

Andrew B. Perrin

The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls



V&R Academic

Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements

Edited by
Armin Lange, Bernard M. Levinson
and Vered Noam

Advisory Board

Katell Berthelot (University of Aix-Marseille), George Brooke (University of Manchester), Jonathan Ben Dov (University of Haifa), Beate Ego (University of Osnabrück), Ester Eshel (Bar-Ilan University), Heinz-Josef Fabry (University of Bonn), Steven Fraade (Yale University), Maxine L. Grossman (University of Maryland), Christine Hayes (Yale University), Catherine Hezser (University of London), Alex Jassen (University of Minnesota), James L. Kugel (Bar-Ilan University), Jodi Magness (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Carol Meyers, (Duke University), Eric Meyers (Duke University), Hillel Newman (University of Haifa), Christophe Nihan (University of Lausanne), Lawrence H. Schiffman (New York University), Konrad Schmid (University of Zurich), Adiel Schremer (Bar-Ilan University), Michael Segal (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Aharon Shemesh (Bar-Ilan University), Günter Stemberger (University of Vienna), Kristin De Troyer (University of St. Andrews), Azzan Yadin (Rutgers University)

Volume 19

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Andrew B. Perrin

The Dynamics of Dream-Vision
Revelation in the
Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 7 tables

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISSN 2198-1361
ISBN 978-3-647-55094-7

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website:
www.v-r.de

© 2015, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, 37073 Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U. S. A.
www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized
in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying,
recording, or any information storage and retrieval system,
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting, printed and bound by ☉Hubert & Co GmbH & Co. KG,
Robert-Bosch-Breite 6, 37079 Göttingen

For Tanya, for everything.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	12
Abbreviations	13
Books, Series, and Journals	13
Sigla Used in Dead Sea Scrolls Transcriptions and Citations	14
Abbreviations for Frequently Cited Aramaic Compositions and Manuscripts	14
Acknowledgments	17
Foreword	19
Chapter One: Mapping the World of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls	23
Introduction	23
A Corpus or Collection? Dream-Visions and the (Dis)Unity of the Aramaic Texts	30
The Direction of This Study	37
Part One: Shared Compositional Patterns	39
Chapter Two: A Prospectus of Aramaic Dreams and Dreamers	41
Introduction	41
Compositions Featuring Dream-Visions	42
1 Enoch	42
Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1–36)	43
Astronomical Enoch (1 Enoch 72–82)	44
Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 83–91)	46
Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 92–105)	47
Birth of Noah (1 Enoch 106–107)	47
Book of Giants	48
Words of Michael	51
Genesis Apocryphon	52
Testament of Jacob	57
New Jerusalem	58

Aramaic Levi Document	61
Apocryphon of Levi	65
Visions of Amram	67
Daniel 2–7	70
Aramaic Apocalypse	72
Four Kingdoms	73
Fragmentary Texts Exhibiting Dream-Vision Features	74
Prayer of Nabonidus	74
4QVision ^a	76
4QpapVision ^b	76
4QVision ^d	77
4QpapApocalypse	78
Excursus: Dreaming in Aramaic before and beyond the Dead Sea Scrolls	78
Texts Mistakenly Associated with Dream-Vision Revelation	82
Tobit	82
4QPseudo Daniel ^{a–c}	83
4QExorcism	84
Jews in the Persian Court	85
4QVision ^c ?	86
Summary of Findings	86
Table 1: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls at a Glance I: Prominent Literary Themes, Images, and Motifs	88
Chapter Three: Writing Dream-Visions in Aramaic: Common Forms, Structures, Idioms, and Phrases	91
Introduction	91
Overlapping Terminology for Dreams and Visions	92
Table 2: Etymological Survey of Dream Terms in Some Languages of the Ancient Near East	94
Formulae Introducing Dream-Visions	96
Table 3: A Cross-Section of Dream-Vision Introductory and Concluding Formulae	97
Phrases and Idioms Marking Narrative Movement	102
Oneirocritical Terminology and Methods	106
Awakening Formulae and Responses Elicited by Dream-Visions	110
Summary of Findings	114
Table 4: The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls at a Glance II: Prominent Formal and Philological Features	118

Part Two: Shared Applications of Dream-Visions 121**Chapter Four: The Exegetical Underpinnings of Some Pre-Diluvian and Patriarchal Dreamers 123**

Introduction 123

An Enochic Example: Philological Flexibility in Gen 5:22 and 24 and the Root of 1 Enoch's Expansive Revelatory Tradition 125

Uncovering Scripture's Intimations of Dream-Visions in Genesis Apocryphon 128

A Threefold Combination of Verbs Alluding to Revelation in Gen 9:21 and 24: "to reveal (גלה), "to awake (יקץ)," and "to know (ידע)" 129

Informing Abram of the Plan behind the Sister-Wife Ruse in Gen 12:11 133

From Theophany to Dream-Vision: Harmonizing Gen 12:7, 13:14, and 15:1 135

An Underlying Interest in Casting the Patriarchs as Prophetic Dreamers: Are Noah and Abram also among the Prophets? 139

Excursus: Curiosities of Composition and Exegesis in Mordecai's Dream-Vision in Greek Esther Addition A 144

Levi's Visionary Installment as a Priest in Aramaic Levi Document . . . 149

The Suggestiveness of Mal 2:5–6: Levi "descended (נחת)" after "walking with (הלך אחי)" God 152

A Complementary Clue in 1 Sam 2:27: The Lord "revealed (גלה)" Himself to Levi 154

Summary of Findings 156

Chapter Five: Dreaming of the Temple and Priesthood in This World, the Otherworld, and the World to Come 158

Introduction 158

An Enochic Example: Revealing the Calendar of the Heavens and Endorsing its Earthly Application in Astronomical Enoch 160

Visions of Amram on the Genetics of the Priesthood 162

Grafting Amram and Aaron into (Aramaic) Levi's Priestly Family Tree 162

Table 5: Priestly Terminology for Levitical and Aaronide Priesthoods in Aramaic Levi Document and Visions of Amram . . . 165

An Otherworldly Endorsement from the Celestial Melchizedek . . . 166

Interpreting the Cult: Displaying Sacerdotal Halakhah in New Jerusalem 171

Excursus: Temple Authorization Dream-Visions from the Ancient Near East, Egypt, Hebrew Scriptures, and Graeco-Roman Antiquity . .	178
Additional Glimpses of Priestly Dreams and Dreamers	183
Testament of Jacob: A Partial View of Priestly Precincts, Praxis, and Promises	183
Apocryphon of Levi: Envisioning an Eschatological Priest-Saviour .	185
Summary of Findings	188
 Chapter Six: (P)Reviewing the Course and Configuration of History through Dream-Vision Revelation	190
Introduction	190
An Enochic Example: The Scope and Structure of Human History in the “Apocalypse of Weeks”	193
The Flood in Historical Retrospect and Prospect	197
Urzeit und Endzeit as a Historiographical Principle in Book of Giants	197
The Deluge, Lay of the Land, and Eschatology in Noah’s Dream-Vision in Genesis Apocryphon	201
The Eras of Empires: Four Kingdom Chronologies from the Exile to the Eschaton	210
Daniel 2 and 7: The God of Israel’s Direction of Pagan Dominions .	210
World History Redux: Retrofitting Rome into the Scheme in Four Kingdoms	212
Table 6: Proposed Referents for the Historical Scheme of Four Kingdoms	214
Other Views of Geopolitical Upheaval or Succession	218
The Culmination of Israelite History in New Jerusalem	218
Another Monarch Learns His Place in World History in Aramaic Apocalypse	221
Summary of Findings	225
 Chapter Seven: Overview and Outcomes	227
Toward a Description of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls as a Constellation of Texts	227
An Enlivened Encounter with the Scriptural Past: Pseudepigraphy, Epistemology, and Dream-Vision Discourses	233
The Quest for the Ancient Jewish Apocalypse: Four Prescriptions from the Aramaic Texts	238
Table 7: Lists of Apocalypses and Apocalyptically Oriented Texts among the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls	240

Table of Contents	11
Closing Thoughts	246
Bibliography	248
Ancient Sources Index	284
Author Index	307

List of Tables

Table 1 The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls at a
Glance I: Prominent Literary Themes, Images, and Motifs 88

Table 2 Etymological Survey of Dream Terms in Some Languages of
the Ancient Near East 94

Table 3 A Cross-Section of Dream-Vision Introductory and
Concluding Formulae 97

Table 4 The Dream-Visions of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls at a
Glance II: Prominent Formal and Philological Features 118

Table 5 Priestly Terminology for Levitical and Aaronide Priesthoods in
Aramaic Levi Document and Visions of Amram 165

Table 6 Proposed Referents for the Historical Scheme of Four
Kingdoms 214

Table 7 Lists of Apocalypses and Apocalyptically Oriented Texts
among the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls 240

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used in this book typically follow those in *The SBL Handbook of Style For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (eds. Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley A. Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). Abbreviations and sigla not found there are given in the following forms.

Books, Series, and Journals

<i>AJ</i>	Ancient Judaism
ANESSup	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement
<i>AramStud</i>	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
BibAC	The Bible in Ancient Christianity
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DCLY	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook
<i>DNTB</i>	<i>Dictionary of New Testament Background</i> . Edited by Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
DSS-SE	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> . By Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
DSSR	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> . Edited by Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
<i>EDEJ</i>	<i>Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism</i> . Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
<i>EDSS</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FoSub	Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes
IELOA	Instruments pour l'étude des langues de l'Orient ancien
<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
<i>JANES</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society</i>
JCPs	Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series
JCTCRS	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
<i>JHebSc</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JHMAS</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences</i>

JSJS	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSSSup	Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LBQ	La Bibliothèque de Qumrân
LHB/OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
NETS	<i>New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright III. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
SAIS	Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture
SAK	<i>Studien zur Altägyptischen Kultur</i>
SBAIL	Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israel and Its Literature
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SHCANE	Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East
<i>SJC</i>	<i>Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia</i>
SJS	Studia Judaeslavica
TAPS	Transactions of the American Philosophical Society
<i>ThWQ</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten: Band 1</i> . Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.
WAC	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation</i> . By Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005.

Sigla Used in Dead Sea Scrolls Transcriptions and Citations

(?)	Uncertainty over reading or reconstruction
[]	Bracketed text reconstructed
{ }	Bracketed text erased
< >	Emended text
Ⲁ, ⲁ, Ⲃ	Possible letter, probable letter, certain letter
◦	Traces of an illegible character
//	Overlapping text between manuscripts cited

Abbreviations for Frequently Cited Aramaic Compositions and Manuscripts

<i>AnAp</i>	“Animal Apocalypse” (1 <i>Enoch</i> 85–90) of the <i>Book of Dreams</i>
<i>ApocrLevi</i>	<i>Apocryphon of Levi</i> (represented by 4Q541 and perhaps 4Q540)
<i>ApW</i>	“Apocalypse of Weeks” (1 <i>Enoch</i> 93: 1–10; 91: 11–17) of the <i>Epistle of Enoch</i>
<i>AramApoc</i>	<i>Aramaic Apocalypse</i> (represented by 4Q246)
<i>AstrEn</i>	<i>Astronomical Enoch</i> (1 <i>Enoch</i> 72–82)
Athos	Folium containing a section of <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> in the Mount Athos Koutloumousiou Monastery
<i>BD</i>	<i>Book of Dreams</i> (1 <i>Enoch</i> 83–91)
<i>BG</i>	<i>Book of Giants</i>

Bodl.	<i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah in the Oxford Bodleian Library
BW	<i>Book of Watchers</i> (1 Enoch 1–36)
Cambr.	<i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah in the Cambridge Taylor-Schechter Collection
FourKgds	<i>Four Kingdoms</i> (represented by 4Q552, 4Q553, and 4Q553a)
GenAp	<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i> (represented by 1Q20)
NJ	<i>New Jerusalem</i> (represented by 1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, and 11Q18)
T. Jacob	<i>Testament of Jacob</i> (represented by 4Q537)
T. Qahat	<i>Testament of Qahat</i> (represented by 4Q542)
VisAmram	<i>Visions of Amram</i> (represented by 4Q543–547)
WordsMich	<i>Words of Michael</i> (represented by 4Q529, 4Q571, and 6Q23)

Acknowledgments

This volume is a revision of my doctoral dissertation defended at McMaster University in 2013. I was first introduced to the Aramaic language and invited into the world of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls in a seminar facilitated by Daniel Machiela in 2010. In the years thereafter, I had the great pleasure of researching and writing a study on Aramaic dream-visions under his expert guidance and mentorship. I was also fortunate to have Eileen Schuller and Stephen Westerholm serve on my advisory committee. I cannot imagine a more genuine, accomplished, and insightful trio of teachers to oversee the project that would later develop into this book. Their work and wisdom constantly challenged my thinking and continues to shape me as a young scholar. I am also grateful for the detailed and erudite external reader's report submitted by Loren Stuckenbruck, and to Anders Runesson, who stepped in at the eleventh hour to serve as the internal-external reader for my dissertation defence.

My studies at McMaster were made possible through the generous support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Harry Lyman Hooker Senior Fellowship. My dissertation research was further enhanced in my short tenure as the George A. Barton Fellow at the Albright Institute of Archaeological Research in Jerusalem in the fall of 2012. This research travel was also supported by a doctoral scholarship from the Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion. Much of chapters two through four were drafted in the libraries of the Albright Institute and École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem. Special thanks also go to Adolfo Roitman of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum and Pnina Shor of the Israel Antiquities Authority for providing the invaluable experience of working with the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls in their care.

The international guild of Qumran scholars is truly comprised of the best minds and most collegial persons I have encountered in academics. In the life of this project I have benefitted greatly from formal and informal conversations on my work with scholars at home and around the globe. As I worked toward completion of the dissertation, Joseph Angel, John J. Collins, Edward Cook, and Hindy Najman graciously shared unpublished articles that served as welcome sparring partners when finalizing chapters six and seven. At various stages of my ongoing research, conversations with Kyung Baek, Esther Eshel, Matthew Goff, Dorothy Peters, and Eugene Ulrich helped me rethink and refine my approach to these materials. In the final stages of my revisions I was honoured to have Florentino García Martínez introduce my study with

his own words in the foreword. Florentino's *Qumran and Apocalyptic* remains the essential overture for any work on this suite of Aramaic literature and was a volume never far from reach for the duration of my research. Closer to home, I should thank my friends and co-sufferers in doctoral studies, Ian Koiter, Andrew Krause, Anthony Meyer, John Screnock, and Matthew Walsh, who regularly did what good friends must: to point out the best and worst of my ideas. I had the opportunity to craft the dissertation into a book among the best of colleagues as a Postdoctoral Fellow at my *alma mater*, Trinity Western University. With questions still lingering after my dissertation defence, I was glad to land in a workspace just steps away from the ever-open office doors of my very first teachers in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Martin Abegg Jr. and Peter Flint. Special thanks are also due to the series editors of *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements*, Armin Lange, Vered Noam, and Bernard Levinson, as well as the peer reviewers, who critically engaged and enthusiastically accepted my contribution to this fine series. I am also appreciative for the diligence of Christoph Spill and Moritz Reissing at Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, who oversaw the final editorial production of the manuscript with great skill and patience.

Finally, my academic life would not be as enriching were it not for the family members who have journeyed with me throughout my education and early career. From my enrollment in preschool to days as a postdoc, my parents Daryl and Rosanne Perrin have supported me in more ways than I care to admit on the printed page. My in-laws, Evan and Betty Warden, are constant reminders that the encouragement of two families is better than one. To my young children Emma and Jude, I am grateful for the energy and warmth with which you fill our home each day. Most of all, to my wife Tanya, I cannot offer enough thanks. You are the truest of friends, a faithful companion on this adventure, a source of timely words of wisdom, and make every place we find ourselves feel like home. It is only fitting that your name appears on the opening page of this book. It would have never been started, saved from several near abandonments, or finished without you.

Andrew B. Perrin

November 2014

Langley, British Columbia, Canada

Foreword

One of the questions put to the participants of the conference held at Aix-en-Provence in 2008 was do the Aramaic texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit enough characteristic traits that allow us to consider them a “corpus,” a category of related texts with an inherent unity? A perusal of the conference proceedings¹ shows that the question was not central in the discussions. As one reviewer of the book put it: “it should not go unnoticed that no dialogue has been realised on the question whether or not the Aramaic texts may be considered a distinct corpus, which is simply taken for granted by some contributors.”² In my own contribution to the conference I reflected on how Dimant’s and Tigchelaar’s recognition of either the pre-mosaic character or Diaspora context of this Aramaic literature allows us to give a tentative answer to the specificity of these texts when compared with other Aramaic and Hebrew writings of the period.³ I concluded that, “[a]lthough some Hebrew compositions at Qumran deal with ‘pre-mosaic’ protagonists (4QCommentary on Genesis, for example), and we also have some Aramaic works with a Diaspora setting (Aḥiqar) outside Qumran, we can assert that the Aramaic literature found at Qumran is characterized by a predominant interest in ‘pre-mosaic’ protagonists or by a setting in the Diaspora.”⁴ In a more recent study on the relationship between the Aramaic texts from Qumran and the Hebrew Scriptures, I found that while no single thematic, stylistic, or formal criterion allows us to define this Aramaic literature as a homogeneous “corpus,” the paired clusters of pre-mosaic and Diaspora writings do

¹ Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010).

² Hans Debel, review of Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, eds., *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008*, *JSJ* 43 (2012): 80–82, here 82.

³ Florentino García Martínez, “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008* (eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 435–50; Deborah Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJS 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–205; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem,” in *Flores Florentino*, 257–70.

⁴ García Martínez, “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?” 437.

share thematic, stylistic, and formal characteristics that are perfectly compatible.⁵ For example, the description of this literature must account for a third prominent element, namely that “a disproportionately large number of these [Aramaic] compositions” have an “apocalyptic character.”⁶

Andrew Perrin here adds a completely new element to this ongoing discussion and considerably advances our understanding of the compositions transmitted in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. By focusing on the pervasive usage of dream-visions present in twenty of the twenty-nine Aramaic compositions partially preserved at Qumran, he demonstrates convincingly that we can consider these non-sectarian Aramaic writings as a real group of texts, making the term “corpus” an adequate descriptor of the Aramaic collection. Perrin’s book presents in detail all the compositions which contain dream-visions, maps out the compositional patterns of dream-visions, collates their major recurring motifs and images, and puts them in the perspective of the other ancient dream-visions attested outside the Dead Sea Scrolls. He gives balanced attention to literary features, such as the oneirocritical terminology and introductory/awakening formulae, and to the use of Aramaic linguistic idioms, which together confirm that clusters of these texts originated in common scribal environments. The central element of the book is the analysis of three main applications, concerns, or purposes of the dream-visions. The authors of *Genesis Apocryphon*, *1 Enoch*, and *Aramaic Levi Document* are shown to deduce dream-visions by means of exegetical analysis of the Hebrew Scriptures. Other dream-visions like those in *Astronomical Enoch*, *Visions of Amram*, and *New Jerusalem* defend a particular set of priestly interests including, calendar, the genealogy of the priesthood, or the function of the temple cult. Finally, a large cross-section of texts are documented for their use of dream-visions as a historiographical mechanism, allowing dreamers to claim special knowledge of God’s predetermination of past, present, and future world history.

By emphasizing the similarities between the dream-visions, Perrin advances a fresh model for understanding the Aramaic texts, plotting them out as a constellation, inside of which a given text which has influenced the origin of others (as may be the case with Daniel) can be considered as the point of departure for a smaller configuration within the larger pattern. His work opens new ways for understanding the origins of this literature in priestly circles and asks critical questions of their early reception and readerships. Perrin contextualizes his findings with an intelligent use of Najman’s

⁵ Idem, “Les rapports avec l’Écriture des textes araméens trouvés à Qumran,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures* (ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; BETL 270; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 19–40.

⁶ Idem, “Aramaica Qumranica Apocalyptica?” 437.

theory of discourses tied to founding figures and Newson's theory of the discourse of "apocalyptic scribalism." Signaling common points among the two models, Perrin shows how the authors of the Aramaic texts used dream-visions in order to give authority to their compositions, making the scriptural traditions relevant to their worlds. Perrin further applies the results of his study to illuminate the background and development of apocalypticism. He argues for the origins of the apocalypse in dream-vision literature, demonstrates how apocalypses can be embedded in writings of various genres, suggests that some apocalypses have strong priestly concerns, and details how the apocalyptic historiographies of Daniel 2 and 7 were but tokens of a now fuller suite of historically minded Aramaic texts.

In short, Perrin's study is very well-constructed and perfectly documented. He gives much attention to philological detail and carefully weighs different interpretations put forth by other scholars. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* is a major contribution to the study of Judaism of the Second Temple Period in general and to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and apocalyptic literature in particular.

Florentino García Martínez

Research Professor of Theology and Religious Studies (Emeritus),
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium

Professor of Theology and Director of the Qumran Institute (Emeritus), University of Groningen, Netherlands

Chapter One: Mapping the World of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls

Introduction

As the *lingua franca* of the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Achaemenid empires, Aramaic was the language the Israelites inherited through exile. Aramaic saw an increased usage among Judaeans scribal literati in the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods.¹ Until relatively recently, little was known about their literary heritage apart from the imperial correspondences imbedded in Ezra, the dramatic tales and visions in Daniel 2–7, some outlying evidence from Elephantine, and scholarly suspicions that Aramaic originals lingered behind some apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings.² With the discovery

¹ Beyer ascribed the increased usage of Aramaic across the ancient Near East from the eighth century B.C.E. onward to the language's simplicity, flexibility, and adoption in imperial policy and communication (Klaus Beyer, *The Aramaic Language: Its Distribution and Subdivisions* [trans. John F. Healey; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986], 9–10). For a more detailed and nuanced account of the appropriation of Aramaic in this period than I can give here, see Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Official and Vernacular Languages: The Shifting Sands of Imperial and Cultural Identities in First-Millennium B.C. Mesopotamia," in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (ed. Seth L. Sanders; OIS 2; Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2006), 187–216. Fitzmyer described the phase of the Aramaic language reflected in the Qumran collection as "middle Aramaic," situated between Standard/Official Aramaic (ca. 700–200 B.C.E.) and Late Aramaic (ca. 200–700 C.E.) (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Phases of the Aramaic Language," in *The Semitic Background of the New Testament: A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 2:57–84; idem, "Aramaic," *EDSS* 1:48–51). The linguistic study of these materials is now aided by two key resources: Ursula Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte, I: Grammaire* (IELOA 5; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004); and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic* (ANESSup 38; Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

² I employ the term "pseudepigraphy" in the technical sense, defined by Lange as "the ascription of a literary work to another author by way of title, content, or tradition" (Armin Lange, "In the Second Degree: Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature," in *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature* [eds. Philip Alexander, Armin Lange, and Renate Pillinger; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 3–40, here 4]). On the recommendation of Yoshiko Reed, I will limit my usage of the term "pseudepigrapha" to refer "to the products of this literary process" *not* to a modern anthology of ancient writings (Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Pseudepigraphy, Authorship, and the Reception of 'The Bible' in Late Antiquity," in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser*,

of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Cairo Genizah fragments, as well as the not infrequent identification of medieval witnesses to such Aramaic writings in modern libraries and archives, the collection of known ancient Jewish Aramaic literature has swelled to some twenty-nine titles.³ These include copies of works that were received as scripture in various Jewish and Christian traditions, such as *1 Enoch*, Daniel 2–7, or Tobit. Other writings were known formerly only from glimpses and adaptations in later compositions, like *Aramaic Levi Document* (ALD) in the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* or *Book of Giants* (BG) in Manichaean literature. Still others were less fortunate in their reception history. It seems that writings like *Genesis Apocryphon* (GenAp), *New Jerusalem* (NJ), and *Visions of Amram* (VisAmram), to name a few, remained tucked away in the Qumran caves, unknown and unread for nearly two millennia.

One of the more pressing questions in current research is whether the Aramaic writings from the Judean Desert constitute a coherent group within the

11–13 October 2006 [eds. Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu; BibAC 6; Leiden: Brill, 2008], 467–90, here 468 n. 5). As Najman underscored, the activity of ascribing knowledge to ancestral figures should not be misconstrued as authorial forgery or trickery; rather, it is a “literary device that engages, elaborates on, and interprets the tradition” (Hindy Najman, with Itamar Manoff and Eva Mroczek, “How to Make Sense of Pseudonymous Attribution: The Cases of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch,” in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* [ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012], 308–36, here 326). For discussions on some problematic applications and the evolution of meaning of the term pseudepigrapha in modern scholarship, see Annette Yoshiko Reed, “The Modern Invention of ‘Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,’” *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36; and Loren T. Stuckenbruck’s introductory essay “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” *EDEJ*, 143–62.

³ The statistical distribution of Aramaic material in the Dead Sea Scrolls is determined by the sum total of manuscripts and the state of preservation of individual texts. Dimant counted 900 manuscripts, 121 of which (approximately 13%) were penned in Aramaic (Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* [eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; JSJS 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 197–205). Berthelot and Stökl Ben Ezra’s figure of approximately 10% is based on a calculation of eighty-seven of 129 Aramaic texts that are “sufficiently well-preserved to be studied” among the “some 900 manuscripts found at Qumran” (Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Aramaica Qumranica: Introduction,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008* [eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra; STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 1–12, here 1). García Martínez tallied twenty-nine compositions among 120 legible and usable Aramaic manuscripts (Florentino García Martínez, “Scribal Practices in the Aramaic Literary Texts from Qumran,” in *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer* [eds. Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper; SHR 127; Leiden: Brill, 2010], 329–41). Tigchelaar calculated that the Aramaic texts comprise 12% of the 930 texts among the Qumran collection (Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Dead Sea Scrolls,” *EDEJ*, 163–80).

wider collection or are a disparate ingathering of texts that happenstance found their ways into the caves off the northwest shores of the Dead Sea. It is generally recognized that these Aramaic materials originated before and beyond the ken of the scribal community that lived at Qumran.⁴ As such, their very presence in the Qumran collection raises intriguing questions regarding the compositional provenances of individual or clusters of Aramaic texts and the circumstances that lead to their reception and, potentially, continued transmission at Qumran. Arguably the most immediate payoff of studying the Aramaic texts is an illumined understanding of the currents of thought that circulated more broadly in ancient Judaism in the mid Second Temple era, which were then inherited by and inspired the Qumran movement. While this largely uncharted world of ancient Jewish Aramaic literature holds great promise and prospect for research into these overlapping worlds, their unknown past and unexplained situation at Qumran creates methodological and terminological issues for scholars attempting to describe the content, nature, context, and scope of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. It is possible to illustrate many of these issues by dissecting the ways in which the common nomenclature the “Qumran Aramaic texts” might be taken to connote vastly

⁴ The compositional dates of the Aramaic texts span the fourth to second centuries B.C.E. (the dates of individual works will be established in Chapter Two). The pre/non-sectarian origin of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls is generally agreed upon. For statements in this regard, see Stanislav Segert, “Bedeutung der Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer für die Aramäistik,” in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft: Hans Bardtke zum* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 183–87; J. T. Milik, “Écrits présséniens de Qumrân: d’Hénoch à Amram,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 91–106; Ben Zion Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 B.C.E.): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 257–81; Michael O. Wise, “Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (ed. T. Muraoka; Abr-Nahrain Supplements 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 124–67; Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts,” 198–99; Jan Joosten, “Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 351–74; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJS 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 155–71; and Daniel A. Machiela, “Aramaic Writings of the Second Temple Period and the Growth of Apocalyptic Thought: Another Survey of the Texts,” *AJ*, forthcoming. However, VanderKam (James C. VanderKam, “Apocalyptic Tradition in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [eds. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 113–34) and García Martínez (“Scribal Practices,” 336–39) cautioned that it is unproven that composition in Aramaic immediately disqualifies a work from originating at Qumran.