

# The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book<sup>1</sup>

Eibert Tigchelaar  
KU Leuven

## Summary

Whereas scholarship generally assumes a fixed text of *Jubilees* by the second century B.C.E., this article explores the evidence for first-century B.C.E. revisions and *Fortschreibungen*. The combined evidence of 4Q216 and 4Q217 hints at a first-century B.C.E. addition to *Jub.* 1, and the absence of *Jub.* 23:32 from 4Q176 frag. 21 may indicate subsequent *Fortschreibung*. The article argues, following Milik, for a manuscript bisection of *Jubilees*, and for a reassignment of 4Q176 frag. 21 to 4Q221. An appendix presents the hitherto unpublished fragment 4Q221 frag. 20.

## 1. Previous Use of the Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts in *Jubilees* Research

Before the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Book of *Jubilees* was only known from Ethiopic manuscripts including the *maṣṣāḥafa kufāle* or “Book of Divisions,” from a fragmentarily preserved Latin translation, and from Greek citations from or allusions to the work most often referred to as ἡ λεπτή Γένεσις, generally translated as “The Little Genesis,” but more likely to have meant “The Detailed Genesis.” Since only the Ethiopic presents a complete text, that text has been the basis for literary and historical analyses. The Latin manuscripts and Greek quotations were used mainly for additional text-critical evidence. The discovery of the very fragmentary Hebrew *Jubilees* manuscripts from Qumran has not altered this approach substantially, and most scholars of *Jubilees* refer to the Hebrew manuscript evidence only occasionally. The debates about the composition of *Jubilees* thus remain largely based on the text of the Ethiopic version. The evidence of the so-called *Pseudo-Jubilees* manuscripts (4Q225-4Q227) is sometimes used, but only in a few cases that of the so-called *Jubilees* manuscripts.

The attention for the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts has been mainly textcritical and textual. VanderKam’s research has been very influential. Based on the small sample of the then published Dead Sea Scrolls *Jubilees* fragments, VanderKam concluded in 1977 that the “text of *Jub.* which the Ethiopic manuscripts provide is very accurate and reliable. It reproduces the Hebrew text (*via* a Greek intermediate stage) literally and precisely in nearly all cases,” and that the few variants “are nearly all minor in character and even debatable in some cases.”<sup>2</sup> The subsequent publication of the more extensive textual evidence of the Qumran Cave 4 *Jubilees* manuscripts,

---

<sup>1</sup>Is is a pleasure to dedicate this paper to Marc Vervenne, who welcomed Dead Sea Scrolls research at the KU Leuven, on the occasion of this retirement in 2014 as professor of Old Testament.

<sup>2</sup>James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 94.

which VanderKam published in the 1990s with J. T. Milik,<sup>3</sup> “reinforced those conclusions, although there are indeed differences between the Hebrew and Ethiopic readings in a number of details.”<sup>4</sup> Such differences are, however, not fully recorded. In DJD 13, the editors have generally reconstructed the lost text on the basis of retroversion from the Ethiopic. In some cases where they did not do so, as in 4Q216 VII 6-7, this is because of “major textual difficulties” which show that a “major deviation separates the two versions” (namely that of the Ethiopic and of 4Q216).<sup>5</sup> However, in other cases (e.g., 4Q216 II 14-17) the positioning of the preserved words in the fully reconstructed lines does not match with the fragmentary manuscript evidence, indicating a difference between the versions which is only hinted at in the comments.<sup>6</sup> Textually, the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments provide the original Hebrew wording of some important words and expressions. This goes, for example, for the Ethiopic expression *ḥagg wa-səm*, “law and testimony,” which now with certainty can be read as תורה ותעודה.

Because of the fragmentariness of the manuscripts, they have rarely been used for literary or historical arguments. One exception is 4Q216, written in two hands, the oldest of which is dated by VanderKam to ca. 125-100 BCE, and by Milik “nearer to the mid-second century BCE.”<sup>7</sup> For VanderKam this indicates that 4Q216 “comes from a period not far removed from the time when *Jubilees* was written.”<sup>8</sup> For Kugel, that “one should situate the time of the book’s composition no later than the middle of the second century.”<sup>9</sup> Another exception concerns the number of the *Jubilees* manuscripts. Even a cautious count of fourteen *Jubilees* manuscripts gives the highest number of manuscripts of any given nonbiblical text. As a result many scholars have argued for the authoritativeness or the popularity of this work at Qumran.

The Qumran manuscript evidence has rarely been referenced in the discussions about the literary composition of the work. This is due to the fragmentariness of the material, which preserves material from less than half of the chapters of *Jubilees* (and sometimes only a few verses or words from those chapters), and has very few cases where one and the same section is covered by two or more manuscripts.<sup>10</sup> It is also due to suppositions regarding to the authorship, date, and composition of *Jubilees* in relation to the Qumran evidence. Many scholars have assumed on literary grounds a final composition of the work, sometimes stated to have been composed by one sin-

---

<sup>3</sup>Joint publication by James VanderKam and Józef Milik, preliminarily in various articles since 1991, and principally in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part I* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

<sup>4</sup>James C. VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of *Jubilees** (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 3-21 at 10.

<sup>5</sup>DJD 13:21.

<sup>6</sup>DJD 13:11: “If the text here and at the beginning of line 14 is properly restored, line 14 would be left rather short ... but the Ethiopic version contains no additional words.” Note that the problem also pertains to the too short number of words between the remains of lines 15 and 16.

<sup>7</sup>DJD 13:2.

<sup>8</sup>Idem.

<sup>9</sup>In this volume, n. 6.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. in a glance, DJD 39:294-95.

gle author,<sup>11</sup> before the oldest Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts, and therefore have interpreted the manuscript evidence accordingly. This essay will look anew at some of the manuscript evidence in relation to the literary or compositional theories.<sup>12</sup> I am indebted to some older suggestions by Charlotte Hempel<sup>13</sup> and Menahem Kister,<sup>14</sup> and to a paper of and the conversation with Matthew Monger.<sup>15</sup>

## 2. Dead Sea Scrolls *Jubilees* Manuscripts

The reference to at least fourteen *Jubilees* manuscripts<sup>16</sup> is misleading, if this implies that all or most of those manuscripts contained the entire book of *Jubilees* (as known from the Ethiopic version).<sup>17</sup> The Ethiopic version of *Jubilees* is considerably longer than the book of Genesis (which in turn is larger than the book of Isaiah). While scrolls covering the entire book of Isaiah, like 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, require a relatively small script with many lines per column (and a small distance between the lines), this clearly is not the case with most *Jubilees* fragments. A manuscript that clearly meets both criteria is the papyrus manuscript 4Q223-224, with small letters and 54 lines per column.<sup>18</sup> While the preserved sections only cover *Jub.* 32-40 (or 41), this manuscript, if it had all of

---

<sup>11</sup>E.g., Tod Hanneken, “The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses” (Ph.D. diss. Notre Dame, 2008), 122.

<sup>12</sup>In spite of Hanneken, “The Book of Jubilees Among the Apocalypses,” 123, who simply states that there is no manuscript evidence for any of the theories or redaction or insertion.

<sup>13</sup>Charlotte Hempel, “The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim; Edinburg: T&T Clark, 2000), 179-96.

<sup>14</sup>Menahem Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments of the Book of Jubilees: *Jub.* 23:21-23, 30-31,” *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 529-36.

<sup>15</sup>Matthew Monger, working at the Oslo Menighetsfakultet on a PhD on the manuscript transmission of *Jubilees*, shared with me his paper “The Transmission of *Jubilees*: Reevaluating the Textual Basis” which he presented at the Enoch Graduate Seminar, Montreal May 2014. We had a long discussion September 26, 2014 in Oslo where we shared ideas.

<sup>16</sup>VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of *Jubilees*,” 5-6.

<sup>17</sup>Reinhard Deichgräber, “Fragmente einer Jubiläen-Handschrift aus Höhle 3 von Qumran,” *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 415-22, at 421 already raised the question whether some *Jubilees* manuscripts might have contained only specific parts of *Jubilees*. Cf. also Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments,” with regard to 4Q176 (see below section 5). To my knowledge, Monger (“it is difficult to assume that all the manuscripts normally listed as being ‘copies of *Jubilees*’ are fragments of complete works”) was the first to apply to the *Jubilees* fragmentary manuscripts the insights from material reconstruction. See, within the Göttingen tradition, most recently, Eva Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmhandschriften aus der Wüste Juda* (STDJ 109; Leiden: Brill, 2014), for example p. 7 on format.

<sup>18</sup>Independently, Matthew Monger and I had made similar calculations.

(Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, would have required 40-42 columns.<sup>19</sup> The small size of the letters of 1Q17, 1Q18, 2Q19, 2Q20, would also be compatible with a long scroll with all of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. With other manuscripts, one scroll for the entire book cannot be ruled out, but would have resulted in a scroll even larger than the large Isaiah scroll or the Cave 11 Temple Scroll. For example, 4Q219, reconstructed to have had 38 lines per column, would have required about 68 columns for the entire (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, resulting in a scroll of close to 9 meters.<sup>20</sup> The larger size of the letters of 4Q220 and 4Q222 virtually rules out that they represent a scroll with the entire text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. In the case of 4Q216, with only seventeen lines per column, a scroll with the entire text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees* would have required, at least one hundred, but likely many more columns, something that should be ruled out.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, the large letters of 4Q217 indicate that this could not have been a manuscript with all of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*.

The existence of one or more fragments corresponding with the text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees* does therefore not necessary indicate that the original manuscripts contained all of the text of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*. One can consider various alternative possibilities. The first is that a Hebrew text corresponding to Ethiopic *Jubilees* was copied in two parts.<sup>22</sup> The middle of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* is in chapter 23, and one can imagine that a literary bisection of the text would conclude one half with Abraham's death in *Jub.* 23 and the concluding Apocalypse in chapter 23, and begin the other half with the Isaac and Jacob stories that are found from *Jub.* 24 on. A division into two parts may also explain why so many fragments preserve texts of *Jub.* 21 to 27. Those fragments then would not remain from the middle of a scroll, but from the beginning or end of a scroll with one half of *Jubilees*. One may note that there is only one manuscript (4Q221) that has texts from both parts. A second alternative is that some manuscripts only copied a section of *Jubilees*, such as the creation story (*Jub.* 2), Abraham's final admonitions (*Jub.* 21-22), or the apocalypse (*Jub.* 23:12-31). This would be most likely if fragments suggest a short scroll, for example because of the large writing, a column with few lines, or an usual format.

---

<sup>19</sup>Calculations based on one column of Hebrew text corresponding to about 1250 words in Charles's translation. Charles's entire translation has 51145 words. The width of a column being in 4Q223-224 section II just larger than 10 cm, a scroll of 40-42 columns would have been slightly more than 4 meters.

<sup>20</sup>Calculation based on number of words of *Jub.* 21:10 (starting in last line of col. I) to 22:1 (ending in last line of col. II). Width of column with margin taken to be 13 cm.

<sup>21</sup>The translation of *Jub.* 1 prologue up to *Jub.* 2:24 (corresponding with 4Q216 cols. 1-7) is about 5 to 6% of the length of the entire translation of *Jubilees*.

<sup>22</sup>For a manuscript bisection of *Jubilees*, but without any details, cf. J. T. Milik, in "Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 60 and in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 58. On the manuscript bisection of some Isaiah manuscripts, see George J. Brooke, "On Isaiah at Qumran," in *As Those Who Were Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. C. M. McGinnis and P. K. Tull; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 69-85, esp. 77-80.

The question which manuscripts or fragments are referred to as *Jubilees* is also largely dependent on their textual relationship to the Ethiopic *Jubilees*. Illustrative is VanderKam's original criticism of Kister's identification of 4Q176 frg. 21 as corresponding with Jub 23:30-31, because the "text would disagree with the Ethiopic,"<sup>23</sup> whereas he later accepted this identification in spite of the disagreement. Similarly, VanderKam questioned the identification of 4Q217 frags. 1 and 2 with Jub. 1:29 "because most of the words in the Ethiopic text do not correspond with those in frg. 2 2," even though he later concedes "that Jub. 1:29 has suffered some corruption in the course of transmission."<sup>24</sup> The question is then to what extent the textual and literary form of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* is determinative for our identification of a Hebrew manuscript or fragment as *Jubilees*. The question is important, since a longer process of redaction or rewriting, would have led to different versions within the Hebrew transmission, while we do not know which stage of the transmission is reflected in the Ethiopic *Jubilees*.

### 3. The Manuscript Evidence of 4Q216, and Compositional Theories Relating to *Jubilees* 1

The manuscript remains of 4Q216 consists of fragments from two consecutive sheets, sewn together (see frg. 12), but written in two different scribal hands. The first sheet, with remains from the Prologue up to Jub. 1:28 are written in a late Hasmonaeon hand, dating to approximately the mid-first century BCE. The second sheet, with remains of Jub. 2:1-24, was written in a palaeographically older hand, dated, as stated above, by VanderKam to ca. 125-100 BCE, and by Milik "nearer to the mid-second century BCE."<sup>25</sup> The editors explain this phenomenon as follows:

It is very likely that the outer sheet of the scroll became worn or damaged and had to be replaced. The affected columns were then recopied and the new sheet stitched to the older parts of the manuscript. Only the happy accident of finding fragments written in two scripts yet sewn together into one manuscript allows one to see that they belong to a single copy of the book, not two.<sup>26</sup>

The editors' hypothesis of a repair sheet may have been based on 11Q19, the Temple Scroll, which indeed seems to have a repair sheet at its beginning.<sup>27</sup> The first, to my knowledge, to question the

---

<sup>23</sup>James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees Translated* (CSCO 511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), ix.

<sup>24</sup>DJD 13:25 and 27.

<sup>25</sup>DJD 13:2.

<sup>26</sup>J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (1991): 243-70, at 246. See similarly, DJD 13:1.

<sup>27</sup>On the replacement of sheets, cf. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125. Another example suggested tentatively by John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington is in 4Q418 (see discussion in DJD 34:225-26). I contest this in my *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the*

repair sheet hypothesis was Hempel who wondered whether “we may be witnessing the compositional growth of *Jubilees*,”<sup>28</sup> and who produced literary arguments for the compositional adding of chapter 1 before chapter 2,<sup>29</sup> but did not elaborate on this suggestion. Independently, Monger stated the same more explicitly: since the second sheet begins with *Jub.* 2:1,<sup>30</sup> that sheet could have been the first one of the original manuscript before the material addition of the sheet with *Jub.* 1.<sup>31</sup> Do those observations support the compositional hypothesis proposed by Kister, that *Jub.* 1, alongside several other sections including the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23, was a redactional addition to an older version of *Jubilees*?<sup>32</sup>

All considerations must be based on the impossibility that the original 4Q216 (copied in the second century BCE) contained the entire book of (Ethiopic) *Jubilees*, and on the possibility (but not certainty) that this original 4Q216 began with what is now *Jub.* 2:1. The most simple hypothesis is that 4Q216 was an excerpt from the book of *Jubilees*. The excerpt might have started with ch. 1, which then would have been replaced later by a repair sheet. Or the excerpt started with the present *Jub.* 2 because a scribe, who may have been writing for exercise, or for his own interest, had an interest in the creation story, or in the Sabbath. A few generations later, a scribe then added the chapter that had originally not been copied. Or, alternatively, the scribe’s excerpt started with *Jub.* 2:1, because at the time of copying that section was still the beginning of his text. In that case, a later scribe decided to complement that scribal excerpt by adding the missing chapter. Or, even more speculatively, that the original 4Q216 (of which only the text corresponding to *Jub.* 2:1-24 re-

---

*Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 61-64.

<sup>28</sup>Hempel, “The Place of the Book of Jubilees at Qumran and Beyond,” 189.

<sup>29</sup>Idem, 190.

<sup>30</sup>The editors start their reconstruction of col. V with *Jub.* 2:1, and this assumption influences their placement of the other fragments in cols. IV to VI. According to this reconstruction the lost text of *Jub.* 1:29 would just fit in the bottom lines of col. IV. Yet, if one would shift all the fragments in cols. IV-VI one or two lines downwards, then the second sheet would not anymore start with *Jub.* 2:1 but with part of *Jub.* 1:29. (It would also create two extra lines for the “missing” *Jub.* 1:15-25, a large section of text which the editors place in the missing col. III.) Materially, the top of frag. 13 has preserved too little to determine whether it is the top margin. At best, a careful examination of damage patterns of frags. 12-17 with frag. 18 (which has top and bottom margin) may give additional evidence. Also if one adopts the editors’ placement, then the exact beginning of *Jub.* 2:1 at the beginning of a sheet does not necessarily imply that it was the beginning of the original manuscript: the same scribe decided not to begin the sixth day at the bottom of col. VI, but left—according to the editors—two blank lines, and started this day at the beginning of a new column (col. VII). One other example of a new literary section starting on a new sheet can be found on 4Q256 col. IX.

<sup>31</sup>Monger, “The Transmission of Jubilees: Reevaluating the Textual Basis.”

<sup>32</sup>Menahem Kister, “Concerning the History of the Essenes—A Study of the *Animal Apocalypse*, the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Damascus Document*,” *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1-18 [Hebrew]; cf. also Michael Segal, *the Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

mains) represents one of the sources that ultimately was incorporated in the book of *Jubilees*. In that case, the addition of the first sheet could have been a material part of the compositional process.

Such considerations and speculations on the basis of materiality of the manuscript should be checked against the literary analysis of the text. Can one imagine the text of *Jub.* 2:1-24 (inasmuch as evidenced in 4Q216) as the beginning of a literary work, or even as an independent separate unit? Certainly, the angelic dictation to Moses in what is now *Jub.* 2:1 (“The angel of the presence said on God’s order to Moses: ‘Write all the words about the creation ...’”<sup>33</sup>) is somewhat unexpected as the beginning of a text, without an explicit narrative setting as the one that is provided in the present *Jub.* 1. Such a somewhat abrupt beginning would require the already existing idea of angelic intermediacy and dictation at Sinai, which subsequently would have been made explicit and elaborated in *Jub.* 1. One might argue similarly for the phrase “This is the testimony and the first law” (cf. *Jub.* 2:24), the last words preserved in col. VII. These words (see similarly 2:33 and 3:14) need not presuppose the reference to the law and the testimony in *Jub.* 1 (Prologue, vss. 4, 26, 29). Instead, the importance of these concepts in *Jubilees* might have been secondarily highlighted in ch. 1.

Whereas the creation account in the largest part of *Jub.* 2 may be read independently of other sections of *Jubilees*, it is precisely those last preserved words of 4Q216, “this is the testimony and the first law,” that precludes the possibility that the second sheet of 4Q216 represents materially one of the sources that was incorporated in *Jubilees*. The phrase reflects one of the overall themes of *Jubilees*, and would make no sense in an independent source.

#### 4. The 4Q217 Fragments and *Jubilees* 1

The tag on PAM 43.261 with the 4Q217 fragments briefly describes the plate as “4Qm 126 (40) 2 mss pap ment Jub.” Also the DJD edition ascribes those fragments to two papyrus manuscripts: eleven fragments belonging to 4Q217 (named 4QpapJubilees<sup>b</sup>?), and four other ones to a different manuscript (even though they have been given the numbers 4Q217 12-15).<sup>34</sup> It is not clear whether, and if so why, frags. 12-15 were once associated with *Jubilees*. The tag stating “pap(yrus) ment(ioning) Jub(ilees)” clearly refers to 4Q217, which in frag. 2 reads “the divisions of the times for the law and for the,” identical to the reference to *Jubilees* in the prologue, and similar to the wording in *Jub.* 1:29. The DJD edition transcribes and comments on frags. 1 and 2 separately, but only can tentatively align them, as proposed by Milik, in the same lines of a column and read

1 ויק[ח ...] מחלקות העתים לתורה ול[...]  
2 השנים [...] לכל ש[ני] העולם מן  
הברי[אה ...] 3 החדשה [...] וכל [הנ] ברא עד היום. [...] 4 [...] ...[...]  
ה[...]  
5 [...] ב את כל[...]  
6 [...] ...[...]

<sup>33</sup>In 4Q216 V 1 only a few of those words have been preserved.

<sup>34</sup>DJD 13:23.

1 and he (the angel of the presence?) too[k ...] the divisions of the times, for the law and for [...] 2 the years [...] for all the y[ears of] eternity, from the crea[tion ...] 3 the new [...] and all [that is] created until the day [...] 4 ... [...] in Jer]usalem [...] 5 [...] all [...] 6 [...] ... [...]

Most words of the broken text can be found in the same order in Eth. *Jub.* 1:29.

*And* the angel of the presence, who was going along in front of the Israelite camp, *took* the tablets (which told) of the *divisions of the years* from the time *the law* and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, *year* by year in their full number, and their jubilees *from* [*the time of the creation* until] the time of *the new* creation when the heavens, the earth, and *all* their *creatures* will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, *until the time* when the temple of the Lord will be created *in Jerusalem* on Mt. Zion. All the luminaries will be renewed for (the purposes of) healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth.<sup>35</sup>

Nonetheless, the texts do not entirely correspond, and some of the phrases like “the divisions of the times, for the law and for” and “all the years of eternity” find closer correspondences in the Prologue than in those of (Ethiopic) *Jub.* 1:29. The DJD edition struggled with the relation of these fragments to the Ethiopic *Jubilees*, and could only connect them if “some major textual changes [...] occurred between the Hebrew original and the Ethiopic translation (via a Greek intermediary).”<sup>36</sup> The DJD editors did not consider the possibility of variant Hebrew wording or literary editions, though.

Materially, the few papyrus fragments, with large writing and large spacing between the lines, rule out the possibility that 4Q217 was a manuscript that included the entire *Jubilees*. At best it may have contained a small portion. The “scribal hand in the cursive sequence”<sup>37</sup> would also be unexpected for a formal copy. Such writing is more common for documents, personal copies or for notes. The text of the two fragments of 4Q217 can most easily be interpreted as a variant and shorter wording of *Jub.* 1:29. For example, 4Q217 frags. 1-2 line 3 היום עד ברא [הנ] וכל [...] החדשה suggests a text much shorter than the corresponding Ethiopic “*the new* creation when the heavens, the earth, and *all* their *creatures* will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, *until the time*.” One may suppose that 4Q217 is a shortening of a longer text that is behind the Ethiopic, perhaps by parablepsis from the first “all the(ir) creatures” to the second “all the creatures.” Or, alternatively, the Ethiopic text reflects an expansion. Thus, the final clause of

---

<sup>35</sup>Translations of the Ethiopic *Jubilees* generally are adopted from VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees Translated*.

<sup>36</sup>DJD 13:25.

<sup>37</sup>DJD 13:23.



Ethiopic *Jub.* 1:29, “All the luminaries will be renewed for healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth” with the unique reference to the “elect ones of Israel” and the sudden reference to healing (a motif that returns in 23:29-30) could very well be an addition to the text. Whether that clause was a *Fortschreibung* of the text, commenting on the preceding renewal of the “powers of the sky,” or whether the expansion of the last part triggered the simultaneous or subsequent insertion of the “powers of the sky” cannot be determined. In either case, the hypothesis that this final clause of Eth. *Jub.* 1:29 represents a later stage of the text strengthens Milik’s proposal that the few letters of line 6 would correspond to *Jub.* 1:2 בְּתוֹב אֶת כָּל דְּבָרֵי.<sup>38</sup>

The other short fragments are not very helpful in determining the nature of the manuscript, and at best the few remaining but damaged and isolated words may also be associated with the text of *Jubilees*. Though 4Q217 frags. 1-2 attest to a variant text of *Jub.* 1:29, one can only hypothesize about the nature of 4Q217. We can observe that in Eth. *Jubilees*, the prologue and 1:26, 27-28, and 29 present four textually related but different formulations of the contents of what follows in the book. Such differences may be due to literary variation, or to the translation from the Hebrew through the Greek to the Ethiopic, or even in the Ethiopic transmission. The evidence of 4Q217 suggests that some of the variations may be due to the internal growth or the redaction of the Hebrew text. Minimally, these fragments witness to rewriting or *Fortschreibung* of the Hebrew *Jubilees* text up to the first century BCE.

The indications of 4Q216 (possible mid-first century BCE addition of *Jub.* 1 to a manuscript containing *Jub.* 2) and 4Q217 (apparently a different textform of *Jub.* 1:29 attested in the early to mid-first century BCE<sup>38</sup>) may be combined. 4Q217, a short, cursively written papyrus manuscript is our first, admittedly very fragmentary, material witness to the connection of *Jub.* 1 and 2. Given its cursive character and differing textform, one may even muse whether this manuscript was one of the drafts made by those scribes who eventually redacted the book of *Jubilees*. Of course, this is farfetched, but a consideration of some possible arguments against this conjecture, namely incongruence of date and place, is helpful to shed light on our preconceptions.

First, the hypothesis of rewriting or *Fortschreibung* of *Jubilees* in the first century BCE is entirely feasible in light of the many minor and major textual and literary variants we witness in first-century BCE manuscripts from Qumran, nonbiblical as well as biblical texts (e.g., the *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts). However, it is incongruent with scholarly practice, which by and large takes the Eth. *Jubilees* text as witness to the assumed second-century BCE form of its text. The hypothesis of an early to mid-first century BCE redactional addition of ch. 1 (and some other sections like ch. 23) brings us even later than Kister’s late second-century dating of those chapters, and requires a reconsideration of its possible literary and theological relationships to other Dead Sea scrolls compositions.

---

<sup>38</sup>The palaeographical dating of 4Q217 in DJD 13:23 is problematic, and characteristic for the dating by most DJD editors. The forms of the letters are compared with several samples presented and dated by Cross, and the proposed palaeographical date is the mean of the dates of Cross’s samples.

Second, the hypothesis that Qumran Cave 4 would have contained a draft made by the scribes who wrote or edited new parts of *Jubilees*, is at odds with the theory of Cave 4 as the library or text depository of a secluded sectarian community. That theory would then lead one to conclude that our present version of *Jubilees* was a product of that community. While none of the alternative theories has been broadly accepted, they do serve as a reminder to allow for different historical scenarios.

## 5. *Jubilees* 23 in the Hebrew Manuscripts

If *Jub.* 1 may have a later redactional addition, then we should also look at the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23:9-32 (or 23:12-31) which may have belonged to the same redactional layer.<sup>39</sup> Four different Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts preserve fragments covering parts of *Jub.* 23, namely 2Q19, 3Q5, 4Q176 frags. 19-21, and 4Q221.

2Q19 consists of a single fragment written in an Herodian hand, with remnants of *Jub.* 23:7-8, and ending with the words “old and full of days.” After that the next line is uninscribed. The editor interpreted the unwritten area at the bottom of the fragment as a possible bottom margin.<sup>40</sup> Alternatively, this unwritten area might also have been an entire empty line, separating 23:8 from the new section 23:9ff. Or perhaps this text simply broke off with the end of the life of Abraham.

Baillet published seven fragments, written in a first-century CE hand, as 3Q5, of which some were subsequently identified as *Jubilees* fragments. Fragments 1, 3, and 4 can be identified with certainty as corresponding to resp. *Jub.* 23:12-13, 6-7, and 10,<sup>41</sup> and frag. 2 perhaps with *Jub.* 23:23.<sup>42</sup> Thus, 3Q5 contained both the section preceding the apocalypse and the apocalypse proper. The relatively large size of the letters makes it unlikely that the scroll contained all of *Jubilees*. The fragments might derive from a scroll ending with *Jub.* 23.

More problematic are the two other and older manuscripts (4Q176 19-21 and 4Q221) and the relation between the two. In DJD 5, John Allegro published in 1968 fifty-seven fragments as part of 4Q176 (*4QTanhûmîm*). John Strugnell already remarked that frags. 19-21 were materially very

---

<sup>39</sup>E.g., Segal, *the Book of Jubilees*, 321. Note that the apocalypse is integrated in the text, and that one cannot simply detach a number of verses as an originally independent unit.

<sup>40</sup>M. Baillet in DJD 3:78: “marge inférieure?”

<sup>41</sup>M. Baillet, “Remarques sur le manuscrit du livre des Jubilés de la Grotte 3 de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 423-33 at 428-29 identified the correspondence of frag. 4 with *Jub.* 23:10, but read mistakenly הַרְשִׁיעַ] מַפּ in frag. 4 line 2. Instead, the second word should be read הַרְעוּתָּה. For the Hebrew plural הַרְעוּת corresponding to singular ḥakay in the Ethiopic, see also 4Q221 5 3 (*Jub.* 37:13). I therefore do not agree with the dismissal of the identification by VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 100-101.

<sup>42</sup>For the identification of frag. 2 see most recently E. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings Volume 2* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi, 2013), 233, though I am skeptical about the reading of וְכֹל at the end of line 2.

much the same,<sup>43</sup> and later Kister identified three of those fragments (19-21) as corresponding to the text of *Jub.* 23:21-23, 30-31.<sup>44</sup> He interpreted the fragments as deriving from two consecutive columns, since the textual reconstruction of the lines of frags. 19-20 renders a very broad column (of 13, 12, and 15 words in lines 2-4), while the reconstruction of frag. 21 results in a very narrow column of only five words in a line. The straight vertical left side of frag. 20 might join neatly to the straight vertical right side of frag. 21,<sup>45</sup> although it would result in a very narrow intercolumnar margin of 0.6-1.0 cm.

Kister touches upon the nature of the manuscript 4Q176 19-21, and considered four alternatives:<sup>46</sup> (1) the fragments belonged to a manuscript of the whole Book of *Jubilees*; (2) the manuscript contained only the Apocalypse of *Jub.* 23 excerpted from the book of *Jubilees*; (3) the manuscript contained the Apocalypse, but as an independent unit reflecting the text before it was taken up in *Jubilees*; (4) the fragments belonged to another text (like the *Tanḥûmîm*) which contained quotations from sacred scripture and from *Jubilees*. Kister does not explicitly choose, but one may guess that because of the narrow second column, typical for last columns of a scroll, and the blank line (bottom margin?) after *Jub.* 23:31, he favoured the option that the manuscript contained only the Apocalypse.

But do 4Q176 19-21 belong together? In a postscript Kister refers to the observation of Émile Puech that the scribal hand of frag. 21 is similar to that of 4QJub<sup>f</sup> (4Q221). Indeed, the edition of 4Q221 mentions that “4Q176 21, now recognized to be from another manuscript of *Jubilees*, was copied by the scribe of 4Q221.”<sup>47</sup> Milik described the hand of 4Q176 frags. 19-20 as “a semi-formal hand, clumsy and inexperienced” and the scribal hand of 4Q176 frag. 21 as “a semi-cursive hand of a professional ... precisely the hand of the scribe who copied 4QJub<sup>f</sup>.”<sup>48</sup> It is not clear what Milik believed,<sup>49</sup> but VanderKam (who had earlier criticized Kister’s identification of frag. 21) maintained the distinction between 4Q176 19-21 and 4Q221,<sup>50</sup> without considering the possibility that 4Q176 21 should be reassigned to 4Q221, resulting in two different *Jubilees* manuscripts, recognizable by two different hands.

---

<sup>43</sup>As had already been remarked by John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276 at 235.

<sup>44</sup>Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments.”

<sup>45</sup>As had already been remarked by John Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276 at 235.

<sup>46</sup>Kister, “Newly-Identified Fragments,” 535.

<sup>47</sup>DJD 13:64.

<sup>48</sup>J. C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, “4QJub<sup>f</sup> (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” *HAR* 14 (1994): 233-61 at 233.

<sup>49</sup>VanderKam and Milik, “4QJub<sup>f</sup> (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” 233 n. 1, announces Milik’s forthcoming article, “A propos de 4Q176 19-21 (*Jub* 23),” which, however, was never published.

<sup>50</sup>The choice of words in “4QJub<sup>f</sup> (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” 233, “Milik believes that it is necessary to distinguish two hands in Kister’s fragments” betray his reluctance to follow Milik.

With regard to material appearance, 4Q176 frags. 19-21 are clearly distinct from the other 4Q176 fragments. While most of the 4Q176 (*4QTanḥûmîm*) fragments are lighter and tobacco-coloured, frags. 19-21 are darker and have a reddish tone.<sup>51</sup> Most of the 4Q221 fragments are lighter, but frag. 5 is dark, similar to 4Q176 19-21. The appearance of the skin of 4Q176 frag. 21 is different from both 4Q176 19-20 and 4Q221, possibly because of the process of gelatinization of the skin. The straight edges of 4Q176 20 and 21 might fit, but would result in an uncharacteristically short margin between the writing. Altogether, I am strongly inclined to follow the evidence of the scribal hand, and reassign 4Q176 21 to 4Q221. What can we then say about *Jub.* 23 in both manuscripts?

The manuscript 4Q176 frags. 19-20 consists of two fragments with the text of *Jub.* 23:21-23. The left edge of frag. 20 could be the straight left end of a sheet. Given the reconstructed width of the lines one can imagine, for example, a two-column sheet of 22-23 lines or more, that could have contained the apocalypse. However, one can also envisage a larger manuscript, containing a more extensive part of *Jubilees*, and perhaps ending with ch. 23. The size of the letters, and the space in between the lines would seem to rule out that these fragments belonged to a manuscript of the whole book of *Jubilees*.

The fragments published as 4Q221 attest to *Jub.* 21-23 (frags. 1-3), to *Jub.* 33 (frag. 4), and to *Jub.* 37-39 (frags. 5-7). Twelve more fragments have not been identified, and according to the DJD edition three of those may not belong to the manuscript. 4Q221 frag. 3 preserves the left end of six lines that correspond to *Jub.* 23:10-13. The height of the columns in 4Q221 is not known, but 4Q176 frag. 21 would have derived some columns to the left (two or three columns?) of frag. 3. The narrow reconstructed column of 4Q176 frag. 21 suggests it came from the end of a sheet, and possibly from the end of a manuscript. This, it would be possible that the fragments of 4Q221 actually derive from two different manuscripts, one ending with *Jub.* 23, and the other beginning with *Jub.* 24. But then the unwritten space at the bottom of 4Q176 frag. 21 is conspicuous, since it suggests the possibility that *Jub.* 23:32 was not included in the column, and hence not in the manuscript.

The manuscript evidence, all later than the middle of the first century BCE, does not offer much conclusive evidence. 3Q5 and 4Q221 attest to the apocalypse being part of the book of *Jubilees*. 4Q176 19-20 could have derived from a sheet only containing some form of the apocalypse, but this is only one of several options. Likewise, one cannot say anything conclusive about 2Q19. This means that the possibility that ch. 23 or the apocalypse could have formed a separate unit cannot be clearly supported by the manuscript evidence. Indeed, given the later dates of the manuscripts, this would not be expected.

---

<sup>51</sup>Clearly, 4Q176 19-21 were not associated with the 4Q176 fragments on the basis of the skin, but on the general semicursive correspondence of the hand of 4Q176 20 with that of some other 4Q176 fragments. Thus, on PAM 41.309 frag. 20 is on the same plate as frags. 16, 18, 22, 30 (and some other smaller 4Q176 fragments). On PAM 41.813 frags. 19-21 are (together with 4Q425 frag. 6) on the top left section of the plate, and several 4Q176 fragments on the bottom. Important is the tab, which states: "4Q misc s/curs 22 JMA," thus clearly indicating that the semicursive script was the criterion for putting those fragments on one and the same plate (and later for assigning them to one manuscript).

However, the manuscript evidence does support the idea of a scribal bisection of *Jubilees*, and perhaps the late date of the redaction that added *Jub.* 23:32 as a conclusion to ch. 23, or perhaps even to the first half of the book.

## 6. Summary

The approach of this essay has been to look afresh at some of the manuscript evidence of the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts, in relation to the theories of the composition of *Jubilees*. Most of the manuscripts are too fragmentary and too young to yield any new insights. However, the joint evidence of the older manuscripts 4Q216 and 4Q217 does support the hypothesis of a late addition of *Jub.* 1. There is inconclusive manuscript evidence for the different hypotheses about the apocalypse of *Jub.* 23, except for the likelihood that it served as the ending of the first scroll of a scribal bisection of *Jubilees*. On a much smaller level, the apparent absence of the end of *Jub.* 1:29 in 4Q217, and of *Jub.* 23:32 in 4Q221 suggests an ongoing *Fortschreibung* or rewriting of *Jubilees*, rather than the work of one final author, redactor, or interpolator responsible for a final version.

## Appendix: An Unpublished Fragment Formerly Referred to As 4Q221 Frag. 20

Museum Plate #363 contains all the 4Q221 fragments (both the identified frags. 1-7 and the unidentified frags. 8-19), as well as one other fragment (frag. 20) that the editors no longer considered part of 4Q221.<sup>52</sup> This fragment was also included with 4Q221 on PAM 43.188, and (only its upper part) on PAM 42.223. Apparently, this fragment has not been published anywhere else. The fragment is written in the same style as 4Q221, but the hand is executed with more attention. On the basis of the new IAA photographs,<sup>53</sup> one can transcribe this fragment as follows.

לְבִי ]	1
] תּוֹרֹתָ	2
] אִסְפָּרָה	3
] הֵל בְּתוֹךְ	4
] לִיזֵן וְאִבְרָכָה	5
bottom margin	

<sup>52</sup>VanderKam and Milik, “4QJub<sup>f</sup> (4Q221): A Preliminary Edition,” 233: “[frg. 20 is no longer considered part of 4Q221].”

<sup>53</sup><http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-361320> and B-361321.

In line 4 one can read קהל, and the large spaces between the words in lines 4 and 5 suggest poetry or even stichometric writing. The text does not seem to match that of any other text, but the connection of the words in lines 3-4 is also found in Ps 22:23: אֶסְפְּרָה שְׁמִידָא לְאַחֵי בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל אֲהֻלֵּיךְ.