STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

EDITED BY

F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

P.W. FLINT

VOLUME XLVI



THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AS BACKGROUND TO POSTBIBLICAL JUDAISM AND EARLY CHRISTIANITY

PAPERS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AT ST. ANDREWS IN 2001

EDITED BY

JAMES R. DAVILA



BRILL LEIDEN · BOSTON 2003

SEVENFOLD HYMNS IN THE SONGS OF THE SABBATH SACRIFICE AND THE HEKHALOT LITERATURE: FORMALISM, HIERARCHY AND THE LIMITS OF HUMAN PARTICIPATION*

RA'ANAN ABUSCH Princeton University

Introduction

The thematic, verbal and stylistic affinities between the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice¹ and the hymnic material contained in the Hekhalot corpus have raised fundamental questions about the relationship between the liturgical traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and later Jewish mystical writings. Scholars have diverged widely in their assessment of both the cohesiveness of this complex of related traditions and the continuity of its development in its passage from second temple Judaism to the Hekhalot literature of Late Antiquity.²

Text designations for the Songs follow Carol Newson, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat," in Qumran Cave 4: VI, Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1 (DJD 11; ed. E. Eshel et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 173-401. See also the full critical edition presented in Carol Newsom, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition (HSS 27; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1985). I have also consulted Bilhah Nitzan, Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994); James R. Davila, Liturgical Works (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls 6; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 83-167. Other textual information can be found in Adam S, van der Woude, "Fragmente einer Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11QSirSab)," in Von Kanaan bis Kerala; Festschrift für 7. P. M. van der Ploeg (ed. W. C. Delsman et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1982), 311-337; Carol Newsom and Yigal Yadin, "The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," IE7 34 (1984): 77-88; Elisha Qimron, "A Review Article of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition by Carol Newson," HTR 79 (1986): 349-71. The cycle was first named and identified in John Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Oumrân - 4O Serek Šîrôt 'Ôlat Haššabbāt," in Congress Volume: Öxford 1959 (VTSup 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960), 318-345.

² Just about every major scholar has weighed in on this discussion, which is far more complex and nuanced than I can do justice to here. Most important among those who have emphasized historical continuity, see Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends* in Jewish Mysticism (3rd ed.; New York: Schocken, 1954); idem, Jewish Gnosticism, As the earliest Hebrew work that combines *Merkavah*-speculation, exegetical activity focused on the book of Ezekiel, and cultic-liturgical forms, the *Songs* offer the most exciting possibility for grounding later literary and religious developments in this earlier period. However, despite the striking correspondences between the *Songs* and the Hekhalot corpus, evidence for *direct literary dependence* between the two traditions has remained elusive.³ The tension between this persistent textual divide and the tantalizing parallels in these texts makes the methodological questions of comparison central to any interpretation of the evidence.⁴

Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York: Schocken Books, 1965); Ithamar Grünwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden: Brill, 1980); Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions," RevQ 13/49-52 (1988): 199-213; Lawrence H. Schilfman, "Merkavah Speculation at Oumran: The 4OSerekh Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat," in Mystics, Philosophers and Politicians: Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of Alexander Altmann (ed. J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski; Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1982), 15-47; idem, "Sifrut Ha-Hekhalot ve-Kitve Qumran," Mehgere Yerushalaym Be-Mahshevet Yisra'el 6 (1987): 121-38 (Hebrew). Schiffman stands alone in this group, since, in addition to the phenomenological and/or traditionsgeschietliche methodology of the others, he also employs linguistic and text-critical tools. In most other cases, a primarily textualliterary position has emphasized rupture rather than continuity. Ephraim E. Urbach believed the early tannaitic tradition of Merkavah-speculation to be primarily exegetical ("Traditions' about Merkavah Mysticism in the Tannaitic Period," in Studies in Mysticism and Religion; Festschrift für Gershom Scholem [ed. E. E. Urbach, R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and Ch. Wirszubski; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1967], 1-28 [Hebrew section]); he has been followed by David Halperin, The Merkavah in Rabbinic Literature (New Haven; American Oriental Society, 1980); idem, The Faces of the Chariot (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988). For a principled critique of the comparative method as it is applied in the field of early lewish mysticism, see Peter Schäfer, "New Testament and Hekhalot Literature: The Journey into Heaven in Paul and in Merkavah Mysticism" 775 35 (1984); 19-35; also idem, "Research on Hekhalot Literature: Where Do We Stand Now?," in Rashi, 1040-1990: Hommage à Ephraim E. Urbach: Congrès européen des Études juives (ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna; Paris; Éditions du Cerf, 1993). 229-235.

³ See the assessment in Johann Maier, "Zu Kult und Liturgie in der Qumrangemeinde," *RacQ* 14/56 (1990): 572: "Doch die Entsprechungen beruhen zum grossen Teil auf der gemeinsamen Ezechiel'schen Basis und bestehen in bestimmten, kulttheologische zentralen Motiven, *keineswegs auf textlicher Abhängigkeit*" (emphasis mine). In his later work, even Schiffman concurs with this more cautious assessment. Compare his articles from 1982 and 1987 respectively (Schiffman, "Merkavah Speculation at Qumran," 46–7; idem, "Sifrut Ha-Hekhalot ve-Kitve Qumran," 133–4).

¹ Recently several review articles have addressed the difficulties and implications of comparing the *Songs* and the Hekhalot literature: Elisabeth Hamacher, "Die Sabbatopferlieder im Streit um Ursprung und Anfänge der Jüdischen Mystik," *JSJ* 27 (1996): 119–154; James R. Davila, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Merkavah Mysticism." in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: Clark, 1999), 249–264; Michael D. Swartz, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish Magic and Mysticism," *DSD* 8 (2001): 182–93.

^{*} I am grateful to Martha Himmelfarb, Leah Hochman, Annette Reed, and Peter Schäfer for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this paper and to James Davila, whose astute editorial work greatly strengthened the final product.

Previous scholarship has privileged comparison of the fractured and sonorous style characteristic of the "numinous" hymns that are found both in the Songs and in the Hekhalot literature.⁵ In the hopes of further expanding the range of comparative approaches, this paper will instead focus on the genre of the sevenfold hymn contained in both works. I will demonstrate not only that these hymns share a number of important features, but also that these characteristics are interdependent. The compositions are marked by an extreme formalism that includes but extends far beyond their deployment of various poetic patterns built around the number seven. These highly structured poetic constraints lend themselves in turn to a thematic emphasis on description - in particular accounts of the hierarchies and protocols of the angelic sphere. Finally, the indirect and oblique descriptive discourse that emerges from this confluence of formal and thematic interests has important implications for the way the genre positions the implied human community within the dramatic and narrative structure of the hymns. In this way, the genre thus limits the scope of human involvement in the liturgical act. Human participation is primarily presented indirectly through the detailed description of angelic praise. Like a play composed entirely of stage-directions, the sevenfold hymn records only the procedures by which the angels offer praise to God, suppressing fully the actual words of the imagined heavenly liturgy. Consequently, human participation in the liturgical act is perforce mediated, embedded as it is within its narrative function.

The central portion of the Sabbath cycle is composed of a series of shorter units. In songs 6 and 8, these shorter compositions are made up of seven parallel phrases, each of which shares a series of formal poetic features. These sevenfold hymns, in particular the two independent examples contained in song 6, exhibit a wide range of formal and thematic affinities with a hymn found in the Hekhalot corpus at §271 within the macroform Hekhalot Rabbati.⁶ Yet, comparison of these sevenfold compositions shows that, despite their similarities, the Qumran Songs and the late antique Hekhalot hymns function within discrete cultural and textual frameworks. Within the context of the Hekhalot corpus, the genre's avoidance of direct hymnic speech and its not unrelated cautious approach to the problem of human participation carries a very different valence than they do in the Songs. This is in large measure because, in contrast to the Sabbath cycle's explicit rejection of human participation, §271 occurs alongside a wide variety of compositions in which we do, in fact, hear the unmediated voice of the human community, and even the angels themselves, directly praising God. Indeed, a wide range of divergent opinions about the possibility and desirability of direct human involvement in the liturgical activities of the heavenly sphere is especially evident in the portion of the text that features the sevenfold hymr^{$\frac{1}{2}$} (§§271–277). It is precisely the shift in the attitudes of these hymnic collections towards the notion of human participation in the heavenly liturgy that highlights the enduring correlation between this genre and its distinctive mode of indirect praise. Only by integrating narrative and dramatic considerations into an analysis of the poetics of these compositions is it possible to address the salient question of the relationship between the genre's formal principles and its discursive style. Ultimately, however, it is comparison of the two sets of hymnic material within their discrete literary systems that will

⁵ These hymns have consequently come to play a crucial, if contentious, role in debates concerning influence and continuity in the development of Hebrew "mystical" poetry. See the seminal comments in Scholem, Major Trends, 57-63; also idem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition (New York: Schocken, 1965), 128. Scholem imported the category of the "numinous" from Rudolf Otto, The Idea of the Holy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), 5-7, 17-18. See also Aharon Mirski, "רולדות שרשור", Tarbiz 28 1958: 171-280 (Hebrew); Johann Maier, "Serienbildung und 'numinoser' Eindruckseffekt in den poetischen Stücken der Hekhalot-Literatur," Semitics 3 (1973): 36-66; Karl E. Grözinger, "Singen und ekstatische Sprache in der frühen jüdische Mystik," 787 11 (1980): 66-77. Contrast this tradition of scholarship with the more nuanced approach in Philip S. Alexander, "Prayer in the Heikhalot Literature," in Prière, Mystique et Judaïsme: Colloque de Strasbourg, 10-12 Septembre 1984 (ed. R. Goetschel; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1987), 43-64. Others have, of course, analyzed the more conventional poetics of the cycle, although without drawing comparisons with the Hekhalot hymns: see Newsom, Songs, 5-21 and passim; Bilhah Nitzan, Oumran Prayer, 173-200; Stanislav Segert, "Observations on Poetic Structures in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," RevO 13/49-52 (1988): 215-223.

⁶ Hekhalot paragraph designations are given according to Peter Schäfer's Spropse zur Hekhalot-Literatur (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981). I also make use of Peter Schäfer et al., Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur, vol. 2: §§ 81–334 (TSAJ 17: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987). The Hekhalot manuscript tradition is characterized by the fluctuation and instability of both longer and shorter textual units. The macroform Hekhalot Rabbati varies widely in the manuscripts (e.g., §§81–193, §§81–277, §§81–335, §§81–321+489–495). For discussion of the fluid nature of the manuscripts, see Peter Schäfer "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature," in Hekhalot-Studien (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 8–16; idem, "Zum Problem der redaktionellen Identität von Hekhalot Rabbati," in Hekhalot-Studien, 63–74.

allow us to refine our understanding of the notion of human participation operative in them.

I. The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: Textual History and Communal Setting

The Sabbath cycle, composed of thirteen songs, was discovered in nine separate manuscripts at Qumran. Yigael Yadin identified a tenth amongst the textual remains of the Masada excavations.7 Although only a fraction of the text has been recovered and many of the manuscripts preserve only fragmentary readings, the impressive philological and editorial work of Carol Newsom and others has yielded significant sections of continuous text as well as evidence for the cycle's overall thematic development. Paleographic analysis dates the earliest manuscript copies to the late Hasmonaean period (c. 75-50 B.C.E.), while the latest copies from Qumran date from the middle of the first century C.E. The large number of manuscripts of the Songs found at Qumran suggests that the cycle should be viewed within the larger literary and historical context of the Qumran community, especially in light of the wide variety of thematic and formal features it shares with sectarian material.⁸ The cycle was apparently recited in the community during the thirteen Sabbaths of the first quarterly period of the 364-day calendar used at Qumran.⁹ Neverthe-

⁷ 4Q400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407; 11QShirShab; and Mas1k. For a useful and concise review of these manuscripts, see Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 85–6 (note that Davila accidentally miscounts the number of manuscripts of the *Songs*).

^a Carol Newsom, in her most comprehensive treatment of the question of the work's origins, argues that the *Songs* was produced outside the sect, but came to play an important and influential role within the community ("Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* [ed. W. Propp, B. Halpern, and D. Freedman; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990], 167–187).

⁹ Maier argues that numerical month designations in the exordium indicates that the cycle was limited to the Nisan season (Johann Maier, "Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat: Some Observations on their Calendrical Implications and on their Style," in *The* Madrid Quaran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991 [ed. J. Trebolle and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11, 1-2; 2 vols; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 2:546-52). In contrast, Newsom entertains the possibility that the cycle could have been recited throughout the four parallel periods of the year (Newsom, Songs, 19-20). Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones 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 (Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, "The Temple Within: less, it is possible that the cycle was not initially of sectarian origin, as suggested by the copy found at Masada. Thus, while it is undoubtedly the case that the sect served as one of the text's primary sites of transmission and performance, we should be careful not to overemphasize absolute conformity between the cycle and other liturgical and hymnic material found at Qumran. This paper, therefore, analyzes the cycle primarily on its own terms, but makes use of other materials from Qumran where they seem to address similar themes and motifs.

A number of heuristic labels have been applied to the *Songs*: culticliturgical,¹⁰ exegetical-meditative,¹¹ or quasi-mystical.¹² Yet, whatever its ultimate *Sitz im Leben*, on a strictly generic level the cycle is made up of a series of "liturgical invitations."¹³ Bilhah Nitzan has rightly assigned the *Songs* to this category, noting that the cycle does not represent a conventional liturgy in which the actual words of praise or petition are specified.¹⁴ Thus, although the *Songs* seem to be intended for recitation, they, like other such hymns, are primarily structured around the order and manner of praise. 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

The Embodied Divine Image and its Worship in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish and Christian Sources," *SBLSP* 37 [1998]: 399-431, esp. 410).

¹⁰ Maier, "Shire 'Olat hash-Shabbat," 552–53, deemphasizes the experiential and exegetical nature of the cycle, preferring to focus on its liturgical function within the Qumran community. He has argued forcefully that the cycle functioned as an accompaniment to scriptural readings ("Begleittext") performed within the Qumran community by the appropriate priestly watches as a replacement for the cultic sacrifices of the Sabbath ("Kultersatz"). See also Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scralls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137–38.

¹¹ Carol Newsom, "Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran *Shabbat Shirot*," $\mathcal{J}\mathcal{J}S$ 38 (1987): 11–30. Newsom emphasizes the importance of the exegetical-meditative aspect of the cycle, locating with remarkable acuity exegetical activity in the twelfth song of the cycle based on intertextual use of Ezekiel 1, 3 and 10; Psalm 68; Exodus 19–20; Daniel 7:9–10.

¹² See Newsom, Songs, 16–17; Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 273–4, 319–20; idem, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran," JQR 85:163–183. For detailed methodological discussion of the applicability of the category "mystical" to the Songs, see Elliot R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan," JQR 85 (1994): 185–202.

¹³ Compare passages such as Pss 148, 150:1-2, and the Song of the Three Young Men (Daniel LXX 3:28–68) in which the various categories of heavenly and earthly creatures are called upon in a hierarchical order to praise God.

¹⁴ Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 183-89, 195-200.

of the heavenly temple structures and the clothing of the angelic high priest. The songs do not claim to record the content of angelic speech. Instead it is the angelic host itself – its hierarchies, its speech, and its activities – that constitutes the primary focus of the cycle.

Scholars have universally recognized that the Songs shift their focus as the cycle progresses, moving from the establishment and ordering of the angelic priesthood towards the description of the heavenly temple. However, the question of how exactly to divide its thirteen songs remains controversial. Newsom has suggested a tripartite division, grouping together songs 1-5, 6-8, and 9-13. For Newsom, the seventh song constitutes the dramatic peak of the cycle.¹⁵ By contrast, Devorah Dimant has suggested that the cycle reaches its climax at its end (i.e., in song 13) and, hence, has supported a bipartite division of the composition.¹⁶ In my view, neither is strictly speaking correct. I suggest instead that the middle songs function as a microcosm for the larger whole. The seventh song, in particular, mirrors the cycle's trajectory towards the visually rich and animated descriptions of the architecture of the heavenly sanctuary. The adjacent songs 6 and 8 primarily focus on the multitude of angelic beings participating in the heavenly liturgy. Nevertheless, song 7 introduces into this scene the active participation of animated temple architecture in singing praise to God. The graphic depiction of angels carved or woven into the walls, floors, implements and tapestries of the heavenly sanctuary is a distinctive feature of the cycle.¹⁷ In fact, these

¹⁷ See, for example, 4Q405 19, 5 (רוקמה ברני צורוח אלוהים); 4Q405 23 II, 7 (רוקמה כמאשי אורנ); אלוהים חיים מפוחח באלמי מבואי מלך); 4Q405 14–15 I, 5–6 (דימה כמאשי אורנ); see also the many other similar passages in which terms from the plastic arts appear (e.g., דימה אלוהים חיים מפוחח באלמי מבואי מלך). Similar patterns of thought and usage characterize the *Berakhot* texts from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q286–290). For critical edition, consult Bilhah Nitzan, "Berakhot," in DJD 11, 1–74. See also B. Nitzan, "4QBerakhot (4Q286–290): A Preliminary Report," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies, Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G. J. Brooke; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 53–71; idem, "4QBerakhot^{a-e} (4Q286–290): A Covenantal Ceremony in the Light of Related Texts," *RevQ* 16/64 (1995): 487–506. See most recently Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 49–82. architectural structures increasingly come to dominate the singing of praise.¹⁸ The general trajectory within song 7 – from praising angels to praising architectural structures – mirrors the narrative arc of the entire cycle in its movement away from the human community towards the increasing angelification of temple architecture. This virtually unique form of "architectural" participation is achieved by 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.¹⁹ Thus, although on the whole the middle section of the work emphasizes rigid order and hierarchy, it presages the fragmentation of formal poetic structure and the concomitant expansion of the circle of participation in liturgical praise. Songs 6–8 demarcate a coherent dramatic scene in which God, the chief angels and the angelic multitude, along with the animated architectural features of the heavenly sanctuary, all play central roles.

Song 6^{20} includes two adjacent, but independent, poetic units, a cycle of the praises of the seven chief princes of the angels and a cycle of their blessings. The chief princes ($\mathfrak{W}\mathfrak{W}$) in this composition are most certainly angelic figures who lead seven companies of angels.²¹ These two hymns share a wide variety of thematic and formal features. Both emphasize the importance of a hierarchical and sequential process of liturgical action. This heavily systematized representation of praise offered to God by the heavenly entourage enhances the already ritualized atmosphere of the cycle. Yet, these units are not static. For its effectiveness, each depends on its manipulation of highly controlled verbal variation, in particular the use of synonyms for the act of praise itself. In this way, the units generate a tension between the repetition of formulaic syntactic structures and

¹⁵ Newsom, Songs, 13–17; Newsom, "Merkabah Exegesis," 13. Morray-Jones views the seventh song only as a preliminary crescendo; in his view, song 12 serves as the climax of the cycle and song 13 as its denoument (Morray-Jones, "Temple Within," 417–20).

¹⁵ Devorah 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; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 31–51, esp. 41 n. 40.

¹⁸ See my comments below on 4Q401 1 I, 41-46. Cf. 4Q403 1 II, 11-17.

¹⁹ See my forthcoming article "Angelic Architecture: Temple Art and The Poetics of Praise in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," in In Heaven as It is on Earth: Imagined Realms and Earthly Realities (ed. R. S. Abusch and A. Y. Reed; New York: Cambridge University Press),

 $^{^{20}}$ Maslk I, 8-H, 1–26 = 4Q403 1 I, 1–29; 4Q404 1–2; 4Q405 1–3; possibly also 4Q401 3, 13.

²¹ According to Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 120, these seven angelic figures are akin to the seven archangels widely referred to in second temple Jewish literature (e.g., Tobit 12:15; *1 Enoch* 20:1-7; *T. Levi* 8:2). See also the seven angels who "stand before God" in the heavenly temple in Revelation (8:2-3, 6-13; 9:1, 13; 11:15; 15:1, 5-7; 16:1-21). The designation "chief prince" draws on both military (e.g., Exodus 18:25; Numbers 1; 1QM III, 12-14) and cultic (e.g., 2 Kings 25:18; 1QM II, 1; XV, 4; XVI, 11) vocabulary.

the spontaneity of irregularity. Moreover, when taken as a unit, these hymns draw a direct parallel between the praise offered God by the chief princes and the blessings offered in God's name by the chief princes to the rest of the angelic host. This movement serves to evoke an inclusive depiction of the supernal assembly in which the chief princes function as active hinge figures, mediating between God and the wider community of lower angelic beings.

II. The Praise of the Seven Chief Princes

The praise of the seven chief princes $(4Q403\ 1\ I,\ 1-9;\ Mas1k\ II,\ 1-22)$ contains seven parallel liturgical proclamations concerning the recitation of hymns of praise to God. Each of these liturgical phrases is characterized by a theme word designating the type of praise offered in each (e.g., "blessings," "magnification," etc.). These designations are recapitulated in nominal form at the end of the hymn in a condensation of the entire composition.

Sev]en psa[lms of his blessings; sev]en (8) [psalm]s of the magnification[of his rightcousness, seven psalms of the] exaltation of [His] kingship; [seven]psalms of [the praise of His glory; sev]en ps[alms of thanksgiving for His wonders;] (9) [seven psalms of re]joi[cing] in His strength; seven[psalms of prai]se for His holiness.²²

As we shall see, this "précis" form is typical of this genre of descriptive hymns of praise. Yet, alongside its fixed verbal constituents, this hymn is remarkable for its deployment of formal variation, and the productive tension it develops between its static and dynamic elements.

The formal poetic patterns are parsed in Table 1 below. This table breaks the hymn into the seven constituent units built around the praise offered by the successive chief princes (first, second, third, etc.). In addition, each of these seven units is broken into three sections, marked 1, 2 and 3 under the leftmost column ("element designation"). Each of these phrases is in turn broken down into three phrases marked a, b, and c according to their function in the phrase, which is described in the column to its right. For example, the designation 1a indicates that phrase 1a serves as the "title of praise" (function "a") within "section 1." It is important to note that these

Table 1. Order of Praise (4Q403 1 1, 1-7): Overall Structure of Composition²³

Phrase Designa- tion	Function of Phrase	First Prince	Second Prince	Third Prince	Fourth Prince	Fifth Prince	Sixth Prince	Seventh Prince
theme 1 (underlined)	key word	ברד	מרב	<u>sn</u>	שכח		רנן	זמר
theme 2 (italicized)	key word	עלש	יצדק	מלאך	נבר	כבד	טוכ	קדש
1a: <i>THL</i> + theme 1 (nominal)	title of praise	תהלת ברכה	מהלה נ <u>רולה</u>	תהלת רומס	ההלת שבח	מדלה הנדות	חהלה 25	חהלה זמר
lb: tongue + ordinal number	instrument of praise	בלשון הראישון	בלשון השני	בלשון השלישי	בלשון הרביעי	בלשון החמישי	בלשון השטי	בלשון השביעי
1c: subjective genitive (3 + 7 only)	actor: addresser			לנשיאי רוש				לנשיאי רוש
2a: theme 1 (3 + 7 only)	title of praise			רומם אמתו				זמר עוז
2c: divine epithet + theme 2	actor: addressee	לאלוהי עולמים	למלך אמה וצרק	למלך מלאכים	לנבורפל כל אלוהים (inverted)	למלך הכבוד	לאל המכ	לאלוחי קודש
2b: 7-fold (static) + theme 1 + <i>PL</i> '	song of praise: instrumental	בשבעה <u>ברכות</u> פלאיה	בשבעה <u>נרולות</u> פלאיה	בשבעה <u>הימי</u> פלאיה	בשבעה נכורות פלאח	בשבעה הודות פלאיה	כשבעה רצות פלאיה	כשבעה זברי נפלאתיה
3a: theme 1 (verbal form)	act of praise	ובבד	ונדיל	רימס	נשבח	ודנ	D.	ונפר
3c: divine epithet + theme 2	actor: addressee	למלך כול קדושי עולמים	לאל כול אלוהו מערי צרק	לאלוהי מלאכי רום	לאלוחי נבורות	לאל הכבוד	למלך דטוכ	למלך הקדוש
3b: 7-fold, 7-fold (static) + <i>DBR</i> + theme 1 + <i>PL</i> ?	song of praise: instrumental	שבעה בשבעה דברי ברכות פלא	שבעה בשבעה רברי נרולוה פלא	שבעה בטבעה דכרי חומי פלא	טבעה כשבעה רברי חשכוחות פלא	שבעה בשבעה רכרי הרות פלא	שבעה בשבעה רכרי רצת פלא	שבעה בשבעה רברי זמרי פלא

²² 4O403 1 I, 7-9 (Newsom, "Shirot," 260).

 $^{^{23}}$ The table represents a composite of Mas1k ii 1-19 and 4Q403 1 i, 1-7 (Newsom, "Shirot," 243-44 and 256). For detailed parsing of this unit's poetic structure, see also Newsom, "Shirot," 249-50.

function designations (a, b and c) do not appear in the same order in all three sections, further enhancing the tension between fixity and variation, which is vital to the poetic motion of the composition. This tension can most clearly be seen in the contrast between the static use of the numeric designations and the dynamic use of progressive enumeration. For instance, the "tongue" ($\forall \forall \forall \rangle$) with which the praise is spoken (phrase 1b) builds to its logical climax as it progresses through the ordinal numbers. In contrast, the other numerical designations in the hymn (2b and 3b) use as their constant the number seven, which in each case modifies the medium of praise. At the same time, the phrases containing the static number designation vary in their use of the two theme words that mark each of the seven proclamations.

Alongside this tension within each of the seven units, the composition exhibits significant variation amongst these units. Scholars have noted that each proclamation contains two parallel statements: a noun phrase describing the type of praise to be recited and a verbal clause declaring its actual recitation.²⁴ For example, in the psalm of the fifth chief prince, the nominal phrase "seven wondrous thanksgivings" is immediately followed by the statement "he will give thanks."²⁵ In each proclamation, a single theme word is used in parallel constructions. This twofold structure constitutes the inner logic of each of the seven phrases from which the composition is built. The potentiality of the noun phrase is set in motion by its verbal realization.

As shown in Table 1, however, the double structure does not characterize the entire composition. While the hymn generally follows this pattern, it diverges from it in a number of crucial cases. In two crucial instances, the hymn deviates from this twofold pattern. In the praise of princes 3 and 7, the proclamation breaks down into 3 separable sections of 3 phrases each (1a-b-c, 2a-c-b, 3a-c-b)rather than 2 units with 4 and 3 phrases respectively (1a-b + 2c-b, 3a-c-b), as in the other five units.²⁶ Rather than a 4+3 metrical

²⁴ For discussion of this twofold pattern, see especially Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 299.

rhythm, the proclamations of princes 3 and 7, have a 3+3+3 metrical pattern.²⁷ This contrast between the twofold and threefold structure is laid out in the analysis in Tables 2a (the third chief prince) and Table 2b (the fourth chief prince).

Table 2a. Praise of Third Chief Prince (4Q403 1 I, 1): Unit Structure

Psalm of exaltation (title)	la: title	תהלת רומם
by the tongue of the third (instrument)	lb: instrument	בלשון השלישי
of the chief princes (actor)	lc: addresser	לנשיאי רוש
an exaltation <of faithfulness<="" his="" td=""><td>2a: title</td><td>רומם <אנתו</td></of>	2a: title	רומם <אנתו
to the King of angels	2c: addressee	למלך מלאכים
with its seven wondrous exaltations	2b: instrument	בשבעה רומי פלאיה
he will> ²⁸ exalt the God of lofty angels seven times with seven words of wondrous exaltation.	3a: action 3c: addressee 3b: instrument	רומם> לאלוהי מלאכי רום שבעה בשבעה דברי רומי פלא

Table 2b. Praise of Fourth Chief Prince (4Q403 1 I, 2-3): Unit Structure

Psalm of praise	la	תהלה שבת
by the tongue of the fourth	lb	בשלון הרביעי
	$\langle \mathbf{lc} \rangle$	
	(2a)	····· ······
to the Warrior who is above all heavenly	$1c=\langle 2c \rangle$	לנבור על כול אלוהים
beings with its seven wondrous acts of	1b'=(2b)	בשבע גבורות פלאה
power		
and he will praise	2a=(3a)	רשבת
the God of power	2c=(3c)	לאלוהי נבורוה
seven times with seven words of wondrous	2b'=(3b)	שבעה בשבעה רברי תשבהות
praise.		פלא

This reconstruction is supported by my poetic analysis, since, if we read לששא, we expect it to be followed by the modifier רוס and, most likely, also element 2a, for which there is not enough room in the line. Concerning the possibility that elements 1c and 2a did occur in the preceding line we must remain entirely agnostic, since we have no basis on which to reconstruct the section between the end of the first fragment of song 6 (Mas1k I, 8–21) and the beginning of the praise of the seven chief princes. I prefer to reconstruct the words preceding line 1 of the fragment simply as prefer to reconstruct the reconstruction in Davila, Liturgical Works, 116–7.

²⁵ 4Q403 1 I, 3-4 (Newsom, "Shirot," 260).

²⁶ The first line of the praise of the first chief prince is missing in all available fragments, although Mas1k II, 1-6 seems to begin in the middle of this unit. Newsom has reconstructed this fragmentary first line in the following manner: (קור ברכות, פלאיה נברך) favoring לאלוהי (Newsom, "Shirot," 244).

²⁷ Compare Nitzan, Qumran Prayer, 299 n. 84.

²⁸ See Newsom, *Songs*, 181: "The text of 4Q403 1 i 1 is haplographic. MasShirShab ii 7 must have contained elements D-F, though unfortunately this material is lost in the lacuna. The schematic reconstruction is modeled after the psalm account of the seventh chief prince. The word TRX appears to be preserved in 4Q405 3 i 13."

The twofold pattern, here exemplified by the proclamation of the fourth chief prince, suits well the dramatic setting of the hymn in which two parties are involved, God and the group of chief princes. Yet, those proclamations structured in this twofold pattern lack two important elements present in proclamations 3 and 7. These threefold proclamations repeat the nominal use of the theme word in element 2a. More importantly, the designation לנשיאי רוש ("of the chief princes") is found only in the threefold structure of proclamations 3 and 7. Aside from this designation, the composition nowhere indicates the identity of those who sing these praises to God. This genitival construction with lamed is, therefore, crucial to the basic meaning of the hymn. Without it, we would not be able to grasp the relationship between the actors in the hymn and the recipient of the praise. Of course, we might anticipate that the praise of the seventh chief prince, as the culmination of the hymn, would deviate from the dominant twofold pattern. Yet, the hymn's typological use of the number seven does not account for the deviation from this pattern in the third proclamation. It seems that for the author of the hymn the sevenfold structure composed of threefold phrasing serves as the model for a perfectly balanced composition. The twofold structure, lacking as it does all mention of the pivotal actors in the liturgical performance and limping along in its imbalanced rhythm, seems provisional alongside the more comprehensive arrangement. By setting apart the third and seventh proclamation, the work highlights the importance of the typological numbers 3 and 7, which were central to the author's conception of order in the heavens. By subtly replacing the twofold pattern with the more stable threefold one, the hymn prefigures in its formal structure the three-tiered image of the heavenly community realized in the second portion of song 6.

III. The Blessings of the Seven Chief Princes

Unlike the previous composition, the blessings hymn found in the second half of the sixth song $(4Q403 \ 1 \ I, 10-29; 4Q404 \ 1-2; 4Q405 \ 3 \ II, 1-19; Mas1k II, 23-26)$ maintains a regular structure throughout. Despite a few minor discrepancies,²⁹ each of the seven units of which the hymn is composed can be divided into a threefold pattern; each

Tab	le 3.	Blessing	of	Seventh	Chief	Prince	(4Q403	1.	l, 23	-26):	Unit	Structure [*]	j
-----	-------	----------	----	---------	-------	--------	--------	----	-------	-------	------	------------------------	---

Phrase	Function of Phrase	Translation	Hebrew Original		
1a itle of unit: ordinal number (variable component) + chief prince (fixed)		The seventh among the chief princes	הטביעי בנשיאי רוש		
1b	verb of blessing (fixed)	will bless	יברך		
lc	instrumental epithet: ³¹ "name" (fixed) + attribute of God [theme word 1] (variable)	in the name of His holiness	בשם קדשו		
Id	recipients of blessing: "all" (fixed) + substantive [theme 1 in units 3, 4, 6, 7] (variable) + ethical/epistemological terms (units 3-7)	all the holy ones who establish knowledge	לכול <i>קדושים</i> ממיסרי דעת		
1e instrument: "seven words" (fixed) + nominal [theme 1 in princes 3, 4, 6, 7] (variable) + PL' (fixed)		with seven words of His wondrous holiness	בשבעה רברי קודש פלאו		
2b	verb of blessing (fixed)	and he will bless	וברך		
2d	recipients of blessing: "all" (fixed) + substantive (variable) + object (often ethical/ epistemological)	all who exalt His statutes	לכול ברימי משפטיו		
2e	instrument: "seven words" (fixed) + PL^2 (fixed)	with seven wondrous words	כשבעה דברי פלא		
2f	function of blessing (only in princes 6, 7)	to be as strong shields	למנני עוז		
3Ь	verb of blessing: fixed	and he will bless	וברך		
3d	recipients of blessing: "all" (fixed) + substantive in construct with object, often ethical/ epistemological (variable)	all who are appointed for righteousness	לכול נועדי צדק		
3g	attributes of recipients: participle + object + adverb (only in song 7)	who praise His glorious kingship [] forever	מהללי מלכוח כבודו () נצח		
3e	instrument: "seven words" (fixed) + PL' (variation in units 4, 5)	with seven wondrous words	בשבעה דכרי פלא		
3f	function of blessing /missing in unit 3)	for eternal peace.	לטלום שלמים		

³⁰ Text and translation are from Newsom, "Shirot," 257, 261. Lacunae are supplied from 4Q404 2, 5–8 (Newsom, "Shirot," 295) and 4Q405 3a H, 15–19. For detailed parsing of this unit's poetic structure, see Newsom, "Shirot," 268; Núzan, *Quarran Prayer*, 301–7.

²⁹ These variations are noted in Newsom, Songs, 196.

³¹ I understand this element instrumentally because of its similarity to the phrase

section is demarcated by the verb "to bless" (elements 1b, 2b and 3b). As in the previous table, I have categorized each phrase according to both the section in which it occurs (1, 2, and 3) and its function (a, b, c, d, e and f). Each of these phrases is composite, made up of both variable and fixed elements.

This hymn shares a number of important similarities with the previous one. Most noticeable is a passage at the close of the main body of the hymn which recapitulates its foregoing action: "And all the [chief] princes [will bless togethe]r the divine [g]od[s] in [His holy name with] all (27) [their] sevenfold t[estimonies. And] they will bless those appointed for righteousness and all the bles[sed... bles]sed for e[ve]r [...] (28) to them."32 Yet, since the composition is not characterized by the use of theme words, the recapitulation is not as extensive. In fact, paronomasia is employed in the blessings of only princes 3, 4, 6, and 7. And, where it does turn up, it is only employed in the first section of the unit. This relatively restricted use of variation is further emphasized by the recurrent use of which is incorporated into a number of fixed expressions throughout the hymn (e.g., element 2e: דברי פלא בשבעה). Thus, the blessings hymn subordinates to its rigid phraseology the modes of variation so characteristic of the preceding composition. The few deviations from the established pattern are no more than minor shifts within the predictable pattern (e.g., phrase 3e in units 4 and 5). Those deviations that do perform a significant function within the composition (such as phrases 2f, and 3f, which clarify the function of the blessing and the identity of the recipients) are located primarily towards the culmination of the hymn in the praise of the sixth and seventh princes.

This remarkably rigid and stable threefold structure should in large measure be read as a formal expression of the hymn's dramatic action, the reciprocal three-way exchange among the hymn's primary actors. Unlike the praise of the seven chief princes, which restricts its dialogue to two actors, the giver and the recipient of praise, the blessings of the seven chief princes incorporate the broader community of angels into its dramatic setting. The seven chief princes are introduced in the first element of the song (1a), followed imme-

diately by the fixed phrase "will bless" (כרך). The agent in whose name this action is accomplished, namely God himself, is then given. The subsequent two sections (2 and 3) do not recapitulate the actions of the princes and God, only briefly echoing the verb of blessing (phrases 2b and 3b). Instead, they describe in detail the attributes of the recipients. In this way, they focalize the set of actors entirely missing from the previous hymn. This emphasis on the comprehensive scope of this community of recipients is further evident from the application in each of the three sections of the word "all" $(\Box C)$ to the angelic ranks (1d, 2d and 3d). The chief princes, rather than being solely concerned with praising God, are here described as turning outwards toward the multitude of angels in order to mediate to them the fruits of their praise, God's blessing. The composition closes with a blessing formula, the only portion of either of the hymns of song 6 formulated in direct discourse, recited by the seven chief princes along with the larger multitude: "Blessed be the Lord, the K[ing of] all, above all blessings and pr[aise."³³ This benediction is then followed by a statement that confirms the triangle of reciprocity prefigured by the formal structure of the composition: "And he will bless all the holy] ones who bless [Him and declare Him right]eous (29) in the name of His glory. [And He will bl]ess all the everlastingly blessed ones."34

The emphasis on the recipients of blessing in this hymn and their inclusion in the liturgical action is striking, raising important questions about the boundaries of this tripartite congregation. This is especially true since the text often characterizes these recipients of blessing using either "ethical" or "epistemological" qualities (elements 1d, 2d, and 3d). For example, such phrases as ירוך 35 ("those whose way is perfect") and אין מערי צרק 1d, 2d, are applied to this group. These attributes raise crucial questions concerning the identity of the actors depicted in the hymn,

[&]quot;by the tongue of" in the preceding cycle. Newsom interprets the phrase as an invocation (Newsom, *Songs*, 195).

³² 4Q403 1 I, 26-28 (Newsom, "Shirot," 261).

⁴⁹ 4Q403 1 I, 28 (Newson, "Shirot," 261).

³⁴ 4Q403 1 I, 28-29 (Newsom, "Shirot," 261).

¹⁵ $4\overline{Q}403$ 1 I, 22. For the use of this phrase, see especially 1QS II, 2; CD II, 15–16; 1QM XIV, 7. Davila writes: "With small variations, the phrase 'those whose way is sound' appears often in the Q[umran] L[iterature]... always referring to human beings, especially the sectarians. Presumably it applies to human beings here as well" (*Liturgical Works*, 121–2).

³⁶ 4Q403 I I, 27. In 1QSa II, 2, the phrase הוערים לעצה היוד is applied to members of the covenantal community (the *yahad*).

because they make explicit use of semantic fields drawn from the human sphere. It remains unclear whether such phrases refer to human or angelic figures. This problem is especially acute in the case of the blessings hymn, which lacks any explicit statement concerning the identity of this group.³⁷ Moreover, this question proves particularly important for establishing the relationship between the human narrators of the sevenfold hymns and the liturgical action they describe. Are we then to imagine a closed community in heaven? What place does the human community have in this liturgical drama?

In an attempt to answer precisely these questions, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis has developed a new interpretative paradigm for the *Songs*, arguing that "much of the language within the *Songs*, though not all, refers to the Qumran community members who now have a heavenly, angelic and divine identity."³⁸ Building upon the possibility that the Qumran community and, in particular, its priesthood conceptualized itself in angelic and even divine terms, Fletcher-Louis interprets the use of a common semantic field to describe both humans and angels as evidence for their ultimate identification.³⁹ This view seems to assume that linguistic identity. This assumption, however, is especially problematic in the *Songs*, in which language functions primarily as a mode of representation and the imagined realms are perforce described as mirroring the earthly reality of the author(s).

In fact, the *Songs* themselves explicitly reject the idea that the boundary between the human and the angelic is permeable. The one interjection on the part of the human community in the entire cycle is an articulation of anxiety precisely concerning the limits of human knowledge and the human capacity to participate in the heavenly praise along with the angels: "(6) But [...] how shall we be considered [among] them (\Box)? And how shall our priest-hood (be considered) in their dwellings? And [our] holiness their (7) holiness? [What] is the offering of our tongues of dust (\Box)

(compared) with the knowledge of the g[ods?"⁴⁰ This use of the first person plural stands in marked contrast to the third person plural pronouns applied to the angelic singers throughout the "blessings" hymn. The human tongue (לשון) remains qualitatively different from the "tongues" which serve as the instruments of angelic praise throughout songs 6–8.⁴¹ The *Songs* thus articulate a hierarchy in which a fundamental gap divides the human community from its heavenly counterpart.

This reading of this passage is complicated by the allusion to human song contained in the fragmentary section that follows: "our jubilation, let us exalt the God of knowledge לאלוהי (לארובית גרוממה לאלוהי) (דעה) Although this line employs verbal roots elsewhere in the cycle applied to angelic song (רנה רמם), I do not think that these words are in any way intended to undermine the distinction just drawn between human and angelic praise. Instead, this line simply continues the logic of the preceding section by extending this hierarchical thinking to include God Himself: God is deserving of human praise because He is as far removed from the angels ("all who have knowledge" of line 9) as they are from human beings. Taken as a whole, the argument of this passage resembles Psalm 8, which simultaneously emphasizes the praiseworthiness of God by articulating human inadequacy, while at the same time affirming the necessity of human praise. Likewise, the Songs situate human song within a hierarchy of praise. Human praise can appropriately express the glory of God, but is nevertheless fundamentally distinct from the higher modes of praise recited by the angels.

More precisely stated, this fragment of the *Songs* should be read as an explicit polemical rejection of the possibility of full human participation in the angelic sphere.⁴³ Although uncommon, this conception of human participation is articulated elsewhere in the texts

 $^{^{37}}$ Newsom notes that "the one explicit reference to angels (... לכול $\mathfrak{K}(\mathcal{C})$ in 4Q403 l i 18) is a damaged reading." (Newsom, Songs, 196).

³⁶ Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 367–99, esp. 369.

¹³⁹ His analysis is heavily indebted to Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 (1992): 1-31.

^{* 4}Q400 2, 5-8. Translation from Newsom, "Shirot," 188.

¹¹ Contrast especially the phrase הרומת לשוניהם in 4Q403 1 II, 26. For the systematic use of "tongue" as the primary instrument of praise, see also 4Q403 1 I, 6; 4Q403 1 II, 26–29; 4Q403 1 II, 36–37 and *passim*.

¹² 4Q400 2, 8 (Newsom, "Shirot," 188).

⁴³ My view concurs with the findings of Esther Chazon: "To sum up, the Shirot maintain a substantive and qualitative distinction between human praise and that of the angels." (Esther G. Chazon, "Liturgical Communion with the Angels at Quimran," in Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Quimran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Quimran Studies Oslo 1998, Published in Memory

found at the Dead Sea, most notably a fragmentary hymn that has been termed the "Self-Glorification Hymn" by Esther Eshel, the text's primary editor.⁴⁴ According to Eileen Schuller, this poetic composition is found in two separate recensions at Qumran, the first in three manuscripts (4Q427 6 III, 1-2 + 7 I, 5-23 [= 4QH^a], 4Q471b, and 1QH^a XXVI, 6-14) and the second in a closely related, but distinct, text, 4Q491 11 L⁴⁵ A fifth fragment, 4Q431 (= 4QH^e), written in a hand very similar to 4Q471b, contains a hymn that follows the "Self-Glorification Hymn" in that manuscript.⁴⁶ This complex textual situation has raised important questions concerning both the place of this material within the wider Hodayot corpus47 and the redactional activity it underwent in its transmission within the Oumran community.48 From her synoptic analysis of these fragments, Devorah Dimant has concluded that the first person "Self-Glorification Hymn" was initially an older, independent unit that was juxtaposed with a second-person plural address and thereby incorporated into a new textual complex.49

⁴⁴ Esther Eshel, "4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn," RevQ 17/65-68 (1996): 186-94; idem, "4QSelf-Glorification Hymn (= 4QH^c frg. 1?)," in Qumran Cave 4: VI, Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2 (DJD 29; ed. E. Chazon et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 421-32.

⁴⁵ Eileen Schuller, "4QHodayot"," in DJD 29, 100–102. For text and translation of 4Q427 6 III, 1-2 + 7 I, 5-23, consult idem, "4QHodayot"," 95–108; idem, "A Hymn from a Cave Four *Hodayot* Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii," *JBL* 112 (1993): 605–28; idem, "The Cave 4 *Hodayot* Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description," *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–150. For emendations and comparison of three of these manuscripts, see Devorah Dimant, "A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q 427 7, 4Q491 11 and 4Q471B," *JQR* 85 (1994): 157–61. See also in the same volume John J. Collins and Devorah Dimant, "A Thrice-Told Hymn," *JQR* 85 (1994): 151–55. For 4Q491, consult Maurice Baillet, *Quartan Grotte 4. III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 26–29.

³⁶ Schuller, "4QHodayot"," 199-208.

¹⁷ See Eileen Schuller, "The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like (with Particular Attention to 4Q433, 4Q433a, and 4Q440," in Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumnan, 182-93.

¹⁸ Eshel maintains that the "Self-Glorification Hymn" was initially a separate composition, which was subsequently interpolated into the *Hodayot* corpus (Eshel, "4Q471b," 191-4). For differing opinions concerning the relationship amongst these various fragments as well as of these fragments to the *Hodayot* corpus, see Martin G. Abegg, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of B. Z. Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 136-8.

¹⁹ Dimant, "Synoptic Comparison," 161: "4Q491 and 4Q427 share not only the transition from a first person hymn to a second personal plural address, but also

The speaker of this independent poetic unit makes the claim that he has achieved an exalted status among the angels. This claim has made the question of the identity of the speaker central to the interpretation of the hymn and its potential significance for our understanding of the Qumran community.⁵⁰ Yet, whether the speaker should be identified as Michael, the Teacher of Righteousness, or the eschatological high priest, what makes the hymn most important for comparison with the *Songs* is the paradoxical tension it maintains between the speaker's apparent degradation at hands of men and his elevated status among the angels. The speaker described himself as "despised," "despicable," and "shunned" by men,⁵¹ while at the same time claiming that he "dwells in the holy council"⁵² and is even permitted to take a seat in heaven.⁵³ The speaker's rhetorically effective self-deprecating stance functions as an emblem of his special status.

What then is the relationship between this "false modesty" and the expression of human limitation in the *Songs*? Just as in the *Songs*, the author of the "Self-Glorification Hymn" employs the root דוש in the *hitpa'el* in order to articulate his place in the hierarchy of creation. Yet, the speaker here arrives at the opposite conclusion. Consistent with his identity as "beloved of the king and companion to the holy ones" (דיר מלך רע קרושים),⁵⁴ he states: "I am reckoned

⁵⁰ For differing opinions on this question, see Baillet, DJD 7, 2-72; Morton Smith, "Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a," in Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Figael Yadin (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 181-88; see also a revised version of this paper: idem, "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491," in Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290-301; John J. Collins, "A Throne in the Heavens: Apotheosis in Pre-Christian Judaism," in Death, Ecstay, and Other Worldly Journeys (ed. J. J. Collins and M. Fishbane; Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1995), 43-58; Martin G. Abegg, "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness," in Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 61-73. Most recently, Eshel argued that the speaker should be identified as the eschatological high priest (Eshel, DJD 29, 424-7).

³⁴ 4Q471b 2-3. For texts and translations, I follow Eshel, DJD 29, 428-31.

³² 4Q471b 1.

³⁴ 4Q471b 6.

of Maurice Baillet [ed. D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 98-102).

actual and preceding lines ... It would mean also mean that the two distinct literary units were already juxtaposed in the textual tradition reflected by the two texts. Thus, these texts indicate the complexity, and perhaps the antiquity, of the textual and literary history lying behind these works."

³³ 4Q471b 4.

with the angels" (אני עם אלים אחחשב).55 And, whereas the speakers in the Songs doubt the purity of their tongues, the speaker here wonders "who could measure the flow of my lips (ומול שפתי מי יכיל); who can associate with me in speech (מי בלשון יוערני?)?"⁵⁶ The singular speaker of this hymn is accorded precisely the exalted status and function that the communal collective denies itself in the Sabbath cycle. The polemic contained in the Songs need not be seen as a refutation of the specific claims put forward in this hymn. Certainly we need not seek theological uniformity in the collection, especially considering the possible nonsectarian nature of the Sabbath cycle.57 Yet, even if we are to view these two texts as parts of a unified system, we should be careful not to conflate their intended meaning by seeking a stable notion of "angelification" or "participation" throughout the Qumran corpus. The "Self-Glorification Hymn" explores the special and unique status of one exceptional figure, whereas the Songs seek to articulate a hierarchical relationship between the human narrators and the angelic actors in the heavenly liturgical drama.

Although comparison between works within the broader corpus of materials found at Qumran can often unlock the meaning of individual works, this approach just as often lead to pitfalls in interpretation. My formal analysis of the Songs has demonstrated the coherence between the literary genre of the cycle and its theological stance concerning the role of the human in liturgical acts of praise. In so far as the human community functions as the implied narrators of the heavenly drama, they do participate in the liturgy, but only in this limited sense. This form of participation in no way constitutes experiential or ontological transformation. In fact, the descriptive and indirect discourse of the hymns lends a voyeuristic quality to the Songs. The human narrators stand outside the threefold drama depicted in the sixth song of the cycle. Through its use of highly formal patterns of description, the hymn maintains the rigid internal boundaries within the celestial community and between the heavens and the earth. The structure of the sevenfold hymn thus serves an essential function in shaping the significance of the work. In order to grasp more fully the nature of the sevenfold hymn, the following section will explore the way this form maintains its essentially descriptive character within a vastly different literary setting.

IV. Sevenfold Praise in the Hekhalot Corpus: אדדה דוא אדדן (Hekhalot Rabbati §271)

The hymn analyzed in this section, "You are Lord" (§271), is contained in the Hekhalot literature, the earliest independent corpus of Jewish mystical writings. This composition falls at the end of the most stable and prevalent configuration of the macroform Hekhalot Rabbati, §§81-277.58 In this context, it is found embedded in a short collection of primarily liturgical compositions (§§268-277). A fragment detailing the alternate names of the angel Metatron (§277), which concludes with a benediction, marks the end of this section. In fact, most of the compositions which comprise this portion of Hekhalot Rabbati (except §268 and §277) are first attested in the oldest identifiable fragment of the Hekhalot corpus found amongst the textual remains of the Cairo Geniza, T.-S. K 21.95.S, although often only in partial form and in a radically dissimilar order.⁵⁹ This fragment, written on a leather scroll (megillah), was likely copied before the 9th century.⁶⁰ Johann Maier is the last scholar to have subjected any of these hymns to thorough formal analysis.⁶¹ To my knowledge, the formal and discursive features of the sevenfold §271 have never been compared to those of the Qumran Songs.

All of the hymns contained in this discrete textual unit are characterized by highly formal poetic features. §271, however, is unique for its use of the number seven as a structuring principle. This composition

⁴⁶ Schäfer, Geniza-Fragmente, 10.

 $^{^{55}}$ This line is fullest in 4Q491 11 7 (Baillet, DJD 7, 26–9). Eshel reconstructions 4Q471b frag. 1c using 4Q491 (Eshel, DJD 29, 428).

⁵⁶ 4Q471b 5-6, reconstructed from 4Q491 11, 10.

³⁷ See footnote 8 above.

 $^{^{58}}$ Schäfer, Übersetzung, 2:xv-xix. The Sar-torah section that follows it (§§278-306) constitutes an independent redactional unit.

³⁹ Schäfer has published this as fragment G1 in his *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984), 9 · 32. On the implications of this fragment for the formation of the Hekhalot corpus as a whole and of *Hekhalot Rabbati* in particular, see Schäfer, "Zum Problem der redaktionellen Identität von *Hekhalot Rabbati*," 70-72; also see the English summary of this section in idem, "Tradition and Redaction in Hekhalot Literature," 10-12.

⁶¹ Johann Maier has treated two of these units separately in two brief articles. On §271, see "Hekhalot Rabbati xxvi, 5," *Judaica* 21 (1965): 129-33; on §274, "Hekhalot Rabbati xxvii, 2-5," *Judaica* 22 (1966): 209-217. My analysis is indebted to Maier's work, See also Johann Maier, "Poetisch-liturgische Stücke aus dem 'Buch der Geheimnisse," *Judaica* 24 (1968): 172-81.

consists of two sections. The first is a short introduction, which prefigures the structure of the cycle to follow: the seven theme-words used in the hymn are listed as substantives in apposition to the main title of God, i.e., Lord (18). In fact, this introductory précis lends an added dimension to these theme words, which are used as substantives nowhere else in the composition. The final line of the introduction, forms an *inclusio*, recapitulating the first line. The phrase "You are Lord" thus functions as a title, which introduces the main fixed element of the hymn, but is not included in the body of the hymn. In this way, the hymn can be read as an expansion on the "lordship" of God. This introductory section functions in very much the same way as the concluding summaries so typical of the sevenfold hymns of the *Songs*, in this case adumbrating the form and content of the hymn that follows.

The second part of the composition forms the main body of the hymn. This seven-part song details the praise offered to God by a series of figures. As in the Sabbath *Songs*, the actual words of praise are not given; instead the order of praise is described. Each of the seven phrases which make up the hymn contain three units. Each unit has a constant element and a variable element constructed from the unit's theme word. The poetic structure of these phrases can be expressed as a simple formula: constant 1 + variable 1, constant 2 + variable 2, and constant 3 + variable 3; or, more precisely, *'atlah hu* + theme word as predicate (masculine singular), *lekha* + theme word in participial form (masculine plural), and *kol ba'ale* + theme word in nominal form (abstract noun). This can best be seen in Table 4 below.

The formal similarities between this hymn and the earlier hymns of the sixth Sabbath song are striking. In addition, the hymns share a common vocabulary of praise. Some of this vocabulary has roots in the second temple period. For example, the first two elements of this hymn, \Box and \Box , are also the first two elements of the liturgical series found in 1 Chr 29:11. Even more noticeable, however, is the common emphasis on the fullness and comprehensiveness of the liturgical activity. Both the "blessings" hymn and the Hekhalot hymn make the systematic use of the word \Box . This sense of inclusiveness is further enhanced by the comprehensiveness of the formal structure.

As in the "blessings" hymn, the identity of those offering praise to God is left indeterminate. While it is true the phrase $\exists u \in U$ is

Table 4. The Sevenfold Structure of Hekhalot Rabbati §27162

·/	an g Heisian Husian	0
 You are Lord, the great (1) the mighty (2) and the awesome (3), the righteous (4) the pious, (5) and the holy (6), and the faithful (7), 	Introductory précis: 1. title phrase 2. chain of seven substantives using theme words in apposition to title	 אחה הוא ארון אורול (1) הגיבור (2) הגיבור (3) הגיבור (4) הצריק (5) החסיר (5) והנאמן (7)
3. [long-suffering and full of grace and truth]. ⁶³	3. liturgical insertion from Exodus 34:6.	3. (ארך אפים ורב) הסד ואמתן
 You are Lord, God of gods and Lord of Lords. 	4. <i>inclusio</i> expanding on title phrase	4 אתה הוא ארון. אלוהי האלהים וארוני הארונים
 5. You are great, (1A) they declare You great, (1B) all the great ones. (1C) You are mighty, (2A) they declare You mighty, (2B) all the mighty ones. (2C) 	 5. 7 threefold units: 1. 'attah hu + variable (predicate) 2. lekha + variable (m. pl. partic.) 3. kol ba^cale + variable (nominal) 	5. אחה הוא נרול לך מגדילים כל בעלי נדולה אחה הוא ניכור לך מגבירין כל בעלי נבורה
You are awesome, (3A) to You rejoice (3B) all who rejoice. (3C)		אתה הוא נורא לך מרננין כל בעלי רננות
You are righteous, (4A) they declare You righteous, (4B) all the righteous ones. (4C)		אחה הוא צדיק לך מצדיקין כל בעלי צדק

⁸² I follow the version of the text found in MS V228 of Schäfer's Sympose, except for the first phrase (ארהר הוא אדון הנרול), which is given in a shortened form (ארהר הוא אדון נרול). Several of the other versions deviate from the strict formal pattern, leaving out a phrase and placing the elements out of order (e.g., M22) or incorporating foreign material (e.g., M40 which adds הארון נרול) to some phrases). The order of the verbs of praise in V228 corresponds exactly to G1 B/16-27 (Schäfer, Geniza-Fragmente, 13).

 $^{^{63}}$ Exodus 34:6. Though present in all major manuscripts, the phrase is outside the formal constraints of the composition. It is entirely absent from the version found in G1 at B/18.

Table 4 (cont.)

You are pious, (5A)	אחה הוא תסיר
they declare You pious, (5B)	לך מחסירין ⁶
all the pious ones. (5C)	כל בעלי חסידות
You are holy, (6A)	אחה הוא קרוש
they declare You holy, (6B)	לך מקרישין
all the holy ones. (6C)	כל בעלי קרושה
You are faithful in your words, (7A) You are entrusted with faith (7B) by all the faithful ones. (7C)	אתה הוא נאמן בדבריך לך מאמינין כל בעלי אמונה

applied to humans in other portions of the Hekhalot corpus,⁶⁵ the use here is most closely paralleled in a hymn from earlier in *Hekhalot Rabbati*:

Be elated, be elated, you elevated ones (בעלי רוממה)! Be exalted, be exalted, you sublime ones (בעלי זהוון)! Be mighty, be mighty, you mighty ones (בעלי נבורה)! Be proud, be proud, you proud ones (בעלי נאוה)! Because elevation and might, pride and sublimity are for the king of the world alone *and for all his attendants* (משרחיון). For it befits the *attendants* of his pride to be proud, and the bearers of his throne are worthy of being mighty⁶⁶

This fourfold hymn bears striking resemblance to the sevenfold hymn here under consideration. Although less artful in its variation, each of the four phrases contains three units in which the theme word is used in both its nominal and its verbal form. This hymn, however, leaves no doubt that the phrase here refers to God's angelic attendants (משרחד), who are said to bear up God's throne. In light of this usage, it is doubtless the case that in §271 those who offer praise are likewise the angelic host.

Despite the similarity in angelological terminology between these two hymns, there remains a crucial difference: in §271 it is the angels who offer praise, but in §167 they serve as the very objects of veneration. In both cases, it is the human community that functions as narrators. However, in one case the discourse is indirect and descriptive, while in the other the human voice participates directly in the praise. This disparity between these two hymns corresponds to the widely divergent judgments offered in the Hekhalot corpus concerning the appropriateness of human participation in the angelic liturgy and the possibility for human mediation between the heavenly and earthly spheres.⁶⁷ Immediately following the hymn in §167, the text makes an unequivocal statement: "A decree from heaven upon you, descenders to the chariot, if you do not report what you have heard and if you do not testify what you have seen on the countenance, countenance of elevation and of might, of pride and of sublimity."68 However, this declaration is contested within the macroform Hekhalot Rabbati and even within the very microform containing this sevenfold hymn. For example, §274 asserts that it is the obligation of all creatures to offer praise to God. However, a parallel passage found in a Geniza fragment assigns this same responsibility to "the House of Israel in all their dwelling places" as well.69 By contrast, in §276, the text cautions: "Who can speak (about) one of your thousands upon thousands of myriads upon myriads of mighty deeds?"70 The implicit answer: neither human beings, nor angels. In yet another formulation, §307 declares: "Who can recount the wonders of God (מי יוכל להנות שבתו) Who can proclaim the praise (מי ימלל נבורות ה') of the King of Kings? Only the service-angels (אלי מלאכי השרח)"יין (אלי מלאכי השרח)

244

⁶⁴ I supply this reading from MS M22. MS V228, along with all the other manuscripts published in the *Synopse*, read מיחלים, "to long for."

⁶⁵ In particular, see §§147-8: בעלי תשוכה are said to be more beloved of God than בעלי השרח.

³⁶ §167. I follow the reading in MS M22 in Schäfer's Synopse.

⁶⁷ For a synthetic treatment of the divergent attitudes towards the relationship between human beings and angels within the Hekhalot literature, see Peter Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994). For Schäfer's treatment of the same theme in rabbinic literature, consult his *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbinischen Engelvorstellung* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975).

^{69 §169.} I again follow the reading in MS M22: אורדי מרכבה אם גורה שמים אליכם יורדי מרכבה אם גונהות שלא השיחם אל א השיחם על פנים פני רוממה וגבורה נאה החזיון.

⁶⁶ G1 D/13-14: במושבוחיהם (sic) שכן מקומ (Schäfer, *Geniza-Fragmente*, 15).

²⁰ §276. I follow MS V228.

¹¹ This passage echoes Psalm 106:2. It is only found in *Hekhalot Rabbati* in MS V228.

The implication here is that it is the task of angels, and not of humans, to offer praise to God.

Conclusion

This modest comparison of several select hymns from the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Hekhalot corpus suggests that the genre of the sevenfold hymn carried with it an implicit answer to the question of human participation in the heavenly liturgy. I have argued that the oblique, descriptive discursive style of this genre was well suited to the emphasis on organization and hierarchy characteristic of formulaic poetic structures. In this way, the sevenfold compositions we have looked at offer the human community an opportunity to participate in the heavenly liturgy drama, while at the same time asserting a fundamental boundary between human beings and the angelic host they describe. Despite the increasing emphasis in the Hekhalot literature on the permeability of the boundary between heaven and earth and between the human and the angelic, the sevenfold hymn retained its primarily indirect character. I have argued that in the highly specific form of the sevenfold praise there exist important similarities between the poetry of the Qumran sectarians and of the Hekhalot authors. In particular, the location of the human participant within in the cosmological structure imagined in the hymn, the relative directness of the poetic discourse, and even the symbolic significance of the formal sevenfold arrangement of the hymns point to a significant continuity between these compositions.

I have shown that literary influence need not be conceptualized as a process that can occur only at the poles of *oral tradition* and *concrete textual dependence*. Instead I have pursued a model of influence that takes seriously the mediating force exerted by formal poetic structures in conjunction with notions of literary genre. These alternative media are all the more potent as agents of continuity within a ritual-liturgical tradition, in this case one whose performance and musical history is virtually unrecoverable. Both of these compositions apparently belonged to a continuous tradition of postbiblical religious poetry, *the sevenfold invitation to praise*. I believe that this more cautious approach reveals that, although the *Songs* did not serve as a direct link in the evolution of Hebrew mystical poetry throughout Late Antiquity, they – like the Hekhalot hymns – can serve as snapshots of a widespread, dynamic and tenuous process of development. As I have shown, a certain style of indirect and descriptive speech constituted an intimate component of this liturgical genre. In our search for continuity in the history of Hebrew religious and mystical poetry, it is necessary to attend not only to isolated formal or thematic features of the disparate compositions, but also to their larger literary and cultural contexts.