

## EPOCHS AND END-TIME: THE 490-YEAR SCHEME IN SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE\*

CANA WERMAN

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

From the inception of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, scholars have taken note of an underlying conception shared by Qumranic and apocalyptic literature, namely, the assumption that historical events proceed according to divinely charted epochs predating creation and unfold according to a plan that includes end-times for happiness and for suffering.<sup>1</sup> The covenanters believed themselves on the threshold of a revolution that would see the completion of the divine plan and usher in the End of Days.

This article treats two works from Qumran, recently published by Devorah Dimant, that provide a deeper understanding of epochal calculations in sectarian literature, works that shed light on the self-praise of the Qumranites as “the men of truth . . . whose hands do not grow slack in the service of the truth, when the last period is drawn out for them, for all of God’s periods will come according their fixed order, as he decreed for them in the mysteries of his prudence” (1QpHab 7:10–14).<sup>2</sup> The two texts in question are the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* and *Pseudo-Moses*. Although Dimant identified *Pseudo-Moses* as part of the *Apocryphon*,<sup>3</sup> I submit that these are two separate works and

\* I wish to thank Dena Ordan for preparing the translation. This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant n. 733/03).

<sup>1</sup> For example, J. Licht, “The Doctrine of ‘Times’ according to the Sect of Qumran and Other ‘Computers of Seasons’” (Hebrew), *Eretz-Israel* 8 (1967) 63–70.

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, the translations of Qumran texts are cited from J. H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> See D. Dimant, ed., *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) (henceforth: Dimant, DJD 30). As we shall see below, the name Jeremiah appears a few times in the fragments assigned to the *Apocryphon*. Dimant’s decision to entitle 4Q390, in which God addresses an unnamed figure ‘Pseudo-Moses’ was explained by her as follows: “That this divine speech is addressed to Moses is attested by number of features. First of all, it is shown in the fact that . . . the address is modeled on the Deuteronomic phrases and allusions,

that Dimant's original identification of 4Q390 as *Pseudo-Moses* was correct.<sup>4</sup>

The following sections examine the content, structure, and historical scheme of each of these compositions separately, noting the unique features of each text. As I shall demonstrate, in their calculation of epochs, both the *Apocryphon* and *Pseudo-Moses* utilize a 490-year period whose starting point is marked by the destruction of the First Temple. Nonetheless *Pseudo-Moses*' historical scheme and worldview differ from those of the *Apocryphon*. Whereas the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* treats Antiochus' decrees and uses a 490-year span to explain their causes, *Pseudo-Moses* gives them but brief mention, centering rather on a historical scheme that employs the 490-year span to enhance attacks on the Hasmonean regime. I further argue that each of these texts originated in a different milieu: the *Apocryphon* in a non-sectarian context; *Pseudo-Moses* within the Qumran community.<sup>5</sup> In the final section I will compare the divisions of the 490-year span in *Pseudo-Moses* with the blueprints found in other works from the Qumran library.

found in almost every line. Secondly, in frg. 1 a single reference to the addressee occurs: '... They (Israel) will not walk in my ways which I have commanded you so that you may warn them.' This phrase is a combination of two typical Deuteronomic locutions related to Moses. Moreover, the task required of the addressee consists of receiving divine commandments from Yahweh and transmitting them to the people of Israel. This amounts, in fact, to a definition of Moses' characteristic role, that of law-giver and mediator between Yahweh and the people of Israel" (D. Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudipigrapha: 4Q390," *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 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992] 2.432-33). For a short survey of the history of the publication of the fragments and the names allotted them (*Pseudo-Ezekiel, Pseudo-Moses, and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah*), see Dimant, DJD 30.1-3.

<sup>4</sup> Dimant, "New Light from Qumran", 405-47. In the general introduction to the *Apocryphon* (Dimant, DJD 30.91-104) Dimant stresses the stylistic, thematic, and terminological similarity shared by all the manuscripts assigned by her to the *Apocryphon*, including 4Q390. On the wording "They (Israel) will not walk in my ways which I have commanded you so that you may warn them," which serves in the earlier paper as an indication that 4Q390 is addressed to Moses, she comments that "here the locution is apparently appropriated in a discourse to Jeremiah. Compare 4Q385a 18 I 6-7: '... ויצוה את אשר יעשו בארץ שביא[ם]ן' (Dimant, DJD 30.239). However, as we shall see below, 4Q390 differs radically from the rest of the manuscripts in its attitude toward the Return, in the sort of accusations it makes against the people of Israel, and in its use of the 490-year scheme. It is also important to note that there is no overlap between the fragments of 4Q390 and the other manuscripts. See Dimant, DJD 30.93.

<sup>5</sup> The term Qumran community is used here to denote the groups whose existence is implied by sectarian scrolls (*The Rule of the Community, Rule of the Blessings, Hodayot, Damascus Document, and the pesharim*). Characteristic features of these communities are isolation from the rest of the people due to halakhic differences and

*The Apocryphon of Jeremiah*

The *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, like Daniel, tackles the questions of theodicy that arose during the period of Antiochus' decrees,<sup>6</sup> providing, however, an answer different from the one found there. Before contrasting these two texts, I survey the structure and content of the Apocryphon.

Examination of some of the fragmentary texts that comprise the *Apocryphon* (restored mainly on the basis of 4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388a, and 4Q389) elicits three narrative levels, each represented by a different speaker: an anonymous speaker in the external frame; Jeremiah in the next level;<sup>7</sup> and God in the main body of the text. The external frame, which acquaints us with Jeremiah's life and the composition he wrote, explains how the *Apocryphon* reached the people. It describes Jeremiah's leave-taking of the exiles forced to go to Babylonia and his warning to them regarding the pitfalls of engaging in idol worship like their ancestors (4Q385a 18 i a-b 1-7; Dimant, DJD 30.159). The frame story, which goes on to relate how Jeremiah went down to Egypt, is consistent with the biblical account (Jer. 43:1-8). In the *Apocryphon* the exiles en route to Egypt turn to Jeremiah with the following request: "And they told him, 'Please inquire [of Go]d [on our behalf' but] Jeremia[h did not listen] to them, [n]ot inquiring of Go[d] on their behalf [nor offering up on their behalf] supplication and prayer" (4Q385a 18 ii 1-4; trans., Dimant, DJD 30.164). Nonetheless, God speaks to Jeremiah, commanding him to warn the people against indulging in idol worship (4Q387 1 6-7). Jeremiah, living in Egypt, sends the *Apocryphon* to the Babylonian exiles, and it is read before "a[ll the Children of I]srael" (4Q387 1 6-7; Dimant, DJD 30.220-21). The next narrative level is delivered by Jeremiah, who attests that he wept, and perhaps prayed as well, apparently in anticipation of the coming exile

---

the adoption of a solar calendar, the 364-day calendar described in the Astronomical Book in Enoch. I make no claim for a link between Khirbet Qumran and these groups, nor do I argue that its membership was confined to a single group.

<sup>6</sup> I deliberately use the term "decrees of Antiochus," in rejection of Martin Hengel's proposal that they were initiated by the high priest Menelaus, a proposal sharply criticized by Menahem Stern. See the latter's review of "M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*" (Hebrew), *Kiryat Sefer* 46 (1970-71) 94-99. Hengel recently reiterated his view in "Judaism and Hellenism Revisited," *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (ed. J. J. Collins and G. E. Sterling; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 2001) 6-37.

<sup>7</sup> This is based on the assumption that 4Q383 is part of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*. See Dimant, DJD 30.94-95.

(4Q383 1; Dimant, DJD 30.118). As mentioned earlier, God is the central speaker in the body of the text. In his answer to Jeremiah's prayer, God relates the history of the Israelite nation from beginning to end, stressing the people's ingratitude, sins, and justified punishment. On this basis, I characterize the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* as an apocalyptic work in which God is the main speaker and in which a historical overview is provided from a lofty divine perspective.<sup>8</sup>

The opening of the divine historical survey as revealed to Jeremiah has been poorly preserved.<sup>9</sup> The earliest historical event found in our fragments is the exodus from Egypt. A partially preserved sentence mentions Kadesh Barnea. Two lines later, we find "and their children I brought to the [ land ]" (4Q389 2 1-4; Dimant, DJD 30.223-24). Based on the appearance of the phrase "and what they repaid me" (l. 3), it appears likely that these lines also mentioned the sins of the people.

The lines treating the early monarchy convey the impression that the *Apocryphon's* author took a positive view of this period. God mentions Solomon in his speech to Jeremiah, saying: "and I have delivered the life of his enemies into his hand [ ] and I took sacrific[ce] from his hand" (4Q385a 1 a-b 4-6; Dimant, DJD 30.132-33). The preceding lines almost certainly spoke of David.<sup>10</sup> Although David's name has not been preserved, God notes, presumably of David, that "his heart did not grow haughty towards me" (l. 4).

On the other hand, in the continuation of this survey of the bulk of the First Temple period, the author makes accusations against the people, placing the following condemnation in God's mouth: "[and you sa]jid, ['You ] have left[ us our God' and you spurned my statutes and you forgot the festivals of my covenant], and [you] profaned [my name and my consecrated things] [and you defiled *my Temple*, and *you sacrificed* yo]ur [sacrifices] to the goat-demons, and you [ ], and you violated everything de[li]be[rately ] [and I loo]ked for faith, [but] I did not find [ ] (4Q387 1 2-6; Dimant, DJD 30.175-76).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See also: Dimant, DJD 30.96. For further evaluation of the *Apocryphon's* genre, see below.

<sup>9</sup> Its poor preservation led Dimant to conclude that this section opened the composition, being the outermost portion of the scroll when rolled, whereas the events of the Second Temple period were in the middle of the composition and of the scroll. See Dimant, DJD 30.94.

<sup>10</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.133-34.

<sup>11</sup> The italicized words are not in the manuscript cited but appear in a parallel text.

This represents the turning point of the *Apocryphon*. From here on, God's speech to Jeremiah deals with the future. God foretells the coming of a long period of exile, a punishment for the terrible sins of the people during the First Temple period; this period spans 490 years.

The book of Jeremiah constitutes the source for a seventy-year duration of the exile: "For thus said the Lord: When Babylon's seventy years are over, I will take note of you, and I will fulfill to you My promise of favor—to bring you back to this place" (Jer. 29:10). It is possible that several poorly preserved lines of the *Apocryphon*, which relate to the exile of the people from their land and allude to Lev. 26:34's setting of the exile as the number of sabbatical years not observed from the time of the Israelites' entry to the land, computed its length according to weeks of years (seven-year cycles):<sup>12</sup>

- (7) [ and I delivered ] you into the hand of your enem[y], and I made desolate [your land]  
 (8) [and the land ] paid off its sa[bba]th[s] by being desolate [ ]  
 (9) [ ] in the land[s] of [yo]ur enemies until the year of [ ]  
 (10) [ t]o your land [ to re]visit [ ]  
 (4Q387 1 7-10; Dimant, DJD 30.175-76)

Nonetheless, the author of the *Apocryphon* focuses primarily not on the people's exile from their land, but rather on that of God from his people, the time of God's "hiding his face" during which he allows them to be subjected to foreign rule. As in the book of Daniel, the seventy years of exile named by Jeremiah are interpreted in the *Apocryphon* as "seventy weeks" (Dan. 9:24); namely, 490 years; also, as in Daniel, the end of the period in the *Apocryphon* is linked to Antiochus' decrees. However, unlike Daniel, the *Apocryphon* counts jubilees and not weeks: ten jubilees, or ten forty-nine-year units will pass from the exile until the coming of redemption. Although the people have returned to their land, God is not with them, as God says to Jeremiah in the *Apocryphon*: "[ ] and be resolute to serve me with all your heart and with al[l your soul. And they will se[e[k] my pre[s]ence in their affliction, but I shall not respond to their inquiry because of the trespass [wh]ich they have trespassed [against] m[e], until the completion of ten jubilees of years; and you will be wa[l]king in ma[dness] and in blindness and bewilderment of heart" (4Q387 2 i-ii 1-5; Dimant, DJD 30.190; trans. 181).

<sup>12</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.177. The combination of Jeremiah and Leviticus 26 is already found in 2 Chron. 36:21. See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1985) 479-89.

Moreover, the author of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, unlike the author of Daniel, creates plain parallels between the sins of the people in the late First Temple period and their punishment, and that of the people during the days of the pre-Antiochus period Hellenizers and their punishment.<sup>13</sup> By way of illustration I cite the lines relevant to this issue in sequence, restored according to 4Q387, 4Q388a, and 4Q389. (Of these texts, 4Q387 is the primary witness upon which the restoration is based.)

- (1) [ ]and be resolute to serve me with all your heart
- (2) and with al[l your soul. And they will se[e[k] my pre[s]ence in their affliction, but I shall not respond to their inquiry
- (3) because of the trespass [wh]ich they have trespassed [against] m[e], until the completion of ten
- (4) jubilees of years; and you will be wa[l]king in ma[dness] and in blindness and bewilderment
- (5) of heart. And because of the sin of that<sup>14</sup> generation, I shall [tear away] the kingdom from the hand of those who hold
- (6) it, and [I sha]ll raise up over it others from another people, and [the in]solence will rule
- (7) over all [the l]and, and the kingdom of Israel will be lost. In those days
- (8) there [will] b[e a king and h]e (will) be a blasphemer and he will commit abominations, and I shall tear away
- (9) [his] king[dom, and] that [king will be handed over] to other kings.<sup>15</sup> And my face shall be hidden from Israel
- (10) and the kingdom will turn<sup>16</sup> to many nations. And the Children of Israel will be crying out
- (11) [becau]se of the heavy yoke in the lands of their captivity, and there will be none to deliver them<sup>17</sup>
- (12) because they spurned my statutes and abhorred my Torah, therefore I have hidden
- (13) my face from [them until] they accomplish their iniquity. And this is the sign to them of the requital of
- (14) their iniquity [for] I shall leave the land because of their haughtiness towards me, and they will not know
- (15) [tha]t I have spurned them and they will once again do evil, and the evil will be gr[eat]er than the former evi[l]<sup>18</sup>

<sup>13</sup> A link and a parallel between the First Temple period and the decrees of Antiochus are also found in 2 Macc. 8:19, and in chapter 15 there. However, the parallel drawn there is between the siege by Sennacherib and the decrees and not between Nebuchadnezzar and the decrees. See M. Kister, "Legends of the Destruction of the Second Temple in Avot De-Rabbi Natan" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 67 (1998) 520.

<sup>14</sup> Dimant reads וְהָיָה. In my judgment, the reading וְהָיָה suggested here better fits both the remains of the letters and the context.

<sup>15</sup> The final four words are according to 4Q385a (Dimant, DJD 30.139).

<sup>16</sup> It appears that הַשּׁוֹב should be הַשּׁוֹב; see Jer. 6:12.

<sup>17</sup> According to 4Q387 2 (Dimant, DJD 30.179) to this point; from here according to 4Q389 (Dimant, DJD 30.228).

<sup>18</sup> According to 4Q389 8 (Dimant, DJD 30.228) to this point; according to 4Q388a from this point on (Dimant, DJD 30.208).

- (16) [and they will violate the covenant which I made] with Abrah[a]m and wi[th] I[s]aac and with  
 (17) [Jacob. In those days] will arise a king of the Gentiles, a blasphemer and a doer of evil and in his [days I shall remove]  
 (18) Israel from (being) a people. In his days I shall break the kingdom of Egypt. [and I will save]<sup>19</sup>  
 (19) Egypt, and I shall break Israel and deliver it up to the sword<sup>20</sup>  
 (20) [and] I [shall lay wa]ste the [l]and and I shall drive man away and I shall abandon  
 (21) the land in the hand of the angels of Mastemot, and I shall hide [my face]  
 (22) [from Is]rael. And this shall be the sign for them in the day when I abandon the land [in desolation]  
 (23) the priests of Jerusalem [will retur]n to worship other gods  
 (24) [and to act] according to the abominations [of the Gentiles]<sup>21</sup>  
 (25) three who will rule [ ]  
 (26) [and] the holy of holie[s]  
 (27) [ ] and thos[e] who lead to righteous[ness ]

An additional fragment, 4Q387 3 (Dimant, DJD 30.191), is important for our topic. Even though it is not part of the above sequence, it may have been located nearby:

- 4Q387 3  
 (28) [ ] the altar  
 (29) [ those ki]lled by the sw[ord ]  
 (30) [ ] be polluted [ ]  
 (31) [ ] three priests who will not walk in the ways of  
 (32) [the] former [priests]. By the name of the God of Israel they will be called  
 (33) And in their days will be brought down the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant and the slaves of foreign things  
 (34) and Israel will be rent asunder in th[at] generation, each m[a]n fighting against his neighbor  
 (35) over the Torah and over the covenant. And I will send hunger upon the [lan]d, but not  
 (36) for br[ea]d, and a thirst, but no[t] for water; [ra]ther for [hearing my words]

Lines 1 to 5 declare that God has decreed to hide his face. If chronological considerations guided the author, then the lines mentioning the exile from and the return of the people to its land preceded these lines in which God hides his face. (The extant fragments do not bear witness to this sequence; on the other hand, neither do they negate it.) The author here sets forth the idea that the return to the land does not mean that God has returned to his people. The people must fulfill their iniquity (according to the biblical model of “for the iniquity of the

<sup>19</sup> My reconstruction.

<sup>20</sup> 4Q388a (Dimant, DJD 30.208) to this point; 4Q387 2 (Dimant, DJD 30.186) from this point.

<sup>21</sup> 4Q387 2 (Dimant, DJD 30.186) to this point; 4Q388a 7 (Dimant, DJD 30.208) from this point.

Amorites is not yet complete” [Gen. 15:16]) and receive their punishment. Next, the author goes on to enumerate the kingdoms that will rule over the Israelites during their exile and their return. Initially, the Israelites will be punished with loss of their independence and of their kingdom (lines 6–7).<sup>22</sup> A blasphemous king will rule (lines 7–8); he will be punished and will lose the entire kingdom and will be handed over to other kings (lines 8–9). The historical context indicates that this refers to Nebuchadnezzar and the Persian conquest of Babylonia.<sup>23</sup> Babylonia’s downfall does not hasten redemption; nor does Persia’s conquest by the Greeks (alluded to in line 10: “and the kingdom will turn to many nations”), because God’s face is hidden from the Israelites.

During this period of subjugation and of God’s hiding his face the people sin readily. As noted, the author of the *Apocryphon* draws a parallel between the late First Temple period and the Hellenizers, submitting that at the end of the 490-year period the people and the priests again sin by engaging in idol worship. The sin of the people prior to the 490-year period resembles the sin at its end: “They will once again do evil, and the evil will be gr[eat]er than the former evi[l and they will violate the covenant which I made] with Abrah[a]m and wi[th I]saac and with [Jacob]; the priests of Jerusalem [will retur]n to worship other gods [and to act] according to the abominations [of the Gentiles]” (lines 15–16; 23–24).<sup>24</sup>

The punishment inflicted on the people near the end of the ten jubilees resembles that of the late First Temple period, although the author, who was familiar with Antiochus’ reign, was aware that they could not be identical. On the one hand, in both periods we find the appearance of a blasphemous king, in the case of the latter period, to be identified as Antiochus (see lines 16–17).<sup>25</sup> On the other, as the author is cognizant that the people do not have full sovereignty, he therefore cannot speak here of the loss of the kingdom. Thus, if of the

<sup>22</sup> There is duplication here, which perhaps alludes to the long process of the loss of hegemony by the Judean kingdom (2 Kings 24–25).

<sup>23</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.183, 231.

<sup>24</sup> If three priests are mentioned in line 25, the reference may be to Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus.

<sup>25</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.210. In 1 and 2 Maccabees Antiochus is termed נבל (wicked fool). See D. R. Schwartz, “Antiochus the נבל (1 Maccabees 1:24)” (Hebrew), *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 13 (2002) 183–97. However, as Dimant notes (*ibid.*), in 1 Macc 1:24 Antiochus is accused of speaking with excessive arrogance. The similarity between the *Apocryphon* and Dan. 7 is striking: the small horn that sprouts form the head of the fourth beast (Antiochus) is said to have “a mouth that spoke arrogantly” (v. 8).

First Temple period God says, “I shall [tear away] the kingdom from the hand of those who hold it, and [I sha]ll raise up over it others from another people, and [the in]solence will rule over all [the l]and, and the kingdom of Israel will be lost” (lines 5–7), of Antiochus’ reign God says, “In his [days I shall remove] Israel from (being) a people . . . and I shall break Israel and deliver it up to the sword” (lines 17–19).<sup>26</sup>

A similar reworking is found in the author’s attempt to create parallelism for the motif of exile. The author cannot maintain that the people are being subjected to a second exile, for there was no exile of Jews from the boundaries of Palestine under Antiochus. Without creating too great a disparity from the reality of the period of Antiochus’ decrees,<sup>27</sup> the author places in God’s mouth a description similar to that of the First Temple period. The Babylonian exile which ended the First Temple period is described as follows: “[ and I delivered ]you into the hand of your enem[y], and I made desolate [your land] [and the land ]paid off its sa[bba]th[s] by being desolate [ ]” (4Q387 7–10; Dimant, DJD 30.176), and God follows this with a statement: “And my face shall be hidden from Israel” (1. 9). Concerning the period of Antiochus’ decrees, we find God saying to Jeremiah: “[and] I [shall lay wa]ste the [l]and and I shall drive man away and I shall abandon the land in the hand of the angels of Mastemot,<sup>28</sup> and I shall hide [my face] [from Is]rael” (lines 20–22).

Writing in the postdecree period, the author of the *Apocryphon* engages in a reckoning regarding the events affecting the people from the destruction of the First Temple until the decrees of Antiochus. The reason for the choice of Jeremiah specifically, both as the speaker and

<sup>26</sup> The parallel between the late First Temple period and of Antiochus’ reign also pertains to the “blasphemous king’s” attitude toward Egypt. Egypt’s power was broken during Nebuchadnezzar’s day (2 Kgs 24:7); in Antiochus’ day Egypt was on the verge of defeat (lines 18–19).

<sup>27</sup> On the flight of the residents of Judea and Jerusalem to the mountains and to the desert during the period of the decrees, see 1 Macc. 1:37, 2:28–29; 2 Macc. 5:27, 8:1.

<sup>28</sup> As Dimant comments, this is the earliest text in which the angels of Mastemot appear. One of her reasons for incorporating 4Q390 into the *Apocryphon* is the appearance of the angels of Mastemot in both works (personal communication). Note, however, that in the *Apocryphon* the angels of Mastemot appear only in the description of the decrees of Antiochus, at the conclusion of the period lasting ten jubilees. The mythic aspect of a force fomenting rebellion and sin is extremely limited in the *Apocryphon* and is used to describe a period for which the author of the second half of Daniel uses a mythical troop in explanation. *Pseudo-Moses* attributes the rule of the angels of Mastemot to a much longer time frame (see discussion below); consequently, despite the use of the same figures, the resemblance between the *Apocryphon* and *Pseudo-Moses* is restricted.

the addressee of God's message, is readily apparent. It was the prophet Jeremiah who assigned a number, seventy, to the years of exile and there is no person more suited to hear and understand the history of the people during those years. Jeremiah learns here that during the seventy (weeks of) years the people will be punished by being distanced from their land and their God. Nor does the people's desire to return to God affect the length of the exile, which is fixed "until] they accomplish their iniquity" (line 13). For part of the time that God hides his face, the angels of Mastemot rule, and the people are once again dragged into idol worship and are punished. This is explicitly stated by God: "and be resolute to serve me with all your heart and with all your soul. And they will see[k] my pre[s]ence in their affliction, but I shall not respond to their inquiry" (lines 1–2).

Accordingly, the author of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* viewed the decrees of Antiochus and the desecration of the Temple as a punishment for the sins of the people in the pre-decree period, a stance similar to the one found in 2 Maccabees.<sup>29</sup> To his story of Antiochus Epiphanes' visit to Jerusalem, the author of 2 Maccabees introduced reworked verses from the Song of Moses (Deut. 31:30–32:44), as Daniel R. Schwartz notes.<sup>30</sup> From the description found in 2 Maccabees, it appears that punishment in the form of Antiochus came because God chose to hide his face from the people due to their sins: "the Lord had neglected the Place only because He was for a moment angry at the sins of the inhabitants of the city" (2 Macc. 5:17; Anchor Bible), which echoes Deut. 32:19–20: "The Lord saw and was vexed and spurned His sons and His daughters. He said: I will hide My countenance from them." But Antiochus, the king of the "nation of fools" from the Song of

<sup>29</sup> And perhaps in the work called the *Testament (or Assumption) of Moses*. See J. J. Collins, "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; CRINT 2, vol. 2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984) 344–49. In order to substantiate this conclusion, entire chapters of the Testament must be transposed. I agree with Licht's assertion that the work has two strata ("Taxo or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance," *JJS* 12 [1961] 100–103). In my opinion, the historical scheme of the first stratum included Shivat Zion (chap. 4), moral sinning of the people during the Persian period (chap. 5:1); the sin of the Hellenizers (chap. 5) and Antiochus, whose coming is a punishment for the sins of the Hellenizers (chap. 8). (Although similar to Licht's, this scheme differs somewhat.) Because the sins of the people do not justify so severe a punishment as Antiochus inflicts, a martyrological solution, the one initiated by Taxo, is necessary (chap. 9; see *ibid.*, 95–100).

<sup>30</sup> Schwartz, "Antiochus the נבול," 196; D. R. Schwartz, "On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees," *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 227–32.

Moses (v. 21), did not understand that his success was due to God's hiding of his countenance (vv. 27–28). Yet 2 Maccabees and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* differ in their evaluation of the sin and its cause. 2 Maccabees blamed the people for their adoption of Hellenism. From his perspective, Hellenism constituted the showcases of Hellenistic culture: gymnasia, competitions, and their accompanying ceremonies.<sup>31</sup> The author of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* speaks of worshipping other gods (line 23). According to 2 Maccabees, it was the people's sin that caused the hiding of the divine countenance, which enabled Antiochus to succeed, whereas in the *Apocryphon* the people's sin resulted from the hiding of the divine countenance, itself the consequence of previous sin.

The author of the *Apocryphon* equated the adoption of Hellenistic culture by the Jerusalem priesthood with idolatry.<sup>32</sup> Evidently, in his eyes, any aspect of Hellenism was unacceptable. This perhaps sheds light on a detail in the outer frame story, which shows a clear preference for the Babylonian as opposed to the Egyptian exiles. Its author stresses that Jeremiah accompanied the exiles to Babylonia to the river (4Q385a 18 i–ii a–b 1–7; Dimant DJD 30.159–60). God's words to Jeremiah are read to the Babylonian exiles and not to the Egyptian ones (4Q389 1 6–7; Dimant, DJD 30.220–21). Nor does Jeremiah accede to the request of the exiles in Egypt to inquire of God on their behalf (4Q385a 18 ii 1–4; Dimant, DJD 30.163–64). Albeit, the book of Jeremiah also expresses hostility toward the Egyptian exiles, nonetheless, this intensifies in the *Apocryphon*. This perhaps reflects a negative attitude toward Egyptian Jewry; the author of the *Apocryphon* regarded the members of the staunchly Hellenistic Egyptian Jewish community as idolaters.

Apparently, according to the *Apocryphon*, the epoch of exile is slated to end in the period after the Hasmonean revolt. Because the full text has not survived, it is difficult, however, to determine precisely what the author foresaw or expected. It is noteworthy that some fragmentary lines contain an allusion to the completion of the process of redemption when God will fight the northern kings, namely, the Seleucids (4Q387 4; Dimant, DJD 30.194–95), and the kingdom of Greece will disappear (4Q385a 16 a-b; Dimant, DJD 30.152–53). Whether

<sup>31</sup> See B. Bar-Kochva, "Judaism and Hellenism: Between Scholarship and Journalism" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 63 (1994) 464–65; M. Himmelfarb, "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees," *Poetics Today* 19 (1998) 19–40.

<sup>32</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.188.

or not the *Apocryphon* expressed eschatological hopes cannot be ascertained, nor can we determine whether such hopes, if expressed, were linked to the conclusion of the 490-year period or some later era.

There is also a lack of clarity with regard to place of the Hasmonean revolt and regime in the *Apocryphon's* historical scheme. It is not possible to determine if its author included this period in the time of divine hiding of its countenance, that is, as belonging to the ten jubilees, or views it as later. The *Apocryphon* does not mention the Hasmoneans by name, but speaks of “three priests who will not walk in the ways of [the] former [priests]. By the name of the God of Israel they will be called. And in their days will be brought down the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant and the slaves of foreign things” (lines 31–33). The people return to the Torah, but this involves dissension: “and Israel will be rent asunder in th[at] generation, each m[a]n fighting against his neighbor over the Torah and over the covenant. And I will send hunger upon the [lan]d, but not for br[ea]d, and a thirst, but no[t] for water; [ra]ther for [hearing my words]” (lines 34–36).

Clearly, as its priests will be called by the name of God, the *Apocryphon's* author views the Hasmonean period as superior to the preceding one.<sup>33</sup> During this period the idolatry characteristic of the First Temple and the Hellenistic periods disappears. Nonetheless, a negative tone remains. Lines 34 to 36, which testify to dissension over the “Torah and over the covenant” during the Hasmonean period, are a reworking of Amos 8:11. Arguably, the following lines, which have not been preserved, could have included a reworking of the next verse: “Men shall wander from sea to sea and from north to east to seek the word of the Lord, but they shall not find it” (v. 12). If so, this passage then represents an accusation of the choice of a mistaken halakhic path by a sector of the people during the Hasmonean period. Even though the people seek the word of God, they do not find it. It is hard to determine what kind of halakhic path, if any, the author of the *Apocryphon* preferred. It is however noteworthy that the *Apocryphon* does not include any sectarian terminology known to us from the Qumran writings (terminology discussed below). Any attempt to assign the *Apocryphon* to a particular group must remain speculative, though there

<sup>33</sup> This expression perhaps sheds light on what Peshier Habakuk says regarding the Wicked Priest: “who was called by his true name at the beginning of his standing” (8:8–9).

are some affinities to the group that wrote the second letter attached to 2 Maccabees.<sup>34</sup>

I wish to return to the question of the relationship between Daniel and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, which, as noted, exhibit a shared 490-year scheme spanning the destruction of the First Temple to the postdecree period. I submit that there is dependence between the two works. In Daniel, the biblical text—Jeremiah’s seventy years—becomes an anchor for understanding the decrees of Antiochus. For their part, the *Apocryphon*’s ten jubilees are incomprehensible without the calculation from Daniel.<sup>35</sup> I suggest that the *Apocryphon* was written in reaction to Daniel. To back this proposal I briefly outline the differences between the two.

Like Daniel,<sup>36</sup> the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* contains a historical survey and an ex eventu prophecy. They differ, however, in the scope of this historical survey. Although Daniel speaks of consecutive kingdoms (Babylonia, the Medes, Persia, and Greece), he describes their coming simultaneously (chap. 7), thereby remaining faithful to a meta-historical mythical model.<sup>37</sup> Even the detailed description in Daniel 11 relates solely to the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms, and does not open with distant history. The *Apocryphon*, on the other hand, opens with antiquity, in this resembling other surveys of history known from the Bible (for example, Nehemiah’s prayer, Neh. 9). Moreover, whereas

<sup>34</sup> See Dimant, DJD 30.106–107 where she points to the similarity between the *Apocryphon* and the letter. (For a discussion of the second letter in 2 Maccabees, see D. R. Schwartz, *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation and Commentary* [Hebrew; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi 2004], 13–19; 78–93.) Dimant also points to similarity between the *Apocryphon* and other writings, such as the *Book of Baruch* and the *Epistle of Jeremiah*.

<sup>35</sup> Use is made of ‘weeks’ and ‘seventy’ in the Animal Vision (1 Enoch 85–90) in describing a period close to the one to which the *Apocryphon* relates. For a discussion of the date of the Animal Vision, see G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 360–61. Nickelsburg does not take Kister’s paper (below, n. 62) into consideration. (For further discussion see below.) However, there are no precise calculations in the Animal Vision and it seems to be alluding to a known chronology more than being its source. The calculation found in Daniel 9 seems to be the basis of this known chronology as it depends on a biblical number—70—while giving it a new meaning. Thus, the *Apocryphon* should be compared to Daniel.

<sup>36</sup> Here I follow Collins’ interpretation of the book and his discussion of its apocalyptic worldview. See J. J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 274–343; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, MT: Scholar Press, 1977).

<sup>37</sup> M. Stone, “Three Transformations in Judaism: Scripture, History and Redemption,” *Numen* 32 (1985) 218–35.

Daniel focuses mainly on foreign history, the *Apocryphon* concentrates, insofar as can be determined, on Israelite history.

Both Daniel and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* contend with Antiochus' decrees and the defilement of the Temple, and both place the explanation in the mouth of a higher authority. But there is a significant difference: in the *Apocryphon* God, not an angel, addresses Jeremiah. True, the *Apocryphon* expresses distance from God—God hides his countenance from the people during the exile. Yet, before and after the exile God again becomes close to his people. In addition, although the *Apocryphon* mentions that the angels of Mastemot rule the people, these angels have neither rivals nor allies, in contrast to Daniel's description of an open struggle in the upper regions. The animals that rise from the sea in Daniel 7 are a rebellious anti-divine force, like the he-goat of chapter 8, which harms God and his temple. Against these forces stand the holy ones and the Son of Man (7:13–14, 25–28), the heavenly equivalent of the terrestrial Israelites, who will inherit the rebellious kingdoms. The myth in Daniel carries a message that the struggle will be determined in heaven and not on earth (7:11–14). The Hasmoneans are but “a little help” (11:34), and their deeds are not wanted. In the *Apocryphon*, on the other hand, the Hasmoneans are praised, for in their day they will bring down “the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant and the slaves of foreign things.”

The *Apocryphon's* divergence from the apocalyptic worldview presented by Daniel is comprehensible in light of its author's theodicy. Antiochus' decrees are a punishment for the sin of idolatry that has spread among the people. Thus, whereas in Daniel no explanation is supplied for the deaths incurred during the persecution, and one must await resurrection (Dan. 12:2–3) to establish their cause, as far as can be determined, the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* views these deaths as justified. Its author validates reality, and therefore seeks redemption neither in upper regions nor in cosmic revolutions.

On the basis of the differences outlined above I surmise that the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* was written in different circles from that of Daniel, perhaps in a group opposing Daniel's mythical bent. Furthermore, if my evaluation is correct then we witness here a subgroup in the apocalyptic literature, one that emphasizes determinism and uses ex eventu prophecy, yet rejects the idea of active, rebellious forces in the heavenly sphere.

*Pseudo-Moses*

As I noted at the outset, *Pseudo-Moses* also utilizes a 490-year historical scheme. Close consideration of its 490-year scheme demonstrates that *Pseudo-Moses* is not part of the *Apocryphon*, but rather an independent work, which I suggest was authored in the Qumran community.

I begin by citing the two large fragments of this work (Dimant, DJD 30.237, 244–45. I follow Dimant's arrangement of the fragments):

## Fragment A

- (2) [and] again I shall [deliver them] into the hand of the sons of Aar[on as the first]<sup>38</sup> seventy years [that]
- (3) the sons of Aaron will rule over them, and they will not walk [in] my [wa]ys, which I command you so that
- (4) you may warn them. And they too will do what is evil in my eyes, like all that which the Israelites had done
- (5) in the former days of their kingdom, except for those who will come first from the land of their captivity to build
- (6) the Temple. And I shall speak to them and I shall send them commandments, and they will understand everything which
- (7) they and their fathers had abandoned. And from (the time) when that generation comes to end, in the seventh jubilee
- (8) of the devastation of the land, they will forget statute and festival and Sabbath and covenant. And they will violate everything and they will do
- (9) what is evil in my eyes. Therefore I shall hide my face from them and deliver them into the hands of their enemies; and [I] shall deliver [them up]
- (10) to the sword. But I shall leave among them refugees, s[o] that [t]he[y] should not be an[nih]ilated in my wrath [and] when [my] fa[ce] is hidden
- (11) from them. And the Angels of Mas[te]mot will rule over them, and [I shall] sp[urn] them and they] will return
- (12) to do [wh]at is evil in [my] eyes, and they will walk in the will[fulness] of their heart]
- (13)

## Fragment B

- (1)
- (2) [and my] house [and my altar and th]e Holy of Ho[lies ]
- (3) so it was done [ ] for these things will befall them [ ] and [there] will be
- (4) the rule of Belial over them so as to deliver them to the sword for a week of years [ and] in that jubilees they will be
- (5) violating all my statues and all my commandments which I shall have commanded th[em and sent in the ha]nd of my servants, the prophets.
- (6) and [t]he[y] will be[gi]n to quarrel among themselves for seventy years, from the day of the violation of the [oath and the] covenant which they will have violated. So I shall deliver them
- (7) [into the hand of the An]gels of Mastemot, and they will rule over them. And they will not know and they will not understand that I was angry with them because of their trespass

<sup>38</sup> My reconstruction.

- (8) [by which they will have for]saken me, and will have done what is evil in my eyes, and what I did not want they will have chosen; to pursue wealth and gain
- (9) [and violence, ea]ch robbing that which belongs to his neigh[b]our, and oppressing each other. They will defile my Temple,
- (10) [they will profane my Sabbaths,] they will for[ge]t my [fes]tivals, and with fo[reign]ers [t]he[y] will profane their offspr[ing]. Their priests will commit violence

The logical progression in fragment A is somewhat convoluted. The author begins by stating that God will at some point deliver the people into the hands of the sons of Aaron, comparing this to an earlier time when the Israelites were under priestly dominion, as the word “again” with which the sentence opens indicates. Thus, there were two separate periods during which the priests ruled, the first of which is said to have lasted seventy years (line 1).

During the first, seventy-year period of priestly rule, the people reverted to the evils committed during the First Temple period (“in the former days of their kingdom”—lines 4–5). Therefore, the time span in question is the Second Temple period. As compared to the period of the return from exile (described in lines 5–7), the Second Temple period is significantly worse. The author relates to the post-exilic period at the end of line 7: “And from (the time) when that generation comes to end, in the seventh jubilee,” enumerating the sins of the people and mentioning the influence of the angels of Mastemot (line 11). At this point it appears that the author again refers to the period during which the sons of Aaron ruled and did evil. Fragment A is thus a survey of the early Second Temple period, divided into the period of the return from exile, seen as good, and the subsequent seventy-year period, seen as bad. However, the literary sequence in fragment A is not strictly chronological. It opens with an epoch of uncertain nature, continues with a seventy-year era during the Second Temple period, switches to the period of the return from exile, and returns to the seventy-year period.

Fragment B, on the other hand, exhibits no divergence from chronological order. The seventy-year period mentioned at the end of fragment A is followed by a period of seven years under the rule of Belial (B, line 4), which is in turn followed by another seventy-year period during which the people again sin (line 6). Although the author fails to explicitly mention the name of the terrestrial ruler during the second seventy-year period, he does, however, specifically mention that the people are ruled by angels of Mastemot (end of line 6, beginning of line 7). There are then two similarities between the two seventy

year periods: they are equal in length and in the role played by the angels of Mastemot. I further suggest that they have another parity: priestly rule. Perhaps the second seventy year period alluded to by the author at the outset is the period during which God will return and deliver the people into the hands of the sons of Aaron.

This initial analysis enables us to discern the different chronological divisions of the two works. The *Apocryphon*, with the exception of the years of exile from the land, has no subdivisions, whereas in *Pseudo-Moses* we find mention of the seventh jubilee (A, line 7), seventy years (A, line 2), seven years in which Belial governs (B, line 4), and seventy additional years (B, line 6, the sum total of all these numbers is of course ten forty-nine year jubilees).<sup>39</sup>

We must note another significant difference between the *Apocryphon* and *Pseudo-Moses*: each one's attitude toward the return from exile.<sup>40</sup> Whereas the *Apocryphon* includes the period of Shivat Zion in the ten jubilees during which God hides his face, *Pseudo-Moses* treats it differently: "those who will come first from the land of their captivity to build the Temple. And I shall speak to them and I shall send them commandments, and they will understand everything which they and their fathers had abandoned" (A, lines 5–7). The author here refers to the existence of prophets and prophecy in the early Second Temple period,<sup>41</sup> in direct contradistinction to the *Apocryphon*'s hidden divine countenance.

Furthermore, whereas *Pseudo-Moses* shares the expectation that 490 years will pass from the late First Temple period to the coming of the longed-for change, it does not link this desired change with Antiochus' decrees, which are mentioned in the beginning of fragment B. The rule of Belial which "deliver[s] them to the sword" for a "week of years" is that of Antiochus. Yet the decrees do not mark the end of the process. They are followed by another seventy years of sin. There is but one point of agreement between the *Apocryphon* and *Pseudo-Moses*: namely, that the period following that of the decrees is

<sup>39</sup> It is possible to count only six and not seven jubilees, as בייבל השביעי (A, line 7) can be interpreted as the beginning, and not the end, of a jubilee. In that case, the total number of years is nine, not ten, jubilees, and the tenth jubilee is that of redemption. See the discussion of "Computation of Epochs and End-time at Qumran" below.

<sup>40</sup> Dimant commented on these lines: "The positive description of the returnees offered here stands in contrast to the negative picture of the preceding and the following generations. Such a favorable attitude to this period stands out in comparison with other contemporary apocalyptic works, which either ignore or criticize the activities of the returnees" (Dimant, DJD 30.240).

one of dissension: “and Israel will be rent asunder in th[at] generation, each m[a]n fighting against his neighbor” (*Apocryphon*, line 34);” and [t]he[y] will be[gi]n to quarrel among themselves” (*Pseudo-Moses*, B, line 6). However, according to the *Apocryphon* the dispute concerns the interpretation of God’s word; in *Pseudo-Moses* the entire people “will have done what is evil in my eyes, and what I did not want they will have chosen; to pursue wealth and gain [and violence, ea]ch robbing that which belongs to his neigh[b]our, and oppressing each other. They will defile my Temple, [they will profane my Sabbaths,] they will for[ge]t my [fes]tivals, and with fo[reign]ers [t]he[y] will profane their offspr[ing]. Their priests will commit violence” (B, lines 8–10).

Examination of the accusation found in both works sheds light on another difference between the *Apocryphon* and *Pseudo-Moses*. Whereas the *Apocryphon* concentrates on idolatry, *Pseudo-Moses* raises a variety of accusations. The similarity between the above accusations and those found in other Qumran works<sup>42</sup> is one criterion for my attribution of the authorship of *Pseudo-Moses* to a member of the Qumran community.<sup>43</sup> This claim is grounded, first of all, in the appearance of the Qumranic accusation of forgetting the festivals, commonly used in Qumran literature to denote the following of a calendar other than the solar one adopted by the sect.<sup>44</sup> In CD, for example, as in *Pseudo-Moses*, this blame is attributed to the generations of the Second Temple period. Additional accusations, related to Hasmonean rule, appear in other Qumran works. In *Pesher Habakuk*,<sup>45</sup> and in MMT as well, we find the priests accused of robbing violent men and the nations. It is possible that MMT’s reference to the sin of stealing as causing the

<sup>41</sup> For a discussion of the cessation of prophecy according to Second Temple period sources, see Ch. Milikowsky, “The End of Prophecy and the Closure of the Bible in Judaism of Late Antiquity” (Hebrew), *Sidra* 10 (1994) 83–94.

<sup>42</sup> The similarity was stressed by Dimant. See Dimant, DJD 30.109 n. 28.

<sup>43</sup> See n. 5 above.

<sup>44</sup> Underlying this argument is our knowledge that the solar calendar was not in use during the generations preceding the founding of the sect. See the discussion by M. Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language, and Calendar” (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 68 (1999) 360–63.

<sup>45</sup> Regarding the Wicked Priest, either Jonathan or Simeon, the *Pesher* states: “Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who was called by the true name at the beginning of his standing, but when he ruled in Israel, his heart became large, and he abandoned God, and betrayed the statutes for the sake of wealth. And he stole and amassed the wealth of the men of violence who had rebelled against God, and he took the wealth of peoples to add to himself guilty iniquity. And the abominable ways he pursued with every sort of unclean impurity” (8:8–13).

loss of places<sup>46</sup> refers to the acquisition of non-Jewish wealth, viewed as bearing aspects of idolatry.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, *Pseudo-Moses* shares the allegation “they will defile my Temple”—with *Pesher Habakuk* (12.7–9) and MMT, which points to the desecration of the Temple as a result of the disputed laws of purity and of intermarriage with non-Jews.<sup>48</sup> The combination זרה (forbidden marriages), דון and המקדש used in *Pseudo-Moses* also appear in an important passage in the *Damascus Document* in which the author engages in a polemic with Pharisee halakhah.<sup>49</sup>

The comparisons made above shed light on the historiography put forth by *Pseudo-Moses*. The returnees remain loyal to God until the seventh jubilee after the destruction, at which point the people abandon the correct calendar and are punished in return. As noted, the people are placed in the hands of the sons of Aaron, a historically correct description. During the Second Temple period, with the disappearance of the Davidic descendant Zerubabel ben Shealtiel, the High Priest became the representative of the people and headed their hegemony.<sup>50</sup> The people are defeated at war: “I shall hide my face from them and deliver them into the hands of their enemies; and [I] shall deliver [them up] to the sword. But I shall leave among them refugees, s[o] that [t]he[y] should not be an[ni]l[ate]d in my wrath [and] when [my] fa[ce] is hidden” (A, lines 9–11). This perhaps refers to the suffering of the people during the Seleucid-Ptolemy wars in the late fourth- and the third century BCE. Moreover, the people are subjected to the rule of the angels of Mastemot (A, line 11). The heavenly and the terrestrial spheres together cause the people to “do what is evil in my eyes, like all that which the Israelites had done in the former days of their kingdom” (A, lines 4–5).

Because of the poor preservation of the text, it is not certain whether the author explicitly mentions the deeds of the Jerusalem priests that adopted Hellenistic culture, or whether he defined their actions as idolatry as a means of drawing a parallel between the First Temple

<sup>46</sup> 4QMMT 3 5–7; see *Qumran Cave 4, V. Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (eds. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 58.

<sup>47</sup> See the discussion by Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” 347 and n. 139.

<sup>48</sup> See the discussion in Kister, “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” esp. 340–48.

<sup>49</sup> CD 4:20–5:11 (M. Broshi, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* [Jerusalem, 1992] 17–19).

<sup>50</sup> Dimant, DJD 30.243; D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (TSAJ 38; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994) 6–29.

period and the second-century-BCE sinners. It is possible that, for the author, the use of a general term such as שרירות לב (A, line 12)—which for the Qumranites denotes someone who does not walk in their accepted way—sufficed.<sup>51</sup> In any event, the sins of that generation over a seventy-year period brought Antiochus, the Belial mentioned in the opening of fragment B.

The author of *Pseudo-Moses*, like that of the *Apocryphon*, creates an analogy between epochs. In this instance, it is not an analogy between the sins of the First Temple period and those of the Hellenistic period, but rather between the Hellenistic and the Hasmonean periods, between the seventy-year periods preceding and following the decrees of Antiochus. The angels of Mastemot (A, line 11; B, lines 6–7) and the sons of Aaron rule during each of these periods, and the people do evil in the eyes of God during both. I surmise that the overall computation promised the casting down of the angels of Mastemot and the sinning priests and the inciters to sin among the priests at the conclusion of the seventy-year period, at which point, God and his followers will acquire hegemony. The fragmentary lines at the end of fragment B do not explain who will bring the desired change. Perhaps the analogy is continued, and Antiochus, who appeared in the eighth jubilee, serves as a paradigm for the punitive force to arrive at the end of the tenth jubilee.

One of the interesting features in *Pseudo-Moses* is its attitude toward the priests. Its author detested the priests that ruled during the third and second centuries BCE and the Hasmoneans as well.<sup>52</sup> According

<sup>51</sup> The accusation of שרירות לב regarding the sect's opponents also appears in CD. See the historical survey in this text, 2:3–17, 12 (Broshi, *Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 13–15).

<sup>52</sup> As I demonstrated in my article (“The Sons of Zadok,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery* [eds. L. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000] 623–30), historically all Second Temple priests were descended from Zadok, who founded the Jerusalem priesthood during David's reign. Consideration of the genealogical lists and *mishmarot* in Chronicles shows that Zadok is the founder of the high priesthood and Aaron of the priesthood in general. Perhaps the appearance of a sect named Saducees during the rise of the Hasmonean house hints at an opposition party within the established Jerusalem priesthood, who used Chronicles to question the right of the Hasmoneans to assume the high priesthood. Qumran opposition to the Hasmoneans was not lineage-based but because they bowed to the Pharisees and because of their immoral behavior. It is thus not surprising that the separatist sect voiced accusations against the priests who ruled prior to the decrees of Antiochus and those who ruled in the post-decree period. Although both groups had worthy lineage, both caused the people to sin.

to *Pseudo-Moses*, the priests rule the people because the latter left the correct halakhic path and the correct calendar; moreover, the priests lead the people from bad to worse during the Second Temple period. This approach is in harmony with what we find in other Qumran writings (see below), which do not take a positive view of the Second Temple period, neither to the period preceding the decrees of Antiochus, nor to the Hasmoneans, despite the fact that priests led the people. *Pseudo-Moses* is unique in explicitly mentioning priestly rule. If its author sought to draw an analogy between the pre- and post-decree periods, and thereby to convince the people of the wickedness of the Hasmonean priests, then the accusations made against the priests who ruled before Antiochus' reign are understandable. There are two groups of sinful priests: the priests ruling before Antiochus' decrees and the Hasmonean priests.

As opposed to the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, in which the 490-year span is a historical period nearing its end, in computing the end-time *Pseudo-Moses* tries to foresee the future. Here lies a second reason for identifying *Pseudo-Moses* as a work originating with the Qumran community. Calculation of epochs appears in additional Qumran works, which, like *Pseudo-Moses*, use a 490-year scheme. As in *Pseudo-Moses* the starting point for the calculations in these texts is the destruction of the First Temple. Its end, however, does not take place near the end of Antiochus' decrees but in the future. Nonetheless, as was noted, it is difficult to make any definitive statements about the future according to *Pseudo-Moses*.

#### *Computation of Epochs and End-Time in Qumran Literature*

In addition to *Pseudo-Moses*, three other Qumran texts use the number 490 in computing epochs and the end-time, albeit sometimes allusively.<sup>53</sup> The historical schemes fueled by the 490-year rubric are not identical. Comparison between these works and *Pseudo-Moses* is important in its own right; moreover, it may shed further light on its author's expectations.

<sup>53</sup> See J. VanderKam, "Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000) 159–78. See also A. Steudel, "אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים in the Qumran Texts," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 233–40. I reject Steudel's attempt to link the calculations at Qumran to known historical events. The various calculations appearing in Daniel, the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, *Pseudo-Moses*, at Qumran, and in *Seder Olam Rabbah*

I begin my comparison with the *Damascus Document*. Although, because its ending was not preserved, this text contains little detail regarding the end-time, it appears that its author adhered to a 490-year scheme, subdivided according to a biblical typology. The author counts 390 years from the exile to the emergence of the sect:

for in their treachery in leaving him, he hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary, and gave them up to the sword. But recalling the covenant with the first ones, he left a remnant of Israel and did not give them up to destruction. And at the end of (his) wrath, three hundred and ninety years after giving them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he turned his attention to them and caused to grow out of Israel and Aaron a root of planting, to inherit his land and grow fat in the goodness of his soil (CD 1: 3–8).

Previous scholars have noted that this number is consistent with the length of the exile according to Ezek. 4:5. The exile ends with the emergence of the Qumran community, but twenty more years pass before the appearance of its leader, the Teacher of Righteousness: “and they were as blind as those who grope for a way for twenty years. But God discerned their works (namely) that they sought him wholeheartedly, and he raised up for them (the) Righteous Teacher to guide them in the way of his heart” (1:9–11). The remaining eighty years of the 490-year period were evidently divided into two forty-year periods: forty years of the Teacher of Righteousness (not mentioned explicitly in CD) and forty years from his death to the coming of redemption.<sup>54</sup>

As opposed to CD, the number 490 receives explicit mention in *Pesher Melchizedek* (11Q13).<sup>55</sup> Relying on biblical verses, the pesher prophesies that Melchizedek, a heavenly figure who fulfills both priestly and monarchic functions, will appear in the tenth jubilee: “and thus this word [will come to pas]s in the first week of the jubilee after [the] ni[ne] jubilees” (lines 6–7). Melchizedek will atone for the Sons of Light who sinned because of Belial and will return them to their

---

(according to which there was a 490-year interval between the destruction of the First and the Second Temples) show chronographic fluidity. Moreover, in that period, the calculation of the Persian and of the Hellenistic periods differed from that of modern historians. For the same reason, D. Dimant’s attempts do not create a clear picture (“The Seventy Weeks Chronology [Dan 9,24–27] in the Light of New Qumranic Texts,” *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* [ed. A. S. Van der Woude; Leuven: Peeters, 1993] 57–70).

<sup>54</sup> The forty years that will pass from the death of the Teacher of Righteousness are mentioned in MS B 20:13–15.

<sup>55</sup> See F. Garcia-Martínez, et al., eds, *Qumran Cave 11.II* (DJD 23; Oxford, 1998) 221–41.

patrimony: “He will proclaim to them an emancipation to release them [from the burden of] all their sins . . . And [the] d[ay of atonem]ent i[s] the end of [the] tenth [ju]bilee, in which atonement is made for all the Son of [Light and] the me[n of] the lot of Mel[chi]zedek” (lines 6–8). Melchizedek is destined to fight Belial and his spirits and to destroy them utterly: “And Melchizedek will exercise the veng[ea]nce of the judgments of Go[d . . . from the hand of] Belial and from the hand of all [the spirits of ] his [lot.] (line 13). This fragmentary text makes no reference to historical events, yet it does clearly state that the conclusion of the ten jubilees marks the beginning of the end-time, in which evil will vanish entirely.

Four hundred and ninety years, subdivided into seventy units, appear in the Animal Vision in *1 Enoch* 85–90,<sup>56</sup> so-named because in it humans are represented as animals: the antediluvian generations are bulls; the postdiluvian generations change their skin: the Israelites are sheep, whereas the nations are a multiplicity of wild animals and beasts of prey. For our purposes, what is important is the calculation hinting at a period of seventy weeks of years, for God placed seventy shepherds over the sheep prior to the destruction of the First Temple (89:59–64). This act is a definitive symbol of God’s hiding his face: God does not lead his people and appoints others in his stead, commanding them to judge the people. Thus, God punishes his people with an exile from Him of seventy time-units.

The period of the seventy shepherds is subdivided into units of twelve, twenty-three, twenty-three, and twelve shepherds. The twelve shepherds represent the period of the Babylonian exile (89:72). Twenty-three rule during the Shivat Zion period, during which the returnees build a defiled temple (90:1). Twenty-three additional shepherds appear at the beginning of the Hellenistic period, symbolized in the vision by the appearance of birds of prey (90:5). At the conclusion of the second period of twenty-three shepherds, a group of lambs opens its eyes and realizes that it has sinned. One of the lambs, which becomes a ram and grows a horn, teaches the group the proper path (90:5–10). This alludes to the founding of the sect, and to the appearance of its

<sup>56</sup> The discussion is based on Menahem Kister’s interpretation (“Concerning the History of the Essenes” [Hebrew], *Tarbiz* 56 [1986] 1–6). Kister’s interpretation differs from mainstream scholarly opinion. See: Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 354–90 and VanderKam, “Sabbatical Chronologies,” 166–69. Kister does not make a definitive identification of the group described in the Animal Vision; I, however, think that it refers to the Qumran sect as I have defined it (see n. 5).

leader, the Teacher of Righteousness. The rule of the shepherds continues for another twelve years, during which the animals representing the nations are in conflict with the horned ram. Victory is achieved with the conclusion of the reign of the final twelve shepherds. A magic sword is placed in the hands of the ram with the horn, and he kills the surrounding animals-nations (90:19). The remaining nations are punished by God, as are the shepherds who acted with excessive cruelty toward their flock (90:18, 20–27).<sup>57</sup> From this point, the period of the End of Days begins, during which a new temple is brought following the removal of the old one (90:28–34). With the coming of a bull that symbolizes the messiah, the sheep become bulls, namely, humans return to live the lifespan enjoyed by the antediluvian generations (90:37–38).<sup>58</sup>

Note that three of the four works that mention a 490-year period differ in their subdivision of this period. The author of the *Damascus Document* uses biblical typology, whereas the *Animal Vision* uses a symmetrical division (twelve, twenty-three, twenty-three and twelve) as does *Pseudo-Moses* (seventy and seventy divided by a week of years). Also differing from work to work is the purpose served by the subdivisions: in the *Animal Vision* and *CD* the numbers teach the reader that the founding of the sect is part of a divinely structured plan; in *Pseudo-Moses* the author creates an analogy in order to convince the reader of the invalidity of Hasmonean rule and of its imminent end.

Also noteworthy are the differences in the nature of the struggle. The *Animal Vision* focuses on a future struggle between the nations and the Qumran community, whereas *Pseudo-Moses* focuses on internal Jewish matters. Perhaps the *Animal Vision* was written early in the history of the community, when it still believed that it could convince the majority of the correctness of its path.<sup>59</sup> The author of the

<sup>57</sup> The verses treating the End of Days are disordered, making it appear that the description of this period in Enoch 90 is duplicated. Ostensibly, verses 13 and 16, and 15 and 18 are identical. One possible solution is to view verses 14–15 as not describing events, but rather as the words of the person recording the shepherds' deeds to the horned ram who fights the animals. This person prophesies that the ram will receive aid (v. 14) and that the Lord of the sheep will exact vengeance (15). Verse 16 bridges between the vision and what happens; therefore, it repeats what was said in verse 13. Similarly, verse 18 describes the reality prophesied in verse 15.

<sup>58</sup> See D. Dimant, "History according to the *Animal Apocalypse*" (Hebrew), *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1/2 (1982) 18–37.

<sup>59</sup> Kister, "History of the Essenes," 6 n. 25.

Animal Vision did not foresee an internal struggle but rather only an external one: the community would lead the people in its battle against the conqueror's rule.<sup>60</sup>

*Pseudo-Moses*, as noted, concentrates on a polemic with the people and its rulers. It appears that its author also turned to an audience outside the sect, in order to persuade it of the sinfulness of its leadership. Herein lies the explanation for the fact that, although a sectarian text, *Pseudo-Moses* nowhere mentions the sect. This is also the reason why *Pseudo-Moses*, written later than the Animal Vision, mentions Antiochus' decrees, whereas the Animal Vision, which is closer in time to the decrees, ignores them. *Pseudo-Moses* addresses a people that saw the decrees as a breaking point. In the Animal Vision, the breaking point is elsewhere, for the temple is impure in any case. The decrees of Antiochus are not mentioned in CD either. In this instance as well, the explanation lies in the nature of its audience, as this work, which attacks the Men of Lies and argues with their path, was addressed to the sect.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, four different works cite a time period of 490 years from the late First Temple period through the founding of the Qumran sect. In two, *Pesher Melchizedek* and the Animal Vision, the end of the 490-year period marks the beginning of the end-time. With regard to the *Damascus Document* and *Pseudo-Moses*, as their conclusions have not survived, we cannot determine if this was the case as well. I think that they also expressed hope for the conclusion of history, as the imminent coming of the end-time pulses in all Qumran writings, as does the belief that the End of Days has begun.<sup>62</sup>

The different schemes presented in the four Qumran works discussed here can be summarized as follows:

Animal Vision:	$7 \times (12 + 23 + 23 + 12) = 490$
<i>Pseudo-Moses</i> :	$7 \times 49 + 70 + 7 + 70 = 490$
Or	$6 \times 49 + 70 + 7 + 70 + 49 = 490$
<i>Damascus Document</i>	$390 + 20 + 40 + 40 = 490$
<i>Pesher Melchizedek</i>	$9 \times 49 + 49 = 490$

<sup>60</sup> A similar viewpoint is found in the War Scroll.

<sup>61</sup> See Shemesh and Werman, "Halakha at Qumran: Genre and Authority," DSD 10 (2003) 124–25.

<sup>62</sup> See Steudel, "אהרית הימים"; Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 348–51.

### Conclusion

If my analysis is correct, then two new works emerge from the recently published Dead Sea Scrolls: one written by the Qumran sect—*Pseudo-Moses*—and the other—the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*—outside it. The 490-year unit plays a role in both works, but is calculated differently. These works not only assist the evaluation of chronological and apocalyptic calculations during the second century BCE, they also sharpen the distinction between two groups of texts. The first group, Daniel and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, counts 490 years from the destruction of the First Temple to the post-decree period. The second group, Qumranic sectarian works, counts 490 years from the destruction of the Temple to the founding of the sect and the end of history.<sup>63</sup> It seems likely that group two, which reflects the ideology of the Qumran sect, borrowed the main timeframe—490 years—from group one, adapting it to its needs. The book of Daniel announced the coming of a political entity to be ruled by a king, a priest, and a prophet with the ending of Antiochus' decrees (Dan. 9:24).<sup>64</sup> This promise of king-priest-prophet was realized, however, to the distress of the Qumran sect, in the hated Hasmonean rule.<sup>65</sup> Perhaps the noting of the end of the period of prophecy in *Pseudo-Moses* testifies to Hasmonean propaganda at the court of Hyrcanus. Against the background of Hasmonean rule the covenanters had to draw the ancient divine plan differently, interpolating the founding of the sect and its future hopes.

Two additional brief observations emerge from the comparison of these works. One regards the use of myth. Above, I noted the anti-mythic approach of the *Apocryphon* as compared to Daniel. Because of its avoidance of myth, the *Apocryphon* represents a literary innovation in the field of apocalyptic literature. This avoidance of myth was adopted by the Qumran community, which explicitly shunned the use of mythical materials. Notwithstanding the influence of the book

<sup>63</sup> In later works the 490-year span is the period between the destruction of the First and Second Temples (*Seder Olam Rabbah* 28). See also Kister, "Legends of the Destruction," 521 n. 214; and the comprehensive and profound consideration by O. Irshai, "Dating the Eschaton: Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Calculation in Late Antiquity," in *Apocalyptic Time* (Numen Book Series: Studies in the History of Religion; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 113–53.

<sup>64</sup> Dimant, "Seventy Weeks Chronology," 58–61.

<sup>65</sup> On John Hyrcanus the high priest, prophet, and king, see Josephus Flavius, *War* 1.69; *Ant.* 13.299–300. For a discussion, see H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of 4QTest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries," *Zion* 55 (1990) 141–50.

of Daniel on the Qumran community, ultimately the covenanters accepted the *Apocryphon*'s non-mythic path.<sup>66</sup>

My second remark is related to the presence of apocalyptic literature at Qumran. The prevailing consensus holds that the Qumranites used pesharim rather than the apocalyptic genre to put forth their deterministic worldview. The existence of *Pseudo-Moses*, an apocalyptic work created at Qumran, undermines this assumption. Its existence also lends support to an underlying assumption of this article, namely, that the Animal Vision was authored by the Qumran sect. *Pseudo-Moses* and the Animal Vision share the features of being placed in the mouths of figures from the past and the absence of myth. According to both the forces of evil are God's servants, sent to punish the people for their sins. The entire people sin, not by committing idolatry, but by leaving the correct halakhic path. Thus, whereas pesharim certainly had their role in the Qumran community, *Pseudo-Moses* provides evidence that it also engaged in the composition of apocalyptic works.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> These changes were already noted by Nickelsburg in his comparison of the Animal Vision to the book of Daniel. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 357. For further assessment, see J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997) 150–53.

<sup>67</sup> This conclusion also has an effect on the evaluation of the *Book of Jubilees* and its sectarian origin. The scholarly consensus is that *Jubilees* was written before the events that led to the separation of the sect. However, paleographical data points to a time of composition ca. 100 BCE; the *Jubilees* halakhah is identical to that of Qumran writings and there are hints in the book to a deep inner struggle. See Werman, "Torah and the Te'udah on the Tablets," *DSD* 9 (2002) 75–103; A. Shemesh and C. Werman, "Halakha at Qumran," 104–129; and C. Werman, "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Community," (Hebrew) *Meghillot* 2 (2004) 37–55. The existence of *Pseudo Moses*, an apocalyptic work, should endorse the conclusion that *Jubilees* was written in Qumran. Furthermore, as Dimant notes there is a striking similarity between *Jubilees* and *Pseudo-Moses* in the accusation made against the people (Dimant, "New Light", 438–39).