HEAVENLY REALMS

AND

EARTHLY REALITIES

IN

LATE ANTIQUE RELIGIONS

Edited by

RA'ANAN S. BOUSTAN
University of Minnesota

ANNETTE YOSHIKO REED
McMaster University

2004

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Angels in the Architecture: Temple Art and the Poetics of Praise in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*

Ra'anan S. Boustan

Since the first partial publication of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (henceforth, the *Songs*) forty years ago,[1] scholars have explained the cycle's repetitious and sonorous language as a device intended to induce intensified states of "religious" feeling or consciousness. This approach views the syntactic and grammatical anomalies of the *Songs* – broken syntax, odd vacillations between singular and plural forms, and in particular dense participial and nominal clusters – primarily as *epiphenomena* of their ritual-liturgical function. Even those who have been wary of using transhistorical categories, such as "mysticism" or "mystical experience," to account for the formal features of *Songs* have nonetheless resorted to functionalist explanations when confronted with the idiosyncratic poetics of the cycle, often relying on supposed phenomenological affinities between the *Songs* and the hymnic material found in the Hekhalot literature.[2]

[1] All text designations and translations for the *Songs* unless otherwise indicated follow C. A. Newsom, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4*, Vol. 6, *Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*, ed. E. Eshel, H. Eshel, C. Newsom, B. Nitzan, E. Schuller, and A. Jardeni (DJD 11; Oxford, 1998), 173–401; I have also consulted Newsom's original critical edition of the cycle, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta, Ga., 1985). The material from Cave 11 is cited according to F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, "11QShirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat," in *Qumran Cave 11*, Vol. 2, *11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (DJD 23; Oxford, 1998), 259–304.
[2] On the formal and verbal affinities between the *Songs* and later Jewish "mystical" poetry, see esp. L. H. Schiffman, "Merkavah Speculation at Qumran: The 4Q Serekh Shirot Olat ha-Shabbat," in *Mystics, Philosophers, and Politicians: Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of A. Altmann*, ed. J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski (Durham, N.C., 1982), 15–47; Schiffman revises his position slightly in idem, "Sifrut Ha-Hekhalot ve-Kitve Qumran," *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 6 (1987): 121–38 [Hebrew]; J. M. Baumgarten, "The Qumran *Sabbath Shirot* and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 199–213. Recently, several review articles have addressed the difficulties and implications of situating the *Songs* within the history of early Jewish mysticism: E. Hamacher, "Die Sabbatopferlieder im Streit um Ursprung und Anfänge der Jüdischen Mystik," *JSJ* 27 (1996): 119–54; J. R. Davila, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Merkavah Mysticism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, ed. T. H. Lim

For instance, despite taking Carol Newsom to task for applying the term "mysticism" to the *Songs*,[3] Johann Maier has written that "the style of the *Songs* is in all their parts formalistic and stereotypical and altogether results in a very solemn and overloaded diction, ceremonious and even static, less expressing thoughts or describing events than giving a numinous impression."[4] Maier's characterization, thus, largely recapitulates Gershom Scholem's assessment of the later Hekhalot hymns as "the *non plus ultra* of vacuousness,"[5] which was itself indebted to the assertion made by the nineteenth-century scholar Philip Bloch that the hymns "do not in the least assist in the process of thought but merely reflect emotional struggle."[6] The dominant paradigm used to interpret the *Songs* – especially those portions of the work that have been characterized as "numinous" – is, thus, deeply committed to the notion that their style represents a purposeful and cultivated meaninglessness.[7]

In this chapter, I take issue with this interpretative framework, which I believe has unnecessarily foreclosed consideration of the central role of the cycle's poetics in generating discursive content. In fact, I show that the cycle achieves its primary conceptual objective: namely, the systematic collapse of the boundary between angelic beings and architectural elements in what might best be termed the "angelification" of the celestial Temple, by means

(Edinburgh, 1999), 249–64, esp. 250–3; M. S. Swartz, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish Magic and Mysticism," *DSD* 8 (2001): 182–93, esp. 184–8.

3   J. Maier, "Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations on Their Calendrical Implications and on Their Style," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*, ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (STDJ 11; Leiden, 1992), 2:553; cf. idem, "Zu Kult und Liturgie in der Qumrangemeinde," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 543–85, esp. 572–4. See also E. R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan," *JQR* 85 (1994): 185–202, which similarly critiques the use of the term "mysticism" in B. Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran," *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–83.

4   Maier, "Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat," 557. On the poetics of the *Songs* in general, see also Newsom, *Songs*, 5–21; B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (Leiden, 1994), 173–200; J. R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2000), 86–8; S. Segert, "Observations on Poetic Structures in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 215–23.

5   G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York, 1941), 57–8.

6   P. Bloch, "Die *Yorde Merkavah*, die Mystiker der Gaonenzeit, und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie," *MGWJ* 37 (1893): 18–25, 69–74, 257–66, 305–11, here 259.

7   Scholem first applied the category of the "numinous" to the study of Jewish mystical poetry in his seminal comments on the Hekhalot hymns in *Major Trends*, 57–63; cf. idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York, 1965), 20–30. For formal analysis of "numinous" poetics in Hebrew mystical poetry, see especially J. Maier, "Serienbildung und 'numinoser' Eindruckseffekt in den poetischen Stücken der Hekhalot-Literatur," *Semitics* 3 (1973): 36–66.

of its distinctive poetic style. This studied juxtaposition and subsequent collapse of the animate and inanimate spheres reveals the generative relationship that existed between Second Temple angelology and the plastic arts of the Jerusalem cult.[8]

After situating the *Songs* within their specific historical context and generic framework, I argue that the cycle possesses a coherent narrative arc as it moves from conventional angelological material to descriptions of animate Temple art and architecture singing the praises of God. Moreover, this broader thematic movement is prefigured in the internal narrative structure of the cycle's seventh and middle song, which betrays a parallel shift in emphasis from angelic actors to angelified Temple structures. I then show that it is through transfer of the verbs of praise so central to the liturgical framework from angelic host to celestial architecture that this narrative trajectory is realized. More interesting still, not only does the cycle describe the cultic art and architecture as participating in the quintessentially angelic activity of singing hymns of praise to God, but it also methodically portrays the angelic creatures in material terms as images inscribed, carved, or woven into the Temple's walls, furnishings, and tapestries. In this way, a single, common semantic field – the vocabulary of praise – is applied both to the plastic arts of the Jerusalem cult and to the angelic creatures who serve God in his supernal Temple. These descriptions of angels and Temple are not drawn from a single base text, such as Ezekiel, but instead incorporate the verbal and conceptual fluidity that is already present in a wide variety of biblical ekphrastic passages describing the Jerusalem Temple.

Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: Textual History and Performative Setting

The cycle of thirteen songs was discovered in nine separate manuscripts at Qumran, eight from Cave 4 and a ninth from Cave 11.[9] Yigael Yadin

8   Note that I do not use the word "angelology" to refer to a coherent body of speculative knowledge regarding the angelic realm because, as P. Schäfer has forcefully argued, there existed no single system of angelology among Jews in Antiquity (*Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen* [SJ 8; Berlin, 1975], 8–9). It is here intended in the looser, more variegated sense suggested by the German word *Engellehre*.

9   Paleographic analysis dates the earliest manuscript copy of the cycle (4Q400) to the late Hasmonaean period (ca. 75–50 B.C.E.), whereas the latest copies from Qumran date from the middle of the first century C.E. The Cave 11 fragments date to ca. 20–50 C.E. and those from Masada to ca. 50 C.E. A concise description of the various manuscripts appears in Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 85–6.

identified a tenth among the textual remains of the Masada excavations.[10] Because of the large number of manuscripts of the *Songs* found at Qumran, as well as a number of thematic and formal features they share with sectarian material, the work is best viewed within the larger literary and historical context of the Qumran community.[11] At the same time, the copy of the cycle found at Masada and the absence of explicit sectarian terminology in the cycle warrant caution concerning the work's origins. In her most thorough and nuanced treatment of this question, Newsom argues that the *Songs* were produced outside the sect, but came to play an important and influential role within the community.[12] Thus, although we cannot assume absolute conformity between the cycle and other liturgical and hymnic material found at Qumran, the sect undoubtedly served as one of the text's primary sites of performance and transmission.

The cycle was apparently recited during the thirteen Sabbaths of the first quarterly period of the 364-day calendar used in the Qumran community.[13] Consequently, the *Songs* have often been understood as representing the text of a liturgical act of worship.[14] Yet, it is clear that they do not represent a

---

[10] The Masada fragments were first published in C. Newsom and Y. Yadin, "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77–88.

[11] I base this observation on the following criteria: (1) The liturgical form of the document points to a highly organized, coherent community as the functional setting for the cycle; (2) despite the absence of other, more explicit signs of sectarian self-consciousness, the use of eschatological and predestinarian language in song 5 indicates ideological and speculative concerns in line with those of the sect; (3) the absence of self-consciously sectarian language might best be explained by the function of the text as an internal document, not per se intended to demarcate the boundaries of the community; (4) the many verbal parallels between the *Songs* and two clearly sectarian works, *Songs of the Maskil* (4Q510 and 4Q511, ed. Baillet) and the Berakhot texts from Cave 4 (4Q286–290, ed. Nitzan) indicate the cycle's influence on the sect's written tradition and perhaps its own sectarian origins; and (5) most significant, the title *maskil* found in the opening formula of each of the songs serves as a name for a sectarian office (1QS iii 13, 1QS ix 26–x 5, and 1QSb).

[12] C. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. W. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. Freedman (Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake, Ind., 1990), 167–87.

[13] Maier argues that the numerical month designations in the *exordium* indicate that the cycle was limited to the Nisan season ("Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat," 546–52). Newsom entertains the possibility that the cycle could have been recited throughout the four parallel periods of the year (*Songs*, 19–20). C. R. A. Morray-Jones, "The Temple Within: The Embodied Divine Image and Its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources," *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 410, argues that the cycle climaxes in the twelfth song, which would have been recited immediately following the covenant-renewal ceremony held on the Feast of Weeks according to the community's calendar.

[14] Maier, "Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat," 552–3.

---

conventional liturgy in which the actual words of praise or petition are given. On a strictly formal level, the genre of "liturgical praise" assumes two basic patterns. The first reports the actual words of praise, as in the Christian *Trishagion* and the Jewish *Qedushah*, as well as in narrative apocalypses such as the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (17:1–3). The second basic form is the "liturgical invitation." Although probably intended for recitation, this form emphasizes the order and manner of praise, often leaving the actual words of the liturgy unrecorded.[15] Bilhah Nitzan has rightly assigned the *Songs* to the second category.[16] The cycle is primarily descriptive, classifying and ordering the hymnic praise to be recited. Each of the songs begins with a call to praise followed by descriptive material ranging from the activities performed by the angels to the architectural features of the heavenly Temple structures and the clothing of the angelic high priest. The content of angelic speech is entirely absent; the praise of God himself is never repeated. Instead, the *Songs* describe and detail the order and conduct of the liturgical activities performed in the supernal realms. It is the angelic host itself – its hierarchies, its speech, and its activities – that forms the focus of the cycle of songs. The cycle is structured both as a summons to a list of worshippers and as an invitation to praise.

The Narrative Trajectory of the Cycle: From Angels to Architecture

Despite the cycle's emphasis on description, it fails to offer a coherent and ordered depiction of a heavenly Temple or even of a series of celestial sanctuaries. Even Newsom comments that "just how the heavenly realm is conceived of in the *Songs* remains elusive."[17] Martha Himmelfarb likewise offers only a partial explanation for the anomalous descriptions of celestial structures in the *Songs*: "the loose correspondence of heavenly temple to earthly seems to reflect the belief that the heavenly temple so transcends the earthly that the correspondence cannot be exact."[18] This puzzlement stems in part from the natural desire to assimilate the *Songs* into a set of conventions for describing

---

[15] Compare passages such as Pss 148, 150:1–2, and the *Song of the Three Youths* (LXX Dan 3:28–68) in which the various categories of heavenly and earthly creatures are called on in a hierarchical order to praise God.

[16] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 183–9, 195–200.

[17] Newsom, *Songs*, 377.

[18] M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York, 1993), 16.

the heavenly Temple, which certainly underlies the cycle.[19] However, at the same time that the cycle draws on this long-standing tradition, its multiplication and animation of celestial structures challenges the conventions for describing an ordered and stable celestial sphere.

Scholars have universally recognized that the *Songs* shift their focus as the cycle progresses, turning from an interest in angelology to a description of the art and architecture of the Temple. However, the question of how exactly to understand this shift remains controversial.[20] This question has had direct bearing on how scholars have divided the thirteen songs of the cycle. For Newsom, the seventh song constitutes the dramatic peak of the cycle; she has thus discerned a tripartite division in the work, grouping together songs 1-5, 6-8, and 9-13 in order to highlight the centrality of the middle section.[21] By contrast, Devorah Dimant has suggested that the cycle reaches its climax at the end (i.e., in song 13) and, hence, has supported a bipartite division of the composition.[22] In opposition to these atomizing approaches, Christopher Morray-Jones perceives a sense of dramatic movement in the cycle as a whole. In his reading, song 7 functions as a preliminary crescendo, whereas song 12 serves as the climax of the cycle and song 13 as its dénouement.[23]

Morray-Jones' insight into the dramatic arc of the cycle suggests the possibility of a concomitant narrative trajectory, which would account for the thematic shift from the protocols and hierarchies of the angelic priesthoods to the detailed description of the heavenly Temple. Seen from this perspective, the seventh and middle song represents a microcosm of the work as a whole. The seventh song is less formally rigid in composition than the sixth

---

[19] On the diverse exegetical sources and strategies employed in the *Songs* to generate its image of the "macrocosmic temple," see especially J. R. Davila, "The Macrocosmic Temple, Scriptural Exegesis, and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *DSD* 9 (2002): 1-19. That the Tabernacle and then the Solomonic Temple were built according to a heavenly model or blueprint [תבנית] is attested to at Exod 25:9, 40; 1 Chron 28:11-12.

[20] See, most recently, C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All The Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden, 2002), 252-394, esp. 325-35, which unconvincingly tries to account for this thematic movement as a shift from the angelic host described in the song's first half to the transformed and deified human community that he believes is described in the cycle.

[21] Newsom, *Songs*, 13-17; idem, "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran *Shabbat Shirot*," *JJS* 38 (1987): 11-30, esp. 13.

[22] D. Dimant, "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G. Stroumsa (TSAJ 32; Tübingen, 1992), 31-51, esp. 41, n. 40.

[23] C. Morray-Jones, "Temple Within," 417-20.

---

and the eighth, which frame it. Song 7 is divided into two sections. The first consists of an expansion of the call to praise with which each of the Sabbath songs opens, whereas the second begins with the words: "With these (angels) let the f[oundations of the hol]y of holies praise, the uplifting pillars of the supremely lofty abode, and all the corners of its structure" (4Q403 1 i: 41). In the second section, the beams, the walls, and the "crafted furnishings of the *devir*" - in particular, multiple chariot thrones (4Q403 1 ii: 15)[24] - engage in song and praise alongside the "godlike spirits" who have been the subject of songs 1-6.

The thematic progression within song 7 - from angels who offer praise to architectural structures that offer praise - mirrors the narrative arc of the entire cycle, which similarly moves from detailed angelologies to rich and animated descriptions of the architecture of the heavenly sanctuary. The "architectural" participation in singing praise to God reflects the progressively intensified identification between the animate angelic beings described in the first half of the cycle and the animated Temple structures of the second half. Rather than functioning as the climax of the cycle, this song points forward to the realization of the cycle's ultimate emphasis on the animation and praise performed by the celestial structures.

Song 7, thus, functions as the cycle's narrative hinge. In contrast to the angelologies of the first half of the cycle, songs 9-12 focus almost exclusively on the praise offered by the supernal sanctuaries. These descriptions appear to move from the outer structures inward, beginning with the vestibules and ending with the holy of holies itself. Newsom has suggested that this trajectory is modeled on the "Temple tour" contained in Ezekiel 40-48, in which the sanctuary is likewise described "from the outside in," although she readily admits that this order might merely follow the logical sequence of the worshiper's experience of moving into the progressively sacred precincts of the Temple.[25] Her attempt to rationalize these descriptive passages, however, is complicated by the absence of simple unidirectional movement within the cycle's narrative trajectory. Although song 9 does mention the "vestibules of their entryways" (4Q405 14-15 i: 5), it quickly skips to describe the "structure of the [m]ost holy [sanctuary] in the inner-sancta (*devirim*) of the King"

---

[24] Besides this passage, multiple *merkavot* appear three times in song 11 (4Q405 20 ii-21-22: 3-5), twice in song 12 (4Q405 20 ii-21-22: 11 and 11Q17 vii: 14), and once in song 13 (11Q17 x: 7). Note, however, that these multiple *merkavot* are not simply synonymous with the single *merkavah* that they occur alongside of in song 12.

[25] Newsom, *Songs*, 54-7.

(4Q405 14–15 i: 6–7). Song 10 then returns to describe the vestibule, brick-work, pavement, and chariot thrones before resuming its discussion of the tapestry (or tapestries) that hangs outside of the *devirim* (4Q405 15 ii–16: 2–16 and 4Q405 17: 1–9). Song 12, in turn, describes the procession of the angels through the vestibules and gates of the celestial Temple. The progression of this sequence, which is circular rather than linear, resists facile comparison with the methodical movement of Ezekiel's description of the future Temple (Ezekiel 40–48).

Not only does the cycle deviate from Ezekiel's ordered plan, but it also draws on a broad range of biblical precedents, belying simple intertextual dependence on Ezekiel.[26] Several key words from songs 9–12 do not occur in Ezekiel's description of the Temple. The terms פרוכת,[27] זבול,[28] and דביר[29] appear nowhere in Ezekiel; תבנית[30] occurs only at Ezek 10:8 and without the architectural associations ascribed to the term in the *Songs*.[31] Even where the *Songs* and Ezekiel do share terminology, this vocabulary is often not distinctive to the text of Ezekiel.[32]

In fact, no Jewish source from Qumran or related Jewish and Christian literature matches the *Songs'* cryptic and puzzling deployment of Temple imagery. These temples are at times intricate, like the concentric palaces pictured in Hekhalot literature; at times, they are even paradoxical, like the twofold heavenly palace in the *Book of the Watchers*, whose interior structure is said to occupy more space than the exterior one (1 Enoch 14:14–15). Despite a common interest in multiplicity and concentricity in some of these texts, Newsom herself concedes that "it is extremely difficult to supply parallels

---

[26] On the limited use of Ezekiel 1 and 40–48 in the *Songs* and the cycle's dependence on a broad range of other Scriptural sources, see Dimant, "Apocalyptic Interpretation," esp. 42, n. 44.

[27] The term *parokhet* is drawn instead from descriptions of the tabernacle (e.g., Exod 26:31; Lev 4:17; Num 18:7).

[28] The term *zevul*, meaning sanctuary, is rather rare in the Hebrew Bible. It is drawn from descriptions of the Solomonic Temple (e.g., 1 Kgs 8:13 and 1 Chron 6:2) and from Isa 63:15.

[29] The term *devir* appears in a wide variety of texts from 1 Kgs 6:19–20 and 2 Chron 2:16 to Ps 28:2. It does not once appear in Ezekiel, nor does Ezekiel devote significant space to descriptions of the inner sanctum of the Temple.

[30] The term *tavnit* seems to have specifically signified a model or blueprint, most likely of divine origin. It is used with regards to the Tabernacle at Exod 25:9, 40 and with regards to the Solomonic Temple at 1 Chron 28:18.

[31] "The cherubs appeared to have the form [תבנית] of a man's hand under their wings" (Ezek 10:18, JPS).

[32] Words such as אולם [vestibule], בין [form], and צורה [shape] are equally prevalent in descriptions of the tabernacle and Temple of Solomon.

---

for the notion of seven heavenly sanctuaries."[33] More important, none of these descriptive passages offers a comparable account of the dynamic and active role played by the Temple structures in the liturgical act of praise. In fact, rather than betraying an interest in developing a coherent depiction of the heavenly Temple or in offering a systematic narrative reenactment of cultic ritual, the cycle's narrative structure highlights the essential affinities between the activities of the angelic priesthoods and those of the animated Temple.

Architectural Language and Temple Art in the *Songs*

If Ezekiel 40–48 and its tradition of describing the idealized, future temple do not constitute a privileged source for the *Songs*, what conception informed the text's deployment of architectural and figural language? In my view, the rich architectural and graphic detail found in the *Songs* grows out of an ekphrastic tradition in which angelological speculation was articulated through the language of the material cult. Scholars who have tried to account for the relationship among art, language, and visionary experience have tended to view the process in diachronic terms, as the progressive spiritualization of the cultic site.[34] Yet, it is clear that the Jerusalem Temple had long served as a privileged locus of prophetic and visionary experience in ancient Israel.[35] Saul Olyan has commented suggestively on the "tendency to divinize or accord special figurative treatment to divine attributes and aspects of temple and ritual ... witnessed throughout the ancient Near East, and paralleled in later Jewish angelic exegesis of divine attributes and cultic terms."[36] As Isaiah's vision in the Temple plainly demonstrates (Isa 6:1–6), the media of the plastic arts, such as architecture and carvings, should not

---

[33] Newsom, *Songs*, 50.

[34] For particularly glaring examples of this tendency, see R. Elior, "Between the Earthly Sanctuary and Heavenly Sanctuaries: Prayer and Hymn in Hekhalot Literature and Their Relationship to Temple Traditions," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 341–80 [Hebrew]; idem, "From Earthly Temple to Heavenly Shrines," *JSQ* 4 (1997): 217–67.

[35] As J. D. Levenson, "The Jerusalem Temple in Devotional and Visionary Experience," in *Jewish Spirituality I: From the Bible Through the Middle Ages*, ed. A. Green (New York, 1985), 58, rightly states, "It was not that the Temple was spiritualized after its destruction. Instead, the spiritual role of the Temple after its destruction was a continuation of the role the Temple had long played in the devotional and visionary experience of Israel in the biblical period."

[36] S. M. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him* (TSAJ 36; Tübingen, 1993), 119–20.

be seen to have priority over verbal description or visionary experience.[37] Instead, although the relationship between literary and artistic traditions is never seamless, the domains of art, language, and vision can best be understood as a triad of compatible media that clustered around the cultic center in Jerusalem, constituting a fluid and synchronic matrix in which each component shaped and was shaped by the others.

The history of the class of angels called the *ophannim* [lit. the wheels] perhaps best exemplifies the process by which the mythological can become frozen in statuary and then reused in textual form. Of the thirty times this word appears in the Hebrew Bible, twenty-eight citations come either from Ezekiel[38] or from the description of the wheels of the laver stand in 1 Kgs 7:32–37. Both sources employ the same distinctive technical prose when describing the *ophannim*. Language that seems so distinctively Ezekelian surfaces precisely in those sections of biblical historical prose passages that describe the Jerusalem Temple. For example, 1 Kgs 7:33 reports that "The structure of the wheels [וּמַעֲשֵׂה הָאוֹפַנִּים] was like the structure of chariot wheels [כְּמַעֲשֵׂה אוֹפַן הַמֶּרְכָּבָה]." In addition, these passages from Ezekiel and 1 Kings also echo the abstract language of the brief account of the Sinai theophany in Exodus: "And they saw the God of Israel: under his feet there was the *likeness* [כְּמַעֲשֵׂה] of a pavement of sapphire, like the very sky for purity" (Exod 24:10). These verbal echoes suggest that the seemingly sober ekphrastic descriptions of the Temple and its art in historical sources are related to prophetic-visionary accounts of Temple theophanies in surprisingly intimate ways. Whatever the precise relationship between these various texts, they undoubtedly represent the threads of literary material out of which the *Songs* are woven. Rather than offering a unified and stable depiction of the heavenly sanctuary or sanctuaries, the *Songs* represent a highly developed elaboration of the enduring ekphrastic impulse already present in a wide range of biblical texts.

The graphic depiction of angels carved or woven into the physical structures of the heavenly sanctuary are particularly central to both the thematic unity and narrative trajectory of the cycle. It is this fluidity between angelic and architectural language that underlies the distinctive combination of architectural description and angelology pervading the latter half of the *Songs*.

---

[37] Indeed, as the massive laver referred to as "yam" or sea (1 Kgs 7:23) and perhaps also the enigmatic columns Yachin and Boaz (1 Kgs 7:21) show, the art of the Temple of Solomon reflects contemporary mythological figures and narratives.

[38] Ezek 1:15–22 is perhaps the most famous passage.

Songs 9–12 are often read as no more than a bewildering, kaleidoscopic accumulation of cultic vocabulary, intended to express the awesomeness of the ritual climate of the Jerusalem Temple. Yet, these intricate compositions do more than just create an evocative sense of place. They imbue the cultic art and architecture with the living force of the angelic beings depicted on them. This effect is apparent in a fragmentary passage assigned by Newsom to song 9[39]:

(5) [And the liken]ess of living divine beings is engraved in the vestibules where the King enters, figures of luminous spirits, [... K]ing, figures [בדיו] of glorious li[ght, wondrous] spirits; (6) [in] the midst of the spirits of splendor (is) a work of wondrous colors, figures of the living divine beings. [... in the] glorious *devirim*, the structure [מבני] of the (7) [mo]st holy [sanctuary] in the *devirim* of the King, fig[ures of the di]vi[ne beings and from] the likeness of [...] of holiest holiness. (4Q405 14–15 i: 5–7)

Song 10 similarly describes the veil(s) of the inner sancta [*devirim*] as having angelic figures woven into it (them): "(3) Beauty upon the veil of the *devir* of the King ... (4) in the *devir* of His presence, the mingled colors of ... everything which is engraved upon the ..., figures of hea[venly beings ...] (5) the glory from both of their sides [...] the veils [פורכות] of the wondrous *devirim*" (4Q405 15 ii–16: 3–5). More striking still is song 11's description of the "wondrous mosaic" [רבקי פלא] composed of multihued "shapes of god-like beings" (4Q405 19ABDC: 3–7). Here, the animated figures engraved into the "floor" of the celestial shrine [מדרס דבירי פלא] and the brickwork under the divine chariot throne [ללבני כבודם] are explicitly equated with the "holy angels" who offer blessings and praise to God.

By contrast, in a passage from song 13, the fluidity of descriptive language progresses in the opposite direction; it is not the carvings or tapestries that are said to be animated like angels, but rather the angels who are compared to carved or woven figures:

(7) ... In their wondrous stations are spirits [clothed with] many colors, like woven work, engraved with figures of splendor. (8) In the midst of the glorious appearance of scarlet, the colors of most holy spiritual light, they stand firm in their holy station before the (9) [K]ing, spirits in garments of [purest] color in the midst of the appearance of whiteness. And this glorious spiritual substance

---

[39] Newsom, *Songs*, 280.

is like fine gold work, shedding (10) [lig]ht. And all their crafted [garments] are purely blended, an artistry of woven work. (4Q405 23 ii: 7–10)[40]

The crafted garments of the angels are continuous with the description of the woven tapestries described in songs 10 and 11. It is as if the angels themselves are formed from the raw materials used to construct the Temple.

Moreover, a number of passages play with variations on phrases built around the term בדן [figure] and its plural בדני as well as the similar word צורה [form]. Such passages link the discursive account of the hierarchies and activities of the various classes of angels in the first part of the cycle with these carved and woven figures.[41] In addition, the roots חקק [engrave],[42] מלח [blend],[43] חרת [inscribe],[44] פתח [engrave],[45] and חקה [engrave][46] appear multiple times in the cycle, all within the context of representations of angelic figures on the structures and implements of the supernal sanctuaries. The juxtaposition of this material vocabulary with the descriptions of the celestial host forges a powerful link between angelic speculation and the iconographic traditions of the Jerusalem Temple, thereby making the cycle's angelologies and its ekphrastic descriptions both thematically and verbally interdependent.

The *Berakhot* texts from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q286–290) further illuminate these patterns of thought and usage.[47] This liturgical work apparently served as an annual covenantal renewal liturgy performed within the sect.[48] Like the *Songs*, 4QBerakhot draws on ekphrastic description of the material cult to articulate its speculative knowledge concerning the angelic realm:

---

[40] Compare the many other similar passages in which terms from the plastic arts (e.g., בדן, חקה, חקק, חרת, מלח, פתח, צורה, רקם) are used to describe the angels, especially: 4Q405 14–15 i: 5–7; 4Q405 19: 5; 4Q405 23 ii: 7.

[41] For use of בדן in the context of the strictly angelological portion of song 7 before the shift to angelified architecture, see 4Q403 1 ii: 9.

[42] For example, 11Q17 vi: 6 and esp. 4Q405 19: 5–6: [ב]דני צורות אלוהים מחוקקי סביב ללבני [כ]בודם.

[43] For example, 4Q405 19: 3–4 and 4Q405 20 ii–21–22: 11.

[44] For example, 4Q405 23 ii: 1–3.

[45] For example, 4Q405 14–15 i: 5.

[46] For example, 4Q405 15ii–16: 4.

[47] For critical edition and translation, I have used B. Nitzan, "Berakhot," in *Qumran Cave 4, Vol. 6, Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*, 1–74.

[48] According to Nitzan, the Berakhot texts seem to represent an expanded version of the ritual alluded to in the *Community Rule* (1QS i–ii), with which it shares many verbal affinities ("4QBerakhotᵃ⁻ᵉ [4Q286–290]: A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts," *RevQ* 16 [1995]: 487–506).

---

(2) their [...] splendid [st]ructures (תב[נ]יות הדרמה) [...] (3) [walls of] their glorious [hal]ls, their wondrous doors [...(4)...] their [...] angels of fire and spirits of cloud [...(5) bri]ghtness of the brocaded spirits (רוקמת רוח) of the holiest holi[ness (6) ...[...]m and firmaments of holy [...(7) [spirits of the holiest] holiness [will sing in joy] in all the due time[s (8) and they will bless] the name of your glorious divinity. (4Q287 2ab: 2–8)

The language is reminiscent of the *Songs*, particularly in its use of technical terms such as תבניה (here in the plural translated as structures) and רוקמה (here translated as brocaded). And, as in the *Songs*, the boundary between angels and their pictographic forms is fluid. By drawing on this rich verbal iconography, both of these liturgical collections achieve what I have termed the "angelification" of temple architecture.

Moreover, both works seem to abandon a systematic depiction of the supernal sanctuary. They emphasize instead the actual participation of the Temple in the liturgical act. The participation of the inanimate elements of the physical cult grows out of the traditional fluidity between the categories of angelic creatures, on the one hand, and of representational and architectural forms, on the other. Yet the existence of a reservoir of iconographic art and language does not in itself account for the cycle's success in merging the domains of angelology and architecture. In what follows, I explore how the cycle's rigorous and precise poetic composition produces this effect.

The Poetics of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, or the Strange Problem of Singular and Plural Forms

Beyond their semantic affinities, both 4QBerakhot and the *Songs* employ plural forms of architectural vocabulary in anomalous and surprising ways. The following passage from the *Berakhot* is typical of this grammatical phenomenon:

(1) the seat [מושב] of Your honor and the footstools [והדומי רגלי] of Your glory in the [h]eights of Your standing-place and the trea[d ([מדר]ך) (2) of Your holiness; and the chariots [ומרכבות] of Your glory, their *keruvim* [כרוביהמה] and their wheels [ואופניהמה] with all [their] councils; (3) foundations [מוסדי] of fire and flames of brightness, and flashes of splendor, li[ght]s of flames and wondrous lights. (4) Majes]ty and splendor, and height of glory, foundation of holiness and foun[tain of b]rightness, and height of beauty; wo[nder (5) of thanks]giving and a well of powers, splendor of praises and great in awesome deeds and healing[s (6) and miraculous works; a foundation of wisdom and a structure of

knowledge and a fountain of insight, a fountain of prudence (7) and a counsel of holiness, and a foundation of truth, a treasury of understanding; structures[49] [מבני] of justice and residences [ומגורי] of hone[sty. (4Q286 1 ii: 1–7)

The plural forms scattered throughout this passage do not merely complicate the task of reconstructing the heavenly realm encoded in this text; they fundamentally call into question whether the poetic form represented by this work even assumes a stable representation of heaven. Like the *Songs*, this text multiplies and animates these architectural structures so that, like the figures carved on them, they can be depicted in the act of praising God. To understand the function of the cycle's enigmatic descriptions of multiple heavenly sanctuaries, its unique language – its repetitions, alternations between singular and plural forms, broken syntax, and sonorous language – must be understood as a mechanism to communicate the distinctive ideational content of the text.

As I have argued, the *Songs* alternate between two primary and contrasting poetic modes. On the one hand, the praise and blessings of the angelic orders are characterized by structured repetition and methodical uniformity, reflecting their interest in hierarchy and protocol. By contrast, the songs that describe the activities of the celestial Temple are marked by fractured irregularity. In this way, changes in poetic form mark significant shifts in thematic content and narrative development.

Song 6, for example, includes two separate hymnic cycles: a cycle of praises of the seven chief princes of the angels and a cycle of their blessings. The cycle of praise (4Q403 1 i: 1–7 and Mas1k ii: 1–19) contains seven twofold liturgical proclamations concerning the praises to God recited in order by the tongue of the seven chief princes. Each proclamation contains two parallel declarations: a noun phrase describing the type of praise to be recited and a verbal clause declaring its actual recitation.[50] Similarly, the blessings of the seven angelic chief princes (4Q403 1 i: 23–26) contains seven threefold blessings in which the chief princes are said to bless either angels or righteous

---

[49] It is telling that F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden, 1999), 544–5, erroneously translate מבני צדק as "from the sons of justice."

[50] For detailed parsing of this unit's poetic structure, see Newsom, *Songs*, 178–80; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 297–301; R. S. Abusch, "Seven-fold Hymns in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the Hekhalot Literature: Formalism, Hierarchy and the Limits of Human Participation," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. J. R. Davila (STDJ 46; Leiden, 2002), 228–32.

---

people in the name of God.[51] These units constitute, in Nitzan's terms, "liturgical-ritual act(s) of sequential recitations by the heavenly entourage."[52] Song 8 likewise contains seven calls, depicting the praise to be recited by seven different figures, one after the other in a kind of liturgical chain. The praise is increased sevenfold each time permission is passed from one angelic prince to the next. In this case, it is quite simple to follow the poetic constraints the author has chosen:

(27) And the tongue of the first [angelic prince] will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is second to him. And the tongue of the one who is second with respect to him will grow strong] (28) sevenfold from [the sound of] the one who is third with respect to [him. And the ton]gue of the thi[rd will] grow strong sevenfo[ld from (the sound of) the one who is fourth with respect to him. And the tongue of the fourth will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of the one who is fifth with respect to him. And the tongue of the fifth will grow strong sevenfold (joining) with the tongue of] (29) the one who is sixth with respect to him. And the tongue of the sixth will grow strong sevenfold (joining with) the] to[ngue of the one who is seventh with respect to him. And with the tongue of the seventh it will grow strong … holiness of the sanctuary. (4Q403 1 ii: 27–29)[53]

This passage is typical of the phenomenon I have been discussing. The angelic priesthoods, founded by God in earlier songs, are here described as fulfilling their allotted functions. The formal parallelism and regularity of such passages thus enhance the impact of their depiction of a sphere dominated by prescribed rules of organization and activity.

By contrast, the descriptions of the praises of the Temple architecture are primarily litanies, which systematically intermingle angelic and architectural language. Songs 9–13, which contain these passages, are characterized by the following formal features:

1. lack of finite verbs,
2. elaborate construct chains,
3. nominal and participial sentences,
4. clustering and repetition of related vocabulary and imagery.

---

[51] Lacunae in this unit are supplied from 4Q404 2: 5–8 and 4Q405 3a ii: 15–19. For detailed parsing of this unit's poetic structure, see Newsom, *Songs*, 207–8; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 301–7; Abusch, "Seven-fold Hymns," 232–35.

[52] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 305.

[53] On the poetic structure of this unit, see Newsom, *Songs*, 242.

No hierarchy differentiates between animated creatures and animated structures. Temple structures do not function as a locus of activity, but as participants in praise. The litany form – its repetitions, its transferal of verbs from one type of being to another, and its absorption of disparate elements within a single scene or activity – invests this collapsing of categories with a sharply rhetorical note. The very performance of the litany or song enacts the dynamic relationship between angelic beings and temple structures that is so central to the thematic content of the cycle.

The lack of hierarchy and structure in passages of the *Songs* that contain a multiplicity of sanctuaries and Temple structures is enhanced by the interchangeable use of singular and plural forms. Their alternation makes it virtually impossible to extract a coherent and stable image of the heavenly sphere or the heavenly Temple structures that are said to inhabit it, thereby undermining the reader's capacity to systematize the use of architecture within the cycle. A single term alternates from singular to plural, seemingly at random within the same passage. For example, the twelfth song places one central chariot throne alongside a series of multiple *merkavot* (4Q405 23 i: 1–13). The latter half of song 7, which I have argued foreshadows the cycle's subsequent animation of the Temple, employs this same verbal technique:

> (11)...And there is a voice of blessing from the chiefs of His *devir* [...] (12) And the voice of blessing is glorious in the hearing of the godlike beings and the councils of [... (13) voice of] blessing. And all the crafted furnishings of the *devir* hasten [to join] with the wondrous psalms of the *devi[r* ...] (14) of wonder, *devir* to *devir* with the sound of the holy multitudes. And all their crafted furnishings [...] (15) And the chariots of His *devir* give praise together, and their *keruvim* and thei[r] *ophannim* bless wondrously [...] (16) the chiefs of the divine structure. And they praise Him in His holy *devir*. (4Q403 1 ii: 11–16)

In this passage, the antiphonal singing of the multiple inner sancta [*devirim*] is systematically juxtaposed to the singular *devir* of God. Similarly, at 4Q405 14–15 i: 7 and 8, the phrases "the inner-sancta of the king" [דבירי מלך] and "the inner-sanctum of the king" [דביר מלך] are found alongside each other without any thematic or narrative explanation for the shift. Elsewhere, the word מושב [seat or stool] appears in rapid succession in both singular and plural forms (4Q405 20 ii–21–22: 2 and 4). Even the word זבול [sanctuary] appears in the plural at the end of the cycle (11Q17 x: 8). All of these cases are equally difficult to rationalize.

Newsom herself seems to have been frustrated by the problem posed by these verbal and poetic techniques. She tries to explain several of the cases, such as the vacillation between the singular and the plural forms of the word *parokhet* [veil] at 4Q405 15 ii–16: 3 and 5 (בפרוכה and פרכות), by suggesting that "one sanctuary is hierarchically superior to the others of lesser sanctity."[54] Yet, the weight of the evidence forces her to articulate the inadequate position that "in translating the Sabbath songs, not all of the plural forms need be rendered as plurals, even though it is clear that in some contexts genuine plurality of sanctuaries is envisioned."[55] This solution does not yield convincing insights into the cycle's depiction of temple structures, nor does it elucidate the cycle's relationship to the Jerusalem Temple.

Certainly, there are precedents for the simultaneous depiction of single and plural forms of the same object. Revelation describes the twenty-four thrones of the elders with the same nomenclature as the one throne of God (καὶ κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου θρόνους εἴκοσι τέσσαρας; Rev 4:4). The Hekhalot corpus, likewise contains this plural usage of the term *merkavah* and, in many cases, depicts these plural structures as participating in liturgical song.[56] In these cases, however, plurality is invariably maintained throughout a given passage and does not alternate at random with singular forms. In both Revelation and the Hekhalot corpus, the plural forms are uniformly linked to a consistent plural conception of heavenly structures, such as the twenty-four thrones of the elders or the multiple chariots in the multiple heavenly throne rooms. In neither case are the alternations as pervasive or as *ad hoc* as in the *Songs*. In my view, this vacillation is systematic and serves to emphasize the similarity between the multiplicity of angelic hosts and temple structures.

The process of "animation" inaugurated in Song 7 is brought to its completion at the end of the entire cycle in a fragment presumed to be from the thirteenth and final song, which typifies the cycle's nonliteral, nonrepresentational depiction of the supernal sanctuary/sanctuaries:

> (6) for the angels of knowledge [למלאכי הדעת], in all ... [...] ... holy upliftings (7) for the thrones of His glory [לכסאי כבודו] and [His foot]stool (ולהדום ר[גלי]) [and for all] the [ch]ariots His majesty (מר[כבות הדרו) and for the *devirim* of his [His] ho[liness] ([ולדבירי קו[דשו) [...] and for the portals of the entrance [ולפתחי מבוא] of (8) [the Kin]g together with all the exits [מוצאי] of [... the cor]ners of its

[54] Newsom, *Songs*, 49.

[55] Newsom, *Songs*, 49.

[56] See especially §§554–555. Paragraph designations follow P. Schäfer's *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2; Tübingen, 1981).

str[uc]ture (פנ[ית מבניתו . . .]) ([בולי]) for the temples of His glory (ולהיכלי כבודו) and for the firmaments of [ולרקיע]. (11Q17 x: 6–8)

The extremely fragmentary state of this passage makes it difficult to interpret. It seems to follow immediately after a detailed description of the clothing of the angelic high priest and the sacrificial offerings he makes in the heavenly Temple.[57] Although most scholars have naturally focused on the significance of this cultic scene, little attention has been paid to what the *Songs* have to say about its setting.[58] The use of *lamed* before this list of architectural features (e.g., "for the thrones of His glory" [לכסאי כבודו]) is peculiar. The grammatical function of the preposition in this series certainly parallels its use in the fragment's first phrase, "to the angels of knowledge." But what function does this particle serve when applied to the inanimate objects that follow this unambiguous angelic designation? Here, at the dénouement of the cycle, we might have expected the text to employ a *locative* designation to specify the celestial Temple as the site of the sacrificial action described earlier in the song. We find instead a passage that traces out the cycle's shifting architectural topography, beginning with God's throne and ending outside in the firmament.

As in the rest of the work, this blueprint cannot be reduced to its spatial coordinates; the heavenly Temple is not so much a locus of angelic life as its semantic and conceptual foundation. Indeed, seen from this view, the intimate relationship between Jewish angelology and the vibrant ekphrastic tradition in the Hebrew Bible may challenge long-cherished notions concerning the aniconism of early Judaism.

---

[57] 11Q17 ix: 3–9; 4Q405 23 ii: 1–13. See especially the cultic vocabulary in 11Q17 ix: 3–5: "suitable [offering]s" (ממוח]ת רצון]), "the sacrifices of the holy ones" [לזבחי קדושים], "the aroma of their offerings" [ריח מנחותם], and "and the ar[o]ma of their libations" (ריח נסכיהם]). On the reasons for the primarily "aromatic" nature of heavenly sacrifice, see M. Himmelfarb in this volume.

[58] For example, Fletcher-Louis, *Glory of Adam*, 356–91.

The Collapse of Celestial and Chthonic Realms in a Late Antique "Apollonian Invocation" (*PGM* I 262–347)

Christopher A. Faraone

One of the many remarkable changes in pagan religious outlook in the late Roman period is the growing tendency to focus on the heavens as the abode of a frequently transcendent god and to develop techniques of ascension to gain access to this (usually male) divinity or his divine knowledge. The presence of a powerful male god in the celestial, realm is not new, of course; the Greeks in archaic and classical times tend to divide up the supernatural into two fairly distinct categories, each with their own forms of ritual and address: (1) the Olympian or celestial, and (2) the chthonian. In the earlier periods, a person could search for supernatural knowledge or prophecy in either direction, upward: for example, by consulting an oracle of Apollo or Zeus, or downward by performing a necromantic ritual or (in mythic narratives) by making a journey to interrogate a ghost. In later antiquity, however, as pagan worshippers turned their eyes increasingly to heavenly deities for divine knowledge, necromancy and other forms of chthonian prophecy seem to diminish in importance.[1] This is not to say that the

---

[1] By "necromancy" I mean – as the Greek etymology makes clear – a ritual designed to elicit prophecy [*manteia*] from a corpse [*nekros*]. For the rising unpopularity of necromancy in the Roman period, see F. Graf, "Magic and Divination," in *The World of Ancient Magic: Papers from the First International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 4–8 May 1997*, ed. D. R. Jordan, H. Montgomery, and E. Thomassen (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4; Bergen, 1999), 295–6; R. Gordon, "Imagining Greek and Roman Magic," in *Witchcraft and Magic in Europe: Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. B. Ankarloo and S. Clark (Philadelphia, 1999), 206–8.