

# Material Philology and Jubilees Manuscripts from Qumran

## Exploring Questions of Theory and Method

Matthew P. Monger

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

**ACCEPTED VERSION** – Please cite final version in JAAJ 10: <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.JAAJ.5.133946>

### Summary

*Material philology as an approach to the study of ancient manuscripts and their texts has grown in popularity over the past decade and its application to the study of the manuscripts of Jubilees opens for a number of important perspectives that nuance our picture of the literary development of the work. This article discusses material philology as both a theoretical position and a methodological toolbox that can both guide the study of the manuscripts and texts of Jubilees and allow for different avenues of analysis. Based on these theoretical and methodological insights, three examples are given of ways in which a material philological approach influences our understanding of Jubilees during the Second Temple Period at the level of the manuscript, text, and work.*

Material philology – the study of texts as embodied in, and inseparable from, their material and historical contexts – has made its way from Medieval Studies to nearly all branches of textual scholarship over the past decades. This emergent focus on manuscripts provides new insights and opportunities when studying ancient texts that may be clouded when viewing the text as a disembodied, extracted entity. The Hebrew Bible and Pseudepigrapha serve as excellent objects of research when using a material philological approach, as the texts have been studied for centuries while the manuscript evidence has changed radically over the past 70 years. The manuscripts found in the Judean Desert are a completely different kind of manuscript evidence than was previously known, even though the texts they contain are often familiar. Jubilees is an especially salient example of the need for, and usefulness of, material philology, given the geographical and chronological distance between the previous textual basis – i.e., the Ethiopic manuscripts from the fourteenth century and later – and the now well-known Qumran fragments from the first centuries BCE/CE. In this article, I will connect theoretical, methodological, and practical considerations in order to make a case for the value of a material philological approach in the discussion of possible editorial activity in ancient texts and show how the approach can be applied to the specific case of the Book of Jubilees. I will begin with a brief historical survey of the material philology in general and as it has been applied to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Then I will move onto a more detailed discussion of theoretical and methodological considerations that form the basis for the material philological approach. I will then turn to some examples of ways in which the application of the theoretical and methodological principles can be part of a discussion of editorial activity in the history of Jubilees.

# Material Philology

Material philology as an approach to reading and interpreting ancient texts has gained traction in many fields in the humanities. Essentially, it marks a shift in focus toward reading texts within their material and historical context, instead of as abstract representations of an assumed older text or as idealized precursors to an established later text. This movement, also called New Philology, is often said to have its catalyst in the 1989 publication by Bernard Cerquiglini, *Éloge de la variante: Histoire critique de la philologie*.<sup>1</sup> Cerquiglini argued that it is *variance*, not stability, which is the primary characteristic of texts transmitted in manuscript cultures. His criticism of traditional philology was warmly received in certain circles of medievalists, who quickly formulated a *New Philology* taking into account the criticisms and ideas of Cerquiglini. The new movement was oriented toward philology, and by extension editorial theory, and the question of how manuscripts and manuscript traditions should be edited and represented. The growing understanding among medievalists, so keenly addressed by Cerquiglini, was that there was a discrepancy between manuscript evidence, which shows pluriform texts and instability, and the presentation of the texts in critical editions.<sup>2</sup> Formative in this period were early publications by Stephen Nichols, “Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” the introduction to a special issue of the journal *Speculum* in 1990, as well as his 1997 publication entitled “Why Material Philology?”<sup>3</sup> The most recent appropriation of new or material philology into other branches of the humanities is often associated with the publication of M. J. Driscoll’s article entitled, “Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New” from 2010.<sup>4</sup>

Generally speaking, the terms *material* and *new philology* are used synonymously. I prefer to use *material philology* as it avoids the pitfalls of the adjective “new” – as though the methods were entirely novel to this particular approach – and because the word *material* is descriptive of the main difference between this approach and a more traditional *textual* philology. Early on, scholars seem to have used both terms to describe the same movement. Driscoll uses the terms *new philology* and *material philology* synonymously, as does Nichols, though, in some of his works, he prefers *material philology*. Within the framework of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the consensus has been to use the term *material philology*, which is fitting given that from the very beginning, many Dead Sea Scrolls scholars have used material methods. Though still working within a more historical-critical paradigm, they have often been forward-thinking when it comes to combining manuscript studies and philology.<sup>5</sup> A more thorough discussion of the contribution of Dead Sea Scrolls scholars and the development of material methods and material philology in working with the Dead Seas scrolls is warranted here.

---

<sup>1</sup> B. CERQUIGLINI, *Éloge de la variante: histoire critique de la philologie* (Paris, 1989); and the English translation: B. CERQUIGLINI, *In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology* (Baltimore, MD, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> A good overview of the background and influence of material philology can be found in L. LIED – H. LUNDHAUG, “Studying Snapshots: On Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology,” in L. LIED – H. LUNDHAUG (ed.), *Snapshots of Evolving Traditions: Jewish and Christian Manuscript Culture, Textual Fluidity, and New Philology* (Berlin, 2017) 1-19.

<sup>3</sup> S. NICHOLS, “Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” *Speculum* 65 (1990) 1-10. S. NICHOLS, “Why Material Philology? Some thoughts,” *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 116 (1997) 10-30.

<sup>4</sup> M. J. DRISCOLL, “Words on the Page, Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in J. QUINN – E. LETHBRIDGE (ed.), *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010) 85-102.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. K. DAVIS, “The Social Milieu of 4QJer<sup>A</sup> (4Q70),” in P. B. HARTOG – A. SCHOFIELD – S. I. THOMAS (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Study of the Humanities* (Leiden, 2018) 53-76.

# Material Philology and the Dead Sea Scrolls

The application of the material philological approach to the study of ancient manuscripts is in some crucial ways different than its application in the study of medieval manuscripts, where the term material philology originated. In the following, I want to outline the development of material methods within the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Materiality has always been important in the study of the fragmentary manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but, as I will show here, while the methods have been materially oriented, the underlying paradigm has, up until very recently, been historical-critical.

After their discovery in the 1940s and 1950s, the scrolls have provided confirmation of and challenges to the traditional understanding of the development of the text of the Hebrew Bible. Many scrolls scholars have been adept at material and paleographical methods, and the publication of principal editions of many of the Dead Sea Scrolls show this focus on the material description.<sup>6</sup> As I see it, there are three main factors that have contributed to the current situation.

First, the manuscripts found in the Judean desert are generally in such a poor state that material analysis has been necessary – and has been practiced – since the very beginning. Because of the limited number of scholars working on the material and the nascent milieu of manuscript scholars working with such ancient material, the same scholars have played both the role of the manuscript's scholar and the philologist.<sup>7</sup> Thus the *methods* of manuscript's scholars are not unfamiliar to the philologists working with the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>8</sup>

Second, many Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts contain texts previously unknown to scholars. Much of the so-called sectarian material, many of the *peshet* texts, and the large number of calendrical texts are all novel and required scholars to do more than reconstruct the

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the discussion of the practices of editing the Dead Sea Scrolls outlined in E. TOV, "The *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*: History and System of Presentation," in E. TOV (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and An Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (Oxford, 2002) 1-25.

<sup>7</sup> From the very first editions in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series, there have been physical and material discussions of the manuscripts. Later, a method for material reconstruction was developed by Hartmut Stegemann, who demonstrated the value of material analysis for understanding the approximate size of individual scrolls. This was further developed and used by Annette Steudel and others. Cf. H. STEGEMANN, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," in L. SCHIFFMAN (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield, 1990) 181-220; A. STEUDEL, "Assembling and Reconstructing Manuscripts," in P. FLINT – J. C. VANDERKAM (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: 1998) 1:516-534; D. STOLL, "Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer – mathematisch oder Wie kann man einer Rekonstruktion Gestalt verleihen?" in H-J. FABRY – A. LANG – H. LICHTENBERGER (ed.), *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.-26. Juli 1993* (Göttingen, 1996) 205-218.

<sup>8</sup> Some examples of analyses of individual texts using a material method are A. STEUDEL, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschata.b). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgehistorische Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Leiden, 1993); E. J. C. TICHELAAR, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text in 4QInstruction* (Leiden, 2001); T. ELGVIN, "How to Reconstruct a Fragmented Scroll: the Puzzle of 4Q422," in A. K. PETERSEN *et al.* (ed.), *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden, 2009) 223-236; G. BROOKE, "4QGen<sup>d</sup> Reconsidered," in A. P. OTEREO – P. A. T. MORALES (ed.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (Leiden, 2012) 51-70. The results of the material analyses published in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series have been collated and processed in E. TOV, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden, 2004).

text, they had to reconstruct the manuscripts. Thus, when working with the Dead Sea Scrolls, scholars were dependent upon material methods of reconstructing the scroll without a good understanding of the text.<sup>9</sup>

Third, the manuscripts found in the caves near Qumran contain the earliest known text of many biblical and related works. Seen in contrast with the previous point, it becomes apparent that the work on known texts was seen as somewhat easier because the fragmented manuscripts could be situated in the known or reconstructed Hebrew text of a given work, allowing an easier process of reconstruction. The philological work on these manuscripts has been framed by the historical-critical approach, and despite the material orientation of the research and the wide range of variants, the idea of establishing the “best” reading has often been at the forefront of scholars’ minds. This has resulted in somewhat of a dichotomy in the way in which known and unknown texts were treated. However, as Emanuel Tov has pointed out, the classification of fragments as known biblical texts may not be so simple. In his *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*, Tov states that:

Some of the very fragmentary texts that have been named biblical may actually have been parts of compositions that included, among other things, long stretches of Bible texts, such as *pesharim* and other commentaries, or paraphrases. For example, 4QGen<sup>k</sup> 5 may actually belong to 4QRP<sup>a</sup> (4Q158)... Likewise, the “biblical” 2QExod<sup>b</sup> may actually contain a rewritten Bible text.<sup>10</sup>

While the scholars working with the Dead Sea Scrolls have been methodologically in tune with the work of manuscript scholars, their theoretical orientation has often been that of traditional textual criticism. The editions of Dead Sea Scrolls have generally confirmed this orientation by first giving a material and/or codicological analysis before turning to the textual discussion. In the analysis of known works, the focus has very quickly turned to the value of the variants in reconstructing text types and confirming/disproving textual theories. It is important to note here that I am not criticizing the general efforts of the DJD editions for their material analysis. On the contrary, I believe that the first editors, as well as their successors, have shown great insight in the ways in which manuscripts have been described, making Dead Sea Scrolls studies one of the fields where many of the commentators actually worked hands-on with the manuscripts. My assertion here is that the presentation of the texts in the editions has still been framed by a historical-critical approach, which caused many texts to be conformed to models that did not necessarily fit the material.<sup>11</sup>

Currently, there is a growing movement toward material philology in the study of ancient texts and manuscripts.<sup>12</sup> In many cases, it seems that while the methods and some of the questions are material philological, the analysis is still framed in terms of traditional philology. There are, however, now a number of studies that implicitly or explicitly operate with a

---

<sup>9</sup> See especially C. A. NEWSOM, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta, GA, 1985); E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman),” in M. L. GROSSMAN (ed.), *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2010) 26-47.

<sup>10</sup> E. TOV, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden, 2010) 112.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. E. ULRICH, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” in P. FLINT – T. KIM (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2001) 51-66.

<sup>12</sup> A paper given in 2012 by Liv Ingeborg Lied entitled “New (Material) Philology and Qumran Studies” at the conference on “New Discoveries in the Judean Desert I,” at the University of Agder, 21-23 August 2012 pointed out the need for connecting material philology and Qumran studies. This was followed up in 2014 by the “Material Philology and the Dead Sea Scrolls” conference that was arranged in Copenhagen, Denmark, which sought to investigate methods and ideas related to material philology.

philological approach.<sup>13</sup> A recent volume by Jonathan Ben-Dov, Asaf Gayer, and Eshbal Ratzon details much of the work that has been done in material philology and suggests methods for material and digital reconstruction of the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>14</sup>

This turn toward a material philological approach in research on ancient texts implies asking different questions while continuing to use and refine both material and philological methods to analyze the manuscripts. Questions such as the following are valuable in a material philological investigation: How was the manuscript prepared? What materials were used, and what was its size and shape? What were the (possible) contents of a particular scroll? Does any given manuscript represent an entire book of the Hebrew Bible or another work, or is it an excerpt or something else? What do different manuscripts teach us about the ways different books were being transmitted during the late Second Temple period? How does the variance found in the texts of different manuscripts affect the meaning of the texts for those who read and used those manuscripts?

Many of these questions concern the relationship of the manuscript to the work in question. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, Psalms manuscripts have provided an excellent case for examining the relationship between manuscripts and works in a framework that we can call material philological.<sup>17</sup> Texts from the book of Psalms are widely represented among Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts, but there is no single manuscript from Qumran that contained all 150 Psalms that are found in the Masoretic Text. In fact, there is wide variation in the contents, structure, and style of the manuscripts containing Psalm texts. Further, there are often non-canonical Psalms found in the same manuscripts as canonical Psalms, raising questions to the state of the Psalter canon during the late Second Temple period. Scholars have only recently begun to evaluate what exactly this means for the understanding of individual manuscripts and for the book of Psalms as a whole.

## Theoretical Considerations

As can be seen from the discussion above, material philology implies a theoretical reorientation when it comes to the focus of research on texts in a manuscript culture in general. In the following, I want to highlight the way material philology as an approach affects the epistemological orientation of the scholar. Material philology is now a broad interdisciplinary

---

<sup>13</sup> See *inter alia* M. PAJUNEN, *Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381* (Göttingen, 2013); D. FALK, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran,” in C. LEONHARD – H. LÖHR (ed.), *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity* (Tübingen, 2014) 33-87; D. WILLGREN, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms* (Tübingen, 2016); K. DAVIS, “‘There and Back Again’: Reconstruction and Reconciliation in the War Texts of 4QMilhama<sup>a</sup> (4Q246a-c),” in K. DAVIS *et al.* (ed.), *The War Scroll, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honour of Martin G. Abegg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, (Leiden, 2015) 125-146; T. ELGVIN, *The Literary Growth of the Song of Songs in the Hasmonean and early-Herodian Periods* (Leuven, 2017); J. M. TUCKER – P. PORZIG, “Between Artefacts, Fragments, and Texts: An Analysis of 4Q255 Column I,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 25 (2018) 335-358; Michael B. Johnson, “A Scroll Divided?: An Examination of the Wadded Bundle of 1QHodayota,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* (2022): 1–40.

<sup>14</sup> Jonathan Ben-Dov, Asaf Gayer, and Eshbal Ratzon, *Material and Digital Reconstruction of Fragmentary Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of 4Q418a*, (Leiden, 2022).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. especially D. WILLGREN, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms* (Tübingen, 2016); M. PAJUNEN, *Land to the Elect and Justice for All: Reading Psalms in the Dead Sea Scrolls in Light of 4Q381* (Göttingen, 2013); E. MROCZEK, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford, 2016).

movement that is developing in a variety of fields but does not simply consist of combining material methods with traditional philology. Instead, it represents a different way of contextualizing texts and manuscripts and evaluating meaning. This comes to expression in the way in which manuscripts and texts are viewed as sources of knowledge. In other words, we may ask the question: what kind of knowledge is accessible through the study of a text or manuscript, and how may that knowledge be approached?

At the outset, it is important to draw a clear distinction between the goals of textual criticism, in particular, and the historical-critical paradigm in general on the one side and material philology on the other. This is keenly outlined by M. J. Driscoll in three points:

1. Literary works do not exist independently of their material embodiments, and the physical form of the text is an integral part of its meaning; one needs therefore to look at “the whole book,” and the relationships between the text and such features as form and layout, illumination, rubrics and other paratextual features, and, not least, the surrounding texts.
2. These physical objects come into being through a series of processes in which a (potentially large) number of people are involved; and they come into being at particular times, in particular places and for particular purposes, all of which are socially, economically and intellectually determined; these factors influence the form the text takes and are thus also part of its meaning.
3. These physical objects continue to exist through time, and are disseminated and consumed in ways which are also socially, economically and intellectually determined, and of which they bear traces.<sup>18</sup>

Thus, material philology studies the manuscript in its specific context and studies features of an individual manuscript as they fit into the socio-cultural context where the manuscript was copied and kept. This is where one of the most important theoretical observations comes to expression. From a material philological perspective, meaning is viewed as being constituted in the production of and engagement with the manuscript itself. That is to say that scribes, readers, and users of a text are “agents of textuality” and are the principal providers of meaning to the text. Thus, analyzing the text as it appears on the pages of a manuscript is a primary focus of material philology, and the context for the analysis is the time and place of the production and use of the manuscript. This point cannot be emphasized enough, as it is often a point of misunderstanding. The material philological approach constitutes an epistemological turn in relation to previous theoretical frameworks. Material philology is not modernist – attempting to find the intended meaning of the author, nor is it strictly post-modern – only finding meaning in the interaction of the modern reader and the text. Material philology is historical, as it seeks to find meaning in the interaction between the historical context and the actual text as it appears on the pages of the manuscript. It is also descriptive in nature but describes meaning as being in the historical and material context, not only in the context of the modern reader.

The consequence of this for the analysis of ancient texts is that instead of adopting a position which *a priori* defines the limits of a particular work, individual manuscripts are viewed as points of the reception of a text, situated in a material and historical context. This means that certain questions are more pertinent than others. For example, many manuscripts contain excerpts or parts of other works or may contain a certain collection of complete works.

---

<sup>18</sup> M. J. DRISCOLL, “Words on the Page, Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in J. QUINN – E. LETHBRIDGE (ed.), *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010) 90-91.

While the form of the text on the pages of such manuscripts may be interesting when compared with the texts of other manuscripts, there are also productive questions that the material philological approach raises, such as the purpose of such manuscripts, how and why they were produced, used and circulated, how their texts influenced and created meaning for readers and users. Additionally, the value of such manuscripts for understanding the process of transmission of a given work must be considered. Given the fact that many of the oldest manuscripts of works from Antiquity are fragmentary, it is of the utmost importance to ask questions about the forms in which they were known and the manner of their transmission.

Another important theoretical constraint of the material philological approach is the precise understanding and application of terms that facilitate a discussion of material, textual artifacts from a material philological perspective: namely *manuscript*, *text*, and *work*.<sup>19</sup> Though these terms are not unique to the material philological approach, the knowledge associated with the different levels and the combination of analysis of all three parts is unique.<sup>20</sup>

## Manuscript

A manuscript is a composite physical and cultural artifact, produced at a certain place at a certain point in time. Thus, when I use the term artifact to describe a manuscript, my usage pertains to the composite object and many different elements that may be studied, including physical features and the text. As the etymology implies, a manuscript is a hand-written document. More importantly, in material philology, a manuscript is an object that may be studied regardless of the state of the text it contains. Material properties such as the size, shape, preparation, age, and degree of damage/repair, etc., are analyzable features that are comparable with other manuscripts.<sup>21</sup> Further, such material properties are the result of historical processes and can provide information on the context of the production and use of the manuscript. I also include here under the rubric of “material properties” the way in which a text is presented on the page, including the preparation of the manuscript (i.e., ruling, line spacing, and the number of lines on the page) and style of writing, and other scribal practices. These properties can help determine the purpose and use of a certain text, and though the

---

<sup>19</sup> These or similar terms are commonly used in the formative works on material philology, cf. M. J. DRISCOLL, “Words on the Page, Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in J. QUINN – E. LETHBRIDGE (ed.), *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010) 93-95; J. QUINN, “Introduction,” in J. QUINN – E. LETHBRIDGE (ed.), *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010) 13-37. Similar discussions have been taking place in the field of textual criticism, cf. G. T. TANSALLE, *A Rationale of Textual Criticism* (Philadelphia, PA, 1992); M. V. FOX, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition With Introduction and Textual Commentary* (Atlanta, GA, 2015). Eibert Tigchelaar has also discussed the use of similar terminology in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, cf. E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman),” in M. L. GROSSMAN (ed.), *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2010) 26-47.

<sup>20</sup> As far as I know, these terms were first introduced into the study of the Pseudepigrapha in L. I. LIED, “Textual Transmission and Liturgical Transformation of 2 Baruch in Syriac Monasticism,” Paper presented at *The Rest is Commentary: New Work on Ancient Jewish Texts* (Yale University, 2013). See also L. I. LIED, “Nachleben and Textual Identity: Variants and Variance in the Reception History of 2 Baruch,” in M. HENZE – G. BOCCACCINI (ed.), *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (Leiden, 2013) 403-428; L. I. LIED, “Text – Work – Manuscript: What is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 25 (2015) 150-165.

<sup>21</sup> See the definition and analysis of paratextual features in G. GENETTE, *Paratexts* (Cambridge, 1997).

measurements of these physical properties are absolute (i.e., size, age, etc.), their interpretation is not. Thus, the analysis of a manuscript should be seen on two axes, one material and one textual. That is, the manuscript will have features that are both similar to and different from other manuscripts. At the same time, the manuscript can be analyzed as the bearer of a text. Likewise, the assessment of the text in its particular form should be shaped by the material attributes of the manuscript.

## Text

From a material philological perspective, a text is defined as what is found on the page of the manuscript – the actual letters and words that were written down. In this way, text cannot be seen as independent of the manuscript but is materially bound to the medium on which it is communicated. Thus, when I describe the Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts that contain words from *Jubilees*, I refer to them as “manuscripts containing text from *Jubilees*.” The text cannot be independent of the manuscript that bears it. The text of a manuscript may be organized in different ways, sometimes segmenting the text into different units, while other times presenting a running text. Sections of the text that are graphically or physically separated from other parts of the text by means of spacing, rubrics, or other features can be called “layout units.”<sup>22</sup> When discussing texts, it is thus relevant to note the source of information, whether it be a particular manuscript source or the text of a critical or scholarly edition.

## Work

The term *work* is used here to describe the *conception* of a composition as a coherent unit.<sup>23</sup> In this way, the name of a work functions as a cognitive placeholder for the idea an individual has not only regarding the contents but often the history and position of that given work. It is at the level of the conception of a work that material philology most deeply shows a theoretical difference from other approaches, as it points us toward imagining different conceptions of a work in different historical and material contexts. For the modern reader, the conception of the work is often based on the version or translation of the work one is most familiar with. This conception may differ from the conception an ancient reader or writer would have had of what we perceive as the same work. In other words, the conception of *Jubilees* is more or less formed by an intuition that is subjective or specific to a cultural group or time period, and which takes place in the mind of each person who encounters the work, and in the collective mind of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Layout units may or may not coincide with literary units, which can be defined as sections of the text that belong together upon examination from a literary perspective. Layout units can differ in different manuscripts, and literary units are the result of the conception of the work by the scholar doing the analysis. Thus, there can be discrepancies between an ancient and a modern idea of the literary units of a work.

<sup>23</sup> I use the term *work* in the same way as others use the term document, composition, or even book in the meaning “a biblical book.” This follows L. I. LIED, “Text – Work – Manuscript: What is an Old Testament Pseudepigraphon,” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 25 (2015) 150-165 and M. J. DRISCOLL, “Words on the Page, Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in J. QUINN – E. LETHBRIDGE (ed.), *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature* (Odense, 2010). Parker uses a similar distinction but chooses the term “document” where I follow Lied’s “manuscript,” cf., D. C. PARKER, *Textual scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford, 2012) 10-31.



field. In addition, the conception may change over time both in the mind of an individual and in the common perception and understanding of a group.

Precision in the use of the term *work* is important in the context of a discussion of different examples of a work. For example, if we take the text of one of the Ethiopic manuscripts of *Jubilees* and compare it to another, we will find certain differences between them. In most cases, the differences are small enough that no scholar would call for a reevaluation of the name of the work in question in some of the manuscripts. Even relatively major differences could be allowed while still calling them the same work if unity is important for the scholar. This could be said to be the case in the common application of the title *Jeremiah* to both the Masoretic version and the LXX version of the biblical book. There are fairly large differences between the two, but both books clearly have a common reference point. On the other hand, when working with some texts, scholars are quick to classify different editions of a story as different works altogether. This has been the case in work with the Dead Sea Scrolls, where we have titles such as “Rewritten Pentateuch” and “Pseudo-Jubilees” being applied to texts that are similar enough to be clearly related to a particular work known from later witnesses, but which deviate from boundaries that modern scholars have set as definitions of what the work should look like.<sup>24</sup>

## The Methodological Framework of Material Philology

Building upon the observations in the previous section, this section serves to outline how a material philological method might function. In the following, I will outline the broader methodological insights that are important to, and incorporated into, material philological analysis. In addition to the broader influences on material philological method, I will pay specific attention here to the challenges of working with texts that are known from translations but also attested with fragmentary evidence from a much earlier period. Put in terms specific to the case of *Jubilees*, the question is how to work with the manuscripts containing text from *Jubilees* from the first century BCE, when the most extensive manuscripts are found in Ge'ez (i.e., a translation) from Ethiopia (i.e., far away) copied in the fourteenth century and onward (i.e., very late). The obvious methodological hurdle here is the distance – linguistically, geographically, and historically – between the most *developed* evidence and the *oldest* evidence.

### The Manuscript

The theoretical groundwork presented in the previous section makes clear that the material philological approach is grounded in the study of the manuscript itself. The perspective of material philology is that the manuscript is to be treated as a composite artifact, which may contain information about the context of its production and use. Material philology is not only concerned with the manuscript isolated from the text or the text isolated from the manuscript but treats both as integrated parts of a whole. Drawing on the methods of manuscript scholars and book historians, a material philological analysis can focus on physical description,

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. S. W. CRAWFORD, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2008).

paleographical analysis, discussion of the scribal practices, and discussion of other post-production features of the manuscript.<sup>25</sup> This process could be termed a material analysis or material description.<sup>26</sup> The purpose of the discussion of the production of the manuscript and its physical properties is to situate the manuscript in a specific context, both historically and within the specific manuscript culture it comes from. It is from this initial work that the discussion of the text proceeds, as it relates to its material and historical context. Based on this material analysis, questions about the origin, style, and contents of a manuscript can be answered. Analysis of these findings plays a central role in the further analysis of the text and work.

## The Text

At the level of methodology, work with text in material philology is quite similar to that of traditional textual philology, as there is continuity in the initial steps of the process. First, there is a process of collecting and identifying variants, where possible. Material philology seeks to free variants from models that describe them as being superior or inferior based on the assumed tradition of the manuscript and considers all variants to be actual representations of what is in the manuscript.

The next step is the analysis of the variance found between different witnesses by attempting to establish a relationship between the variants. To a certain extent, a material philological analysis will follow the methods of the historical-critical approach here as well, attempting to establish variants as the product of scribal error, simple grammatical differences, corrections, improvements to the text, or major revisions. But instead of assigning value to variants in relation to one another as concerns their proximity to a hypothetical reconstructed text or their place within text-types and families, material philology frames the analysis in the context of the production and use of the manuscript itself. Instead of discussing the *best* reading, a material philological analysis will treat the variant readings as constituting meaning in their contexts.

It is important here to note that while a material philological study may suggest that a given reading is the result of a mistake, that same reading is just as valuable for understanding how the text was read and understood in the context of the manuscript. In other words, while there may be good arguments for viewing a variant as being the result of a misreading, mistranslation, or mistake on the part of the scribe, we should not automatically assume that the reader and user of this manuscript would have understood that to be the case. Further, mistakes in one manuscript may be copied as though they are correct when new copies are made.

---

<sup>25</sup> A recent overview of manuscript studies in different traditions can be found in A. BAUSI (ed.), *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies: An Introduction* (Hamburg, 2015) Electronic edition available at <https://www.aai.uni-hamburg.de/en/comst/publications/handbook.html> (last accessed 01.01.2022). This volume is mainly focused on codices, but many of the practices are directly relevant to the study of scrolls. Readers familiar with the editions found in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series will be familiar with this process as applied to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

<sup>26</sup> The term *material analysis* or *material description* may be used to avoid using such terms as “papyrology,” “codicology” and “bibliographical analysis” which all problematically point toward a certain type of document or manuscript which is to be analyzed. This is even more clear when working with the Dead Sea Scrolls, where the assumption is that the majority of the fragmentary manuscripts were once rolled as scrolls, but some of them were likely folded or even left open. In studies of codices or papyri, the terms *codicology* and *papyrology* are of course appropriate. Here, I am trying to find a blanket term that avoids confusion or misnomers in the wider methodological perspective.

Similarly, the discovery of intentional changes to the text should be read in the same way. By comparing the different variants, we can see where one manuscript may teach us something about the historical and theological setting it comes from or was used in that would otherwise not be understood.

## The Work

At the level of the work, a material philological analysis focuses on two perspectives. On the one hand, a discussion of a given manuscript and its text should be situated within the broader transmission history of a work. Situating the manuscript into the long lines of the transmission of a work helps make sense of the variance that can be seen and paints a picture of the different points of comparison that may be analyzed. On the other hand, the work should be evaluated as it relates to the specific socio-cultural setting in which the particular manuscript takes part. Understanding the place of a certain manuscript as a glimpse of the shape of a work at a certain point in time at a specific place in the world is important both for the study of the manuscript and text in consideration but is also important for the (re-)evaluation of the work itself.

## Material Philological Analysis

The findings of the material and textual analyses may be used to discuss a number of features at the level of the manuscript, text, or work. In the following, I will present three examples of finds from material philological analyses that can shed light on different types of finds.<sup>27</sup> The first example is aimed at the manuscript level. By evaluating the different forms of manuscripts containing text from Jubilees had at Qumran, we can paint a different picture of the transmission of manuscripts of Jubilees that allows for a more nuanced understanding of the development of the work. The second example has to do with the text of Jubilees. Here, I will focus on what an analysis of the text of Jubilees 1 in 4Q216 from a material philological perspective might say about the possibility of redactional activity. In the third example, I will focus on Jubilees as a work, discussing the position of the different manuscripts labeled “Pseudo-Jubilees” from a material philological perspective.

### Example 1: Jubilees Manuscripts from Qumran

At the outset, it is important to emphasize that material philology assumes a theoretical possibility that fragments containing text known from a particular work do not come from a copy of the complete work. That is to say that when we evaluate fragmentary manuscripts, it is never assumed that we are dealing with a complete copy of a work. On the contrary, each manuscript should be evaluated individually based on the intersection of textual and material characteristics in order to make a judgment about the possible size and contents of the manuscript. This is particularly important when working with the extremely fragmented manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as the work of reconstruction in order to make sense of

---

<sup>27</sup> The first two examples are taken from recent published studies that show the growing usefulness of a material-philological orientation. The third example is novel in this context.

fragments is necessarily reliant on a subjective assumption of what should fill the gaps, knowledge that is based on the modern conception of the work. The point here is that an honest evaluation of the evidence may give us a different impression of the types and sizes of manuscripts and what they contained. Instead of assuming that there were 14 *copies* of Jubilees found at Qumran, we can say that remains of 14 manuscripts containing text from Jubilees are extant.<sup>28</sup> In addition to this, I consider the manuscripts that in DJD 13 were labeled as “Pseudo-Jubilees” as being so closely related to the Jubilees tradition that they should also be considered here.<sup>29</sup>

An analysis of the manuscripts containing text from Jubilees from Qumran points toward there being a number of different sizes and formats of manuscripts, many of which do not seem to be compatible with what would contain a complete copy of the work known from Ethiopic Jubilees.<sup>30</sup> There is limited evidence for complete copies of Jubilees in the Qumran material. There are very few manuscripts containing consecutive columns of text from Jubilees, and no manuscripts that retain large sections of undamaged text, so we are reliant on reconstructions in order to evaluate the length of all of the Qumran Jubilees manuscripts. However, many of the manuscripts only have one or two remaining fragments, making a reconstruction extremely hypothetical. In these cases, we can still make educated deductions about the type of scroll based on the estimated line length, the distance between lines, and style of writing.<sup>31</sup> If we assume that the vast majority of scrolls fall within the size restraints witnessed by extant complete scrolls, it is reasonable to compare the possible size of Jubilees scrolls with Isaiah scrolls from Qumran, as Ethiopic Jubilees is longer than Isaiah and we would expect a format of comparable or slightly larger size to the Isaiah scrolls.<sup>32</sup> In this connection, another factor that must be considered is whether Jubilees was bisected, as Eibert Tigchelaar has suggested the possibility that manuscripts only contained half of Jubilees with the division coming after Jub 23.<sup>33</sup> I will consider this a possibility in the following and count possible copies of one of the bisections in the same category as entire copies.

Of the seventeen manuscripts under consideration, there is only one that meets the criteria that would point to it being a large style manuscript, namely 4Q223-224 (4QpapJubilees<sup>h</sup>), which, according to the reconstruction in DJD 13, had 54 lines per column.<sup>34</sup> There are several other manuscripts that theoretically may have once contained large amounts

---

<sup>28</sup> For the traditional evaluation of the manuscripts see J. C. VANDERKAM, *Jubilees: A Commentary of the Book of Jubilees, Chapters 1-50* (Minneapolis, MN, 2018) 1:5-8. Note that VanderKam here consistently uses the phrase “copies of Jubilees” to refer to the manuscripts.

<sup>29</sup> This is discussed in detail below, in example 3.

<sup>30</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the following, see M. MONGER, “The Many Forms of Jubilees: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence from Qumran and the Lines of Transmission of the Parts and Whole of Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 30 (2018) 191-211.

<sup>31</sup> Scribal features such as letter size, line length and column size tend to correspond with scroll length, cf. E. TOV, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden, 2004) 74-79.

<sup>32</sup> As a rule, I am hesitant to reconstruct scrolls as being significantly longer than the longest preserved scrolls, i.e., 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (17 sheets totaling 7.34 meters) and 11Q19 (18 sheets totaling 8.146 meters).

<sup>33</sup> E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, “The Qumran *Jubilees* Manuscripts as evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book,” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 579-594.

<sup>34</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “223-224. 4QpapJubilees<sup>h</sup>,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 95-140.

of text, namely 1Q17, 1Q18,<sup>35</sup> 2Q19,<sup>36</sup> 3Q5,<sup>37</sup> and 4Q219,<sup>38</sup> but they are all so small that they cannot be confidently described as being the remains of a complete or bisected copy of Jubilees. Of these manuscripts, only 4Q219 contains more than two fragments. All of these manuscripts are written in neat scripts with regular line spacing and column sizes that are consistent with larger manuscripts. Nonetheless, the line spacing and size of the (reconstructed) columns and sheets would point toward at least the possibility that they were large manuscripts containing a bisection of Jubilees.<sup>39</sup>

The remaining manuscripts have properties that make it difficult to reconstruct them as having been large manuscripts and have been assigned here to the category of smaller manuscripts. These are 2Q20,<sup>40</sup> 4Q216, 4Q217, 4Q218, 4Q220, 4Q221, 4Q222,<sup>41</sup> and 11Q12.<sup>42</sup> As with the majority of the manuscripts in the category discussed above, many of these manuscripts are also very fragmentary, but scribal features point toward these manuscripts being smaller in scale than what would be expected of a complete copy of Jubilees.<sup>43</sup>

Several of the manuscripts, 2Q20, 4Q220, 4Q221, 4Q222, and 11Q12, are written in ways that rule out them being large manuscripts. The column sizes are too narrow and the number of lines per column too few to accommodate a large amount of text. As they are small manuscripts, they may have contained only small sections of Jubilees, collections of different sections from Jubilees, or even had parts of Jubilees together with texts from other works. In other words, it is difficult to determine with precision what the manuscripts may have contained, but some sort of smaller collection seems likely. In this group, we may also place the so-called Pseudo-Jubilees manuscripts, 4Q225-227.<sup>44</sup> These show material features that suggest that they had small, narrow columns not consistent with large manuscripts and should also be seen as containing some subset of material, not a copy of a work the size of Ethiopic Jubilees.

4Q216 is different from the other manuscripts – it was copied in two different hands, sown together between Jubilees 1 and 2, and can be reconstructed with a certain degree of

---

<sup>35</sup> 1Q17 and 1Q18 are discussed in J. T. MILIK, “17-18. Livre des Jubilés,” in D. BARTHELEMY – J. T. MILIK (ed.), *Qumran Cave I* (Oxford, 1955) 82-83.

<sup>36</sup> M. BAILLET, “19. Livre des Jubilés,” in M. BAILLET – J. T. MILIK – R. DE VAUX (ed.), *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumrân* (Oxford, 1962) 77-78.

<sup>37</sup> 3Q5 was originally labelled “Une prophétie apocryphe” by Baillet in M. BAILLET, “96. Une prophétie apocryphe,” in M. BAILLET – J. T. MILIK – R. DE VAUX (ed.), *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumrân* (Oxford, 1962) 96-97. Fragments 1 and 3 were later shown to contain text from *Jubilees*. Cf. R. DEICHGRÄBER, “Fragmente einer Jubiläen-Handschrift aus Höhle 3 von Qumran,” *Revue de Qumrân* 5 (1964-1966) 415-422; A. ROFÉ, “Fragments from an Additional Manuscript of the Book of Jubilees in Qumran Cave 3,” *Tarbiz* 34 (1965) 333-336 [Hebrew]; M. BAILLET, “Remarques sur le manuscrit du Livre des Jubilés de la grotte 3 de Qumran,” *Revue de Qumrân* 5 (1964-1966) 423-433.

<sup>38</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “218. 4QJubilees<sup>c</sup>,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 39-54.

<sup>39</sup> A further discussion of the details here can be found in M. MONGER, “The Many Forms of Jubilees: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence from Qumran and the Lines of Transmission of the Parts and Whole of Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 30 (2018) 191-201.

<sup>40</sup> M. BAILLET, “20. Livre des Jubilés,” in M. BAILLET – J. T. MILIK – R. DE VAUX (ed.), *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumrân* (Oxford, 1962) 78-79.

<sup>41</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “Jubilees,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 1-94.

<sup>42</sup> F. GARCIA MARTINEZ – E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR – A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, *Qumran Cave 11: II* (Oxford, 1998) 207-220.

<sup>43</sup> For a discussion of what these manuscripts may have been, see M. MONGER, “The Many Forms of Jubilees: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence from Qumran and the Lines of Transmission of the Parts and Whole of Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 30 (2018) 202-207.

<sup>44</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “Jubilees,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 141-176.

certainty. Lines and words are spaced evenly, but with a column size of only 17 lines, even half of Jubilees would require a manuscript of at least 9 meters, longer than even the longest scrolls found at Qumran. Further, a reconstruction based on corresponding damage patterns suggests that the manuscript only contained Jubilees 1-2.<sup>45</sup>

The final group of manuscripts contains fragments that may reflect a different type of scribal activity.<sup>46</sup> 4Q176,<sup>47</sup> 4Q217, and 4Q218<sup>48</sup> are all very fragmentary and written in scripts that may suggest that they were never part of a long coherent text. These texts come from key parts of Jubilees that have been viewed as possible places for editorial activity, namely Jubilees 1 and 2. These manuscripts may represent transitional activity between an earlier text type and the later text, as it is known from Ethiopic Jubilees.

This overview of the different types of manuscripts of Jubilees found at Qumran can serve us in the discussion of whether or not we can find evidence for literary growth. The most important point here is that the manuscript evidence points toward there not being a widespread stable transmission of large numbers of complete copies of Jubilees. This is significant as the literature suggesting that Jubilees was stable from the second century BCE and onward speaks of the manuscript evidence in a different way than is reflected in the analysis above. A material philological perspective on the fragments points toward the possibility that the manuscripts, in fact, do not show a stable textual base.

## Example 2: The text of Jubilees 1 at Qumran

Jubilees 1 has been widely discussed as a place of possible redaction or literary growth.<sup>49</sup> Two manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls contain text from Jub 1: 4Q216 fragments 1-12 i and 4Q217. 4Q217 contains text that is very similar to Jub 1:1-4, 29 and 4Q216 fragments 1-12 i contain text from Jub 1:1-2, 4-7 (column i) 1:7-15 (column ii) and 1:26-28 (column iv). As noted above, 4Q217 does not fit into the pattern of well-prepared manuscripts, which may indicate that it served some other purpose. What can be discerned from the manuscript points towards a text type that was very different from Jubilees 1, in which case we may have here evidence of the process of the development of Jubilees.<sup>50</sup> Further, the proposed column 3 of 4Q216 in DJD 13 does not contain any fragments, and the materiality of the scroll may be analyzed as being more likely to have never contained Jub 1:15b-25.<sup>51</sup> In other words, the text

---

<sup>45</sup> See a detailed discussion of the material features of this manuscript in M. MONGER, "4Q216 – A New Material Analysis," *Semitica* 60 (2018) 308-333.

<sup>46</sup> For a discussion of what these manuscripts may have been, see M. MONGER, "The Many Forms of Jubilees: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence from Qumran and the Lines of Transmission of the Parts and Whole of Jubilees," *Revue de Qumrân* 30 (2018) 207-210; E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, "The Qumran Jubilees Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book," *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 579-594.

<sup>47</sup> J. ALLEGRO, *Qumran Cave 4 I* (Oxford, 1968) 60-67. In this book, Allegro labelled the manuscript 4Q*Tanhûmim*, but Menahem Kister has shown that fragments 19-21 contain text from Jubilees, cf. M. KISTER, "Newly-Identified Fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub 23:21-23, 30-31," *Revue de Qumrân* 48 (1987) 529-536.

<sup>48</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, "216. 4QJubilees<sup>a</sup>," in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 23-34.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. M. TESTUZ, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Paris, 1960); G. L. DAVENPORT, *The Eschatology of the book of Jubilees* (Leiden, 1971); E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, "The Qumran Jubilees Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book," *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 579-594.

<sup>50</sup> E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, "The Qumran Jubilees Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book," *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 584-589.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. the discussion in M. MONGER, "4Q216 – A New Material Analysis," *Semitica* 60 (2018) 308-333.

of this manuscript represents a different text-type or stage in the development of Jub 1 than is found in Ethiopic Jubilees. There are several reasons why this might be the case. First of all, the lack of evidence of fragments is conspicuous as there are fragments from all adjoining spaces. Second, any efforts to reconstruct text to fill the missing gap that would arise would not fit the rest of the material reconstruction. Third, the material in Jub 1:15-25 is comprised of prophecies and intercessory prayer that can easily be interpreted as editorial editions. In fact, this is a large section of what Michel Testuz argued for as an editorial edition (1:7-25) based on stylistic and terminological grounds.<sup>52</sup> Given the fact that Jub 1:7-14 is present in 4Q216, Testuz' theory must be expanded to include a stage of development which is represented by 4Q216.

If we take the entire section of Jub 1:15b-25 to be an addition to the text of Jubilees 1, the most important ramification for the understanding of Jubilees as a whole has to do with the mention of Belial in Jub 1:20, which reads: "And do not let the spirit of Belial rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face."<sup>53</sup> In Jubilees, (the) Prince (of the) Mastema is the common demonic figure, not Belial.<sup>54</sup> If we can establish on material grounds that the section that mentions Belial here belongs to a later layer then, the use of *Belial* here can be assigned to a different source than the Mastema texts. As Belial is a prominent figure in other Qumran texts, it is not difficult to envision a Late Second Temple period context for the formulation of the passage here. Thus, by allowing the manuscript evidence to guide our understanding of development of the text, we are presented with a more elegant understanding of why both Mastema and Belial are mentioned in Ethiopic Jubilees: It reflects a more complex development of the work than previously understood.

This example has served to show that a better understanding of the editorial activity on the text of Jubilees is possible from a material philological approach. The combination of attention on the manuscript, on the text, and on literary theories helps enables a more fruitful discussion of the text than what would be possible on simply textual grounds.

### Example 3: Jubilees as a Work at Qumran

The final example here has to do with Jubilees as a work. Since the publication of the Qumran Cave 4 material, it has been commonplace to distinguish between Jubilees and Pseudo-Jubilees as being two different *works*. Looking back to the discussion of terminology above, a work is here defined as the *conception* of a composition as a coherent unit. In this case, simply naming some manuscripts *Jubilees* and others as something else conceptualizes the Jubilees as one thing and the others as another. The use of the label *Pseudo-Jubilees* has been widely discussed. Most scholars seem to agree that these manuscripts contain text that makes one think of Jubilees and are thus somehow related and want to include the name Jubilees in the titles of these manuscripts

---

<sup>52</sup> M. TESTUZ, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Paris, 1960) 39-42.

<sup>53</sup> M. TESTUZ, *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés* (Paris, 1960) 41, mentions this as one of the reasons for viewing Jub. 1:7-25 as a later addition to Jub. 1. See a further discussion of this in M. MONGER, "The Development of Jubilees 1 in the late Second Temple Period," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 27 (2017) 81-112.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. J. C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield, 2001) 127-129; D. DIMANT, "Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema," in A. ROITMAN *et al.* (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (Leiden, 2011) 235-256.

somehow. But what exactly is that relationship? Recent studies of the three manuscripts that received this label agree that they do not all represent the same work.<sup>55</sup> For instance, Michael Segal has argued that two of them, 4Q225 and 4Q226, should be considered later developments that are dependent on the form of Jubilees 17-18 that we know from Ethiopic Jubilees. Thus, he suggests relabeling them “4QReworked/Rewritten Jubilees.”<sup>56</sup> The third manuscript, 4Q227, according to Segal, more likely represents an earlier version of Jubilees 4, or even a reworking of Enochic material prior to its incorporation into Jubilees, and thus suggests labeling this manuscript “4QProto-Jubilees, or perhaps even 4QReworked Enoch.”<sup>57</sup>

Thus, the issue connected to nomenclature is indicative of a deeper problem: scholars have trouble knowing how to define the relationship between the texts of these three manuscripts and the text of Jubilees as we know it from Ethiopic. There are two challenges that underlie the labeling and definition of the manuscripts in relation to Jubilees that I want to address at the outset. First, Jubilees is itself a work that includes versions of many stories known from Genesis and Exodus but told in a different way or with a different focus. Thus, it is not clear how we can know if we are thinking about Jubilees when we read these “Pseudo” texts and not Genesis. Further, Jubilees relies on and/or influences a range of non-biblical works, raising the question of how we could know that we are not thinking about them or even some other unknown source. Second, and more importantly, the idea that a text “makes you think of Jubilees” even though it is not Jubilees requires a very precise understanding of what Jubilees was in the first centuries BCE and CE. Generally, the scholarly conception of Jubilees has been based on the text of Jubilees from Ethiopic manuscripts from the fourteenth century and onward, which are the only witnesses to what could be called a “complete text.” However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the 1400-1500 years between the Hebrew fragments of Jubilees found among the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ethiopic manuscripts should not be taken too lightly. Thus, when we talk about the text of Jubilees in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we should try to keep in mind what Hebrew Jubilees might look like.

Now, what exactly are “Hebrew Jubilees?” One of the fundamental questions that is raised when working with ancient manuscripts and texts is the question of boundaries. No two manuscripts are identical. Even when they contain the same work, their texts will be slightly different. These may be small details related to spelling and grammar or larger differences in content. As the differences between two manuscripts become more apparent, the question of where to draw the line between related texts and works arises. In the case of the initial publication of the three manuscripts under investigation here, it is clear that the editors drew a line between Jubilees on the one hand and Pseudo-Jubilees on the other. In the publication of the material, they had to make a choice of what to call the manuscripts, but in reality, boundaries are quite fuzzy. Asking when Jubilees ceases to be Jubilees and begins to be Pseudo-Jubilees is, in essence, the same as asking when Genesis ceases to be Genesis and begins to be Jubilees. As will be discussed below, 4Q225 is sometimes more Pseudo-Genesis than Pseudo-Jubilees. When the same story is behind each of the representations as we find them, we may wonder how to judge the surface appearances of the texts in relation to one another. Would we consider even radical cosmetic differences to be enough to warrant a new label?

---

<sup>55</sup> See, *inter alia* M. SEGAL, “Dynamics of Composition and Rewriting in Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 555-578; A. LIVNEH, *The Composition Pseudo-Jubilees from Qumran (4Q225; 4Q226; 4Q227): A New Edition, Introduction, and Commentary*, Ph.D. (University of Haifa, 2010) [Hebrew]; C. BERNER, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichts-konzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (Berlin, 2006) 371-378.

<sup>56</sup> M. SEGAL, “Dynamics of Composition and Rewriting in Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 574.

<sup>57</sup> M. SEGAL, “Dynamics of Composition and Rewriting in Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 566. Segal’s labels are still associative in nature, but they represent one way in which scholars are trying to make sense of the relationship between “Pseudo-Jubilees” and Ethiopic Jubilees.



The question of boundaries is further complicated when considering that those who interacted with texts in Antiquity, scribes, readers, listeners, did not necessarily have the same definition of where the boundaries between different works were drawn as a modern scholar. In fact, recent work by scholars such as Brennan Breed, Eva Mroczek and others, show us that our conception of ancient works does not necessarily correspond with the way they were treated in Antiquity and that the search for original versions or contexts might be misguided.<sup>58</sup> Further, a material philological perspective assumes that manuscripts of any given work from Antiquity will show variance and that variance should be seen as evidence of interaction with the text, not as a corruption of it. Thus, our definition of a work such as Jubilees should not be based solely on an idea of textual stability (if such a thing could ever exist) seen through the lens of later witnesses, but rather should be based on an idea of textual plurality. For that reason, I think it is most fruitful to use linguistic terminology – Hebrew Jubilees, Ethiopic or Ge’ez Jubilees, Greek Jubilees, etc., instead of associative terminology like “Pseudo.”

## The Manuscripts

The three manuscripts in question should serve as the foundation for our further discussion of this topic, and I want to present them here briefly with a special focus on features of the manuscripts that have a bearing on the current discussion about the relationship of the manuscripts to Hebrew Jubilees.

The first manuscript is 4Q225, which can be dated paleographically to the early Herodian period, or between 30 BCE and 20 CE.<sup>59</sup> This manuscript is comprised of four fragments, two of which (frg. 2a and 2b) are consecutive columns of text, as can be seen on the right edge of fragment 2b. There are very likely margins both at the top and bottom of fragment 2a, so we can take this to mean that we have only 14 lines of text in each column, and the columns are very narrow, with only 35-40 letters per line.<sup>60</sup> The margins are also very narrow, as can be seen on fragment 2b. The writing is very compact, with letters frequently coming into contact with the lines above or below. These features point to the likelihood of these fragments being part of what was once a very small manuscript, although we are not able to say much about the original size of the manuscript. As noted above, the size of the column stands in a proportional relationship to the length of the scroll. If 4Q225 is “Pseudo-Jubilees,” it is certainly not a pseudo-copy of a text the length of Ethiopic Jubilees.

The second manuscript, 4Q226, can be dated to the last half of the first century BCE, so slightly earlier than 4Q225, and is comprised of fourteen fragments. 4Q226 is more fragmentary than 4Q225, but parallels facilitate a reconstruction of the column width to an average of 25 letters per line for parts of fragment 7, making the columns of this manuscript even narrower than those of 4Q225. We have no extant complete columns, so column height is difficult to discern. There is evidence of stitching at the right-hand side of both fragments 7 and 8, which may indicate that they belong to the same column of text, in which case the columns would have been at least 12 lines in height. The text is laid out very neatly on the fragments, and at the

---

<sup>58</sup> B. W. BREED, *Nomadic Text: A Theory of Biblical Reception History* (Bloomington, IN, 2014); E. MROCZEK, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford, 2016).

<sup>59</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “225. 4QpseudoJubilees<sup>a</sup>,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 141.

<sup>60</sup> Based on the reconstruction of the text in J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “225. 4QpseudoJubilees<sup>a</sup>,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 145-150. The text of fragment 2a can be shown to continue onto 2b, making the reconstruction very probable.

right edge of fragments 7 and 8, we can see scribal markings, dots used to mark the position of the lines, likely to ensure consistency at the transition from one page to another. As with 4Q225, the size and layout of the manuscript point toward this not being a copy of a work of the size of Ethiopic Jubilees, but something else. Most of the fragments do not contain text that is easily identifiable from known works. Thus, the ordering of the fragments is not secure. There are words or phrases that seem to fit into Jub 48-49, though it is not possible to place the fragments in relation to Ethiopic Jubilees. Fragment 7, however, overlaps with 4Q225, making it possible to view these two manuscripts as being related to the same composition.<sup>61</sup>

4Q227 is different from 4Q225-226 in several ways. First, there is no overlap or common story, so it is not clear that they are even part of the same work. Second, the topic of 4Q227 has nothing to do with Mastema. It does, however, have to do with another enigmatic figure that plays a role in many texts from Antiquity and at Qumran: Enoch. The manuscript is comprised of only two fragments that also can be dated to the early Herodian period, between 30 BCE and 20 CE. It is so fragmentary that we cannot even speculate as to the original size. The lines are at least 35 letters wide, and on fragment 2, we see six lines of text plus a wide upper margin. We can also note guide dots marking the tops of each line of text and stitching on the edge of the fragment, which indicates that the scroll continued to a new sheet following this column. Michael Segal argues that 4Q227 reflects an earlier literary stage than what we see in Ethiopic Jubilees,<sup>62</sup> against most previous scholars who have read 4Q227 as being a rewriting and reordering of Jubilees 4.<sup>63</sup> Devorah Dimant, on the other hand, suggests that “this fragment... should perhaps be identified as belonging to Jub. 4, but in a slightly different form.”<sup>64</sup> Given the fact that we do not have any other witnesses to Hebrew Jubilees for this passage, and the disagreement about which is earlier or later, it seems to me that this text from 4Q227 is best described by paraphrasing Dimant: “it likely belongs to *Hebrew* Jubilees, with a slightly different text than *Ethiopic* Jubilees.” Thus, allowing for a wider definition of Hebrew Jubilees opens for a more nuanced picture of the work in its different forms.

## Pseudo What?

One example of the relationship between “Pseudo-Jubilees,” Jubilees, Genesis should suffice here. 4Q225 Fragment 2 begins with a text that is close to Eth.Jub. 14 and Gen. 15, then quickly moves to a text much closer to Eth.Jub. 18 and Gen. 22, where the theme of the text is the Aqedah, the story of how God asks Abraham to take his son Isaac and sacrifice him. This is an important text in this current discussion, as it is the main reason why scholars immediately think of Jubilees instead of Genesis when reading 4Q225. Thus, I want to discuss a few important sections of the text of 4Q225 in relation to Ethiopic Jubilees and Genesis.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> J. VANDERKAM – J. T. MILIK, “226. 4QpseudoJubilees<sup>b</sup>,” in H. ATTRIDGE *et al.* (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4 VIII* (Oxford, 1994) 157.

<sup>62</sup> M. SEGAL, “Dynamics of Composition and Rewriting in Jubilees,” *Revue de Qumrân* 26 (2014) 561-566.

<sup>63</sup> J. T. MILIK, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976) 14; C. BERNER, *Jahre, Jahrwochen und Jubiläen: Heptadische Geschichts-konzeptionen im Antiken Judentum* (Berlin, 2006) 365-366; D. HAMIDOVIĆ, *Les traditions du jubilé à Qumrân* (Paris, 2007) 269-274; A. LIVNEH, *The Composition Pseudo-Jubilees from Qumran (4Q225; 4Q226; 4Q227): A New Edition, Introduction, and Commentary*, Ph.D. (University of Haifa, 2010) 201-202 [Hebrew].

<sup>64</sup> D. DIMANT, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *Vetus Testamentum* 33 (1983) 22, n. 22.

<sup>65</sup> A thorough comparison of Ethiopic Jubilees and Genesis can be found in J. T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8* (Leiden, 2012) 209-226.

The introduction to the Aqedah in 4Q225 differs from that of Genesis and Ethiopic Jubilees. In 4Q225, the story is immediately preceded by the promise to Abraham that he will have as many descendants as there are stars in the sky. This promise to Abraham takes place several chapters prior to the Aqedah in both Ethiopic Jubilees and Genesis. Thus, the framework of the texts is clearly different in each case. It is also interesting to note that 4Q225 is here closer to Genesis 15 than to Ethiopic Jubilees 14.

4Q225	Ethiopic Jubilees <sup>66</sup>	Genesis <sup>67</sup>
Frag. 2 Col. I <sup>3</sup> And Abraham said to God: “My Lord, I go on being childless, and Eliezer <sup>4</sup> is the son of my household, and he will be my heir.”	Chapter 14 <sup>2</sup> And he said, “O Lord, O Lord what will you give me? I am going on without children. And the son of Maseq, the son of my handmaid, is Eliezer of Damascus. He will be my heir, but you have not given seed to me.”	Chapter 15 <sup>2</sup> But Abram said, “O Lord God, what will you give me, for I continue childless, and the heir of my house is Eliezer of Damascus?”
<sup>5</sup> The Lord said to Abraham: “Lift up your eyes and observe the stars, and see <sup>6</sup> and count the sand which is on the seashore and the dust of the earth, for if <sup>7</sup> these can be numbered, and also if not, your seed will be like this.” And Abraham believed <sup>8</sup> in God, and righteousness was accounted to him.	<sup>4</sup> And he took him outside and he said to him, “Look into heaven and count the stars if you are able to count” <sup>5</sup> And he looked at the heaven and he saw the stars. And he said to him, “Thus shall your seed be.” <sup>6</sup> And he believed the Lord and it was counted for him as righteousness.	<sup>5</sup> He brought him outside and said, “Look toward heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them.” Then he said to him, “So shall your descendants be.” <sup>6</sup> And he believed the Lord; and the Lord reckoned it to him as righteousness.

Where 4Q225 2 i 3-4 are very close to Gen. 15:2, Eth.Jub. 14:2-3 has additional information not present in either of the other texts. The same can be said of 4Q225 2 i 5-8, which, though likely conflating the Gen. 15 promise to Abraham with the analogous restatement of the promise from Gen. 22:17, does not have the additional phrase “and he looked at the heavens and saw the stars” found in Eth.Jub. 14:5 but lacking in Gen. 15. There is also a fascinating phrase in 4Q225 that is lacking in Ethiopic Jubilees that seems to try to fix a potential problem in the text of Gen. 22:5. In Genesis, God says to Abraham, “Look toward heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them.” The problem is that it is counting the stars is probably impossible – so 4Q225 reads “for if these can be numbered – and also if not,” safeguarding against Abraham losing his blessing if he should happen to miscount. The main reason for the association with Ethiopic Jubilees is apparent from line 9 and onward:

4Q225	(Ethiopic) Jubilees	Genesis
Frag. 2 Col. I <sup>9</sup> ...Then Prince Mastema came to God and he accused Abraham regarding Isaac. And God	Chapter 17 <sup>16</sup> And Prince Mastema came and he said before God, “Behold,	Chapter 22 <sup>1</sup> After these things God tested Abraham. He said to him, “Abraham!” And he

<sup>66</sup> All citations here are according to O. S. WINTERMUTE, “Jubilees,” in J. H. CHARLESWORTH (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (New Haven, CT, 1985) 2:35-142.

<sup>67</sup> All biblical citations are from the New Revised Standard Version.

<p>said to Abraham: “Take your son, Isaac, your only one whom <sup>12</sup>you love and offer him to me as a whole burnt-offering on one of the high mountains <sup>13</sup>which I will designate for you.”</p>	<p>Abraham loves Isaac, his son. And he is more pleased with him than everything. Tell him to offer him (as) a burnt offering upon the altar. And you will see whether he will do this thing. And you will know whether he is faithful in everything in which you test him.”</p> <p>...</p> <p>18 <sup>1</sup> And the Lord said to him, “Abraham, Abraham.” And he said, “Here I am.” <sup>2</sup> And he said, “Take your beloved son, whom you love, Isaac, and go into the high land and offer him up on one of the mountains that I will make known to you.”</p>	<p>said, “Here I am.” <sup>2</sup> He said, “Take your son, your only son Isaac, whom you love, and go to the land of Moriah, and offer him there as a burnt offering on one of the mountains that I shall show you.”</p>
--	---	---

Here, Prince Mastema has an active role in the Aqedah. The role he plays is parallel to, and very likely related to, the role of Satan at the beginning of the book of Job. Here, Mastema approaches God to accuse Abraham or to get God to put Abraham to the test. Ethiopic Jubilees and 4Q225 are not unique in reading the Aqedah in this fashion, but 4Q225 is the first text to support the reading in Ethiopic Jubilees. A variety of works from Antiquity see the provocation for the Aqedah as a result of angelic intervention, mentioning Satan, ministering angels, and jealous angels in this role, but it is only here that we find the name Mastema in this connection.<sup>68</sup>

As we can see, 4Q225 is more concise than Ethiopic Jubilees here. This is in line with the other passages in 4Q225 *vis à vis* Ethiopic Jubilees, where 4Q225 seems much more condensed. In Ethiopic Jubilees, we can read the words of Mastema where 4Q225 only says that Abraham was accused regarding Isaac. As this is not a theme in Genesis 22, it is possible that 4Q225 is aware of the text as we find it in Ethiopic Jubilees but summarizes by simply saying “he was accused.” Or the opposite, that the “accusation” in 4Q225 was elaborated in other versions of the story, finally making its way into Ethiopic Jubilees. We should also note that this is the same process that seems to have taken place in relation to the text of Genesis. Genesis 22 opens with האלה הדברים “After these things,” which may have been construed as “after these words.” Thus the “words” of Mastema could here be an attempt to formulate what “these words” are in Genesis 22.

It is important to note here that this is the only manuscript from Qumran where the Aqedah is recorded in what we could call the Jubilees tradition. That is, the Aqedah is not recorded in any other Hebrew Jubilees manuscripts. So, we do not know the shape of Hebrew Jubilees when it comes to the Aqedah. While several scholars have argued that the form of the Aqedah in 4Q225-226 should be seen as a reworking or rewriting of Jubilees, that position relies upon an understanding that there was a single finished form of the Aqedah common to

---

<sup>68</sup> Satan is mentioned in b. San. 89b; the ministering angels are mentioned in Gen. Rab. 55:4; jealous angels are mentioned in Pseudo-Philo, LAB 32:1-2 and Midrash *Bereshit Rabbati* 85-86. For further discussion and references, both to these sources and other angelic themes in the Aqedah, see M. J. BERNSTEIN, “Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000) 263-291.

manuscripts of or derived from Hebrew Jubilees. As such, it is better to consider 4Q225 a representation of the “Jubilees” Aqedah in Hebrew, and thus I would suggest talking about the texts of these manuscripts as being part of the evolving Hebrew Jubilees text.

This discussion of the place of 4Q225-227 in the framework of the developing text of Jubilees should be seen in the light of the discussion of the manuscripts above. If, in fact, the other fragmentary texts in 4Q225 and 4Q226 also preserve text related to Jubilees and were perhaps once part of a collection of Mastema related material, this would fit in with what I see to be the wider means of transmitting Hebrew Jubilees in Antiquity – not as primarily through complete copies of what we know as Ethiopic Jubilees, but in a variety of different types of manuscripts and collections. Further, I want to return to the question of boundaries and look at what this pluriformity of texts and manuscripts in the Hebrew Jubilees tradition might have to say about a text which is closely related to Jubilees, namely Genesis. Manuscripts containing text from one or more of the books of the Pentateuch are quite common at Qumran, and Genesis is overrepresented, and this is not just because it is the first book of the Pentateuch. A variety of manuscripts, not only the ones containing text from Hebrew Jubilees, but also others with names such as “Commentary on Genesis,” “Genesis Apocryphon,” and “Reworked Pentateuch.”<sup>69</sup> In many ways, these provide an analogous situation to that of Jubilees. On the one hand, manuscripts labeled as Genesis show a variety of text types, containing readings that are close enough to either the Masoretic text or one of the ancient translations that scholars accept them as Genesis. On the other hand, other manuscripts are labeled as something else because the texts stray too far from Genesis and thus are pseudo. Some suggest that Reworked Pentateuch should be understood as Pentateuch, and, even though I just concluded that it is just as valid to consider manuscripts previously labeled Pseudo-Jubilees as Hebrew Jubilees, the same arguments could, in theory, be used to argue that 4Q225-227 could be considered Genesis.<sup>70</sup>

Thus, we return to where we started, to the problem of boundaries. From my perspective, every manuscript is unique and should be studied and regarded for the specific material features and text that it contains. At the same time, we must allow manuscripts with even radically different text types of similar narratives to be studied in their own right – for each manuscript, as well as the sum of the manuscripts, can give us a glimpse into times, places, and cultures where these texts were copied and read. Material philology provides a lens to do so by highlighting the conceptual limitation of modern literary boundaries so that we can see a fuzzier but more adequate picture of how ancient works circulated and underwent widespread literary developments.

## Conclusion

These examples have been intended to show that the combination of material analysis and textual study can lead to a more nuanced discussion of ancient texts and manuscripts, and in this case, help us argue for possible redactional work within a known work. The material philological approach gives us the tools and perspectives to focus on different levels of the manuscript-text-work composite and look for different results. We have seen three different

---

<sup>69</sup> Cf. S. W. CRAWFORD, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2008); Molly M. Zahn, *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission* (Cambridge, 2020).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. M. SEGAL, “Reconsidering the Relationship(s) between 4Q365, 4Q365A, and the Temple Scroll,” *Revue de Qumrân* 30 (2018) 213-234.

ways this might take place, each carrying implications not only for the manuscript(s) in question but for our understanding of the possibility and actuality of seeing traces of editorial work on Jubilees during the Second Temple Period. Thus, we have seen that the application of specific methods within the theoretical framework of material philology can give fruitful results when working with ancient manuscripts and their texts.

