

4Q216 and the *Jubilees* Creation Account: A Material Philological Analysis

Matthew P. Monger¹

In the context of the study of Hebrew Bible manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Cairo Genizah, and European Genizah, an essay on *Jubilees* may seem out of place. There are, however, good reasons for including the study of compositions, especially those traditionally reckoned as “rewritten scripture,” within the study of Hebrew Bible manuscripts. First and foremost, while the idea of canonicity has long been discussed and is currently receiving attention from many perspectives in the field, the idea of a single fixed canon in the second and first centuries BCE is now considered unlikely.² Second, the method utilized here, material philology, works to associate copies of any given work with the physical and temporal context of the manuscript itself. The focus is not on an earlier stage of textual development, nor on what earlier period the text might reflect, but how the shape of the text in its manuscript context relates to the time and place of copying. Thus, a text such as is found in the Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts is not simply a representation of the work known as *Jubilees* but may, for instance, intersect and overlap, or be part of the reception and transmission history of the text of Genesis during the last two centuries BCE. Further, it can reflect the way Genesis was understood by those who read and copied the manuscripts. Third, the manuscript under investigation here, 4Q216 (4QJubilees^a), contains the creation account of *Jubilees* which, apart from its literary context in the book of *Jubilees*, is so closely related to the Genesis Creation Account that the biblical elements are immediately recognizable.³

It is against this background that I will discuss 4Q216 fragments 12ii–18 (sheet 2) from a material philological perspective.⁴ Through my analysis I will argue that reading the manuscript not as a witness to the work *Jubilees* but as a textual artifact reflecting its time and context gives us new insight into the position of the *Jubilees* Creation Account *vis-à-vis* the Genesis creation story in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Further, there are important textual and

¹ I want to thank the organizers and participants at the EAJS Laboratory Workshop for their discussion and comments, as well as George Brooke, Torleif Elgvin, Charlotte Hempel, Liv Ingeborg Lied, and Loren Stuckenbruck for their helpful suggestions and improvements to this paper.

² This was recently discussed in Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016). Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint and Tae Hun Kim (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 51–66.

³ On the relationship between Gen. 1 and *Jub.* 2 see below.

⁴ On the distinction between the two sheets of the manuscript cf. Matthew P. Monger, “4Q216 and the State of Jubilees at Qumran,” *RevQ* 104 (2014): 595–612. I deal with the first sheet elsewhere in Matthew P. Monger, “The Development of Jubilees 1 in the Late Second Temple Period,” *JSP* 27, no. 2 (2017): 83–112.

literary features to the manuscript which improve our understanding of the transmission of the parts and the whole of *Jubilees* in the Second Temple period. I will begin with a discussion of material philology in methodological and theoretical terms, before exemplifying these methodological and theoretical insights through a discussion of 4Q216.

1. Material Philology as Method and Theory

As material philology may or may not be a term that communicates well to different audiences, I will briefly outline what I mean by it here and how I plan to use it both methodologically and theoretically.⁵ Material philology, also known as new philology,⁶ arose as a distinct theoretical direction from the observations of medievalists working in editorial theory.⁷ The principal observation that variance was the rule,⁸ not the exception, led to a shift in focus by certain scholars toward the manuscript and the context of the production and transmission of the manuscript. By taking seriously the variance found in the manuscripts the new paradigm allowed researchers to lift their focus from discerning the most correct or most original readings and rather focus on what the variance may say for the context of the manuscript. In short, in material philology the material aspects of the manuscript enlighten the philological work, and vice versa.

In manuscript studies this may not seem a great breakthrough. But, from the perspective of biblical studies, the change of focus from the original or most pristine reading to the manuscript in its material context can be quite radical. When it comes to research on the Dead Sea Scrolls the material aspect has always been important. In this context it is important to note that there is a difference between method and theory when it comes to material philology. Scholars working within a text-critical theoretical model may use material

⁵ A good introduction to the topic of new philology or material philology in the field of biblical studies, pseudepigrapha, and related fields can be found in Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug, “Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology,” in *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*, ed. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug, TUGAL 175 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017).

⁶ It is more fruitful here to use the term “material” when concerning all types of manuscripts. Generally speaking, the methods of the material analysis in material philology will not differ from the methodologies of manuscript studies or codicology, depending on the field. However, there are different practices in different fields and the term material philology avoids the misnomer of practicing codicology on scrolls. Further, material philology represents a specific focus of manuscript studies, namely, the intersection of manuscript studies with philological studies of premodern texts.

⁷ First introduced as new philology in Stephen Nichols, “Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 65, no. 1 (1990): 1–10. Cf. also M. J. Driscoll, “Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, ed. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010), 85–102.

⁸ Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris: Seuil, 1989).

methods but with quite different goals and interpretive frameworks than scholars working from the perspective of material philology. In the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls the correlation between the material description of the fragments and the analysis of the text has not always been clear. In many cases, especially concerning the biblical books, the material description has been a preamble to what was seen as the actual work: presenting variants and discussing their relation to later textual versions and recensions. Recently many scholars have begun to combine material and philological aspects of the scrolls to look at broader questions in relation to the production and transmission of the individual Qumran manuscripts.⁹ This in turn has raised questions about the nature and significance of the scrolls, leading to new understandings of both the manuscripts and their texts.

Material philology is not limited to a certain type of texts from a certain period. It is important to highlight this fact here as this methodological and theoretical framework may bear fruit in the analysis of Hebrew Bible manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls, Cairo Genizah, and European Genizah. In the following, I will discuss briefly how the method and theory function in the context of my present material, the Dead Sea Scrolls.

1.1 Material-Philological Method

At the methodological level material philology combines methods from the disciplines of manuscript studies and philology, among others. The methodological starting point is the analysis of the manuscript from the perspective of the manuscript as an artifact.¹⁰ The size, shape, date, construction, provenance, style, and wear of a manuscript all provide important information which may raise questions as to the purpose, use, and value of a manuscript. Further, the contents of the manuscript must be observed in relation to the context in which the manuscript was copied, as well as in relation to the understanding of the work as a whole. For manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible this means determining whether or not a manuscript may or may not have been a copy of a complete work (as we know it today). If so, what does this mean in terms of the transmission of this work? If not, what sort of manuscript is it, what was its purpose, how was it used? These questions may or may not be answerable but they should certainly frame our perception of what we are working with. Further, philological

⁹ E.g., Mika Pajunen, *Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*, *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); Kipp Davis, *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*, *STDJ* 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

¹⁰ An overview of one interpretation of material philology and the Dead Sea Scrolls can be found in Michael Langlois, "Les manuscrits de la mer Morte à l'aune de la philologie matérielle," *RHPR* 95, no. 1 (2015): 3–31.

work to determine the text and understanding of what is in a manuscript should be seen in the material context from which the manuscript comes. While material philology still acknowledges that scribes can make mistakes, it takes seriously that variance is not exceptional and that differences between manuscripts should be analyzed as having value in understanding the text in its context.

1.2 Theoretical Presuppositions

The above discussion of the material-philological method shows that it uses methods known from other disciplines—material, codicological, text-critical, and philological—but reframes the questions that are asked of the material and interprets the results in a different way. This theoretical shift means moving from the reconstruction of more ancient readings and the examination of those readings in a reconstructed context to the reading of the text, with its variance, in different contexts—both the close physical and temporal context, and the context of the transmission and reception of the work in question.

One important aspect of this theoretical perspective is the way in which texts are viewed and treated. Here I find it fruitful to distinguish three levels of analysis which are kept separate:¹¹ 1) the manuscript, the physical artifact; 2) the text, what is written on the sheets of the manuscript; and 3) the work, the scholarly conception or idea of what the text is or where it comes from. By maintaining a distinction between these three levels the scholar can more easily focus on which parts of the analysis are relevant in relation to other types of materials.

In the following, I will present a material philological analysis of sheet 2 of 4Q216¹² which is composed of fragments 12ii–18 and contains text from *Jub. 2*. I will not present a full discussion as the important methodological element here is to see the possibilities that arise from the intersection of material and philological analyses.¹³

2. Material-Philological Analysis

4Q216 is the oldest known manuscript that contains text from what is otherwise only fully known from the Ethiopic *maṣḥafa kufāle* (Ethiopic Book of *Jubilees* = EJ). Dated to the last

¹¹ This important distinction is used by many working in material philology, cf. especially Liv Ingeborg Lied, “Text-Work-Manuscript: What Is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon,” *JSP* 25, no. 2 (2015): 150–65.

¹² All discussions of the manuscript are based on my examination of the manuscript at the scrolls laboratory of the Israel Antiquities Authority conducted in January and February 2016, as well as further examination of the photographs available on the *Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library* available at <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il>, accessed August 21, 2020.

¹³ For a full treatment see Matthew P. Monger, “4Q216: A New Material Analysis,” *Semitica* 60 (2018): 309–33.

quarter of the second century BCE or first half of the first century BCE,¹⁴ 4Q216 has served as an important witness to the early Hebrew text of *Jubilees*. As there is a gap of at least 1,500 years between the assumed date of the composition of *Jubilees*¹⁵ and the earliest EJ manuscripts, the Qumran manuscripts provided important information for understanding the transmission of the text. The general trend in research has been to highlight the similarities between the Hebrew text of the Qumran manuscripts and EJ, assuming a high level of textual stability. Further, the fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran have been seen as evidence of the existence of the entire text of *Jubilees* being present in each case.¹⁶ Whether or not this is the intention of the authors, the lack of distinction between text from a work, on the one hand, and the “complete” work, on the other, seems to be a basic assumption. Further, the assumption of textual stability and complete copies of *Jubilees* is based on a philological paradigm that can be described as maximalist.¹⁷ This paradigm has led to the focus of research being on 4Q216 and the other Qumran *Jubilees* manuscripts as textual witnesses for EJ, instead of viewing the manuscript as an artifact in its own right. Important information about the text and its place in relation to its context goes missing when the focus is primarily on “variants.”

2.1 Physical Description

¹⁴ On paleographical grounds, VanderKam and Milik give the earlier date, while Michael Langlois suggests a date in the first century BCE (personal communication), cf. James C. VanderKam and Joseph T. Milik, “Jubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, ed. Harold Attridge et al., DJD 13 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 2. Upon inspection of the manuscript in 2016 I noted that three separate samples had been taken for radiocarbon dating and marked as such on the plates held by the Israel Antiquities Authority. All three samples were taken from the first sheet, none from the paleographically earlier second sheet. The result of one of the samples was recorded in the IAA database as showing a date between 160–1 BCE (Pnina Shor, personal communication, February 2, 2016). Cf. Monger, “4Q216: A New Material Analysis.”

¹⁵ VanderKam argues for a dating around 160 BCE. This seems to have gained broad acceptance, cf. James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 14 (Missoula (Montana): Published by Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1977). Others, however, have argued for a later date of composition or redaction, cf. most recently Cana Werman, *The Book of Jubilees: Introduction, Translation and Interpretation* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Press, 2015).

¹⁶ This is evident in the language describing *Jubilees* at Qumran, e.g. “The caves from Qumran have yielded a goodly number of copies of Jubilees, all written in Hebrew, and coming from a range of dates. These are the securely identified copies...,” James C. VanderKam, “The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2009), 3. On 4Q216 VanderKam states, “If a scribe penned 4Q216 in c. 100 BCE and if, as seems likely, the fragments came from a complete copy of the text...,” James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 18–19.

¹⁷ An analogous situation has occurred in research on 1 Enoch. For a detailed discussion of many texts see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

4Q216 is made up of 18 fragments of skin of moderate thickness.¹⁸ The portion under investigation here, fragments 12ii–18 (columns V–VII in DJD 13), comprises what was likely a single sheet of parchment in antiquity. The color ranges from light to dark brown and there is significant damage to all the fragments. In some places there is damage to the outer layer of skin but without signs of flaking.

The most interesting material feature of the scroll may be the stitching found on fragment 12. On the right side of the stitching there is text from the end of *Jub.* 1 (column IV in DJD 13), and on the left there is text from the beginning of *Jub.* 2 (column V in DJD 13). The two columns of this fragment, and thereby the two sheets, are written in two different hands.¹⁹ As my focus in this article is on the second sheet, I will not go into the details of the relationship between the two here.²⁰

The fragments can be placed in relation to each other with the help of EJ, with fragments 12ii–18 containing text from *Jub.* 2:1–24.²¹ Using the Ethiopic text as a basis, the principal editors of the manuscript in DJD 13, VanderKam and Milik, have proposed placements for the extant fragments. In my reconstruction of this scroll I have noted damage patterns and correlated these to come to the conclusion that fragment 18 represents the final column of the scroll.²²

Using the method of material reconstruction first developed by Stegemann,²³ and assuming that there was something of a margin following the text of the final column, there would be an approximate circumference of less than 6 cm at the end of the sheet. Beginning at the left edge of the remains, if the circumference of the scroll increased by 4 mm with each turn, there is vertical damage that aligns in fragments 18, 13, and 12 with successive turns, or half turns, of the scroll. There is also angular damage that aligns on fragments 11 and 3i at a distance that would be one turn of the scroll at that point. This brings into question whether or not there was a further column on the same sheet. In addition to the damage patterns we observe that the final column is noticeably longer than the two preceding columns on the same sheet, indicating that the scribe was approaching the end of the sheet and was making

¹⁸ For pictures consult Plates I–II in DJD 13.

¹⁹ A brief discussion of this is found below.

²⁰ This is discussed more thoroughly in Monger, “4Q216 and the State of Jubilees at Qumran.”

²¹ In DJD 13 fragments 12ii–13 are part of column V, fragments 14–17 part of column VI, and fragment 18 part of column VII.

²² Column 7 in DJD 13.

²³ Hartmut Stegemann, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSOTSup 8 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 181–220. A full discussion of this method, its application, and references to further literature can be found in Drew Longacre’s contribution in this volume.

use of all of the space available.²⁴ In addition, the reconstructed text that fills the space remaining after the end of fragment 18 completes a discrete unit in the *Jubilees* Creation Account.²⁵

Based on these material arguments, it is highly likely that 4Q216 ended directly after fragment 18 (column VII in DJD 13). This means that the older sheet of 4Q216 contains only the *Jubilees* Creation Account ending with *Jub.* 2:24. The fact that there are two discrete units maintained in the manuscript, *Jub.* 1 on the first sheet and *Jub.* 2:1–24 on the second sheet, also raises the question of the importance of these texts in their contexts.²⁶

2.2 Paleography and Date

The editors of DJD 13 are not in complete agreement about the paleographical date of the scroll. The first difficulty is the fact that the scroll itself is made up of fragments of two sheets, copied by two different hands, that were stitched together. The first sheet is by a later hand than the second. VanderKam and Milik agree on dating the later hand to the mid-first century BCE (“a late Hasmonaean hand”) but disagree on the dating of the earlier hand of sheet two: VanderKam dates the script to 125–100 BCE while Milik “prefers to date the script nearer to the mid-second century BCE.”²⁷ Recently Michael Langlois has looked at the manuscript and suggested that the earlier hand should be dated to 100–50 BCE and the later hand to 50–25 BCE.²⁸ If we follow VanderKam and Milik’s earlier date then at least the second sheet was copied elsewhere and brought to Qumran at some point in time, though the first sheet could have been copied at Qumran depending on which dating system the community at Qumran followed.²⁹

²⁴ Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 78.

²⁵ *Jub.* 2:1–24 recounts the creation of the world in 22 works, ending with the creation of the sabbath and initial sabbath regulations. *Jub.* 2:25ff contains further sabbatical regulations not integral to the creation account and is analyzed here as secondary. For a broader discussion of this see below.

²⁶ Because the sheet containing *Jub.* 2:1–24 is paleographically older than the sheet containing *Jub.* 1, it may be possible that *Jub.* 2:1–24 was circulated independently prior to the addition of the sheet containing *Jub.* 1. See below for a discussion of the importance of this unit being preserved in a shorter version, which corresponds to the versions preserved in the Greek and Syriac material. In my analysis of the sheet containing *Jub.* 1 I argue on material and literary grounds that the form of the text in 4Q216 fragments 1–12i is significantly different from that of EJ, lacking a large section (*Jub.* 1:15b–25), cf. Monger, “The Development of Jubilees 1.”

²⁷ DJD 13:2.

²⁸ Michael Langlois (personal communication, February 2016). Both conclusions are supported by the results of the radiocarbon analysis cf. footnote 12 above.

²⁹ It is now common to view the presence of the community at Qumran as having started in 100 BCE at the earliest, Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002). Joan Taylor has recently argued for an even later date for the beginning of the presence of the community at Qumran, starting in 34 BCE, Joan E. Taylor, *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). In this case it is uncertain if any part of the manuscript was copied at Qumran. In either

2.3 Variance

In this section I will discuss some details of the text of the fragments of 4Q216 sheet 2. I will not present reconstructions of the entire text, nor discuss in depth the relation between the fragments as such.³⁰ An attempt to reconstruct any missing text may be interesting for the placement of the fragments but will remain hypothetical at best. The text of *Jub. 2* contains the *Jubilees* Creation Account, a recounting of the seven days of creation, divided into 22 works. 4Q216 fragments 12ii–18 contain text from *Jub. 2*:1–24 which make up the section of text that most closely corresponds to Gen. 1:1–2:3, the creation divided into seven days. The section which follows this in EJ, *Jub. 2*:25–33, is a further discussion of sabbath regulations.³¹ In the following, I will discuss the text of 4Q216 as it appears in comparison with the other versions where there is extant text. In the majority of cases the only extant witness to the text is EJ.³²

There are two levels of variants addressed here. On the one hand, the word-level variants that are found in 4Q216 show that while the text is recognizable to the modern eye as *Jubilees*, there are many places where there are smaller and larger differences between the attested texts. On the other hand, there is a major literary variant where the literary structure of the work comes into question. The methodological issue here can be illustrated by the number of total variants in the final three columns (19) compared to the total number of partially extant lines (43). There are variants in nearly half of the lines of text, which all contain less than half a line of text. Thus, it seems likely that the missing text would contain a proportionate amount of variance, making reconstruction nearly impossible. It is also clear from the reconstruction that the reconstructed lines in DJD 13 don't fit exactly but only serve as a guide. In the following, I will present both types of variance in order to show the relationship of this manuscript to the other known manuscripts of *Jubilees*.

2.3.1 Word-Level Variance

case there is no clear evidence of where the manuscript was made, only where it was abandoned and subsequently found.

³⁰ DJD 13 provides reconstructions for the texts in question, though I amend several readings in Monger, "4Q216: A New Material Analysis."

³¹ A further discussion of this is found below.

³² The text of *Jub. 2* has also served as a source for Epiphanius's recounting of creation in his work *On Weights and Measures* (Greek), and the creation account in the Syriac Anonymous Chronicle up to the year 1234, cf. Albert-Marie Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca* (Leiden: Brill, 1970); Jean Baptiste Chabot, *Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens* (Paris: E Typographaeo Reipublicae, 1920).

As with any manuscripts of a given work, we find here minor variances which should be attributed to the scribal process and do not reflect literary or textual changes that affect the contents of the text. These include the addition/omission of a conjunction: fragment 12.2 (column V.10 = *Jub.* 2:2) has וַאֲשֶׁר where EJ has a conjunction; and the repetition of one or more words: in fragment 14.3 (column VI.4 = *Jub.* 2:7) the word עֲשָׂה is repeated and in fragment 17.2 (column VI.12 = *Jub.* 2.11) the words וְאֵת כֹּל are repeated. There are also several examples of the order of words being different in the different versions: fragment 12i.5 (column V.10 = *Jub.* 2:2–3) has a different order of the words מֵאֵפֶלֶה וְשָׁחַר וְאוֹר, compared with the other versions, but this does not greatly affect the text. Words are also in a different order in fragment 18.3 (VII.3 = *Jub.* 2:14).³³

There are also a number of textual variants that show that the level of variance is not only limited to scribal or grammatical issues. Fragment 13.7 (V.7 = *Jub.* 2:2) reads הַקּוֹלוֹת, “sounds” where EJ reads “depths,”³⁴ and fragment 18.9 (VII.9 = *Jub.* 2:18) lacks the word גְּדוּלִים that is present in EJ.

In addition to these differences at the word level, there are several instances where 4Q216 is longer or shorter than any other known version of *Jubilees*. Fragment 18.12–13 (VII.12–13 = *Jub.* 2:20–23) is quite fragmentary and difficult to reconcile with any known text of *Jubilees*. The editors of DJD 13 suggest this is a haplography but, either way, the text of 4Q216 is much shorter than EJ.³⁵

The opposite also occurs: there are several places where 4Q216 has text that is lacking in EJ. Fragment 13 (V = *Jub.* 2:2) has words that make it clear that 4Q216 mentions an extra group of angels that are not evidenced in the other versions. One of the largest differences between the text of 4Q216 and EJ is found at fragment 18.5–8 (VII.5–8 = *Jub.* 2:17) from the final column of 4Q216. The Hebrew text here is very fragmentary but it can be assumed that a retroversion of EJ would not fill the entire space. In other words, there is a large section that is included in this manuscript that is lacking in the Ethiopic. The Syriac *Anonymous Chronicle of 1234*³⁶ and Epiphanius’s *Weights and Measures*³⁷ have long been understood as making use of some form of *Jubilees* in their creation stories.³⁸ Both works are similar to EJ

³³ DJD 13:21.

³⁴ Cf. DJD 13:15.

³⁵ DJD 13:22.

³⁶ Chabot, *Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens*.

³⁷ Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca*.

³⁸ Robert H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, or The Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), xxvi–xxvii.

at *Jub.* 2:15–16, but read quite differently where we would expect verse 17, both being much closer to Gen. 2:3 than EJ and 4Q216 which are considerably longer. 4Q216 f18:5–8 (VII.5–8) reads:³⁹

5. that was in the heavens and on earth [.5 אשר בשמים ובארץ]
6. Sabbath [day] on [which] he ceased	.6 השבת אשר שבת ב
7. were made six days [.7 עשויים ששת ימים]
8. and that should keep the Sabbath on the sev[enth] day [.8 ונשבותה ביום השש]

The other versions read:

EJ ⁴⁰	Syriac ⁴¹	Greek ⁴²
And he gave us the Sabbath day as a great sign so that we should perform work for six days and that we should keep Sabbath from all work on the seventh day.	On the seventh day the mighty one who does not tire rested from all the works which he had done. And because of this, he blessed the Sabbath day, and on the seventh day everything that had been made on the six days was blessed. ⁴³	And God rested from all of his works on the seventh day. And he blessed it and sanctified it.

The phrase corresponding to - אשר שבת ב- is not found in the Ethiopic *Jubilees* but may be compared to the phrasing of the Syriac. The rest of the line must also be considered as a phrase that is lacking in all the later versions. The phrase ששת ימים is extant in the Ethiopic as well but seems to fit a different context than the Hebrew. No matter how it is read, even

³⁹ Cf. DJD 13:19–20.

⁴⁰ Cf. James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 12.

⁴¹ Chabot, *Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens*, 1–7. Cf. also James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 510 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989), 260; VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511, 329–30.

⁴² Denis, *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca*, 74.

⁴³ My translation. See also the slightly different translation in VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511, 330.

accounting for all of the Ethiopic text, the Hebrew text leaves a gap of at least a line and a half in 4Q216. The Syriac Chronicle and Epiphanius, while possibly retaining part of the Hebrew text that is not extant in the Ethiopic, still do not fill the gap and seem to be closer to the text of Gen. 2:3 than *Jubilees*. In other words, there was text at this point in the manuscript that is not clearly reflected in the later versions.

These examples serve to show that there is a level of textual variance between the text of 4Q216 and the versions of *Jubilees* that exceeds simple orthographical and morphological developments. This variance should be seen as a reflection of the way the content of the *Jubilees* Creation Account was understood at the time of the copying of 4Q216. This level of variance also calls for prudence in the reconstruction of text between the fragments as in many cases there is no way to predict where the text of 4Q216 will differ from EJ.

2.3.2 Literary Variance

Fragment 18 retains the entire height of the final extant column of 4Q216 but not the entire width. As noted above, the material reconstruction of the scroll offers evidence for the exclusion of further sheets beyond fragment 18. Further, it is interesting to note that, if we reconstruct verse 24 as filling the remaining space at the bottom of the column, then the column finished precisely at a literary break in the text. If we do not reconstruct additional columns then 4Q216 sheet 2 would be the *Jubilees* Creation Account *without* a discrete unit, *Jub. 2:25–31*. This section is analyzed as a literary unit by VanderKam though he does not view it as secondary.⁴⁴ Kugel sees the division in this chapter coming after *Jub. 2:25*, not *2:24*, but it is not clear why *2:25* should be considered the final words of section *2:1–25* and not the beginning of *2:25–33*.⁴⁵ If we follow VanderKam in viewing the literary unit as beginning after *2:24*, and Kugel in viewing the section as a redactional addition to the base text of *Jub. 2*, then the literary analysis fits with the material analysis. In addition to accounting for the shape of 4Q216 here, this analysis also provides support for one of the redactional additions that Kugel classifies within his “contradictions” in the book of *Jubilees*, thus strengthening Kugel’s theory.⁴⁶ There are two important points to be made here. First, if

⁴⁴ James C. VanderKam, “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000), 267.

⁴⁵ In Kugel’s analysis the section beginning with *Jub. 2:24* is part of a redaction layer added by an interpolator at a time later than the composition of the first layer of *Jubilees*. This is just one of many such interpolations in Kugel’s analysis. Cf. James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, SJSJ 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 35–37, 271–73.

⁴⁶ Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 35–37, 271–73.

this is the case then it is possible that we have in 4Q216 a version of the *Jubilees* Creation Account that ended with *Jub.* 2:24. Second, this should be viewed alongside 4Q218 (4QJubilees^c), a single small fragment containing only text from *Jub.* 2:25–27 from the Herodian Period.⁴⁷ This later fragment shows the earliest evidence of *Jub.* 2:25–27 and the extremely narrow column may point to this not being a complete copy of *Jubilees* but something else. In this connection it is possible that 4Q216 shows an earlier or different recension than 4Q218, or that 4Q218 shows evidence of the growth of the *Jubilees* Creation Account.

In sum, the literary unit that we have in 4Q216 sheet 2 is the *Jubilees* Creation Account ending with *Jub.* 2:24. This should be seen as a discrete unit and thus the manuscript should not be considered a “complete” manuscript of the book of *Jubilees*, but a manuscript containing the *Jubilees* Creation Account. In the following, I will look at the wider context in which this scroll was found, namely the manuscripts found at Qumran, and discuss ways in which this particular manuscript may relate to other works copied and read during the same period.

3. Creation Accounts in the Dead Sea Scrolls

In order to evaluate the importance of the *Jubilees* Creation Account among the Dead Sea Scrolls it is fruitful to establish the place the Genesis Creation Account has within the same corpus, especially considering the established view that *Jubilees* is an intentional rewriting of Genesis and parts of Exodus.⁴⁸

3.1 The Genesis Creation Account and the Dead Sea Scrolls

The book of Genesis, in whole or in parts, is well represented among the Dead Sea Scrolls, being identified in 18 to 20 manuscripts.⁴⁹ No manuscript includes the entire book of Genesis

⁴⁷ Cf. DJD 13:35–38.

⁴⁸ The relationship between *Jub.* 2 and Gen. 1 has been the source of disagreement among *Jubilees* scholars. Stier and Bauer proposed that *Jubilees* should not be seen as a rewriting of the Genesis Creation Account but as an older independent account, cf. Fridolin Stier, “Adam,” in *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe*, ed. Heinrich Fries, vol. 1 (Munich: Kose-Verlag, 1962–1963), 13–25; J. B. Bauer, “Der priesterliche Schöpfungshymnus in Gen. 1,” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 20 (1964): 1–9. This view was later refuted by Steck who showed the close relationship between *Jub.* 2 and Gen. 1, cf. Odil Hannes Steck, “Die Aufnahme von Genesis 1 in Jubiläen 2 und 4. Esra 6,” *JSJ* 8 (1977): 154–82; Odil Hannes Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift: Studien zur literarkritischen und überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Problematik von Genesis 1, 1–2, 4a* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981). Cf. also James C. VanderKam, “Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2,” *DSD* 1, no. 3 (1994): 300–321.

⁴⁹ Manuscripts containing text(s) from Genesis are: 1Q1 (1QGen), 2Q1 (2QGen), 4Q1 (4QGen-Exod^a), 4Q2 (4QGen^b), 4Q3 (4QGen^c), 4Q4 (4QGen^d), 4Q5 (4QGen^e), 4Q6 (4QGen^f), 4Q7 (4QGen^g), 4Q8a (4QGen^{h2}),

and only 6 have text from Gen. 1: 1Q1 (1QGen), 4Q2 (4QGen^b), 4Q4 (4QGen^d), 4Q7 (4QGen^g), 4Q8 (4QGen^h), and 4Q10 (4QGen^k).⁵⁰ Of these, two are so fragmentary as to give little help in understanding the text of Gen. 1 during this period: 1Q1 and 4Q8. 4Q2 should probably also be left out of the discussion for the present time as it is quite different from the other Qumran manuscripts, having a later hand and lower quality leather and being “reminiscent of the biblical scrolls from Murabba‘at.”⁵¹ A cursory look at 4Q4, 4Q7, and 4Q10 shows that the Genesis Creation Account was well known during this period. Variants found in the manuscripts do not stray widely from the variants known from the MT and the ancient translations. This may seem trivial but it is important in this context that the *Jubilees* Creation Account was transmitted *alongside* the Genesis account, not instead of it.

4Q4 provides an interesting example of a scroll with short wide columns, containing 11 lines with 57–67 letter spaces per line. Based on these material features it is almost certain that this manuscript was not an entire Genesis scroll but rather an excerpted one. The only sheet that has survived does not contain the entire text of Gen. 1, but evidence of stitching is visible at the left edge, meaning that another sheet was almost certainly attached at some point, possibly containing the rest of the Genesis Creation Account. George Brooke has argued that it is possible that the manuscript once held 4 or 5 chapters from Genesis, but may also have only contained the creation story or stories.⁵² Brooke also speculates on the importance of having only the very first few chapters of Genesis in a single manuscript.⁵³ We

4Q8b (4QGen^{h-para}), 4Q9 (4QGenⁱ), 4Q10 (4QGen^k), 4Q11 (4QpaleoGen-Exod^l), 4Q12(4QpaleoGen^m), 4Q576 (4QGenⁿ), 6Q1 (6QpaleoGen), and 8Q1 (8QGen). Cf. DJD 39:167–168. DJD 39 also lists 4Q483 (4QpapGen^o or papJub[?]) as a possible Genesis manuscript, cf. Emanuel Tov, ed., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX: The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002). In DJD 7 this is listed as “4QpapGen or papJubj” cf. Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4iii (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982). There are two arguments for leaving it off the list of Genesis manuscripts: 1) the manuscript is so fragmentary that it does not give us anything other than a statistical boost, and 2) it is papyrus and would thus be the only papyrus Genesis manuscript among the DSS. Fragments of text from *Jubilees*, however, are found on papyrus (e.g. 4Q223–224). Further, a Genesis manuscript has been identified in the Schøyen collection, 4Q(?)GenMiniature. Cf. Torleif Elgvin and Kipp Davis, “MS 4612/4. 4Q(?)GenMiniature (Gen 36.7–16),” in *Gleanings From the Caves*, ed. Elgvin Torleif, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois, Library of Second Temple Studies 71 (London: T&T Clark, 2016).

⁵⁰ On the exclusion of 4Q483 see previous note.

⁵¹ Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4 VII*, DJD 12 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 31. Recently several manuscripts from the Schøyen Collection purchased under the impression that they were from Qumran Cave 4 have been analyzed and shown to come from other sites, cf. Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois, eds., *Gleanings from the Caves*, Library of Second Temple Studies 71 (London: T&T Clark, 2016).

⁵² Brooke’s reassessment of this manuscript claims that the scroll could have contained at most the first 4–5 chapters of Genesis, cf. George J. Brooke, “4QGen^d Reconsidered,” in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honor of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense*, ed. Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, JSJSup 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 51–70.

⁵³ George J. Brooke, “Scripture and Scriptural Tradition in Transmission: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*, ed. George J.

may pose the question of whether the creation accounts, or beginnings of the respective books, were purposefully transmitted without the rest of the book in question, in which case 4Q4 and 4Q216 offer very interesting parallels. It is especially when it comes to the creation accounts that we see the importance of the beginnings of Genesis and *Jubilees* as they are received into other works. As it is not controversial that the Genesis Creation Account plays an important role in later works, in the following, I will discuss ways in which the importance of the *Jubilees* Creation Account can be seen in other texts found Qumran, thus showing that the *Jubilees* Creation Account played an important role in the reception of the biblical creation account.

3.2 The *Jubilees* Creation Account and the Dead Sea Scrolls

Now that we have established that both the Genesis Creation Account and the *Jubilees* Creation Account were found at Qumran, I will move on to a discussion of some examples of where the *Jubilees* Creation Account specifically relates to other Dead Sea Scrolls texts in ways that the Genesis Creation Account does not. There are several texts which are fruitful to investigate in this respect and here I will look at three different examples. First, I will discuss a section of 11Q5 (11QPs^a) which has a very clear parallel in the *Jubilees* Creation Account as found in the text of 4Q216. Then, I will discuss how texts discussing the creation of humanity may be related to the *Jubilees* Creation Account. Finally, I will discuss the issue of creation and calendar among the Dead Sea Scrolls. My goal here is not to establish a form of literary dependence between manuscripts or texts. On the contrary, the goal is to show that the texts recorded during this time not only reflect ideas known from the Genesis Creation Account, but also from *Jubilees*. This establishes the importance of the understanding of the creation in the *Jubilees* Creation Account during this period, and in the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

3.2.1 11Q5 XXVI (11QPs^a Hymn to the Creator)

A text from Qumran which shows a clear connection to the *Jubilees* Creation Account is 11Q5 XXVI 11–12 (11QPs^a Hymn to the Creator). This manuscript is described in DJD 4 and is dated paleographically to the first half of the first century BCE. 11Q5 is a collection of

Brooke and Daniel K. Falk, STDJ 103 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) argues that there may be a different understanding of where the divisions in the literary structure of Genesis are during the Second Temple period. That is, he sees reason to believe that the modern widely held understanding of a major break between Gen. 11 and Gen. 12 may not have been the main break in the late Second Temple period.

psalms, many of them from the Hebrew Bible but also several additional psalms, including the Hymn to the Creator. The following passage, lines 11b–12, is relevant to 4Q216 and *Jub.* 2:2–3 as seen in 4Q216 iv 10–11:⁵⁴

4Q216 iv 10–11	11Q5 xxvi 11b–12 ⁵⁵
<p>מאפלה ושחר וְאוֹר וערב אשר הכין בד[עֲתוֹ. אז ראינו מעשיו וְנִבְרַכְהוּ] על כל [מ]עֲשָׂיו וְנִהְלֵלָה לִפְנֵינוּ כִּי שִׁבְעָה [מַעֲשִׂים גְדוֹלִים עָ]שָׂה בְיוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן]</p> <p>darkness, dawn, [light, the dusk which he prepared with] his [know]ledge. Then we saw his deeds and [blessed him] on account of all his [d]eeds and [we praised him in his presence because] he ma[de seven] great works [on the first day.]</p>	<p>מבדיל אור מאפלה שחר הכין בדעת לכו אזראו כול מלאכיו וירגנו כי הראם את אשר לוא ידעו</p> <p>He separated light from darkness, the dawn he established with the knowledge of his heart. Then all his angels saw and sang for he showed them what they had not known.</p>

There are several parallels here that are worth noting. First is the connection between the creation of light and darkness and the creation of dawn.⁵⁶ The Genesis Creation Account does not explicitly mention the creation of dawn, only the creation of light and darkness which are called day and night, followed by the formula that ends each day of creation, “And there was evening and there was morning, the first day.” The *Jubilees* Creation Account has a tendency to make explicit the elements of creation that are necessary to understand the creation account as it progresses. It is likely for this reason the angels and dusk and dawn are mentioned on the first day.⁵⁷ Further, the fourth-century Greek Chronicler Epiphanius makes use of material

⁵⁴ This connection was originally pointed out in Patrick W. Skehan, “*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 343–46. His article was written before the publication of DJD 13 and VanderKam’s edition and translation of *Jubilees* so Skehan’s observations were based on the Ethiopic text and Charles, *The Book of Jubilees, or The Little Genesis*, along with the versional evidence. 11Q5 is discussed by Sanders in Tov, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX: The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, 89–91. He does not comment on the connection to *Jubilees* in his edition. Cf. also the discussion in Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis I–II in the Book of Jubilees* (Boston: Brill, 2000), 26–27; DJD 13:16.

⁵⁵ Text from Martin G. Jr. Abegg, *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts* (Bellingham: Logos Bible Software, 2003)

⁵⁶ Cf. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*.

⁵⁷ On the creation of angels on the first day see below.

from *Jub. 2* in his creation account, and in his use of *Jub. 2:2* he lists the items in a different order, ending with dawn which would align even better with the text of 11Q5.⁵⁸

The second parallel builds on the first—the establishment or preparation of dawn (and other items of the first day of creation) is done through or by God’s knowledge. 4Q216 lacks the word לְבוּ but EJ reads the Ethiopic cognate here, *labbu*, which supports reading “his heart” in the Ethiopic tradition. This is an interesting case and may show that later copies of the text moved even closer to the 11Q5 text. Either way, it seems that the connection here is quite strong.

The third parallel is even more telling. The angels see the works of God on the first day and praise him because of them. 11Q5 reads “then all his angels saw” where 4Q216 reads “then we saw.” The difference is not simply superficial, it is in fact entirely predictable based on the narrative structure of *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* is narrated by the angel of presence who has been tasked with transmitting the narrative to Moses, and is also the first type of angel created on the first day (*Jub. 2:2*). In the perspective of *Jubilees*, the angel then would, for literary reasons, use the first-person plural when speaking of himself and the other angels. In 11Q5 the implied speaker is different, perhaps the psalmist or reciter, while the addressee is God. The angels are spoken of here in the third person. The first-person plural is also used in this way in other passages in *Jubilees*, as seen in 4Q216 vi 8–9 (= *Jub. 2:17*):⁵⁹ “and that we should keep the Sabbath on the se[venth] day.”⁶⁰

These parallels from this relatively short passage seem to show the two texts are related in some way. The question is of course how this relationship may be discussed. Skehan argues that the Hymn to the Creator in 11Q5 xxvi is a liturgical text connected to Psalms 149 and 150, which it is also materially connected to in the manuscript.⁶¹ Skehan follows Sanders’ discussion from the *editio princeps* where verbal connections are made with 1QH^a and 1QS⁶² and views the Hymn as the source of the text in *Jub. 2*.⁶³ Skehan argues that the text is liturgical in nature though it is difficult to know the direction of the influence. Peter Flint, upon the advice of VanderKam, offers a more nuanced discussion, allowing for the

⁵⁸ Cf. Skehan, “*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter,” 345.

⁵⁹ Also many other times such as *Jub. 2:30*; 3:1,9,12,15; 4:6; 5:23; 10:6,11–13; etc.

⁶⁰ Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998).

⁶¹ Skehan, “*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter,” 343.

⁶² James A. Sanders, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, DJD 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 90–91; Skehan, “*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter,” 345.

⁶³ Skehan was working before both the publication of the Qumran *Jubilees* fragments and the publication of VanderKam’s studies and editions, and his arguments, evidence, and dating of the composition of *Jubilees* reflect this.

possibility that the *Jubilees* Creation Account could be older than the Hymn or that the Hymn was not part of the Psalms corpus at the time of the composition of *Jubilees*.⁶⁴ In either case it seems likely that both the Hymn and the parallel text in 4Q216/*Jub.* 2 could be seen as adaptations of a known text or liturgy. It is also possible that later versions of *Jubilees* reflect the development of the liturgical text/hymn that occurred after the copying of 4Q216.

Considering that 4Q216 is the oldest extant copy of the *Jubilees* Creation Account, it is quite possible that subsequent versions reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* which is closer to the text of 11Q5 Hymn to the Creator. Either way it is an important connection as the text of 11Q5 Hymn to the Creator is only known from Qumran.

3.2.2 The Creation of Humanity

As we have seen, the Genesis Creation Account is known and circulated among the texts found at Qumran, but it is also a text about which there seems to have been a good deal of discussion during the Second Temple period. As John J. Collins has pointed out, there are similarities in the interpretation of the creation of humanity in Genesis through Ben Sira and on to the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁶⁵ One area where the *Jubilees* Creation Account clearly differs from the Genesis account is the events of the first day of creation. In addition to light and darkness, and day and night, which are created on the first day in Gen. 1:2–5, the *Jubilees* Creation Account includes the explicit creation of the heavens and the earth (Gen. 1:1), the waters, spirits and angels, evening and dawn. These additional items are all known parts of creation but they are not explicitly mentioned in the Genesis account. Most important to our discussion here is the creation of angels in relation to the creation of humankind.⁶⁶

The question of the creation of angels arises in a variety of biblical passages. Job 38:4,7 implies that the כְּלִיבְנֵי אֱלֹהִים were present when God “laid the foundations of the Earth,” and reading this in connection with Job 1:6 we can understand these כְּלִיבְנֵי אֱלֹהִים as being angels. There are also texts from Qumran that assume the creation of angels or spirits, such as 1QS 3:25 which mentions the creation of רוּחֹת אֹר וְחֹשֶׁךְ. In this article my interest is

⁶⁴ Peter W. Flint, “Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint and Tae Hun Kim (Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2001), 80–126.

⁶⁵ John J. Collins, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2005), 29–43.

⁶⁶ Different works from antiquity have different ideas of when angels were created, e.g. Gen. R. 1:3; *Sir.* 16:26–30; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen. 1:26; 2 En. 29:3.

in the relationship between the creation of angels and the creation of humanity in Qumran texts.

In *Jubilees*, while all sorts of angels and spirits are created on the first day, humankind is still created on the sixth day of creation, leaving no doubt as to which came first. The understanding of the *Jubilees* Creation Account is also helpful in understanding a passage from 4Q417 (4QInstruction^c) 1i: 16–18.⁶⁷ 4Q417 is paleographically dated to the end of the first century BCE but is part of the composition known as 4QInstruction which is, on literary grounds, dated to the second century BCE, and thus prior to the Qumran community. The passage in question contains text that concerns the creation of humanity. It is generally accepted that this section as well as 4Q423 1 rely on Gen.1–3⁶⁸ and Benjamin Wold has thoroughly discussed most connections between the creation of angels and of humanity.⁶⁹ Here I will look closer at the way the *Jubilees* Creation Account can add to this discussion. The text in question, 4Q417 1i: 16–18, reads as follows:

16. לשמרי דברו. והואה חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון. וינחילונו לאנוש עם רוח. כ[י]א

17. כתבנית קדושים יצרו. ועוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין

18. [טו]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחו[.]. [ואתה בן מבין הבט ברז נהיה ודע⁷⁰

16. for those who keep his word. And this is the vision of meditation and a book of remembrance. And he will give it as an inheritance to Enosh together with a spiritual /people/, f[o]r

17. according to the pattern of the holy ones is his fashioning, but he did not give meditation (as) a witness to the spirit of flesh, for it does not know the difference between

18. [goo]d and evil according to the judgment of its [sp]irit. And you, understanding son, consider the mystery of existence, and know...⁷¹

⁶⁷ The texts are edited and discussed in John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar LeMevîn): 4Q415ff*, DJD 34 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

⁶⁸ Cf. Benjamin Wold, “The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction,” *RevQ* 102 (2013): 211–26; Benjamin Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 201 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005); Matthew Goff, *4QInstruction*, SBL Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 2 (Atlanta: SBL, 2013); Jean-Sébastien Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, STDJ 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

⁶⁹ Wold, “The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction.”

⁷⁰ The texts of non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls follow Abegg, *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts* unless otherwise noted.

⁷¹ Translations follow García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* unless otherwise noted.

These few lines of text relate to the *Jubilees* Creation Account in at least two ways which I will outline here.⁷² The first has to do with the reading of לאנוש in 4Q417 1i.16, which is discussed in DJD 34⁷³ as well as by a variety of scholars.⁷⁴ There is a disagreement as to whether the לאנוש referred to here should be understood as Enosh, the son of Seth, as humanity in general, or as Adam, the first man. Lange argues that the interpretation here should be Enosh, son of Seth.⁷⁵ This position has largely been rejected even though the connection between Enosh and the book of remembrance is interesting in connection with *Jubilees*, which I will briefly discuss below.

As stated, some scholars understand Enosh here as humanity in general.⁷⁶ Collins, however, acknowledges this possibility but rejects this in favor of reading אנוש as more specifically signifying Adam, the primordial human.⁷⁷ Collins' arguments are interesting and Wold has elaborated on them, making a strong case for reading "humanity" here, not Adam the first human. While this may be the case at a broader level, it is interesting to note that following Lange's reasoning on this passage in 4QInstruction can be seen in connection with *Jub.* 4:12 where Enosh is specifically credited with being the first to "Call on the Lord's name on the earth." Further, the ספר זכרון mentioned in 4QInstruction also awakens thoughts of *Jubilees* which is rich in book imagery. If Enosh was the first person to call on the name of the Lord, it also seems reasonable that his name could be connected to a "book of remembrance" or "book of meditation" which he, in 4QInstruction, is said to have inherited. This connection would ease the tension pointed to in DJD 34, with *Jubilees* serving as an interpretive bridge between the texts.

⁷² Benjamin Wold gives a thorough history of the relevant research up until the publication of his book in Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*. His overview highlights the fact that there are several difficult words in this section of 4QInstruction and the interpretation of each one affects the whole.

⁷³ DJD 34:164–165.

⁷⁴ Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*, STDJ 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 88; John J. Collins, "Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, STDJ 30 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 615–17; Wold, "The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction," 124–29; Rey, *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*, 296–98; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 158; Torleif Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*, ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, JSOTSup 290 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 139–47.

⁷⁵ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*, 87. Cf. also pp. 86–92 on the view that אנוש is a personal name in 4Q417.

⁷⁶ According to Wold, *Women, Men and Angels*, 128–30 Elgvin is the first to read "humanity" here, cf. Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," 139–47.

⁷⁷ Collins, "Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 37; Collins, "Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," 610–12.

The second and more important connection between 4Q417 1 i 16–18 and the *Jubilees* Creation Account can be found in the phrase *כִּיָּא כְּתַבְנִית קְדוּשִׁים יִצְרוּ* in lines 16–17. This phrase has been translated in different ways; DJD 34 reads “according to the pattern of the Holy Ones *is his* (man’s) fashioning.”⁷⁸ Collins reads “for according to the likeness of the Holy Ones is his inclination (or, he formed him).”⁷⁹ The point here is that Enosh/humanity is formed according to the likeness of the *angels*, in seeming contrast to Gen. 1:26 where humanity is made “in our image.” This is striking when taken on its own but is quite interesting when seen in light of the *Jubilees* Creation Account.

First, the *Jubilees* Creation Account does not include the phrase *וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ* which is found in Gen.1:26. Nor is the phrase reworked into the text in any way. It is difficult to know why *Jubilees* does not include this phrase, and there could be a number of reasons,⁸⁰ but it seems likely that it is not a random omission. What is clear is that *Jubilees* does not indicate that man is created in the image of *אֱלֹהִים*. The grammar of the sentence is difficult and the omission here may indicate that the well-known exegetical problem of *אֱלֹהִים* being the subject of the plural verb, *נַעֲשֶׂה*, is dealt with in *Jubilees* by the omission of the entire phrase.

The question of why the verb *נַעֲשֶׂה* in Gen. 1:26 is in the plural cohortative need not be reviewed here in detail.⁸¹ It may be that the text points to an understanding of *אֱלֹהִים* used with a plural verb as meaning “angel” which also seems to be the case in *Jub.* 4:21.⁸² This understanding of *אֱלֹהִים* is also attested elsewhere during the Second Temple period, most notably in the LXX of Ps. 8:6 which reads *αγγελους* for *אֱלֹהִים*.⁸³ This is where the 4Q417 text becomes quite interesting. The language in this section is much closer to Gen. 2 than Gen. 1 and the connection here to Gen. 2:7 has already been established.⁸⁴ The relevance of 4Q216 and the *Jubilees* Creation for understanding 4Q417 is found in the fact that *Jubilees* provides the interpretive key allowing the association of the angels with creation: in the *Jubilees* Creation Account angels are created on the first day, along with the heavens and the earth, as

⁷⁸ DJD 34:155 (italics in the original). García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* follow this reading, dropping the parenthesis, though the text there is labelled 4Q217 2 i 16–17.

⁷⁹ Collins, “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 38.

⁸⁰ Cf. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 44–45; Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature,” in *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 34–62; Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 32.

⁸¹ Cf. *inter alia* Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 143–46.

⁸² Cf. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted*, 25.

⁸³ Note also Heb. 2:5–9 which clearly follows the LXX reading of “angels” here.

⁸⁴ Cf. especially Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation.”

witnessed by 4Q216 i 5–10. Following this line of reasoning, the creation of angels on the first day in *Jubilees* is the background for understanding Enosh/humanity as being created in the image of *angels*.⁸⁵

A final question must be addressed before moving on. If humanity is created in the image of angels, how is this to be understood? A likely answer is that the image of angels is quite literally their physical nature, as *Jubilees* describes angels in quite human terms. The fact that *Jubilees* views angels in anthropomorphic terms is best illustrated by *Jub.* 15:26–27 where EJ is clear that angels were created circumcised:

Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact... For this is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels.⁸⁶

This anthropomorphic description of angels is not unique to *Jubilees*. It is likely that the reference to the feet of the seraphim in Isa. 6:2 does not refer to literal feet, but to genitals.⁸⁷

Thus, based on the references to the book in connection with the reference to Enosh and the clear understanding of angels being a model for the forming of man, it seems that the *Jubilees* Creation Account is an important text for the interpretation of creation found in 4QInstruction. The application of this is difficult. 4QInstruction and the *Jubilees* Creation Account are both clearly older than the Qumran community. My interpretation here suggests that the understanding of the order of creation and the importance of angels in creation comes to the surface in both of these texts, and that the *Jubilees* Creation Account provides the best model for understanding this section of 4QInstruction.

3.2.3 Creation and Calendar in the Dead Sea Scrolls

⁸⁵ The opposite view that human beings are spiritually or existentially in the image of angels can be seen in 4Q504 fragment 8 where Adam is created “in the image of your glory.” Cf. Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic*, SJSJ 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 272. Many thanks to Helge Kvanvig for pointing this out to me. Cf. also 1 En. 69:11: “For indeed human beings were not created but to be like angels, permanently to live pure and righteous lives.”

⁸⁶ Translation follows VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511.

⁸⁷ See Marvin H. Pope, “Euphemism and Dysphemism in the Bible,” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David N. Freedman (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

A final area where the *Jubilees* Creation Account is important in the context of the DSS is the calendar. *Jubilees* contains one of the clearest examples of a 364-day calendar, which has proven to be important for understanding the calendar in Second Temple Judaism in general and at Qumran in particular.⁸⁸ The *Jubilees* calendar was of great importance in the development of the understanding of the Qumran calendar, a connection first argued by Jaubert.⁸⁹ She identified that the calendar begins on the fourth day of creation, Wednesday, because that is the day that the sun is created. Following this hypothesis, she was able to show that in *Jubilees* the patriarchs never travel on a Sabbath—but only if Wednesday is taken to be the first day of the first month of the calendar. This proved to be a key in interpreting several Qumran calendrical texts which also follow a similar logic. This topic has been dealt with in detail and it is not my purpose here to make new claims about the *Jubilees* calendar. There are, however, several reasons for connecting texts that are unique (to the best of our knowledge) to Qumran and the *Jubilees* Creation Account, and this may also impact our understanding of the importance of the transmission of the *Jubilees* Creation Account in the Second Temple period. First, it seems that, where the *Astronomical Book of Enoch*, 1 En. 72–82,⁹⁰ goes to great lengths to combine the lunar and solar calendars, *Jub.* 2:9 erases all doubt and establishes the sun as the guiding heavenly body for fixing “days, Sabbaths, months, festivals, years, Sabbaths of years, jubilees, and all times of the years.” Second, as Ben-Dov and Ravid⁹¹ have convincingly argued, *Jubilees* has specific motives for adopting the 364-day calendar. That is, the calendar is used both exegetically and prescriptively, i.e., to

⁸⁸ A good overview of both topics as well as an extensive bibliography on the subject is Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*, STDJ 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1–67, 197–244, and throughout. Cf. also James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1998). More specifically related to *Jubilees* is Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2009), 276–93. Earlier work on the *Jubilees* calendar and Qumran can be seen for example in A. Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques,” *VT* 3 (1953): 250–64; A. Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine,” *VT* 7 (1957): 35–61; Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert,” in *The World of Qumran from Within*, ed. Shemaryahu Talmon (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 147–85.

⁸⁹ This was explored early on in Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques”; Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine,” cf. Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert,” 147–85. Jaubert’s work has been refined in Liora Ravid, “The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination,” *DSD* 10, no. 3 (2003): 371–94; Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*. There has been recent discussion as to whether there are one or several 364-day calendrical traditions but Ben-Dov convincingly shows that the texts should all be seen as developments within the same tradition.

⁹⁰ Partially preserved in 4Q208–4Q211, with 4Q208 and 209 containing text of a “synchronized calendar,” cf. DJD 36:95–131.

⁹¹ Ravid, “The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination,” 371–94; Ben-Dov, “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees,” 293 and throughout.

make sense of texts and to prescribe when festivals should be celebrated within a solar calendar. The *Jubilees* Creation Account stands in the Enochic tradition but also challenges or radicalizes this tradition for its own purposes. It seems that the point of the presentation of the calendar in *Jubilees* is to show that the liturgical calendar, where festivals are celebrated in relation to harvests, can be reconciled with a civil calendar made up of 52 seven-day weeks.

The importance of 4Q216 and the *Jubilees* Creation Account in this connection is the interpretive framework for why the calendar should be 364 days—corresponding closely to the solar calendar. The main difference on this point between the *Jubilees* Creation Account and the Genesis Creation Account is found in the following passage:

4Q216 5–7 = <i>Jub.</i> 2:8–9	Gen. 1:14–16
<p>5. [On the fourth day yhwh made the s]un, the moon and the stars. [He placed] 6. [them in the vault of the sky so that they could give light to the whole earth,] to regulate day and night and to separ[ate] 7. [light and darkness. And he placed the sun as a gre]at [sign above the earth] for the day[s], the [sa]bbaths, the [months], 8. [the feasts, the years, the weeks of years and the jubi]lees and for all the cyc[les of the years.]</p>	<p>14. And God said, “Let there be lights in the dome of the sky to separate the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, 15. and let them be lights in the dome of the sky to give light upon the earth.” And it was so. 16. God made the two great lights—the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night—and the stars. 17. God set them in the dome of the sky to give light upon the earth, 18. to rule over the day and over the night, and to separate the light from the darkness.⁹²</p>

In the Genesis account the “lights in the dome of the sky” are the signs “for the seasons and for days and years,” while in *Jubilees* it is clearly stated that it is only the sun that plays this role. This is a polemic against those who would argue for a lunisolar calendar which follows both the sun and the moon. This is clear when read together with *Jub.* 6:32–38 where the angel of presence warns that

⁹² *The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989), Gen. 1:14–18.

There will be people who carefully observe the moon with lunar observations because it is corrupt (with respect to) the seasons and is early from year to year by ten days. Therefore years will come about for them when they will disturb (the year) and make a day of testimony something worthless and a profane day a festival...

This seems to be a major consideration in *Jubilees*—all the major festivals are easily dated to a specific day of a specific month, in the 364-day calendar, and do not change from year to year.

Besides these broader considerations about the calendar at Qumran and in the Second Temple period, my main interest here is related to two Qumran calendrical texts that seem even more related to the *Jubilees* Creation Account than what would be garnered from the general observations. The first text is 4Q320 (4QCalendrical Document A) which explicitly connects creation and the calendar. The second text is 4Q317 (4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar/4QPhases of the Moon), which aligns the lunar and solar calendars.

3.2.3.1 4Q320 (4QCalendrical Document A)

This manuscript is a calendrical text which includes literary elements and is paleographically dated to the last quarter of the second century BCE.⁹³ My interest here is in the connection between the calendar and the creation found in the literary sections. 4Q320 is a *mishmarot* text which is not a simple secular calendar but lists the priestly watches for each month in relation to the lunar and solar calendars. I will here only look at three small parts of this manuscript, fragments 1i, 3 i 9–13, and 4 ii 10–14. Fragment 1i:1 shows the importance, as has been seen in the *Jubilees* Creation Account, of the fourth day being the first day of the calendrical system:

<p>1. [...] to become visible from the East 2. [and] shine [in] the center of the sky, at the base of</p>	<p>1. [--]◉ [--] להראותה מן המזרח 2. [--] [א]ִרָהּ [ב]מְחִצִית השמים ביסוד</p>
---	--

⁹³ The text is discussed in several works: Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts*, DJD 21 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001); Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*; Helen Jacobus, “Qumran Calendars and the Creation: A Study of 4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar (4Q317),” *JAJ* 4, no. 1 (2013): 48–104.

3. [the vaul]t, from evening to morning, on the fourth (day, i.e. Wednesday) of the week of	3. [הבריאה] מערב עד בוקר ב4 בשבת
4. [the sons of Ga]mul, in the first month of the	4. [ג]מול לחודש הרישון בשנה
5. [fir]st year. <i>Blank</i>	5. [הרישון]נה. []
6. [The fifth of (the week of) Jedai]ah (corresponds) to the twenty-ninth (day of a lunar month, and falls) on the thirtieth of the first (month according to the solar calendar).	6. [ב5 בידע]יה ל29 ב30 בו.

Here it is clear that the calendar begins on the fourth day of creation, as required by the view established in *Jubilees*. This understanding is necessary for the further calculations in the text which determine fixed days in the solar calendar that correspond to the lunar calendar and the priestly cycle.

Another passage, 4Q320 f3i:9–13, shows a further connection with the *Jubilee* chronology:

9. [...] the holy years	9. [--] שני הקדש
10. [...] holy creation	10. [ה]בריאה קדש
11. [...] the fourth of the week of	11. [--] ב4 בשבת
12. [the sons of Gamu]l the begi[nn]ing of all the years.	12. [--] גמו[ל] ר[ו]ן ש כל השנים
13. [...] the y]ear of the second jubilee.	13. [--] את[ו]ת היובל השני

In this passage we see the first mention of the jubilee. It is not clear what the reference is to but the relationship between the sun and the jubilee is clearly established in the *Jubilees* Creation Account. The final fragment to be looked at here, 4Q320 4 ii 10–14, increases the connection with the *Jubilees* Creation Account:

10. the days, and according to the weeks,	10. הימים ולשבתת
11. [and] to the months, <i>Blank</i>	11. לחדשים
12. according to the years, and to the Releases	12. [ול]שנים ולשמטים

13. and to the jubilees. On the fourth of	13. וליובלות. ב
14. the week of the sons of Gamul.	14. בשבת בני גמול

The text of this fragment is very close to the text of *Jub.* 2:9 = 4Q216 vi 7–8:

7. for the day[s], the [sa]bbaths, the [months],	7. לימ[ים] זל[ש] בְּתוֹת זל[חדשים]
8. [the feasts, the years, the weeks of years and the jubi]lees	8. [ולמועדים ולשנים ולשבועות השנים וליוב]לים

This text seems very closely related to the formula of the *Jubilees* Creation Account. The text of 4Q320 is closer to *Jub.* 2:9 than it is to Gen.1:14, not only in light of the systematic reference to the solar calendar in 4Q320, but also because of the inclusion of שבתת, חדשים, and וליובלות, as well as the omission of מועדים which is found in Gen.1:14.

Before beginning to draw conclusions about the two texts I will first look at another calendrical text from Qumran which is interesting in relation to the *Jubilees* Creation Account, namely, 4Q317.

3.2.3.2 4Q317 (4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar/4QPhases of the Moon)

4Q317 has been called 4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar⁹⁴ and 4QcryptA Phases of the Moon⁹⁵ and has been previously discussed most recently by Helen R. Jacobus who draws connections between 4Q317 and creation.⁹⁶ Jacobus convincingly shows that the language of 4Q317 stands in the same tradition as 4Q320 in relation to creation and is thus relevant to our discussion here. In particular, the relation between the content of the scroll and the cryptic script it is written in makes for an interesting connection with the use of the calendar.

The text of 4Q317 is highly schematic, making up what could be considered a reference volume for the phases of the moon in relation to the solar calendar. This is interesting from the point of view of the *Jubilees* calendar as *Jubilees* seems to be arguing against the use of the moon for calculating festival dates. The text equates the amount of the moon visible in the cycles of waxing and waning to the solar calendar by way of describing how many fourteenths of the moon are visible, reflecting the number of days between the new

⁹⁴ Jacobus, “Qumran Calendars and the Creation: A Study of 4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar (4Q317).”

⁹⁵ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)*.

⁹⁶ Jacobus, “Qumran Calendars and the Creation: A Study of 4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar (4Q317).”

moon and the full moon, and vice versa. The following text from fragment 1 ii a 2–9 is a good example of the text as a whole:

<p>2. [On the] fifth (day) of it (i.e. the month) [it is covered for]</p> <p>3. twelve (fourteenths,) and so [it enters the day. On the sixth of it,]</p> <p>4. it is covered for thir[teen, and so it enters the day.]</p> <p>5. On the seventh of it, it is co[vered for fourteen, and so]</p> <p>6. it enters the day.</p> <p>7. On the eighth of it, [its light dominates the day in the center of the]</p> <p>8. high vault, [/fourteen and a half/. And at the arrival of the sun]</p> <p>9. its light is obscured [and thus it starts to be visible]</p>	<p>2. [בח]משה בּוֹ [תכסה שתים]</p> <p>3. [ע]שָׂרָא וְכֵן [תבוא ליום. בששה בן]</p> <p>4. תכסה שלוש [עשרא וכן תבוא ליום.]</p> <p>5. בש^ב^עה בו תכס^ה ארבע עשרא וכן]</p> <p>6. תבוא ליום.</p> <p>7. בשמנה בו ת^משול אורה ליום בתוך]</p> <p>8. הרקיע ממע^ל [ארבע עשרא וחצי^]. ובבוא השמש יכלה כול]</p> <p>9. אורה להכסות [וכן יחל להגלות]</p>
---	---

Accordingly, one is able to calculate the day of the year in the solar calendar based on the phases of the moon. This would only be necessary in a situation where the solar calendar plays a vital role. It seems that the function of the text is not to show the compatibility of the two calendars but to ensure that one is able to be certain of the correct day in the solar calendar using the methods easily available through the observation of the moon. This would support a situation where the actual calendar being followed is solar, but where people are still used to calculating the date based on the moon. This manuscript would then provide a key to finding the correct date using methods that are not solar but allow the solar calendar to be correctly calculated. All of this would point to an understanding of the calendar in line with the Astronomical Book of Enoch (AB) rather than *Jubilees*. In AB the calendar makes use of both the sun and the moon, following a 364-day calendar, but allowing for the phases

of the moon. What is peculiar here is that the cryptic script may point in the direction of some aspect of the text not being accepted by those unable to understand the script.⁹⁷

Thus, it is quite interesting that a text which seems to go against the commands of *Jub.* 6 to abandon the moon from the calendar would be written in a cryptic script. One could speculate that this document was prepared as an aid for those who were still reliant on the moon in order to calculate dates but were part of the community using the solar calendar. It may be possible that this reference guide was not meant to be a prescriptive calendar for the community but was used to double-check or the help those who did not know the date in the 364-day calendar.

Current scholarship has accorded much weight to the fact that the lunar calendar still holds much value at Qumran, as these calendrical texts especially seem to indicate. However, it is possible to reinterpret the function of these calendrical texts pragmatically, as I have discussed especially in relation to 4Q317. It does seem that, according to the calendars, i.e. 4Q320, it is the solar calendar (or 364-day calendar) that decides festival dates and the six-year cycle of the priestly courses.⁹⁸ It may be that these calendars that correlate the lunar and solar calendars are not prescriptive in nature but a necessary aid for a group who can easily discern the date based on the position and size of the moon but have no such tool to do so in a solar calendar. The fact that *Jubilees* and other texts found at Qumran seem to argue against the use of the lunar calendar may strengthen this understanding. The community may have ideally relied on a solar calendar but still needed the lunar calendar to help it know what day it was. The calendrical texts that correlate the two calendars can then be seen as an aid for those who want to determine the correct *solar* date in order to maintain the correct calendar in the 364-day cycle. Thus, the calendrical texts may be reading the *Jubilees* Creation Account and its emphasis on the authoritative sun in opposition to the Genesis Creation Account.

4. Concluding Remarks: The Value of Material Philology

In conclusion let us review the way in which this material-philological discussion of 4Q216 has shed light on important features of this manuscript. The goal has been to show the methodological value of the interplay between the manuscript in its material context and

⁹⁷ There is no clear explanation for why cryptic scripts were employed at all. A number of different texts were copied in cryptic scripts and the scripts themselves are not necessarily difficult to decipher, cf. Eshbal Ratson and Jonathan Ben-Dov, "A Newly Reconstructed Calendrical Scroll from Qumran in Cryptic Script," *JBL* 136, no. 4 (2017): 909–10. My postulation here is that they were inherently more difficult for uninitiated readers to understand and thus maintained a level of secrecy *vis-à-vis* outsiders.

⁹⁸ DJD 21:47–48.

philological analysis. The value of this is in framing the philological discussion of the manuscript within the material and temporal context of the manuscript itself, and not simply within a corpus of texts. There are three main conclusions that each touch on a different area where material philology comes into play.

First, the word-level variance found when comparing this manuscript with other witnesses to *Jubilees* shows that, on a textual level, *Jubilees* in first-century-BCE Judea was not identical with *Jubilees* in fifteenth-century Ethiopia. This means that the text of *Jubilees* was still developing and changing during the late Second Temple period. While this is perhaps a mundane finding, it is important that it shape our understanding of *Jubilees* as a whole.

Second, the material reconstruction, and the major literary variant that the reconstruction identifies, shows that in this manuscript the *Jubilees* Creation Account was transmitted without the final section, *Jub.* 2:25–31. The fact that this section also corresponds to a literary seam in the text is an important indication that *Jub.* 2:25–31 was added at a later stage than the writing of the rest of *Jub.* 2. This means that *Jubilees* was still developing also on a literary level during the first century BCE, and other parts of the book may also have been edited during this time.

Finally, when the extant text is viewed in light of the texts among which it was found, its closest relations in time and space, the *Jubilees* Creation Account seems to be an interpretive key for understanding certain Qumran texts. This strengthens the connection between *Jubilees* and texts found at Qumran, and increases the importance of reading 4Q216 as part of Qumran literature.

In sum, the insights of a material-philological analysis allow us to make textual, literary, and philological observations about *Jubilees* which impact our understanding not only of *Jubilees* in the late Second Temple period, but also the transmission and reception of the creation story during this time. By extension, the method utilized here may fruitfully be applied to other manuscripts from the whole range of historical periods from which we have Hebrew Bible manuscripts, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, Cairo Genizah, and European Genizah.

Matthew P. Monger

MF—Norwegian School of Theology, Religion and Society, Oslo

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G. Jr. *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts*. Bellingham: Logos Bible Software, 2003.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumrân grotte 4iii (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Bauer, J. B. “Der priesterliche Schöpfungshymnus in Gen. 1.” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 20 (1964): 1–9.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*. STDJ 78. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. “Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees.” In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, 276–93. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2009.
- Brooke, George J. “4QGen^d Reconsidered.” In *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honor of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense*, edited by Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo A. Torijano Morales, 51–70. JSJSup 157. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Brooke, George J. “Scripture and Scriptural Tradition in Transmission: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*, edited by George J. Brooke and Daniel K. Falk. STDJ 103. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Cerquiglini, Bernard. *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie*. Paris: Seuil, 1989.
- Chabot, Jean Baptiste. *Chronicon ad Annum Christi 1234 pertinens*. Paris: E Typographaeo Reipublicae, 1920.
- Charles, Robert H. *The Book of Jubilees, or The Little Genesis*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.
- Collins, John J. “Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, edited by Matthias Henze, 29–43. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2005.
- Collins, John J. “Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran.” In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, 609–18. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Davis, Kipp. *The Cave 4 Apocryphon of Jeremiah and the Qumran Jeremianic Traditions*. STDJ 111. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Denis, Albert-Marie. *Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum Graeca*. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Driscoll, M. J. “Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New.” In *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, edited by Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge, 85–102. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2010.
- Elgvin, Torleif. “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation.” In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments*, edited by Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, 113–50. JSOTSup 290. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Elgvin, Torleif, and Kipp Davis. “MS 4612/4. 4Q(?)GenMiniature (Gen 36.7–16).” In *Gleanings From the Caves*, edited by Elgvin Torleif, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois. Library of Second Temple Studies 71. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Elgvin, Torleif, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois, eds. *Gleanings from the Caves*. Library of Second Temple Studies 71. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Flint, Peter W. “Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape and Interpretation*, edited by Peter W. Flint and Tae Hun Kim, 80–126. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2001.

- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)*. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.
- Goff, Matthew. *4QInstruction*. SBL Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World 2. Atlanta: SBL, 2013.
- Jacobus, Helen. “Qumran Calendars and the Creation: A Study of 4QcryptA Lunisolar Calendar (4Q317).” *JAJ* 4, no. 1 (2013): 48–104.
- Jaubert, A. “Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân. Ses origines bibliques.” *VT* 3 (1953): 250–64.
- Jaubert, A. “Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine.” *VT* 7 (1957): 35–61.
- Kugel, James L. *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. SJSJ 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kvanvig, Helge S. *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic*. SJSJ 149. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Lange, Armin. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Langlois, Michael. “Les manuscrits de la mer Morte à l’aune de la philologie matérielle.” *RHPR* 95, no. 1 (2015): 3–31.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg. “Text-Work-Manuscript: What Is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon.” *JSP* 25, no. 2 (2015): 150–65.
- Lied, Liv Ingeborg, and Hugo Lundhaug. “Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology.” In *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology*, edited by Liv Ingeborg Lied and Hugo Lundhaug. TUGAL 175. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Monger, Matthew P. “4Q216: A New Material Analysis.” *Semitica* 60 (2018): 309–33.
- Monger, Matthew P. “4Q216 and the State of Jubilees at Qumran.” *RevQ* 104 (2014): 595–612.
- Monger, Matthew P. “The Development of Jubilees 1 in the Late Second Temple Period.” *JSP* 27, no. 2 (2017): 83–112.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Nichols, Stephen. “Philology in a Manuscript Culture.” *Speculum: A Journal of Medieval Studies* 65, no. 1 (1990): 1–10.
- Pajunen, Mika. *Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.
- Pope, Marvin H. “Euphemism and Dysphemism in the Bible.” In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David N. Freedman. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Ratson, Eshbal, and Jonathan Ben-Dov. “A Newly Reconstructed Calendrical Scroll from Qumran in Cryptic Script.” *JBL* 136, no. 4 (2017): 905–36.
- Ravid, Liora. “The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination.” *DSD* 10, no. 3 (2003): 371–94.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. van. *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis I–II in the Book of Jubilees*. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. van. “The Creation of Man and Woman in Early Jewish Literature.” In *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical*

- Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, edited by Gerard P. Luttikhuisen. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Sanders, James A. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IV: The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*. DJD 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "Jubilees and the Qumran Psalter." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 343–46.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift: Studien zur literarkritischen und überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Problematik von Genesis 1, 1–2, 4a*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. "Die Aufnahme von Genesis 1 in Jubiläen 2 und 4. Esra 6." *JSJ* 8 (1977): 154–82.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments." In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, 181–220. JSOTSup 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Stier, Fridolin. "Adam." In *Handbuch theologischer Grundbegriffe*, edited by Heinrich Fries, 1:13–25. Munich: Kose-Verlag, 1962–1963.
- Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin. *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar LeMevîn): 4Q415ff*. DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *1 Enoch 91–108*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert." In *The World of Qumran from Within*, edited by Shemaryahu Talmon, 147–85. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer. *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts*. DJD 21. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Taylor, Joan E. *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1989.
- Tov, Emanuel, ed. *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX: The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. DJD 39. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *Qumran Cave 4 VII*. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran." In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, edited by Peter W. Flint and Tae Hun Kim, 51–66. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- VanderKam, James C. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1998.
- VanderKam, James C. "Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2." *DSD* 1, no. 3 (1994): 300–321.
- VanderKam, James C. "Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1." In *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline, 266–79. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- VanderKam, James C. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 14. Missoula (Montana): Published by Scholars Press for Harvard Semitic Museum, 1977.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 511. Lovanii: Peeters, 1989.

- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 510. Lovanii: Peeters, 1989.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, 3–21. Grand Rapids (Michigan): Eerdmans, 2009.
- VanderKam, James C., and Joseph T. Milik. "Jubilees." In *Qumran Cave 4, VII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, edited by Harold Attridge et al., 1–186. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Werman, Cana. *The Book of Jubilees: Introduction, Translation and Interpretation*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Press, 2015.
- Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Wold, Benjamin. "The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction." *RevQ* 102 (2013): 211–26.
- Wold, Benjamin. *Women, Men and Angels*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.