**The traditions concerning Aaron, and their contributions to the understanding of the changes in the status of the priesthood at the end of the Second Temple period and in the generations following the destruction of the Temple**

 A study of the rabbinic aggadic midrashim concerning Aaron raises a major question, emerging from the content found in many of them. The biblical Aaron, having secured the role of patriarch of the high priesthood, represents ritual leadership, whose central task revolves around the service in the Temple, sacrifices and atonement for the sins of the nation. In the extant rabbinic midrashim, there is hardly a trace of development or description of Aaron’s ritual role in the Temple and in the sacrificial order. Instead, the traditions depict Aaron’s unique qualities, his hierarchal status relative to Moses, the special fraternal relationship between the two brothers and, of course, deliberation as to the extent of his culpability for the sin of the Golden Calf.[[1]](#footnote-1)

 The conventional wisdom in scholarship is that later biblical and post-biblical traditions dealing with the image of Aaron serve as a sort of seismograph for measuring the degree of support for, or opposition to, the status of priesthood in a given era on the part of the contemporary camp of writers.[[2]](#footnote-2) Thus, for example, while one can infer Ben Sira’s admiration for Simon the Righteous, who was the High Priest in his day, from his direct discussion of Simon;[[3]](#footnote-3) it is no less clear from place and space devoted to the image of Aaron in Ben Sira’s survey of the Patriarchs of the nation.[[4]](#footnote-4) Feldman attributes Josephus’ great fondness for the image of Aaron in his *Antiquities of the Jews*[[5]](#footnote-5) to Josephus’ own priestly extraction, in which he took great pride.[[6]](#footnote-6) Feldman uses this to explain Josephus’ decision to omit the narratives concerning Aaron’s sins (the sin of the Golden Calf, his conversation with Miriam concerning the Kushite woman and the sin of *Mei Merivah* [the water of contention]). On the other hand, Feldman explains the extreme minimizing of the scope of narratives concerning Aaron’s positive actions, as a consequence of his political perspective on autocratic rule without partners, as was accepted in the Greek and Roman cultures of his day.[[7]](#footnote-7) Use of the designation ‘the sons of Aaron’ in the Qumran literature is explained by Hempel as pointing to the transformation in the role attributed to those in the sect who were perceived as being replacements for the priests.[[8]](#footnote-8) The role of ritual leadership which the descendants of Aaron filled in the Temple was now taken over by the new ‘sons of Aaron’ (later to be replaced by the designation ‘sons of Tzaddok’) of the sect. Their messianic role in the end of days is described this way, as well.[[9]](#footnote-9) The early Christians’ opposition to the Temple and the priesthood is expressed in many citations in the New Testament.[[10]](#footnote-10) Apparently, the most explicit expression of this is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it mentions the preference for the priesthood of Melchizedek over that of Aaron. Melchizedek, rather than Aaron, is understood as a designation for the High Priest who foreshadows the image of Jesus.[[11]](#footnote-11)

 According to the outline set by scholars, how will Aaron’s image be treated in the pharisaic traditions of the second Temple period, assuming that it reflects the corrupt priesthood of their time, whose representatives desecrated the pharisaic halakha? What will the meaning of the development of the traditions concerning Aaron in the period following the destruction of the Temple be, given that at this time the role of the priests shrunk, as their status changed dramatically?

In this article, we will explore the unique aspects of the midrashic traditions concerning Aaron, in an attempt to thereby depict the social dynamic during the end of the second Temple period, and the new hierarchy of status which was created by the destruction of the Temple, continuing into the period of the Mishna and Talmud.

**The limited freedom of the traditions dealing with Aaron**

 In his book, *החייבים במקרא וזכאים בתלמוד ובמדרשים*,[[12]](#footnote-12) Margulies noted the common phenomenon in which there is a significant difference between the way in which the biblical images are presented in the biblical text and how they are presented in rabbinic sources. Sometimes the Rabbis paint the biblical images more negatively than they appear in the text, whereas other times they exonerate them for sins which are mentioned explicitly in the text. The reasons for these differences in evaluation which have been suggested over the generations are many and diverse. Most of the explanations point to the didactic aims which occupy the author of the particular tradition.[[13]](#footnote-13) According to this approach, one would expect to find, similar to the great admiration for Aaron in the traditions of the periods of priestly leadership which enjoyed popularity and support, interpretations critical of him and his actions in eras of opposition to the priesthood. The fact that the biblical text does not cover up Aaron’s sins increases this expectation. A study of the traditions of the end of the second Temple period and the period of the Mishna and Talmud reveals a plethora of interpretations which deal with Aaron. However, only a few of them contain even the gentlest critique. Even these occur in the local context of Aaron’s explicit sins. They do not deal with his leadership role as the patriarch of the high priesthood. The theory which attempts to explain the phenomenon as a function of the Rabbis’ sensitivity to critique of the national heroes, does not stand up to scrutiny when one compares it to the traditions which deal with other biblical heroes, such as Abraham, Moses and David. In those cases, one finds substantive criticism of their public leadership or personal conduct.[[14]](#footnote-14)

 It would seem that the great disparity between the ideal of priesthood as presented in the biblical text and the reality in the period of the Sages at the end of the second Temple period did not allow for the use of Aaron’s image as the reflection of the High Priest in their time. The image of Moses or King David could serve as a prototype of the leader,[[15]](#footnote-15) and the images of the Patriarchs and prophets could serve as models for the scholar;[[16]](#footnote-16) since the popular support which these authorities enjoyed allowed for the use of the positive images of biblical characters for the purpose of internalizing the lessons of leadership and ethics, both positive and negative. On the other hand, the great disparity between the positive image of Aaron in the biblical text and the increasing estrangement from the images of the priests, made Aaron irrelevant as a model for deriving lessons, both positive and negative.

 What then is the alternative model for the development of Aaron’s image?

 The extant rabbinic traditions dealing with Aaron’s image revolve around four central axes:

1. Ethical aspects of Aaron’s image
2. Leadership hierarchy in the description of Aaron’s status
3. Fraternal relationship between Moses and Aaron
4. Aaron’s role in the sin of the Golden Calf

In the discussion below, we will examine the traditions concerning three of these four axes,[[17]](#footnote-17) and suggest an explanation for their authors choosing to develop Aaron’s image based on these parameters, while almost entirely ignoring his role in the area of the Temple rite.
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