JOHN C. POIRIER

The Tongues of Angels

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
287

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

287

John C. Poirier

The Tongues of Angels

The Concept of Angelic Languages in Classical Jewish and Christian Texts

Mohr Siebeck

John C. Poirier, born 1963; 1993 ThM in New Testament at Duke University; 2005 DHL in Ancient Judaism at the Jewish Theological Seminary (NY); named Chair of Biblical Studies at the newly forming Kingswell Theological Seminary (OH).

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151630-6
ISBN 978-3-16-150569-0
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

© 2010 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

For Nick and Natalie

Preface

I wish to thank the editors of WUNT, especially Professor Dr. Jörg Frey, for accepting my manuscript and for including it in the second series. Their enthusiasm for the project was inspiring. I particularly want to thank my production editor, Ms. Tanja Mix, for always getting back to me so quickly. Her guidance made the task of reformatting my study to WUNT style much less of a chore.

Franklin, 25 May 2010 John C. Poirier

Table of Contents

Preface VII
Abbreviations XI

Chapter 1. Introduction 1

A. Purpose and Organization of this Study 2
B. Methodological Preface 3
  1. Should Pseudepigrapha be Presumed Jewish or Christian? 3
  2. Rabbinic Writings as Historiography 6
C. Conclusion 8

Chapter 2. Hebrew as the Language of the Angels 9

A. Jubilees (and 4Q464) 10
B. R. Yochanan's Dictum: 15
C. Christian Writings 24
  1. The Vision of Paul 24
  2. The Coptic Wizard's Hoard 24
Excursus: The Relative Lack of Hebrew-Speaking Angels in Early Christian Sources 26
D. Conclusion 29

Chapter 3. Hebrew-speaking Angels and Linguistic Ideology in Tannaitic Tradition 31

A. The Hebraic Setting of Rabbinic Piety 32
B. The Proscription of Extra-Synagogal Prayer 37
C. The Empowerment of the Hebraeophone Literati 41
D. Conclusion 46

Chapter 4. The Esoteric Heavenly Language: Fairly Certain Cases 47

A. New Testament (1 Cor 13.1) 47

B. New Testament Continued (2 Cor 12.1–7) 59
C. The Testament of Job 63
D. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah 77
E. The Ascension of Isaiah 81
F. The Apocalypse of Abraham 87
G. The Rabbinic Evidence (*Gen. Rab.* 74.7) 91
H. Ephrem Syrus, *Hymn* 11 100
I. The Book of the Resurrection (attributed to Bartholomew the Apostle) 103
J. Conclusion 108

Chapter 5. The Esoteric Heavenly Language Continued: Less Certain Cases 110

A. The Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 110
B. The Rabbinic Evidence Continued (*b. B. Bat.* 134a || *b. Sukkah* 28a). 120
C. The Nanas Inscription 131
D. The Liturgical Jubilus 135
E. Conclusion 141

Chapter 6. Conclusion 142

Appendix 1. Two Additional Solutions for “the Speech of Palm Trees” (*b. B. Bat.* 134a || *b. Sukkah* 28a) 147
A. The *Palmgeister* in T.-S. K 1.56 and 1.147 147
B. Palm Trees as Neoplatonic Heliotropes 149

Appendix 2. A Partial Response to Christopher Forbes on the Nature of New Testament Glossolalia 154

Bibliography 159

Index of Ancient Sources 203

Index of Modern Authors 215

Index of Subjects 223

Abbreviations

Abbreviations and citation conventions for ancient literature and modern scholarship follow *OCD*^{3} (1996) and *SBL* (1999) wherever possible. In addition, the following abbreviations are used, with full bibliographical details in the Bibliography:

CMC	*Cologne Mani Codex*
Corp. herm.	*Corpus hermeticum*
Dis	Philodemos, *De dis*
Hist. laus.	Palladius, *Historia lausiaca*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
J&CP	Jewish and Christian Perspectives
London MS Or.	London Oriental Manuscript (British Museum)
Mart. Perp.	*Martyrdom of Perpetua and Felicitas*
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
OCD^3	S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3d ed.)
SBL	P. H. Alexander et al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style: for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*
Synopse	P. Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*
T.-S. K	Taylor-Schechter Cairo Geniza text
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

Chapter 1

Introduction

What language do angels speak? For the historian of religion, this question connects with questions about early Jewish and Christian beliefs about angels, prophecy, and mystical ascents. The following pages attempt to make the most of this arrangement. The principal burden of this study is to describe the main views of angelic languages in late antiquity, and to classify and discuss the writings that present evidence for these views.

Among Jews in late antiquity, there were two main views about which language angels spoke. It is not clear what the majority view was during the Second Temple period, but, during the rabbinic era, the view that angels spoke Hebrew appears to have been in the ascendency. This goes hand in hand with the heightened importance of Torah during the late tannaitic/early amoraic period. I call this view "hebraeophone". The other major view is that the angels spoke an esoteric heavenly language, normally unintelligible to humans. In the investigation of primary sources that occupies chapters two, four, and five, the esoteric-language view occupies several times as much space as the hebraeophone view, but the reader should not take that to indicate the degree to which this view might have dominated ancient Judaism and early Christianity. It merely represents the difficulty of discerning the esoteric-language view in certain cases.

"Angeloglossy" is the term that I use to denote the language of angels, irrespective of whether that language is also native to humans or not. I also use "angeloglossy" to denote the phenomenon of humans speaking in esoteric angelic languages. The question of which view of angelic languages is the earlier is difficult, and I do not attempt to answer it. I begin with the hebraeophone view simply because the evidence for it is more straightforward. Although we cannot confidently state that the hebraeophone view of angels is older than the esoteric-language view, the earliest extant source attesting this view (*viz. Jubilees*) is undoubtedly older than any of the sources attesting an esoteric angelic language. In discussing the notion of a specifically *angelic* language, I should mention that there is a wealth of speculation about the language of heaven in Jewish tradition in general, including a widespread tradition that Hebrew is the language of creation and/or heaven, thereby implicitly denying that the heavenly language is esoteric. In these sources, it is often assumed that the earliest human tongue was also the heavenly tongue.[1]

A. Purpose and Organization of this Study

The topic of angelic languages has never before received a book-length treatment. To make up for this neglect, I seek first to establish a few basic facts, *viz.* the nature, extent, and durability of the two principal views concerning what language angels speak.[2] The chronological bounds of this study are far flung. I begin with *Jubilees* (mid-2nd cent. B.C.E.) – the earliest text to touch upon the issue of angeloglossy.[3] As a lower bound, this study uses the main redaction of the Babylonian Talmud (ca. 550–650 C.E.), which I take to mark the end of the "classical" period of rabbinic Judaism. These bounds mark off a period of 700 or 800 years.[4]

This study is organized in the following way: chapter two surveys the documentary evidence for the hebraeophone view, found primarily in *Jubilees*, 4Q464, various rabbinic and targumic texts, and in a tiny minority of Christian texts. Chapter three shows a connection between the linguistic situation and the Palestinian rabbinic view, exploring how third-century rabbis used their linguistic circumstances to their advantage. It begins by trying to establish that Hebrew was a minority language in third-century Jewish Palestine, and argues that the hebraic underpinning of rabbinic theology and ideology, combined with the privilege of being able to read Hebrew in a largely non-hebraeophone and illiterate society, culminated in R. Yochanan's attempt to proscribe the practice of praying outside the synagogue, and that the bare fact of the aforementioned privilege empowered the rabbis within their society. Chapters four and five look at a number of

---

[1] See Rubio 1977:40–1; Paul 1987:esp. 235–43.

[2] The question of whether the mental-communication understanding of angelic "speech" (represented sometime later by Thomas Aquinas and Dante) is a third view, or only a subspecies of the esoteric-language view, is immaterial to this study. It is worth noting, however, that Ephrem Syrus's gradation of languages according to their rarefication suggests the latter.

[3] The frequent claim that *1 En.* 61.11–12 or 71.11 refers to angeloglossy fails of demonstration.

[4] I use the term "classical" strictly in a chronological sense. For Jewish antiquity, the "classical period" is usually thought to end with the main redaction of the Babylonian Talmud, around 650 C.E. (perhaps earlier). For Christian antiquity, the "classical period" is often thought to end earlier: with the death of Augustine of Hippo, in 430 C.E. While this study uses "classical period" in the first sense, it should be noted that the Christian sources that are named in section headings all happen to fall into the period defined by the latter sense, with the exception of parts of the *Coptic Wizard's Hoard*, said to have been written in five hands dating from the fourth to seventh centuries C.E.

Jewish and Christian writings that may refer to an esoteric angelic language. Chapter four treats the more certain references at length, including those found in 1 and 2 Corinthians, the *Testament of Job*, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, *Genesis Rabbah*, and the Coptic *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (hereafter *Book of the Resurrection*) attributed to Bartholomew. Chapter five turns to the cases which are more difficult to decide, including possible references to angeloglossy in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, the Babylonian Talmud, a fourth-century Christian inscription from Kotiaeion (Asia Minor), and the jubilus from the Christian liturgical tradition. These sources represent a wide variety of movements within Judaism and Christianity, which shows the pervasiveness of the esoteric-language view.

The study ends with a summary conclusion (chapter six).

B. Methodological Preface

1. Should Pseudepigrapha be Presumed Jewish or Christian?

Several of the works we will be examining are pseudepigraphic. One of the main concerns of any study comparing elements from pseudepigrapha is that it is often difficult to tell whether a given writing should be classified as (primarily) Jewish or Christian. An earlier generation of scholars was quick to assume that every Jewish-sounding pseudepigraphon with no distinctively Christian elements was bound to be Jewish in origin, but scholarship has recently come to terms with the fact that even those works that contain no distinctively Christian elements may, in fact, be largely or entirely the products of a Christian writer. As William Adler notes, most of the works we are discussing are often ascribed to ancient figures, so that "Semitisms and content seemingly incompatible with a Christian religious outlook may only be antiquarian touches designed to enhance the work's credibility."[5] The tide of opinion of late has been to reverse the burden of proof set up by an earlier generation. According to the new emerging consensus, if a given writing was preserved solely by the church, then, barring clear indications to the contrary, it should be assumed to be Christian.

Robert Kraft addressed these issues in two important essays. He notes that, prior to the eighth century C.E., almost all of the texts that we possess, "[a]part from the DSS and some early Rabbinic materials," were transmitted through Christian channels.[6] These pseudepigrapha "are, first of all,

---

[5] Adler 1996:27.

[6] R. A. Kraft 2001:384. See R. A. Kraft 1994, and the articles now collected in R. A. Kraft 2009. The present trend to take the Christian propagation of the pseudepigrapha more seriously as a clue to its provenance was anticipated in Sparks 1984:xiii–xvii.

'Christian' materials, and recognition of that fact is a necessary step in using them appropriately in the quest to throw light on early Judaism. [This is] the 'default' position – sources transmitted by way of Christian communities are 'Christian,' whatever else they may also prove to be."[7] To a bygone generation, such a position might have sounded hypercritical, but scholars today recognize that Christians and Jews often wrote in the same styles, and drew from the same material. Kraft writes that he "*expect*[*s*] that there were self-consciously Christian authors who wrote new works that focused on Jewish persons or traditions and contained no uniquely Christian passages," listing "the rather innocent homily on the heroic life of a Job or a Joseph" as a prime example.[8] Kraft does not think it impossible for the church to have faithfully transmitted a Jewish writing[9] – but the burden of proof regarding the church's handling of such writings, as well as the presumption that a given writing is Jewish, is (he argues) to be assigned differently than once assumed. This stance was recently bolstered through a book by James R. Davila.[10] Davila supports the use of Kraft's rule with a case-by-case demonstration of the internal consistency of assigning a number of pseudepigrapha preserved by the Church to Christian hands. This recognition that a Jewish-sounding pseudepigraphon may actually be Christian is both the product and the spur of recent attempts to rethink the so-called "parting of the ways" between the two religions. Yet it is important to note that these are two separate issues: (1) How does one tell the difference between a Jewish writing and a Christian writing? and (2) Is there really a solid dividing line between Judaism and Christianity?[11]

---

[7] R. A. Kraft 2001:372.

[8] R. A. Kraft 2001:375. See Kaestli 1995.

[9] R. A. Kraft 2001:379. R. A. Kraft (2001:382–3) notes a famous case (Philo's discussion of the Therapeutae in *De vita contemplativa*) in which the Jewish origin of a writing has been rehabilitated.

[10] Davila 2005.

[11] Scholars have become more sensitive to the problem of separating Christianity from Judaism. As Tomson (1999:193) writes, "Christianity developed as a separate religious community out of Judaism not so much by adhering to a specific messianic confession – which could have kept its place among other Jewish dissenters – but by integrating masses of non-Jews who in the course of history quickly ended up setting themselves off from the mother religion." See J. Taylor 1990; Saldarini 1994:3; Kimelman 1999. Boyarin (1999:10–11) suggests that the border between Judaism and Christianity "was so fuzzy that one could hardly say precisely at what point one stopped and the other began." As R. A. Kraft notes, Boyarin comes close to totalizing the lack of distinction between many forms of Judaism and of Christianity. In some ways, Lieu (1994:esp. 117) has been programmatic for the current flurry of revisionist studies, but she is more interested in showing that many early Jews and Christians viewed the separation in more caustic terms than is implied by the ecumenical-sounding "parting of the ways". The Christians that she names in connection with this are those that were subsequently canonized as the voice of orthodoxy. In this respect, Lieu seems to be arguing that "the parting of the

But do the drawbacks of putting all one's egg in a particular basket justify putting them *all* in a different basket? And how does the fact that a given writing was preserved by the church make it more likely that it was originally Christian? William Gruen III writes that the "practical result" of assigning a Christian provenance to a pseudepigraphon as a matter of default is that the only texts that could be excluded on the basis of their textual tradition would be those found at Qumran. "It would be naïve," Gruen writes, "… to imagine that the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls possessed every text that circulated within Judaism of the Hellenistic and Early Roman period."[12] To be fair, the proponents of the "Christian provenance" default position do *not* state the matter in terms that are open to Gruen's *reductio ad absurdum* – to lobby for a default position is not nearly the same as saying that all the writings assigned a provenance on the basis of that position assuredly belong to that default group. There is room to wonder, however, whether the terms of the Kraft/Davila approach are really the most reasonable.

My purpose in these few paragraphs is to register my (at least) partial dissent from the view argued by Kraft and others. It is far from clear that the church preserved *more* Jewish-sounding pseudepigrapha of Christian origin than of Jewish origin, therefore it is not at all clear that a Christian origin is a safer assumption than a Jewish origin. The safest procedure is to leave the question *non liquet*. In my view, after we have expended every effort to determine whether a given writing is Jewish or Christian, the safest position is to discuss the writing without referring at all to its religious provenance, and to give a slight, tentative, and qualified favor to a position of *Jewish* provenance with respect to those questions where it might make a difference. The Christian-until-proven-otherwise position

---

ways" model is not violent enough. She questions whether NT scholars are correct in appealing to the Aphrodisias inscription pertaining to God-fearers: "They need the God-fearers both to establish continuities leading into the Christian church – it was from this group of synagogue adherents that the earliest Christians were drawn – and to demonstrate the fuzziness of first-century ideas of being a Jew – thus Christian redefinition falls within this internal debate" (Lieu 1994:107). Her point is the precise opposite of that of some more recent revisionists, who emphasize the "fuzziness of first-century ideas of being a Jew" *vis-à-vis being a Christian*. For an example of a non-violent revisionist account, based on Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* and the (now lost) *Controversy between Jason and Papiscus regarding Christ* (mentioned by Origen), see Watson 1997:310. According to Watson (1997:311), "The real 'parting of the ways' occurs not between Justin and Trypho but between Trypho and Maricon. Justin rejects the programme of a radical de-judaizing of Christianity, and it is precisely because he and Trypho have not gone their separate ways but still appeal to the same texts that the disagreement can be so fundamental." See now the papers collected in Becker and Yoshiko Reed (eds.) 2003.

[12] Gruen 2009:164.

cashes in on some good points, but ultimately it probably is not a real advance on the way things used to be done.

2 Rabbinic Writings as Historiography

There are two basic problems with using rabbinic writings as historiography: (1) there is no guarantee that a saying attributed to a rabbi was really said by him, and (2) sayings do not transparently reveal the social reality behind them: one must grapple with the ideological content of a saying before accepting what it says about the situation in Jewish Palestine at a given time.[13] My approach to rabbinic writings is a mediating position between the "hermeneutic of good-will" of Zionist and Israeli scholarship[14] and the documentary approach associated with Jacob Neusner. It is mainly in response to the former approach that Neusner has turned rabbinic documents in upon their own editorial "voices", and it is mainly in response to the latter that scholars have honed useful and responsible approaches to the rabbinic writings.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Neusner made the editorial voice of any given rabbinic document so deafening that the contents of that document could not be used to determine the prior shape of any traditions taken up into that document.[15] His overcompensation for the role of the editor has resulted in an uncontrolled multiplication of "Judaisms" (his term): since each document is but an expression of its editor's own thoughts, each constitutes a carefully constructed form and distinctive expression of Judaism.[16] This takes things way too far: the claim that there are multiple forms of Judaism is of course one that should be accepted and applied intuitively as an explanatory grid for much that we find, but the claim that each rabbinic document represents its own narrow "Judaism" goes far beyond a judicial use of such a grid.

---

[13] Cf. Boccaccini 1994:255: "rabbinic documents are not chaotic collections of ancient material and parallels; they are consistent ideological documents".

[14] For this description, see Schwartz 2002.

[15] Neusner's approach to constructing history from rabbinic writings can be divided into three distinct stages: (1) in the 1950s and 1960s, Neusner used rabbinic literature to write rabbinic biography, (2) in the 1970s, he denounced his earlier biographical studies, and honed a method whereby attributions to a particular figure were to be assumed as accurate attributions only at the level of that figure's circle of influence (i.e. to that figure's generation), and (3) in the 1980s and 1990s, he attributed so much to the editors of the rabbinic writings that a form-critical study of the rabbinic corpus became a vain gesture. The fact that Neusner believes so strongly in absorbing his earlier writings into new books (*verbatim!*) sometimes plays havoc with the attempt to write Neusner's intellectual biography. When what is essentially a rearrangement of paragraphs from the 1970s is published as a "new" book by Neusner in the 1980s, it becomes difficult to discern what Neusner really believed in the 1980s. Ironically, one might even say that the editorial voice in many of Neusner's *own books* is not nearly as powerful as he assumes the editorial voice to be within rabbinic works, even though the former corpus is not advertised as a compilation of earlier material, while the latter is!

[16] In Neusner's words (1993b:301): "Each of the score of documents that make up the canon of Judaism in late antiquity exhibits distinctive traits in logic, rhetoric, and topic, so that we may identify the purposes and traits of form and intellect of the authorship of

To be sure, Neusner's infusion of historical skepticism has served well: the credulity of an earlier day has been replaced by an awareness that much of the rabbinic tradition is tendentious. But scholars today are moving beyond the extreme and restrictive premises upon which Neusner built his system. It is now widely realized that careful methods, based on reasonable assumptions about form history (the type of form history that Neusner himself honed in the early 1970s), can often separate the different strata of rabbinic material. The trademark of this mediating position is the caveat that, while rabbinic history is a possibility, biography always lies beyond our reach.[17] The possibility of writing rabbinic history, no matter how gapped that history might end up, provides the methodological underpinning for my own use of rabbinic writings.

David Goodblatt contends that the "debiographization of rabbinic literature"[18] has had a liberating effect on the task of history. He argues that the amoraic stratum of the Talmud is not hopelessly lost in the medley of voices: "the final editors of the Babylonian Talmud did not attempt to 'homogenize' the two strata [i.e., amoraic and saboraic], but rather left the amoraic material essentially intact."[19] It is this unhomogenized state of the rabbinic sources that allows the possibility of getting behind whatever editorial agendas may be operating. Richard Kalmin has also wrestled with the problem of writing rabbinic history. He argues for what we referred to

---

that document. It follows that documents possess integrity and are not merely scrapbooks, compilations made with no clear purpose or aesthetic plan."

[17] The move away from biography is traced in Saldarini 1986:451–4. In light of the now general warning that rabbinic biography cannot be done, many of the old introductions stand in need of rewriting. Green 1978:87 notes that the biographical approach "is evident in virtually every article on an early rabbinic figure in the recent Encyclopedia Judaica".

[18] Goodblatt 1980:35.

[19] Goodblatt 1980:37. Similarly, Kraemer 1989 contends that the "superficial" characteristics of the amoraic stratum can help the historian of rabbinics determine which attributions are authentic. In this connection, the discussion in Wills 1995:215 of the ancient author's lack of concern for editorial inconcinnities is instructive: "Scribal culture is usually the subculture of literate professionals in an illiterate society who reflect so-called craft literacy. Their drive to eliminate clumsy transitions and repetitions was probably less exercised than that of, say, the letter writers of eighteenth-century England who were part of an emerging literate culture. … Scribes in oral culture are often content to conflate texts and insertions without being overly concerned for transitions and narrative flow."

above as the "mediating position": "[T]he Talmud is comprised of diverse sources which were not completely homogenized in the process of editing."[20] Redaction criticism has traditionally relied upon the extreme difficulty posed to an editor who tries to make a document thoroughly tendentious in a direction different from its sources. Kalmin uses this principle to good effect: "Early material bears the stamp of tradition and is difficult to systematically expunge, even when considered inappropriate from the standpoint of later generations."[21] The principle of applying leverage to an unhomogenized text involves paying attention to instances in which the Babylonian Talmud has not completely "Babylonianized" Palestinian tradition.[22]

C. Conclusion

Bearing these methodologems in mind, I turn first to the book of *Jubilees*, the first and perhaps clearest writing to assert that Hebrew was the primordial language, and to imply that Hebrew was also the native language of the angels. The texts that we will study in connection with that position are fewer in number than those that (either certainly or possibly) posit an esoteric angelic tongue, but they are in no way less important. Indeed, they preserve the earliest traces of a view that would become dominant in Judaism.

---

[20] Kalmin 1994:10.

[21] Kalmin 1994:57. Kalmin (1994:53) notes that "it is unlikely that a document as variegated as the Babylonian Talmud was subjected to the tightly controlled and consistent editorial manipulation" that would result in the characteristic distinctions that one finds between strata.

[22] Kalmin 1994:166–7 notes that hostility between rabbis inheres mostly in *attributed* sources. Anonymous commentary has a tendency to make peace between hostile parties, to ameliorate the amount of insult that an attributed source might contain. Kalmin suggests that the amoraim tended to be less insulting to their forbears and colleagues when editing in the guise of the anonymous voice. He compares the situation to that of the modern journal editor, whose duties extend to a neutral presentation.

Chapter 2

Hebrew as the Language of the Angels

As noted in the Introduction, Jewish and Christian writings from late antiquity give witness to two different views concerning what language angels speak. Some writings promoted the understanding that angels speak Hebrew,[1] while others claimed or implied that angels speak an esoteric heavenly language. In this chapter, I introduce the former of these two views.

That a dominant stream within Judaism attached special religious significance to Hebrew should cause no surprise for the student of religion. Many religions attach a religious significance to a foundational language: John F. A. Sawyer lists Arabic, Sanskrit, Latin, and Avestan as examples of languages holding religious significance in modern times.[2] The motivation for such a view, or for the renewed strength that it might receive at a particular juncture, is often transparently sociological.[3] The special status of the sacred language was often represented by attributing that language to the angels or gods, and it was widely held that the most ancient human tongue was also necessarily divine. A much-cited passage of the neoplatonist Iamblichus (ca. 240–ca. 325 C.E.) makes this reasoning nearly explicit, although it stops short of attributing a special language to the gods: "[S]ince the gods have shown that the entire dialect of the sacred peoples such as the Assyrians and the Egyptians is appropriate for religious ceremonies, for this reason we must understand that our communication with the gods should be in an appropriate tongue [κοινολογίας]."[4] Philodemos argues, on similar grounds, that Zeus speaks Greek (*Dis.* 3).[5]

---

[1] This of set writings also contains claims that the angels speak Aramaic, but that view appears to be a reaction to the view that the angels speak Hebrew.

[2] Sawyer 1999:24. See Coseriu 1988:78–9.

[3] Sawyer 1999:25 lists communal isolation, bilingualism, nationalism, literacy, and political infrastructure as contributing factors in the development of a sacred-language ideology.

[4] Clarke, Dillon, and Hershbell (trans.) 2003:297. Cf. the rendering of T. Taylor (trans.) 1968:293, in which κοινολογίας is rendered "language allied to them". See Assmann 1995:37–46.

[5] See Diels 1917:37. See also Borst 1957–63:1.140.

(For some reason, few of the Greek gods ever *wrote* anything.)[6] As we will see, a number of rabbis had their own form of this argument.[7] It is as Johann Reuchlin once wrote in a letter: "the mediator between God and man was language" – specifically Hebrew.[8] Within various streams of Judaism, the pairing of Hebrew-speaking angels with the use of Hebrew at creation seems to have been undertaken as a matter of course, although there was a potential conflict with the view, also widely held, that each of the 70 (or 72) heathen nations speaks the language of its representative angel.[9]

The hebraeophone view of angeloglossy is most explicitly propounded in *Jubilees* and in a saying attributed to R. Yochanan. The ideology driving this view was also apparently embraced by the Qumran community, as demonstrated by 4Q464, although one searches in vain for an explicit reference to angels speaking Hebrew among the Qumran scrolls. The attaching of religious significance to Hebrew goes back at least to the time of Nehemiah and Ezra, but we do not know how early the specific belief in hebraeophone angeloglossy is. For chronological reasons, I discuss *Jubilees* first (together with 4Q464), then the talmudic references, and finally a few stray references from Christian writings.

A. *Jubilees* (and 4Q464)

The church fathers referred to the book of *Jubilees* as the "Little Genesis", because it retells the biblical narrative from Genesis 1 through Exodus 15. It was probably written in Palestine (in Hebrew) in the second century B.C.E., but a few fragments from Qumran cave four are all that survive of the Hebrew original.[10] For the entire book, we are dependent on an Ethiopic version, which in turn was probably based on a Greek version, and is fragmentarily supported by Greek, Latin, and Syriac versions.

Because *Jubilees* exalts the Torah, R. H. Charles thought that the book was written by a Pharisee.[11] The discovery of the Qumran scrolls has made that view untenable. The book's many affinities with Qumran beliefs have been the subject of many several studies.[12] James C. VanderKam writes,

---

[6] The exceptions are Athena (as shown on a single vase) and the Muses (as in a set scene). See Henrichs 2003.

[7] See Rubio 1977:40–1; Paul 1987:235–43.

[8] Quoted and translated in G. L. Jones 1999:245.

[9] See Borst 1957–63:1.19–5.

[10] VanderKam 1977: 207–85 argues for a date between 161 and 152 B.C.E. See VanderKam 1992:2.635–48.

[11] Charles 1913:2.1.

> [I]t can be said with confidence that Jub. and the specifically sectarian texts from Qumran show an extraordinary similarity in their teachings on predestination, the two moral ways, and the future state of the righteous. … Since Jub. and, in most cases, the Qumran texts date from approximately the same time, one is almost required to see them as products of a common and unique theological tradition. … [T]he fact that they adhered to a unique calendar makes the case overwhelming.[13]

Fragments of *Jubilees* were found in Qumran caves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11, and clear echoes from it are found in the sectarian writings.[14] Ben Zion Wacholder even suggests that *Jubilees* and some other works should "be reclassified as sectarian documents."[15] Although Wacholder's suggestion exaggerates the amount of sectarian *distinctiveness* that *Jubilees* evinces, the point that it was a centrally important text at Qumran needs to be taken seriously. The book obviously has some connection to Qumran, although scholars are divided on whether it was written there[16] or whether it was a product of the community's prehistory. Gene L. Davenport sees two stages in the writing of the book: it was first composed before Qumran came into existence, and then a "second edition" was produced at Qumran (ca. 140–104 B.C.E.).[17] Joseph Fitzmyer has shown that the Qumran *Genesis Apocryphon* is dependent on *Jubilees*, and Gershon Brin has recently argued

---

[12] For a bibliography of studies drawing parallels between *Jubilees* and the Qumran scrolls, see VanderKam 1977:259 n. 95. VanderKam 1977:260 compares the two corpora in respect to "their theological doctrines of predestination, the two moral ways, and the postmortem state of the righteous; their calendar; and their exegesis of Gen.". On *Jubilees*'s presence and literary influence at Qumran, see Hogeterp 2009:34. Compare also the Qumran self-title "plant of righteousness" (from 1QS) with *Jub.* 1.16; 7.34; 16.26; 21.24; 36.6. See Tiller 1997; Tyloch 1988.

[13] VanderKam 1977:270.

[14] *Jubilees* is almost certainly mentioned in CD 16.2–4. See VanderKam 1977:255–6. On the influence of *Jubilees* at Qumran, see Boccaccini 1998:86–98.

[15] Wacholder 1997:210.

[16] For a bibliography of studies arguing that *Jubilees* was written at Qumran, see VanderKam 1977:258 n. 94. See also Eissfeldt 1966:607–8. VanderKam 1977:280–1 disagrees with the Qumran-authorship view: "There are … some noteworthy differences which require that one not assign Jub. to the pen of a Qumran exile. For example, while the sectarians awaited two messiahs, one from Aaron and one from Israel, one looks in vain for a messianic hope in Jub. … Another example is that Jub. requires the death penalty for sabbath violations (2:25–27; 50:13) in harmony with biblical law (Exod. 31:14–15; 35:2; Num. 15:32–36), but CD explicitly rejects capital punishment for such offences (12:3–6). … There is an unmistakable awareness in Jub. that within Israel there is a chosen group (23:16; 26), but there is absolutely no evidence in the book that the author and his party have gone into a Qumran-like exile."

[17] Davenport 1971:16. For a similar two-edition view of *Jubilees*, see Gmirkin 2000. On possible Qumranic authorship, see also Cross 1995:44; Ringgren 1963:225–6.