The Rebuilding of the Temple in the Text of Tobit 13 and its Implications for Second Temple Hermeneutics

Bradley Gregory

1. Introduction

The Book of Tobit, composed sometime during the Second Temple period,[1] was probably originally written in Aramaic[2] and was subsequently

[1] The copies of Tobit at Qumran date paleographically from between 100 B.C.E. to 25 C.E., thus providing a *terminus ad quem*. Among other reasons the absence of awareness of the events surrounding Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Judas Maccabeus as well as a recognition of the scriptural status of the prophets (Tobit 14:4) have led scholars to date the book between 250 and 175 B.C.E. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 50–54; Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 40–42. Zimmerman, however, believes that the concerns of the book of Tobit reflect the persecution under the Seleucids and thus should be dated to the mid-second century B.C.E. See Frank Zimmerman, *The Book of Tobit: An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), 24. The two most probable suggestions for its provenance are Palestine and the eastern Diaspora. See Moore, *Tobit*, 42–43; Benedikt Otzen, *Tobit and Judith* (Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 57–59.

[2] This point is still heavily debated. The discovery of four Aramaic manuscripts and one Hebrew manuscript in Cave 4 at Qumran secures the argument for the Semitic composition of the book. A number of scholars have defended the thesis that Tobit was composed in Hebrew, notably Michael Wise, "A Note on 4Q196 (papTob Ar^a) and Tobit I 22," *VT* 43 (1993): 566–570; Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 299. However, as J.T. Milik was first working on the Qumran fragments he tentatively put forth the judgment that Tobit was likely originally composed in Aramaic and that the Hebrew was a translation. This view has been taken up and persuasively defended by both Fitzmyer (*Tobit*, 18–28) and Moore (*Tobit* 33–39). Cf. J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; SBT; London: SCM Press, 1959), 31. It is also worth noting that

translated into other languages. In its Greek and Latin forms it became part of the set of books that would later be known as the Apocrypha or deutero-canonical works. The narrative, which is set in northern Israel in the late eighth—early seventh centuries, tells the story of two Jews who desired to die due to their circumstances. Tobit, who is forced to live in Assyria, incurs the scorn of others, including his wife, for his steadfast allegiance to Torah and to Jewish customs. A relative of Tobit's, Sarah, also lives a righteous life but wishes to die because of the successive deaths of her seven husbands. These two protagonists demonstrate the efficaciousness of prayer and the ultimate vindication of those who live righteously.[3]

One of the more interesting aspects of Tobit is the history of scholarship that has attended it.[4] Up until the last couple of centuries, the historicity of Tobit was presupposed[5] and concomitantly, it was often assumed to have

_____

even before the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts there were some scholars who suspected a Semitic origin, e.g. Paul Joüon, "Quelques hébraïsmes du Codex Sinaiticus de Tobie," *Bib* 4 (1923): 168–174. Yet, despite the evidence from Qumran there are still those who defend the thesis that Tobit was composed in Greek, including Paul Deselaers, *Das Buch Tobit: Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 43; Göttingen: Vandernhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

   [3] For a sketch of the central themes and religious teachings of the book see Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 46–49. Also Moore, *Tobit*, 3–6, 26–33. General introductions to Tobit may be found in David deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 63–84; Daniel Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 10–26.

   [4] In recent years there has been a resurgence of interest in the book of Tobit. For an overview of the current state of the discussion see Richard A. Spencer, "The Book of Tobit in Recent Research," *CBR* 7 (1999): 147–180, especially 168–173; Ida Fröhlich, "Tobit Against the Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; SJSJ 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 55–70.

   [5] Ambrose's *On Tobit* was more of a polemic against the misuse of money than a commentary. Thus the first commentary on Tobit is usually considered to be that of Bede. Although interpreting the story allegorically and Christologically, Bede clearly presupposed the historicity of the narrative (cf. §1), though, as one would expect, he does not offer a discussion for the date of composition. See Seán

been composed either in the eighth century or the seventh century (or shortly afterwards). Although a seventh century date was still accepted as late as 1877 by Gutberlet,[6] the increasing recognition of geographical and historical errors and of anachronisms resulted in a new consensus that the book must have been composed after the beginning of the Persian period. How far after this point was a matter of much debate. Though many scholars still argued for a date in the pre-Christian period, a number of scholars argued for a much later date. Hitzig, Rosenthal, Graetz, and Neubauer all placed Tobit, or at least its final form, in the mid-second century C.E.[7] Neubauer reviews with approval the arguments of Graetz and others that the emphasis in the story on issues of proper burial and the absence of references to Tobit by Josephus demand that "the book can scarcely have been composed earlier [than the Bar Kokhba revolt]" and should be dated to the reign of Hadrian.[8] Kohut went even further and suggested a date in the early third century.[9]

However, Zimmermann offers a number of criticisms against dating all of Tobit past the close of the Second Temple period and tentatively suggests

_____

Connolly, *Bede on Tobit and on the Canticle of Habakkuk* (Portland: Four Courts Press, 1997), 18–21. Not surprisingly, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Luther and subsequent reformers challenged the historicity of the book while Roman Catholic scholars for the most part continued to defend it. See A. Wikgren, "Tobit, Book of" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4:660.

[6] Constantin Gutberlet, *Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt* (Münster: Theissing, 1877), cited by Moore, *Tobit*, 30; Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 50. For others see Zimmerman, *Book of Tobit*, 22 n.1.

[7] F. Hitzig, "Zur Kritik der apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments," *ZWT* 3 (1860): 250–261; M. Rosenthal, *Vier apokryphische Bücher aus der Zeit und Schule R. Akibas* (Leipzig: Schulze, 1885), 104–150; H. Graetz, "Das Buch Tobias oder Tobit: Seine Ursprache, Seine Abfassungszeit und Tendenz," *MGWJ* 28 (1879): 519; A. Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit: A Chaldee Text from a Unique Ms. in the Bodeleian Library, with Other Rabbinical Texts, English Translations and the Itala* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1878), xvi – xvii.

[8] Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, xvii.

[9] G. Kohut, "Etwas über die Moral und die Abfassungszeit des Buches Tobias," *JZWL* 10 (1872): 49–73.

that the principal portions of the book were likely composed in the early second century B.C.E.[10] But what is more interesting is that he goes on to argue that "as we pass into chapters 13 and 14, it is clear that we are in a different climate. As will be seen, they have been added to the original narrative core."[11] For Zimmermann, the heart of this deduction is that these two chapters presuppose a situation where Jerusalem and the temple have already been destroyed. For him, this argument excludes any possibility that these chapters were composed with the rest of the book and secures a date for them after 70 C.E. "The conclusion would seem to be inescapable. It is evident that Jerusalem has been destroyed, with the Temple as well; the walls, towers, and battlements overthrown; the people scattered, captive, and in mourning. The date of this psalm [i.e. Tobit 13] suggests itself, sometime after the destruction of the Temple, 70 CE."[12] Similarly, chapter 14 is "apocalyptic in mode and tenor" and thus although "he apparently finger-points the Second Temple, he means really a future Third to be built."[13]

As is well known, Zimmermann's conclusion has been held to have been conclusively disproved by the discovery of the fragments of Tobit at Qumran. Substantial portions of Tobit 13 are preserved in fragments 4QTob[a,e] (4Q196, 4Q200) and partial verses from Tobit 14 are preserved in fragments 4QTob[a,c,d,e] (4Q196, 198–200).[14] Within chapters 13 and 14 the

[10] Zimmerman points out, among other things, that Tobit is quoted authoritatively in 1 Clement and Polycarp. See the discussion in Zimmerman, *Book of Tobit*, 21–24.

[11] Zimmermann, *Book of Tobit*, 24. The secondary nature of chapters 13 and 14 was first proposed by Hitzig and followed by Rosenthal, Graetz, Neubauer, and Kohut. More recently it has still been defended by Deselaers, *Das Buch Tobit*, 413–17; M. Rabbenau, *Studien zum Buch Tobit* (BZAW 220; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 67–93.

[12] Zimmermann, *Book of Tobit*, 25. Cf. the discussion in M. M. Schumpp, *Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt* (EHAT 11; Münster: Aschendorff, 1933), XLII–LI.

[13] Zimmermann, *Book of Tobit*, 25–26.

[14] The official publication of the Tobit texts may be found in Joseph Fitzmyer, "Tobit" in *Qumran Cave 4: XIV. Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; ed. M. Broshi et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 1–76 (+ plates I–X). A translation that synthesizes the

pericopes that are extant are 13:6–12; 13:12–14:3; 14:7 (manuscript a), 14:2–6, 10 (manuscript c), 14:10 (manuscript d), and 12:20–13:4; 13:13–14; 13:18–14:2 (manuscript e).[15] What is important for our purposes is that Zimmermann's thesis that the final form of Tobit is post-70 C.E. is largely dependent on the references to rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple in particular (Tobit 13:10; 14:4–6). One will notice in this regard that the papyrus of 'manuscript a' is largely missing for 13:10 and 'manuscript c' only preserves a small portion of the right hand side of the column for 14:2–6. Despite these lacunae for the references to the rebuilding of the temple, Fitzmyer is confident in concluding: "Granted, the Qumran texts of Tobit 13–14 are fragmentary; but what solid reason is there for denying that these chapters in their entirety were part of the original?"[16] Yet, other scholars are more reserved. Moore, following Richardson, cautions that "such testimony, however, does not mean that *all* of chapters 13 and/or 14 were part of the original Tobit."[17] The question arises then, to which this essay is directed, as to how confident we may be in assuming that the references to rebuilding the temple in Tobit 13:10 and 14:4–6 are original, or even if later, were redacted before the close of the Second Temple period.[18] Is it possible that while chapters 13 and 14

––––––––––––––

five Qumran witnesses and provides more generous reconstructions than those found in the DJD volume, along with a popular introduction, may be found in Martin Abegg Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1999), 636–646.

[15] A full table of the extant text of Tobit at Qumran may be found in Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 1–2.

[16] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 43.

[17] Moore, *Tobit*, 22 (emphasis original); H. Richardson, "The Book of Tobit," in *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary on the Bible* (ed. C. Laymon; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), 527.

[18] Despite Fitzmyer's confidence in accepting all of Tobit 13 and 14, it needs to be noted that he does not go so far as to reconstruct the reference to rebuilding the temple in the critical edition of 4QTob^a. See Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 26–27. Collins is among those who still hold that portions of these two chapters were secondary to the original layer of composition. See John Collins, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit," in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International*

were substantially included in the original composition, the specific references to rebuilding the temple were later interpolations or secondary glosses?

Although the answer to this question ultimately will be uncertain and necessarily speculative, it is possible to build a circumstantial case that raises the probability of an accurate reconstruction of the missing text in the Qumran manuscripts. In order to assess what may be deduced from this manuscript evidence the following procedure will be followed. First, the Qumran texts will be situated within the larger framework of the textual history of Tobit. More specifically, we will examine the degree of textual affinity present between the Qumran versions (at least what is extant) and between the Qumran witnesses and the Greek recensions. Second, the Qumran manuscript containing the lacuna of the temple reference will be studied in order to determine the amount of space present where one would expect to find the reference to rebuilding the temple. Third, the Greek recension that has the most textual affinity with the Qumran text will be retroverted into Aramaic and the degree of correspondence between the reconstructed Aramaic text and the lacuna will be assessed. Finally, conclusions will be drawn about the probability of such a reading and the implications will be noted for the study of Tobit *vis à vis* the larger framework of Second Temple hermeneutics.

This procedure requires that the study be limited to Tobit 13:10 because it is extant in a manuscript with enough material on which to build an argument. In other words, enough of the manuscript has survived to determine with relative certainty the relationship of the text to the Greek recensions and the likely size of the lacuna for the reference to rebuilding the temple. The passage in Tobit 14:4–6, on the other hand, is only extant in manuscript c, a manuscript that only provides one other small pericope in

----

Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004 (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér; SJSJ 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 25, 39–40. For the likelihood that chapters 13–14 had an independent existence as an "eschatological psalm" see below, sec. 4.

addition to 14:4–6. Additionally, there is no complete line, making it impossible to reconstruct the column width with any certainty.

2. Establishing the Textual Affinity Between the Qumran Manuscripts and the Greek

2.1. The Place of 4Q196 in the Textual History of Tobit

The manuscript evidence for Tobit is complicated and sometimes difficult to adjudicate. Before the discovery of the Qumran manuscripts in 1952 the most reliable texts of Tobit were those in Greek and Latin.[19] The book was also preserved in Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, and Ethiopic, though all of these versions are largely derivative from the Greek recensions and so of little consequence for this study.[20]

There are two major extant Greek recensions of Tobit and a third minor one.[21] There is a short recension, labeled G[I] by Hanhart, that has as its main

---

[19] The standard critical edition of the Greek text is Robert Hanhart, *Tobit* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum VIII,5; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983). A critical edition of the Vulgate is currently being prepared by Jean-Marie Auwers, but presently the Latin text may be found in A. Brooke, N. McLean, and H. Thackeray, *Esther, Judith, Tobit in The Old Testament Greek* (Cambridge, UK: University Press, 1940), 123–144. The Vulgate text is placed in parallel to other versions of Tobit in Vincent Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses* (SBLDS 180; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000). A comprehensive synopsis of all the versions, ancient and medieval, complete with concordances of the Greek, Latin, Hebrew and Aramaic, may be found in Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (FoSub 3; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004).

[20] There are also Hebrew and Aramaic versions among the medieval witnesses, though these are clearly translated from Greek versions. See Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 12–13; and the excellent discussion in Schumpp, *Das Buch Tobias*, XIII–XLI.

[21] The most comprehensive analysis of the textual history of Tobit in its Greek manuscripts is found in Robert Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (Mitteilungen des Septuagint-Unternehmens XVII; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984). Hanhart's nomenclature and conclusions have set the terms for the textual study of Tobit in the past two decades. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 3–17.

textual witnesses Vaticanus (B), Alexandrinus (A) and Venetus (V). This text contains all the principal portions of the Tobit story, is characterized by a good quality of Greek, and was the primary text used throughout the history of the Christian churches. The longer recension, labeled G^{II} by Hanhart, is preserved in Sinaiticus (a) and only a few other fragmentary manuscripts.[22] The Sinaiticus text has two lacunae, 4:7–19b and 13:6i–10b,[23] with the result that this text must be supplemented with what is extant in MS 319 (the other principal witness to G^{II}), the Vetus Latina, or G^{I}. The third (and minor) Greek recension, labeled G^{III} by Hanhart, attempts to mediate between the shorter and longer recensions. Because it is only relevant for 6:9–12:22, it may be left to the side for the purposes of examining the text of Tobit 13.[24]

While the text of G^{III} is easily identified as dependent on the other two, what is the relationship between G^{I} and G^{II}? While a few scholars follow the conventional wisdom that the shorter text is more likely to be earlier,[25] a number of studies have demonstrated that in the case of Tobit, it is far more likely that G^{I} is an abridgement of G^{II}.[26] This conclusion is based primarily on three factors. First, the textual tradition reflected by G^{II} shows evidence of infelicities in being translated from a Semitic[27] *Vorlage* and these Semitisms were subsequently eliminated by G^{I}.[28] Second, G^{I} "reflects ideas, historical conditions, and theological developments later than those of

---

[22] It is also reflected in the Vetus Latina (VL).

[23] The verse divisions of the lacunae are those of Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 5.

[24] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 5.

[25] Notably, Deselaers, *Das Buch Tobit*, 374–500.

[26] Besides Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte*, 21–48; Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 3–6, see especially, Carey Moore, "Tobit, Book of, " *ABD* 6:585–594; J. D. Thomas, "The Greek Text of Tobit," *JBL* 91 (1972): 463–471; D. C. Simpson, "The Chief Recensions of the Book of Tobit," *JTS* 14 (1912–13): 516–530; J. R. Harris, "The Double Text of Tobit," *AJT* 3 (1899): 541–554.

[27] Whether the *Vorlage* was Hebrew or Aramaic is debated. Zimmerman and Moore (*Tobit*, 59–60) contend for a Hebrew *Vorlage*, though both believe that Tobit was originally composed in Aramaic.

[28] Thomas, "The Greek Text of Tobit," 469–470.

[G^{II}]."[29] Third, and most significantly, the longer recension of G^{II} is supported by the Aramaic and Hebrew texts discovered in cave 4 of Qumran. While the Semitic manuscripts and G^{II} are not a perfect match in every case, the degree of affinity between them unquestionably shows the historical priority of the longer recension.[30]

Furthermore, in seeking to determine the originality of the reference to rebuilding the temple in Tobit 13:10, it should be noted that this reference is attested in both G^{I} and G^{II}, though it is worded slightly differently.[31] In G^{I} the text reads "ἐξομολογοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἀγαθῶς καὶ εὐλόγει τὸν βασιλέα τῶν αἰώνων ἵνα πάλιν ἡ σκηνὴ αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομηθῇ εν σοι μετὰ χαρᾶς,"[32] whereas G^{II} says "…καὶ πάλιν ἡ σκηνή, σου οἰκοδομηθήσεταί, σοι μετὰ χαρᾶς."[33] The value of the agreement between G^{I} and G^{II} is evident when one recalls that G^{I} was not redacted from Sinaiticus (or MS 319) *per se* but from the recension of which Sinaiticus and MS 319 are witnesses. The fact that the reference to rebuilding the temple is preserved in all four ancient witnesses (G^{I}, G^{II}, VL, and Vulgate)[34] indicates that if the reference is secondary it was added

[29] Moore, "Tobit, Book of," 6:591; Cf. Simpson, "The Chief Recensions of the Book of Tobit," 518.

[30] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 9–10. Also, George Nickelsburg, "Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times: Tobit" in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT; ed. Michael Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 45; Michael Stone, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha," *DSD* 3 (1996): 276; James VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 35.

[31] In discussing Tobit 13–14 I use "temple" and "tabernacle" interchangeably since the claims are set in the context of Jerusalem and thus the two carry much the same force. In the LXX σκηνη is regularly used to translate both אהל and משכן. For more see Wilhelm Michaelis, "σκηνη, σκηνος, σκηνωμα, σκηνοω, επισκηνοω, κατασκηνοω, σκηνοπηγια, σκηνοποιος," *TDNT* 7:368–394.

[32] "Acknowledge the Lord in goodness, and bless the King of the ages, so that his tent may be rebuilt in you in joy."

[33] "And again your tent shall be rebuilt for you with joy."

[34] See Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit*, 402–403. There are slight variations. G^{II} is unique among the four in that the reference does not appear as part of a purpose/result clause. Also, the Vulgate is unique in having the tent/tabernacle the object of an active verb rather than the subject of a passive verb: "*ut reaedificet in te tabernaculum suum*//so that he might rebuild his tabernacle in you."

and/or glossed so early as to prevent the proliferation of its absence in any extant manuscript traditions.[35] Nevertheless, the fact that G^{I} is not so much an independent witness to an early text of Tobit as it is a conscious redaction of G^{II} implies that in tracing the origins of the reference to rebuilding the temple, the most significant Greek manuscript continues to be that of Sinaiticus (with the aid of MS 319). Therefore, in order to assess the probability of the originality of this reference, we must narrow our focus to the relationship first between the Qumran witnesses and then between the Qumran materials and the G^{II} recension.

2.2. *The Relationship Between 4Q196 and the other Tobit Texts at Qumran*

Although all five manuscripts of Tobit (four Aramaic, one Hebrew) are fragmentary, there are some pericopes that are extant in more than one manuscript, allowing us to draw some important, though necessarily tentative, conclusions about the stability of the Tobit text at Qumran. These multiply-attested verses and pericopes are presented in table 1.

Table 1: Overlap in the Qumran Tobit texts[36]

4QpapTob^a ar (4Q196)		4QTob^b ar (4Q197)		4QTob^c ar (4Q198)		4QTob^d ar (4Q199)		4QTob^e (4Q200)	
frg.	Passage	frg.	Passage	frg.	Passage	frg.	Passage	frg.	Passage
		1	*3:6–8*					*1i*	*3:6*
6	*3:9–15*							*1ii*	*3:10–11*
9, 10	*4:5, 7*							*2*	*4:3–9*
11	4:21–5:1	2	4:21–5:1						
13	6:6–8	4i	5:19–6:12						

[35] There are two minuscules of G^{I} that omit verse 10 entirely but these are late (107, fourteenth century, and 126, fifteenth century). In particular, 107 is a G^{III} text, which means that it is clearly dependent on other G^{I} texts, which contain verse 10, and so should not be granted much weight. For the sake of completeness it should also be noted that one other late minuscule has "σπουδη" instead of "σκηνη" (106). See the apparatus in Hanhart, *Tobit*, 170.

[36] This is an abbreviated table taken from Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 1–2.

14i	6:13–18	4ii	6:12–18				
14ii	6:18–7:6	4iii	6:18–7:10				
17i	*12:18–13:6*					*6*	*12:20–13:4*
18	13:12–14:3			1	14:2–6	*7i*, ii	*13:13–14;* 13:18–14:2
				2	14:10	2	14:10

*Passages in italics are those in which the parallel is between the Hebrew manuscript and only one Aramaic manuscript.

One will notice that the task of comparison is complicated by the fact that several parallel verses are between an Aramaic copy and the Hebrew copy. For these passages the material is fragmentary enough that it is difficult to say more than that there is, for the most part, no reason to suspect much textual variation. For example, in examining 4Q196 (frg. 10) and 4Q200 (frg. 2) on Tobit 4:7 there are only three words that may be compared, but they are equivalent (with respect to the language shift):

Tob 4:7 [4Q196, frg. 10, line 1][37]

[כארך] ידך ברי הוי ע[בד צדקתא   ]

Tob 4:7 {4Q200, frg. 2, line 6]

צדקות [עושה] וכארך ידכה בני היה [   ]

Similary, for Tob 13:13 the texts in 4Q196 and 4Q200 are essentially equivalent:

Tob 13:13 [4Q196, frg. 18, line 2]

[אדין [חדי ובועי בב[ני קשיטיא   ]

Tob 13:13 [4Q200, frg. 7i, line 1]

אז שמחי ודוצי[   ]

The only potentially variant reading occurs in Tob 12:20, where 4Q200 reads "and he caused him to ascend" (והעלהו).[38] While this half of v. 20 is

---

[37] Unless otherwise noted all transcriptions and reconstructions follow those in Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 1–76.

not extant in the Aramaic texts, G^{II} and VL read "and he ascended" (καὶ ἀνεβή // *et ascendit*).[39]

However, there is more data with which to work for the overlapping Aramaic portions. In surveying the materials one will note that the divergences are few; even the orthography is quite consistent. The few differences between the manuscripts fall into three categories. One kind of divergence is due to a scribal error. For instance, for Tobit 14:3 4Q196 has "ובקדה" whereas 4Q198 preserves the correct reading, "ופקדה." Depending on the characteristics of the *Vorlage* of 4Q196, the error may have been either graphic or phonological. Another kind of divergence, one quite common among the Qumran literature, is the interchangeability between the *Aphel* and the *Haphel*. For example, for Tobit 7:1, 4Q196 reads "והשכחו לרעואל יתב" whereas 4Q197 reads "ואשכחו לרעואל יתב." Thirdly, and most importantly for our purposes, there are a couple of expansions. The central verse in this regard is Tobit 6:7.

4Q196, frg. 13, lines 2–3

ר לי] אמ[אחי   עזריה] *(vacat)*

[ז   [   ] עלוהי [   ] מה סם ב[לבב נונא וכבדה

4Q197, frg. 4i, line 12

[מר לה עזריה אחי מה סם בלבב נונא ובכ[בדה ובמררתה [וא]

There are two differences between these two texts. First, 4Q196 contains the additional imperatival clause "tell me."[40] Second, in the 4Q197 text the preposition "b" is distributed over both "לבב" and "כבדה." It seems clear, though, that the nature and infrequency of the variations within the

_____

[38] It is unclear whether this has any significance since *qal* and *hiph'il* forms were often interchangeable in Second Temple Hebrew.

[39] Most of the correspondences between the Aramaic manuscripts and the Hebrew manuscript are helpfully placed in parallel in Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 144–145.

[40] It seems clear that the imperatival clause is a secondary gloss; only 4Q196 and the Vulgate have it. All other witnesses (G^I, G^{II}, VL) agree with 4Q197. Cf. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit*, 208–209, who surprisingly overlooks the correspondence on this point between 4Q196 and the Vulgate: "Vg…alone reads the phrases *ut dicas mihi* and *servare iussisti*."

Qumran manuscripts warrant the conclusion that the text of Tobit was stable, but not absolutely uniform.[41] In addition, it should be noted that the variations that are extant give no evidence of a tendency to gloss for theological purposes or for a sectarian *Tendenz*.

2.3. The Relationship Between 4Q196 and the Greek of G^{II}

As was noted above, among the Greek recensions of Tobit, the one closest to the text type of 4Q196 (and the other four Qumran manuscripts) is that which is contained in G^{II} (Sinaiticus). Before turning to 4Q196 frg. 17ii (which contains Tobit 13:6–12) it is necessary to survey the whole manuscript to determine its textual character *vis à vis* the Greek witnesses.

The cases where 4Q196 agrees with G^{II} against the other text forms are numerous, leading all scholars who have worked on the Qumran material to conclude that these two are more akin to each other than to the textual traditions represented by any of the other ancient witnesses.[42] A few examples may be offered for the sake of illustration. In Tobit 1:19, only 4Q196 (frg. 2, line 1) and G^{II} report that Tobit knew that the king knew about him (καὶ ὅτε ἐπέγνων ὅτι ἔγνω περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὅτι ζητοῦμαι τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν ἐφοβήθην καὶ ἀπέδρασα// וכדי ידעת [די] ידע בי [ולי בעה למקט]ל דחלת וערקת). G^{I} and others only report that Tobit knew he was being sought to be put to death (ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὅτι ζητοῦμαι ἀποθανεῖν φοβηθεὶς ἀνεξώρησα). Only a few verses later, in Tobit 1:22, 4Q196 (frg. 2, line 7) and G^{II} agree that Ahiqar was the chief cupbearer (Αχιχαρος γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἀρχιοινοχόος// ואחי]קר אחי הוה רב שקה) rather than simply a cupbearer, as

---

in G^I (Αχιαχαρος δὲ ἦν ὁ οἰνοχόος).[43] A third example may be found in Tobit 4:2 where G^{II} and 4Q196 (frg. 8, line 2) have a reference to telling Tobias about "this money" (περὶ τοῦ ἀργυρίου τούτου//ע[ל כספא] דן), whereas the direct object is absent in G^I. Finally, in Tobit 7:3 4Q196, 197 and G^{II} agree that it was Edna who asked the visitors where they were from, not Raguel as in G^I.[44]

Nevertheless, despite the general agreement between G^{II} and 4Q196, there are also a few instances where the Qumran texts agree with G^I over against G^{II}.[45] In fact, there are three such occurrences in chapters 13 and 14.[46] In Tobit 13:1 G^I and 4Q200 contain a reference to Tobit's composition of a psalm (or prayer) of praise, which is absent in G^{II}.

Tobit 13:1 [4Q200, frg. 6, line 4]

בכן דבר טובי וכתוב תהלה בתשבוחת ואנ]מור[

Tobit 13:1 [GI]

καὶ Τωβιτ ἔγραψεν προσευχὴν εἰς ἀγαλλίασιν καὶ εἶπεν

Tobit 13:1 [GII]

καὶ εἶπεν

The other two instances, in Tobit 14:1–2, do not involve additions but rather a difference in detail. In 4Q196, 200, and G^I Tobit loses his sight at the age of fifty-eight, whereas in G^{II} the age given in sixty-two.[47] In the next

[43] Another interesting aspect of this verse is that Sinaiticus (G^{II}) has Sennacherib appoint Ahiqar, wheras 4Q196 and VL read "Esarhaddon." See Wise, "A Note on 4Q196 (papTob ara) and Tobit i 22," 566–570.

[44] For additional examples of correspondences between G^{II} and the Qumran texts, see the versions on Tobit 5:21; 6:5–6, 12; 7:1, 11; 14:1–2.

[45] This is one of the great puzzles of the textual history of Tobit. Perhaps the best explanation is that soon after G^I was redacted from G^{II}, there was a certain degree of cross-fertilization between the two, resulting in these anomalies. Ultimately, though, there is still no persuasive explanation for this phenomenon. However, when all the evidence is weighed it is difficult to deny that the Qumran MSS more closely resemble the G^{II} manuscripts and the few places where they agree with G^I against G^{II} must be treated as the exceptions.

[46] Other examples may be seen in Tobit 2:2; 3:11; and 12:22.

[47] VL also has fifty-eight, while the Vulgate has fifty-six. Cf. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit*, 426–427.

verse, 4Q198 and G[I] report that Tobit "continued to fear God" (καὶ προσέθετο φοβεῖσθαι κύριον τὸν θεὸν//והוסף למדחל לאלהא), while G[II] says that he "continued to bless God" (καὶ ἔτι προσέθετο εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεὸν). In addition there are a number of cases where the Qumran material agrees with VL over against both G[II] and G[I] or differs from all other ancient witnesses.[48] The latter cases are particularly prominent in chapter 13. In regard to these divergences, Moore rightly concludes that "the Semitic *Vorlage* of G[II] was close to, but by no means identical to, the Qumran texts."[49]

What are the implications of this data for the place of the Qumran manuscripts in the textual history of Tobit? First, our most ancient extant witnesses (4Q196–200, G[I], G[II], VL) cannot be conceptualized as bearing direct relationship to one another. Rather, they are representatives of different textual forms of the book of Tobit. In other words, a manuscript in the G[I] family is a redacted form of a manuscript in the G[II] family (but not necessarily Sinaiticus). Similarly, while there is a high degree of textual affinity between the Qumran material and G[II], one must be cautious in drawing conclusions, especially as regards reconstructing missing text(s), by appealing to another member within this textual family. Nevertheless, despite the textual variations among the Qumran material and G[II], it must also be emphasized that there is no evidence, either within the Qumran material or between a Qumran text and a G[II] text, that there was any major revisional activity or theological modification within the extant witnesses to this Qumran/G[II] family.

While one could postulate that the reference to rebuilding the temple in 13:10 is a gloss postdating the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E., the fact that it is attested in all the textual families mitigates against this. Furthermore, since there is no evidence within the Qumran/G[II] family of glossing for theological purposes, the burden of proof must fall on those

[48] Examples of the former may be found in Tobit 3:10; 4:8; 6:11; 12:1; 13:11. Examples of the latter are present in Tobit 1:22; 2:2; 3:10, 12; 6:6; 9:2; 10:7; 12:22; 13:2–3, 8, 12–13.

[49] Moore, *Tobit*, 58.

who would see the temple reference as a secondary gloss.[50] In order to assess this probability, the lacuna in the Qumran papyrus will now be examined.

3. The Nature and Reconstruction of the Lacuna in 4Q196 for Tobit 13:10

According to Fitzmyer, the cols. of 4Q196 are approximately 15 cm wide and contain between thirteen and sixteen lines each.[51] This conclusion seems to be based largely on the evidence of frg. 2. Both lines 9 and 11 are preserved enough to measure their width. Only a few other frgs. contain a substantial amount of text (frgs. 6,13,14i,14ii,17ii,18) and none of them have an entire line intact. However, clear margins are preserved in frgs. 14ii and 17ii.[52] Lines 6 and 7 of the former, which contain Tobit 7:1–2a, are also extant in 4Q197 (frg. 4iii, lines 3–4) thus allowing one to reconstruct the rest of the lines with good confidence. The reconstruction provided by Fitzmyer[53] suggests that the col. width was consistent throughout the document (approximately 15 cm). There is some variation in the col. width from line to line because the scribe does not break words at the end of a line; rather he either finishes the word or moves to the next line before beginning it (cf. the left cols. in 4Q196, frgs. 2 and 14).

This scribal practice, of course, creates some ambiguity for reconstructing lacunae that span multiple lines, as with Tobit 13:10, which spans lines 9 and 10 of frg. 17ii. One needs to find the probable range of line length to determine how early the scribe was willing to go to the next line or how late he was willing to stay on a line to complete a word. Then the proposed reconstruction needs to be assessed in order to know where the break would most likely come. The second line may then be calculated with respect to the number of characters that would fit the remainder of the lacuna. Obviously, this is a very speculative procedure and so any

---

[50] It should be noted that while both G[I] and G[II] use "σκηνη," the VL and the Vulgate use the slightly more specific "*tabernaculum*."

[51] Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 7.

[52] The enumeration of the frgs. is that of Fitzmyer, "Tobit", plates I–V.

[53] See Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 22.

conclusions that are drawn from it must necessarily be very tentative.[54] Nevertheless, the exercise may provide some circumstantial evidence for the likelihood that 4Q196 was equivalent to G[II] in regard to Tobit 13:10.

Turning to the frgs. of 17ii, which contain Tobit 13:6–12, another problem immediately arises. Because there is no line that is completely preserved on the frg., one cannot calculate the range of line length with much confidence. However, there is enough text present in lines 1, 3–5 that one may calculate the amount of text allotted to each line (in terms of number of characters), assuming of course that Fitzmyer's reconstructions are accurate.[55] This is admittedly an inexact method since the space required for the formation of letters varies not only from one letter to another (e.g. from י to א), but even for each time the same letter is formed. The inexactness is only exacerbated by the fact that the same scribe may spell words differently (e.g. *plene* or defective) even within the same pericope.[56]

Despite these difficulties, one may observe that lines 1–5 in frg. 17ii accommodate roughly 45–50 characters per line.[57] Moving down the fragment to lines 8–10, Fitzmyer offers the following transcription:[58]

[	ירושלם [קרית קדשא י]כת[שׁנׁלֹ]י על	] 8
[	בקו] שטא הוד]י	] 9
[	יתבנ]ה לכ]י	] 10

[54] An obvious complication is that in reconstructing missing portions there is no way for the reader to know whether or not there may have been superlinear additions/glosses in the missing portion of the text.

[55] For lines 1–3a, Fitzmyer's reconstruction requires a slight variation from the wording present in G[II], G[I], and VL (though an equivalent concept). Lines 3b–4 conform to G[I] and VL, but this part of the text is missing from Sinaiticus through homoioteleuton. Cf. Skemp, *The Vulgate of Tobit*, 394–398.

[56] This appears to be less of a concern for this manuscript. For example, in our frg. (17ii), the word "קושטא" appears twice and is spelled *plene* in both of them. Furthermore, the reconstruction of Tobit 13:10 does not contain words that would have much variation in spelling.

[57] As noted above, the variation is due to the scribe's unwillingness to "wrap around" a word onto the next line. Line 1 contains 47 characters; line 3 has 50; line 4 has 47; line 5 has 50.

[58] Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 26.

8 [Jerusalem,] holy city, he will [affl]ict yo[u, concerning]
9 [with righ]teousness acknowle[dge   ]
10 [shall be bui]lt for yo[u]

Therefore, between "acknowledge" (הודי) and "for you" (לכי), there is one missing line. According to G[I],[59] the intervening text would read "ἐξομολογοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἀγαθῶς καὶ εὐλόγει τὸν βασιλέα τῶν αἰώνων ἵνα πάλιν ἡ σκηνὴ αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομηθῇ εν σοι μετὰ χαρᾶς//Acknowledge the Lord in goodness and bless the King of the ages, so that his tent may be rebuilt in you in joy." The last half of the verse is also preserved in Sinaiticus (G[II]): "καὶ πάλιν ἡ σκηνή σου οἰκοδομηθήσεταί σοι μετὰ χαρᾶς//And again your tent will be built for you with joy." Collating these two witnesses,[60] a plausible translation of this text into Aramaic is "בקושטא הודי ל... ברכי מלך עלמיא די עוד מקדשך[61] יתבנה לכי בחדוה."[62]

Counting the number of characters between the ה of הודי and the ל of לכי, the sum is forty-five letters (counting spaces). This count is within the general range of space per line for this column. Nevertheless, given the uncertainty of the amount of space present, it is always possible that some other word besides מקדש was present, such as ירושלם.

---

[59] G[II] is absent in the first part of this text and resumes with "καὶ πάλιν ἡ σκηνή σου οἰκοδομηθήσεταί σοι μετὰ χαρᾶς."

[60] The two witnesses must be collated because the first half of the verse evidently dropped out of Sinaiticus (or its *Vorlage*) due to homoioteleuton. Therefore, it is to be expected that a G[II] witness 500 years earlier would likely have had what is still extant in G[I].

[61] This reconstruction follows G[II]. If one were to opt for the reading in G[I] the reconstruction would read "מקדשה."

[62] It is likely that בקושטא is adverbial, modifying הודי, rather than the conclusion to the previous verse (G[I]: καὶ πάλιν ἐλεήσει τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν δικαίων), which is plural. The G[I] text for 13:10 has αγαθως, which is adverbial (Hanhart, *Tobit*, 170). Some witnesses however, read αγαθος or αγαθω (adjective), perhaps under the influence of the virtually identical and frequent refrain in the Psalter "Praise the Lord for he is good" (Ps 106:1; 107:1; 118:1, 29; 135:3; 136:1; 147:1; cf. Ps 34:9; 52:9; 54:8; 100:5).

Another detail that needs to be considered is the reconstruction of יתבנה on line 10. As Fitzmyer notes, only the upper left portion of the letter transcribed as ה is preserved on the papyrus.[63] The very small amount of this letter that is preserved makes it difficult to give much confidence to the reconstruction, but when one compares this stroke (right to left, slightly upward) to the way the scribe forms letters on the rest of the manuscript, Fitzmyer's supposition seems quite reasonable, especially when one would expect יתבנה before לכי in the Aramaic of the G^II family of texts.[64]

The likelihood that the content of this missing line is very close to what would have been found in G^II (before the homoioteleuton) is further strengthened by the consonance between 4Q196 and the Greek texts of Tobit with respect to the content of ch. 13. Line 8 of the papyrus matches the Greek text with the phrase "קרית קדשא" which is descriptive of Jerusalem.[65] Furthermore, if Fitzmyer has transcribed/reconstructed יכתשנכי ("will afflict you") correctly,[66] then the context both matches the other ancient witnesses and suggests that the reconstructed יתבנה is in reference either to Jerusalem or to the temple.

To sum up, what conclusions may be drawn from all the textual data explored above? While one can never know for sure what would have been in a missing text, the circumstantial evidence for the temple reference seems to be as strong as one could hope. The text of Tobit within the Qumran manuscripts and among the G^II family in general appears to have been fairly stable before the close of the Second Temple period. Even the few variables that are present show no evidence of intentional glossing for

---

[63] Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 27.

[64] This reconstruction is strengthened by the observation that the verb "בנה" is still extant for Tobit 13:16 (frg. 18, lines 7–8) in reference to the gates and towers of Jerusalem. However, while this virtually assures that Fitzmyer's reconstruction of יתבנה (or תתבנה) is correct, it still does not help identify the subject of the verb, whether the tabernacle or Jerusalem.

[65] While the *yod* and *tav* are fully visible, only the tops of *resh* and *qof* are preserved.

[66] Cf. "After קדשא only the lower end of *yod* is visible. At the very end only the tops of letters can be seen, probably שנכ." (Fitzmyer, "Tobit," 27).

theological purposes. In addition, the references to the rebuilding of the temple are universally attested in all extant manuscripts and within 4Q196 the size of the lacuna in lines 10–11 of frg. 17 is conducive to the length of Tobit 13:10 attested in both G[I] and G[II]. Furthermore, the portions of 4Q196 that are extant show no significant differences from its Greek relatives. Therefore, despite the variables and guesses involved in our reconstruction, there seems to be no good textual reason to suggest that the reference to rebuilding the temple was not original to the composition of chapter 13.[67] This is especially true once the reference is placed in the wider context of Second Temple hermeneutics. Then, as we will see, the theological presuppositions that motivated the late dating of Tobit 13–14 by scholars such as Zimmermann largely disappear and there is even less reason to suspect that the references post-date the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.

4. The Implications of Tobit 13:10 (and 14:2–6) for Second Temple Hermeneutics

In reading through Tobit 13–14 one could simply respond to Zimmermann's claim that Tobit 13:10 reflects the destruction of the Second Temple with the observation that the reference to the rebuilding of the temple is made by Tobit (who is set in pre-exilic times) in reference to the return from the Babylonian exile.[68] Therefore, could it not be simply a *vaticinium ex eventu* of the construction of the Second Temple in the late sixth century that is retrojected into the mouth of the pre-exilic Tobit by the post-exilic author?

---

[67] Even if one holds that chs. 13–14 were a later addition, these chapters were almost certainly in place and fairly stable before the close of the Second Temple period. Cf. Collins, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit," 25, 39–40.

[68] Another option is that οικοδομεω can be used in the softer sense of refurnishing the temple as in 1 Macc 4:48. Cf. Helen Schüngel-Straumann, *Tobit* (HThKAT; Wien: Herder, 2000), 168: "Das Verb οικοδομεω kann sowohl für den Wiederaufbau des Zweiten Tempels (vgl. Esr 5, 2.3.4 u.a.) gebraucht werden, wie auch für die Wiedereinrichtung durch die Makkabäer (vgl. 1 Makk 4, 48)." However, Tobit 13 is a different genre of literature than 1 Maccabees and can hardly have this softer sense. The force of the eschatological program for ending the exile requires the sense of "rebuilding."

This is unlikely because the details of the prayer are grander than the return from exile and construction of the temple reflected in other Jewish works such as Ezra-Nehemiah and Haggai. The psalm in Tobit 13 rather focuses on an eschatological vindication of Jerusalem and her people. In fact, some scholars such as Flusser have identified a form critical category within Second Temple literature called the "eschatological psalm," which had a sociological origin in "Israel's longing for deliverance from the foreign yoke and from the eschatological hopes connected with Jerusalem."[69] According to Flusser the three defining characteristics of this genre were a dependence on themes and concepts from Second Isaiah, an emphasis on "joy," and the function of concluding a text or major section of a text. Even a cursory read of Tobit 13–14 makes it clear that all three of these characteristics permeate this text.[70] Besides Tobit 13–14, Flusser identified the following compositions as "eschatological psalms": *Baruch* 4:5–5:9; *Psalms of Solomon* 11; *Sirach* 35:17–20; 36:1–17; and 11QPs[a] XXII:1–15.[71] Furthermore, the eschatological character of Tobit 13–14 is strong enough that several scholars have maintained that these chapters, or at least the bulk of them, had an independent existence before being redacted onto the end of the original Tobit story.[72]

Whether or not Tobit 13–14 had an independent existence, what is clear is that the composition in its final form more closely reflects the theology and hopes of the Second Temple author than it does of a simple prophecy after

[69] David Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers" in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 556.

[70] Cf. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 301–320; Moore, *Tobit*, 275–287.

[71] Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," 556–558.

[72] See Collins, "The Judaism of the Book of Tobit," 25. Zimmermann (*Tobit*, 24–25) and Deselaers (*Das Buch Tobit*, 42) feel the independence of Tobit 13–14 is certain. Nickelsburg is more cautious in entertaining it as a possibility; cf. George Nickelsburg, "Tobit" in *Harper's Bible Commentary* (ed. James Mays; New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 801. Even those who defend the originality of these chapters are prone to admitting that they are quite intelligible even without the story to which they are attached, e.g. Patrick Griffin, *The Theology and Function of Prayer in the Book of Tobit* (Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America; Washington, D.C., 1984), 235; cited in Moore, *Tobit*, 283.

the fact.[73] In other words, the fulfillment of the prediction that Jerusalem and her people will be vindicated and that the temple will be rebuilt is not to be primarily located in the sixth century return from Babylon; rather this latter complex of historical events is viewed as the initiation of an eschatological program with a more distant horizon. Albertz is worth quoting at length:

> It is noteworthy that the book of Tobit vastly expands the temporal horizon of the exile. It encompasses not just the Assyrian exile, which Tobit actually experiences, but also the Babylonian exile, which he foresees clairvoyantly (Tob 14:4). But even the return and the rebuilding of the temple in 520 does not bring the exile to an end—in contrast to the conception of the Chronicler's History and the Story of the Three Youths… In this view, the exile includes the entire present and future history of Israel until the great eschatological day of salvation, promised by the prophets (Tob 14:5). It becomes the most inclusive category for interpreting the course of Israel's history until the eschaton.[74]

When viewed from this angle, it is not surprising that Tobit 13–14 would contain references to rebuilding the temple even while the Second Temple was in existence. Because the return from exile and the rebuilding of the temple have become paradigmatic categories within Second Temple eschatological hopes, the author is neither interested in simply a *vaticinium*

---

[73] One of the ways the author does this is by an abundance of allusions to the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy 32. See Steven Weitzman, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1996): 49–61; Moore, *Tobit*, 284–285. It should also be noted that the whole book of Tobit reflects the influence of Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic theology. See Alexander Di Lella, "The Deuteronomic Background of the Farewell Discourse in Tob 14:3–11," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 380–389; idem, "Two Major Prayers in the Book of Tobit," in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran: Inaugural Conference of the ISDCL at Salzburg, Austria, 5–9 July 2003* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley; DCL 2004; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 97–100; William Soll, "Misfortune and Exile in Tobit: The Juncture of a Fairy Tale Source and Deuteronomic Theology," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 209–231.

[74] Rainer Albertz, *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* (trans. David Green; SBL 3; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 33–34.

ex eventu nor in aligning the psalm with the particular historical circumstances of his own day. His horizon is rather much broader.

Where does this view of the exile as persisting up through the author's present day fit within the context of Second Temple literature? While there were certainly some works that viewed the exile as a more prosaic historical time period (e.g. Judith 4:3; 5:18–19), the perspective of Tobit 13–14 is surprisingly well attested.[75] Perhaps the most well known example is found in Dan 9:22–27.[76] The prophecy in Jeremiah 29:10–14 that the exile would last for seventy years is reinterpreted in Daniel 9 as "seventy weeks of years" (9:22–27). After an examination of the (re)interpretation of Jeremiah by the author of Daniel, Knibb concludes that "in the author's view everything that had happened between the carrying away into captivity of the Jewish people and the time of Antiochus was of little importance…the exile is understood as a state that is to be ended only by the intervention of God and the inauguration of the eschatological era."[77] Other examples similar to this view of the exile may be found in the Animal Apocalypse in *1 Enoch* (89:59–90:19), *Jubilees* 1:9–18, *Test. Levi* 16–17, *Assumption of Moses* 3, and *CD* I:5–11.[78]

Furthermore, beyond just the conception of the exile as an enduring state, the expectation of an eschatological temple is also well attested. In fact, there seems to have been a fairly tight nexus between the restoration of

[75] Albertz (*Israel in Exile*, 4–15) draws attention to three other models for understanding the exile: as a "lost opportunity" (Jeremiah 39–43), as "(temporary) end of history" (2 Kings), and as a "sabbath for the land" (2 Chronicles).

[76] The first scholar to provide a full study of the exile as a *theological idea* was Peter Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration: A Study of Hebrew Thought in the Sixth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1968). Ackroyd's study has been advanced particularly in relation to Daniel 9 by Michael Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *HJ* 17 (1976): 253–272.

[77] Knibb, "The Exile in Intertestamental Literature," 255. For more on the interpretation of Jeremiah in Daniel 9 cf. John Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 352–358.

[78] It should be noted that while they have a similar conception of the exile, all of these have their own nuances in their understanding of the idea. See Knibb, "The Exile in Intertestamental Literature," 256–268.

Jerusalem and the construction of an "eschatological" temple.[79] Building on the (post-)exilic prophets (e.g. Isa 40–66; Ezek 40–48; but cf. Mic 4) a sort of "restoration eschatology"[80] developed among some Second Temple Jews that encompassed four major themes: the return of the Diaspora, the rise of a Davidic king who would liberate Israel from foreign rule, an eschatological temple, and the streaming of the nations to Zion.[81] Besides Tobit 13–14, examples of the importance of an eschatological temple may be found in *1 Enoch* 25:5; 89:73; 90:28–29; 4QpPs37 3:11; 11QTemple 29:8–10 (cf.

[79] Gaston challenges this perspective, arguing that the primary eschatological expectation was of a new Jerusalem/Zion. Where references to a new temple occur they are largely incidental and derived from "historical profanations." However, McKelvey is more persuasive when he argues that, in the stream of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah, references to "Zion" would have naturally carried with them the association of a new temple (cf. Isa 44:28; 56:5–7; 60:7, 13; 66:20). Sanders defends McKelvey's position and advances the thesis in light of Jesus' statements about the destruction of the current temple. According to Sanders, this nexus was strong enough that the author of Revelation felt the need to deny it: "And I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (Rev 21:22). Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (NovTSupp XXIII; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 162; R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 11–24; E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 77–90.

[80] The term "restoration eschatology" is that of Sanders (*Jesus and Judaism*, 77–90).

[81] Cf. George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 18: "Much of post-biblical Jewish theology and literature was influenced and sometimes governed by a hope for such a restoration: a return of the dispersed; the appearance of a Davidic heir to throw off the shackles of foreign domination and restore Israel's sovereignty; the gathering of one people around a new and glorified Temple."; so also Wilken, though slightly overstated: "Everything is now oriented to the center, and when the exiles returned it was no longer possible to conceive of the land without including the city and temple, a view that would become normative in the centuries after the exile." (Robert Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992], 14). Cf. Moshe Weinfeld, "Inheritance of the Land – Privilege versus Obligation: The Concept of the 'Promise of the Land' in the sources of the First and Second Temple Periods [Heb.]," *Zion* 49 (1984): 126.

Sib. Or. 3:294).[82] Yet among these works there is diversity. The picture in Tobit 13–14 generally lacks the vivid descriptions of grandeur that are found in some descriptions (e.g. *1 Enoch* 90:28–29), but does picture a temple qualitatively greater than in other sources (e.g. *1 Enoch* 25:5; 2 Macc 2:7).[83] Furthermore, there is diversity over who will build the temple. In Tobit 13–14 the implication is that the people of Israel will build the new temple. However, most other sources believe that it will be God who will build (or bring) it (*1 Enoch* 90:28–29; *Jub.* 1:17; 11QTemple 29:8–18).[84]

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, not only is there no textual evidence to suggest that Tobit 13:10 is a later gloss, but all of the textual data presents a cumulative, though circumstantial, case that the reference to the rebuilding of the temple was likely composed during the period when the Second Temple was still in existence. Furthermore, the historical and theological presuppositions that motivated earlier scholars such as Zimmermann to date these portions of Tobit to a time after the fall of the temple in 70 C.E.

[82] Often, as in *1 Enoch*, the author emphasizes the dissatisfaction with the current temple. Cf. George Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 395: "The destruction, exile, and rebuilding notwithstanding, the situation parallels the circumstances that led to the destruction and exile. Nothing has really changed. Therefore the people will continue to suffer at the hands of the their disobedient shepherds and to be victimized by the wild beasts."

[83] One will notice the difference in perspective within the book of *1 Enoch*. Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch*, 315) comments that 25:5–6 "provide no clue to the author's attitude about the present state of Jerusalem and its sanctuary. They indicate only that life in the eschaton will center around Jerusalem and its sanctuary, the source of eternal life."

[84] A mediating position may be found in *Sib. Or*. 5:414–33 where it appears that an angelic or messianic figure ("a blessed man from heaven") is the builder. The fifth Sibylline Oracle likely dates from between the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. and the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135 C.E. and so its post-destruction perspective makes it less immediately relevant to this discussion. See John Collins, "Sibylline Oracles: A New Translation and Introduction" in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols; ed. James Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983–85), 1:390.

have largely dissolved in light of recent research on the contemporary
literature. Rather, Tobit 13–14 is part of a larger hermeneutical tendency
within Second Temple works to view the exile as an enduring state and to
cast certain Isaianic themes (e.g. the glorification of Jerusalem, the
rebuilding of the temple, the vindication of the Jewish people, and the
streaming of the nations to Zion) into an eschatological framework that
allowed theological hopes seemingly to cut across historical realities.