 3.58, 4.36-48, 7.42, 14.15, 14.29-31, 15.7; 2 Macc. 15.17.

LXX: Judah has been forsaken and an abomination has been committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; because Judah has profaned the holy things of the Lord (ἐβεβήλωσεν Ἰουδας τὰ ἅγια κυρίου), which he loved, and has pursued other gods.

Two observations are important. First, intermingling with foreign women defiles the Sanctuary.³⁹ Secondly, Mal. 2.12 completes the picture by noting that the ‘holy things’ are none other than the implements of the Temple. As such, the phrase τὰ ἅγια refers to the Sanctuary and its implements, and it is not difficult to see the intention of the authors in PssSol 1.8.⁴⁰

The fullest account of Temple defilement in PssSol occurs at 8.11-12:

- 11) They stole from the holy things of God (τὰ ἅγια τοῦ θεοῦ—וְהוֹרִי־עֲשׂוֹדִק) as though there was no redeeming heir
- 12) They walked on the altar (θυσιαστήριον) of the Lord in all sorts of uncleanness and with an issue of blood they defiled the sacrifices (ἐμίαναν τὰς θυσίας) with common/profane meat.

It is interesting to note that the Syriac version begins verse 11 with ܠܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ, which lends further support to the assertion that the phrase τὰ ἅγια (וְהוֹרִי־עֲשׂוֹדִק) is a direct reference to the Temple. Joseph Trafton’s work on the Syriac version makes this useful insight:

...in Jewish Gk of this period τὰ ἅγια seems to be a technical term for the sanctuary or Temple (cf. e.g., I Macc 3:43; Heb 9:24; Jos., *War* 2:341). Indeed, τὰ ἅγια occurs in two other places in the PssSol, and in both cases Sy has a phrase meaning “sanctuary” or “Temple”⁴¹

³⁹ I have already mentioned the prohibition in Ezra, which may be seen as being obedient to Deut. 7.3; cf. Herford *Talmud and Apocrypha* 39-44. Also note section on *Literary Genre and Poetics* 3.2.

⁴⁰ This type of phraseology occurs again in 2.3. The verse uses the same type of language—ἐμίαναν τὰ ἅγια κυρίου—and ἐβεβήλωσαν τὸ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ. Also note the instance in 8.22 in which the things consecrated to the name of God are defiled; cf. section on *Temple Motif* 4.2.

⁴¹ Joseph L. Trafton *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* SCS 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 28.

Trafton's point is well made and there is plenty of other evidence to lend support. The term *θυσιαστήριον*, for instance, can be suggestive of nothing but the altar in the Temple. By the 2nd century B.C.E., the term seems to have become synonymous with the Heb. *מצב*, and certainly supports the conclusion that the authors are here interested in the status of purity at the Jerusalem Temple.⁴²

It is clear that the authors of PssSol were concerned with the Temple at Jerusalem, nearly even to the same degree as the covenanters at Qumran. But the nature of PssSol's concern is different. At Qumran, as I have tried to show above, the community envisioned itself as representing a new, pure, corporeal Temple. There is no such ideology at work in PssSol. Rather, the authors simply bring up the defilement of the Temple to offer reasons for the current historical problems. Their use of the Temple's impurity is apologetically and polemically motivated: the sinners are castigated for their failures to maintain purity at the Jerusalem Temple, which the authors still maintain to be legitimate. At Qumran, on the other hand, the Jerusalem Temple is beyond hope and thus there was a need for a new Temple free from impurity and illegitimacy. Presumably, the righteous in PssSol maintain such purity and adherence to the Law of Moses. The sticking point is that the authors of PssSol do not envision the need for a *new* Temple, just a re-purified one.⁴³

⁴² Daniel *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire 23* suggests: *Mizbéah est rendu uniformément par θυσιαστήριον dans tous les fragments (LXX fragments) que nous possédons*. Indeed, a point so obvious as this might appear to be a point hardly worth making. All commentators, so far as I am aware, agree that the text is here referring to the Jerusalem Temple.

⁴³ J.J. Collins "The Nature of Messianism in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim, ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 199-217 draws the conclusion that much 2nd Temple Period literature subordinated the royal (Davidic) to the cultic. He notes Deuteronomy's adaptation of a Law-centered monarchy in which kingly prerogatives are subordinated to fidelity to the Torah as an attempt to overcome the 'cognitive dissonance' created by the fall of the Davidic monarchy. This may present an example of Philip Davies' theory of the systematic integration of Jewish concepts with the Law, e.g., only where Messiah is connected with the Law is there a discussion of an 'anointed' figure; note e.g., Davies "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Case of the Messiah" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Timothy H. Lim, ed.; Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000) 219-232. This perception dovetails in places with the thesis engendered by PssSol. The Messiah is kingly (17.21), yet he fulfills priestly, or cultic, functions by purifying Israel (17.22) and the surrounding nations (17.30ff). I would argue, however, that on this point Collins and Davies have underrepresented the biblical material. Ezekiel is a book of key importance with respect to the confluence of priestly and royal hopes. Collins notes this element in Ezekiel and suggests a subordination of the kingly to the priestly. Yet 'subordination' may be too strong a term. It is often the case that the royal function of biblical kings is overshadowed by their cultic duties. In the historical books kings are judged by their actions as advocates or opponents of God's will, i.e., the either do good or evil in the sight of the Lord. This may be explained by the fact that much of the biblical material speaks from a priestly perspective. As such, it should be

The above conclusion should not, however, drive too great a wedge between the communities of Qumran and PssSol. In fact, the authors of PssSol envisioned themselves as representatives of the divine purpose of God, both in the way of a 'divine plan' (messianic advent) and perpetuation of the existing covenant. There are similarities between the two communities and the question may now be asked: Did the authors of PssSol envision themselves as implements of the Temple functions or sacrifices to atone for the Land and Israel as it appears was the case at Qumran? The twice-daily prayers of the covenanters may offer an insight into this question.

For the authors of 1QS, the Qumran Community was required to live apart from the rest of Judaism in general and from the function of the Jerusalem Temple in particular. This is not to suggest, however, that the covenanters saw the ideological functions of the Temple in any way annulled. Rather, atonement and the ministrations of the Temple seemed to have been all the more important to them.⁴⁴ To what extent are

expected that the royal arm would be subjugated to the priestly. This is particularly true if one considers the foundations of Israel religion rest on the Divine Presence in Israel, a Presence that is approached by the High Priest alone. Speaking from the exile, Ezekiel clearly envisions a return to the Land and the advent of both offices, but is far more concerned with the reestablishment of the Temple (cf. 37 and 40ff—also note Haggai and Zechariah 3-4). On the relation between the earthly and divine kings, note John Gray *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979) 84-85. Collins *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (New York: Crossroads, 1983) 71-72 states: "Despite the flagrant violation of Deuteronomic law, later Judaism stopped short of condemning the temple outright." The comment is embedded in Collins' discussion of the Leontopolitan Temple in Egypt, which he suggests was never intended to replace the one in Jerusalem.

⁴⁴ Note 11QT on this point. Prevailing opinion regarding 11QT suggests that it is a Qumranic composition. Cf. E.-M. Laperrousaz "Does the Temple Scroll Date from the First or Second Century BCE?" in *Temple Scroll Studies* (George Brooke ed.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 91; Yigael Yadin *The Temple Scroll* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985) 222-229 demonstrates the central significance of the Temple scroll to the covenanters; Geza Vermes *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987) 129; Shemaryahu Talmon "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity" in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam eds.; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 11 lists 11QT as a 'foundation document'. Hartmut Stegemann "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran" in *Temple Scroll Studies* (George Brooke ed.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 126-128 objects to this conclusion. One of his primary supports for this objection rests on a critique of Yadin's position that the Temple Scroll was intended to form another book of Torah. Stegemann also notes that the 'Law of Moses' is never referred to in the Scroll, which is a common characteristic of other Qumranic scroll. The two criticisms, though, do not seem to dovetail completely. If the intention of the author of 11QT was to render a 'supplement' to the Torah, it would make sense stylistically *not* to quote from the Law of Moses. This seems a particularly difficult position to defend in the light of Lawrence H. Schiffmann's "Laws of War in the Temple Scroll" *RQ* 13 (1988) 300-310 identification of the biblical sourcing for laws of warfare found in the Temple Scroll. Moreover, Schiffmann "The Temple Scroll and the Nature of its Law: The Status of the Question" in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam eds.; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 43 points out, there are stylistic similarities, e.g., the square script

these ministrations detectable? As a point of departure, I will offer a quotation from Charlesworth's and Qimron's introduction:

The Qumran calendar was solar (see 1QS 10.1-3), but the one in the Jerusalem Temple cult was lunar. The Qumran sect did not pray to the sun; it prayed towards the sun, especially during the soft, diffused light in the morning from daybreak to sunrise and in the evening between sunset and nightfall. The sect believed that at these two periods of twilight they were involved in bringing light back to the earth at the dawning of the sun, and helped insure the return of the sun the following morning. These times for prayer are stipulated in 1QS 10.1-3...⁴⁵

As a whole, the document constantly refers to the community with language elsewhere used for the Temple. The community is the institution at which atonement may now be made, it 'continues God's will', and it represents the institution of the 'Law of Moses' all of which are essential to keep in mind when examining any detail of the composition. I do not think that Charlesworth and Qimron have accurately assessed the text in 1QS 10 based on the overall tenor of the document on two accounts. First, hoping that the sun rises the next day could certainly be classified as a human characteristic (who does not wish for the sun to return!) and seems, therefore, to be too mundane an explanation to give to the passages in 1QS that speak of luminary activity. Secondly, there is a biblical precedent for attending to the sun's activity that has nothing to do with the sun *per se*. Note Lev. 22.7:

And when the sun sets (אָבַד) he shall be clean, and afterwards he may eat of the holy donations, for it is his food.

The cycle of the sun, then, constitutes a necessary ingredient in the formula for re-purification, to which the rabbis attest.⁴⁶ The context of this statement in Leviticus is, of

representation of the divine name, between 11QT and the 'canonical' books at Qumran; cf. Yadin *Temple Scroll* 224.

⁴⁵ DSSM II 3.

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g., *Tebul Yom*, which discusses the actions of one who has immersed but is not yet purified because evening has not yet come; *Kelim* 1.8 in which the one immersed is excluded from the Temple precincts. In the case of the passage in *Kelim*, the importance of the rising of the sun becomes prominent: any religious or sacrificial business that was missed on the day of impurity must await the opening of daily religious practices with the morning sacrifice. While the prescriptions enforced depend on the setting of the sun, to participate in any of the activities of Israelite worship, one must wait for the next day. The issue of the *Tebul Yom* in 4QMMT^a frags. 3-7 col. 1.18 centers on the purification that takes place at sunset with no mention of the *tamid*.

course, the prohibitions from eating of sacrifices while one is impure. In this setting, the sun marks out the temporal boundaries for the administration of the re-purification process. Without the setting and rising of the sun, purity would be unattainable. Moreover, the Qumran Community would certainly have been aware of the Deuteronomist's warnings against even turning one's attention towards the heavenly bodies for any reason, including the sun (Deut. 4.19; 17.3). They would have discouraged any type of behavior that implicated them with luminary manipulation. Solar admiration was certainly not in the mind of the legist in Leviticus, and likely not foremost on the minds of the covenanters at Qumran.⁴⁷ This raises the question of what was intended by the passages dealing with the rising and setting of the sun?

There exists no biblical precedent for the attitude of 'bringing light back to the earth'. I suggest, therefore, that we look for a different meaning in the passage in 1QS. Instead of escorting the sun back to the land of living, I think it more appropriate to envision the covenanters as having attending the rising of the sun as *temporal* marker. Shemaryahu Talmon has this to say of the Qumran calendar:

The adherence to either the solar or the lunar year is intimately connected with the reckoning of the day from one appearance of the moon to the other, namely from sundown to sundown, which would be the normal method in a lunar calendar, or from sunrise to sunrise, as is to be expected in a solar calendar.⁴⁸

The significance of Talmon's statement is that for the Qumran covenanters the rising of the sun is the primary point of calendar reckoning. The daily undulation is important not only to initiate the day's sacrificial festivities, but it is the meter by which the celebrations of the central festivals are gauged. The solar calendar marked not only the accurate dates for celebrating the yearly feasts it also indicated the diurnal ministrations of the Temple. The important issue for the present discussion is the daily ministrations. In light of the daily significance of the sun's progression, I suggest that the concept being

⁴⁷ Cf. fn. 64 below.

⁴⁸ Shemaryahu Talmon "Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant'" in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich eds.; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 386. Significantly, Margaret Barker "The Temple Measurements and the Solar Calendar" in *Temple Scroll Studies* (George Brooke ed.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 63 makes this observation: "...but how was the solar calendar established? It must have been done by observing the positions of the sunrise and sunset, and this would have needed fixed markers by which solstices and equinoxes could be predicted." This, of course, emphasized the importance of the rising of the sun and may be the reason for the interest in the sunrise in 1QS.

dealt with here in the document has everything to do with the daily offering in the Temple known as the *tamid*.

Leaney has this to say on the subject:

It is not fanciful to suggest that the Essenes worshipped God before sunrise as a recalling of his creation: each day repeats the creative act which began the orderly sequence of the ages. Moreover, with the sun God created the determiner of the times and seasons, the divisions of the calendar by which conduct and worship were to be regulated on the annual as well as on the daily scale. See 1QS 10.1ff. for the sun's regulations of daily liturgical practice in a manner like that of the rest of Judaism.⁴⁹

It is this 'daily liturgical practice' that is of interest to this discussion, and I think Leaney has rightly pointed to the daily regulation and conduct of worship as an important element in the sect's religious ethos.⁵⁰ The *tamid* offering is discussed in Ex. 29.38-43. It is to consist of two one-year-old lambs (38) offered twice daily, once in the morning and once in the evening (39).⁵¹ Schürer has this to say of the *tamid*:

The most important part of regular worship was the daily burnt-offering of the people, the **עֹלֹת הַתָּמִיד**, or simply **הַתָּמִיד**, 'the perpetual one'.⁵²

The importance of the *tamid* offering is well attested. Jubilees 6.14, for instance, traces the institution of the *tamid* offering back to Noah. It is clear that the authors of Jubilees favored a solar calendar (4.17-21; 6.36-38), much like the Dead Sea Community, and valued the *tamid* highly. Jubilees 30.14 refers to the 'continual' worship of the earthly and angelic priests. C.T.R. Hayward offers this insight:

Here (30.15) we encounter a reference to the twice daily sacrifice of lambs in the Temple which the Bible orders (Exod. 29:38-42) as *tâmîd*, 'continual, perpetual'. Jubilees offers a highly complex interpretation of this sacrifice, in which the earthly ministers correspond to angelic servants of God in heaven.⁵³

⁴⁹ Leaney *Rule of Qumran* 79; F.M. Cross *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) states: '...there can be no doubt that Josephus and the Qumran manuscripts are in essential agreement as to the sectarian attitude toward sacrifice and the Temple'.

⁵⁰ Indeed, the *tamid* offering was of particular importance to all Jews as Deborah Rooke *Zadok's Heirs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 25 has pointed out.

⁵¹ The *tamid* was likely offered just before the morning sun and just after the evening sun had set. *M. Tamid* 3.2 suggests as much; cf. also John I. Durham "Exodus" in v. 3 of *WBC* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987) 396; cf. Philo *Heres* 174; *Spec. Leg.* I.171, 276.

⁵² Schürer *HJP* v. II 299.

⁵³ C.T.R. Hayward *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1996) 10.

Hayward's comment points to the larger association of human, Jewish priestly activity to that of the heavenly, angelic priestly activity, which Qumran rejoins emphatically.⁵⁴ John C. Endres has noted the similarities between Jubilees and Qumran on this point and remarks:

In Jubilees sacred time plays a very important role along with sacred space: this emphasis on calendar and festivals pervades the book, while the stress on space (e.g., the Jerusalem Temple) emerged by indirection (cf. 32.22). In the Qumran materials, however, a different phenomenon appears: Essene resistance to the Jerusalem priesthood and cult led them to remove themselves from that location and to establish a sectarian center in the desert. One object of the Essene protest was the violation of sacred times and festal days by the priestly class and their leader in Jerusalem...⁵⁵

In Jubilees, the sun takes on the importance of monitoring the occasion of yearly festivals and feasts, yet little attention is paid to its diurnal responsibilities. Why was this?

One explanation may be that the relative proximity enjoyed by the authors of Jubilees to the Temple allowed them to continue to observe its daily functions and may explain their lack of concern for the daily undulation of the sun. They had not undertaken, as had the Qumran community, a separation from the *space* of the Jerusalem Temple. Whether one holds to a lunar or solar calendar is immaterial with respect to the *daily* rising and setting of the sun; the *tamid*, therefore, would have remained largely unspoiled in the eyes of the authors of Jubilees. By not having completely estranged themselves from the Jerusalem Temple, Jubilees essentially validates its daily functions.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ That the covenanters at Qumran associated their activities with the angelic realm is clear. Note Y. Yadin's discussion of Qumranic angelology in *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962) 229-242; Tiller "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls" 326-335 makes this point clear. The 4Q400-407=ShirShabb^{a-h} material speaks to this reality. Carol A. Newsom "Introduction" in *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* DSSSMM 4B (James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom eds.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999) 7 notes that the "Terms for the organization of the angels are similar to those found in Qumran sectarian literature for both the heavenly and earthly communities..."

⁵⁵ John C. Endres, S.J. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* CBQ 18 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1987) 234.

⁵⁶ Incidentally, this may argue in favor of a relatively early date for Jubilees. Some scholarship assigns the dates of 175-165 BCE to the book of Jubilees. This would mean that the authors of Jubilees would have been aware of the edict of Epiphanes' banning the offerings in the Temple. Yet the author of Jubilees does not fault the Gentiles for their actions, but puts the blame squarely on the Jews for who abandon the covenant and assimilate (e.g., chapter 23). Other documents contemporary with Epiphanes, however, concentrate on the prohibitions against sacrifices in the Temple. Both Daniel 8.9-12 and 1 Maccabees 1.41-50 tell of the abolition of the daily offerings in the Temple. In Daniel's cryptic way, the "horn" of Epiphanes has reached up to the "host of heavens" and has "thrown to the earth some from the host, from

The DS Community, on the other hand, had cut all ties with the Jerusalem Temple. For this reason, the Community had to replace the Jerusalem Temple in kind and according to the ordinances and regulations in the Law of Moses.⁵⁷ To this end, the Community became the Temple, not simply analogically, but literally, and was thereby compelled to carve out space accordingly.⁵⁸ This meant a radical re-appropriation of the function and ministrations of the Temple. Regarding the *tamid*, I suggest that the community replaced this daily sacrifice with morning and evening prayer. To begin with, note 1QS 10.1-3:

- 1) With the times that he has commanded: at the beginning of the rule of light to its strength, and when it is gathered to its assigned place at the beginning of
- 2) the watches of darkness, when he opens his storehouse and (the earth) shall bask in it and in its strength, when it is gathered before the light, when the
- 3) luminaries shine forth from the realm of holiness, when they are gathered to the place of glory, at the beginning of the appointed times, the days of the new month, together with their strength...

Certainly the solar calendar is here being advocated. Also important in this discussion, however, is the *daily* function of the sun. It rises at the times God has commanded and proceeds to its assigned place. 1QH certifies this position and lends further evidence of the radical program of re-appropriation occurring at Qumran. Note 1QH 20.4-7:

- 4) ...praises and prayers to fall down and beseech continually (תמיד) from period to period, with the coming of light (מבוא אור)

the stars, and has trampled on them" (v. 10). Furthermore, the "horn" of Epiphanes "took away the exalted daily offering (התמיד) from the Prince of the host." Two observations are ready to hand: the "host of heaven" is the priesthood in Jerusalem—with the Prince of the host being the High Priest—and the same host is directly associated with the luminaries in the heavens. 1 Maccabees 1.45, more prosaically, simply states that Epiphanes forbade burnt offerings, sacrifices, and drink offerings in the Sanctuary.

⁵⁷ Indeed, this is something of the picture painted by Josephus *BJ* II.119-161 in regard to the Essenes.

⁵⁸ CD 3.19; Daniel R. Schwartz's comments on this line in *DSSSM* I 17 read, "The sectarian 'sure house' replaces that of Israel, which has been 'cut off,' just as the 'sure house' of the promised new 'Zadokite' priesthood replaced the wicked Elides, who were 'cut off.'" This observation does not seem consistent with his and J.M. Baumgarten's introductory observation in the same volume 7, "...while other Qumran texts usually either ignore the Temple cult (e.g. 1QH), spiritualize it (e.g. 1QS), or criticize the way it is currently maintained (1QpHab 12.8-9), CD (11.19-12.2; 16.13ff.) suggests that the Temple is pure, shows a concern to maintain its purity, and reflects participation in its cult." 11QT, for instance, speaks of nothing but the Temple and its functions, but this should not be taken to mean that the Jerusalem Temple is the object. It could be that 11QT served to preserve the function of the Temple for the community in exile.

- 5) to its dominion in the course of the day, according to its regulation (לַתְּכוּנוֹ), according to the ordinances of the great luminary, with the return of the evening and the departure
- 6) of light, when the dominion of darkness begins, at the appointed moment (לְמוֹעֵד) of the night, in its course to the face of the morning and the period
- 7) when it withdraws to its dwelling before the light, at the departure of the night and the coming of the days continually (תָּמִיד)

The first thing to notice is that this selection concerns ‘praises and prayers’. These are compared in these four lines with the continual offering of the *tamid*. The times of their recitation is directed by the coming and going of the ‘great luminary’, a clear reference to the sun. Here the Qumranites seemed intent to associate their religious activities in the form of prayer and praise as replacements for the *tamid* service offered at the Temple.

It is possible that the covenanters imitated the procession of the luminaries in their daily activities, still modeling their behavior on that of the Temple. Josephus may have recorded as much in his assessment of the religious practices of the Essenes.⁵⁹ Josephus

⁵⁹ In *BJ* II.128-133, Josephus recounts how the Essenes live their daily lives. They “offer prayers” in the morning before sunrise (128-129), then they go to their “various crafts,” return, put their clothes back on, purify themselves by bathing and then enter to eat as though entering “some sacred shrine.” After eating, the sectarians put off their “holy vestments” and return to their work. The whole eating procedure is undertaken with the utmost reverence and sobriety—Josephus uses the term “mystery.” The whole affair seemingly struck Josephus as a type casting of the priesthood at the Temple inasmuch as he elsewhere describes the priestly ministrations at the Temple in similar language; cf. e.g., *BJ* V.212-231. Commenting on Josephus’ understanding of the Temple service, Hayward *The Jewish Temple* 144 states, “...Josephus may imply that the worship of the Temple symbolized the universe in its various parts, in such a way that the cosmos might be said to worship God in the course of Temple Service.” Understandably an argument might be made that Josephus was injecting Greek philosophy into his description of Jewish religious practices in order to make the reading more appealing to his Hellenistic audience, note e.g., *Ant.* XV.10.4.371 and XVIII 1.5.18-22 and that this makes his accounts dubious. That point notwithstanding, in his discussion of Josephus Sandmel *Judaism and Christian Beginnings* 164 offers this note: “The identification of the Essenes with Pythagoreans has yielded an assortment of far-fetched theories on the part of those who forget that Josephus, in writing for Greek Gentiles, put things in terms that they would understand; accordingly, his identifying the Essenes with Pythagoreans may have no real substance, for he treats Sadducees and Pharisees too as if they were like Greek philosophical schools, and we know they were even more unlike them”; cf. also Schürer *HJP* v. I 57. Schürer *et. al HJP* v. I 43-61 (quotation from 45) strikes a fairly balanced pose towards Josephus by stating, “The former Jewish priest became a Greek man of letters.” *Idem.* 48 do note that the whole of much of Josephus’ work was intended to elicit a favorable impression of Jewish religious practices amongst the Greek and Roman world, but caution once more 57, “...it must be said that his main weakness was not to his discredit, namely that he wrote with the intention of praising his people.” Thus, while Josephus is guilty of ‘coloring’ his account, tendentiousness of that kind does not eliminate the truth contained in his statements regarding Jewish religious practices.

may indeed offer some insight into the understanding of prayer at Qumran, which some scholars have noted. In her commentary on 4Q408(Apocryphon of Moses^{c?}), for instance, A. Steudel has this to say regarding the occurrence of the phrase לעבדתם in the document:

This could refer to the service of the stars (e.g., Ps 148.3) or of heavenly beings (e.g., ShirShabb from Qumran and Masada), but also to the service of the people (e.g., CD XI.23). Another, probably better, possibility is that it refers to the labour of human beings, the daily work of people (e.g., CD XX.7). Compare מעמל in line 11. Both terms (לעבדתם, מעמל) would in this case relate the work of people to the morning and evening prayers. On the Essenes, cf. Josephus *J.W.* 2.8.5.⁶⁰

Steudel goes on to emphasize the parallels between the practice at Qumran and Josephus' account of the Essenes as describing one and the same procedure.⁶¹ In 1QS 10.3, the authors incorporate the whole of the divine order. The luminaries 'shine forth...at the beginning of the appointed times'. The language, also in 1QH 20.4-7 (cf. above), makes best sense if understood as a reference to the appointed feasts and festivals. But to associate the meaning of the celestial movements to that of the feasts and festivals is also to implicate the priests and their ministrations at the Temple, namely the מועד. This association is not unprecedented in biblical literature. Sirach 50.5-7 reads:

- 5) How glorious he was, surrounded by the people, as he came out of the house of the curtain.
- 6) Like the morning star among the clouds, like the full moon at the festal season:
- 7) like the sun shining on the temple of the Most High, like the rainbow gleaming in splendid clouds...

Here the High Priest Simon is compared to the 'sun shining' and to the 'full moon'. In 1 Enoch 2-5, obedience to the law of the Lord (5.4) is compared to the obedience of the

The association of the Essenes with Pythagoreans does not render null his account of the prayer habits of the Essenes. This is particularly true if support for 'Essene-like behavior' attested in Josephus can be supported from other sources, as is seemingly the case with the Qumranic material.

⁶⁰ A. Steudel "408. 4QApocryphon of Moses^{c?}" *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI* in *DJD XXXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000) 308.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* 298.

luminaries in their courses (2.1). In the Test. of Levi 14.3, Israel is compared to the 'lights of heaven, like the sun and moon'. Again, the *Test. of Naphtali* 3.2-3 relates:

- 2) Sun, moon and stars do not change their order: so too you must not change the law of God by the disorderliness of what you do.
- 3) The Gentiles went astray and forsook the Lord and changed their order, and they went after stones and rocks, led away by spirits of error.

It is not difficult to see that the path of the luminaries and the duties of Israel, whether in the form of fidelity to the law or priestly ministrations, became very closely associated in Jewish literature of the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C.E.⁶² E. Larson, commenting on 4Q458(Narrative A), which contains the mention of the moon and stars has this to say:

...if the judgment theme is continued here, then it is possible that the reference to the moon and stars serves one of the two purposes commonly found in other texts of the Second Temple period. (1) Their regularity in following the path divinely ordained for them is used as a contrast to the lack of human faithfulness in carrying out God's law.⁶³

Larson goes on to mention *Test. of Naphtali* 3.2 and PssSol 18.10-12 (see below) as two examples of the 2nd Temple literature of which he speaks. The use of luminaries as ideal representations of proper religious fidelity was, I suggest, also present in the literature most central to the Qumran community.

The authors of 1QS 10 combines the issues of prayer and the daily action of the luminaries. Note lines 9-10:

- 9) I will sing with skill and all my song (is) to the glory of God, and the strings of my harp to the measurement of his holiness, and the flute of my lips I shall lift up in line (song?) his judgment
- 10) As the day and the night enter, I will enter into covenant with God; and as

⁶² In CD 5.18, the 'Prince of Lights' is opposed by a *נזיר* and his brother, which Schwartz *DSSSMM* I 21 suggests is a reference to Jannes and Jambres who opposed Moses; cf. also 2 Tim. 3.8. But in CD this cannot be a reference to those who opposed Moses because Moses is standing next to the 'Prince of Lights' on one side with Aaron on the other. I suggest, based on CD 4.2-3: 'The priests are the penitents of Israel who departed from the land of Judah', and CD 6.5-6: 'the penitents of Israel who depart from the land of Judah and dwell in the land of Damascus. God called them princes...' that the 'Prince' (a reference to priesthood) 'of Lights' (a reference to luminosity that I have suggested points to priesthood in the act of ministering) is a reference to the High Priest of the community.

⁶³ E. Larson "458. 4QNarrative A" *DJD XXXVI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 359.

evening and morning go out, I will recite his statutes, and where they are I will set

Endres' comment returns now to serve us well. Without the physical Temple, the covenanters at Qumran were left to 're-create' the Temple in other means.⁶⁴ This amounted to nothing short of a redefinition of Temple categories. The community becomes the Tabernacle; praises become sacrifices; proper and fastidious observance of the Law of Moses becomes purificatory rites. In the instance at hand, praise of the lips became a means wherein the daily 'sacrifice' could still be rendered.⁶⁵ 4Q503, therefore, which Charlesworth and Qimron cite as evidence of the daily prayers to 'help insure the return of the sun the following morning', is better taken as an indication of daily, priestly sacrifice.⁶⁶ As F.M. Cross has stated:

While the sun is determinative in fixing the times of the day and year at Qumran, so that their calendar is purely solar, there is, of course, no hint of sun worship in these prayers or elsewhere in the Qumran literature.⁶⁷

The *tamid* is an appropriate category for this type of prayer and it is likely that the Qumran writers were desirous to re-appropriate the Temple *tamid* service by way of daily prayer vigils.

Metaphorical language involving celestial bodies is at work in PssSol as well. Chapter 18 of the document contains three verses in which appeal is made to the created order. In PssSol, this appeal is directed to the obedience of the luminaries. Note verses 10-12:

- 10) Great and glorious is our God, dwelling in the highest, who orders the path of the luminaries (to mark) the right hour from day to day; and they have not stepped aside from their way, which you have appointed them.

⁶⁴ The notion that the Temple can be so "re-created" is supported by a number of modern scholars; cf. Jacob Neusner *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities* v.22 (Leiden: Brill, 1974-1977) 99; Douglas *Leviticus as Literature* 230-231 argues that such a system is in place in Leviticus to replicate Temple holiness, without the Temple proper.

⁶⁵ Again the rabbis give us some indication of this viewpoint; cf. *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* 4 and *b.Gittin* 56ab.

⁶⁶ Cf. fn. 48.

⁶⁷ Cross, *Library of Qumran* 86-87, fn. 3. Cf. also Menahem Mansoor *The Thanksgiving Hymns* vol. III of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* (J. Van der Ploeg ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1961) 173.

- 11) In fear of God is their way each day, from the day in which he made them until eternity
- 12) And they do not wander from that (course) from the day he created them, from the generations of old they have not departed from their course, unless God commanded them by the ordering of his servants.

The term used for ‘wandering’ in verse 12 is especially important to this discussion. The Greek verb *πλανάω* is used, which means to ‘be misled’, ‘deceive or mislead’, ‘stray away or lead astray’. In LXX, this term renders several Hebrew terms (סור, תעה, נדח) and is used to explain the actions of either 1) someone who is lost or a wandering donkey or heifer (e.g., Gen. 21.14, 37.15; Ex. 14.3; 23.4; Deut. 22.1; Ps. 107.4) or 2) someone who has strayed from the precepts of the Law of Moses to follow other gods (Deut. 4.19, 11.28, 13.6; Ps. 119.110, 176). Wandering, then, is either a sign of being lost geographically or being estranged from the Mosaic covenant. For Qumran, ‘wandering’ of this kind was interpreted as a sign of disobedience to the Law of Moses. Note CD 1.13-17:

- 13) ...they depart from the way; that is the time that was written concerning it, ‘as a wayward heifer (כפרה סור ירה),
- 14) thus did Israel stray’, when a man of mockery stood that sprinkled upon Israel
- 15) waters of falsehood and leading them astray in chaos without a way, to bring low the eternal heights and to depart
- 16) from the paths of righteousness and to move the border that the first ones set up in their inheritance so as
- 17) to cause to cling to them the curses of the covenant, to deliver up to the sword of vengeance

Later in line 20, the author of CD states clearly his intention: waywardness is defined as disobedience to the covenant contained in the Law of Moses (CD A 2.17—4Q266 2.II.13-16; CD A 3.4, 10-12—4Q269 2.1-6; CD A 5.20—4Q266 3.II.7; 11QT 56.7-8).

Aside from the importance placed on the luminaries in PssSol, the concept of the personal *tamid* is present. Note 3.3-4:

- 3) The righteous continually (διὰ παντός) remembers the Lord, by confessing and justifying his judgments.
- 4) The righteous does not lightly esteem being disciplined by the Lord; his acceptable thing is continually (διὰ παντός) before the Lord.

The Greek phrase, διὰ παντός, is used routinely in the Pentateuch to translate the Heb. term **דָּמָה** (cf. e.g., Ex. 25.30, 27.20; Lev. 6.6, 13, 24.2; Num. 4.7, 9.16, 28.10ff; 29.6; 2 Chr. 2.3). In Numbers 28 and 29, the phrase is used to render the actual twice-daily burnt offerings. This is what prompted my translation of εὐδοκία in verse 4 as ‘acceptable thing’. As a term in this context, ‘pleasure’ seems unsuited for two reasons. The first is the presence of διὰ παντός and its connotation. The second is that there are less grammatical elements to supply if the term is rendered ‘acceptable thing’ rather than ‘pleasure’. In order to translate εὐδοκία as ‘pleasure’ or ‘desire’ one must supply ‘is to be’, whereas with ‘acceptable thing’ one must only supply ‘is’. This better suits translations of Gk. sentences missing verbs and conforms to the concept presented by διὰ παντός. Apart from that, the phrase is specifically known as a rendering of the Heb. phrase for the *tamid* offerings. Furthermore, the presence of ‘memory’ components in this text also commends its ‘cultic’ affiliation.⁶⁸ Two points are noteworthy from PssSol.

First, the authors associate the characteristic of righteousness with the presentation of the daily burnt offerings. This means that the significance of the burnt offerings for the authors is central to the relative righteousness of the individual. This is in keeping with the invectives leveled against the sons of Jerusalem in 2.3-5, in which they are accused of having defiled the sanctuary and sacrifices of the Lord. Secondly, the *tamid* here intimated by the authors is *not* specifically limited to an actual animal sacrifice. In fact, no mention is made of animal sacrifice. Instead, the authors bring the *tamid* offering to bear in a context discussing the praise of the righteous. In short, the

⁶⁸ B.S. Childs *Memory and Tradition in Israel* (London: SCM Press, 1962) 12-14 has noted that the concept of memory often occurs in a set formulations with **זָכַר** referring to the invocation of God, which we have already seen was thought to take place at the Temple.

authors are here associating praise with sacrifice, not at all unlike the efforts of the Qumran writers.

The ordinances and commandments of the Lord are conveyed in terms of perpetuity. In the Pentateuch, ordinances such as the Noahic covenant (Gen. 9.12), the inheritance of the Land of Israel (Gen. 48.4), and the purification offerings, ablutions, sacrifices, and particular rites and prohibitions (e.g., Ex. 28.43, 30.21; 31.16; Lev. 3.17, 6.11, 7.34-36, 10.9) are all 'eternal ordinances'. It is not difficult to see how a connection between the eternal motion of the sun, moon, and stars and that of the intended eternal rhythm of the covenantal parameters could have been made. Nor is it difficult to see the DS community's meaning behind the term 'wandering'. The authors of CD A uses two of the Pentateuchal terms for straying—סור and תעה—and thereby links his idea to that of the Pentateuchal authors. For Qumran, 'wandering' represents precisely this: a departure from these statutes and observances of the Law of Moses. For PssSol, the eternal nature of the covenant is linked overtly with the actions of the luminaries in the heavens, which do not wander from their accorded paths. I think this is exactly what the authors of PssSol meant in 18.10-12. The rhythmic and eternal actions of the luminaries are analogous of the intended actions of the Temple and the constancy of the Law of Moses. In short, the final point is this: priestly language of this type, which associates Temple functions and ministers with the heavenly luminaries, is present at both Qumran and PssSol. For Qumran, then, being in the will of God included replicating the functions and ministrations of the Jerusalem Temple, adhering closely to the Law of Moses, and establishing a community wherein purity was paramount.

It must be stated, however, that the similarities between PssSol and Qumran in the area of priestly language are limited. The authors of PssSol do not envision the entire 'community' as acting as the luminaries, that is, as the priesthood. Rather, the authors see their 'community', the devout, as participating in God's divine plan of redemption in support of the Jerusalem Temple. This divine plan requires a purified Jerusalem through the advent of the Messiah. It does not, however, require another Temple apart from the one present at Jerusalem. In this respect, the authors of PssSol harmonize more with the likes of Jubilees than Qumran in that they did not advocate a complete separation from the Jerusalem Temple. The document does, however, share conceptual frameworks with

Qumran such as the condemnation of those who profane the Temple and pervert the Law of Moses as well as the association of the Law of Moses and Temple functions with the constant, daily activities of the heavenly bodies.

4—*The Will of God at Qumran and in PssSol:*

In the course of the foregoing discussion, the reader may have developed a question or two about the precise nature of the two communities: what do the Law of Moses and the Temple represent for each community? Indeed, why are the two categories so important? In this subsection I will try to define the relationship between the Law of Moses and the Temple in the area of the ‘will of God’. The understanding of ‘will of God’ to be followed is this: the will of God is that mankind remain faithful to the Law of Moses and maintain the proper purity with respect to the Temple. In order to flesh out these two categories, Law and Temple, I will continue with the linguistic analysis already started. The term that will guide my discussion is $\eta\zeta\gamma$ (nominally, $\eta\zeta\eta$).

The word most often used at Qumran to discuss the will of God is $\eta\zeta\eta$ or $\eta\zeta\gamma$. LXX render this term with several Greek words, $\pi\rho\sigma\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota/\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma/\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha/\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$. Within the biblical text, the meaning of the term can range from uncontrolled ambition⁶⁹, to volition on the part of God⁷⁰ or the faithful⁷¹, or to God’s ‘favor’ towards his people.⁷² The vast majority of the instances, however, pertain directly to sacrificial acceptance.⁷³ In the settings that are not directly related to sacrifice, the term is used most often as a means of discussing fidelity to the covenant, either on the part of God or the faithful. In fact, only Gen. 49 may be rightly separated as a distinct usage of the term.⁷⁴ In short, the term is used by and large in situations referring to either sacrifices or to the Law of Moses.

⁶⁹ Gen. 49.6.

⁷⁰ Deut. 33.11, 16, 23, 24; Ps. 89.18.

⁷¹ 2 Chr. 15.15; Ezra 10.11; Ps. 103.21.

⁷² Ps. 106.4; Is. 60.10.

⁷³ Ex. 28.38; Lev. 1.3, 19.5, 22.19, 20, 21, 29; 23.11; Ps. 19.15, 69.14; Is. 56.7, 58.5, 60.7; 61.2; Jer. 6.20; Ezek. 20.40-41; Hosea 8.13; Amos 5.22; Micah 6.7; Hag. 1.8; Mal. 1.8-13, 2.13.

⁷⁴ In fact, this is the only instance in the whole of the Bible in which the term is rendered by LXX with something other than a form of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ or $\epsilon\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$. In Gen. 49, LXX use $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\iota\alpha$.

In 1QS, the term is used to refer to acceptable sacrifices (3.11—referring to the individual; 8.10), God’s will (5.1, 4; 9.13, 24; 11.17-18), or God’s pleasure (4.1—referring to God’s delight in the community). These usages are very similar to those found in HB. The exceptional aspect of Qumran, however, is that it is the community itself that is the ‘acceptable’ sacrifice. Note the translation of 3.9-12:

- 9) ...and his times will be established to walk perfectly
- 10) in all God’s ways, just as he commanded for the appointed times of his fixed times, and he shall not turn either to the right or the left and he shall not
- 11) transgress even one of all his words (דבריו). Thus he shall be accepted (לפני אל) as a pleasing atonement (בכפורי ניהוח) before the Lord and it shall be for him a covenant
- 12) of the eternal community (יחד).

The affinities to sacrificial language of HB are evident.⁷⁵ An important concept in this section is displayed by the use of the term דבר in line 11. The covenanters, so it seems, understood their function as a sacrificial atonement for the Land (cf. 9.4) to be mediated through obedience to God’s word. Elsewhere in the document (e.g., 5.4) the will of God is set in opposition to those who are ‘stubborn of heart’. This phrase is used by the Deuteronomist to describe the nature of those who do not obey God’s commandments (Deut. 29.18), by the Psalmist in the same manner (Ps. 81.13), and is a favorite of Jeremiah’s to describe a disobedient Israel (Jer. 7.24; 9.13; 11.8; 13.10; 16.12; 18.12; 23.17). CD 3.10-13 captures this image again:

- 10) ...and they were given up
- 11) to the sword for forsaking God’s covenant (ברית אל) and choosing their own will (ברצונם) and they turn after the stubbornness of
- 12) their heart (שרירות לבם) to do each man according to his will (רצונו), but those who remained firm in the commandments of God (במצות אל) (ובמחזיקים)

⁷⁵ 1QM 2.5 uses רצון in the context of sacrifice and is the only instance in the War Scroll of the term.

13) who remained in them, God established his covenant (הקים אל את בריתו) for Israel...⁷⁶

The contrast is clear: disobedience is defined as following after one's own will and not adhering to the covenant God established through his commandments, that is, the Law of Moses (compare CD 2.13-21 with 3.2).

In the context of 1QS 3.9-12, the connection made between sacrificial atonement and obedience to God's word effectively frames the basic constitution of the community: proper obedience to the words of God serves to establish an atoning element, namely the community, in the land apart from the defunct Temple at Jerusalem. 1QS 8.8-10 makes this point clear:

8) ...a most holy habitation (מעון קודש קודשים)

9) for Aaron in all knowledge of the covenant of judgment (לברית משפט) and to offer a pleasing odor (ולקריב ריח ניחוח) and a house of perfection and truth in Israel;

10) to establish (להקים) the covenant of eternal statutes. They will be accepted to atone on behalf of the land (והיו לרצון לכפר בעד הארצ) and to decide judgment over wickedness; there shall be no more iniquity when these are established in the council of the community for two years among the perfect of the way.⁷⁷

This section is saturated with priestly language. The element on which I wish to concentrate is found in line 10: והיו לרצון לכפר בעד הארצ. The 'acceptability' of the community as an atoning element in the land once more presents them as a sacrificial offering. The web woven in this section, however, does not simply catch the sections of the Pentateuch that discuss sacrifice. The authors goes one step further and binds sacrifice and strict fidelity to the Law of Moses, the 'covenant of eternal statutes', together. For the

⁷⁶ Daniel Schwarz *DSSSMM* I 17 notes regarding this section of the document: 'According to lines 10-14, God's original covenant with all of Israel is now limited to members of the sect alone'.

⁷⁷ The text in this portion of the document is fragmented and confusing. Note Charlesworth's and Qimron's comments *DSSSMM* II 35.

authors, it is adherence to this Law that transmutes the community into an 'acceptable' sacrifice. Once again, CD offers further confirmation of this point. Note 11.21:

...but the prayer of the righteous ones is like an acceptable grain offering (כמנחת רצון)

Presumably the 'righteous ones' are those who have aligned themselves with the communal directives. As a result, their praises are accepted as sacrificial offerings.

We know the term 'acceptable' may also mean 'volition' or 'will' in HB. The same is true for Qumran. Note 1QS 5.1:

And this is the rule for the men of the community, who volunteer (המתנדבים) to repent from all evil and to hold fast to all that he commands (צוה), to his will (לרצונו), to separate from the community...

Three points are noteworthy before I begin discussing the term for 'will'. First, המתנדבים is a term used for volition in and of itself; thus I have rendered it with 'volunteer' (cf. Jdg. 5.2, 9; 2 Chr. 17.16; Neh. 11.2). It is also frequently used as a term that refers to a willingness to offer one's services as a type of sacrifice (Jdg. 5; 1 Chr. 29.5-6, 9, 14, 17; Ezra 1.6, 3.5).⁷⁸ The second note pertains to the term צוה. This is a frequently used term in HB meaning, 'command', 'charge', or 'order'. When God is the subject of the term it came to be synonymous with his covenantal ordinances: the Law of Moses was God's commandment. Once again the authors are keen to point out that fidelity to Law of Moses is a defining characteristic for the identity of this community. The third note that I would like to discuss pertains to the structure of the sentence, which will provide a segue to the discussion of רצון.

Note the last two thirds of the Hebrew:

לשוב מכול רע ולהחזיק בכול אשר צוה לרצונו להבדל מעדת

⁷⁸ It must be noted that the use of this term in Pentateuch only occurs in the form of the name of Aaron's son Nadab.

The line is dominated by three infinitive clauses. The first infinitive—**לשוב**—requires the understanding of ‘repentance’, which makes sense in the context.⁷⁹ Next, the authors heightens the repentance of the individual by suggesting that they will ‘firmly seize’ (**להחזיק**) all that God has commanded; in effect a complete turnabout from ‘all evil’. The final infinitive in the line is **להבדל**, a catch phrase for this community. Those intent on joining the community must repent, firmly hold onto God’s commandments, and separate themselves from the men of deceit (cf. 5.2); this is the recipe required in order to offer an atoning sacrifice to God. The only element left unaccounted for in this line is **לרצונו**.

All modern translations render this term as ‘will’, even though other possibilities exist, e.g., ‘favor’, ‘selection’. I think the modern translations to be right and that the ‘will of God’ as understood by the authors of 1QS is the Law of Moses. The structure of the sentence suggests as much as there is an elided element in the middle of the line. The term in question—**לרצונו**—is left unaccounted for unless something is understood to be preceding it. I suggest that the term is set in parallel with **צוה** and that the infinitive **להחזיק** is governing both **צוה** and **לרצונו**. Thus the phrase, with the elision reproduced in parenthesis, would look something like this:

להחזיק בכול אשר צוה (להחזיק) לרצונו

The middle of the phrase would then read,

...to remain firm in all that he commanded, to hold fast to his will with the result being that God’s will and his commandments are set in synonymous parallelism. In short, **רצון** is synonymous with the Law of Moses, which is a synonym of God’s covenant with his people.⁸⁰

At Qumran, then, the will of God was inextricably linked to obedience to the commandments of God expressed in the Law of Moses. As a sociological constitution, the Law also discusses the proper maintenance and function of the Temple, which served

⁷⁹ **שוב** had certainly become a term for ‘repentance’ by the time of Qumran. Jacob Milgrom “The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance” 202-203 discusses the evolution of this term until it means ‘repentance’ and cites its usage by HB.

⁸⁰ The change of preposition from **ב** to **ל** is acceptable with **חזק** in the *hiphil*. Cf. BDB 305.

to embody the nexus between God and Israel. Thus the Law and the Temple were equally important to the covenanters, to the point that the authors at Qumran sought to blend the two into one, over-arching theological framework, genetically linking fidelity to the Law with purity in the Temple (i.e., community). Infidelity to the Law of Moses, therefore, could defile and prohibit proper ritual sacrifices.⁸¹ Animal sacrifices in the Temple were replaced in the community by offerings of prayer and praise. Such an attitude towards sacrifice is not unprecedented in HB (e.g., Ps. 69.31-32; also note Heb. 13.15). For the DS community, so it seems, strict adherence to the Law of Moses created a status within the collection of faithful adherents, the community, wherein the proper praises and prayers could atone for the land as though sacrifices in a purified Temple. The creation and maintenance of this 'status' represented for the Qumranites the will of God.

Now we can turn to PssSol to examine its understanding of God's will. Proceeding from a corpus of material to one document presents problems. In individual documents at Qumran the specific 'will' of God, וְיָצַו or וְיָצַר , is mentioned only a few times. What I have attempted to do in the foregoing is to demonstrate the nature of this 'will' by way of content of specific documents and of the community as a whole (albeit represented only by several of its larger archetypes). PssSol, while constituting a community of sorts, belongs to no specific communal grouping like Qumran. So in turning to PssSol, the instances in which the 'will' of God is explicit will be far less apparent than in the collection of documents at Qumran. In the case of PssSol, there are no other documents expressly composed by the same community that lend reflection on PssSol.⁸² The paucity of occurrences notwithstanding, I will proceed to examine each instance of the occurrence of overtly 'will-language' and in so doing will attempt to construct the perception of the will of God in PssSol.⁸³

The first example comes from PssSol 2.3-5, which reads:

- 3) Because of these things, the sons of Jerusalem defiled the holy things of the Lord ($\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$), profaning the gifts of God in lawlessness.

⁸¹ This is precisely Davies' point "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls" 222-223.

⁸² A problem noted by R.R. Wilson "The Problems of Describing and Defining Apocalyptic Discourse" in *Anthropological Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy Semeia* 21 (Robert C. Culley and Thomas W. Overholt eds.; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982) 134-135.

⁸³ Cf. section *Dt. 32* and PssSol section 5 and my discussion of this term therein.

- 4) Because of these things he said, Throw them far from me, I am not pleased with them (οὐκ εὐδοκῶ)
- 5) The beauty of her glory was despised before God, it was dishonored completely.⁸⁴

This section falls on the heels of the first recorded instance in PssSol of the invasion of the Gentiles. The authors are quick to point out that it is because the sons of Jerusalem defiled the holy things (sanctuary) and gifts (sacrifices) of God that the punishment of the Gentile has come. In verse 4, the authors uses the term εὐδοκέω to describe the Lord's displeasure. In LXX, this term means 'pleasing' but may also mean 'accepted'.⁸⁵ In those cases in LXX where the term is likely better represented as 'accepted' the context is a description of the worth of the community of Israel vis-à-vis their fidelity to the covenant with God. If the community, or individual in the case of Ps. 50, is worthy, that is obedient and faithful, they are acceptable to the Lord; if unfaithful, they are not acceptable to the Lord. In the case of PssSol, I suggest that acceptability is what is meant by the term. For the authors, the sons of Israel are not acceptable to the Lord because they have defiled the Temple and its sacrifices. For this reason, God has brought punishment upon them in the form of a foreign and powerful invader.

The next instance in PssSol I have already discussed above in the portion of this paper dealing with the *tamid*. The issue PssSol 3.3-4 bears repeating here, this time emphasizing the term εὐδοκία as a reference to offerings. Note the text once more:

- 3) The righteous continually (διὰ παντός) remembers the Lord, by confessing and justifying his judgments.
- 4) The righteous does not lightly esteem being disciplined by the Lord; his acceptable thing (ἡ εὐδοκία αὐτοῦ) is continually (διὰ παντός) before the Lord.

⁸⁴ The text itself, and therefore its translation, is debated among modern scholars as to whether the text, currently εὐόδοκεν or εὐώδοκεν, is legitimate. Trafton *Syriac Version* 33 points out that the Syriac confirms neither Greek reading, but resonates most closely with εὐοδόω. Most commentators maintain the text as presented by Rahlfs, which contains the emendation to εὐδοκέω.

⁸⁵ Ps. 50.18, 21—LXX; Jer. 14.10, 12; Hag. 1.8; Mal. 2.17.

As I suggested earlier, εὐδοκία should be understood here as referring to a type of *tamid* offering. This *tamid* is not an animal sacrifice but an offering of praise and song (cf. 3.1-2). Most translators render the term in verse 4 as ‘pleasure’ or ‘desire’, but I do not think that this captures the sense of the chapter. As I have suggested from the material at Qumran, praise did come to function as a type of offering in place of animal sacrifice. The reason for this at Qumran was clear: they did not value the authority of the Jerusalem Temple and needed to re-appropriate its ministrations to their own community, which they understood as a new, corporeal Temple. I do not think that such a radical departure was in the minds of the authors of PssSol. Rather, I think PssSol 3 represents the authors’ expression of the division between those who fulfill the covenantal parameters, for instance proper Temple piety, and those who do not, such as those in PssSol 2. Nothing was more important than the ministrations at the Temple, and if that Temple was defiled, which seems the case for the authors (cf. 2.3-5; 8.10-12), then another means, in this case praise, must be found to carry on the functions.⁸⁶

The final instance in PssSol is 7.1-3, which reads:

- 1) Do not encamp away from us, O God, lest those that hate us turn attack us
us without reason
- 2) For you have rejected them, O God; do not let their foot tread upon your most
holy inheritance (κληρονομίαν ἁγιάσματος)
- 3) You, discipline us by your will (ἐν θελήματί σου), and do not give us over to
the Gentiles.

First and foremost, this chapter begins with a plea for God’s help from invaders. The sanctity of the Temple compound—κληρονομίαν ἁγιάσματος—is at stake. I suggest that this chapter functions as an appeal to the Lord in the light of the sins of the sons of Jerusalem enumerated elsewhere (2.3-5; 8.10-12). The authors are hoping that instead of a Gentile’s incursion upon the *sancta*, the Lord will simply discipline his nation according to his will. It is this last verse that I wish to concentrate upon, which is laden with irony.

⁸⁶ For many 2nd Temple Period Jews, the implications of their religious fidelity or infidelity had global consequences, cf. e.g., Jubilees 19.23-25 in which ‘Jacob and his descendants’ will ‘strengthen the earth’ and ‘renew the luminaries’. In short, Israel’s obedience to the Laws of God maintains the created order.

The Greek term θέλημα is used in a range of circumstances. In 1 Kings 5, for instance, it refers simply to the exchange between Hiram king of Tyre and Solomon, to the effect that Hiram will do what Solomon desires—θέλημα (on individual desire cf. also Dan. 11.16, 36). More frequently, the term is used in settings referring to fidelity to the Law of God as his will (Ps. 39:9; 102:21; also Ps. 142:10; 144:19), or God's personal satisfaction with something (Is. 48.14, 62.4; Jer. 9.23; Mal. 1.10). Psalm 39.9 (LXX tradition) affirms the usage of this term as a reflection of God's will. Note the Greek text and translation:

τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα σου ὁ θεός μου ἐβουλήθην καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ
τῆς κοιλίας μου

I desired to do your will, O my God, and your law in the midst of my heart.

An examination of the structure of the Greek text leads to the following conclusion: ἐβουλήθην stands as the fulcrum upon which the two halves swing. What this effectuates is a balance between the two halves, a synonymity. The 'will of God' and 'your law' are set up as parallels, a construction present for example in 1QS 5.1. I think the reading in PssSol requires this interpretation of the term.

The first two verses of chapter 7 open with a plea for God to a) remain dwelling in the midst of his people and b) to protect his holy inheritance from the invading Gentiles. It is already clear from the document that the punishment meted out by God on Israel is a result of their sins and a reflection of his righteous judgments (cf. e.g., 2.10, 15, 18). This is to say, the punishment of invasion and exile in the document are understood by the authors to be righteous. Furthermore, the Law of Moses, which is to be understood as God's will, sanctions these punishments (cf. e.g., Lev. 26 and Deut. 32; note punishment meted out in PssSol 2 and 8). According to PssSol, the discipline of the Lord is upon the faithful adherents (cf. e.g., 3.4, 13.8, 16.11, 17.42). If we consider the will of God to be strict adherence to the law, so supported by Ps. 39 (LXX) and Qumran, and the discipline of the Lord to be upon the faithful, then it stands to reason to suggest that the will of God in PssSol 7.3 should be understood to mean the Law of Moses.

In the light of these examinations, the concept of the will of God in PssSol resonates with the understanding of the will of God at Qumran. Both communities envision fidelity to the law, a purified Temple, and a direct participation in the divine plan of God as central to their religious identity. Both communities understand the need to lay a firm foundation of covenantal loyalty, and based on this initial observation, it appears that the two communities understood the will of God in similar terms. The difference lies not in the theoretical aspect of their religion, but in its application to their community. The Qumran covenanters saw no other option than to break completely with the Jerusalem Temple. The authors of PssSol, however, apparently lived in relative peace with the Temple itself while calling for a purification of those who administered its functions. This too, however, is only a difference of degree.

5—Conclusions:

From the foregoing analysis several observations may be made. PssSol shares many affinities with the Qumranic literature. Among these are the stress on the importance of adherence to the Law of Moses and the purity of the individual vis-à-vis the divine presence as embodied in the Temple. The two communities differ in the application of these religious tenets. The Qumran community, it would seem, *became* the Temple and signified fidelity to the Law of Moses. Effectively, when one entered into the community at Qumran, one entered into the covenant with God and became part of the corporeal Temple. This observation goes far in explaining their strict disciplinary practices and purity laws. Furthermore, the Qumran community broke completely with the Jerusalem Temple and its religious rule. Observances and ministrations at the Jerusalem Temple were no longer viewed as valid for the community. This schism resulted in the advent of a radical program of a) re-appropriating religious categories, wherein prayers and praise become equivalent to sacrifices in the Temple; b) analogical projection whereby the community becomes the corporeal Temple; and c) metaphorically reallocated religious concepts by which entering the community is equated to circumcising one's heart and entering God's covenant as recorded through the hand of Moses.

The authors of PssSol did not go as far as the covenanters in expressing their doubts about the Jerusalem Temple and its religious rule. The document does not contain the same type of ideological and theoretical religious language as one finds at Qumran. These differences notwithstanding, the basic thrust of the document resonates in no small way with that of Qumran. The 'community' of PssSol envisioned itself as the righteous, yet while they do castigate the sinners, both Jew and Gentile, they never go so far as voluntary self-removal from mainstream society. As such, it is plausible to suggest that the community in PssSol remained active in the daily religious rhythm of mainstream Judaism, while at the same time harboring misgivings about the Temple's current administration. They are not particularly troubled by the invasion of the Gentiles from a religious standpoint. They clearly were frightened by the prospects of war, but this did not precipitate a disbelief in the application of God's judgments. In fact, quite the opposite is true; the invasion of the Gentiles confirmed the authors' suspicions that the sons of Jerusalem had committed grievous sins and had defiled the Temple. These punishments were 'foretold' in the Law of Moses (e.g., Lev. 26 and Deut. 32) and therefore viewed as the natural course of action given the nature of the sinners' transgressions. This should not be misconstrued, however, as an acceptance of Gentile rule. Quite the opposite is true, in fact, as the authors of PssSol quickly show the death of the Gentile invader and plead on several occasions for release or protection from the Gentiles' grasp. Thus while the covenanters produced texts such as 1QS and 1QM,⁸⁷ a community in Jerusalem produced its own smaller and less militant version of their reaction to the defilement of the Temple and wanton disobedience to the Law of Moses in PssSol. Like the Qumranites, the authors of PssSol saw lawlessness and Temple defilement as the chief catalysts in the visitation of destruction. Many of the differences between the two communities are simply quantitative. In quality, they share many of the same basic tenets.

⁸⁷ Talmon "Community of the Renewed Covenant" 11 lists 1QM as a 'foundation document' of the Qumran community; Yadin *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* 3-4 (3) states: "Our scroll forms an organic part fo the literature of the Qumran Sect. This is proved by its style, its language, and the views expressed in it. Many of its expressions, and even whole sentences, recur in other sectarian writings." An example of these "other sectarian writings" are 1QS 1.17; 1QH 5.16; and CD 20.25 in which the 'period of wickedness' (1QM 17.1) is mentioned; also compare 1QS 2.4-5 with 1QM 13.1-2.

These shared tenets revolve around the Law and the Temple. As such, I suggest that this is a reflection of a priestly aspect to both communities. At Qumran, that much is clear. In PssSol, however, the case is more opaque. The authors never refer to the righteous as being priestly, although I have shown an instance in which the *tamid* seems to be the subject and the righteous the performer (PssSol 3.7). In this conclusion I suggest that the authors of PssSol are priestly in their outlook if priestly is to be defined from the standpoint of a particular concern with the Law and the Temple. While the authors of PssSol are not as overt or as radical as their counterparts at Qumran, they are every bit as much concerned with the purity of the Temple and strict adherence to the Law of Moses. For this reason, it seems plausible to suggest that the authors of PssSol originated from the priestly circles. Inasmuch as this conclusion is based on the fundamental premises of the document, Law and Temple, my conclusion for the authors' priestly origins is on much firmer footing than arguments that rely on nomenclature. I suspect that the more subdued nature of PssSol regarding Temple malpractice as compared to the Qumran literature is due to their continued proximity to the Jerusalem Temple. Not having broken completely with the Jerusalem religious community, the authors of PssSol attempt reform from the inside rather than from without. This proximity tailored the complaints of PssSol to fit their particular milieu: the Jerusalem Temple.

Finally, the conclusions reached in this section provide an introduction for the next. The community that produced PssSol was clearly concerned to convey the concept of 'covenant' in traditional terms. Abraham, Moses, Jacob, and the Law combined with the central importance of the current Jerusalem Temple indicates that the authors' understanding of 'covenant' was predicated on a strict interpretation of the Law of Moses. This is to say, PssSol presents us with a mainstream understanding of covenant. The Qumranites, on the other hand, considered themselves to be a community apart. In CD the community is the 'new covenant (ברית החדשה) in the land of Damascus' and 1QS speaks of entrance into the community as tantamount to entering into covenant with God.⁸⁸ Essentially, the difference is that of degree. The covenanters' reaction to the profanation (on-going) of the Temple was to separate themselves radically and permanently from the Jerusalem hierarchy whereas PssSol, while castigating the

⁸⁸ CD A 8.21 and 1QS 5.7b-8a.

Jerusalem hierarchy, does not advocate such a separation. 'Qumranite theology', therefore, understood the concepts of Covenant and Temple differently than much of the rest of Judaism. While revisions of ideas regarding Temple, will of God and covenant were espoused at Qumran, the NT writers were also revising the concepts of Temple, will of God, and covenant. While the concepts of blood, sacrifice, Temple, and Law figure prominently, they are re-drawn with an eye to the concept of a 'New Covenant'.

EXCURSUS

The Psalms of Solomon and the NT:

The Need for a Re-evaluation

Yet even then, when they live in the land of their enemies, I shall not despise them, nor shall I abhor them unto their destruction thereby breaking my covenant with them, for I am the Lord their God. I shall remember for them the first covenant that I brought them up from the land of Egypt before the eyes of all nations to be their God. I am the Lord. These are the statutes, the judgments and the Law that the Lord established between himself and the sons of Israel on Mount Sinai through the hand of Moses.

Lev. 26.44-46

1—Introduction:

In this excursus, I will demonstrate the need for re-evaluating PssSol in the light of the first four sections and how my findings may be applied to the use of the document in the area of the NT. I have selected the NT as a test case precisely because the PssSol appear to be known best to scholarship largely as a result of their use by NT scholars, particularly in discussions of messianism. Furthermore, modern NT scholarship often provides the best examples of the misuse of 'Intertestamental' texts. The document PssSol continues to hold interest and relevance for NT scholarship, but most attention is directed towards only a fraction of the whole composition, namely chapters 17 and 18. Generally, this is to employ the document as a proof-text in search of pericopes that support or undermine NT theories on Christology. In the process, however, such examinations often ignore the larger picture of PssSol. The question that I will attempt to answer in this section is this: what, in the course of the document itself, led the authors to view messianism as *the* solution to their problems? Only by examining the document as a whole and assessing its dominant elements can one turn to interpreting the concept of messianism. By not setting the messianic sections into the thematic and conceptual whole of the document, NT scholars often miss the issue of the Messiah's function *within the document itself*.

This nearsighted approach to PssSol by NT scholarship is reflective of the kind of studies engendered by those who focus on studies in the Pseudepigrapha and Early Judaism. Specialist studies on the document are often driven by thematically fragmentary approaches to the narrative structure; central motifs in the document, e.g., the Temple and

the Law of Moses¹, are treated (if at all) separately from, and not used to reflect on, other motifs within the document, e.g., the issue of the sinners and the righteous or the messianic advent. An examination of contemporary studies of PssSol, undertaken in the introduction, soon makes clear that these central motifs of the document have been largely overlooked, exposing the document to misuse. Modern scholars in general, not only NT scholars, regularly interpret PssSol in the light of NT categories. This is an issue of methodology. The predominant approach prefers to assess sections of the document apart from the larger narrative framework.² Consequently, the 'voice' of the document is too often dampened by a myopic desire to explain existing NT perspectives, or to depict pre-Christian Jewish messianic expectations, or to explain selections from PssSol in the light of NT categories and concepts. The failure to authenticate the document's integral voice is largely a result of scholars' conclusions that it displays no real consistency or thematic intent. In short, PssSol is viewed as a composition only in the loosest sense of the word; its constituent elements fit together only with some difficulty and discomfort

¹ I make this point contrary to the opinion that the authors show very little interest in the priesthood and Temple; cf. Chester "Jewish Messianic Expectations" 27-30; Franklyn "The Cultic and Pious" 1-17; B.L. Mack "Wisdom Makes a Difference" in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the turn of the Christian Era* (ed. Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) 35-38; Pomykala *The Davidic Dynasty* 159-170. As I argued in the section *Temple Motif*, the Temple forms the focal point for the anthropological views of the authors of the PssSol, which defines the categories 'sinner' and 'righteous' throughout the document. The overt references to the Temple in 1.7; 2.3 and 8.11-13 are supplemented by more subtle references in 3.8, a reference to the Day of Atonement ritual as described in Lev. 16. Also, the presence of reference to illicit sexual unions is clearly meant to notify to the reader that what categorized the sinful Jewish element as 'sinners' was their performance of morally defiling transgressions—this can only be understood within the context of a society still intimately concerned with Temple holiness. The overt references to the Law are many and obvious, but the subtle appropriation of the Law of Moses may lie in the oft used term 'discipline'. Cf. 7.9; 10.3; 13.9 and contrast these instances with the failure of the sinners with respect to the Law in 4.1, 8; the whole of chapter 14, which conveys the distinction clearly; and 15.10. With regard to messianism in the document, the categories Law and Temple both define the activities of the Messiah in the document. In short, obedience to the Law and proper respect for the Temple and the purity associated with it constitute the background and purpose of the Messiah in PssSol. Furthermore, the notion of kingship in Judaism carried with it the connotation of a form of religious status. Robert R. Hahn "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: 'The Lord's Anointed' Reconsidered" *NTS* 31 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 621-627 states (624): 'The political power of the pre-exilic monarchs has passed to the Persian emperors, and their religious status has been inherited by the high priests'.

² On the NT scholarship, note our discussion below; on the independent rubric, note J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (New York: Doubleday, 1995) 50-56; *Apocalypticism and the DSS* (London: Routledge, 1997) 75-76; and *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 143-144; "The Son of God Text from Qumran" in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. Martinus C. de Beor; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 71.

precisely because the authors themselves were ill-prepared to deal with the historical calamities that culminated in the sack of Jerusalem by Pompey.

Contrary to such opinions, I have suggested that PssSol is a masterfully wrought defense of the Jewish faith in a time of crisis, one intended, as much as anything else, to produce hope in the readership. This view emerged an analysis that assumes that a reading of the entire document is pre-requisite to an interpretation of its particular constituent elements. I suggested that the authors intended the document to be read as a whole, and that it displays a remarkably stable narrative, so stabilized by the recurrence of the aforementioned central motifs. This stability suggests that individual Psalms operate in harmony to produce a progressive narrative³, one that seems to be based in large part on and informed by select texts from HB such as Deut. 32.⁴

The purpose of this section is to demonstrate that, far from being an *ad hoc* composition, PssSol is in fact thematically and structurally coherent, and that an assessment of individual concepts within the document must be set first against the backdrop of the document's overall theological intent. This I have shown with respect to the categories 'sinner' and 'righteous'. In this section I will discuss the issue of messianism within the document more fully, having approached the topic only cursorily earlier.

2—PssSol in NT Research

2.1—Christology

It would not be inaccurate to suggest that, by and large, NT research has committed the vast majority of its time and energy to PssSol mining for a model of pre-Christian messianism in order to contribute to the debate of NT Christology.⁵ As Wright noted in his commentary,

Finally, these psalms link for the first time the concepts of *Messiah* and *lordship* into a new construct which the Gospel of Luke later seizes as a title for Jesus (Lk.

³ 'Narrative' is a difficult word to avoid. I am following Alter *Art of Biblical Poetry* 62-84 and his discussion of Hebrew poetry. Alter uses the term 'narrative' to describe the 'act' of poetry and states, "In the case of biblical poetry, the two basic operations of specification and heightening within the parallelistic line lead to an incipiently narrative structure of minute concatenations..."

⁴ Nickelsburg has noted this possible connection in *Jewish Literature* 205.

⁵ Collins *Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* 75 has noted that the PssSol are the only clear messianic passage in any literature of the 2nd Temple Period apart from the DSS.

2.11), and the New Testament develops into the concept of 'Christ the Lord', a concept that played an important part in the development of New Testament Christology.⁶

Indeed, PssSol is no stranger to NT research. For a number of years, the collection of 18 psalms has been finding its way into NT compilations, periodicals and books. These references are generally terse, very specialized, and rarely do they take advantage of PssSol as a thematic whole. Rather, PssSol seemingly serve the sole purpose of identifying a pre-Christian messianic concept outside Qumran (PssSol 17 and 18). The facts are that, in NT scholarship, PssSol have been used in topics that range from Christology, to discussions regarding the ingathering of the 12 tribes,⁷ to the specialized study of ἡ γένεα αὐτῆ found in Mk. 13.30,⁸ to brief appearances referring to the mercy of the Lord.⁹ The Psalms have also received some attention as an Early Christian Psalter.¹⁰ The document itself, however, is rarely discussed as a whole.¹¹ For my purposes here, I have selected a few examples of the predominant use of PssSol in NT scholarship today.

2.1.1—M. de Jonge

In his 1991 publication *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*, Marinus de Jonge attempts to describe Jesus' view of his relationship to God before Easter and the Church's assessment of the same after Easter. To accomplish this, de Jonge draws '...longitudinal

⁶ Wright, "The Psalms of Solomon," 643.

⁷ A. S. Geysler, "Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel" in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Lambrecht; Paris-Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1980) 306.

⁸ E. Lovestam, "The ἡ γένεα αὐτῆ Eschatology in Mk. 13.30 parr." in *L'Apocalypse* 406.

⁹ J. Louis Martyn "On Hearing the Gospel both in the Silence of the Tradition and in its Eloquence" in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. Martinus C. De Boer; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 133-136.

¹⁰ Note Gray, "The Psalms of Solomon," in *APOT* v. II 626-28; Thackeray, *Septuagint* in which he discusses the function of PssSol as additional to the Haftarah readings during the Jewish summer fasts, 105-107; Winninge, *Sinners and the Righteous* 18-19.

¹¹ Although Winninge's recent publication of *Sinners and the Righteous* is a step in the right direction, his thesis stands or falls on the issue of authorship; for Winninge, the Pharisees were the authors of the PssSol. Against this last point note fn 32. Winninge also seems to fail to address the larger issue to which the terms sinner and righteous speak in the PssSol: that of purity. See our discussion of this point below. That the remarkable nature of the statements made in PssSol 17 and 18 in the light of chapters 1-16 has not produced a more detailed study and holistic use of the document is stunning, and will be discussed in my forthcoming dissertation.

lines leading from Judaism through Jesus to early Christianity.¹² He states his methodology as follows:

In order to outline with some degree of probability Jesus' own views concerning his relationship to God and the nature of his mission, it is necessary to 'ask back', starting from the earliest forms of response.¹³

It is precisely this 'asking back' that is sometimes problematic in NT research. All too often, complimentary pre-Christian texts are sought out as a means of solidifying an argument rather than of informing the examination. This will become clearer below. With de Jonge's methodology in hand, we may examine his use of PssSol in his argument.

Commenting on Mark 14.61-62, de Jonge remarks on the designation *χριστός*:

The question remains, however, whether Mark's presentation of Jesus' reaction to the title *christos* reflects Jesus' own attitude or the early Christology also expressed in the early pre-Pauline formulas. It is important to remember that Isa. 11:1-5, ... has exercised a considerable influence on Jewish expectations concerning the coming royal Son of David.¹⁴

De Jonge then cites the 'very conspicuous example' of PssSol 17, which he relates to the passage in Is. 11. De Jonge's conclusion is that this passage from PssSol attests to the 'pre-Christian' Christ that he sees in Mark's narrative.¹⁵ The messianic portrayal found in PssSol is, then, a representative of the same messianic concept later embraced by Jesus and his followers, both before and after Easter. As such, it serves de Jonge's thesis well; he concludes:

Mark's characterization of Jesus' activity on earth as prophet, teacher and exorcist as that of 'the Christ, Son of David' is very much in line, then, with the picture of David found in parts of the Old Testament and in some Jewish sources, as well as with certain expectations concerning the future ideal Son of David.¹⁶

On a simple hermeneutical level I must disagree with de Jonge's interpretation of PssSol 17. Whatever else he may be, the Messiah of PssSol is without doubt a political figure, and his religious attributes are clearly to be applied in a historical timeframe. De

¹² Marinus de Jonge *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991) 77.

¹³ *Ibid.* 76.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 71.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* His picture of Jesus as represented by Mark's Gospel may be found on p. 70.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 71; also note M. de Jonge "The Psalms of Solomon" in *Outside the Old Testament* CCWJC 4 (M. de Jonge, ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 174 in which he notes that the Messiah from PssSol is not simply a 'political' figure.

Jonge seems to downplay this and simultaneously to indulge in a more subtle misunderstanding of the text. The 'debate' about the political and/or spiritual nature of the Messiah is not a concern which features at all in PssSol. For PssSol the matter is simple: the Messiah is a political figure. M. de Jonge's views, as well as those of H.J. de Jonge and Wayne A. Meeks noted below, are products of their methodology: they have approached PssSol from the perspective of the NT. An approach to PssSol that submits the text to questions of *Jesus'* (self) understanding of the title *χριστός* as it might be applied to a prophet, wise man (psalmist), exorcist, and not political authority is certainly anachronistic. While the messianic section in PssSol 17 does indeed recall Is. 11.1-5, as de Jonge points out, it is set in the tension of the redemption of Israel in the prophetic future as governed by the interpretation and reception of texts and religious programs.

I have suggested that this program is the prophetic paradigm through a comparison with Dt. 32. In 'asking back' to the pre-Christian Jewish literature, de Jonge has imported certain arguments not necessarily inherent to the pre-Christian text. Approaching the post-biblical Jewish texts from the standpoint of the NT, as de Jonge has done, forces the former into a particular mold at the outset; in the sequence of analysis, this requires that the post-biblical Jewish material actually stand at the end of the transmission history of particular themes rather than in the middle. Instead of following a chronological order, which is appropriate, de Jonge approaches the subject topically. The mere mention of *χριστός* does not associate PssSol with NT Christology *a priori*. As I concluded in my comparison between Qumran and PssSol, it is apparent that PssSol aligned its theology with a more mainline approach to the Law and Temple vis-à-vis Qumran this conclusion was reached through comparing closely the distinct approaches and understanding of both communities and not, as it appears de Jonge has done with NT and PssSol, by projecting Qumranic thought patterns onto the PssSol.

For PssSol, the composite elements of its messianism are informed first and foremost by the anticipation of God's redemptive and salvific work in Israel, the catalyst being Pompey's catastrophic invasion and conquest of Jerusalem. To understand the Messiah of PssSol requires that one first understand the necessary elements or events that bring about his advent. For the authors of PssSol, these elements and events are the punishment and redemption of Israel. But herein lies the larger and more visceral issue,

the purity of Israel. The moral impurity of Israel inevitably leads to expulsion from the Land. Based on this, I aver that the document here reflects the understanding of God's redemptive plan as suggested, for instance, by Ezekiel 36.22-25 and that the Messiah represents for these authors the 'purifying' element in this redemptive plan.¹⁷ De Jonge's use of PssSol focuses on a topic that is at best secondary to the authors' intent. While it is undeniable that the Messiah of PssSol 17 is a political figure, the more central issue for the authors is purity, not polity.¹⁸ The authors of PssSol arrive at this conclusion through a detailed study and evaluation of key HB passages. The Messiah is a political figure who is the *coup de grâce* in the authors' future hope for the purification of Israel, i.e, the theological program of the prophetic paradigm. It is possible that de Jonge's thesis would benefit in the end if a comparison were made specifically with respect to the element of purity between the Messiah of PssSol and Jesus.

2.1.2—H.J. de Jonge and Wayne A. Meeks

With respect to the issue at hand, both H.J. de Jonge and W. Meeks offer a similar response to M. de Jonge. As such, I will treat both in this section. While H.J. de Jonge's method differs very little from M. de Jonge's, he rightly points out that PssSol 17 does present a political Messiah. In this regard he states:

But this Son of David must first acquire and exercise the kingship of Israel, much as David had been the political king of Israel (v. 4c). He must take the place of the hated and illegitimate kings of the house of the Hasmoneans. He must have the strength to break the power of the lawless leaders (v.22a). He must cleanse Jerusalem of the heathens (that is the Romans) who are crushing and ruining it (v. 22b).¹⁹

¹⁷ I am consciously trying to avoid the loaded term 'eschatology' in this section as messianism does not necessarily imply eschatology. Rather, it is more akin to a "future hope." As Schaper *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* 141 has aptly noted, neither messianism nor eschatology were ever a systematized set of beliefs but depended, rather, on religious needs.

¹⁸ In fact, Deborah Rooke *Zadok's Heirs* Oxford Theological Monograph (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 319-321 misses the very same element as de Jonge in her approach, which suggests that the Messiah mentioned in PssSol is *purely* political, having very little to do with anything of the priesthood. Against this, note Wayne A. Meeks' "Asking Back to Jesus' Identity" in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honor of Marinus de Jonge* JSNTS (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1993) 48 in which he speaks of the "encomia that attribute to the king all...the priestly features...over which he presides."

¹⁹ H.J. de Jonge "The Historical Jesus' View of Himself and His Mission" in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honor of Marinus de Jonge* JSNTS (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1993) 26.

H.J. de Jonge's critique, however, does not reflect a different valuation of texts involved, but simply a different valuation of potential processes involved the formation of those texts. In short, he has not altered his opinion of how to use the texts, but only how they related to the claims of Jesus in the NT. So, while his statements are rightly put, they offer no substantive alteration from the approach endorsed by M. de Jonge.

Regarding the office of the Messiah in PssSol 17, it is paramount to understand the placement of the narrative in the framework of the entire document. PssSol 17 first begins with a short section (vv. 1-4) that links chapters 16 and 17 together.²⁰ This is important to note in so far as the authors of PssSol intended the 17th chapter to be read in the light of the 16th. What follows in 17.5-18 is a revisitation of the contemporary historical milieu already discussed in chapters 1, 2, and 8 detailing the punishment of Israel for sins committed. It is only after this reassessment of the impetus behind the historical debacle that the anticipated political role of the Messiah is described. As such, it is here important to note that the function of the Messiah in ch. 17 is simply an aggrandized statement of the same trust and hope that the authors elsewhere convey by the use and placement (structural intent) of key terminology in the narrative. This is most notable in ch. 2 in which the tribulation of conquest and exile is punctuated not by lament, but by the validation of God's righteous judgments.²¹ PssSol 17.1-4 act as a culmination of the hope of the authors carried over from chapter 16, and is an overt expression of trust in the Mosaic covenant (v.1—God as king over his people; cf. Ps. 29.10; Is. 44.6) and in the Davidic covenant (v. 4—a righteous ruler who will defend

²⁰ Note that PssSol 16 is entitled 'For Help for the Devout' and then goes on to detail the 'slumbering' (sinning) of the devout (1-2), the salvation of the Lord (3-6), a plea for God to keep the devout's soul from sinning again (7-11), and then an appeal for strength to endure discipline (12-15). Note that it is discipline that the authors are concerned with, which might easily suggest the capacity of a king. Thus the help of the devout is the watchful eye of the king. PssSol 17.1-4 praises God as king, as well as his earthly representative. [On this point note the section in our forthcoming dissertation on thematic concatenation in the PssSol.]

²¹ In particular note PssSol 2.10, 15, 18, 30, and 32, in which the organization of 'hopeful' messages are interspersed amongst dire historical events. The pattern is as follows: the authors first connect the beginning of the chapter with the end of chapter 16 (concatenation), then they revisit the historical dilemma, and finally they discuss the restitution of the nation of Israel through the work of a future Messiah. As Winnige *Sinners and the Righteous* 26-27 has noted, "A thematic current throughout the psalm is a didactic preaching about the righteousness of the (sic.) the Lord (v 10, 15, 18, 32)..."

God's people on earth).²² As such, PssSol 17.5-18, which represents a synopsis of the historical setting for the whole of the document, functions to set the stage for the initiation of God's redemptive plan. At the end of chapter 17, the authors seem intent to convey a sense of trust to the readership, an assurance that, the present conflagration notwithstanding, the faithful of God will see His redemption.

Far more problematic in H.J. de Jonge's response to M. de Jonge's is his methodology. As is conspicuous from the title, H.J. de Jonge is concerned to show the historical Jesus' messianic self-awareness. Having summarized M. de Jonge's position, H.J. de Jonge objects:

A vulnerable point in the argument of de Jonge appears to be the idea that because of his self-awareness as a prophet, teacher and exorcist, Jesus could have called himself the son of David. I do not deny that Jesus acted as a prophet, teacher and exorcist. But I wonder if it is really probable that a Jewish teacher around the year 30 CE could have found the fact that he acted as prophet, teacher and exorcist, sufficient grounds to apply to himself the designation of son of David, let alone 'the anointed of the Lord'.²³

As H.J. de Jonge himself admits, he has entered the realm of speculation. He asserts that it is *unlikely* that a 1st century Jew 'could have' considered himself the 'son of David' or the 'anointed of the Lord'. In this line of speculation, H.J. de Jonge points out that Jesus would have been claiming some right to rule, and that most *NT* researchers agree that Jesus did not have such ambitions.²⁴ But it is difficult to see how an understanding of 2nd Temple period literature, e.g., PssSol, has influenced this observation. While H.J. de Jonge has acknowledged PssSol contribution to messianism, it is only insofar as the document 'proves' that messiahs were expected to be political figures. He then highlights the words of Jesus that seemingly contradict such political aspirations and draws conclusions accordingly. Such as it is, H.J. de Jonge's approach is also methodologically anachronistic. His perceptions of Jewish messianism are informed by his understanding of the issues of NT Christology. Instead, could it be that the issue of kingship in PssSol, reflected in the Gospel accounts of Jesus, is indicative of the diachronic perception of

²² Pomykala *The Davidic Dynasty* 159-170. Although I do not fully agree with Pomykala's assessment of the chapter, in particular his assessment of the presence of priestly and Temple motifs in the chapter, he presents some very important observations on the messianic concept vis-à-vis Davidic tradition.

²³ H.J. de Jonge "The Historical Jesus" 26.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 26-27.

'kingship' in the HB sense of the word as received by 1st century B.C.E. and C.E. communities and not 'kingship' in the modern sense of the word?

There are several instances from HB in which the king, or 'anointed of the Lord', does not trust in normal kingly devices, i.e., human power and authority.²⁵ One noteworthy example is in CPs. 33.16 (32.16—LXX). The text reads:

A king is not saved by greatness of might, nor a warrior by the greatness of strength.

It is important to point out that this Psalm in the LXX is given the title τῷ Δαυιδ. If we are to understand that this is a Psalm of David, which reflects a reliance on a power other than that of military might and authority, then I think it plausible to suggest that the 'rule' of a Davidic king is not a static concept in Second Temple Judaism based solely on the military might of a particular warrior. The selections from Hosea and Zechariah confirm this observation, and PssSol seems to follow suit. But this is not to suggest that the actions of such a Messiah are not *historically intended*. Certainly the actions of the Messiah in 17.22 demonstrate authority in purging Jerusalem from Gentiles and unrighteous rulers, likely in reference to the Gentile sinners who have profaned the Temple in 2.2 and the sinful Jewish element castigated throughout the document, and point to the authors' understanding of the reality of the messianic advent.²⁶

The authors of PssSol are keen to point out that these sinful contingents are so classified because of their actions against the Temple.²⁷ Thus the action of the Messiah is one of purification of Jerusalem and the nation of Israel; this purification is a historical event. Chapter 17 goes on to make this point clear. In vv. 26-32, the Messiah purifies the people (v. 26) and Jerusalem (v. 30). Moreover, the Messiah of PssSol 17 was certainly not modeled on any contemporary example of kingship. In fact, the political and military prowess of the Messiah is nominalized in favor of a Messiah who acts under the authority

²⁵ Note e.g., Hosea 1.7; Zech. 4.6.

²⁶ Pomykala *The Davidic Tradition* 162-162.

²⁷ When Pompey went up into the Temple he was condemned not because he was a Gentile, but because he was alien (ἄλλότρια). Cf. my discussion of this term in the section *Temple Motif*. Prohibition from entry into the Holy of Holies does not define 'Gentile'. If it did, many Jews would also be considered 'Gentile'. What it does demonstrate is that the Gentiles in ch. 1 were not intrinsically sinful; they became sinners when they entered into the sanctuary *because* they, as 'alien,' were not permitted by the Law of Moses to enter the Holy of Holies.

of God with “superhuman” characteristics. The Messiah installs God’s kingdom by the “word of his mouth” (v. 24), without relying on “horse and rider and bow” (v. 33), and without collecting either money or troops for war (v. 33).²⁸ Later, in v. 34b, the Messiah shows compassion to the nations who are reverent before him. Most importantly, however, one should remember that the chapter is enclosed by claims of God’s kingship (vv. 1 and 46). As such, it is the rule of God that is at issue in chapter 17 and it is into this theological concept that the work of the Messiah should be placed. In short, the work of the Messiah in PssSol is to *establish* the kingdom of God on earth, not to *rule* it.

Returning to H.J. de Jonge’s comment one can now see its shortcoming, essentially the same as M. de Jonge’s. The argument in PssSol regarding the political function of the Messiah is secondary to the work of the Messiah as purifier. The purgation of the people, Jerusalem and the nations is tantamount to the establishment of the kingdom of God on the earth. This, I suggest, is the appropriate position from which a comparison between the Messiah in PssSol and Christ of the NT should be undertaken.²⁹

It is important to remember that H.J. de Jonge’s point of separation from M. de Jonge pertains to a disagreement regarding the portrayal of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. In keeping with M. de Jonge’s methodology of ‘asking back’, H.J. de Jonge seems content to begin with presuppositions derived from the Christian Scriptures. Thus the point of departure begins in the NT. His use of PssSol does not witness to the concept of messianism in NT times as much as they support a particular NT view of Christ’s self-understanding.

Such sharp distinctions between PssSol and the NT are evidence of the generally perfunctory attention given to the document in NT research. Based on H.J. de Jonge’s criterion, one of the last questions in his article now seems impossible to answer,

This raises the question whether Jesus could have called himself ‘son of David’ in the sense of the figure depicted in *Psalms of Solomon* 17 without implying at the very least that he aspired to political kingship. I think not.³⁰

²⁸ For “word of his mouth” note Is. 11.4 (cf. also Ps. 2.9) and Rev. 1.16, in which the “sharp, two-edged sword comes out of the ‘son of Man’s’ mouth and 2.27 in which the same authority vested in messianic tones in Num. 24.17 and Ps. 2.9 is given to all who “do the will” of God. Incidentally, this is the same image of the king presented in Deut. 17.14-19.

²⁹ Cf. e.g., Mt. 3.2, 4.17; Mk. 1.15.

³⁰ H.J. de Jonge “The Historical Jesus” 26.

The application of PssSol in the manner ascribed by H.J. de Jonge has not considered the placement of messianism within the context of the prophetic paradigm endorsed by the authors of PssSol. Moreover, the issue of polity imported to PssSol from Christology obfuscates any comment PssSol may offer in its own right on messianism. In short, H.J. de Jonge's use of PssSol in his argument is flawed due to its dependence on an *a priori* assessment of Jesus, one that is then used to formulate questions for PssSol such as:

Did Jesus speak of himself as 'the anointed one', or did others give him this name? And if the latter is the case, did it happen during Jesus' lifetime or after his death?³¹

PssSol can offer no answer to such questions other than to suggest that Jewish messianic perceptions in the 1st century B.C.E. had conceived of messianism in those terms in a pre-Christian context.³² H.J. de Jonge's use of PssSol is further evidence that, with respect to NT scholarship, the document is largely subsumed under the umbrella of existing opinion.

Wayne A. Meeks has offered a similar critique of M. de Jonge's position. Regarding M. de Jonge's focus on the charismatic elements of the Messiah in PssSol 17 and its application to Jesus. Meeks points out the following:

Certainly the longed-for savior for whom the psalmist (of PssSol) prays will be 'powerful in the holy spirit and wise in the counsel of understanding with strength and righteousness.' But he displays these virtues precisely as 'their king, son of David' (v. 21), and he is throughout the relevant verses of the psalm pre-eminently a royal figure.³³

On this point two comments need be made. First, in much the same manner as H.J. de Jonge above, Meeks demonstrates one of the shortcomings of M. de Jonge's work. Yet a possible flaw in the critical framework surfaces, summarized in his final assessment:

The question, put as simply as possible, is this: is the identity of Jesus something that can intelligibly be separated from the sum of all knowable responses to him?³⁴

³¹ Ibid. 23.

³² It is important on this point to bear in mind that the authors of the PssSol harbored this messianic ideal as a historical reality, albeit a future one.

³³ Wayne A. Meeks' "Asking Back to Jesus' Identity" 47.

³⁴ Ibid. 48-49 my parenthesis.

As with M. and H.J. de Jonge above, Meeks seems largely interested in the texts that are *responses* to Jesus, not those that might inform the development of the NT texts themselves. Meeks's use of PssSol in this regard reflects the same oversight exhibited in the papers of M. and H.J. de Jonge above, and the same criticisms apply.

Secondly, simply stating that the Messiah of PssSol is 'preeminently a royal figure' does not explain the function of the Messiah in the religious self-awareness of the authors.³⁵ As I have argued above in commenting on H.J. de Jonge's use of the document, the Messiah in PssSol establishes, rather than rules, the kingdom of God on the earth. Though royal and political, he is primarily a purificatory figure for the authors, one who will make the longed for rule of God on the earth a reality.³⁶ On this note, the functions of the royal figure, i.e., king, in HB often incorporated a religious office as well.³⁷ For instance, the successive reigns of the kings detailed in 2 Chr. 14-36 are concerned initially with the religious activities of the kings. It is through the king that religious practices, either negative (e.g., Jehoram 2 Chr. 21.4f) or positive (e.g., Asa 2 Chr. 14.2f.) If we are to understand the nature of the person and work of Jesus, it is important to see his function as a purificatory figure much as we see his historicity as divine regent.

3—Conclusions

In the cases of M. de Jonge, H.J. de Jonge and Meeks, PssSol is given a voice only in so far as it fits the conceptual framework of each scholar's argument. This is problematic on two accounts. First, as evidenced from their disagreements, there is little consensus on the actual meaning of the messianic pronouncements in PssSol. Most NT scholarly work on the document has not attempted to place the messianic section of PssSol within the wider context of the document, but rather to assess the nature of Jesus' ministry and personality and *then* 'ask back' to the post-biblical literature and HB. The

³⁵ Gene L. Davenport "The Anointed of the Lord in PssSol 17" in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (Eds. George W.E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins: Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980) 75 suggests in regard to the Messiah in PssSol: 'The king, as the one who will sanctify the city, will function thereby as a figure with cultic responsibilities in addition to his royal ones'.

³⁶ Pomykala *The Davidic Tradition* 169-170 has noted this connection but curiously suggests (168) that the Temple and priesthood have no place in chapter 17.

³⁷ Shozo Fujita "The Metaphor of Plant in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period" in *JSJ* 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 32 fn. 11 notes: 'The messiah of the Psalms unites the offices of king and priest...'

effect of this type of approach becomes clear when contrasting the positions of M. and H.J. de Jonge and Meeks: the isolation of the section from PssSol can take on many different meanings depending on one's personal disposition to the text. Obviously, this does little to advance an understanding of the NT Christ from the perspective of PssSol. Secondly, this methodology actually discourages a look back through the literature of HB by imposing criteria on source and complimentary texts not necessarily inherent in those texts. As I have argued briefly here, it is only from the perspective of HB antecedents that PssSol may be fully understood. Only when the document has been understood in such a manner and in its own terms may it speak to the NT.

In his introduction to *The Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*, S.P. Brock, responding to the criticism that the document was influenced by both Testaments, wrote:

...what it (the blend of Christian and Jewish phrases) suggests is the common use of the same popular contemporary ideas and phrases.³⁸

Brock's comments could not have been more pertinent with respect to post-biblical texts. The value of his insight, however, has not yet been fully appreciated in the application of post-biblical, pre-Christian texts by NT scholars. Ultimately, the goal is to show the relationship between the two Testaments, but any assessment that attempts such a demonstration must consider the post-Prophetic, pre-Christian witnesses such as PssSol. As James H. Charlesworth has commented:

...the quotation of 1 Enoch by Jude clarifies that any study of the relation of the Testaments must now include the Jewish Pseudepigrapha and other writings we brand as extracanonical. These documents were certainly considered inspired by many early Jews and Christians.³⁹

What I have attempted to show in this final section is that NT Christology has often mined PssSol in search of 'proof-texts' in support of particular views on the nature of Christ's historicity. Two conclusions, one particular and one general, may be made. In particular, NT categories and debates are often imported to PssSol in seeking non- or pre-Christian messianic witnesses. In so doing, the concept of messianism in PssSol is homogenized *a priori* with NT perspectives on the life and works of Christ at the expense

³⁸ S.P. Brock, "Psalms of Solomon," in *AOT* 506.

³⁹ Charlesworth, "What has the Old Testament to do with the New?" 55, also note 60.

of the document's distinct voice. This deficit, I aver, is a symptom of disassociating the concept of messianism from the theological program espoused by the document. This program is, I have argued, the prophetic paradigm and the institution of God's divine plan. It is the means by which the authors assimilate the historical event of Pompey's invasion into their religious self-awareness, within which the messianic concept fulfills the final purification and redemption of Israel and the world. For PssSol, the Messiah and his work are intelligible only with respect to his function within the prophetic paradigm.⁴⁰

In general, the shortcomings on the part of NT scholars are largely a reflection of the need for an evaluation of the document that considers the particular concepts in the light of the prophetic paradigm. This section simply highlights the need for a re-evaluation of PssSol in light of the document's central thesis. A failure to assess individual elements in the light of the fundamental themes runs the risk of misunderstanding the religious disposition embodied by the document. In order for the document to be used inter-textually, the first step must be a proper assessment of the theological program used by the authors. For example, much of NT reworks HB themes and concepts with an eye to the concept of the 'New Covenant'. Use of PssSol as a tool of NT criticism must first consider that the document presents its concepts from the perspective of the 'Old Covenant' and that the authors are curmudgeons of this Covenant. Contrasts between NT discussions of these concepts (e.g., purity—cf. Phil. 3.6, Col. 1.22, Eph. 5.27, 1 Peter 1.19; an expanded concept of 'Israel'—cf. Mt. 3.9; Lk. 3.8; Rom. 9) must be explained with these different perceptions of covenant and Temple in mind. In short, NT scholarship would benefit from a study that presents the holistic, theological program of PssSol as a means to interpreting the authors' understanding of particular concepts.

⁴⁰ Any comparison between Jesus and the Messiah of PssSol must consider the nature of the Messiah in PssSol. For instance, when Jesus heals the paralytic in Mat. 9.1-8, he first forgives the afflicted of his sins. Is there any relationship between the work of Christ in this pericope and the purity of the Temple? According to the binding laws of purity (Lev. 21) it would seem likely that this man would have been forbidden to enter the Sanctuary precincts. In addition to healing the man, might it not also be the case that Jesus purified this man from a ritual impurity? Thus the issue of ritual impurity, at least for the Gospel writers (note the synoptic parallels in Mark 2.1-12 and Luke 5.17-26), is connected to sin. How do PssSol, with the figure of the kingly Messiah purifying Jerusalem from the pollution of sin (17.30; this is really the theme of 17.35-42) and a pre-occupation with purity, comment on this understanding of Christ's work?

Effects of the Study

1—*Internal Conclusions:*

In *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, George Nickelsburg comments regarding PssSol 7:

The psalm (7) reflects none of the panic or anguish that one would expect in the face of imminent conquest (cf. 8.1-6).¹

His observation highlights a dominant characteristic of these psalms: an assurance that the God of Israel will save his people. Nickelsburg's observation is right, not only for chapter 7, but for the whole of the document. This note of assurance is, as I have suggested in the foregoing thesis, a direct result of the implementation of the prophetic view of history as a means of addressing the historical event of Pompey's invasion of Jerusalem.

In the first chapter, a comparison was made between PssSol and the well-known prophetic example of Deut. 32. *Ha'azinu* was clearly held to be of central importance for Jewish groups during the 2nd Temple period as well as being interpreted as a prophetic text by the ancient commentators. The primary purpose of comparing PssSol with Deut. 32 was to discern the depth of the authors' reliance on the prophetic view of history. This is to say, to what degree did the authors of PssSol replicate this perception in their efforts to respond to historical events. The examination yielded the conclusion that the authors relied quite heavily on the prophetic paradigm and implemented it as a means of encouraging their readers.

In the second chapter, a detailed examination of the poetic elements of the text was made. By suggesting the unity of the compilation, this section confirmed the findings in the first chapter: if the arrangement was woven with an appreciable degree of cohesion, it makes sense to suggest that a particular thesis was being argued for in the document. This certainly seems the case. Moreover, this section highlights, although space limited a comprehensive analysis, another deficiency in PssSol research. Rarely, if ever, is the poetic structure of the arrangement taken into consideration when

¹ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature* 206.

interpretations are offered individual passages. Clarity is certainly to be gained from such a disciplined examination.

The third section saw the implementation of the holistic reading undertaken. It became clear that the Temple motif was central to the authors' understanding of the advent of the historical punishment represented in Pompey's assault. The sinfulness of Israel leading to punishment is a central feature of the prophetic paradigm, and the authors of PssSol made absolutely clear that the Temple represented the point at which this sinfulness was manifested. In short, the terms sinner (ἁμαρτωλός) and righteous (δικαιός) are determined by a particular attitude towards or relationship with God's divine presence, manifest at the Temple complex and embodied in the laws regarding purity and impurity from HB. It is impossible to understand these terms, 'sinner' and 'righteous', without first understanding the nature of the issue of ritual and moral impurity in HB, which clearly functioned for the authors as a guiding rule. This Temple motif, which is comprised of the distinctions between sinners and righteous as well as the practical aspects of Temple propriety, initiates the prophetic paradigm, in that it defines the sinfulness that leads to punishment. In short, the metaphysical reaction (divine punishment) is contingent upon historical activities (disregard for Temple purity, arrogance of the Gentiles). Moreover, this motif also functions as a cumulative point in the document, for when the messiah comes purity again takes center stage.

In the excursus, the results of the introduction, inter-textual comparison, poetic evaluation, and discussion of the Temple motif are combined to permit an examination of the application of PssSol to the discussion of a particular theological concept. Christology has a clear interest in PssSol and uses the document for reference material to Jewish theological activities in the century preceding the origination of the Christian tradition. The argument put forward in the fifth chapter argues for a re-examination of this concept from PssSol in light of both the authors' use of the prophetic paradigm and the centrality of the Temple motif. These concepts are oftentimes overlooked in NT criticisms of the document, which is a direct result of the lack of a commentary which commends these themes as central to the document. The re-evaluation of the messianic theme in PssSol 17 and 18 (undertaken in chapters 1-3) suggests that it is impossible to understand messianism for the authors of PssSol without envisioning this theological concept as the

cumulative experience within the prophetic paradigm as well as the final solution to the issue of impurity and sin. In short, the Messiah in PssSol 17, by undertaking the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, is actively finalizing Israel's redemption, the world's recognition of God's sovereignty, and the stasis of purity envisioned in the ideal world of the Israelite priesthood.

The fourth section in which a comparison was made between the communities of Qumran and PssSol was central to our argument by offering a contemporary comparative body of literature by which the make-up of PssSol was better evaluated. The wide-ranging and varied literature found at Qumran exemplifies many of the central characteristics of PssSol and other 2nd Temple Jewish documents, e.g., the pairings sinners/righteous, pure/impure, Jew/Gentile, and commentary on the Temple at Jerusalem. The duality envisioned by the covenanters, which functioned as a central theological tenet, and the abiding presence of concerns for the Temple make Qumran a worthwhile comparative partner. The primary conclusion reached in this section was that, while PssSol and Qumran share many similarities as to their views of God, community, and Temple, they differed significantly on the degree or qualitative distinctions in which they employed these concepts. This helps to set the Jewish text PssSol more clearly within in the religious milieu of 1st century BCE Palestine.

2—External Implications and Applications:

The foregoing study has shown that, far from being a reflection of separatist or 'fringe' theology, PssSol conveys mainstream theological concepts and speaks from inside the Jerusalem hierarchy. As such, the document offers insights into the understanding of Jewish perceptions on fundamental concepts such as purity, sin, Divine Presence in the Temple, Law, and messianism. Furthermore, the authors constantly examine the manner in which these concepts affect human existence, both Jew and Gentile. By commenting on these theological tenets, PssSol occupies a position of fundamental importance in understanding not only Jew-Jew relationships during the Early Roman era, but also Jewish perceptions on the nature of the Gentiles. In this light, the document deserves a place of reference on par with the likes of ben Sira, Jubilees, I Enoch, and much of the rest of the Pseudepigrapha and post-biblical texts. Historically

Speaking, the document gives a clear indication that Jewish theology envisioned God's action in human history as pervasive. Furthermore, the authors clearly saw human action as encouraging a divine response, whether good or bad. This type of blend, of the historical with the metaphysical, is not unlike that which is advocated in the New Testament perception of the Incarnation. As I have shown, however, the messianic element within the text does not advocate an Incarnation in any way. As such, similarities drawn between PssSol and NT pertaining to Christology remain restricted to the issue of a Davidic messiah endowed with God's power. The application of that power differs considerably between PssSol and NT.

Further implications of my findings on post-biblical and NT studies are several. First, if the document speaks from the standpoint of mainstream Judaism, then the concepts it address must be interpreted in the light of a wider thesis. The authors are concerned, first and foremost, to defend traditional covenantal faith in the face of theologically challenging events. Traditional covenantal faith points continuously to the institutions of Law and Temple as they are defined in the Pentateuch, and argues that these institutions are not only efficacious but are indicative of God's presence in the Land. As such, an argument of this type is a call for repentance, one that uses HB texts as 'witnesses' to God's divine plan.

Second, an emphasis on a straightforward, biblical interpretation of the institutions of Temple and Law dictates, or should do so, how other concepts, such as purity, sin, righteousness, Israel as a nation, and messianism are viewed. Regarding messianism, for instance, NT scholarship must first determine the *function* of messianism in relation to the central argument of the document, a return to covenantal obedience and Temple purity. Inasmuch as the authors' focus is the Law and obedience, Temple and purity, then the function of Messiah must be seen as a tool for establishing God's hegemony on Earth through a perfected application of Law and Temple. In short, the concepts discussed in PssSol must be set within the context of the wider thesis, one that is arguing first and foremost for a perfection of obedience in relation to the Law and purity in relation to the Temple.

In 1916, Rendel Harris and A. Mingana wrote in their appraisal of PssSol: 'It (PssSol) has little interest for ourselves, and will probably have less for other people'.² As a text that represents a diachronic re-appropriation of a theological program from HB, a mainstream application of central Jewish tenets such as the Temple and Law, and sets specific concepts such as sinner, righteous, and Messiah within the framework of that theological program and defines them in relation to the central Jewish tenets, the value of the document for understanding Jewish interpretive efforts in the Early Roman Era can hardly be overstated. Hopefully, this study provides a reversal of Harris and Mingana's statement.

² R. Harris and A. Mingana *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* (Manchester: University Press, 1916) v. 1 vii.

Primary Sources

Biblical Material:

Masoretic Text 1990 Edition of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. All translations from this edition are mine unless otherwise noted.

Septuagint All translations are mine unless otherwise noted. Two editions were used:

- 1) For general reference work A. Rahlf's 1979 edition was consulted.
- 2) For textual work in the section on Deut. 32, the Göttingen edition of LXX has been used.

Post-biblical Material:

Dead Sea Scrolls I have noted where a translation from the DSS is my own. Otherwise, the following translations were consulted:

- 1) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998.
- 2) *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth et. al. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994-1997.
- 3) *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. Volumes 14, 26, and 36. Oxford: University Press, 1998-2000.

Psalms of Solomon While all translations are my own, several editions of the text were consulted. These include:

- 1) Robert Wright "Psalms of Solomon." Pages 639-670 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press, 1985.
- 2) Brock, S.P "The Psalms of Solomon." Pages 649-682 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by H.F.D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
- 3) Kenneth Atkinson *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Apoc. and Pseud. Several editions consulted include:

- 1) *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Volume. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press, 1984-1985.
- 2) *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by H. F. D. Sparks. Oxford: University Press, 1984.

- 3) *The Apocryphal and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 Volumes. Edited by R. H. Charles et. al. Oxford: University Press, 1913.

Josephus All translations of Josephus taken from editions of Loeb Classical Library.

Philo All translations of Philo taken from editions of Loeb Classical Library.

Rabbinic Material:

Talmud All translations of Babylonian Talmud taken from relevant editions of *The Babylonian Talmud*. Edited by Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein. London: Soncino Press, 1935-1952.

Mishnah All translations of Mishnaic sources taken from *The Mishnah*. Translated by H. H. Danby. Oxford: University Press, 1933.

Targum Two sources were consulted with regard to the Targumic material.
1) *The Bible in Aramaic*. Edited by Alexander Sperber. Leiden: Brill, 1959-1973.
2) *The Aramaic Bible*. Edited by Martin McNamara, et. al. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1987-1998.

Midrash All translations of Midrash Rabbah taken from relevant editions of *The Midrash Rabbah*. Edited by Rabbi Dr. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: Soncino Press, 1935-1951.

Other Reference Material consulted but not cited:

Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath. *Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Reprint, 3 vols. in 2, Grand Rapids, 1983.

Brown F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1907.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford, 1996.

Koehler, L. W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden, 1994-1999.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1910.

Payne Smith, R. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford, 1903.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. *A Bibliography of Pseudepigraphic Research: 1850-1999*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Other Ancient Material:

Aristotle. *On the Art of Poetry*. Translated by T.S. Dorsch. New York: Penguin, 1965.

Seneca. *Letters From a Stoic*. Translated by Robin Campbell. London: Penguin Books, 1969.

Bibliography

Works Specifically on Psalms of Solomon

Commentaries and Texts:

Atkinson, Kenneth. *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon Pseudepigrapha*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001.

Brock, S.P. "The Psalms of Solomon." Pages 649-682 in *The Apocryphal Old Testament*. Edited by H.F.D. Sparks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Gray, G. Buchanan. "The Psalms of Solomon." Pages 625-652 in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Edited by R.H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916.

Hahn, Robert R. *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 13. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.

Harris, R., and A. Mingana. *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon v. 1*. Manchester: University Press, 1916.

Hilgenfeld, A. *Die Psalmen Solomo's und die Himmelfahrt des Moses, griechisch hergestellt und erklärt* ZWT 11. 1868.

Ryle, H.E., and R.J. James. *The Psalms of the Pharisees: Commonly called the Psalms of Solomon*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1891.

Viteau, J. *Psaumes de Salomon*. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1911.

Wright, Robert. "The Psalms of Solomon." Pages 639-670 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Press, 1985.

Studies:

Aberbach, Moses. "The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon." Pages 379-396 in *Jewish Quarterly Review* 41. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.

Atkinson, Kenneth. "Towards a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon: Implications for Understanding the *Sitz im Leben* of an Unknown Jewish Sect." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 17 (1998): 95-112.

- Davenport, Gene L. "The Anointed of the Lord in PssSol 17" in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by George W.E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Franklyn, P.N. "The Cultic and Pious Climax of Eschatology in the Psalms of Solomon." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 18 (1987): 1-17.
- Hahn, Robert R. "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17:32: 'The Lord's Anointed' Reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 620-627.
- O'Dell, Jerry. "Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 241-258.
- Rosen, Debra and Alison Salvesen. "A Note on the Qumran Temple Scroll 56:15-18 and Psalm of Solomon 17.33." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987): 99-101.
- Schüpphaus, Joachim. *Die Psalmen Salomon: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- Trafton, Joseph L. *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- _____. "The Bible, The Psalms of Solomon, and Qumran." Paper presented at The 2nd Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins. Princeton, NJ, Nov. 9-12, 1997.
- Tromp, Johannes. "The Sinners and the Lawless in Psalms of Solomon 17." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (1993): 344-361.
- Winnings, Mikael. *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters*. Coniectanea Biblica NT Series 26. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1995.
- Wright, Robert. "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes." Pages 136-154 in *1972 Proceedings of the IOSCS*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Other Works:

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. "Amos." In *New International Biblical Commentary* 17. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Ackroyd, Peter R. *Continuity*. Oxford Alden Press: 1962.

- Adam, A.K.M. *Making Sense of New Testament Theology: 'Modern' Problems and Prospects*. Studies in American Biblical Hermeneutics 11. Macon, GA: Mercer, 1995.
- Adler, William. "Introduction." Pages 1-31 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996.
- Alexander, Philip S. and Geza Vermes. *Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts*. Qumran Cave 4 XIX DJD XXVI. Oxford: University Press, 1998.
- Alexander, Philip S. *Targum of Canticles*. Vol 17a in Martin McNamara, Michael Maher, and Kevin Cathcart eds. *The Aramaic Bible*. London: T and T Clark, 2003.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1984.
- Anderson, Bernhard W. *The Living World of the Old Testament*. London: Longman, 1988.
- _____. "The Bible as a Shared Story of a People." Pages 19-37 in *The Old and the New Testaments: Their Relationship and the "Intertestamental" Literature*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.
- Aune, D.E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Barbour, Ian. *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues*. London: SCM Press, 1998.
- Barker, Margaret. "The Temple Measurements and the Solar Calendar." Pages 63-66 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. George Brooke ed.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1979.
- _____. "Sacrifice and Offering" in *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963.
- _____. *Biblical Words for Time*. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1996.
- _____. *Oracles of God: Prophecy in the Post-Exilic Period*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

- Barton, Stephen. *Invitation to the Bible*. London: SPCK, 1997.
- Bellinger, W.H. Jr. *Psalms and Prophecy*. JSOT 27. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Berdayaev, Nicolai. *The Meaning of History*. London: Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press, 1936.
- Binder, Donald D. *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*. SBL Dissertation Series 169. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.
- Brock, Sebastian. "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources." Pages 212-232 in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30 (1979): 212-232.
- Brichto, Herbert Chanan. *Towards a Grammar of Biblical Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- _____. "On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement." Pages 19-55 in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47. Cincinnati, OH: Hebrew Union College, 1974.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "Deuteronomy." In *Abingdon Old Testament Commentary*. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 2001.
- _____. *The Prophetic Imagination*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Carmignac, Jean. "Description du phénomène de l'Apocalyptique dans l'Ancien Testament." Pages 163-170 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- Catchpole, David R. "The Anointed One in Nazareth." Pages 231-251 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Marinus C. de Beor. JSNT 84. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Charlesworth, J.H., et al. "Damascus Document." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* vol. II. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- _____. "Rule of Community." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* vol. I. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- _____. "What has the Old Testament to do with the New?" *The Old and the New Testaments: Their Relationship and the "Intertestamental" Literature*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Walter P. Weaver. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1993.

- _____. "From Jewish Messianology to Christian Christology: Some Caveats and Perspectives." Pages 234-260 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E.S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. "Jewish Hymns, Odes, and Prayers (ca. 167 B.C.E.- 135 C.E.)." Pages 411-436 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters as found in The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters II*. Edited by R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nicklesburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- _____. *Odes of Solomon*. Texts and Translations 13. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Chester, Andrew. "Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christianity." Pages 17-89 in *Paulus und das antike Judentum WUNT 58*. Edited by M. Hengel and U. Heckel. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Memory and Tradition in Israel*. SBT 37. London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Clements, Ronald E. "Deuteronomy." In *New Interpreters Bible* vol. II. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989.
- _____. *Prophecy and Tradition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- _____. *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Clifford, Richard J. *The Wisdom Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Abraham. *Everyman's Talmud*. New York: Schocken Books, 1949.
- Collins, J.J. "The Nature of Messianism in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 199-217 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000.
- _____. *The Apocalyptic Imagination*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. *Apocalypticism and the DSS*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- _____. *Sceptre and Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- _____. "The Son of God Text from Qumran." Pages 65-82 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. de Beor. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

- _____. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. *Between Athens and Jerusalem*. New York: Crossroads, 1983.
- _____. "Towards the Morphology of a Genre." Pages 1-19 in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. *Semeia* 14. Edited by John J. Collins. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979.
- _____. "Apocalyptic Eschatology as the Transcendence of Death." Pages 21-43 in *CBQ* 36. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1974.
- Conway, Colleen M. "Toward a Well-Formed Subject: The Function of Purity Language in the Serek Ha Yahad." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 21 (2000): 103-120.
- Cross, F.M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts." Pages 115-130 1972 *Proceedings of IOSCS Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft. Los Angeles: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- _____. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." Pages 132-205 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by G.E. Wright. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1965.
- _____. "The Tabernacle." Pages 45-68 in *Biblical Archaeologist* 10:3. Jerusalem: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1947.
- Daniel, Suzanne. *Recherches sur le Vocabulaire du Culte dans la Septante*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966.
- Davies, Philip R. "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Case of the Messiah." Pages 219-232 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran." Pages 151-159 in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1, 2 (1994): 151-159.
- Dogniez, Cecile and Marguerite Harl. *La Bible D'Alexandrie* vol. V. Paris: Leuven Press, 1998.
- Douglas, Mary. *Leviticus as Literature*. Oxford: University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.

- _____. Critique and Commentary to *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism* by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.
- Drazin, Israel. *Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy*. Baltimore: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1982.
- Drummond, James. *The Jewish Messiah: A Critical History of the Messianic Idea Among the Jews from the Rise of the Maccabees to the Closing of the Talmud*. London: Longmans, Green, 1877.
- Durham, John I. "Exodus." In *Word Biblical Commentary* v. III. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Eaton, John. *Vision in Worship*. London: SPCK, 1981.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Bible Association of America, 1987.
- Eskola, Timo. *Messiah and the Throne: Jewish Merkabah Mysticism and Early Christian Exaltation Discourse*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2001.
- Fairweather, William. *The Background of the Gospels*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1951.
- Feldman, Louis. *Jews and Gentiles in the Ancient World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Fisch, Harold. *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Foucault, Michael. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Fujita, Shozo. "The Metaphor of Plant in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period." Pages 30-45 in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7 (1976).
- Geiger, Abraham. *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 6 vols. 1868.
- Geyser, A. S. "Some Salient New Testament Passages on the Restoration of the Twelve Tribes of Israel." Pages 305-310 in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. Paris-Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1980.

- Gillingham, S.E. *The Poems and Psalms of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: University Press, 1994.
- Gray, John. *The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979.
- Greenspoon, Leonard J. " 'It's All Greek to Me': Septuagint Studies Since 1968." *Currents in Research* 5 (1997): 147-174.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Gutmann, Joseph. "Synagogue Origins: Theories and Facts." Pages 1-7 in *Ancient Synagogues: The State of Research*. *Brown Judaic Studies* 22. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- _____. *The Jewish Sanctuary Iconography of Religion* 23:1. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Haran, Menachem. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Hartman, Lars. "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre." Pages 329-343 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. David Hellholm ed. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- Hayward, C.T.R. "Understandings of the Temple Service in LXX Pentateuch." Paper presented for the fortnightly Postgraduate Research Seminar in Old Testament at the University of Durham, England 8th Oct. 2001.
- _____. "Balaam's Prophecies as Interpreted by Philo and the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch." Pages 19-36 in *New Heavens and New Earth: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by P. J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- _____. "Red Heifer and Golden Calf: Dating Targum Pseudo-Jonathan." Pages 9-32 in *Targum Studies* vol. 1. Edited by Paul V.M. Flesher. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- _____. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society in The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran After Fifty Years." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 26 (1997): 43-53.
- Herbert, A.S. "Wisdom." Pages 1039-1040 in *Dictionary of the Bible Revised Edition* Edited by F.C. Grant and H.H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963.

- Herford, R. Travers. *Talmud and Apocrypha: Comparative Study of the Jewish Ethical Teaching in the Rabbinical and Non-Rabbinical Sources in the Early Christian Centuries*. London: Soncino Press, 1933.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran. Acta Theologica Danica* vol. 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Hughes, Merritt Y. Introduction to *Paradise Lost*, by John Milton. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1962.
- Jakobson, Roman and Morris Halle. *Fundamentals of Language*. New York: Mouton Publishers, 1980.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- de Jonge, H.J. "The Historical Jesus' View of Himself and His Mission." Pages 21-37 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- de Jonge, Marinus. *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
- _____. "The Psalms of Solomon." Pages 159-177 in *Outside the Old Testament*. CCWJC 4. Edited by M. de Jonge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Kirk, G.S. *Homer and the Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Kittel, Bonnie. *The Hymns of Qumran*. SBL Dissertation Series 50. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Kiuchi, Nobuyoshi. *A Study of Hata' and Hatta't in Leviticus 4-5*. FAT 2. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2003.
- Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: University Press, 2000.
- Klein, Michael L. *The Fragment-Targums of the Pentateuch* v. II. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980.
- Larson, E. "461. 4QNarrative B." *DJD XXXVI*. Oxford: University Press, 2000.
- _____. "458. 4QNarrative A." In *DJD XXXVI*. Oxford: University Press, 2000.
- Leaney, A.R.C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*. London: SCM Press, 1966.

- Laperrousaz, E.-M. "Does the Temple Scroll Date from the First or Second Century BCE?" Pages 91-97 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George Brooke. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Levine, Baruch. *In the Presence of the Lord*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Lewis, C.S. *Preface to Paradise Lost*. London: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Lovestam, E. "The η γενεα αυτη Eschatology in Mk. 13.30 parr." Pages 403-413 in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. Paris-Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Mack, B.L. "Wisdom Makes a Difference." Pages 15-48 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the turn of the Christian Era*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Maher, Michael. "The Meturgemanim and Prayer." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 41. (1990): 226-246.
- Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Volume III of *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. Edited by J. Van der Ploeg. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "On Hearing the Gospel both in the Silence of the Tradition and in its Eloquence." Pages 129-147 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Mathews, Shailer. "Pseudepigrapha" revised by Bruce M. Metzger. Pages 820-823 in *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963.
- Mayes, A.D.H. "Deuteronomy." In *New Century Bible Commentary*. Edited by H.H. Rowley and Michael Black. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Co., 1981.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Asking Back to Jesus' Identity." Pages 38-50 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. In *The Anchor Bible Commentary Series*. 3 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. "Numbers." In *JPS Torah Commentary Series*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

- _____. *Cult and Conscience*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- _____. "Israel's Sanctuary: A Priestly Picture of Dorian Gray." *Revue Biblique* 83 (1976): 390-399.
- _____. "The Compass of Biblical Sancta." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 65. (1975): 205-216.
- _____. "Priestly Doctrine of Repentance." *Revue Biblique* 82 (1975): 186-205.
- Moberly, R.W.L. *The Bible, Theology, and Faith: A Study of Abraham and Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation* v. II. *Brown Judaic Studies* 101. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- _____. *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities*. 22 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1974-1977.
- _____. *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.
- Newsom, Carol A. "Introduction." Pages 1-15 in *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. DSSSMM 4B. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1999.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Olofsson, Staffan. *The Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. *Coniectanea Biblica OT* 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International: 1992.
- _____. *God is My Rock*. Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. "History of the Septuagint Text." Pages lvi-lxv in *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

- von Rad, Gerhard. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Rast, Walter E. *Tradition History and the Old Testament. Guides to Biblical Scholarship Old Testament Series*. Edited by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Directions in Pentateuchal Studies." *Coniectanea Biblica* 5 (1997): 43-58.
- Rooke, Deborah. *Zadok's Heirs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Sanders, E.P. *The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences*. Pages 7-43 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000.
- _____. "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses." Pages 447-459 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- Sanders, Jack T. "When Sacred Canopies Collide. The Reception of the Torah of Moses in the Wisdom Literature of the Second-Temple Period." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 32 (2001): 121-136.
- Sandmel, Samuel. *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Schaper, Joachim. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT 2. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions According to the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 262-277.
- _____. "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 123-142 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Historical Context*. Edited by Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh, T and T Clark, 2000.
- _____. "The Temple Scroll and the Nature of its Law: The Status of the Question." Pages 37-55 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- _____. "Laws of War in the Temple Scroll." Pages 299-310 in *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 299-310.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*. Translated by Hubert Hoskins. New York: Seabury Press 1979.

- Schürer, Emil. *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edited and Revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar and Matthew Black. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1973.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Rule of Community." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* vol. I. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.
- Seitz, Christopher. "Book of the 12." Paper presented for the fortnightly Postgraduate Research Seminar in Old Testament at the University of Durham, England 15th Nov. 2001.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (32:1-43)." Pages 156-168 in *A Song of Power and the Power of Song*. Edited by Duane L. Christensen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews under Roman Rule*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus Tyrannos*. Translated by Robert Fagles with notes by Bernard Knox. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran." Pages 123-148 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George Brooke. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Steiner, George. *In Bluebeard's Castle: Some Notes Towards a Redefinition of Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Steudel, A. "408. 4QApocryphon of Moses^c?" In *DJD XXXVI*. Oxford: University Press, 2000.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha and The Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 383-390 in *Biblical Archaeology Today*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Wisdom and Holiness at Qumran: Strategies for Dealing with Sin in the *Community Rule*." Pages 47-60 in *Where Shall Wisdom Be Found?*" Edited by Stephen Barton. Edinburgh: T & T Clark: 1999.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant'." Pages 379-395 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

- _____. "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity." Pages 3-24 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1967.
- _____. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study of Origins*. London: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Tigay, Jeffery. "Deuteronomy." In *The JPS Torah Commentary*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tiller, Patrick. "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 312-335 in *DSD* 4:3. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.
- Toy, C.H. "Proverbs." As found in *The International Critical Commentary Series*. Edited by S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C.A. Briggs. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1959.
- Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, et al. "4QDeut^a." In *DJD XIV*. Oxford: University Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- _____. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Vielhauer, Phillipe. "Apocalyptic." Pages 582-600 in *New Testament Apocrypha* v. II. E. Hennecke, W Schneemelcher, and R. McL. Wilson. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.
- Watson, Wilfred G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry*. *JSOT* 26. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect*. NTOA 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*. Greifswald: L. Bamberg, 1874.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Story as Torah*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 2000.

- Wevers, J.W. *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Whybray, R.N. *Reading the Psalms as a Book*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Wilson, Robert R. "The Problems of Describing and Defining Apocalyptic Discourse." Pages 133-136 in *Anthropological Perspectives on Old Testament Prophecy*. *Semeia* 21. Edited by Robert C. Culley and Thomas W. Overholt. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Wright, Christopher. "Deuteronomy." In *New International Bible Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996.
- Yadin, Y. *The Temple Scroll*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985.
- _____. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.